**Category 1: Advances in Methodology Rubric**

Please rate the following statements using the rating scales below.

| **Strong**  **5** | **4** | **Adequate**  **3** | **2** | **Weak**  **1** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Advances the state of the art in the field |  | Somewhat advances the state of the art in the field. |  | Fails to advance the state of the art in the field. |
| The methodological advance or innovation is clearly described. |  | The description of methodological advance or innovation is somewhat clear. |  | The description of methodological advance or innovation is fuzzy. |
| Methodology is clearly described, including enough information so that the innovation can be replicated. |  | Methodology is described, including some information so that the innovation can be approximated or replicated only with additional information or help. |  | Methodology is ambiguously described and includes limited information. |
| There is a thorough and thoughtful discussion of appropriate applications of the innovation. |  | There is some discussion of the appropriate applications of the innovation or some applications discussed are inappropriate. |  | Discussion of applications of the innovation is missing, minimal or inappropriate. |
| There is a thorough and thoughtful discussion of special conditions that affect the use of the methodology in particular contexts. |  | There is some discussion of special contextual conditions that affect the use of the methodology. |  | There is minimal or no discussion of special conditions that affect the use of the methodology. |
| Recommendations are clearly stated, appropriate, and realistic. |  | Recommendations are stated, but somewhat appropriate, and/or realistic. |  | Recommendations are missing or are generally in appropriate, and/or unrealistic. |
| The appearance, format and quality of the writing are clear, appealing and easy to follow. |  | The appearance, format and quality of the writing are somewhat clear, appealing and easy to follow. |  | The appearance, format and quality of the writing are fuzzy, unappealing and/or difficult to follow. |

Average Rating:

Out of Possible Points: 35