We are now accepting nominations for the *Gifted Child Quarterly* Paper of the Year award for Volume 63! Please submit your nomination at https://tinyurl.com/GCQPaperofYearVol63. Nominations are due no later than January 31. Details about the process are below.

Nominations for articles for the *GCQ* Paper of the Year are being solicited by the Editors from members of the NAGC Publications Committee, the pool of *GCQ* reviewers, as well as past editors of *GCQ* and the chair of the Research and Evaluation Network. We also solicit nominations from the NAGC general membership. Note that self-nominations are limited to the first author of the article. All articles must have been published in Volume 63. Those published OnlineFirst but not yet in print are not eligible.

The 4 to 6 papers most frequently nominated will be considered for the award.

A *GCQ* Paper of the Year award committee will be appointed by the Editors, in consultation with the Association Editor. Each committee member will rank the papers based on the rubric below, and the Editors will use the reviewers’ ratings to identify the *GCQ* Paper of the Year.

NOTE: The following criteria are to be used for the evaluation of papers that are under consideration for the *GCQ* Paper of the Year Award. Please note that for each topic area, benchmark criteria are provided that should be used for your evaluation. In some cases, scale ratings have not been defined so as to allow for the situations where the paper does not fully meet the provided criteria.

**Topic Relevance and Importance (1-5 Scale):**
5: The article topic is relevant and important to a broad range of the *GCQ* readership. The article provides findings that significantly impact the field of gifted and talented education and/or the development of gifted students. That is, the findings can be immediately built upon, i.e., implemented immediately in practice, basic research, or policy implementation.

3: The article topic is important and relevant but to a limited *GCQ* readership. The article’s findings may potentially impact the field, but additional study of the area is warranted.

1: The article topic is limited in terms of its importance and relevance to the *GCQ* readership. The findings of the article will likely have little to no impact for the field of gifted and talented education and/or the development of gifted students.

**Innovation (1-3 Scale):**
3: The article provides new, unique, or alternative understandings of the topic, with the potential for furthering thought and/or research within the field of gifted and talented education.
2. The article provides important extension of the findings on a topic to other populations or in other contexts that enhance the generalizability or further understandings.

1: The article verifies current understandings of the topic but does not provide new insights on or generalizations about the topic.

**Validity of Idea (1-3 Scale):**

3: The article supports the intellectual quality of its focus by providing a convincing rationale supported by (1) current (and/or seminal if appropriate) theory and research and (2) relevant literature within and/or outside the field of gifted and talented education.

1: The article is built upon a rationale supportive of its focus with only limited literature within and/or outside the field of gifted and talented education.

**Methodology (1-3 Scale):**

3: The research design and all procedures implemented are appropriate relative to the research question(s) posited, thus the findings provide for rigorous evidence for the topic under study, ruling out alternative explanations for the results (where applicable). All procedures relative to participants (where applicable), data collection (where applicable), and data analysis are appropriate given the question(s) posed, thus providing findings that have generalizability. The authors use the most sophisticated, yet appropriate, data analysis techniques.

1: The research design and procedures implemented are closely aligned with the research question(s) posited, although more sophisticated analysis techniques could have been applied. Or, there are threats (e.g., extraneous variables, weak instrumentation, limited sample) not fully accounted for that limit the generalizability or transferability of findings.

**Quality of Writing (1-3 Scale):**

3: The writing style of the article is engaging and appropriate for the topic and the *GCQ* readership using language that takes readers to a new level of understanding. The writing is clearly focused, purposeful and leads to key points or conclusions. The article is technically sound, but results and discussion are accessible to a broad range of *GCQ* readers. Language and style make the article more elegant than one would normally expect.

2: The writing style of the article is appropriate for the topic and the *GCQ* readership. The article is readable, concise, and cohesive.

1: The writing style conveys critical information but is either too verbose and/or complex for interpretation by most readers or it does not provide enough detail or explanation to make the results easily interpretable.
The following articles in Volume 63 are eligible for nomination:

**January 2019, Volume 63, Issue 1**

An Evaluation (And Vindication?) of Lewis Terman: What the Father of Gifted Education Can Teach the 21st Century by Russell T. Warne

A Longitudinal Case Study of Exceptional Leadership Talent by Thomas P. Hébert

The Occupational/Career Decision-Making Processes of Intellectually Gifted Adolescents from Economically Disadvantaged Backgrounds: A Mixed Methods Perspective by Jae Yup Jung and Marie Young

Profoundly Gifted Students’ Perceptions of Virtual Classrooms by Jessica Alison Potts

**April 2019, Volume 63, Issue 2**

Coaching Parents to Use Higher Level Questioning with Their Twice-Exceptional Children by Jennifer A. Ritchotte and Hasan Y. Zaghlawan


The Influence of Parental and Self-Expectations on Asian American Women Who Entered College Early by Rachel U. Mun and Nancy B. Hertzog

**July 2019, Volume 63, Issue 3 (Topical Issue: Understanding Gifted Perspectives)**

Presenting a Qualitative Study: A Reviewer’s Perspective by Jean S. Peterson

On Deciding to Accelerate: High-Ability Students Identify Key Considerations by Lynn Dare, Elizabeth Agnes Nowicki, and Susen Smith

Giftedness in the Making: A Transactional Perspective by C. Owen Lo, Marion Porath, Hsiao-Ping Yu, Chen-Ming Chen, Kuei-Fang Tsai, and I-Chen Wu

From A (Aggression) to V (Victimization): Peer Status and Adjustment Among Academically Gifted Students in Early Adolescence by Kristen F. Peairs, Martha Putallaz, and Philip R. Costanzo

**October 2019, Volume 63, Issue 4**

Inequities of Enrollment in Gifted Education: A Statewide Application of the 20% Equity Allowance Formula by Kristen N. Lamb, Peter Boedeker, and Todd Kettler
The Effects of Academic Giftedness and Gender on Development Trajectories of Hopelessness Among Students Living in Economically Disadvantaged Neighborhoods by Anneliese C. Bolland, Kevin D. Besnov, Sara Tomek, and John M. Bolland

Machine Learning in Gifted Education: A Demonstration Using Neural Networks by Jaret Hodges and Soumya Mohan


Who Gets Served in Gifted Education? Demographic Representation and a Call for Action by Scott J. Peters, Marcia Gentry, Gillman W. Whiting, and Matthew T. McBee