

ETD Strategic Plan Report – ASEE, June 2007

Six of the most pressing strategies/goals for ETD were identified and discussed at the June 2006 ASEE and the January 2007 CIEC meetings. See the appended report where the red marks are the results of the discussions from the previous meetings. The June 2006 report is currently posted on the new ETD website (www.engtech.org).

Submitted by:

Abi Aghayere

ETD Strategic Plan Report, June 2007

by

Abi Aghayere

Table of Contents

Prioritized List of ETD Strategies	pp 3-4
Progress Reports from Strategy/Action Item Champions	pp 5-10
Appendix 1 (Related to Goal #3, Strategy 3C)	pp 10-15
Appendix 2 (Related to Goal #3, Strategy 3C)	pp 15-16
Appendix 3 (Related to Goal #2, Strategy 2A)	pp 16-17

ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY DIVISION (ASEE) Strategic Plan – Prioritized List of Strategies

A prioritized list of the most important strategies from the ETD Strategic plan was developed and the champions for those strategies were contacted and encouraged to develop action plans and progress reports. The progress reports from the champions for the six strategies identified follows.

Goal # 1	Strengthen ETD as the organization that supports engineering technology faculty	
Strategy 1.E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote and support faculty development 	
	Champion(s):	
	Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In conjunction with ETC , provide faculty development activities for ET faculty. Champions: ETLI Board, ETD Program Chair, CIEC Program Chair Develop national guidelines for promotion of ET faculty. Champions: Tom Hall, Steve Schneiderman, Al McHenry Provide information for ET faculty members seeking to publish in professional technical publications
	Timeframe:	
	Status/Evidence:	

Strategy 1.G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase recognition of ET faculty through awards 	
	Champion(s):	Robert English
	Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue publicizing current awards Create additional awards
	Timeframe:	Every Nov. and Dec.
	Status/Evidence:	A number of people have been contacted about nominating someone for ASEE awards. Announcements have been made on the ETD listserv.

Goal # 2	Promote the quality of engineering technology education with a focus on programs, faculty, and students	
Strategy 2.A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote TAC/ABET accreditation 	
	Champion(s):	TAC representative to ASEE (Timothy W. Zeigler)
	Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In conjunction with ETC, promote ties to TAC/ABET (esp. 2-year schools) Improve dissemination of workshop materials through ETLI and links to ATE centers

	Timeframe:	
	Status/Evidence:	
Strategy 2.C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop faculty development guidelines (<i>This is in concert with Strategy 1E of Goal #1</i>) 	
	Champion(s):	
	Action Item(s):	○
	Timeframe:	
	Status/Evidence:	

Goal # 3	Promote scholarship opportunities for faculty	
Strategy 3.C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop policy/procedures for quality control of scholarship at ASEE conferences, in conjunction with ETC 	
	Champion(s):	ETD Vice Chair of programs – Scott Dunning; Ron Land; CIEC Program Chair
	Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Publish paper review policies ○ Develop recommendations for an elevated review process
	Timeframe:	CIEC 2006
	Status/Evidence:	Ron Land presented a draft for paper review policies at the ETD Exec. Board meeting at ASEE2005
Strategy 3.D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support early-career faculty in scholarship 	
	Champion(s):	Mike Kozak, Jack Waintraub, Ken Rennels
	Action Item(s):	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide a database for early career faculty to seek potential collaborators (web-based?) ○ Offer a session at ASEE/CIEC for new engineering technology educators
	Timeframe:	
	Status/Evidence:	

PRIORITIZED STRATEGIES: PROGRESS REPORTS/ACTION PLANS

1. Goal # 1, Strategy 1.E: Promote and support faculty development

Action Plan Items: In conjunction with ETC, provide faculty development activities for ET faculty.

Champions: **ETLI Board, ETD Program Chair (Hal Broberg), CIEC Program Chair**

Hal Broberg's Recommendations:

1. During my 14 TAC/ABET visits I found more and more universities requiring greater traditional publication/grant activity from Engineering Technology educators. Because of this I recommend that ET faculty development help prepare faculty to publish in Journals and to write and obtain grants from government and industry. The focus should be on "applied" research, but scholarly activity is necessary.

*****(Action required by Carol Richardson - to report back by CIEC 07)***

2. I recommend that the Journal of Engineering Technology expand its number of articles and/or its number of issues to give engineering technology educators an outlet that is recognized as THE journal to publish in for ET educators.

*****(Action required by JET Board and Carol Richardson - to report back by CIEC 07) - Carol Richardson reported back at CIEC 2007 that she talked with the JET Board and that we cannot afford a 3rd JET issue.***

I recommend that a proposal (I believe by Bob Herrick at Purdue) to do a complete peer review on a limited number (10 per year?) of papers for the ASEE annual conference and publish these in the conference as "selected" papers. With 184 papers submitted this year of which 27 were rejected, out of about 265 abstracts, these 10 or so papers would be "elite". These papers should be publicized and, depending on the university, could count as much as a journal paper because of the chance of selection (10/184= 5.4%).

2. GOAL #1, Strategy 1.E: Promote and support faculty development

Action Plan Items: Develop national guidelines for promotion of ET faculty.
Champions: Tom Hall, Steve Schneiderman, Al McHenry

- Required Action Plan Completion Date:

- Steps

<i>No.</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Responsible Individual</i>	<i>Budget Needed</i>	<i>Completion Date</i>
1.	Develop proposed guidelines*	Champions	0	ETLI 06
2.	Present proposal to the ETD Executive Bd	Champions	0	CIEC 07
3.	Send approved proposal to ETD members for comment (include administrators)	Champions	0	Feb 07
4.	Receive comments from the field	Champions	0	Apr 07
5.	Compile comments and incorporate suggestions into the proposal	Champions	0	Jun 07
6.	Present revised proposal to the ETD Board	Champions	0	Jun 07

VI. Performance (Assessment) Measures

- Guidelines are useful to 75% of the membership
- Guidelines can be implemented by 75% of the schools represented
- Guidelines are helpful to at least 75% ETD faculty members seeking promotion

* There is a start on this as a paper to be presented at the ASEE 2006 Annual Conference. Further work is needed in terms of staffing it with those who have done considerable work on this strategy in the past.

3. Goal #1: Strategy 1G: Increase recognition of ET faculty through awards

Action Plan Items: Identification of a broad array of awards and a document listing websites of these awards.

Champions: **Robert English**

A number of senior ETD members were encouraged to nominate deserving members for ASEE Fellow, McGraw, and Berger awards. There were multiple nominations for these awards. Nominators should renominate unsuccessful candidates.

Notes from Strategic Planning Meeting of July 21, 2006:

- Encourage ETD members to nominate deserving members for other awards such as ASME and IEEE Education awards, and the National Academy of Engineering awards.

4. Goal #2, Strategy 2.A: Promote TAC/ABET accreditation

Champion(s): TAC representative to ASEE (Timothy W. Zeigler)

The Strategic Plan, Goal 2 Strategy 2.A has two action items, but there were no plans or activities associated with them. I have attached an action plan for future consideration.
Thank you

1. ETD shall provide multiple sessions/workshops (with a focus on programs, faculty, administration, students, and accreditation) at the ASEE annual conference, CIEC, and ETLI. Provide a separate invitation (from ETD) to 2-year schools to participate as session/workshop developers/moderators.

NOTE: Multiple ETD sessions on a variety of topics are scheduled for ASEE 2006 (Chicago); however representation of 2-year schools appeared limited to only three sessions. There is no apparent participation of 2-year schools in three important sessions:

3647 Assessment and TC2K Methods
2548 Leadership and Administration in ET
2250 TC2K Methods and Models

*****(Action required by Scott Dunning)* – see appendix for Scott Dunning’s report.**

2. ETLI host colleges/universities shall include 2-year institutions. Selected ETLI workshops shall target administration and accreditation issues at 2-year schools.

NOTE: Host colleges/universities for the 2006 ETLI do include 2-year schools.

3. The ASEE annual conference shall include a minimum of two sessions with

combined sponsorship of the Engineering Technology Division and the Two-Year College Division. One of those sessions shall focus on accreditation.

NOTE: ASEE 2006 has no such combined sponsorship sessions and none of the scheduled Two-Year Division sessions address accreditation topics.

*****(Action required by Scott Dunning)***

Notes from Strategic Planning Meeting of July 21, 2006:

- Carol Richardson will do some outreach during the ETD fall 2006 elections to encourage members from 2-year institutions to contest for office.

5. Goal #3, Strategy 3.C: Develop policy/procedures for quality control of scholarship at ASEE conferences, in conjunction with ETC
**Champion(s): ETD Vice Chair of programs – Scott Dunning; Ron Land
CIEC Program Chair**

Action Items to Support Strategy 3.C

I. Review Paper Policy

This year the automated system used by ASEE for paper submission and review changed from CAPS to Smoothpaper. I have updated the Paper Review policy originally developed by Ron Land to reflect the changes. It is attached [see Appendix 1] for reference, review and discussion.

During the past year we reviewed 265 abstracts and 184 papers. This was only possible by the willingness of some reviewers to review 6 to 8 papers each. Thus, we need to be sensitive to the loads we placed on our volunteer reviewers. We tried to give maximum flexibility to our reviewers concerning their approach to reviews, but in retrospect, I realize that I should have provided more guidance to the reviewers. Without guidance, some reviews provided little or no supporting comments to justify the scores. Ron Land provided a draft review form [see Appendix 2] to me that I forwarded to reviewers upon request. *I recommend that we approve the use of that that review form as the standard for reviews.*

II. Elevated Review Process Recommendations

I have discussed the merits and requirements associated with an elevated review process with Ron Land who in conjunction with Ron Rockland initiated the discussion on this topic. Based upon their input, *I recommend that ETD initiate a two-tier review process in Fall, 2007 for paper submissions to ASEE 2008.* Authors would be allowed to choose which review level they would like to submit to.

The Level 1 review would be basically the process we use now. This level review will be directly enhanced by requiring reviewers to use the attached review form but enhanced by a set of review guidelines tailored to support the review form. ETD would need to add some additional details to the attached review form describing what reviewers should consider when answering each of the queries in the review form. Additionally, I recommend that we ask reviewers to formally agree to use the form and follow the guidelines, particularly the suggestion that written critiques/suggestions are necessary for any items scored below a 4 on the 1 - 5 scale.

The Level 2 review process would be double-blind and would be done by a select set of reviewers defined as the ETD editorial board. Editorial board members would have to be recommended by a selection committee made up of the last 5 program chairs and qualified by an objective 'process.' I suggest that we review the policies used by JET, JEE and Prism and develop a subset of our own from those used by them. A draft proposal for this objective process should be submitted for discussion at the upcoming CIEC meeting. Clearly, this process could require a longer time line than level 1 and might necessitate being done outside the standard ASEE submission process. If that is the case, we will have to negotiate with ASEE how we can mesh it with the Smoothpaper.

I propose that we tie the more intense review to something like 'invited paper sessions' (only after passing the review would the author be invited to present, and presentations would be in special sessions – such as an ETD-mini plenary). This would allow us to provide recognition for promotion, tenure, professional advancement, or whatever for our colleagues. Level 1 should help to some degree (if we do some work to disseminate the review policy), but Level 2 could be a venue approaching the recognition of JET. Upon implementation of this policy, ETD should present a formal announcement to ETD faculty, deans and administrators.

Notes from Strategic Planning Meeting of July 21, 2006:

- Ron Land will put together additional guidelines for the current review process.
- JET Board should be encouraged to invite authors with “Best paper” nominations at the ASEE Annual Conference to submit an expanded version of their paper for publication in JET. - At the CIEC 2007, Ron Land indicated that he plans to work with Scott Dunning to develop a “Selected or Invited Paper” session at the ASEE Annual Conference.

6. Goal #3: Promote Scholarship Opportunities for Faculty **Strategy #6: Support early-career faculty in scholarship.** **Champions: Mike Kozak, Ken Rennels, Jack Waintraub**

Action Item #1: Provide a database for early career faculty to seek potential collaborators (web-based?)

Action Item #2: Offer a session at ASEE/CIEC for new engineering technology educators.

