

Revised Rubrics - 04/03/2023

Research

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
Content				
<p>Research Questions:</p> <p>Rate the goals, purposes, and/or research questions of the paper</p>	<p>Excellent:</p> <p>Research question(s) are well defined within the context, and align with the purpose and goal of the paper</p>	<p>Incomplete;</p> <p>Research question(s) are well defined but lacks either the context of literature or is not in full alignment with goals</p>	<p>Poor:</p> <p>Research question are ill defined and/or not related to context of literature or is not in full alignment with goals</p>	Missing
<p>Theoretical Frameworks: Rate how well the research is supported by relevant frameworks (e.g. concepts, theories, practices)</p>	<p>Excellent;</p> <p>The framework is well defined and is in alignment with the context, goals and research questions.</p>	<p>Incomplete;</p> <p>The framework is well defined but lacks in alignment with the context, goals, and/or research questions.</p>	<p>Poor;</p> <p>The framework is ill defined and/or lacks in alignment with the context, goals, and/or research questions</p>	Missing
<p>Methodology and Methods:</p> <p>Rate how well the paper follow quality standards according to established procedures (e.g., qualitative/quantitative /mixed methods, standard practices)</p>	<p>Excellent;</p> <p>The methodology/method is well chosen, the methods are appropriate and described in detail. Also, the methods are suited to answer the research questions</p>	<p>Incomplete;</p> <p>The methodology/method is well chosen, but the paper lacks in appropriate methods to answer the research questions</p>	<p>Poor;</p> <p>The methodology/method is not clearly defined and/or methods are not appropriate to answer the research questions</p>	Missing

<p>Results adherence:</p> <p>Rate how well the paper address the research questions-goals in its findings/results and how well the results presentation is in alignment to the body of knowledge and frameworks?</p>	<p>Excellent;</p> <p>Results are well described and answer the posed research question. Also the findings are aligned to body of knowledge and frameworks</p>	<p>Incomplete;</p> <p>Results are well described and answer the posed research question. However, the alignment to body of knowledge and frameworks is lacking</p>	<p>Poor;</p> <p>Results do not adequately answer the posed research question and/or the alignment to body of knowledge and frameworks is lacking</p>	<p>Missing [can be transferred to WIP]</p>
<p>Contributions/ Implications: Does the submission describe its contribution to the existing knowledge? Are the findings/results addressing limitations and implications? Is the submission providing convincing, enlightening conclusions and suggesting future directions?</p>	<p>Excellent;</p> <p>Contributions are well described and the findings and implications are clearly stated. Limitations and conclusions advance knowledge and suggest future directions</p>	<p>Incomplete;</p> <p>Contributions are described and the findings and implications are stated. However, paper lacks on imitations or future directions. Also, the paper's conclusion lacks conclusive comments to advance knowledge.</p>	<p>Poor;</p> <p>Contributions are not clearly stated nor the findings and implications. Lacking limitations, conclusive comments, and future directions</p>	<p>Missing</p>
General Paper Mechanics				
<p>RELEVANCE TO FIE</p> <p>Rate how much the submission is congruent with FIE's mission and vision?</p>	<p>Fully relevant</p>	<p>Somewhat relevant</p>	<p>Limited relevance</p>	<p>No relevance</p>
<p>ADVANCE THE BODY OF KNOWLEDGE: Rate how much the submission advance body of knowledge in engineering and/or computing education</p>	<p>Exemplary Advancement</p> <p>The paper is timely and advance the body of knowledge in an exemplary way.</p>	<p>Good Advancement</p> <p>The paper is timely and advance the body of knowledge. However lacks in</p>	<p>Limited Advancement;</p> <p>The paper makes limited contribution to existing body of knowledge</p>	<p>No advancement</p>

		some areas which could be revised		
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