

2024 HONORS IN ACTION PROJECT AWARD

Chapters may submit one entry which describes an in-depth Honors in Action (HIA) Project based on a theme of the 2022/2023 Honors Study Topic, *The Art and Science of Play*.

- HIA Projects incorporate the following components:
 - Academic research and analysis
 - Action (service or advocacy *and* collaboration)
 - Impact
- HIA Projects require substantive academic investigation of a theme related to the Society's current Honors Study Topic.
- Your analysis of your research should determine the action component of your project.
- The current [Honors Program Guide](#) is a primary resource to help you develop and implement your HIA Project.
- **Research Edge**, an online [PTK Edge course](#) available to all PTK members and advisors, teaches the basics of academic research and how to conduct an HIA Project.
- **Review the Judging Rubrics in this document often to guide your project implementation and when writing your award entry.**

SUBMISSION DEADLINE:

Wednesday, January 17, 2024, by 5:00 pm Central Standard Time at <http://my.ptk.org>

Word Count Limit: The essay responses for the entire application cannot exceed 2600 words. No limit is given for each essay question, but to the application as a whole.

Optional: Chapters may attach up to three tables, charts, or photographs that illuminate their Honors in Action research and action.

1. Provide a brief abstract or summary of your Honors in Action Project including the following components: academic research into and analysis of sources related to the Honors Study Topic, action that addresses a need in your community that was discovered through your research and analysis into the Society's current Honors Study Topic, and the impact of your project. (*NOTE: Recommended word count for the abstract is no more than 300 words.*)

2. What theme in the current Honors Program Guide did your chapter focus on?

Theme 1 – The Essence of Play

Theme 2 – Economics of Play

Theme 3 – Systems of Play

Theme 4 – Architecture and Design of Play

Theme 5 – Soul of Play

Theme 6 – Nostalgia as Play

Theme 7 – Play It Forward

3. Summarize your research objectives. In other words, what did your chapter set out to accomplish in terms of its research? (See Research Objectives Rubric in the HIA Rubrics for more detail.)

4. Describe your academic research into the Honors Study Topic, your research question(s), your analysis of your research findings, and your research conclusions.

5. List in alphabetical order the 8 academic/expert sources that were most enlightening regarding multiple perspectives of the Honors Study Topic theme you selected. Briefly explain why these were the most important sources and what you learned from each of them as you researched your theme.

- Use full, formal APA citations for each source.
- Bold, italics, and underlining are **not** available in the application software.
- The list of sources should be alphabetized by the **last name of the first author** of each work.

6. Summarize your project action and collaboration objectives. In other words, what did your chapter set out to accomplish in terms of its collaborations and action?

7. Describe the service or "action" components of this Honors in Action Project that were inspired by and directly connected to your Honors Study Topic research. (Action can also include promoting awareness and advocacy.) Be sure to include information about the people and/or groups with whom you collaborated, why you chose these collaborators, and the impact they had on the outcomes of the project.

8. What are the quantitative and qualitative outcomes of your project? What impact did your project have on the problem addressed and on opportunities for chapter members and others to grow as scholars and leaders?

NOTE: HIA Project entries may be selected for *Civic Scholar: Phi Theta Kappa's Journal of Undergraduate Research*. However, chapters may opt out of consideration by selecting that option in the online Honors in Action Project Award application.

The entry will be judged in its entirety based on the following criteria. Maximum score is 100 points.

ACADEMIC RIGOR OF RESEARCH – 34 points

RESEARCH QUESTION

5 points - The chapter developed a thoughtful, answerable research question to guide its academic investigation of the Honors Study Topic through one of the themes in the 2022/2023 Honors Program Guide.

4 points - The chapter developed a research question to guide its academic investigation of the Honors Study Topic.

3 points - The chapter developed a research question that minimally guided its academic investigation of the Honors Study Topic.

2 points – The chapter conducted research without a clear research question to guide its investigation into the Honors Study Topic.

1 point – The chapter conducted research without a research question.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

NOTE: Research objectives are related to your Honors Study Topic academic research and include, but is not limited to, things such as the development of your Honors in Action (HIA) team, the number of sources to review (this can certainly be more than 8, but you choose the 8 most impactful sources to include in your Hallmark Award entry), how the team will determine research conclusions, the team’s reflection objectives, the project timeline, and other objectives you hope to accomplish with your HIA project.

5 points – Research objectives clearly emphasized the importance of intentional research as the cornerstone of the Honors in Action Project.

