

FIE Work-In-Progress (WIP) 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 – Needs Improvement	1 - Unsatisfactory
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.	For a WIP level paper, the motivation for the innovative practice is adequately defined within the context and reasonably aligns with the purpose and goal of the paper.	For a WIP level paper, the motivation for the innovative practice is only somewhat defined and lacks either the context of literature or is not in full alignment with goals.	Motivation for the innovative practice is ill-defined, even for a WIP level paper. It does not appear to be related to the context of the literature or is not in full alignment with goals.	Missing.
Description of Innovative Practice	For a WIP level paper, the description of the innovative practice is well-defined, offering a comprehensive understanding of the design and its application.	For a WIP level paper, the description of the innovative practice is adequately defined. The paper provides a general understanding of the design and its application.	The description of the innovative practice is limited even as a WIP. The paper lacks either design or the application of the innovative practice.	The description of the innovative practice is provided with limited knowledge of design and application.	Missing.

Situating Innovative Practice in Existing Work	For a WIP level paper, the innovative practice is fully situated in existing work with comprehensive descriptions drawn from relevant literature and/or existing practices.	For a WIP level paper, the innovative practice is adequately situated within existing work, with descriptions drawn from relevant literature and/or existing practices.	Even for a WIP level paper, the existing work is described with limited information on the alignment between existing work and innovative practice.	Even for a WIP level paper, the information on existing work is poorly described and is not in alignment with the innovative practice.	Missing.
Quality of Innovative Practice	For a WIP level paper, 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 novel, with useful practices. As a WIP, the work has the potential to advance engineering and computing education.	The described practice is only somewhat novel even as a WIP. 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 even as a WIP.	Missing.
Evaluation of Innovative Practice	As a WIP, the evaluation mechanism is rigorously designed, incorporating reflective processes that offer deep insights into ongoing research or present results of empirical data.	As a WIP, 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 even for a WIP level paper.	The evaluation mechanism is poorly structured or lacks the appropriate rigor and reflective depth even for a WIP level paper.	Missing.
Relevance to the FIE's mission and vision	The WIP paper is fully congruent with FIE's mission and vision	The WIP paper has relevance to FIE's mission and vision.	The WIP paper is somewhat relevant to FIE's mission and vision.	The WIP paper has limited relevance to FIE's mission and vision.	No relevance.

Advance of the Body of Knowledge in engineering and/or computing education	Exemplary advancement: The WIP paper is timely and advances the body of knowledge excellently.	Good advancement: The WIP paper makes reasonable advances in the body of knowledge,	Fair advancement: The WIP paper somewhat advances the body of knowledge. However, even as a WIP it should be revised to more specifically highlight the contribution(s) to the field.	Limited Advancement: The WIP paper makes a limited contribution to the existing body of knowledge.	No advancement.
Language and Expression in the organization; adherence to the IEEE paper template; meeting the page limit.	Excellent in language and English expression, the use of the IEEE paper template, and meeting the page limit,	Good in language and English expression, the use of the IEEE paper template, and meeting the page limit.	Reasonable in language and English expression but, could be improved and meet the page limit.	Poor, unlikely that it can be sufficiently improved and/or the page limit was not met.	Very difficult to understand or the page limit was not met.
Reviewer Confidence	I have expertise related to the content of the WIP paper and am highly confident in my review.	I have research experience relevant to the content of the WIP paper and am confident in my review.	I have minimal research experience relevant to the WIP paper topic and am modestly confident in my review.	I am a novice to the WIP paper content and somewhat confident in my review.	I am new to the WIP paper content and have little-to-no confidence in my review.
Overall Evaluation reflecting the combinations of all review criteria	Accept the WIP paper.	Accept the WIP paper with Minor Revisions; No additional review is required.	Accept the WIP paper with major revision; will require an additional review to determine accept/reject.	Accept the WIP paper with major revisions and require thorough review to determine accept/reject.	Reject the WIP paper.