

Innovative Practice Category Abstract Review Criteria (2024)

The innovative practice category is for scholarly papers about novel practices in the area of engineering and/or computing education. Papers should be well situated in prior literature on teaching and learning and outline an innovation of value and interest to engineering and/or computing educators.

Abstracts: Innovative Practice Abstracts should be 300-500 words and clearly present the paper’s relevance to engineering and/or computing education and how the work is innovative.

Each abstract must briefly state the paper’s specific contribution to the innovative practice of engineering and/or computing education. Contributions may be made in various forms and should include (a) a description of what is unique about the innovative practice, (b) how the innovative practice differs from and builds on previous practice as documented in the literature, and (c) 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), the motivations for the innovative practice, and any assessment results or other support to evaluate the effectiveness of the innovative practice.

The abstract needs to include at least three keywords selected from the engineering education taxonomy (<http://taxonomy.engin.umich.edu/taxonomy/>). **In addition, authors should specify if the paper will be in the “Full” or “WIP” paper track and define one topic area on the paper submission platform.**

Abstract Review Rubric:

Category	5	3	1
Innovation: Rate how this submission makes a novel/innovative and significant contribution to engineering/computing education.	Highly original, thought-provoking, novel, and significant	Some originality; Useful extension to established work, and small impact	Not original or innovative and limited contribution
Connection to literature: Rate how well this submission describes how the innovation is situated in the literature	Well described and clearly situated in the literature	Weak description and connection to the literature	Not described or clearly situated in the literature
Relevance: Rate how the submission is relevant to engineering/computing education	Highly relevant	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Not relevant
Category accuracy: Rate how well the submission meets the innovative practice category	Paper appears to be in proper category	Paper could be in either category	Paper appears to be in wrong category