

## **Professional File Review Rubric**

Articles published in biannual *AIR Professional File* volumes are journal-length publications grounded in relevant literature that synthesize current issues, present new processes or models, or share practical applications related to institutional research. They differ from articles published in traditional academic journals in that they address fundamental aspects of institutional research work and are less focused on theory and theoretical perspectives. If you have any questions or if a conflict of interest arises, please contact Sharron Ronco (Coordinating Editor) and Stephan Cooley (AIR) at scooley@airweb.org.

**Reviewer Name:**

Manuscript No.:

Title:

Date Sent:

**Review Due:**

Criteria	Score (1-low to 5-high or n/a)	Comments
<b>Abstract</b>		
The abstract tells the reader what the manuscript is about and highlights findings.		
<b>Framing</b>		
The need for the manuscript is established.		
The value added by the manuscript is identified.		
Objectives [or research questions] are clearly articulated.		
<b>Analytic Procedure</b>		
Approach [or methodology] is appropriate.		
Information [or data] collection is adequately described.		
Information [or data] sources are clearly identified.		
<b>Reporting</b>		
Findings are adequately and accurately described.		
Tables and figures effectively supplement the text.		
Conclusions highlight important contributions of the study.		
Limitations are identified.		
<b>Structure</b>		
The manuscript has a logical flow.		
The manuscript is well-written.		
Use of references is appropriate to the topic.		

**COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR(S)**

What are the strengths of the article?

In what ways could the author improve the manuscript?

Other comments:

**COMMENTS FOR THE EDITOR**

Why would this article be of interest to readers?

Confidential thoughts for the editor:

Recommendation: