NACADA Annual Conference Proposal Rating Rubric

Scholarly Papers Session Type

Readers Evaluation

INSTRUCTIONS

Comments: Provide specific, positive, and relevant suggestions and comments for all proposals. Please stay focused on the proposal itself and use moderate, temperate, and clear language to provide feedback for how the proposal could be improved.

Format: Proposals submitted as a Scholarly Paper may only be considered under this format.

Guidelines: Well written, includes complete description with background information, overview of the paper, theoretical frameworks, and clear arguments. If social science research: description of methods, data collected (including indication of IRB protocols completed or in process), findings, and implications for academic advising.

Also includes: Clear indication that the manuscript will be ready for submission by the September 1 deadline.

Effective Descriptions: Provides a clear focus for the scholarly paper to be presented
Describes the theoretical constructs and arguments addressed
Arguments deal with issues salient to academic advising

Ask yourself:
1. Are the arguments and theories clearly stated? Is the subject matter "timely"?
2. Are the proposal and abstract well written, and free from grammatical and typographical errors?
3. Does the topic contribute to the advancement of the field of advising?
4. Does the presenter/author offer a novel approach to the argument(s)?
5. Does the proposal suggest that the author(s) have engaged with related literature?
6. Who is the audience for this session? Scholarly papers should be both accessible and appropriately complex for educators interested in deep issues and arguments related to academic advising.

NACADA SCHOLARLY PAPER PROPOSAL RATING RUBRIC
Reader Evaluation

Proposals must be well written with no grammatical or typographical errors. Proposals should include complete descriptions with information on the presenters and their institution(s), background information, relevant theories and scholarly literature, overview of the presentation, and arguments to be presented. Proposal can include the intended audience for the paper. Proposals should clearly articulate the familiarity and background of the presenters with the subject matter, and in the case of social science research involving data from human subjects, indication that Institutional Review Board approval has been obtained according to the requirements of the sponsoring institution.

Criteria	1 Does not meet expectations	2 Below Expectations	3 Satisfactory	4 Good	5 Excellent
Intent: Does the proposal clearly lead to a completed manuscript?	There is no indication that the manuscript could be completed by the deadline.	The study is in the early stages of analysis and the manuscript has not yet been written.	The manuscript is in the early stages of preparation	The manuscript is in final stages of preparation and will be submitted by the deadline.	The manuscript is completed and ready for submission.
Significance: Does the proposal deal with issues and/or arguments salient to academic advising?	The proposal does not adequately address issues related to academic advising.	The proposal minimally addresses issues and/or arguments related to academic advising.	The proposal addresses interesting issues and/or arguments, but they are only tangentially related to academic advising.	The proposal addresses issues and/or arguments salient to academic advising, but lacks clarity.	The proposal clearly deals with issues and/or arguments salient to academic advising.
Clarity: Is the proposed scholarly paper (abstract and description) clearly articulated?	The purpose and goals of the paper are not mentioned.	The purpose and goals of the paper are not at all clear.	The purpose and goals of the paper are minimally explained.	The purpose and goals of the paper are adequately stated and explained.	The purpose and goals of the paper are clearly articulated.
Contribution: Would this paper introduce new arguments, questions, theories, or issues?	This paper fails to suggest any new argument, question, theory, or issue.	This paper only minimally addresses an advising-related question, theory, argument, or issue.	This paper addresses arguments, questions, theories, or issues that are not particularly new.	This paper introduces interesting arguments, questions, theories, or issues.	This paper introduces new, complex arguments, questions, theories, or issues.
Scholarship: Does the argument make use of the methods and epistemologies of one or more academic discipline?	The proposal fails to mention any methods or epistemologies of an academic discipline.	The proposal minimally addresses a method or epistemology of an academic discipline.	The argument makes use of the methods and epistemologies of one or more academic discipline, but lacks clarity.	The argument makes use of the methods and epistemologies of one or more academic discipline, but lacks clarity.	The argument clearly makes use of the methods and epistemologies of one or more academic discipline.

1/17/2021

	IF APPLICABLE:	*Not all proposals are based on the criteria below. These scores are intended to provide an appropriate rating score where applicable. Proposals should not be adversely evaluated if a specific criterion is not appropriate to the proposal.*					
Criteria	**1** **Does not meet expectations**	**2** **Below Expectations**	**3** **Satisfactory**	**4** **Good**	**5** **Excellent**	**Not Applicable**
Empirical Research: Grounded in research (connections to the literature, description of methods, findings, and recommendations, as well as emphasis on results and qualitative or quantitative evidence collected, where applicable) *N/A means that the proposal is not an evidence-based study*	No evidence of an approved IRB protocol for date from human participants, or any intention of applying for approval. There is no attempt to ground the study in the literature.	Some information about the proposed study is included, but seems incomplete. The literature is minimally addressed, and/or the research methods are minimally described. IRB protocol has not yet been submitted.	Most aspects of the proposed research study are described, but data collection is not yet underway. IRB approval has been applied for. There may also be weakness in important areas, such as, description of methods, review of literature, analysis plans, etc.)	All aspects of the research study are clearly and completely described. The study is being conducted under an approved IRB protocol. Data collection is complete but data analysis is not yet finished.	All aspects of the research study are clearly and completely described. The study was conducted under an approved IRB protocol.	Proposal is not evidence-based (data-based).
Inquiry: The paper argues for a novel position on the issue at hand, or argues for a familiar position in a novel way.	The subject matter is clearly outdated or fails to present a clear argument.	The paper only minimally articulates a position on an issue related to academic advising.	The paper argues position or issue related to academic advising, but lacks complexity and innovation.	The paper clearly articulates an interesting argument salient to academic advising.	The paper argues for a novel position on the issue at hand, or argues for a familiar position in a novel way.	
Diversity: Does the proposal include issues of equity and/or inclusion and/or diversity?	The paper mentions issues in these areas, but does not explain how it is relevant to these issues.	This paper covers and explains relevant ideas in these areas.	The paper offers insights and new ideas, approaches, and/or concepts having to do with equity, inclusion, and diversity.	The paper provides a number of well-articulated insights and new ideas, approaches, and/or concepts having to do with equity, inclusion, and diversity.	This paper would provide a significant addition to the field in the areas of equity, inclusion, and diversity.	Paper does not deal with issues of diversity, equity, or inclusion.

Comments (please provide formative comments to further clarify your assessment of the proposal**):**

1/17/2021