



## Rubric for Research-to-Practice Abstracts

	5	3	1
<b>Theoretical Framework</b>	Described specifically	Described semi-specifically	Not described
<b>Implications for Practice:</b>	Described specifically	Described semi-specifically	Not described
<b>Description:</b>	Context, motivations, accomplishments specific	Context, motivations, accomplishments semi-specific	Context, motivations, accomplishments not described
<b>Relevance</b>	Clear and specific	Described mostly in general, but applicable terms	Not described
<b>Track accuracy</b>	Appears to be strong full-paper submission	Could be either full or WIP	Appears to be Short/Work-in-progress submission

**Contribution:**

Each abstract must briefly state the specific contribution of the paper towards illustrating how engineering education research informs engineering education practice. Contributions may be made in various forms, but they should answer such questions as: What is situation being addressed? What are the goals of the practice being implemented? What research provides the foundations for the inventive practice?

**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 practice, motivations for the practice, research that has supported the practice, what results have been obtained, and what remains to be done. Ideally, the authors would include a clear statement of implications for educational practice, the certainty to which their attempt to transfer research to practice aligned with the expectations from related work, and delineate the actor(s) and action(s) implied.



## Rubric for Research-To-Practice Submissions (full paper)

### Full Paper

**RESEARCH-TO-PRACTICE** category submissions should provide coherent and convincing arguments of how the education research is transformed into education practice and argue how this new practice advances the state of knowledge in the field.

The criteria for full papers in the research-to-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?
- To what extent is the paper professionally written? All papers must be submitted in English.

	5	4	3	2	1
<b>Theoretical Framework:</b> <i>Rate and summarize how this submission describes the theoretical framework relative to its contribution to engineering education.</i>	Complete, accurate and useful description of relevant pedagogical theories	Accurate and worthwhile description of relevant pedagogical theories	Some useful description of relevant pedagogical theories	Incomplete, vague or unsupported description of the relevant pedagogical theories	Very limited description of the relevant pedagogical theories
<b>Implications for Practice:</b> <i>Rate and summarize how this submission makes a contribution extending research in engineering education to the practice of engineering education.</i>	Highly original, extensible and/or novel translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Extensible and/or practical translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Somewhat extensible and/or practical translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Limited application of pedagogical research to practice; not very original, extensible or novel.	Incomplete or very limited application of pedagogical research to practice
<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

# R2P 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 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</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

# R2P Category Review Criteria



<i>preliminary analysis of empirical data.</i>					
<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



## Rubric for Research-To-Practice Submissions (short paper)

### Short Paper

**RESEARCH-TO-PRACTICE** category submissions should provide coherent and convincing arguments of how the education research is transformed into education practice and argue how this new practice advances the state of knowledge in the field. Short paper (i.e., Work-in-Progress) research-to-practice submissions should provide motivation for the practice, research that has supported the practice, what results have been obtained, and what remains to be done. The "Work in Progress:" phrase should be the first words of the abstract.

The criteria for the short papers in the research-to-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 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>Theoretical Framework:</b> <i>Rate and summarize how this submission describes the theoretical framework relative to its contribution to engineering education.</i>	Complete, accurate and useful description of relevant pedagogical theories	Accurate and worthwhile description of relevant pedagogical theories	Some useful description of relevant pedagogical theories	Incomplete, vague or unsupported description of the relevant pedagogical theories	Very limited description of the relevant pedagogical theories
<b>Implications for Practice:</b> <i>Rate and summarize how this submission makes a contribution extending research in engineering education to the practice of engineering education.</i>	Highly original, extensible and/or novel translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Extensible and/or practical translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Somewhat extensible and/or practical translation of pedagogical research to practice.	Limited application of pedagogical research to practice; not very original, extensible or novel.	Incomplete or very limited application of pedagogical research to practice

# R2P Category Review Criteria



<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 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

# R2P Category Review Criteria

