

William J. Kraemer Outstanding Sport Scientist Award

Personal Statement

Within 2 pages, explain why you deserve to be selected as the recipient of the 2027 William J. Kraemer Outstanding Sport Scientist award. In your response, please be sure to address the following:

1. The significance and impact of your research contributions and how they bridge the gap between science and practical application.
Provide supporting evidence of your impact such as: Publication record as lead or senior investigator, funding to support your lab, invited presentations, contribution to position stands or policy changes, other relevant evidence.
2. Your leadership or innovative approaches in advancing your field
Consider your role in mentoring and supporting the next generation of researchers

Personal Statement Rubric

** The essay/personal statement may be submitted as a written statement.*

**To be reviewed by at least three members of the NSCA Awards Subcommittee*

Definitions

Excellent	• Definition: Demonstrates outstanding scholarship, independence, and mentorship that adds significant value to the field. • Example: A scientist who demonstrates consistent research productivity and leadership by consistently engaging their research team. Research is innovative and advances the field, empowers trainees to engage in the research process.
Very Good	• Definition: Shows continuous scholarship, developing independence, and some mentorship that adds value to the field. Example: A scientist who demonstrates research productivity and leadership by engaging their research team. Research is innovative and advances the field, empowers trainees to engage in the research process.
Good	• Definition: Has some scholarship productivity that was independent of doctoral work, and some mentorship that adds value to the field. Example: Someone who has several publications in the field. Research is developing a novel trajectory, and trainees are engaged the research process.
Fair	• Definition: Exhibits potential for scholarly independence, limited publications and evidence of mentorship. • Example: Someone who has published in the field, but with limited work reflecting independence since degree and provides minimal evidence of trainee engagement.
Poor	• Definition: Lacks continuous publication record or evidence of scholarly engagement. Not evidence of mentorship. • Example: Some who has limited to no publication record, no evidence of work done since degree conferral. Not trainees engaged.

	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor
Significance and impact of research contributions (Consider scope and quality of scholarship)	5	4	3	2	1
Leadership or innovative approaches in advancing the field (Consider roles in directing research and application to the field)	5	4	3	2	1
Role in mentoring and supporting the next generation of researchers (Consider how their leadership has encouraged students' professional development or engagement with the NSCA)	5	4	3	2	1
Accomplishments that reflect independence as an investigator (Consider the lead/senior authorships, grants that support research independence, lab directorships, etc.)	5	4	3	2	1
Total					