Research-to-Practice Category Review Criteria (2016)

The research-to-practice category is for scholarly proposals that outline applications of research in engineering and/or computing education. Excellent proposals are well situated in the theoretical framework(s) that support teaching and learning, and applies these theoretical frameworks to the practice of engineering and/or computing education.

Abstracts: Research-to-Practice Abstracts should be 300-500 words and should clearly present the theoretical frameworks of teaching and learning being applied, and the implications for the practice of engineering and/or computing education. In addition, each abstract should be identified as a “Full” or “Short” paper track proposal, and define at least one topic keyword.

Each abstract must briefly state the specific contribution of the paper towards illustrating how engineering and/or computing education research informs educational practice. Contributions may be made in various forms, but they should describe the setting for the practice in the broad context of engineering and/or computing education, (not necessarily the particular institutional context), motivations for the practice, research that supported the practice, and results obtained. Abstracts must outline the theoretical frameworks that inform the practice and state the implications for educational practice with a focus on action.

Rubric for Research-to-Practice Abstracts

	5	**3**	**1**
Theoretical Framework: *Rate how this submission uses existing theory to support the work*	Described specifically	Theoretical framework's appropriateness or contribution in research unclear	Not described
Implications for Practice: *Rate how the submission describes the implications of this work to the practice of engineering/computing education*	Described specifically	Implications for practice are unclear, impractical, or only partially supported	Not described
Relevance: *Rate how the submission is relevant to engineering/computing education*	Clear and specific	Described mostly in general, but applicable terms	Not described
Track accuracy*: Rate how well the submission meets the full or short paper track criteria*	Paper appears to be in proper track	Paper could be in either track	Paper appears to be in wrong track