

Revised Rubrics - 04/03/2023

Innovative Practice

Note: For each item, please provide the author(s) with your reasoning and constructive feedback on how they can further strengthen their paper in the comment box.

Criteria	3	2	1	N/A
Contents				
<p>MOTIVATION OF INNOVATIVE PRACTICE</p> <p>Rate the goals, vision, and/or purpose of the innovation</p>	<p>Excellent: Motivation of the innovative practice is well defined within the context, and align with the purpose and goal of the paper</p>	<p>Incomplete: Motivation of the innovative practice is well defined but lacks either the context of literature or is not in full alignment with goals</p>	<p>Poor: Motivation of the innovative practice is ill defined and/or not related to context of literature or is not in full alignment with goals</p>	Missing
<p>DESCRIPTION OF INNOVATIVE PRACTICE</p> <p>Rate the description of innovation for its design and application of innovation</p>	<p>Excellent: Description is well defined with design and application of the innovative practice</p>	<p>Incomplete: Description lacks on either design or the application of the innovative practice</p>	<p>Poor: Description of the innovation is provided with limited knowledge of design and application</p>	Missing

<p>SITUATING INNOVATIVE PRACTICE IN EXISTING WORK</p> <p>Rate how well the innovative practice is supported by relevant literature studies and/or existing practices</p>	<p>Excellent: The innovative practice is fully situated in existing work with description from relevant literature and/or existing practices</p>	<p>Incomplete: The existing work is described with limited information on the alignment between existing work and innovative practice</p>	<p>Poor: The information on existing work is poorly described, and is not in alignment with the innovative practice</p>	<p>Missing</p>
<p>QUALITY OF INNOVATIVE PRACTICE</p> <p>Rate the innovative practice from novelty and quality of work, and potential to advance engineering and computing education.</p>	<p>Excellent: The described practice is an original idea, with completely thought provoking practices. Also, the work has potential to advance engineering and computing education</p>	<p>Incomplete: The described practice is novel in some ways. However, the potential to advance engineering and computing education is limited</p>	<p>Poor: The described practice is not novel, and doesnot have the potential to advance engineering and computing education</p>	<p>Missing</p>
<p>EVALUATION OF INNOVATIVE PRACTICE</p> <p>Rate the evaluation mechanism of the innovative practice for rigor and reflective depth</p>	<p>Excellent The evaluation mechanism is rigorous, reflective, and provides insights to ongoing research or presents results of empirical data</p>	<p>Incomplete: The evaluation mechanism is reflective and insightful but lacks rigor in some areas</p>	<p>Poor: The evaluation mechanism is poorly structured or lacks the appropriate rigor and reflective depth</p>	<p>Missing</p>
<p>General Paper Mechanics</p>				
<p>RELEVANCE TO FIE</p> <p>Rate how much the submission is congruent</p>	<p>Fully relevant</p>	<p>Somewhat relevant</p>	<p>Limited relevance</p>	<p>No relevance</p>

with FIE's mission and vision?				
ADVANCE THE BODY OF KNOWLEDGE: Rate how much the submission advance body of knowledge in engineering and/or computing education	Exemplary Advancement The paper is timely and advance the body of knowledge in an exemplary way.	Good Advancement The paper is timely and advance the body of knowledge. However lacks in some areas which could be revised	Limited Advancement; The paper makes limited contribution to existing body of knowledge	No advancement
LANGUAGE AND EXPRESSION: Rate the organization, IEEE paper template usage, language and English expression used in the submission.	Good/Excellent, appropriate as is	Reasonable, may need some revision	Poor, unlikely that it can be sufficiently improved	Very difficult to understand
Reviewer Confidence & Overall Evaluation				
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: Please indicate your level of expertise related to the content of this submission.	Expert/High	Experienced/Medium	Novice/Low	None/Low
OVERALL EVALUATION: This should reflect the combination of the individual section's evaluations.	Accept (Minor revisions only, no additional review required)		Revisions (Will require an additional review to determine accept/reject)	Reject