



Student Research Paper Award Criteria

Preamble

The Student Research Paper Award recognizes research excellence in an unpublished paper written while completing a Masters of Library and Information Studies (MLIS) or [equivalent degree](#). The annual award of \$500 and one-year CAPAL membership is designed to encourage the practice of original academic research in the LIS field. 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.

Criteria for the Research Paper

- Must be based on an unpublished paper written and submitted during your time as a student and for the most recent academic year (July - June)
- Should be relevant to academic libraries or academic librarianship
- Must be between 2000 and 5000 words in length (Excluding references)
- Should typically include original qualitative or quantitative research
- Group outputs or papers by multiple authors **are** eligible for this award. In the case of a group submission, please only submit one application
- If necessary, please edit the paper to meet the rubric and checklist

Eligibility & Application Requirements

- CAPAL membership is **not** required of applicants for this award
- Proof of enrollment in a Canadian MLIS or [equivalent program](#)
- A copy of the paper being submitted for the award (in PDF format)
- A reflective statement or audio/video recording of up to 500 words (3-5 minutes) commenting on:
 - the context in which the paper was written (e.g., class, assignment name, co-op placement, independent study)
 - what was learned during the research process
 - potential of the research for future publication

Award winners will be asked to supply a web-quality headshot and a short bio for communications and social media. They may also be invited to present their research at the annual CAPAL conference and/or to submit their paper to Canadian Journal of Academic Librarianship (CJAL).

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

Checklist and rubric

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

Please check all that apply

- ___ There is proof of enrollment in a Canadian MLIS or equivalent program.
- ___ The paper is unpublished.
- ___ The paper is 2000-5000 words in length.
- ___ The paper was written while a student in a MLIS or equivalent program.
- ___ The reflective statement is up to 500 words, or reflective recording/video is 3-5 minutes.
- ___ Includes the context in which the paper was written (e.g., class, assignment name, co-op placement, independent study).

Reflective statement/recording/video

Criterion	3	2	1	Notes
Description of the research process (for understanding what was learned)	Provides a clear, concise description of the research process	Provides a description of the research process with too few or too many details	Does not provide a description of the research process.	
What was learned during the research process	Provides deep reflection on what was learned. Identifies areas for improvement.	Provides limited reflection on what was learned. Identifies areas for improvement.	Does not provide insights on what was learned. Does not identify areas of improvement.	
Potential of the research for future publication	Clearly and convincingly describes why and how the paper could be adapted for future scholarly publication. to the field of academic librarianship.	Description of why and how the paper could be adapted for future scholarly publication is less clear and convincing.	Does not describe why or how the paper could be adapted for future scholarly publication.	

Student paper

Criterion	3	2	1	Notes
Relevance to academic libraries or academic librarianship	The paper is clearly relevant to academic libraries or academic librarianship.	The paper could be relevant to academic libraries or academic librarianship. The relevance is not clearly stated.	The paper is not relevant to academic libraries or academic librarianship.	
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	
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"> • Inappropriate methodology(-ies) for the topic • Assertions lack evidence • No discussion of limitations • Conclusions cannot be drawn from evidence presented 	

Criterion	3	2	1	Notes
Information sources / bibliography	Wide variety of excellent-quality sources. Sources are well integrated into the work	Limited variety of good-quality sources. Sources are adequately integrated into the work	Limited variety of low-quality sources. Use of a wide variety of quality sources. 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	