**SAA Publications Program ‒ Rubric for Peer-Reviewed Case Studies**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Case Study Title: | Case Study Author: |
| Responsible Group/Series Editor: / | Reviewer: |

*Instructions for the Peer Reviewer:* Referring to the description/template for the case study series to which this pieces was submitted, please highlight or shade the box that best matches your judgment. Neither your ratings nor your identity will be shared directly with the author, but comments may be shared, as noted below. When you have completed your review, please return the form to Series Editor.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Excellent** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Poor** | **Comments (may be shared with author)** |
| Relevance of the Topic | Highly relevant to the mission and purpose of the case study series to which it was submitted | Somewhat relevant to the mission and purpose of the case study series to which it was submitted | Marginally relevant to the mission and purpose of the case study series to which it was submitted | Not relevant to the mission and purpose of the of the case study series to which it was submitted |  |
| Context and Statement of Problem or Purpose | Excellent statement of the context/theoretical or practical problem or challenge | Good statement of the context/theoretical or practical problem or challenge | Fair statement of the context/theoretical or practical problem or challenge | Poor statement of the contex/theoretical or practical problem or challenge |  |
| Methodology/Narrative | Thoroughly develops major points with relevant evidence and solid reasoning | Adequately develops major points with evidence and reasoning | Somewhat develops major points with evidence and reasoning | Contains major problems with the quality of the evidence and reasoning |  |
| Analysis/Discussion | Analyzes or discusses issues in a sophisticated and thought-provoking fashion | Analyzes or discusses issues in a good or adequate fashion | Analyzes or discusses issues in a minimally acceptable fashion (could benefit from additional development) | Analyzes or discusses issues in an incomplete or unacceptable fashion |  |
| Organization | Excellent organization of ideas and supporting points, fully complies with case study template | Good organization of ideas and supporting points; substantially complies with case studies template | Fair organization of ideas and supporting points; marginally complies with case studies template | Poor organization of ideas and supporting points; does not comply with case studies template |  |
| Mechanics | Few to no errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format | Some errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format | Many errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format | Major errors in usage, spelling, punctuation, and reference format |  |

**Recommendation:**

**\_\_\_\_\_ Accept in current form.** The case study is acceptable for publication, with minor copyediting.

**\_\_\_\_\_ Revise and resubmit.** Please describe suggested revisions above or in “Additional Comments for Author” (next page).

**\_\_\_\_\_ Reject.** The case study does not merit publication or is not suitable for this series.

**Additional Comments for the Author:**