We propose to combine the two action items into one panel-conducted, open workshop at CIEC 2007, with all participants welcome. Dr. Keith Johnson has agreed to include this workshop in the CIEC 2007 schedule. Dean Michael Dyrenfurth of Purdue University will begin the session by presenting an updated version of an earlier publication that addresses achieving promotion and tenure and the importance of scholarship.

Ken, Jack and I, along with Dean Dyrenfurth, will follow the presentation with an input session from those in attendance regarding what specific items should be included in this data base and how to best relate this subject to current tenure-track engineering technology faculty.

We will ask those in the session for topics and the most appropriate method for collecting and providing a data base for ASEE members who are seeking research collaboration.

The three "champions" will collect and assemble the recommended information, possibly utilizing the List Serve, between CIEC 2007 and CIEC 2008 and plan to make the information available at CIEC 2008. Additional consideration is to make the database available to ASEE members through the ASEE/CIEC website.

Appendix 1 - (Related to Prioritized Strategy #5)

Engineering Technology Division
Solicitation and Paper Review Process for Annual ASEE Conference
June 2006

Prepared by Ron Land, Vice-Chair of Programs, 2005
Updated by Scott Dunning, Assistant Vice-Chair of Programs, 2006

For the last four years, the Engineering Technology Division (ETD) of the American Society of Engineering Educators (ASEE) has used a multi-step process for soliciting and reviewing papers submitted for presentation at the annual ASEE conference. That process is summarized below:

Listing of Suggested Presentation Topics

Development of ETD's program for ASEE begins with generation of a list of suggested topics for technical sessions for the coming year's conference. The Vice-Chair for Programs is responsible for generating the list and disseminating it to potential authors. Typically, the list is a derivative of the session topics from the previous conference. Variations and modifications to the list usually arise from three sources –

- The ETD Program Planning Session, which is always scheduled for Wednesday afternoon of the previous conference
- Special requests supplied by the division membership

- Attendance and responses from the session surveys from the previous conference (This information is provided by the ASEE Conferences Dept.; however, it often is not available until late summer or early fall. Generally, calls for papers and announcement of tentative session topics need to go out before this time.)

Calls for Abstracts/Papers

The first call for papers should occur shortly after a list of session topics is established, typically by early to mid July. The Vice-Chair for programs is also responsible for issuing calls for papers. Three venues have been used in recent years to make calls:

- The ETD listserv
- The Conferences Information page on ASEE's website
- The Prism

Calls via the listserv can be done directly by the Vice-Chair and should be repeated approximately monthly from July until shortly before the deadline for abstract submissions (typically late September to early October). Calls via ASEE's webpage and the Prism are coordinated through the ASEE Conference Coordinator. Calls via the listserv can and should include the list of session topics; however, space limitations in the Prism generally prohibit listing sessions. A list of sessions may or may not be possible on ASEE's webpage depending on the directions from ASEE's Conference Coordinator.

This last point is an important one for program organization. In recent years, authors submitting abstracts were asked to identify, in order of preference, their recommendations of proposed sessions to host their papers. This information is of great help to the Vice-Chair and Assistant Vice-Chair for Programs when assigning papers to sessions, adjusting session topics in response to demand, and particularly in choosing session time slots at the Conference. While many authors have heeded this request in recent years, many have not, often because they have responded to a call for papers that did not include the list of session topics. Thus, it is important to include in all calls for papers, even those that do not include the session list, a clear indication that session preferences are expected with the abstract. Clearly, it is also important that calls not containing a session list must identify where the list can be found (see below re. reference materials for authors).

As a final point, all calls for papers should remind authors that, to be acceptable to ETD, a paper must have some relevance to education. The position of the Division is that ASEE's conference is an 'educational' venue, and therefore, purely technical papers are not appropriate.

Arranging Session Moderators, Co-moderator and Reviewers

For the last three years, the Division has assigned a moderator, co-moderator and two additional paper reviewers to each technical session. The moderator is responsible for organizing the session, acting as liaison with authors whose papers are assigned to the session, and conducting the session at the conference. The co-moderator acts as a backup to the moderator and is expected to take over moderator duties should some unexpected event prevent the moderator from fulfilling his or her role. The moderator, co-moderator

and reviewers all participate in the assessment of papers assigned to their session. (See below.)

