



# Sheryl Kiefer Outstanding Research Award submission packet



**DEADLINE: THURSDAY, March 1, 2018 2:35 PM**

The Lee's Summit North Library Media Center wants to honor students who recognize the importance of research. We are looking for students who understand that the ability to seek out reliable information, use that information for effective problem-solving, and communicate what is learned to others is a skill you will use daily in an information-rich future. The LMC is pleased to offer the research scholarship in honor of former LSN librarian Sheryl Kiefer. The \$500 prize and a plaque on the entry hall to the LMC will be awarded to the student who submits the best research based project based on the provided scoring guide.

**Guidelines:**

1. Read and follow these guidelines carefully. Any missed steps could result in disqualification of your entry from the contest.
2. Any LSN senior is eligible to enter the scholarship competition. You may submit ONE entry for the contest. If you have more than one great research paper, submit the best.
3. Submitted papers must be the student's own original work with appropriate citations.
4. Submitted papers must have been written for a class at LSN, but you may make as many revisions as you like to better meet the provided scoring guide.
5. IB extended essays are welcome, but you are strongly encouraged to consult the scoring guide and rewrite as necessary for the parameters of this competition.
6. Please submit three copies of your project. One copy must have your name, the class for which you originally wrote the paper, and the teacher for whom you wrote the paper. The other two copies will be used in the blind judging, and must not have any identifying marks (primarily, your name and your teacher's name should NOT be on these copies).
7. Non-traditional formats may be used to present your research (video, Prezi, etc.) as long as a works cited section is either included or attached. The presentation must stand on its own.
8. Submit your packet to Mrs. Rockwell at the LMC circulation desk. Do NOT give your submission to either Mr. Russell or Mr. Miller, as they are judges and cannot know who is entering their work in the contest.
9. **Submissions must be turned in by 2:35 PM Thursday, March 1, 2018.** No late submissions will be accepted under any circumstances. You may submit beginning January 3, 2018.
10. The scoring process could take more than a month. The judges will notify the winner in person, then tweet the winner's name and entry title. Follow the LMC on Twitter @LSNLMC to be among the first to know who wins. Good luck!

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_ Total Score \_\_\_\_\_/35

	<b>Thesis/ Essential Question</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Synthesis</b>	<b>Citation</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>Conventions</b>
<b>5</b>	Student posed a thoughtful, creative question or thesis statement that engaged the student in challenging or provocative research. The question breaks new ground or contributes to knowledge in a focused, specific area.	Student gathered information from a variety of quality electronic and print sources, including appropriate databases. Sources are relevant, balanced and include critical readings relating to the thesis or problem. Primary sources were included (if appropriate).	Student carefully analyzed the information collected and drew appropriate and inventive conclusions supported by evidence. Voice of the student writer is evident.	Student developed appropriate structure for communicating product, incorporating variety of quality sources. Information is logically and creatively organized with smooth transitions.	Student documented all sources, including visuals, sounds, and animations. Sources are properly cited, both in-text/in-product and on Works-Cited/Works-Consulted pages/slides. Documentation is error-free.	Student effectively and creatively used appropriate communication tools to convey conclusions and demonstrated thorough, effective research techniques. Product displays creativity and originality.	No noticeable grammar, spelling, or usage errors in project or works cited.
<b>3</b>	Student posed a focused question involving the student in challenging research.	Student gathered information from a variety of relevant sources--print and electronic	Student product shows good effort was made in analyzing the evidence collected	Student logically organized the product and made good connections among ideas	Student documented sources with some care. Sources are cited, both in-text/in-product and on Works-Cited/Works-Consulted pages/slides. Few errors noted.	Student effectively communicated the results of research to the audience but the product lacks originality or creativity.	Fewer than one grammatical, spelling, or usage error in the project or works cited.

	<b>Thesis/ Essential Question</b>	<b>Evaluation</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>Synthesis</b>	<b>Citation</b>	<b>Product</b>	<b>Conventions</b>
<b>2</b>	Student constructed a question that lends itself to readily available answers	Student gathered information from a limited range of sources and displayed minimal effort in selecting quality resources	Student's conclusions could be supported by stronger evidence. Level of analysis could have been deeper.	Student could have put greater effort into organizing the product	Student needs to use greater care in documenting sources. Documentation was poorly constructed.	Student needs to work on communicating more effectively	Two or more grammatical, spelling, or usage errors per page in the project.
<b>1</b>	Student relied on teacher-generated questions or developed a question requiring little creative thought.	Student gathered information that lacked relevance, quality, depth and balance.	Student's conclusions simply involved restating information. Conclusions were not supported by evidence.	Student's work is difficult to follow based on organization and structure.	This could be the lamest attempt at a works cited in the post-writing-on-stone-tablets world.	Student needs to work on communicating more effectively	Convention errors so numerous as to be distracting
<b>0</b>	Thesis or question is fatally flawed or is so over-done as to be cliched.	Student gathered little or no relevant evidence.	Student did not draw conclusions.	Student's work is not logically or effectively structured.	No documentation provided.	Student showed little evidence of thoughtful research. Product does not effectively communicate research findings.	So many errors that the research is lost amid the butchery of the English language