

Rubric for the reviewers of research 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. Explanation: <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 research, substantiating statements. - Awareness and clear attribution of the work of others. 	<p>The content does not sufficiently build on appropriate prior work or contextualize the purpose. Explanation: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>Please develop (further) context or links to prior work. More specifically: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>The context and the link to prior work is established.</p>
<p>Research design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear research aims, objectives, research questions, or hypotheses. - Appropriate research methodology (quantitative and/or qualitative), consistent with the research questions. - Well-planned collection, reporting and analysis of empirical data (if applicable). - Well-developed discussion and conclusion - Ethical permission is obtained, if necessary. 	<p>The research design is insufficient to qualify this paper as a research paper. Explanation: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>Please develop the description of the research design (further). More specifically: <i>feedback</i></p>	<p>The research design is well developed and explained.</p>
<p>Presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Structure of the manuscript and coherence between, e.g., research questions, methodology, analysis, discussion, and conclusions. - Appropriate title, abstract. - Readability and language. - Compliance with the formatting requirements of the provided template for a research paper. 	<p>This paper is difficult to read and understand due to structure, word choices, or grammar/spelling errors. Explanation: <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 research paper award? If yes, please substantiate your answer."