Recruiting of moderators, co-moderators and reviewers is the responsibility of the Assistant Vice-Chair for Programs and generally begins about the same time as the initial call for papers (mid- to late summer). Many moderators and reviewers return each year, so the first source for volunteers is usually the list of names from the previous year. However, calls for help via the ETD listserv are generally necessary to obtain a full complement of volunteers.

Reference Materials for Authors

The Division's move to a more involved review process in recent years has necessitated that authors be given more detailed guidance regarding preparation of abstracts and papers than can be included in a simple call for papers. As a result, it has become the practice for the Vice-Chair for Programs to establish informational websites for prospective ETD authors. These websites generally provide information about:

- The ETD Paper Review Process
- Critical Dates and Deadlines for Submission of Abstracts and Papers
- Guidelines for Authors Outlining Good Practices for Paper Preparation
- Guidelines for Session Moderators Describing Moderator Duties
- Guidelines for Reviewers Describing Good Review Practices and Expectations
- Information About Schedules and Conference Sessions (once available)

An example of this year's page can be found at –

<< http://www.ipfw.edu/asee_etd/ >>.

The materials available at these sites have been accumulated and/or developed by previous Program Vice-Chairs and Assistant Vice-Chairs (most thanks go to Ron Rockland and Ron Land).

Abstract Reviews

The first actual stage of reviews is the review of abstracts. These reviews have to be completed in an approximate 2-week long window in mid-October. Responsibility for abstract review and acceptance is assigned to session moderators, and if they choose, their session co-moderators. Thus, it is important that session moderators and co-moderators be identified and assigned to technical sessions by the time this window opens (early October).

The moderators (and co-moderator) decide acceptance or rejection of abstracts assigned to their sessions. If they are uncertain about the acceptability of an abstract, it is referred to the Vice-Chair and Assistant Vice-Chair of Programs for a decision. Typically, the Vice-Chair and Assistant Vice-Chair agree to concur on such decisions.

The 2-week window for the abstract review process requires special attention. Session moderators are asked only to review abstracts assigned to their sessions, which means it is essential that the assignment of abstracts to sessions be known as soon as possible after the 2-week review window opens. Since the Division typically receives upward of 250

abstracts, it is not feasible to wait until the review window opens to make these assignments. Instead, it is essential that the Vice-Chair for Programs monitor and assign abstracts to sessions as the abstracts are submitted into Smoothpaper (note – this is where the recommendations from authors become critical; see comments above). By doing so, most session assignments will be made by the deadline, and the few remaining abstracts can be assigned early in the 2-week window. This is critical if abstracts are to be gotten to moderators in time for them to conduct adequate reviews.

The Assistant Vice-Chair for Programs is responsible for assigning the session moderators in Smoothpaper. Smoothpaper will automatically notify the moderator when this occurs so that that individual can log in to the system and review the abstracts assigned to their session. The Assistant Vice-Chair is also expected to send an e-mail to moderators including general instructions about the abstract review process and a clear reminder of the short timeline for responding. This work needs to be done in the first couple of days of the 2-week review window, which will give moderators about a week to complete the reviews and still leave the Vice-Chair and Assistant Vice-Chair a couple of days to enter official acceptance or rejection decision into Smoothpaper. Smoothpaper will automatically send the author a message to each author regarding acceptance or rejection.

As is obvious from above, the ASEE Smoothpaper system is an integral part of the abstract review process, and special attention must be given to the constraints it imposes. As everyone knows, all abstracts must be submitted via Smoothpaper. However, once material is in Smoothpaper, ASEE provides general access to only a single ‘program chair.’ ASEE does not recognize an assistant chair role and, therefore, does not provide Assistant Vice-Chair access to CAPS either. Thus, it is generally efficient, if not absolutely necessary, for the Vice-Chair for Programs to share his or her login information to permit the Assistant Vice-Chair to work in Smoothpaper.

Draft Paper Reviews

Acceptance of an abstract by the ETD is essentially an invitation to an author to submit a draft paper for review and possible acceptance. Unlike some divisions, it does not imply acceptance of the final paper nor an invitation to present at conference.

The deadline for draft paper submission is typically in early January, after which there is about a three week window for review and acceptance decisions. It is at this stage where the Division review process has been expanded in the last several years. The Division now requires four reviews of each paper; the four reviewers are the moderator, co-moderator and the two paper reviewers assigned to the session housing the paper. To foster more consistency among reviews, reviewers are expected to use a standard review form that requires both qualitative and quantitative scoring of a variety of characteristics. The form developed by Ron Land and approved by the ETD Executive Committee should be sent to each reviewer. The quantitative scoring is useful for the Vice-Chair and Assistant Vice-Chair when deciding which papers to move from presentation sessions to the poster session. The qualitative comments are used to inform authors of recommended changes to their papers.

Reviewers are assigned to individual papers in the Smoothpaper system, which gives them access to examine those papers and record their comments and their accept/reject decisions online. The Assistant Vice-Chair is generally responsible for assigning reviewers to papers (this is one of the tasks that requires the Assistant Vice-Chair to access CAPS using the Vice-Chair's login information – see above).

As noted above, the Division now requires the use of a standard paper review form. However, this form is not part of Smoothpaper. In Smoothpaper, reviewers only have the ability to choose one of four accept/reject choices ('Accept as is', 'Accept with minor revisions', 'Accept with major revisions', or 'Reject') and to include comments via a simple text entry window. Thus, the process for getting information from the standard review form into the review process is a little bulky. Reviewers must enter (usually by a 'copy and paste') the information directly into the Smoothpaper comment window.

Reviewers' accept/reject decisions do not decide the ultimate resolution of a paper, nor do they go to authors. They are simply information made available to the Vice-Chair via Smoothpaper. With the Division's new review process, the practice has been to accept the recommendation of the four paper reviewers if at least three of the four agree on acceptance or rejection. If there is a split recommendation, the paper is referred to a fifth reviewer whose recommendation becomes the deciding vote. The Assistant Chair is responsible for soliciting volunteers to act as these second-level reviewers. Typically, no more than 10 to 15 papers fall into this category, so only a small number of second-level reviewers are needed.

As with abstract reviews, the timeline for review of draft papers must be considered. Since ultimate accept/reject decisions for draft papers can only be entered in Smoothpaper by the Vice-Chair and Assistant Vice-Chair, reviewers' recommendations must be in hand sufficiently in advance of the final deadline for the decisions to be made. Clearly, decisions can be entered as the reviews are completed, but it is generally prudent to require reviews be completed several days to a full week ahead of the final deadline. This ensures that there is time to deal with the ever present last minute rush, and it ensures that there is time for any second-level reviews to be completed.

Once accept/reject decisions are made, the Vice-Chair and Assistant Vice-Chair will split the responsibility to enter those decisions into Smoothpaper. Smoothpaper automatically issues e-mails to the authors indicating the decisions. The Vice-Chair and Assistant Vice-Chair have the option to include or edit reviewers' comments as well as include their own comments with the Smoothpaper e-mail. This is why it is convenient for reviewers to include their qualitative review comments in their responses to Smoothpaper. However, it is also why reviewers need to be professional in their critiques. The Vice-Chair and Assistant Vice-Chair should review all reviewer comments before forwarded them to the authors.

Final Paper Reviews

Final papers are generally due into Smoothpaper around the first of March, and there is one week for review and final acceptance. The Division's review policy asks the Vice-Chair and Assistant Vice-Chair to be responsible for the final review decisions. They are expected to split the necessary final reviews for papers that were accepted pending

revisions. Smoothpaper allows for the viewing of all review comments while simultaneously displaying the final paper for ease of comparison.

As always, timeline is important. With only a week to enter final acceptance decisions, the Vice-Chair and Assistant Vice-Chair must act quickly to meet the Smoothpaper deadlines. Once the final decisions are entered into Smoothpaper, authors will be automatically notified of the final disposition of their papers, and the review process is complete.

Appendix 2 - (Related to Prioritized Strategy #5)

2006 ETD Paper Evaluation Form

The paper you are reviewing has been submitted for presentation at one of the Engineering Technology Division sessions at the American Society of Engineering Education (ASEE) annual conference. Please review the paper critically, answer the following questions, and use the answers to determine an aggregate ranking for the paper. Your judgment will help maintain the quality and effectiveness of our conference papers. Reviewers' comments will be provided to the authors; however, reviewers' names will remain confidential.

PAPER TITLE: _____

PRIMARY AUTHOR: _____

Consider the following points, and mark a numerical score in the box following each item. Let 5 = strongly agree, 4 = agree, 3 = neutral, 2 = disagree, and 1 = strongly disagree.

1. The subject is timely, up-to-date, and useful: []
2. The paper describes original or innovative ideas or approaches: []
3. The paper should be of interest to the intended ETD session/audience: []
4. The paper is applications-oriented and relevant to technology education: []
5. The paper appears to be technically and factually sound: []*
6. The paper is written in a scholarly tone: []*
7. Proper grammar, punctuation, syntax, & spelling are used: []*
8. Overall, the paper is well-written, i.e., the components listed below exist, are fully developed, and present concepts clearly and concisely: []*
 - (a) introduction
 - (b) body
 - (c) summary
 - (d) recommendations and/or conclusions
 - (e) references cited, as appropriate
9. The treatment of the topic is complete: []*
10. You enjoyed reading the paper: []*

Aggregate score: _____ (= total of individual rankings assigned above [max = 50])

Check one of the following to indicate your overall recommendation for this paper. You will be asked for this recommendation when entering your review in the CAPS system. (Note – Unless you scored a 4 or greater on all of the above evaluation items **and** you have no comments or suggestions for the author, you **should not choose** ‘Accept as is.’)

- Accept as is
- Accept with minor revision
- Accept with major revision
- Reject

* If your score for any of the topics marked with an * is rated (1, 2, or 3) on the scale of 1 to 5, you should include comments below describing your concerns relative to the topic.

Comments should provide specific suggestions to improve the paper; avoid general statements such as ‘The paper should be re-written.’

COMMENTS: (Add pages as necessary)

Appendix 3 - (Related to Prioritized Strategy #4) – submitted by Scott Dunning

4. Goal #2, Strategy 2.A: The Strategic Plan, Goal 2 Strategy 2.A has two action items:

1. ETD shall provide multiple sessions/workshops (with a focus on programs, faculty, administration, students, and accreditation) at the ASEE annual conference, CIEC, and ETLI. Provide a separate invitation (from ETD) to 2-year schools to participate as session/workshop developers/moderators.

Update: Session topics for the ASEE Annual Conference are affected by two factors. First, the Program Chair submits session requests to ASEE through Smoothpaper for sessions. ASEE then approves or rejects the requests. This year a request was submitted for 51 sessions. Only two of those were rejected. A session on recruiting and retention was rejected and a session on network administration was rejected.

The next and most important factor is author submissions. While some authors will write papers that are targeted at a specific session topic, most just submit papers that they believe will be of interest to the general ETD audience. Thus, ETD can request and receive approval on any session topic, but the topic titles are hinged on the author submissions. For ASEE 2007, ETD received approval for the following sessions whose titles will have to be changed:

- 2247 Information Technology Capstone and Design Projects*
- 2147 Civil ET Capstone and Design Projects*
- 2547 Successful Grant Proposals*
- 2549 Student Teamwork*
- 3150 Graduate Education in ET, The Need for Ph.D.s*
- 3548 Relationships/Interaction with Engineering Programs*

The final titles will be confirmed after all draft papers are reviewed, but it appears that we need the following

One additional session related to EET Curriculum

One additional session related to MET Curriculum

One additional session related to Assessment and Accreditation of Two Year Programs

One additional session related to Assessment Experiences and Lessons Learned

The final two additional sessions will relate to curriculum development in one of the disciplines

With these changes in mind, the final program will meet the goal of providing multiple sessions with a focus on programs, faculty, administration, students and accreditation.

The program chair did not send out a separate invitation to faculty at two year schools to serve as moderators this year, but representatives from two year schools applied and were accepted as moderators. A request has been submitted for combined sponsorship of two ETD sessions with the Two-Year College Division one of which will cover accreditation topics.