

## **Constructive & Reliable Example—Research Paper**

### **Criterion Ratings:**

- Study objectives or purpose: 3
- Review of the literature 2
- Theoretical or conceptual framework 2
- Research plan, Study methods, or modes of inquiry 4
- Data sources or evidence 5
- Analytical plan or approach 3
- Findings (Preliminary/partial/full) 4
- Study significance 2

### **Comments**

- This proposal is well written and may have the potential to add to the literature on philanthropy in higher education. I especially applaud the the multi-institutional sample and robust dataset. However, I offer the following comments to improve the distinctiveness and conceptualization of the manuscript:
- While the proposal seems to be well rooted in the traditional studies of higher education philanthropy (including some articles from the above referenced reader), many of these articles lacked consideration of social and educational justice. This has led to the basic findings that those who are more privileged in college (i.e., come from wealthier families) give more. Certain articles with newer frameworks (for example those by Noah Drezner K. Tsunoda, J. Cabrales, J. Garvey, F. Huehls, etc.) may be useful as foundation to your research . Although a bit more dated, an additional great resource would be the ASHE Reader Series volume "Philanthropy, volunteerism, and fundraising in higher education." There are philanthropy scholars from other fields outside of higher ed, but since this is higher ed specific, there should be some consideration of this growing body of literature. Another great place to look is the journal Philanthropy and Education.
- My concern extends from the literature review to the conceptual model and how the variables are considered. There are variables considered here which may need to be examined in different models. For example, membership in a fraternity requires payment of dues whereas membership in student government may not (at least directly). Considering these together as "involvement" may not truly measure the same thing. I suggest looking at studies by Weerts and Ronca who do a good job of considering some involvement variables and use a variety of methods to study this. I would suggest two separate variables at the least and perhaps two separate models based on the differences in what you want to measure by means of "involvement."
- The dataset included in this proposal is very comprehensive, including 20 institutions, across multiple institutional types as well as both PWIs and MSIs. Additionally, the visual display and description of the findings was easy to interpret. This robust dataset coupled with your ability to present the findings in interesting ways could provide a unique insight to the literature on philanthropy. However further development of the conceptualization and deeper dive into the literature on giving for marginalized populations is needed as a basis for the study

**DECISION: REJECT**

## **Constructive & Reliable Example—Interactive Symposium**

### **Criterion Ratings:**

- Importance of the topic, issue, or problem to the field of higher education (contributions in knowledge, theory, and/or practice) 5
- Originality of the session 4
- Clarity of focus: Integration and coherence of panelists' perspectives as a group of experts 4
- Range of knowledge and/or points of view represented by panelists 5
- Strategies for involving audience in the discussion and promoting interactive learning 5
- Overall clarity of the proposal (e.g., quality of writing, organization of ideas, clarity of assumptions, logic of arguments, etc.) 5

### **Comments**

- The proposed panel brings together a group with expertise to address a pressing topic--the role of faculty with regards to governance on economic issues. Overall, this proposal is well-conceived, offers a variety of informed voices on the topic, and will draw and support good discussion in the audience.
- The proposal is well conceived and supported by literature. The framing of this topic is strong, discussing the nuanced balances across questions of the Iron Triangle (quality, cost, and access), considering the paradigmatic differences across faculty and other governance stakeholders (Board, administration).
- The four experts on this proposal all bring a unique perspective to the issue, but I do wonder how Presenter 4 would bring their study of students' perspectives on governance to bear on the faculty discussion
- Finally, I wonder if there might be some discussion of how higher education program faculty, in particular, could be leaders on their campuses, helping facilitate stronger faculty governance in these important economic issues.

**DECISION: ACCEPT**

### **Unconstructive Example**

#### **Criterion Ratings:**

- Study objectives or purpose: 3
- Review of the literature 3
- Theoretical or conceptual framework 3
- Research plan, Study methods, or modes of inquiry 1
- Data sources or evidence 1
- Analytical plan or approach 1
- Findings (Preliminary/partial/full) 1
- Study significance 3
- Overall clarity of the proposal (e.g., quality of writing, organization of ideas, clarity of assumptions, logic of arguments, etc.) 3

#### **Comments**

- This is one of the worst proposals I have read, methodologically. You can't make causal inferences from these data. Perhaps review your notes from your early methods classes.

