

### JPACTe Rubric (Research and Theory)

Author number:			Date reviewed:	
CRITERIA	Not appropriate for Journal	Major Revisions	Minor Revisions	Publishable
<b>CONTENT</b>	<p>The article does not exemplify the spirit of constructivism from the perspective of the reviewers.</p> <p>The content is not well suited to the readership</p>	<p>The article touches upon aspects of constructivism from the perspective of the reviewers, but is in need of philosophical revision.</p>	<p>The article touches upon aspects of constructivism from the perspective of the reviewers, but is in need of clarification of some of the ideas presented.</p>	<p>The article aligns well with constructivism from the perspective of the reviewers.</p>
<b>DEVELOPMENT</b>	<p>The focus is not clearly defined or developed.</p> <p>The manner in which ideas have been presented is not well suited for the readership.</p>	<p>Ideas are loosely presented. The focus, although presented, is not well developed.</p>	<p>The article is detailed and provides in-depth coverage of the content. Only minor revision to presentation of material is necessary.</p>	<p>The response is thoroughly developed and insightful providing convincing details, examples, references and supportive statements as needed.</p>
<b>STYLE</b>	<p>The writing is awkward and lacks a clear sense of direction. Ideas and details seem strung together in a loose or random fashion.</p> <p>There is little internal structure. There is no real lead or conclusion. Sequencing needs work.</p>	<p>The organizational structure is adequate but the response is periodically confusing. There is a recognizable introduction and conclusion; however, sequencing is weak in transition and lacks a logical pattern.</p>	<p>The organizational structure is strong enough to move the reader through the response without undue confusion.</p> <p>There is a recognizable introduction and conclusion. Sequencing shows a logical pattern and transitions work well.</p> <p>Only minor revisions to style are required.</p>	<p>The organization enhances and showcases the central ideas in the response. The order, structure, and presentation of information are compelling. The structure matches the purpose and audience. The introduction draws the reader in and the conclusion leaves the reader with a sense of closure.</p>
<b>FORMAT</b>	<p>Presentation of paper is not in accordance with APA style and/or the required format provided.</p>	<p>Presentation of paper is in accordance with APA style and/or the required format provided; however, there are frequent errors in form.</p>	<p>Presentation of paper is in accordance with APA style and/or the required format provided. There are minor errors in form.</p>	<p>Presentation of paper is in accordance with APA style and/or the required format provided. There are no errors in form.</p>
<b>MECHANICS</b>	<p>Errors in spelling, punctuation, capitalization, usage, grammar, and/or paragraphing repeatedly distract the reader and make the text difficult to follow.</p>	<p>The response shows reasonable control over a range of standard writing conventions. Conventions are typically handled well and enhance readability; at times errors are distracting.</p>	<p>The response demonstrates an adequate grasp of standard writing conventions and utilizes these conventions to enhance readability. Errors are few and do not unduly detract from the response.</p>	<p>The response demonstrates a strong grasp of standard writing conventions to enhance readability. There are no spelling errors, and other mechanical errors are minimal.</p>