

Rubric for the reviewers of practice papers at SEFI conferences

Criteria	Unacceptable = 0	Adjustment(s) needed = 1	Accepted, nice work = 2
<p>Value of the contribution, for instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relevance for engineering education and its development in Europe and/or the world. - Originality in treatment of the topic, bringing new perspectives. - Innovative potential for engineering education. 	<p>The value of this contribution for the Engineering Education community is insufficient or unclear. More specifically: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>Please develop the paper to increase its value to readers. More specifically: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>The value of this contribution is clear and well described.</p>
<p>Relating to appropriate prior work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contextualizing the purpose of the work substantiating statements. - Awareness and clear attribution of the work of others. - Approach to related discourses within the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). 	<p>The content does not build on appropriate prior work or related discourses within SoTL literature. More specifically: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>Please develop (further) the link to prior work or related discourses within SoTL. More specifically: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>The link to prior work or related discourses within SoTL is well established.</p>
<p>Adaptability and impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The work is readily adaptable to other cases (for example classrooms, universities, etc.) to allow for rapid implementation in the learning environment. - The extent to which the work can be applied to a variety of contexts is clear. - The impact on the engineering education community is clear. 	<p>It's not clear how this work can be adapted to other contexts, or the impact is unclear. More specifically: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>Please develop the adaptability or impact. More specifically: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>The adaptability and impact are well developed.</p>
<p>Presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Structure of the manuscript and coherence between, e.g., goals, discussion and conclusions. - The set-up of this intervention/work is clearly presented. - Clear indication whether this work is recently initiated, work in progress, or completed work. - Appropriate title, abstract. - Readability and language. - Compliance with the formatting requirements of the provided template for a practice paper. 	<p>This paper is difficult to read and understand due to structure, word choices, or grammar/spelling errors. More specifically: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>Please develop the format, structure, word choices or grammar and spelling. More specifically: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>The paper is fully readable: it's clear, well structured, with satisfactory language.</p>
Conclusion	<p>If one of the first three criteria is unacceptable (not remediable within the provided time), the paper is rejected.</p>	<p>If one of the criteria needs adjustment, the paper is accepted but revision is needed.</p>	<p>If all the criteria are accepted, the paper is accepted.</p>

When the four criteria are accepted as nice work, the reviewer has to answer the following extra question: "Has this paper impressed you for any of the four criteria and is this paper by consequence eligible for the best practice paper award? If yes, please substantiate your answer."