| ***Voices* Submission Rubric** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Ready for the Reviewing Process | Requires Some Revision | Requires Extensive Revisions | Not Appropriate for *Voices,* see below for details |
| Grammar and Sentence Construction | Spelling, grammar, and language are consistent with graduate-level writing. Prose is clear, readable. | The writing is competent, but undeveloped. Sentence structure is simplistic, but readable. | Numerous errors in spelling, usage, and punctuation. |  |
| Organization | Well-organized with a compelling introduction, thesis, and body. Ample supporting evidence. | The organization is fairly clear. The reader could outline the piece. Paragraphs have adequate development and are divided appropriately. | Organization is deficient; lacking functional transitions, paragraphs are neither coherently developed nor arranged.  Piece may greatly exceed stipulated word-count. |  |
| Social Work Values | Appropriately conveys a social work perspective throughout the piece. | Perspective is dissonant, displays some deficit in understanding Social Work’s core principles. | Espouses ethics or principles that are decidedly inconsistent with social work “values,” per the NASW code of ethics.\* Contains inflammatory or offensive language. |  |
| Relevancy/Content | Topical, thoughtful and well-researched. | Topic is defined only generally. The supporting evidence may also be general, or presented in an illogical or circuitous manner. | Subject matter is irrelevant, flawed, or lacking in depth. |  |

\*see the NASW website- [socialworkers.org](http://socialworkers.org)- for more extensive breakdown of social work principles.

**NOTE:** Voices accepts a variety of pieces, from poetry to research to visual media. The rubric is meant as a general guide. The editorial team realizes that not all submissions will have “supporting evidence” or similar content.