#### **DECISION: REJECT**

**Why it is a poor example:** The review is condescending and not specific enough to make improvements. It is, however, reliably rated across the three forms of rating

### **Unconstructive Example**

#### **Criterion Ratings:**

- Study objectives or purpose: 2
- Review of the literature 2
- Theoretical or conceptual framework 2
- Research plan, Study methods, or modes of inquiry 2
- Data sources or evidence 2
- Analytical plan or approach 2
- Findings (Preliminary/partial/full) 2
- Study significance 2
- Overall clarity of the proposal (e.g., quality of writing, organization of ideas, clarity of assumptions, logic of arguments, etc.) 2

#### **Comments**

I want to thank the author for their proposal. However, this proposal leaves a lot to be desired, theoretically, methodologically, and it is underdeveloped.

#### **DECISION: ACCEPT**

**Why it is a poor example:** The comments are too broad to be helpful and there is no variation in the criterion ratings. It appears they have made a “general” judgement about the proposal rather than rating, specifically with the criteria.

## **Unreliable Example**

### **Criterion Ratings:**

- Study objectives or purpose: 5
- Review of the literature 5
- Theoretical or conceptual framework 5
- Research plan, Study methods, or modes of inquiry 4
- Data sources or evidence 4
- Analytical plan or approach 4
- Findings (Preliminary/partial/full) 5
- Study significance 5
- Overall clarity of the proposal (e.g., quality of writing, organization of ideas, clarity of assumptions, logic of arguments, etc.) 5

### **Comments**

- I deeply appreciate the topic of this proposal, which does not receive enough attention in our field. The theoretical framework makes a strong contribution. The quotes really highlight the lived experiences of the phenomenon of interest. I might recommend describing the specific form of phenomenology in more depth, but it is clear that the methods were well executed.

### **DECISION: REJECT**

**Why it is a poor example:** The comments and ratings do not match the recommendation. It does, however, give constructive comments.

### **Unreliable Example**

#### **Criterion Ratings:**

- Study objectives or purpose: 2
- Review of the literature 2
- Theoretical or conceptual framework 3
- Research plan, Study methods, or modes of inquiry 4
- Data sources or evidence 3
- Analytical plan or approach 3
- Findings (Preliminary/partial/full) 3
- Study significance 4
- Overall clarity of the proposal (e.g., quality of writing, organization of ideas, clarity of assumptions, logic of arguments, etc.) 3

#### **Comments**

- This proposal has been thoughtfully executed. I appreciate the newly developed conceptual framework that is well steeped in the literature base. I might recommend using JT Snipes recent work to enhance the framing further. The narrative methods are thoughtfully described and connect well to the research questions. This proposal offers a great deal of new thinking and implications for our field

#### **DECISION: ACCEPT**

**Why it is a poor example:** The comments and decision do not match the criterion ratings. Reviewer needs to “tune” their ratings to 4 or Above as “Accept”

### **Unconstructive and Unreliable Example**

#### **Criterion Ratings:**

- Study objectives or purpose: 5
- Review of the literature 3
- Theoretical or conceptual framework 3
- Research plan, Study methods, or modes of inquiry 3
- Data sources or evidence 3
- Analytical plan or approach 3
- Findings (Preliminary/partial/full) 5
- Study significance 5
- Overall clarity of the proposal (e.g., quality of writing, organization of ideas, clarity of assumptions, logic of arguments, etc.) 5

#### **Comments**

I like this proposal because the topic is so important to the higher education landscape. Learning outcomes assessment is too often left off of the higher education research agenda. Although this study doesn't have a strong data set, and the framework is missing foundational work of Ewell, and others, this would make a strong contribution because the topic is so significant.

#### **DECISION: ACCEPT**

**Why it is a poor example:** The reviewer may have a "pet topic" here; also ratings do not match the decision; and comments are too generalist to be constructive for the author.