



## Early Career Researcher Award Criteria

### **Preamble**

The Early Career Researcher Award is designed to encourage excellence in research in early career professional academic librarians. This annual award of \$500 and one-year CAPAL membership is presented to an individual or group having recently published or presented research that will make a significant impact on LIS and the broader community. In the case where a group is granted the award, the prize money will be split among all winners, and each individual will be given one year of free CAPAL membership.

### **Eligibility**

- Applicants must be a current CAPAL member in good standing.
- This award is open to individuals who have graduated from a Master of Library and Information Science program or [equivalent](#) within the last five years.
- The research must be related to library and information science.
- Group outputs or papers by multiple authors are eligible.
  - In a case where multiple contributors are applying for the award in the same submission, each of the applicants must be within five years of graduation, and the cash award will be split equally amongst those applicants.
  - Multi-authored works that include co-authors who are not early career professionals are eligible, but the applicant(s) must be within five years of graduation and have contributed a substantial amount to the research output, as articulated in the reflective statement.

### **Research Output**

Submissions must be completed and disseminated research. The output may include the following (not exhaustive):

- Journal article (not including book reviews)
- Book chapter
- Conference presentation
- Conference poster
- Open educational resource

## **Application Requirements**

- A copy of the research output being nominated for the award
- Reflective statement commenting on...
  - the impact the research has had on their personal librarianship practice
  - the impact of the research on LIS research and/or practice or the impact on users/communities
  - For collaborative/multi-authored works only: the candidate must also clearly articulate their contributions to the research output. This should include what support they had (mentorship, grant funding, etc.)
  - Length of reflective statement:
    - For single authored works (up to 500 words)
    - For submissions with more than one applicant, an additional 200 words can be included per individual for the personal reflective statement.
- Applicant CV
  - 2-3 pages highlighting library work experience, qualifications, research interests, publications (if applicable)

Award winners will be asked to supply a web-quality headshot and a short bio for communications and social media.

If you have any questions about your eligibility or the application process, please contact the CAPAL Awards Committee at [capalawards@gmail.com](mailto:capalawards@gmail.com).

*\*The Awards Committee will be prioritizing applications by individuals that have not yet won this award*

**Rubric: Early Career Researcher Award**

***Curriculum vitae (weighted 10%)***

The candidate \_\_\_\_ does / \_\_\_\_ does not meet criteria for an early career researcher (5 years or less from graduation with MLIS or equivalent).

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Demonstrated research productivity	Research output exceeds expectations for length of time from graduation with MLIS or equivalent	Research output meets expectations for length of time from graduation with MLIS or equivalent	Research output is below expectations for length of time from graduation with MLIS or equivalent	
Evidenced development as a researcher	Increasing independence and/or leadership in research – appropriate for length of time from graduation with MLIS or equivalent	Some independence and/or leadership in research – appropriate for length of time from graduation with MLIS or equivalent	No independence or leadership in research – appropriate for length of time from graduation with MLIS or equivalent	

***Reflective statement (weighted 40%)***

The reflective statement \_\_\_\_ does / \_\_\_\_ does not meet the word limit (up to 500 words).

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Impact of the research on their personal librarianship practice	Offers insights into the impact on their personal librarianship practice. Presents deep reflection	Offers insights into the impact on their personal librarianship practice. Presents limited reflection	Does not offer insights into the impact on their personal librarianship practice	
Impact or potential impact of the research on LIS research and/or practice, or the (potential) impact on users/communities	Describes the (potential) impact of the research on a wider audience or community. Describes significant impact	Describes the (potential) impact of the research on a wider audience or community. Describes limited impact	Does not describe the (potential) impact of the research on a wider audience or community	

**Research output (weighted 50%)**

The work \_\_\_\_ does / \_\_\_\_ does not meet criteria (a work not by a group or by multiple authors).

The work \_\_\_\_ is / \_\_\_\_ is not complete and disseminated.

Criterion	3	2	1	Notes
Research output completion and dissemination	Work is completed and disseminated in a final version	Work is completed and disseminated in a version that is not final (preprint, draft, etc.)	Work is not completed and/or not disseminated	
Research question, thesis or purpose statement	There is a clear research question, thesis or purpose statement. Provides a new topic or a novel take on a common topic	There is a clear research question, thesis or purpose statement. Provides a familiar take on a common topic	There is no clear research question, thesis or purpose statement	
Organization	Clear organization of ideas. Argument is maintained and supported throughout the work	Organization of ideas is present. There is an attempt to sustain an argument throughout the work	Ideas are not fully organized. It is not possible to follow the argument throughout the work	
Handling of evidence	Uses methodology(-ies) appropriate for the topic. Provides evidence for all assertions. Fully discusses limitations. Conclusions clearly drawn from evidence presented	Uses methodology(-ies) appropriate for the topic. Provides evidence for most assertions. Adequately discusses limitations. Conclusions drawn from evidence presented	Any of the following are present, singly or in combination: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Inappropriate methodology(-ies) for the topic</li> <li>● Assertions lack evidence</li> <li>● No discussion of limitations</li> <li>● Conclusions cannot be drawn from evidence presented</li> </ul>	
Information sources / bibliography	Wide variety of excellent-quality sources. Sources	Limited variety of good-quality sources. Sources are adequately	Limited variety of low-quality sources. Use of a wide variety of quality sources.	

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Notes</b>
	are well integrated into the work	integrated into the work	Sources are poorly integrated into the work	
Mechanics and quality of writing	No grammatical, spelling, punctuation and other mechanical errors. Well written for the audience. Judicious use of jargon	Few grammatical, spelling, punctuation and other mechanical errors. Well written for the audience. Overuse of jargon	Many grammatical, spelling, punctuation and other mechanical errors. Poorly written for the audience	
Contributes to the scholarly conversation	Includes well-considered recommendations for the future	Includes adequate recommendations for the future	Does not include recommendations for the future	