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**Peer Review Rubric**

Manuscript Number/Title:

**The *TLCSD* Editorial Board encourages peer reviewers to hold high standards, be constructively critical, and practice a sense of mentorship in the writing of their reviews.** We appreciate your assistance in reviewing this manuscript!

**Please make your comments in a different color font so that authors can easily find your suggestions and feedback.**

Summary comments (detailed comments should be provided below in individual content sections):

Line edit suggestions (e.g., for punctuality, grammaticality, APA format):

Please complete items 1-3 for ALL manuscripts.

1. **Well-Defined** **Purpose**:

* The manuscript has a central question or focus that the entirety of the paper is organized around.
* The progression of ideas presented is cohesive and logical.
* Appropriate background information is included to provide a rich context for the work described.
* The manuscript has content appropriate for TLCSD.

 \_\_\_\_ strongly agree \_\_\_\_\_ agree \_\_\_\_ not sure \_\_\_\_ needs improvement

 **Reviewer Comments & Suggestions for Improvement:**

2. **Grounded in Context**:

* The manuscript clearly describes the location and dynamics connected to the SoTL work (e.g., classroom, disciplinary, institutional, cultural contexts).
* There is an evident tie between the context of the SoTL work and the contents of the manuscript.

 \_\_\_\_ strongly agree \_\_\_\_\_ agree \_\_\_\_ not sure \_\_\_\_ needs improvement

 **Reviewer Comments & Suggestions for Improvement:**

3. **Connections to Evidence**:

* A clearly articulated review of relevant literature grounds the manuscript's topic(s)/purpose(s) and frames the work described in the manuscript.
* Literature reviewed is current and represents a sufficient overview of relevant professional literature.

 \_\_\_\_ strongly agree \_\_\_\_\_ agree \_\_\_\_ not sure \_\_\_\_ needs improvement

**Reviewer Comments & Suggestions for Improvement:**

Please complete items 4-6 for manuscripts that collect and analyze research data (e.g., qualitative and/or quantitative data are reported); otherwise please go to question #7. Typically, reflections and scholarly teaching manuscripts do not have data.

4. **Methodologically Sound**:

* The participants who are a part of this study are described thoroughly.
* It is clear that this study is ethically sound and that (where appropriate) institutional ethics approval was obtained by contributors.
* Manuscript features an explicit, intentional, and rigorous application of research tools appropriate to the question, context, and/or discipline.

 \_\_\_\_ strongly agree \_\_\_\_\_ agree \_\_\_\_ not sure \_\_\_\_ needs improvement

**Reviewer Comments & Suggestions for Improvement:**

5. **Reporting of Results**:

* Data are reported accurately and in a manner that readers can easily understand.
* Procedures/processes for data analysis are clearly described.
* Interpretation of data is accurate and logical.
* Limitations of study design are presented.

 \_\_\_\_ strongly agree \_\_\_\_\_ agree \_\_\_\_ not sure \_\_\_\_ needs improvement

**Reviewer Comments & Suggestions for Improvement:**

6.**Discussion/Contribution**:

* Others will likely find this work important and/or applicable to their teaching/learning contexts.
* Manuscript presents implications for practice for themselves and others.

 \_\_\_\_ strongly agree \_\_\_\_\_ agree \_\_\_\_ not sure \_\_\_\_ needs improvement

**Reviewer Comments & Suggestions for Improvement:**

Please complete items 7-8 for manuscripts describing the results of a reflective SoTL project (e.g., data are not reported, rather manuscript focuses on reflections of own/others’ teaching, connections to current issues/topics in the field, or some other theoretical frame).

7. **Content/Structure**

* + The scheme/approach to the process of reflection is sufficiently explained.
	+ Key points within the reflective paper are supported through sufficient examples and/or contextualization.
	+ Alternatives to the contributors’ own reflections are presented.
	+ Any further questions raised by the reflection are presented and/or addressed.

 \_\_\_\_ strongly agree \_\_\_\_\_ agree \_\_\_\_ not sure \_\_\_\_ needs improvement

**Reviewer Comments & Suggestions for Improvement:**

8. **Discussion/Contribution**:

* Others will likely find this work important and/or applicable to their teaching/learning contexts.
* Manuscript presents implications for practice for themselves and others.

 \_\_\_\_ strongly agree \_\_\_\_\_ agree \_\_\_\_ not sure \_\_\_\_ needs improvement

**Reviewer Comments & Suggestions for Improvement:**