Research Category Review Criteria

Rubric for Research Submissions

RESEARCH category submissions should position the current research in relation to related and prior work, showing the need for a new or enhanced approach. A high impact paper in this category is one that has a sound theoretical and empirical structure in terms of identification of the problem, design of solution/investigation, methods used during data collection, and an empirically-based final analysis. The criteria for papers in the research 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 Papers

Full papers are expected to present some relevant aspects of learning theory and show how these are applied in educational practice. 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				
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK & RESEARCH QUESTION: Rate how well a research goal/question is articulated and related to a relevant theoretical framework.	Excellent; the research question is well defined within the context of literature and the theoretical framework presented.	Incomplete; the research question is well defined but lacks either the context of literature or a theoretical framework.	Poor; Research question is ill defined and/or not related to relevant literature or a theoretical framework	Missing
METHODS: rate how well the submission describes their study design and it's appropriateness for answering the stated research question. *Reminder: Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed methods are welcome.*	Excellent; the methods are described in detail and well suited for answering the stated research question and aligned with the theoretical framework.	Incomplete; the proposed methods appear appropriate but lack important details.	Poor; the proposed methods are incomplete and appear inconsistent with the proposed research question and theoretical framework.	Missing

FINDINGS: Rate how well the submission describes the results of the study in context of the literature and draws appropriate conclusions and implications from findings.	Excellent; the results are well described and answer the posed research question. Literature is cited to contextualize findings and support conclusions implications.	Incomplete; the results are well described and answer the posed research question. However, limited to no literature is cited to contextualize findings. Implications overgeneralize findings.	Poor; results do not adequately answer the posed research question or support the drawn conclusions or implications. However, limited to no literature is cited to contextualize findings.	Missing
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