Innovative Practice Category Review Criteria

Rubric for Innovative Practice Submissions

Submissions under the Innovative Practice category should demonstrate appropriate rigor and reflective depth when outlining the novel practice at their and other institutions. A high impact paper in this category is one that develops new and intriguing insights in the context of ongoing research, builds on previous practice as documented in the literature, and/or presents preliminary analysis of empirical data. The criteria for papers in this category are the following:

- To what extent are the practices described in the paper extensible, innovative or impactful translations of pedagogical research to educational practice?
- Does the work demonstrate knowledge of related work and discuss the relevance of the submission's contribution in the context of the prior literature in the field and other relevant areas?
- What is the breadth of the audience that will be interested in the subject of the paper?
- To what extent is the paper professionally written? All papers must be submitted in English.

Full Paper
Full papers should demonstrate scholarly quality as evaluated on the strength of the methodology used, the quality/depth of the theoretical foundation, and the quality/depth of the analysis and related discussion. In addition, these should maintain a high level of scholarly quality, reflecting on how this work extends/is distinguished from other work attempted in similar areas.

Note: 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	3	2	1	N/A
Contents				
INNOVATION: Rate and summarize how this submission makes a novel/innovative contribution to engineering and computing education.	Highly original, thought provoking, novel	Some originality; Useful extension to established work	Vague, not original, or unsupported novelty	Missing
SCHOLARLY QUALITY: Rate and summarize how the submission demonstrates appropriate rigor and reflective depth when outlining the novel practice at their and other institutions. *Reminder: Qualitative, Quantitative, and*	Develops new and intriguing insights in the context of ongoing research or presents preliminary analysis of empirical data	Detail of the research that was performed is unclear in portions of the work	The research appears to be poorly structured and the analysis/argument is hard to interpret	Missing

mixed analysis methods are welcome.				
General Paper Mechanics				
SIGNIFICANCE: Rate how important the contribution of this submission is to engineering and computing education.	Very important; of broad and/or significant impact	Important; Measurable impact and/or significance	Limited; Some impact and/or significance	Very limited or no contribution
CONTEXT & LITERATURE: Rate how well the submission contextualizes the work, both through a detailed description of the local context (if applicable) and prior work from relevant literature.	Excellent; the submission demonstrates clear knowledge of related work that effectively relates to the submission's context/contribution	Incomplete, but useful references to related work; reasonably connected to the submission's context/contribution	Minimal references and/or connection to the submission's context/contribution	Little or no reference to related work and/or context is disconnected to the submission's contribution
LANGUAGE AND EXPRESSION: Rate the organization, IEEE paper template usage, language and English expression used in the submission.	Good/Excellent, appropriate as is	Reasonable, may need some revision	Poor, unlikely that it can be sufficiently improved	Very difficult to understand
Reviewer Confidence & Overall Evaluation				
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: Please indicate your level of expertise related to the content of this submission.	Expert/High	Experienced/Medium	Novice/Low	None/Low
OVERALL EVALUATION: This should reflect the **combination** of the individual section's evaluations.	Accept (Minor revisions only, no additional review required)		Revisions (Will require an additional review to determine accept/reject)	Reject