4 points - Research objectives included the importance of intentional research as the cornerstone of the Honors in Action Project.

3 points – Research objectives minimally included the importance of intentional research as the cornerstone of the Honors in Action Project.

2 points – Research objectives about the importance of intentional research were unclear.

1 point – Research objectives did not include the importance of intentional research.

ACADEMIC RESEARCH

5 points - The entry clearly conveys in-depth academic research into the Honors Study Topic through one of the Themes in the current Honors Program Guide.

4 points – The chapter conducted substantive research into a theme in the current Honors Program Guide, though the direct connection to the Honors Study Topic is unclear.

3 points – The chapter conducted research into a Theme in the current Honors Program Guide, but there is no explicit connection to the Honors Study Topic

2 points – The chapter conducted minimal research into one of the Themes in the current Honors Program Guide and did not explicitly connect its research to the Honors Study Topic.

1 point – No evidence to indicate chapter conducted academic research into a Theme in the current Honors Program Guide.

RESEARCH CONCLUSIONS

NOTE: Research conclusions are what you learned and can articulate from your substantive academic research into PTK's Honors Study Topic. Hallmark Award judges should see evidence of members' critical thinking and research skills strengthened as a result of the chapter's academic research. The research conclusions lead you directly to your chapter's action – be sure to make it clear WHY your research conclusions led to your *specific* plan of action.

5 points - The in-depth academic research clearly provided substantial material for the chapter to carefully weigh and consider in determining an action component to implement that clearly addressed a finding and is directly connected to their research conclusions. Clear, compelling evidence shows the research activities allowed participants to strengthen critical thinking skills.

4 points - Academic research provided material for the chapter to consider in determining an action component to implement that addressed a finding and is connected to their research conclusions. Evidence shows the research activities allowed participants to develop critical thinking skills.

3 points - The entry shows some evidence of academic research into the Honors Study Topic, and the team's research provided material for the chapter to consider in determining an action component to implement that addressed a finding.

2 points – The entry shows minimal evidence of academic research into the Honors Study Topic, and the action component of the project is not clearly and directly connected to the research and/or the action component of the project was decided before the chapter conducted its research into the Honors Study Topic.

1 point – The entry shows no evidence of academic research into the Honors Study Topic and no explicit connection between the research and action components of the project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY/CITATIONS

A. ACADEMIC SOURCES

3 points - The chapter's research included 8 sources that were clearly academic publications, academic interviews with expert sources conducted in the past year by the chapter team.

1.5 points - The research included 8 sources, at least 6-7 of which were from academic publications or academic interviews with expert sources conducted in the past year by the chapter team.

.5 point – The chapter's research included sources that only included 5 or fewer from academic publications or academic interviews with expert sources conducted in the past year by the chapter team.

B. SOURCES' RANGE OF VIEWPOINTS

3 points - Expert sources are clearly wide-ranging and clearly represent different points of view about the Honors Study Topic and the theme selected by the chapter from the current Honors Program Guide.

1.5 points - Expert sources are somewhat wide-ranging and represent some different points of view about the Honors Study Topic and the theme selected by the chapter from the current Honors Program Guide.

.5 point – There is little evidence that sources are wide-ranging and represent different points of view about the Honors Study Topic and the theme selected by the chapter from the current Honors Program Guide.

CITATIONS

A. APA CITATIONS STRUCTURE

3 points - The citations are written in formal, full, and consistent APA style and structure.

1 point - Citations are formal and consistent in structure, but not all citations show full information about the source and/or not all citations are written in formal, full, and consistent APA style.

.5 point – Citations are not formal, full, consistent, and/or citations are not written in formal, full, and consistent APA style and structure.

B. BIBLIOGRAPHIC ANNOTATIONS

3 points - Bibliographic annotations of academic sources provide robust evidence supporting why the source was significant to the chapter's research and how the evidence clearly related to the chapter's research conclusions.

2 points - Bibliographic annotations of academic sources provide some evidence supporting why the source was significant to the chapter's research and how the evidence related to the chapter's research conclusions.

1 point - Bibliographic annotations of academic sources provide little or no evidence supporting why the source was significant to the chapter's research and how the evidence related to the chapter's research conclusions.

SPELLING AND GRAMMAR

2 points - Spelling and grammar are faultless. Entry is well-written and easy to follow.

1 point - There were a few errors in spelling and/or grammar. Entry has some awkward writing OR does not give enough specific details.

.5 point - There were spelling and/or grammar errors throughout. Writing is disjointed and does not give enough specific details.

