



**Region 2 Outstanding Contribution to Scholarship Award
Scoring Rubric**

Outstanding Contribution to Scholarship Award:

This award recognizes an individual who has contributed meaningful scholarship in academic advising and will allow the winner to share their research during the regional conference. During the evaluation and selection process, nominees will be evaluated on the impact of their contributions with particular attention to their scholarship's potential impact on future research and discussion. This may be represented by a history of continued influential scholarship or a single, innovative contribution. Region 2 seeks to recognize well-published, as well as novice scholars in the region.

Eligibility:

- Both self nominations and nominations by others are encouraged.
- Must be a member of NACADA Region 2.
- Previous winners are not eligible.

<p align="center">Award Criteria</p> <p align="center"><i>*All required and optional documentation other than the resume or curriculum vita should not exceed two pages, single spaced, and must be submitted in pdf format.</i></p>	<p align="center">Inadequate</p> <p align="center">0</p> <p align="center"><i>*No evidence is demonstrated. Expectations not met.</i></p>	<p align="center">Fair</p> <p align="center">1</p> <p align="center"><i>*Some evidence is demonstrated. Some expectations met.</i></p>	<p align="center">Proficient</p> <p align="center">2</p> <p align="center"><i>*Most evidence is demonstrated. Meets expectations.</i></p>	<p align="center">Outstanding</p> <p align="center">3</p> <p align="center"><i>*All evidence is demonstrated. Exceeds expectations.</i></p>
<p>Required Documentation:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nomination Letter <p>Optional Documentation: <i>*Strongly encouraged</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Letter(s) of Support <i>*Maximum two</i> 2. Nominee's Resume or Curriculum Vita 3. Nominee's Personal Advising Philosophy Statement 	<p>Incomplete nomination. Required documentation not included.</p> <p><i>Application ineligible for further evaluation.</i></p>	<p>Required documentation included.</p> <p>Optional documentation not included.</p>	<p>Required documentation included.</p> <p>Some optional documentation included.</p>	<p>All required and optional documentation included.</p>
<p>Originality:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Are the nominee's original ideas distinguished from those of others? 2. Was the topic a novel issue to the field of advising? 3. If not a novel issue, did the nominee address the issue in an original way? 	<p>Nominee's research has no evidence supporting demonstrated originality.</p>	<p>Nominee has some evidence supporting demonstrated originality.</p>	<p>Nominee has compelling evidence supporting demonstrated originality.</p>	<p>Nominee has overwhelming evidence supporting demonstrated originality.</p>
<p>Accessibility:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has the nominee published, presented, or shared their research? 2. Is the nominee's research accessible to others at their institution or within Region 2? 3. Are technical terms defined when necessary and used appropriately? 	<p>Nominee has no evidence supporting demonstrated accessibility.</p>	<p>Nominee has some evidence supporting demonstrated accessibility.</p>	<p>Nominee has strong or compelling evidence supporting demonstrated accessibility.</p>	<p>Nominee has overwhelming evidence supporting demonstrated accessibility.</p>

<p>4. Are explanations concise, yet thorough and sufficiently detailed to facilitate understanding?</p> <p>5. Does the author anticipate and address the target audience's likely questions or counter-arguments?</p>				
<p>Meaningful and Significant Impact:</p> <p>1. Is the nominee's research relevant to the overall field of academic advising?</p> <p>2. Is the topic a significant or emerging issue in the field of academic advising?</p> <p>3. Does the research provide insights that are interesting and valuable to the field of academic advising?</p> <p>4. Has the work been influential in the advancement of the field of academic advising?</p> <p>5. Does the nominee's research potentially impact future research and discussion?</p> <p>6. Has the work been cited in subsequent publications or conference presentations?</p>	<p>Nominee has no evidence supporting documented meaningful and significant impact.</p>	<p>Nominee has some evidence supporting documented meaningful and significant impact.</p>	<p>Nominee has strong or compelling evidence supporting documented meaningful and significant impact.</p>	<p>Nominee has overwhelming evidence supporting documented meaningful and significant impact.</p>

**Original rubric design created by Karen B. Hauschild, College of Charleston on behalf of Region 3 Awards and Scholarships, adapted by NACADA Global Awards, modified for NACADA Region 2 Awards and Scholarships by Michele Applegate, University of Delaware 6/28/20.*

Sources

https://nacada.ksu.edu/Portals/0/Awards/ShafferAwardRubric_2.pdf

<https://nacada.ksu.edu/Portals/0/Awards/ScholarInquiry2020.pdf?ver=2020-03-04-165034-103>