

Journal of Contemporary Studies: Peer Review Rubric

Article Title:

JCAS expects peer reviewers to give substantive, narrative feedback for each of the following aspects of a submission.

Criteria ¹	Description	Quality (Excellent, Very Good, Adequate, Inadequate, or Poor)	Feedback/Commentary
Statement of Problem or Purpose	Articulation of the problem, issues, or gap(s) in knowledge that the article addresses.		
Relevance of the Topic	Relevance of the research topic to the mission of the journal, which is "to further awareness of issues and developments in the work of professional archivists, curators, librarians and historians, and to serve as a locus for graduate students and professionals in library science, archival science, and public history to contribute original works of research and inquiry for peer-review and publication." How well does the article relate to this mission?		
Contribution to the Field	Contributes new knowledge and/or fills gaps in the scholarship of the library science, archival science, and/or public history fields.		

¹ Criteria and definitions built upon these sources: http://files.archivists.org/periodicals/Peer_Review_Form.pdf
<http://eiratansey.com/2019/08/01/peer-review-for-archivists-or-wtf-is-going-on-with-this-saa-pre-print/>

Organization	Structure of the article. How clearly is the information organized? How logically are the main points and supporting ideas presented?		
Drawing and Building Upon Relevant Sources	Demonstrates knowledge of relevant scholarship in the library science, archival science, and/or public history fields, situating their research and argument in the context of other work. Does the author provide a balanced look at the major works in the field? Does the article address the strengths, weaknesses, and gaps in the literature?		
Methodology	Is the research methodology used for this article clearly articulated and consistently used? Is the method chosen appropriate for the subject and evidence used?		
Discussion	Does this article clearly and thoroughly develop major points, grounded analysis, and arguments in the provided evidence?		
Conclusion	Does the article include a clear and compelling conclusion that is grounded in the evidence presented in the discussion?		
Mechanics	Was the article clearly written? Did you have concerns about usage/spelling/grammar/typos or overall coherence? Are there any recommendations you would make regarding the organization of the article for better comprehension?		

Citational Justice ²	Has the author drawn on relevant research and critical analysis available from scholars and activists from under-represented communities? Do they consider the impact of their research or scholarship on vulnerable/marginalized people and communities?		
Additional Comments for the Author(s)			
Recommended Resources for the Author(s)			

² On “citational justice” or the “politics of citation”: <https://areomagazine.com/2019/12/19/citational-justice-and-the-growth-of-knowledge/>
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0966369X.2017.1339022?journalCode=cgpc20>
<https://www.genderavenger.com/blog/politics-of-citation>