SERVICE/ACTION – 33 points

ACTION OBJECTIVES

5 points - Project objectives were clearly measurable and clearly emphasized the importance of taking action or serving AND emphasized the clearly-defined proposed scope of the project.

4 points – Project objectives were measurable and emphasized the importance of taking action or serving and defined the scope of the project.

3 points – Project objectives were minimally related to the action part of the project and minimally defined the project's scope.

2 points – Project objectives were unclear and/or did not relate to the action part of the project or define the scope of the project.

1 point – Project objectives were unclear and/or the scope of the project was not defined.

ACTION'S CONNECTION TO PTK'S HONORS STUDY TOPIC

6 points – The chapter clearly shows with specific evidence how the action was developed from the chapter's Honors Study Topic research conclusions.

5 points – The chapter shows how the action was developed from the chapter's Honors Study Topic research conclusions.

4 points – The chapter implicitly shows how the action was developed from the chapter's research conclusions.

3 points – The chapter conducted Honors Study Topic research, but the action did not appear to develop from the chapter's research conclusions.

2 points – The chapter developed the action piece of the project without strong connections to academic research into the Honors Study Topic.

1 point – The chapter engaged in action/service with little or no Honors Study Topic research to support the need for the project.

OUTREACH/COLLABORATION

5 points - The chapter's project (Academic Investigation and/or Action) reached a variety of audiences including BOTH the college and the community, and the role(s) played by collaborators were substantive and stemmed from the chapter's research conclusions.

4 points - The chapter's project (Academic Investigation and/or Action) reached a variety of audiences including BOTH the college and the community, and the collaborators were selected as good fits for the action selected as a result of the chapter's research conclusions.

3 points – The chapter's project (Academic Investigation and/or Action) reached a variety of audiences including BOTH the college and the community.

2 points – The chapter's project (Academic Investigation and/or Action) reached at least one of the following: the college or the community.

1 point – Little or no evidence that the chapter worked with outside collaborators from the college or community.

COMMUNICATION

5 points - There is clear and compelling evidence that communication among the participating individuals and/or organizations was effective and efficient and that they explicitly shared common objectives.

4 points - There is substantive evidence that communication among the participating individuals and/or organizations was effective and efficient and that they shared common objectives.

3 points - There is evidence that communication among the participating individuals and/or organizations was effective and that they shared common objectives.

2 points – There is some evidence that communication among the participating individuals and/or organizations was effective.

1 point – There is little or no evidence that communication among the participating individuals and/or organizations was effective.

HEIGHTENED AWARENESS OF SELF AND COMMUNITY IN RELATION TO GLOBAL ISSUES

5 points – Solid, specific evidence is given that chapter, college, and community participants heightened their awareness of self and community in relation to global issues.

4 points – Solid, specific evidence is given that chapter participants heightened their awareness of self and community in relation to global issues.

3 points - Evidence is given that participants heightened their awareness of self and community in relation to global issues.

2 points – Minimal evidence is given that participants heightened their awareness of self and community in relation to global issues.

1 point – There is no evidence given that participants heightened their awareness of self and community in relation to global issues.

INCREASED APPRECIATION FOR VALUE OF INFORMED ACTION AS LIFELONG ENDEAVOR

5 points – The entry provided clear, strong, and specific evidence that participants increased their appreciation for the value of informed action/service as a lifelong endeavor.

4 points - The entry provided clear evidence that participants increased their appreciation for the value of informed action/service as a lifelong endeavor.

3 points – The entry provided evidence that participants increased their appreciation for the value of informed action/service as a lifelong endeavor, though the evidence could have been more specific.

2 points – The entry provided minimal evidence that participants increased their appreciation for the value of informed action/service as a lifelong endeavor.

1 point – The entry provided little or no specific evidence that participants increased their appreciation for the value of informed action/service as a lifelong endeavor.

SPELLING AND GRAMMAR

2 points - Spelling and grammar are faultless. Entry is well-written and easy to follow.

1 point - There were a few errors in spelling and/or grammar. Entry has some awkward writing OR does not give enough specific details.

.5 point - There were spelling and/or grammar errors throughout. Writing is disjointed and does not give enough specific details.

IMPACT – 33 points

CONTRIBUTION TO UNDERSTANDING OF THE HONORS STUDY TOPIC

6 points - Without question, the project made substantial, specific contributions to participants' understanding of a theme as it relates to the current Honors Study Topic.

5 points – The project made a strong contribution to participants' understanding of a theme as it relates to the current Honors Study Topic.

