

Best Paper Guidelines

Journal of Engineering Technology®

Eligibility

All papers, with the exception of ETD best papers from the ASEE and CIEC conferences, published in *JET* over a two-year period are eligible for this award, starting with the Fall 2020 issue.

Evaluation Committee

All members of the current *JET* Editorial Board, with one ETD officer appointed by the division chair, will serve as reviewers. The immediate past editor will serve as committee chair. The chair will prepare a spreadsheet to record scores, send it and the scoring rubric to all evaluators, receive results, and determine a winner. In the case of a tie, a subcommittee of three, chosen by the immediate past editor, will reevaluate the papers.

Criteria

Evaluation will follow the ASEE “Best Paper” rubric (page 2). Each paper will be judged on the following criteria:

- Content: includes originality, research approach (if appropriate), scholarship, relevance, goals
- Focus: order, conclusions
- Language: style, mechanics

Timeline

Judging will begin following the dissemination of the Spring issue at the end of year 2. Judges will have three weeks to review and evaluate all papers, complete the spreadsheet, and send the results to the committee chair. Results will be announced at the division business meeting at the annual conference.

Award

The award will consist of plaques for all authors and \$500, to be shared equally among authors.

Best Paper Evaluation Rubric

		3 Excellent	2 Good	1 Satisfactory	0 Needs improvement
Content	<i>Originality</i>	Content contains a highly original treatment of, or new perspective on, the topic	Content contains some original treatment of, or new perspective on, the topic	Content contains moderately original treatment of, or new perspective on, the topic	Content contains minimal original treatment of, or new perspective on, the topic
	<i>Research Approach</i>	The research approach is novel and/or sophisticated and appropriate for the purpose of the paper and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, or more specific)	The research approach is advanced and appropriate for the purpose of the paper and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, or more specific)	The research approach is basic but still appropriate for the purpose of the paper and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, or more specific)	The research approach is inadequate and/or inappropriate for the purpose of the paper
	<i>Results</i>	Data collection and assessment results are very clear and logical, strongly supporting the goals of the paper	Data collection and assessment results are clear and logical, supporting the goals of the paper	Data collection and assessment results are somewhat clear and logical, moderately supporting the goals of the paper	Data collection and assessment results need improvement
	<i>Scholarship</i>	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a significant extent	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a moderate extent	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a limited extent	Content does not review and build on appropriate prior work
	<i>Relevance</i>	The paper makes a highly significant contribution to the field of engineering/ technology education.	The paper makes a significant contribution to the field of engineering/ technology education.	The paper makes a moderate contribution to the field of engineering/ technology education.	The paper makes a minimal contribution to the field of engineering/ technology education.
Focus	<i>Goals</i>	The goals are strongly developed and explicitly stated	The goals are developed and explicitly stated	The goals are not fully developed and/or stated	The goals are not developed and/or stated
	<i>Order</i>	The order in which ideas are presented is explicitly and consistently clear, logical and effective	The order in which ideas are presented is reasonably clear, logical, and effective, but could be improved	The order in which ideas are presented is occasionally confusing	There is little apparent structure to the flow of ideas, causing confusion
	<i>Conclusions</i>	The conclusions are very well formulated and are strongly supported by the data	The conclusions are well formulated and are supported by the data	The conclusions are moderately effective and are only partially supported by the data	The conclusions are minimally effective and do not appear to be supported by the data
Language	<i>Style</i>	The paper is clear, concise, and consistent. It is easily understandable and a pleasure to read	The paper is mostly understandable, with occasional inconsistencies that could be improved	Multiple sections of the paper are difficult to read/ understand. The paper could be better structured or more clearly explained	The paper is difficult to read/ understand due to sentence/ paragraph structure, word choices, lack of explanations, etc.
	<i>Mechanics</i>	The writing is near perfect with little to no grammar or spelling errors	Minor grammar or spelling errors are present, but do not detract from the content. Content is clear	Some grammar or spelling errors are significant and detract from the content. Paper requires further editing	Pervasive grammar or spelling errors distort meaning and make reading difficult