Revised Rubrics - 04/03/2023

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.

Research-to-Practice

Criteria	3	2	1	N/A
Contents				
Theoretical Frameworks: Rate how well the practice is supported by relevant frameworks (e.g. concepts, theories, practices)	Excellent; The framework is well defined and is in alignment with the context, goals and research questions for practice.	Incomplete; The framework is well defined but lacks in alignment with the context, goals, and/or research questions for practice.	Poor; The framework is ill defined and/or lacks in alignment with the context, goals, and/or research questions for practice	Missing
Intended Outcome	Excellent: The learning outcomes or objectives are well defined. Authors clearly articulate intentions for instructional strategies for the research or theoretical frameworks.	Incomplete: The learning outcomes are defined but not clearly articulated with instructional strategies or research-theoretical frameworks.	Poor: The authors just made mentions to the course or topic without articulation with research.	Missing
Application Design: Rate how well the submission applies pedagogical research in engineering and computing education to create or design educational activities such as assessment, instruction, course projects, curricular activities etc.	Excellent; Highly original,extensible and/or novel application of pedagogical research to practice.	Incomplete; Extensible and/or practical application of pedagogical research to practice.	Poor; Very limited application of pedagogical research to practice	Missing

Methods: rate how well the submission describes their study design and its appropriateness for answering the stated research question. *Reminder: Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed methods are welcome.*	Excellent: the methods are described in detail and well suited for answering the stated research question and aligned with the theoretical framework and intended outcomes.	Incomplete: The proposed methods appear appropriate but lack important details.	Poor: The proposed methods are incomplete and appear inconsistent with the proposed research question and theoretical framework.	Missing
Findings	Excellent: The findings are clearly described and show evidence of intended outcomes. The practices used for validation are sound and solid.	Incomplete: The findings marginally describe and show evidence of intended outcomes. The practices used for validation are not solid.	Poor: The findings do not show clear evidence of intended outcomes or the practices used for validation are not accepted practices.	Missing
Discussion and conclusions	Excellent: The discussion is clear as to how the implementation adds to the IEEE scope. Implications and further innovations are considered.	Incomplete: The discussion is clear but the implications and further innovations are marginally considered.	Poor: The discussion is not clear and the implications and innovations are not considered.	Missing
General Paper Mechanics				
RELEVANCE TO FIE Rate how much the submission is congruent with FIE's mission and vision?	Fully relevant	Somewhat relevant	Limited relevance	No relevance

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