FIE Full Paper Rubrics – 05/28/2024

Innovative Practice

Directions for Reviewers: The rubric consists of three areas for evaluation: (a) *Contents,* (b) *General Paper Mechanics*, and (c) *Reviewer Confidence & Overall Evaluation*. 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	5 – Excellent	4 – Good	3 – Fair	2 – Incomplete	1 - Poor
Motivation for Innovative Practice	The motivation for the innovative practice is well-defined within the context and aligns with the purpose and goal of the paper.	The motivation for the innovative practice is adequately defined within the context and reasonably aligns with the purpose and goal of the paper.	Motivation for the innovative practice is only somewhat defined, but lacks either the context of literature or is not in full alignment with goals.	Motivation for the innovative practice is ill-defined and/or not related to the context of literature or is not in full alignment with goals.	Missing.
Description of Innovative Practice	The description is well-defined, offering a comprehensive understanding of the design and application of the innovative practice.	The description of the innovative practice is adequately defined. The paper provides a solid general understanding of the design and its application.	The description lacks either design or the application of the innovative practice.	The description of the innovation is provided with limited knowledge of design and application.	Missing.
Situating Innovative Practice in Existing Work	The innovative practice is fully situated in existing work with comprehensive descriptions drawn from relevant literature and/	The innovative practice is adequately situated within existing work, with descriptions drawn from relevant literature and/or	The existing work is described with limited information on the alignment between existing work and	The information on existing work is poorly described and is not in alignment with the	Missing.

	or existing practices.	existing practices.	innovative practice.	innovative practice.	
Quality of Innovative Practice	The described practice presents a truly original idea, showcasing highly innovative and thought-provoking practices. The work exhibits significant potential to advance engineering and computing education,	The described practice is an novel, with useful practices. Also, the work has the potential to advance engineering and computing education.	The described practice is only somewhat novel. The potential to advance engineering and computing education is limited.	The described practice is not novel and does not have the potential to advance engineering and computing education.	Missing.
Evaluation of Innovative Practice	The evaluation mechanism is rigorously designed, incorporating reflective processes that offer deep insights into ongoing research or present results of empirical data.	The evaluation mechanism is adequately structured and reflective and offers some insights into ongoing research or presents results of empirical data.	The evaluation mechanism is only somewhat structured and has reflective elements but lacks rigor in some areas.	The evaluation mechanism is poorly structured or lacks the appropriate rigor and reflective depth.	Missing.
Relevance to the FIE's	The FULL paper is fully congruent with FIE's mission and vision.	The FULL paper has relevance to FIE's mission and vision.	The FULL paper is somewhat relevant to FIE's mission and vision.	The FULL paper has limited relevance to FIE's mission and vision..	No relevance.
Advance of the Body of Knowledge in engineering and/or	Exemplary advancement: The FULL paper is timely and advances the body of knowledge excellently.	Good advancement: The FULL paper makes reasonable advances in the body of knowledge,	Fair advancement: The FULL paper somewhat advances the body of knowledge. However, it	Limited Advancement: The FULL paper makes a limited	No advancement.

computing education			should be revised to more specifically highlight the contribution(s) to the field.	contribution to the existing body of knowledge.	
Language and Expression in the organization and the IEEE paper template usage	Excellent in language and English expression and the use of the IEEE paper template.	Good in language and English expression and the use of the IEEE paper template.	Reasonable in language and English expression. but could be improved.	Poor, unlikely that it can be sufficiently improved.	Very difficult to understand.
Reviewer Confidence	I have expertise related to the content of the FULL paper and am highly confident in my review.	I have research experience relevant to the content of the FULL paper and am confident in my review.	I have minimal research experience relevant to the FULL paper topic and am modestly confident in my review.	I am a novice to the FULL paper content and somewhat confident in my review.	I am new to the FULL paper content and have little-to-no confidence in my review.
Overall Evaluation reflecting the combinations of all review criteria	Accept.	Accept with Minor Revisions; No additional review is required.	Accept with major revision; will require an additional review to determine accept/reject.	Accept with major revision and require thorough review to determine accept/reject.	Reject.