Organization

This framework is separated into two parts. **Part I** applies to the author's reflection and **Part II** serves as a creative critique of the author's creative piece. When reviewing the reflection, keep in mind how it connects to and uses the creative piece to build an academic dialogue.

Key Terms

Ways of knowing: The norms, values, and established practices that inform what and how communities generate knowledge. Communities often include, but are not limited to, academic disciplines and cultural groups with distinct traditional knowledge. This also refers to knowledge perspectives informed by identity and lived experiences.

Integrate: Bring together. This could include combining the products of research from different domains; or, bringing together insights, methods, or analyses from multiple disciplines to approach a topic from a unique perspective.

Methods of integration: The ways submissions draw on different aspects of multiple disciplines or ways of knowing, such as their methods, concepts, or forms of evidence.

Check-Plus/Minus System

- ✓+ **Exemplary**: No revisions; scholarly level
- ✓ **Good**: Few revisions; we expect most submissions to be around here on most points
- ✓- **Fair**: Some substantive revision required to get to the ✓ territory and be acceptable
- X **Lacking/Absent**: The expectation isn't met, or major/structural changes would be required
- 0 **Not relevant**

Part I

Knowledge and Understanding

✓?	Question
	Does the submission **clearly** display **accurate working knowledge** of a **breadth** of current and ongoing work that is relevant to the areas of inquiry identified?
	Does the submission draw **novel connections** between works, to their project, and to other ongoing projects?
	Does the submission **properly cite all points** that are not the author's own?

Comments:

Analysis

✓ ?	Question
	Does the submission substantially engage with relevant scholarship and perspectives, enriching their submission with **fair, constructive, and appropriately critical** discussion?
	Are the conclusions strongly **supported across the disciplinary perspectives or ways of knowing** involved?
	Have most **significant potential objections** been addressed, with the **conclusions tempered** as appropriate?
	Does the submission give interesting **insights into the project's process or content** under consideration through methods of integration?
	Are **limitations and confounding factors** discussed? *They may discuss or identify the values embedded in their choice of media.*

Comments:

Integration

✓ ?	Question
	Does the submission explicitly indicate where different disciplinary perspectives or ways of knowing are drawn upon or integrated in the project?
	Are the methods of integration **appropriate for** the project? Consider the disciplines, ways of knowing, goals, research questions, theoretical perspectives, and methods involved.
	Is the medium **appropriate for** the project? Consider the disciplines, ways of knowing, goals, research questions, theoretical perspectives, and methods involved.
	Does the author **show intention and careful justification** in/of their methods of integration?
	Does the author recognize and fairly discuss the **benefits and challenges of an integrative approach** they encountered in their process? *Note: this is not a requirement, but marks an exceptional submission.*
	Does the author generate **meaningful insights about the disciplines or ways of knowing** involved? *Note: this is not a requirement, but marks an exceptional submission.*
	Does the author's medium and integrations **impact the scope** of the project's content or context, or demonstrate **adaptation to different ways of knowing?** *In other words, how does the author's choice of disciplines and ways of knowing change the questions that can be asked or the medium that can be used?*

Comments:

Creation

✓?	Question
	Does the author's deployment of theories make a **creative (novel, interesting, or innovative) contribution** to existing literature or body of work?
	Does the submission **draw meaningfully** upon all disciplines and ways of knowing involved? *Note: see paper metadata on OJS for the disciplines and ways of knowing the author has identified.*
	Does the author **reflect upon barriers** to their project (e.g., personal, communicative, affective, institutional) and **how they influenced the project?** *Note: this is not a requirement, but marks an exceptional submission.*

Comments:

Communication and Clarity

✓?	Question
	Does the submission provide **clearly stated and compelling reflective goals,** such as a thesis, main idea, aim, or objective? *Consider both the statements themselves and their motivation. In the comments section here, underline the thesis or statement of goals.*
	Is the submission **well-organized, with a logical flow** (or if not, is this structure intentional and justified)?
	Do **points support** each other, leading to constructive conclusions?
	Is the reflection **easy to follow** when accompanied by the creative piece?
	If applicable, are works cited **current** as in accordance with what is appropriate in the discipline(s) or ways of knowing involved, with a **consistent referencing style?**
	Is the submission **free from spelling/grammatical errors?** *Please mark any errors on the submission.*
	Is language used **clearly and thoughtfully?**
	Is the writing **well-edited and appropriate** for undergraduate audiences? *Mark any confusing, unclear, or specialized language that is not defined.*
	Is the submission **intellectually generous**, i.e., is all relevant background described **fairly and accessibly** for people unfamiliar with the involved ways of knowing?

Comments:

Part II

Application and Creation

✓ ?	Question
	Does the piece have a **distinct and unique** voice or style, creating a fresh and original presentation of ideas? *For written pieces, is it readable with a compelling narrative and natural dialogue? For visual pieces, do style choices create an interesting and compelling experience?*
	Are you **immediately drawn** into the piece? *For written pieces, does it have an effective hook?*
	Does the piece have an **established sense** of time and place? Does the setting support the story or visual context?
	Is the main subject or character **identifiable yet unique**? *For written pieces, are emotions believable and do they provide understandable motivations?*
	Does the subject or main character and style provide a strong **potential for conflict**? Does the conflict move the story forward or enrich the visual context?
	Does the piece **draw meaningfully** upon all disciplines and ways of knowing involved? *Note: see paper metadata on OJS for the disciplines and ways of knowing the author has identified.*

Comments:

Communication and Clarity

✓?	Question
	Does the spelling, grammar, punctuation, and structure **show attention to detail,** and that care was taken? *Note: This will only apply to pieces with an integrated written portion*
	Does the piece **hold your interest**? If inspirational elements are introduced, do they flow or integrate smoothly?
	Is language used **clearly and thoughtfully?**
	Is the submission **well-organized** and does it **flow smoothly** (or if not, is this structure intentional and justified)? *For written pieces, does the story build logically and believable to the end or climax?*

Comments: