AHRMM Fellow Paper Evaluation Rubric

The AHRMM writing rubric provides a guide for AHRMM Fellows to assess Fellow Candidate papers. The intent is to identify format, logic, and content standards.

Candidate Name:		Date Submitted:		RECOMMENDATION (Mark One): ACCEPT _____
Name of Evaluator:		Date of Evaluation:		ACCEPT WITH REVISIONS _____ REJECT _____

	EXCEPTIONAL	SATISFACTORY	RE-WORK	COMMENTS
CONTENT: Purpose, Thesis, Controlling Idea, and/or Mapping Statement; applicable to array of entities	Author provided a clear and well developed thesis/argument for the paper. Paper had a clear mapping statement.	Purpose was understood. Clear and concise development. Thesis/mapping statement could be developed further.	Simplistic idea; thesis was unclear, missing or not discernible.	
EVIDENCE: Analysis, Problem-Solving, Conclusions	Thesis/argument and main points addressed, accurate and supported with author's points and references used in the appropriate context. Alternative points of view presented.	Narrative well-constructed, insightful, and thought provoking. Evidence provided but limited. Original conclusions supported by applicable and reputable sources.	Evidence insufficient or not clear. Main points were not supported. References were not relevant, did not support main points or were used in wrong context.	
Structure/Organization	Sequential and logical development of thesis, problem statement and methodology. Ideas well-articulated and paragraphs linked.	Paper logically organized, clear development of thesis and supporting ideas. Ideas and paragraphs flow well.	Structure unclear or confusing. Paragraphs are weak; transitions missing and/or illogical.	
Style/Format	Paper was in APA format. Sources referenced APA style.	Paper contained format errors, but was in APA format.	Paper was not in APA format. Sources incorrectly cited.	
Grammar, Spelling, and Mechanics	Proper grammar used; no spelling errors; and tone consistent and appropriate.	Limited grammar and/or spelling errors. Tone and/or tense shifted.	Misspelled words, jargon, acronyms present. Incorrect grammar used.	
CQO RELEVANCE	The author speaks to the intersection of Cost, Quality, and Outcomes: YES / NO			
OVERALL PAPER ASSESSMENT: *Space for additional comments and/or elaboration of approve/ reject recommendation.*	Recommend for Publication: YES NO CQO Relevant: YES NO Recommend candidate for presentation: YES NO		*Note: comments can overflow into second page.*	