



## Rubric for Innovative Practice Abstracts

	5	3	1
<b>Innovation:</b> <i>Rate how this submission makes a novel/innovative contribution to engineering education.</i>	Highly original, thought provoking and novel	Some originality; Useful extension to established	Not original or innovative
<b>Significance:</b> <i>Rate how this submission communicates the significances of its contribution to engineering education.</i>	Very important; of broad and/or significant impact	Some impact and/or significance	Very limited contribution
<b>Description:</b> <i>Rate the quality of the submission's context, motivations, and accomplishments.</i>	Context, motivations, accomplishments specific	Context, motivations, accomplishments semi-specific	Context, motivations, accomplishments not described
<b>Relevance:</b> <i>Rate how the submission is relevant to the conference topic(s) and engineering education.</i>	Highly relevant	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Not relevant
<b>Track accuracy:</b> <i>Rate how well the submission meets the FP/SP category criteria</i>	Appears to be strong full-paper submission	Could be either FP or SP	Appears to be SP submission

### ABSTRACT:

#### **Contribution:**

Each abstract must briefly state the specific contribution of the paper to the innovative practice of engineering education. Contributions may be made in various forms, but they should answer questions such as the following: What is unique about the innovative practice to be presented? How does this innovative practice differ from and build on previous practice as documented in the literature, including previous FIE conferences? What new ideas would conference participants take away from this paper and/or presentation?

#### **Description:**

In this section, the authors would describe the setting (in the broad context of engineering education, not necessarily the particular institutional context) for the innovative practice, motivations for the innovative practice, what has been accomplished, what results have been obtained, and what remains to be done. Abstracts should clearly present the paper's relevance to engineering education and how the work is innovative.

Short paper submissions must begin the abstract with the term: "Work In Progress:"



## Rubric for Innovative Practice Submissions (full paper)

### Full Paper

**INNOVATIVE PRACTICE category** submissions 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, and/or presents preliminary analysis of empirical data.

The criteria for full papers in the innovative practice category are the following:

- How does the work advance frontiers in education within the context of FIE?
- To what extent are the practices described in the paper innovative, leading-edge, cutting-edge?
- 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?
- Does the work demonstrate scholarly quality as evaluated on the strength of its methodology, the quality/depth of its theoretical foundation, and the quality/depth of its analysis and related discussion? Innovative practice papers should introduce new ideas and encourage a discourse that can potentially advance the field in some way.
- To what extent is the paper professionally written? All papers must be submitted in English.

	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Innovation:</b> <i>Rate and summarize how this submission makes a novel/innovative contribution to engineering education.</i>	Highly original, thought provoking and novel	Important and worthwhile new work	Some originality; Useful extension to established	Vague or unsupported novelty	Not original or innovative
<b>Significance:</b> <i>Rate and summarize how this submission is important and makes an important contribution to engineering education.</i>	Very important; of broad and/or significant impact	Of measurable impact and/or significance	Some impact and/or significance	Limited; Some interesting points	Very limited contribution
<b>Relevance:</b> <i>Rate how and explain how the work advances frontiers in education within the context of FIE.</i>	Highly relevant	Clearly appropriate and well focused	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Somewhat relevant, but not focused	Not relevant
<b>Language and Expression:</b> <i>Rate and assess the</i>	Excellent, exemplary use of language enhancing the	Good, appropriate as is	Reasonable, may need some revision	Poor language, unlikely that it can be sufficiently improved	Very difficult to understand

