

Rubrics for Research-To-Practice Category Submissions

RESEARCH-TO-PRACTICE category submissions (Abstracts, Full Papers and Work In Progress Papers) should provide coherent and convincing arguments of how the education research is transformed into education practice and argue how this new practice advances the state of knowledge in the field. 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 the theoretical framework(s) that support teaching and learning, and applies these theoretical frameworks to the practice of engineering and/or computing education.

Abstracts should be 300-500 words and should clearly present works of teaching and learning being applied, and the implications for the practice of engineering and/or computing education. **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 towards illustrating how engineering and/or computing education research informs educational practice. Contributions may be made in various forms, but they should describe the setting for the practice in the broad context of engineering and/or computing education, (not necessarily the particular institutional context), motivations for the practice, research that supported the practice, and results obtained. Abstracts must outline the theoretical frameworks that inform the practice and state the implications for educational practice with a focus on action. **The phrases "Full Paper" or "Work In Progress" as well as "Research to Practice Category" must be the first sentence of the abstract.**

	5	3	1
Theoretical Framework: <i>Rate how this submission uses existing theory to support the work</i>	Described specifically	Theoretical framework's appropriateness or contribution in research unclear	Not described
Implications for Practice: <i>Rate how the submission describes the implications of this work to the practice of engineering/computing education</i>	Described specifically	Implications for practice are unclear, impractical, or only partially supported	Not described
Relevance: <i>Rate how the submission is relevant to engineering/computing education</i>	Clear and specific	Described mostly in general, but applicable terms	Not described
Track accuracy: <i>Rate how well the submission meets the full or short paper track criteria</i>	Paper appears to be in proper track	Paper could be in either track	Paper appears to be in wrong track

R2P Category Review Criteria



Full Paper Review Criteria and Rubric

Full papers are expected to present some relevant aspects of learning theory and show how these are applied in educational practice. 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 "Research to Practice Category" must be the first sentence of the abstract.**

	5	4	3	2	1
Theoretical Framework: <i>Rate and summarize how this submission describes the theoretical framework relative to its contribution to engineering education.</i>	Complete, accurate and useful description of relevant pedagogical theories	Accurate and worthwhile description of relevant pedagogical theories	Some useful description of relevant pedagogical theories	Incomplete, vague or unsupported description of the relevant pedagogical theories	Very limited description of the relevant pedagogical theories
Implications for Practice: <i>Rate and summarize how this submission makes a contribution extending research in engineering education to the practice of engineering education.</i>	Highly original, extensible and/or novel translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Extensible and/or practical translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Somewhat extensible and/or practical translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Limited application of pedagogical research to practice; not very original, extensible or novel.	Incomplete or very limited application of pedagogical research to practice
Significance: <i>Rate and summarize how this submission is important and makes an important contribution to engineering education.</i>	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: <i>Rate how and explain how the work advances frontiers in education within the context of FIE.</i>	Highly relevant	Clearly appropriate and well focused	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Somewhat relevant, but not focused	Not relevant
Language and Expression: <i>Rate and assess the organization, language and English expression used in the submission.</i>	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: <i>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.</i>	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

R2P Category Review Criteria



Full Paper Review Criteria and Rubric Continued

Scholarly Quality: <i>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.</i>	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 or analysis	The research appears to be poorly structured and the analysis or argument is hard to interpret
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: <i>Please indicate your level of expertise related to the content of this submission.</i>	Expert	High	Medium	Low	None
OVERALL EVALUATION: <i>This should reflect the combination of the individual section's evaluations.</i>	Accept		Accept with revisions		Reject

R2P Category Review Criteria



Work in Progress Paper Review Criteria and Rubric for Research to Practice Category

Work-in-Progress (WIP) Research-to-Practice submissions should provide motivation for the practice, research that has supported the practice, what results have been obtained, and what remains to be done. WIPs should introduce new ideas and encourage a discourse that can potentially advance the field in some way. **The phrases "Research to Practice Category" and "Work in Progress: " must be the first sentence of the abstract.**

	5	4	3	2	1
Theoretical Framework: <i>Rate and summarize how this submission describes the theoretical framework relative to its contribution to engineering education.</i>	Complete, accurate and useful description of relevant pedagogical theories	Accurate and worthwhile description of relevant pedagogical theories	Some useful description of relevant pedagogical theories	Incomplete, vague or unsupported description of the relevant pedagogical theories	Very limited description of the relevant pedagogical theories
Implications for Practice: <i>Rate and summarize how this submission makes a contribution extending research in engineering education to the practice of engineering education.</i>	Highly original, extensible and/or novel translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Extensible and/or practical translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Somewhat extensible and/or practical translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Limited application of pedagogical research to practice; not very original, extensible or novel.	Incomplete or very limited application of pedagogical research to practice
Significance: <i>Rate and summarize how this submission is important and makes an important contribution</i>	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

R2P Category Review Criteria



Work In Progress Review Criteria and Rubric Continued

Relevance: <i>Rate how and explain how the work advances frontiers in education within the context of FIE.</i>	Highly relevant	Clearly appropriate and well focused	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Somewhat relevant, but not focused	Not relevant
Language and Expression: <i>Rate and assess the organization, language and English expression used in the submission.</i>	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: <i>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.</i>	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: <i>Please indicate your level of expertise related to the content of this submission.</i>	Expert	High	Medium	Low	None
OVERALL EVALUATION: <i>This should reflect the combination of the individual section's evaluations.</i>	Accept		Accept with revisions		Reject