

FIE Full Paper Rubrics – 05/28/2024

Research-to-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
Theoretical Frameworks regarding concepts, theories, and/or practices	The theoretical framework is well-defined and aligns with the context, goals, and research questions.	The theoretical framework is adequately defined and aligns with the context, goals, and research questions.	The framework is somewhat defined, but lacks alignment with the context, goals, and/or research questions. There is a need for further clarification.	The framework is ill-defined and lacks alignment with the context, goals, and research questions for practice.	Missing.
Intended Outcome	The learning outcomes or objectives are clearly defined. Authors clearly articulate intentions for instructional strategies for the research or theoretical frameworks.	The learning outcomes or objectives are adequately defined. Authors articulate intentions for instructional strategies for the research or theoretical frameworks.	The learning outcomes are only somewhat defined and are not clearly articulated with instructional strategies or research-theoretical frameworks.	The authors only briefly mentioned the course or topic without articulating instructional strategies, the research, or theoretical frameworks upon which the work is built.	Missing

Application Design	The application of pedagogical research to practice is exceptionally original, novel, and extensible in designing educational research activities, such as assessment, instruction, course projects, curricular activities, etc.	The application of pedagogical research to practice is appropriately documented, original and demonstrates a degree of novelty, providing insights into designing educational research activities.	The application of pedagogical research to practice is not clearly articulated. The extension to designing educational research activities, such as assessment, instruction, course projects, curricular activities, etc. Is unclear.	The application of pedagogical research to practice is very limited.	Missing.
Methods: Established procedures adhere to quality standards for quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods	The methods are highly appropriate and sufficiently described, adhering to exemplary quality standards and suited well to answer the research questions.	The methods are suitable and described, meet established quality standards, and demonstrate a clear connection to the research questions.	The methods are outlined but lack sufficient detail to evaluate their suitability to effectively address the research questions.	The methods are not clearly defined and/or are inappropriate to answer the research questions.	Missing.
Findings	Findings are meticulously described and show evidence of intended outcomes. The practices used for validation are sound and solid.	The findings are adequately described and satisfactorily address the evidence of intended outcomes. The practices used for validation are acceptable.	The findings are somewhat described and include some evidence of intended outcomes. The practices used for validation are less clear.	The findings do not show compelling evidence of intended outcomes, or the practices used for validation are not accepted practices.	Missing [should be transferred to WIP].

Discussion	Findings and implications are articulated providing a comprehensive understanding of study outcomes and how the implementation adds to the body of knowledge engineering and/or computing education. Implications and further innovations are considered.	Findings and implications are communicated; Limitations and conclusions are considered to suggest future research directions; Contributions are well-described.	Findings and implications are somewhat communicated. The discussion lacks one or more of the following: clearly stated findings, limitations of the study, future directions of the research, and/or concisely stated conclusions.	Findings, implications, or contributions are not clearly stated; Lacking limitations, conclusive comments, and future directions. The discussion is unclear, and the implications and innovations are not considered.	Missing [should be transferred to WIP]
Relevance to the FIE	The paper is fully congruent with FIE's mission and vision.	Good Relevance.	Fair relevance.	Limited relevance.	No relevance.
Advance of the Body of Knowledge in engineering and/or computing education	Exemplary advancement: The paper is timely and advances the body of knowledge excellently.	Reasonable advancement: The paper makes fair advances in the body of knowledge.	Fair advancement: The paper somewhat advances the body of knowledge. However, it should be revised to more specifically highlight the contribution(s) to the field.	Poor or limited advancement: The paper makes a limited to no significant contribution to the existing body of knowledge.	No advancement.
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 the FULL paper.	Accept the FULL paper with Minor Revisions; No additional review is required.	Accept the FULL paper with major revision; will require additional reviews to determine accept/reject.	Reject as a FULL paper but may be more appropriate as a WIP. If resubmitted as a WIP, it will need to be reviewed to determine accept/reject.	Reject as a FULL paper.