

FIE Work-In-Progress (WIP) Paper Rubrics – 05/28/2024

Research

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 – Satisfactory	2 – Needs Improvement	1 - Unsatisfactory
Research Questions	Research questions are well-defined within the context and align well with the purpose/goal of the paper.	Research questions are relevant within the context and align with the purpose/goal of the paper.	Research questions are somewhat relevant and lack either the context of literature or are not in full alignment with the goals of the paper.	Research questions are ill-defined and not related to the literature, or are not in alignment with the goals of the paper.	Missing.
Theoretical Frameworks regarding concepts, theories, and/or practices	For a WIP level paper the theoretical framework is well-defined and aligns with the context, goals, and research questions of the paper.	For a WIP level paper the theoretical framework is adequately defined and aligns with the context, goals, and research questions of the paper.	For a WIP level paper the framework is somewhat defined and lacks alignment with the context, goals, and/or research questions.	The framework is ill-defined even for a WIP. It lacks alignment with the context, goals, and research questions of the paper.	Missing.

<p>Methods: Established procedures adhere to quality standards for quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods</p>	<p>The methods are highly appropriate, and for a WIP level paper, are sufficiently described, adhering to exemplary quality standards and suited well to answer the research questions.</p>	<p>For a WIP level paper, the methods are suitable and described, meet established quality standards, and demonstrate a clear connection to the research questions.</p>	<p>The methods selected are outlined, but even for a WIP lack sufficient detail to evaluate their suitability for effectively addressing the research questions.</p>	<p>The methods are not clearly defined and/or methods are not appropriate to answer the research questions even for a WIP paper.</p>	<p>Missing.</p>
<p>Preliminary Results and/or Discussion</p>	<p>For a WIP level paper, the preliminary results are clearly described, effectively answering the proposed research questions and/or discussed to provide a comprehensive understanding of the findings. The future directions of the study were clearly addressed</p>	<p>For a WIP level paper, the preliminary results are presented and adequately address the proposed research questions and/or discussed to provide an understanding of the findings. The future directions of the study were mentioned.</p>	<p>Preliminary results are presented and somewhat answer the proposed research questions and/or a discussion provides an understanding of the findings. However, even for a WIP level paper more details are expected. In addition, future directions of the study are only briefly communicated.</p>	<p>Even for a WIP level paper, the preliminary results do not adequately answer the proposed research questions and/or are not adequately discussed. The future directions of the study were only briefly mentioned.</p>	<p>Missing.</p>
<p>Relevance to the FIE's mission and vision.</p>	<p>The paper is fully congruent with FIE's mission and vision.</p>	<p>Good relevance</p>	<p>Fair relevance</p>	<p>Limited relevance</p>	<p>No relevance.</p>

Advance of the Body of Knowledge in engineering and/or computing education	Exemplary advancement for a WIP level paper; The paper is timely and advances the body of knowledge excellently.	Good advancement; For a WIP, the paper reasonably advances the body of knowledge.	Fair advancement; The WIP paper only somewhat advances the body of knowledge. It should be revised to more specifically highlight the contributions.	Limited Advancement; The WIP paper makes limited-to-no significant 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 revisions; will require an additional review to determine accept/reject.	Accept the WIP paper with major revisions and require thorough reviews to determine accept/reject.	Reject the WIP paper.