

2018 Rubric for Leigh S. Shaffer NACADA journals award

| Element | <u>Not Present (1)</u> Element is weak or absent | <u>Minimally Presence (2)</u> Element has been attempted, but serious deficiencies are evident. | <u>Present(3)</u> Element is present, but is not fully developed or is unevenly applied. | <u>Highly Present (4)</u> Element is fully developed or consistently applied |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Published in NACADA Journal (Y/N) | NO | N/A | N/A | YES |
| At the Time of Publication, the Originality of Work | At the time of publication, author's ideas were not new in any way NOR did the author use previously researched topic in a novel way | At the time of publication, while the author's idea was not new it was a novel interpretation of a previously researched topic | At the time of publication, author's idea was new in a way that builds upon previous research | At the time of publication, author's ideas were new OR author used previously researched topic in novel way |
| At the Time of Publication, Addressed an Emerging Area in the Scholarship of Academic Advising | At the time of publication, the topic revisited an existing topic in the scholarship of academic advising | At the time of publication, few aspects of the topic addressed could have been considered emerging in the scholarship of academic advising | At the time of publication, several aspects of the topic addressed could have been considered emerging in the scholarship of academic advising | At the time of publication, the entire topic addressed is an emerging area in the scholarship of academic advising |
| Accessibility to the Audience | Demonstrates little awareness of audience; fails to anticipate questions and concerns; consistently underestimates or overestimates the audience's prior knowledge | Demonstrates inconsistent awareness of audience; does not routinely anticipate questions and concerns; sometimes underestimates or overestimates the audience's prior knowledge | Demonstrates adequate understanding of audience; generally presents information and ideas with readers in mind; generally anticipates readers' questions and concerns. | Demonstrates sophisticated understanding of audience; presents information and ideas with readers clearly in mind; anticipates readers' questions and concerns and addresses them with skill. |
| Significance/Impact of the Work | Work is not relevant at all to the field of academic advising | Work is relevant to field of academic advising and has been cited in a few subsequent presentations and/or publications | Work is relevant to field of academic advising and has been cited in numerous presentations and/or publications | Work is relevant to the field of academic advising, has been cited in subsequent publications, has been cited in NACADA or other relevant conference presentations, and has been influential in the advancement of the field of academic advising |

Questions to Consider

| | |
|--|--|
| Published in NACADA Journal (Y/N) | <p><i>Dichotomous Value: Yes or No</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If “No,” nomination does not meet criteria for award |
| Originality of Work at the Time of Publication | <p><i>Refers to the uniqueness of the subject matter or the use of published subject matter in a new way at the time of publication</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the authors’ original ideas distinguished from those of others? • Was the topic a novel issue to the field of advising? • If not a novel issue, did the author address the issue in an original way? |
| At the time of publication, addressed an Emerging Area in the Scholarship of Advising | <p><i>Refers the degree to which the subject matter addressed a developing or evolving line of research in academic advising at the time of publication</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was/is the topic a significant issue in the field of academic advising? • Was/is the topic a relatively new topic to academic advising? |
| Quality of Writing | <p><i>Refers to the paper’s communicative qualities and readability</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do sentences employ appropriate structure, syntax, punctuation, voice, and tone? • Does the author use appropriate vocabulary and convey meaning precisely and accurately? • Is text grammatically proficient (e.g., tense, agreement, etc.)? • Does the author make effective use of transitional words and phrases? • Does the author manage complex sentences effectively? • If tables and figures are appropriate, are they present? • If tables are present, are they used effectively to complement the text? • Does the paper title fit the topic? |
| Accessibility to the Audience | <p><i>Refers to the degree to which the author understands their audience?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the author provide sufficient background to orient the reader to the topic? • Are technical terms defined when necessary and used appropriately (not gratuitously)? • Does paper provide insights that are interesting and valuable to the reader? • Are explanations concise, yet thorough and sufficiently detailed to facilitate understanding? • Does the author anticipate and address the target audience’s likely questions or counter-arguments? |
| Significance/Impact of the Work | <p><i>Describes writer’s practices in developing and refining the assignment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the work relevant to the overall field of academic advising? • Has the work been influential in the advancement of the field of academic advising? • Has the work been cited in subsequent publications? • Has the work been cited in NACADA or other relevant conference presentations? |

NOTE: This list of questions is intended to be used as a guide for reviewers of works nominated for this award. The list likely does not contain all of the possible questions that a reviewer may consider for a particular element in the rubric, and some of the questions may not be applicable for all submitted nominations.