Engineering Libraries Division (ELD) Conference Papers Rubric

Rubric Usage:

This rubric is intended to assist authors and reviewers in ELD throughout the process of preparing submissions for the ASEE Annual Meeting, but is not exhaustive. This rubric supplements existing guidance from ASEE.

Each area below should be considered as the expectation/standard for papers. Examples by area of "Needs Improvement" and "Excellent" follow the main list if needed for reference by the reviewer. This rubric should not be used to replace comments to authors, but guide reviewers in giving actionable feedback.

Paper Content Areas:

Originality
- ❏ Addresses a new question/practice, or a previously studied question in a new way, with emphasis on innovation and new contributions to the practice of librarianship.

Introduction/Background
- ❏ Introduces specific topic/area of interest and relevance to ELD such as: current issues/trends in academic librarianship, academic publishing, and/or engineering education.
- ❏ Review of relevant literature informs the research question(s) and/or methodological approach, and makes clear what the paper seeks to add to existing knowledge.
- ❏ Use of references is appropriate for the topic.

Method - Research/Practice Approach
- ❏ May be traditional research or practice-based approach, and may be completed, "proof of concept", or "work in progress", but must be clearly explained.
- ❏ Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods research are all valid methodological approaches.
- ❏ Method(s) are described adequately such that a reader could successfully replicate and apply processes to a new question.

Results - Data & Analysis
- ❏ Results are presented in such a way that the relationship to research question/practice is clear.
- ❏ Data are adequately summarized in narrative, tables, graphs, statistics, illustrations, appendices, and/or other representations. If statistical and/or mathematical analysis are utilized, they should be appropriate and sufficient for their purpose.
- ❏ Interpretation of results acknowledges any assumptions or possible biases.

Conclusions
- ❏ Relates specifically to research question(s)/practice(s) and to goals of the study undertaken.
- ❏ Statements are supported by the methodology and analysis of data or outcomes.
- ❏ If work did not fully address the question/practice, reporting of inconclusive and/or negative outcomes can be instructive and is acceptable.
- ❏ Limitations and/or areas outside of project scope should be acknowledged.
- ❏ Next steps should be thoughtfully considered and noted for papers in any category.

Structure & Language Areas:

Format & Order
- ❏ Paper structure elements, including references, are consistent, clearly presented and adhere to guidelines prescribed by ASEE.
- ❏ Each of the elements of the overall paper acts in concert with the others to provide a logical narrative that leads the reader to the central message of the paper. This order is reiterated in appropriate parts of the paper to enhance clarity.

Style & Tone
- ❏ Paper is readable and word usage reflects clarity and academic or scholarly communication.
- ❏ Variability in style is acceptable, recognizing differences in types of work and background of authors, but a consistent voice throughout the paper is expected.
- ❏ It is expected that authors have taken advantage of peers, colleagues, writing centers, etc. to ensure that their content is clearly expressed in English.

Mechanics
- ❏ Paper can be smoothly read and understood, without errors of grammar or spelling hindering comprehension of meaning or fact.
- ❏ A few minor errors of spelling or grammar may be present, but should not be a pattern.

Examples of Needs Improvement & Excellent by Area:

	Needs Improvement	Excellent
Paper Content:		
Originality	● Does not explicitly inform the reader what new contribution this provides ● The identified contribution is not new in reality	● Highly original approach towards research or practice
Introduction/ Background	● Lack of clear purpose/research question/focus of study ● Cursory or missing discussion of framing works ● Previous work in this area is inaccurately represented	● Work is clearly situated within the body of related research and a valuable contribution to this body is evident ● Previous research is accurately represented and relevant themes or other relationships are synthesized ● Chosen background sources are all relevant and contribute meaningfully to the narrative
Method - Research/Practice Approach	● Description of methods is cursory or nonexistent, lacking detail needed to repeat the study ● Lacks rationale for subject selection method, producing a disconnect between research question/focus of study and data collected	● Described so well that a reader can implement the research/practice themselves ● Evidence of thoughtful consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of chosen methods
Results - Data & Analysis	● Graphical presentation of data is biased or misleading, or not consistent with the text discussion ● Text accompanying data simply reiterates the data and adds no additional meaning ● Negative results are apparent or implied, but not directly addressed ● Data is overinterpreted or underinterpreted	● Graphical presentation of data or results is intuitively understood and suitable for presentation to people unfamiliar with the topic ● Textual description of data clearly describes items of statistical and practical significance and aids the reader in correct interpretation of the data ● Data outliers are thoughtfully considered and justification is given for inclusion or exclusion
Conclusions	● Some stated goals are not addressed in reporting of conclusions ● Connection between purpose and goals of the research is marginal or not explicit ● Claims are too broad or sweeping and go beyond that which is supported by current or previous work	● Demonstrates coherence between the aims of the work and the conclusions ● Explains how the work is valuable to the community ● Results are discussed from multiple angles and are interpreted at a level consistent with the accuracy and completeness of the data ● Limitations of current work discussed, and areas for future research are identified

Structure & Language		
Format & Order	• Format does not follow ASEE guidelines in major ways • Ideas are presented in a sequence that is difficult to follow • Sections of the paper are not unified in support of a clear message; missing appropriate transitional vocabulary or text to summarize ideas and direct the reader's attention to upcoming content	• ASEE format is followed exactly, including citations • Ideas are logically presented with each section building on the other to provide a coherent message • Content flows very well and author utilizes elements of transition to move reader from idea to idea
Style & Tone	• Language used in paper makes it difficult to read and/or understand for a typical ASEE/ELD reader	• No grammatical errors, and tone is intelligent/scholarly without being difficult to read • Paper is a pleasure to read
Mechanics	• Persistent spelling and grammar issues throughout which are distracting to the reader	• Masterful use of grammar and devoid of spelling errors