# Innovative Practice Category Review Criteria



<i>organization, language and English expression used in the submission.</i>	quality of the submission				
<b>Context:</b> <i>Rate the effectiveness of relating this work in demonstrating a strong knowledge of related and prior work. Rate and include specific suggestions of missing literature.</i>	Excellent knowledge of related work that effectively relates to the contribution	Good, reasonably complete knowledge of related work; related to the contribution	Incomplete, but useful references to related work; reasonably connected to the contribution	Incomplete references and/or connection to the submission's contribution	Little or no reference to related work and/or context is disconnected to the submission's contribution
<b>Scholarly Quality:</b> <i>Rate and summarize how the submission demonstrates 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, and/or presents preliminary analysis of empirical data.</i>	The research is methodologically strong, theoretical foundation is good, and analysis/discussion are of high quality	Relevant theory and method are applied with some limitations	The submission uses theory and analysis methods though details are unclear in places	Theoretical underpinnings are weak and there are flaws in argument/analysis	The research appears to be poorly structured and the analysis/argument is hard to interpret
<b>REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE:</b> <i>Please indicate your level of expertise related to the content of this submission.</i>	Expert	High	Medium	Low	None
<b>OVERALL EVALUATION:</b> <i>This should reflect the combination of</i>	Accept		Accept with revisions		Reject

# Innovative Practice Category Review Criteria



<i>the individual section's evaluations.</i>					
--	--	--	--	--	--



## Rubric for Innovative Practice Submissions (short paper)

### Short Paper

**INNOVATIVE PRACTICE category** submissions should demonstrate appropriate rigor and reflective depth when outlining the novel practice at their and other institutions. Short paper (i.e., Work-in-Progress) innovative practice submissions should outline the innovation and how it improves upon prior practice. A high impact paper in this category is one that develops new and intriguing insights in the context of ongoing research, and/or presents preliminary analysis of empirical data. The "Work in Progress:" phrase should be the first words of the abstract.

The criteria for the short papers in the innovative practice category are the following:

- How does the work advance frontiers in education within the context of FIE?
- To what extent are the practices described in the paper innovative, leading-edge, cutting-edge?
- 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?
- Does the work demonstrate scholarly quality as evaluated on the strength of its methodology, the quality/depth of its theoretical foundation, and the quality/depth of its analysis and related discussion?  
Work-in-Progress papers and innovative practice papers should introduce new ideas and encourage a discourse that can potentially advance the field in some way.
- To what extent is the paper professionally written? All papers must be submitted in English.

	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Innovation:</b> <i>Rate and summarize how this submission makes a novel/innovative contribution to engineering education. Work-in-Progress submissions should outline the innovation and how it improves upon prior practice.</i>	Highly original, thought provoking and novel	Important and worthwhile new work	Some originality; Useful extension to established	Vague or unsupported novelty	Not original or innovative
<b>Significance:</b> <i>Rate and summarize how this submission is important and makes an important contribution to</i>	Very important; of broad and/or significant impact	Of measurable impact and/or significance	Some impact and/or significance	Limited; Some interesting points	Very limited contribution

# Innovative Practice Category Review Criteria



<i>engineering education.</i>					
<b>Relevance:</b> <i>Rate how and explain how the work advances frontiers in education within the context of FIE.</i>	Highly relevant	Clearly appropriate and well focused	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Somewhat relevant, but not focused	Not relevant
<b>Language and Expression:</b> <i>Rate and assess the organization, language and English expression used in the submission.</i>	Excellent, exemplary use of language enhancing the quality of the submission	Good, appropriate as is	Reasonable, may need some revision	Poor language, unlikely that it can be sufficiently improved	Very difficult to understand
<b>Context:</b> <i>Rate and summarize the effectiveness of relating the contribution of the work to salient related and/or prior work. Include specific suggestions of missing literature.</i>	Excellent knowledge of salient related work that effectively relates to the contribution	Sufficient knowledge of salient related work that relates to the contribution	Incomplete, but useful references to salient related work; reasonably connected to the contribution	Incomplete references to salient literature; weakly connection to the contribution	Inaccurate or no reference to salient work and/or context is disconnected to the submission's contribution
<b>REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE:</b> <i>Please indicate your level of expertise related to the content of this submission.</i>	Expert	High	Medium	Low	None
<b>OVERALL EVALUATION:</b> <i>This should reflect the combination of the individual section's evaluations.</i>	Accept		Accept with revisions		Reject