4 points – The project contributed to participants' understanding of a theme as it relates to the current Honors Study Topic.

3 points – The project made some contributions to participants' understanding of a theme as it relates to the current Honors Study Topic.

2 points – The project made minimal contributions to participants’ understanding of a theme as it relates to the current Honors Study Topic.

1 point – Little or no evidence to support the project’s contribution to participants’ understanding of a theme as it relates to the current Honors Study Topic.

CONTRIBUTION TO UNDERSTANDING OF THE IMPORTANCE OF LIFELONG INTENTIONAL SERVICE

5 points – Without question, the action piece of the project made a substantial, specific, and measurable contribution to improving an issue determined from the chapter’s Honors Study Topic research conclusions and within the clearly-defined proposed scope.

4 points – The action piece of the project made a strong contribution to improving an issue determined from the chapter’s Honors Study Topic research conclusions and within the defined proposed scope.

3 points – The action piece of the project made a contribution to improving an issue determined from the chapter’s Honors Study Topic research conclusions and within the defined proposed scope.

2 points – The action piece of the project made a contribution to improving an issue within the defined proposed scope.

1 point – The contribution to improving an issue of the action piece of the project is unclear and/or the scope of the project is unclear.

CONTRIBUTION TO IMPROVING AN ISSUE WITHIN THE CLEARLY-DEFINED PROPOSED SCOPE

5 points – Without question, the project had significant, specific short-term impact and clear potential for long-term impact.

4 points – The project had strong short-term impact and clear potential for long-term impact.

3 points – The project had some short-term impact and potential for long-term impact.

2 points – The project had minimal short-term impact and minimal potential for long-term impact.

1 point - The short-term impact and potential for long-term impact of the project is unclear.

RESEARCH QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE OUTCOMES

Research outcomes are related to your Honors Study Topic academic research and research objectives and include, but are not limited to, things such as the development of your HIA team, the number of sources reviewed (this can certainly be more than eight, but you choose the eight most impactful sources to include in your Hallmark Award entry), how the team determined its research conclusions, how the team reflected throughout the research part of the project, how the team met its project timeline, and how the chapter met its other research-related objectives. Finally, how did the team determine whether members grew as scholars and leaders?

5 points – Without question, the project’s research outcomes were exceptional and specific for the Honors in Action time frame, addressed the chapter’s objectives, and were both quantitative and qualitative.

4 points – The chapter addressed the project’s research outcomes for the Honors in Action time frame, addressed the chapter’s objectives, and included both quantitative and qualitative evidence.

3 points – The chapter addressed the project’s research outcomes for the Honors in Action time frame and included both quantitative and qualitative evidence.

2 points – The chapter addressed their project’s research outcomes for the Honors in Action time frame and included quantitative OR qualitative evidence.

1 point – The project’s research outcomes were unclear for the Honors in Action time frame though the entry may have included quantitative and/or qualitative outcomes.

ACTION QUANTITATIVE AND QUALITATIVE OUTCOMES

5 points – Without question, the project’s action outcomes were exceptional and specific for the Honors in Action time frame, addressed the chapter’s objectives, and were both quantitative and qualitative.

4 points – The chapter addressed the project’s action outcomes for the Honors in Action time frame, addressed the chapter’s objectives, and included both quantitative and qualitative evidence.

3 points – The chapter addressed the project’s action outcomes for the Honors in Action time frame and included both quantitative and qualitative evidence.

2 points – The chapter addressed the project’s action outcomes for the Honors in Action time frame and included quantitative or qualitative evidence.

1 point – The project’s action outcomes were unclear for the Honors in Action time frame though the entry may have included quantitative and/or qualitative outcomes.

REFLECTION

5 points – Without question the chapter assessed in an intentional, consistent, and reflective way throughout the project what they learned, how they grew as scholars and leaders, and how they met their proposed project objectives.

4 points – The chapter assessed in an intentional and reflective way what they learned and how they grew as scholars and leaders.

3 points – The chapter assessed in a reflective way what they learned and how they grew as scholars and leaders.

2 points – The chapter assessed in a minimal way what they learned and how they grew as scholars and leaders.

1 point – The chapter did not appear to assess what they learned and how they grew as scholars and leaders.

SPELLING AND GRAMMAR

2 points - Spelling and grammar are faultless. Entry is well-written and easy to follow.

1 point - There were a few errors in spelling and/or grammar. Entry has some awkward writing OR does not give enough specific details.

.5 point - There were spelling and/or grammar errors throughout. Writing is disjointed and does not give enough specific details.