

## *James Madison Undergraduate Research Journal* Screening Criteria

*JMURJ*'s mission is to promote, publish, and share the excellent research and scholarship created by undergraduate students in all JMU disciplines. The *JMURJ* Editorial Board uses the inclusive criteria below to screen submissions before forwarding them to JMU faculty reviewers with expertise in the specific discipline.

When *JMURJ* editors identify opportunities for revision during our initial screening process, we type notes right into this "Screening Criteria" document. Scholars who work to address these suggestions may then resubmit their work.

<p><b>Authorship</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Did a JMU undergraduate student or team of JMU undergraduate students create the submission?</li> <li>● Was the submission created in conjunction with a professor who might need to give permission to publish (e.g., in a lab, as part of an ongoing larger project, as part of a larger IRB which may contain confidential information, or funded by a grant secured by a professor)?</li> </ul>	<p>If there are <b>concerns</b> or <b>uncertainties</b>, ask questions.</p>
<p><b>Institutional Review Board Approval</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do the activities reported on involve living human participants (e.g., does the submission include data obtained through intervention or interaction with individuals, or identifiable private information)?</li> <li>● If so, does the submission explicitly confirm IRB approval to conduct and publicly disseminate this research?</li> </ul>	<p>If <b>NO</b>, ask questions.</p>
<p><b>Length</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● If the submission is primarily text-based, is it 2,000 – 6,000 words (excluding any abstract, notes, and/or References / Works Cited / Bibliography page)?</li> <li>● If the submission is <b>not</b> primarily text-based, can it be viewed, heard, or otherwise appreciated in a reasonable time?</li> </ul>	<p>If <b>NO</b>, reject or return to author.</p>

**Accessibility**

- Is the research/scholarship presented in a way that a diverse academic audience will be able to understand?
- Does the submission as a whole work to limit and/or to explain discipline-specific concepts and terminology?

**Content**

- Does the scope of the research in the submission—or in a component of the submission—clearly support the project’s claims?

**Methodology**

- Is it clear that there is a purpose that leads to a discovery or an application of knowledge?
- Is it clear that the purpose engages appropriate primary and secondary research?
- Does the submission discuss, apply, and/or analyze the source material, or does it seem to be simply presented?

**Organization & Cohesion**

- Is it clear that the sections are relevant, and do they seem to flow?
- Is it clear that the submission’s organization effectively supports its purpose?
- Is it clear that there is a conclusion that convincingly presents the evidence and argument or provides a framework for additional research, scholarship, or inquiry?

**Readability**

- Does the submission consistently display a mature command of language through vocabulary, syntax, grammar, and punctuation?
- Are there consistent mechanical errors that are significant obstacles for comprehension or readability?
- Can the audience easily read and understand any figures, tables, or images?