

Instructions for Faculty Reviewers

- 1) Review the “Purpose of a prelim exam” in the *Instructions to Graduate Students*.
- 2) Read the prelim and make comments as needed in the prelim document.
- 3) Rate each item in the rating form by indicating whether the prelim **does** or **does not yet** meet the threshold based on the definition listed for each specific item.
- 4) For any item(s) in which the threshold is not yet met, specific comments *must* be included for that item to offer clear guidance about how to reach the threshold. Comments may also be included for any items in which the threshold is met.
- 5) Include narrative comments in the space provided on the rating form summarizing your overall impression of the prelim.
- 6) Indicate the overall rating for the relevant version of the prelim. The following process and delineation of submissions (i.e., initial vs. official) is aligned with the Graduate School’s policies regarding prelim submissions and was designed to support students’ success in accomplishing this important milestone.

Initial Submission

- **On track- Revise as needed**

See ratings and comments to identify any areas for growth for the official submission

Official Submission #1

- **Pass**

Threshold met for all items

- **Revise & Resubmit** (Attempt failed)

Threshold not yet met for at least one item

Official Submission #2

- **Pass**

Threshold met for all items

- **Fail**

Threshold not met for at least one item

- 7) Sign the rubric form.
- 8) Email the following two items to the DCT and Graduate Program Assistant: the completed and signed rubric form and the prelim document with your comments.

Student:

Reviewer:

Submission:

Date:

1) **Focus/Purpose/Topic:** Identify and summarize the significant theme/problem/question/topic to be addressed in the paper

Threshold not yet met

Focus/purpose/topic is unclear, unidentified, or inaccurately represented; Presents a superficial view

Threshold met

Clearly and accurately states and summarizes the focus/purpose/topic of the paper

Comments:

2) **Contribution to the Literature:** Articulate how the analysis presented in this paper contributes to the literature

Threshold not yet met

Minimal/superficial or no discussion of how this review makes a contribution to the literature

Threshold met

Clear communication of how paper could have the potential to move the field forward and/or make novel, innovative contributions that would positively impacting the field and/or future research

Comments:

3) **Critical Methods Evaluation:** Critically evaluate the methods of the studies that are cited, including an explanation of advantages/disadvantages of different methods as well as articulation of implications (e.g., what we can or cannot know based on methods used)

Threshold not yet met

Limitations/advantages of the methods used in reviewed studies are minimally or vaguely/superficially discussed

Threshold met

Meaningful limitations/advantages of the methods in reviewed studies are discussed in clear, synthesized ways integrated throughout the paper and include explanation of the implications of the limitations

Comments:

4) **Synthesis and Integration:** Integrate the literature within and across sections to communicate the key points of the paper

Threshold not yet met

Minimal integration across studies/findings; Simply “lists” the results of studies with insufficient connection/integration of the findings and/or insufficient clarity with regard to agreement or lack thereof across the relevant literature; Includes irrelevant details of studies covered

Threshold met

Comprehensively synthesizes the literature throughout the paper; Identifies patterns and inconsistencies across findings; Communicates only key information from studies

Comments:

5) **Breadth:** Comprehensively review theoretical and empirical papers in the field

Threshold not yet met

Insufficient coverage of topic; Several key theories or seminal studies/papers are not referenced in the paper

Threshold met

There is sufficient breadth and coverage of the topic; Major theories and seminal studies/papers are discussed

Comments:

6) **Empirical Evidence:** Provide supporting data or evidence (explanations or citations) to support arguments throughout the paper

Threshold not yet met

Minimal or unsubstantial discussion and critique of evidence

Threshold met

Substantiates most arguments; Critiques of evidence, contextual issues, or assumptions are supported with citations, logic, theory, and/or reported data

Comments:

7) **Diversity, Equity and Inclusion:** Incorporate implications of findings for diverse/marginalized groups and/or discuss the role that power/privilege may play in your analysis

Threshold not yet met

Paper incorporates minimal and/or superficial analysis of culture and/or oppression, and/or includes language that is harmful to people from marginalized groups

Threshold met

The paper references or analyzes the role of culture, diversity and/or power in the topic, discusses meaningful implications for diverse groups, and/or conveys multi-level understanding of DEI-related issues

Comments:

8) **Future Directions:** Include ideas for future directions that are linked to the content of the paper/state of the literature

Threshold not yet met

Paper includes minimal and/or vague or no future directions

Threshold met

Paper offers clear future directions that follow clearly from the content of the paper/state of the literature and indicate how these future directions would advance the field

Comments:

9) **Writing Style:** Writing is clear and concise with good logical flow of information. Sections and transitional words and phrases are used throughout the paper as “road signs” to the reader.

Threshold not yet met

Many words express few ideas; Word choice compromises clarity; Tone may be colloquial or conversational; Paragraphs may drift; May lack direction or may lack topic or concluding sentences; Sections and transitions are used incorrectly or inconsistently

Threshold met

Words and phrases are generally well-chosen and clear; Paragraphs are generally well-constructed (e.g., topic, supporting, and concluding sentences are used) with good transitions between ideas and sections throughout the paper.

Comments:

10) **Writing Accuracy:** Writing includes good diction, spelling, and grammar; Correct use of APA style throughout the paper and reference list.

Threshold not yet met

*Many spelling and/or grammatical errors;
APA style is not followed with many errors*

Threshold met

Correct spelling and grammar; APA style is generally followed with minimal errors

Comments:

OVERALL RATING

Initial Submission:

On track- Revise as needed
See ratings and comments to identify any areas for growth for the official submission

Submission #1:

Submission #2:

Reviewer Signature

Date

Overall Comments: