

# Meadish Paper Competition Rules (V1.0)



Student Host Champion: Nick Saia (ncsaia@ksu.edu)

Faculty Host Champion: Dr. Mustaque Hossain (mustak@ksu.edu)

*Mid-American Ingenuity*

## Background

As a part of the 2023 ASCE Mid-America Student Symposium, the Kansas State ASCE Student Chapter will host the required Student Symposium Paper Competition. Since the paper and presentation topic and rules mimic the ASCE Daniel W. Mead Prize Competition, a student will be able to enter both completely independent competitions using the same paper. Participating students are cautioned that the entry due dates are independent and entering one does NOT translate to entering both.

## Overview

Participation in the Student Symposium Paper Competition, including submission and presentation by a member of an ASCE Student Chapter, is a requirement for that Student Chapter to be eligible to advance to an ASCE Society-wide Competition Final. A Student Symposium Paper Competition emphasizes the importance of being able to write and present a paper as essential communication skills for all engineers and often necessary for advancement in your career. Only one paper per ASCE Student Chapter can be entered into the Mid-America Meadish Paper Competition. Student chapters are encouraged to host a local competition to select the best paper / presentation to represent their Student Chapter.

## Written Paper and Oral Presentation Topic

Per [ASCE's Code of Ethics](#), engineers govern their professional careers on fundamental principles that, above all else, protect and advance the health, safety, and welfare of the public through the practice of Civil Engineering.

Most engineering designs rely on regulations that trickle down from federal, state, and county levels. In some situations, regulations and the ethical considerations of engineers may not always align due to regulations requiring updates to incorporate new standards of practice or as a result of outside influences.

### **How does an engineer balance regulations and ethics?**

## Recognition

The winner of the Meadish Paper Competition will receive a plaque provided by ASCE and all other finalists will receive an appropriate certificate recognizing their achievements. The scoring will be based on equal weighting of the written or oral portions of the competition.

## Rules

1. Author / presenter must be a member of ASCE Student Chapter that they are representing and a student member of the Society who is in good standing.
2. Papers (a) be limited to 1 paper from each Student Chapter; (b) not exceed 2,000 words in length; (c) be written by only 1 person and presented by the same person; and (d) not have previously been published in other school or Society publications.
3. A Committee of three to five judges will review each paper and presentation and follow the establish grading rubric for this competition. Each paper will be scored on originality, adherence to topic, spelling and grammar, clarity, quality, and overall adherence to competition rules. Each presentation will be scored on the reflection of the presentation on the ideas presented in the paper, ability to communicate key concepts, personal bearing, delivery style, and overall adherence to the rules. Up to a ten-point penalty can be assessed for errors in logic or facts.

## Scoring Rubric

Written Paper Scoring			
Total of 50 Points			
	Excellent	Competent	Needs Work
<b>Adherence to Topic</b>	Author was able to stay focused on the topic and did not stray from the main talking points/arguments. <b>10 - 9 Points</b>	Author was able to stay mostly focused on the topic and only strayed from the main talking points/arguments a couple of times. <b>8 - 5 Points</b>	Author was did not stay focused on the topic and it is not clear where the author's talking points/arguments are going. <b>4 - 1 Points</b>
<b>Presence of Original Ideas and Research Involved</b>	Author presented and defended their position(s) on the topic, while demonstrating that they researched opposing views and were able to incorporate that into their reasoning. <b>10 - 9 Points</b>	Author was able to present their position(s) on the topic, but ideas were not original or defended fully. They were able to demonstrate that they researched opposing views, but did not incorporate that into their reasoning. <b>8 - 5 Points</b>	Author did not present their position(s) on the topic and their ideas were not original. No research on opposing views can be found or is easily discernible. <b>4 - 1 Points</b>
<b>Command of Subject Matter</b>	Author demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of the topic and is comprehensive and reasonable with their main talking points/arguments. <b>10 - 9 Points</b>	Author demonstrates some knowledge and understanding of the topic, but ideas have not been fully discussed and their main talking points/arguments are lacking in discussion. <b>8 - 5 Points</b>	Author does not demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of the topic and does not any talking points/arguments. <b>4 - 1 Points</b>
<b>Spelling and Grammar / Length</b>	Paper was at or under the maximum 2000 word limit. Minimal grammatical and spelling errors. <b>5 Points</b>	Paper was at or under the maximum 2000 word limit. Several grammatical and spelling errors, but still readable. <b>4 - 3 Points</b>	Paper was over the maximum 2000 word limit. Many grammatical and spelling errors that made it difficult to understand/read. <b>2 - 1 Points</b>
<b>Overall Clarity, Organization, Quality of Paper, and References</b>	Paper was clear, concise, and easy to read. All discussions were logical in the order they were presented. Paper appears professional and consistent in formatting. References are from legitimate resources and organizations. Resources are properly cited. <b>15 - 12 Points</b>	Paper was clear but not always concise or easy to read. Most discussions were logical in the order they were presented. Paper appears professional and consistent in formatting. References are from legitimate resources and organizations. Resources are properly cited. <b>11 - 8 Points</b>	Paper was not clear, concise, or easy to read. Discussions were not logical in the order they were presented. Paper is not professional or consistent in formatting. References are not listed or from legitimate resources and organizations. Resources are not cited at all or properly. <b>7 - 1 Points</b>

Oral Presentation Scoring			
Total of 50 Points			
	Excellent	Competent	Needs Work
<b>Presentation Concepts and Theme</b>	The Presenter is able to address and support the concepts and theme of the topic clearly and concisely to the audience. Audience is able to understand the discussion and topic. <b>10 - 9 Points</b>	The Presenter is able to address and support the concepts and theme of the topic to the audience, with some <i>vaugness</i> . Audience is mostly able to understand and follow the discussion and topic. <b>8 - 5 Points</b>	The Presenter is not able to address and support the concepts and theme of the topic to the audience. Audience is struggling to understand the discussion and topic. <b>4 - 1 Points</b>
<b>Ability to Communicate Key Concepts</b>	The Presenter communicates the key concepts from their paper in a clear and concise manner that allows the audience to easily understand the importance of the topic and their arguments. <b>20 - 15 Points</b>	The Presenter communicates some of the key concepts from their paper in a semi-clear manner. Audience can understand the importance of the topic and their arguments, but may have some issues piecing the argument together. <b>14 - 9 Points</b>	The Presenter does not communicate the key concepts from their paper in a clear and concise manner and the audience has trouble understanding the importance of the topic and their arguments. <b>8 - 1 Points</b>
<b>Personal Bearing</b>	The Presenter had great professionalism, energy, and showed excitement to present. Presenter made eye contact, projected their voice, and was poised. <b>5 - 4 Points</b>	The Presenter was not very professional, energetic, or excited to present. Presenter made little to no eye contact, was difficult to hear, and was not poised. <b>3 - 1 Points</b>	
<b>Delivery Style</b>	The Presenter was able to engage the audience. It appeared well practiced and did not appear that the presentation was memorized or that they were reading off the screen. Presenter used technical language correctly. <b>10 - 9 Points</b>	The Presenter was able to partially engage the audience. It appeared mostly practiced, but also that the presentation was partially memorized or that they were reading off the scree. Presenter used technical language correctly most of the time. <b>8 - 5 Points</b>	The Presenter was not to engage the audience. It appeared that the presentation was memorized or that they were reading off the screen. Presenter did not use technical language correctly. <b>4 - 1 Points</b>
<b>Time</b>	Presentation was within the 5 minute time limit. Any overage time was permitted by the Judges. <b>5 - 3 Points</b>	Presentation was either over the 5 minute time limit (by 2 or more minutes) or was significantly under the time limit. <b>2 - 1 Points</b>	

Penalty			
<b>Errors in Logic or Facts</b>	Points can be deducted if there is an error in logic or facts. <b>Up to 10 Points</b>		

