

RESEARCH PAPER RUBRIC

Element (% of total score)	1 (Weak)	2	3 (Moderate)	4	5 (Exemplary)
Description (5%) Longer than three sentences. Does not clearly describe content and participant expectations.	Longer than three sentences. Does not clearly describe content and participant expectations.		Includes an enticing two- or three-sentence description. Clearly captures what the session will cover and what participants can expect to learn.		Meets level 3 criteria, plus: Includes how participants will be engaged. Uses language that is intriguing, compelling and/or clever. Clearly states examples of positive impact(s) that resulted from this idea.
Presenter bio(s) (5%) Does not convey experience with regard to SEL research.	Does not convey experience with regard to SEL research.		Conveys relevant experience with regard to SEL research.		Conveys that they are highly knowledgeable and experienced with regard to SEL research and would likely contribute to the <i>Exchange</i> goal of promoting a rich diversity of backgrounds, perspectives, and experiences.
Conference alignment (5%) <i>Describe how your proposal aligns with the conference theme (Leaders as Learners) and key messages (1) "SEL is grounded in science" and/or (2) "To promote students' social and emotional competence, we must also prioritize the social and emotional competence and capacity of adults."</i>	Does not address the conference theme in a way that seems likely to contribute to theory, research, practice, or policy.		Addresses the conference theme in a way that could contribute to theory, research, practice, or policy. May be a meaningful session for researchers, practitioners, and/or policymakers.		Clearly addresses the conference theme in significant ways that will contribute to theory, research, practice, and/or policy. Likely to be a very meaningful session for multiple audiences.
Objectives (10%) <i>List two to four intended objectives that describe what</i>	Intended objectives are not stated, cannot be inferred, and/or do not seem		Intended objectives may not be stated, but can easily be inferred and seem possible to achieve given the format.		Intended objectives are clearly stated and have a high likelihood of being achieved given the format.

Element (% of total score)	1 (Weak)	2	3 (Moderate)	4	5 (Exemplary)
<i>aims will be met as a result of your proposal.</i>	likely to be achievable.				
Insights and innovation (10%) <i>Briefly describe how your session will be cutting-edge, thought-provoking, and groundbreaking for many participants.</i>	Not current, original, or groundbreaking. Attendees are unlikely to gain new knowledge or insights.		Current and fairly original, if not groundbreaking. Attendees may gain new knowledge and insights.		Cutting-edge, thought-provoking, and groundbreaking for many participants. Attendees are very likely to gain new knowledge, insights, and practical takeaways.
Theoretical frameworks and previous research basis (15%) <i>Outline the framework, theory, and/or previous research that inform your proposal.</i>	Does not mention a framework, theory, or previous research in ways that relate to the presentation content.		Mentions a framework and refers to relevant theory or previous research in ways that demonstrate knowledge and provide some justification for the presentation content.		Clearly defines a framework and discusses state-of-the-art theory, or previous research in ways that demonstrate in-depth knowledge and provide direct justification for the presentation content.
Methods, techniques, or modes of inquiry (15%) <i>Briefly describe your research methods, including systems for data collection and approach to data analysis.</i>	Methods are not well-defined (e.g., do not include the sample, measures, data collection methods or analysis plan), not appropriate, or not sufficiently rigorous.		Methods are described, moderately appropriate, and rigorous.		Methods to conduct the research are appropriate and rigorous, and include how data was collected, sample, measures, and analytic plan.
Substantiated conclusions and/or recommendations (20%) <i>Outline your conclusions/recommendations and the evidence they're founded in.</i>	Draws unsubstantiated conclusions or makes unsupported claims or recommendations.		Suggests that at least indirect support for conclusions and/or recommendations can be provided, based on a reasonably well-designed investigation/project.		Indicates that ample support for well-substantiated conclusions and recommendations will be provided based on a rigorously designed investigation/project.

Element (% of total score)	1 (Weak)	2	3 (Moderate)	4	5 (Exemplary)
<p>Scholarly significance of the study or work (15%)</p> <p><i>Briefly explain how your research addresses a gap in the knowledge base of the SEL field.</i></p>	<p>Minimally fills the gap in our existing knowledge base.</p> <p>Few to no novel ideas in theory, practice, methods, or populations are provided.</p>		<p>Moderately fills the gap in our existing knowledge base.</p> <p>Some novel ideas in theory, practice, methods, or populations are provided.</p>		<p>Fills a gap in our existing SEL field's knowledge base.</p> <p>Novel ideas in theory, practice, methods, pedagogy, or populations are provided.</p>

CASEL reserves the right to change programming at any time, for any reason.

CASEL may cancel, at any point, sessions submitted by facilitators or presenters who are unable to attend.