Rubrics for Innovative Practice Category Submissions

INNOVATIVE PRACTICE category submissions (Abstracts, Full Papers and Work In Progress Papers) should demonstrate appropriate rigor and reflective depth when outlining the novel practice at their and other institutions. A high impact paper in this category is one that develops new and intriguing insights in the context of ongoing research, builds on previous practice as documented in the literature, and/or presents preliminary analysis of empirical data. The criteria for papers in this category are the following:

- To what extent are the practices described in the paper extensible, innovative or impactful translations of pedagogical research to educational practice?
- Does the work demonstrate knowledge of related work and discuss the relevance of the submission's contribution in the context of the prior literature in the field and other relevant areas?
- What is the breadth of the audience that will be interested in the subject of the paper?
- To what extent is the paper professionally written? All papers must be submitted in English.

Abstract Review Criteria and Rubric

Excellent proposals are well situated in prior literature on teaching and learning, and outline an innovation of value and interest to engineering and/or computing educators.

Abstracts should be 300-500 words and should clearly present the paper's relevance to engineering education and how the work is innovative. All author and institutional identifying information must be removed from the abstract due to the double-blind review process. Abstracts must briefly state the specific contribution of the paper to the innovative practice of engineering and/or computing education. Contributions may be made in various forms, and should include a description of what is unique about the innovative practice, how the innovative practice differs from and builds on previous practice as documented in the literature, and new ideas that conference participants would take away from this paper. The abstract should describe the setting for the innovative practice in the broad context of engineering and/or computing education, (not necessarily the particular institutional context), motivations for the innovative practice, and the results obtained. **The phrases "Full Paper" or "Work In Progress" as well as "Innovative Practice Category" must be the first sentence of the abstract.**

Innovative Practice Abstracts	5	3	1
Innovation: *Rate how this submission makes a novel/innovative and/or significant contribution to engineering/computing education*	Highly original, thought provoking, significant and/or novel	Some originality; Useful extension to established work and/or small impact	Not original or innovative; limited contribution
Relevance: *Rate how the submission is relevant to the conference topic(s) and engineering/computing education*	Highly relevant	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Not relevant
Track accuracy: *Rate how well the submission meets the full or short category criteria*	Paper appears to be in proper track	Paper could be in either track	Paper appears to be in wrong track

Innovative Practice Category Review Criteria

Full Paper Review Criteria and Rubric

Full papers should demonstrate scholarly quality as evaluated on the strength of the methodology used, the quality/depth of the theoretical foundation, and the quality/depth of the analysis and related discussion. In addition, these should maintain a high level of scholarly quality, reflecting on how this work extends/is distinguished from other work attempted in similar areas. **The phrases "Full Paper" and "Innovative Practice Category" must be the first sentence of the abstract.**

	5	4	3	2	1
Innovation: *Rate and summarize how this submission makes a novel/innovative contribution to engineering education.*	Highly original, thought provoking and novel	Important and worthwhile new work	Some originality; Useful extension to established	Vague or unsupported novelty	Not original or innovative
Significance: *Rate and summarize how this submission is important and makes an important contribution to engineering education.*	Very important; of broad and/or significant impact	Of measurable impact and/or significance	Some impact and/or significance	Limited; Some interesting points	Very limited contribution
Relevance: *Rate how and explain how the work advances frontiers in education within the context of FIE.*	Highly relevant	Clearly appropriate and well focused	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Somewhat relevant, but not focused	Not relevant
Language and Expression: *Rate and assess the organization, language and English expression used in the submission.*	Excellent, exemplary use of language enhancing the quality of the submission	Good, appropriate as is	Reasonable, may need some revision	Poor language, unlikely that it can be sufficiently improved	Very difficult to understand
Context: *Rate the effectiveness of relating this work in demonstrating a strong knowledge of related and prior work. Rate and include specific suggestions of missing literature.*	Excellent knowledge of related work that effectively relates to the contribution	Good, reasonably complete knowledge of related work; related to the contribution	Incomplete, but useful references to related work; reasonably connected to the contribution	Incomplete references and/or connection to the submission's contribution	Little or no reference to related work and/or context is disconnected to the submission's contribution

Full Paper Review Criteria and Rubric Continued

Scholarly Quality: Rate and summarize how the submission demonstrates appropriate rigor and reflective depth when outlining the novel practice at their and other institutions. A high impact paper in this category is one that develops new and intriguing insights in the context of ongoing research, and/or presents preliminary analysis of empirical data.	The research is methodologically strong, theoretical foundation is good, and analysis/discussion are of high quality	Relevant theory and method are applied with some limitations	The submission uses theory and analysis methods though details are unclear in places	Theoretical underpinnings are weak and there are flaws in argument/analysis	The research appears to be poorly structured and the analysis/argument is hard to interpret
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: Please indicate your level of expertise related to the content of this submission.	Expert	High	Medium	Low	None
OVERALL EVALUATION: This should reflect the combination of the individual section's evaluations.	Accept		Accept with revisions		Reject

Short Paper

Short paper (i.e., Work-in-Progress) innovative practice submissions should outline the innovation and how it improves upon prior practice. Short papers should introduce new ideas and encourage a discourse

Innovative Practice Category Review Criteria

Work In Progress Review Criteria and Rubric for Innovative Practice Category Submissions

Work-in-Progress (WIP) Innovative Practice category submissions should outline the innovation and how it improves upon prior practice. WIPS should introduce new ideas and encourage a discourse that can potentially advance the field in some way. **The phrases "Innovative Practice Category" and "Work in Progress: " must be the first sentence of the abstract.**

	5	4	3	2	1
Innovation: *Rate and summarize how this submission makes a novel/innovative contribution to engineering education. Work-in-Progress submissions should outline the innovation and how it improves upon prior practice.*	Highly original, thought provoking and novel	Important and worthwhile new work	Some originality; Useful extension to established	Vague or unsupported novelty	Not original or innovative
Significance: *Rate and summarize how this submission is important and makes an important contribution to engineering education.*	Very important; of broad and/or significant impact	Of measurable impact and/or significance	Some impact and/or significance	Limited; Some interesting points	Very limited contribution
Relevance: *Rate how and explain how the work advances frontiers in education within the context of FIE.*	Highly relevant	Clearly appropriate and well focused	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Somewhat relevant, but not focused	Not relevant
Language and Expression: *Rate and assess the organization, language and English expression used in the submission.*	Excellent, exemplary use of language enhancing the quality of the submission	Good, appropriate as is	Reasonable, may need some revision	Poor language, unlikely that it can be sufficiently improved	Very difficult to understand
Context: *Rate and summarize the effectiveness of relating the contribution of the work to salient related and/or prior work. Include specific suggestions of missing literature.*	Excellent knowledge of salient related work that effectively relates to the contribution	Sufficient knowledge of salient related work that relates to the contribution	Incomplete, but useful references to salient related work; reasonably connected to the contribution	Incomplete references to salient literature; weakly connection to the contribution	Inaccurate or no reference to salient work and/or context is disconnected to the submission's contribution
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: *Please indicate your level of expertise related to the content of this submission.*	Expert	High	Medium	Low	None
OVERALL EVALUATION: *This should reflect the combination of the individual section's evaluations.*	Accept		Accept with revisions		Reject