ACPA23 Scholarship Program Reviewer Rubric

To shape a high-quality learning experience, the ACPA23 Program Team created the rubric below for Program Reviewers who are evaluating the Scholarship Program proposals.

Program review: Program Reviewers should use this rubric for evaluating scholarship session program proposals. The rubric below is for reference only and all program reviews must be submitted by Reviewers online. Reviewers will receive their login information and password for the program evaluation system when program review begins. Please note after the review process is complete, all text responses submitted on the online review form will be provided by email as feedback to the Coordinating Presenter.

Review Bias: We ask Reviewers to consciously consider their own biases and how they may impact your reviews. All individuals hold biases based on their various identities, professional positions, and life experiences. Consciously considering your biases allows you to understand how they impact your reviews, be that in a negative or positive way. We ask that you make note of these impacts and, if necessary, adjust your reviews to compensate for them.

Some Things to Consider:
1. ***Programmatic Element Criteria***
   When developing your proposal or reviewing the details of the proposal, element criteria can be found in each row of the rubric in the first column of each row.
2. ***Scholarship Sessions***
   ACPA is committed to supporting and advancing scholarship in the field of higher education and student affairs.To support this endeavor, the 2023 Convention Team has opened a call for a variety of scholarship-focused sessions that highlight a diversity of scholarly-foci, methodologies, modalities, and stages of finished product. Scholarship Sessions can focus on a variety of topics, including:
   a. *Research-in-Process:* Research-in-process sessions take the best parts of communal roundtable discussions, paper discussant feedback, and add the opportunity to develop a paper at almost ANY STAGE OF READINESS. Papers that are fully drafted (as in past years) should be submitted in this session type as well.
   b. *Multimodal:* Scholarship presentations in this area include performance, visual, digital, and other arts-based forms of knowledge creation and distribution. Multimodal presentations can include forms such as Zines, storytelling, poetry, documentary, photo-voice project, artifact presentation, or the presentation of research findings in another creative format. Multimodal sessions exist in two formats: (a) 20-minute long presentation in which two multimodal presentations

are assigned to one session block, with time for audience feedback (60 minute session in total); (b) 40 minute-long presentation in which one multimodal presentation is assigned to a session block, with time for audience feedback; (c) poster-style.

c. *Methods Workshop:* Methods workshops allow members to present a project that uses compelling research methods and teach others how to apply this method to their own work. Presentations in this format should be considered continuing professional development allowing members to build self-efficacy and capacity around creating scholarship and assessment tools to bring back to their campuses.

d. *Research Posters & Practice Posters:* Posters on display during scheduled times of ACPA23 with presentation times facilitated by the authors.

3. **Stage of Readiness**

Scholarly works in the Research-in-Process sessions do not need to be, but may be, fully completed by Convention time. Therefore, submissions should not be penalized if they do not have fully fleshed out findings, for example. They should, however, exist at a level of readiness where a significant presentation can be given and meaningful discussions can occur within the Convention space (i.e., beyond data collection). Research-in-Process presenters will be required to submit their scholarship at least 3 weeks before the start of the Convention.

Please contact conventionprograms@acpa.nche.edu with any questions about the educational session program proposal or review process, or the Program Reviewer Rubric below.

ACPA 2023 Scholarship Program Review Rubric

Criterion	Exemplary – 3	Acceptable – 2	Needs Improvement – 1	Not Acceptable - 0
Objectives of Scholarship	Asks insightful questions and offers analysis of issues; contains substantial, logical, and concrete development of ideas; arguments are explicit and convincingly interpreted.	Asks insightful questions or offers analysis of issues; contains some appropriate details and examples, as well as support or evidence that is well articulated and clear.	Identifies issues and questions; offers somewhat obvious support that may be too broad; content is too general.	Offers simplistic, underdeveloped, or cryptic support for ideas presented; inappropriate or off-topic generalizations, faulty assumptions, errors of fact.
Framework Utilized	Provides a clear, nuanced description and appropriate use of relevant theory or theories.	Provides an adequate description of the selected theory and appropriately applies the theory to the study purpose.	Lacks clear description of theory or utilizes a theory incongruent with the study purpose.	No description of theory or offers a description that leaves the reader confused.
Literature, Sources, Methodology, or Modality	The proposal fully incorporates the pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy context for the presentation content into the description via citations and/or terminology related to the field or content of the presentation. Uses sources to support, extend, and inform the writer's overall message and ideas; successfully integrates concepts together into a coherent message and well-organized section.	The proposal somewhat presents the pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy context for the presentation content via citations and/or terminology related to the field or content of the presentation. Uses sources to support, extend, and inform the writer's overall message and ideas; employs a variety of source materials and incorporates unlikely voices.	The proposal refers loosely or tangentially to a pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy context, but the citations and/or terminology are not specific, recent, or relevant to the field or content of the presentation.	The proposal does not mention pedagogical, research, theoretical, and/or policy context. Neglects important sources; overuse of quotes or paraphrases to substitute writer's own ideas and attitudes; incoherent presentation of ideas.
Research-in-Process, Multimodal, and Poster Sessions	Exemplary – 3	Acceptable – 2	Needs Improvement – 1	Not Acceptable - 0
Work on Findings	Findings provided do an exemplary job of answering the research questions and offer a well-rounded look at the data.	Findings provided engage the research questions in an adequate manner and offer a few examples from the data. For analysis in progress, author(s) provide a clear plan for developing their findings.	Author(s) offer limited insight into their plan for developing findings if analysis is not yet complete. If analysis is complete, findings provided engage the research questions in a cursory manner and/or offer limited examples from the data.	Findings are not provided, the author(s), do not provide a plan for developing the findings, and/or the study results do not address the research question(s).
Significance of Topic	Topic is cutting-edge, groundbreaking, and significant to the field and potential audience. Topic addresses content related to the Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience. Topic somewhat addresses content related to the Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization.	Topic is only tangentially related to the field, is not completely current, or is not important to the field and/or to the potential audience. Topic tangentially addresses content related to the Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization.	Topic is not current and/or lacks importance or appropriateness to the field and/or to the potential audience. Topic does not address content related to the Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization.
Methods Workshop	Exemplary – 3	Acceptable – 2	Needs Improvement – 1	Not Acceptable - 0
Outline of Structure & Strategies for Interaction	Outline of the structure is appropriate for the time provided, and the author(s) offers exemplary strategies for interaction.	Outline of the structure seems appropriate for the time provided, but the author(s) offer limited strategies for interaction.	Outline of the structure may be difficult to fit into the time provided and/or the author(s) offer limited strategies for interaction.	Outline of the structure does not seem feasible for the time provided and/or no strategies for interaction are offered.
Relevance of Topic	Topic is cutting-edge, groundbreaking, and significant to the field and potential audience. Topic addresses content related to the Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization.	Topic is current, important, and appropriate to the field and potential audience. Topic somewhat addresses content related to the Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization.	Topic is only tangentially related to the field, is not completely current, or is not important to the field and/or to the potential audience. Topic tangentially addresses content related to the Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization.	Topic is not current and/or lacks importance or appropriateness to the field and/or to the potential audience. Topic does not address content related to the Strategic Imperative for Racial Justice and Decolonization.