

## ***Professional Development Committee Kathleen Tattersall New Assessment Researcher Award***

### **Submission Procedure**

The steps are the following:

- The applicant must check their eligibility as a New Assessment Researcher (NAR).
- The applicant must e-mail the required application documents to the AEA Secretariat at [admin@aea-europe.net](mailto:admin@aea-europe.net) by March 31<sup>st</sup>.
- After the deadline, the complete and eligible applications are sent to a review panel that is composed of fellows of AEA-Europe.
- After the review committee makes a decision (which could be that no award is given), the winner of the award will be announced before the annual conference where the KTNAR keynote should take place.

### **Criteria for Eligibility**

To be eligible for the award, the applicant must:

- be a “new” assessment researcher. “New” researchers are defined as being within the first three years after being awarded their doctoral degree from an institution in a country within Europe (full-time equivalent), including the period of research training. There is no age qualification;
- have the support/nomination from professional colleagues that their work represents a considerable contribution to the assessment field.

### **Submission Criteria**

Applicants should submit the following:

- A letter of nomination from two professional colleagues: one of whom should be a member of AEA-Europe.
- A cover letter which also outlines their career goals, including the potential contribution to the field of assessment.
- An extended abstract (**3000 words max.**) of their research which would be the basis of the keynote presentation which the applicant wishes to present at the annual conference of AEA-Europe. The applicant may be requested to send the original paper, papers or PhD thesis that is/are the basis of the presentation.
- An up-to-date CV.

### **Appointing the Review Panel**

A panel is appointed to review the applications that have met the Criteria for Eligibility. The Panel will consist of three senior assessment researchers drawn from the Fellows of the Association, or past Presidents of the Association. To avoid conflicts of interest,

no member of the Review Panel may work at the same institution as, be a supervisor of, or provide a letter of recommendation for any of the applicants being judged.

### **Procedure to reach a decision**

The panel will review the applications using the review criteria (see Appendix), where applications will be evaluated and assessed as either being inadequate or adequate.

The criteria used are as follows:

- If the work is reviewed as “Inadequate” on one or more of the criteria, the applicant cannot win the KTNAR-award.
- If all applications have at least one criterion rated as “inadequate”, no KTNAR-award is given out.
- If there is one applicant with no criterion rated as “inadequate”, this applicant wins the KTNAR.
- All applicants who achieve a rating of adequate on all criteria, will be ranked on each criterion based on the table included in the Appendix. The panel uses the form as follows: an applicant with lowest ranking gets a score of 1 on that criterion, the next candidate a score of 2, etcetera. The sum of scores on all criteria constitutes the final score given by the panel to each applicant. The applicant with the highest score wins the KTNAR-award.
- In the event where a single winner cannot be identified due to a tie, the review panel members will be asked to rank-order the tied applications to select a final applicant. With three Review Panel members, the applicant with votes from at least two panel members wins the KTNAR-award.

## Appendix:

### Review criteria that refer to the quality of the abstract

| Criteria                                     | Inadequate  | Adequate  |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Clarity/<br/>completeness</b>             | The structure of the abstract is not clear, word usage is not always appropriate and it will take an informed reader some difficulty to extract the main ideas and follow the supporting reasoning.   | The abstract is well structured. The use of words and the way ideas are formulated is concise and clear in a way that even for an uninformed reader the main ideas and the support that is presented will be immediately clear.                               |
| <b>Relation to<br/>existing<br/>research</b> | The abstract does not clearly show any relation with or build on previous research in educational assessment. Neither does it focus on issues which have been found to be relevant and useful in previous research within the European context.                     | The abstract builds on previous research in educational assessment and adds to finding that can be useful within the European context. There is clear evidence to show that the topic is relevant or has its roots in research in educational assessment      |
| <b>Originality/<br/>innovativeness</b>       | The underlying ideas are well-known and have been the subject of other widely-published investigations. Approaches are standard and conclusions are as might be expected and do not contribute to wider or deeper understanding of issues in educational assessment | The research makes a significant and original contribution to the field of educational assessment. The methodological approaches are innovative and the conclusions contribute to wider or deeper understanding of issues in educational assessment           |
| <b>Impact</b>                                | The abstract does not mention any significant impact the work would have on existing assessment policies or practices, or the impact mentioned is of limited importance; it has little real-world impact.   | The abstract makes clear what impact the work has on existing assessment policies and practices and suggest ways of exploring unresolved issues in this respect; it has real-world impact to the wider community of assessment researchers and practitioners. |

### Scoring form for rank-ordering candidates

| Scoring form                  | scores for all candidates for alle criteria by reviewer |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
|-------------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <i>[Reviewer name]</i>        | Applicants  |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Criterion                     | <i>[name 1]</i>   | <i>[name 2]</i> | <i>[name 3]</i> | <i>[name 4]</i> | <i>[name 5]</i> | <i>[name 6]</i> | <i>[name 7]</i> |
| Clarity/ completeness         |   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Relation to existing research |   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Originality/innovativeness    |   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Impact                        |   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Reviewer Score                |   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |