



## 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
<b>Innovation: 5RRR</b> <b>P</b> <b>RRR</b> <b>IRRR</b> <b>RPR</b>	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
<b>Relevance: 5RRR</b> <b>RRR</b> <b>RPR</b>	Highly relevant	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Not relevant
<b>Track accuracy: ■■</b> <b>■</b> <b>□</b>	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"
<b>Innovation: Rate and summarize how this submission makes a novel innovative contribution to engineering education.</b>	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"
<b>Significance: Rate and summarize how this submission is important and makes an important contribution to engineering education.</b>	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"
<b>Relevance: Rate and explain how the work advances frontiers in education within the context of FIE.</b>	Highly relevant"	Clearly appropriate and well focused"	Appropriate and reasonably focused"	Somewhat relevant, but not focused"	Not relevant"
<b>Language and Expression:</b> □ □ □ □ □	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"
<b>Context: Rate the effectiveness of relating this work demonstrating a strong knowledge of related and prior work. Rate and include specific suggestions of missing literature.</b>	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"



# Innovative Practice Category Review Criteria



that can potentially advance the field in some way. The phrase "Work in Progress " must be the first words of the abstract.

o

	5"	4"	3"	2"	1"
<b>Innovation:</b> 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"
<b>Significance:</b> Tcvg"cpf" uw o o ctk  g" j q y" v j k u" uwd o kuukqp"ku"ko rqtvcpv" cpf" o cmgu"cp" k o rqtvcpv"eqpvtkdwwkqp" vq"gp i kpggtkpi" gfwecvkqpl "	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"
<b>Relevance:</b> Tcvg" j q y" cpf"gz rnckp"j q y"v j g" y q t m" c f x c p e g u" h t q p v k g t u" k p" g f w e c v k q p" y k v j k p" v j g" e q p v g z v" q h" H K G 0 "	Highly relevant"	Clearly appropriate and well focused"	Appropriate and reasonably focused"	Somewhat relevant, but not focused"	Not relevant"
<b>Language and Expression:</b> Tcvg"cpf"cuuguu"v j g" q t i c p k   c v k q p. " n c p i w c i g" c p f" G p i n k u j" g z r t g u u k q p" w u g f" k p" v j g" u w d o k u u k q p 0 "	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"
<b>Context:</b> Tcvg"cpf" uw o o c t k   g" v j g" g h h g e v k x g p g u u" q h" t g n c v k p i" v j g" e q p v t k d w w k q p" q h" v j g" y q t m" v q" u c n k g p v" t g n c v g f" c p f l q t" r t k q t" y q t m 0 " k p e n w f g" u r g e k h k e" u w i i g u v k q p u" q h" o k u u k p i" n k v g t c w w t g 0 "	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"
<b>REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE:</b> Rngcug"kp fkecvg" { q w t" ngxgn"qh"gz r g t v k u g" t g n c v g f" v q" v j g" e q p v g p v" q h" v j k u" u w d o k u u k q p 0 "	Expert"	High"	Medium"	Low"	None"
<b>OVERALL EVALUATION:</b> V j k u" u j q w n f" t g h g e v" v j g" e q o d k p c v k q p" q h" v j g" k p f k x k f w c n" u g e v k q p 0 u" g x c n w c v k q p u 0 "	Accept"	"	Accept with revisions"	"	Reject"