

## 2020 Best Paper Rubric

Please adapt this rubric to value both research and practitioner-based manuscripts equally.

		<b>3 = Excellent</b>	<b>2 = Good</b>	<b>1 = Satisfactory</b>	<b>0=Needs Improvement</b>
<b>CONTENT (50%)</b>	<b>Goals</b>	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
	<b>Research or Practitioner Approach</b>	The research or practitioner approach is sophisticated and appropriate, and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, other).	The research or practitioner approach is advanced and appropriate, and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, other).	The research or practitioner approach is basic, but still appropriate, and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, other).	The research or practitioner approach is inadequate and/or not appropriate for the purpose of the paper.
	<b>Results or Outcomes</b>	Data collection and assessment results/outcomes are very clear and logical, strongly supporting the paper goals.	Data collection and assessment results/outcomes are clear and logical, supporting the paper goals.	Data collection and assessment results/outcomes are somewhat clear and logical, moderately supporting the paper goals.	Data collection and assessment results/outcomes need improvement.
	<b>Conclusions</b>	Conclusions, implications, and discussions are very well formulated and are strongly supported by the results/outcomes.	Conclusions, implications, and discussions are well formulated and are supported by the results/outcomes.	Conclusions, implications, and discussions are moderately effective and are only partially supported by the results/outcomes.	Conclusions, implications, and discussions are minimally effective and do not appear to be supported by the results/outcomes.
	<b>Other</b>	Presentation order of ideas is explicitly and consistently clear, logical and effective.	Order of ideas is reasonably clear, logical and effective, but could be improved.	Presentation order of ideas is occasionally confusing.	There is little apparent structure to the flow of ideas, causing confusion.
<b>FOCUS (35%)</b>	<b>Originality</b>	Content contains highly original treatment of, or new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains some original treatment of, or new perspective on, the topic	Content contains some original treatment of, or new perspective on, the topic	Content contains minimal original treatment of, or new perspective on, the topic.
	<b>Relevance</b>	The paper makes a highly significant contribution to engineering.	The paper makes a significant contribution to engineering.	The paper makes a moderate contribution to engineering.	The paper makes a minimal contribution to engineering.
	<b>Scholarship or Context</b>	Content reviews or builds on appropriate prior work or contextualizes practitioner purpose to a significant extent.	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work or contextualizes practitioner purpose to a moderate extent.	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work or contextualizes practitioner purpose to a limited extent.	Content does not review and build on appropriate prior work or contextualizes practitioner purpose.
<b>LANGUAGE (15%)</b>	<b>Style</b>	The paper is clear, concise, and consistent. It is easy understandable and a pleasure to read.	The paper 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.
	<b>Mechanics</b>	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.