Innovative Practice Category Review Criteria

Rubric for Innovative Practice Submissions

Submissions under the Innovative Practice category 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, builds on previous practice as documented in the literature, and/or presents preliminary analysis of empirical data. The criteria for papers in this category are the following:

- To what extent are the practices described in the paper extensible, innovative or impactful translations of pedagogical research to educational practice?
- 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?
- What is the breadth of the audience that will be interested in the subject of the paper?
- To what extent is the paper professionally written? All papers must be submitted in English.

Full Paper
Full papers should demonstrate scholarly quality as evaluated on the strength of the methodology used, the quality/depth of the theoretical foundation, and the quality/depth of the analysis and related discussion. In addition, these should maintain a high level of scholarly quality, reflecting on how this work extends/is distinguished from other work attempted in similar areas.

o

	5	4	3	2	1
Innovation: *Rate and summarize how this submission makes a novel/innovative contribution to engineering education.*	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
Significance: *Rate and summarize how this submission is important and makes an important contribution to engineering education.*	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
Relevance: *Rate how and explain how the work advances frontiers in education within the context of FIE.*	Highly relevant	Clearly appropriate and well focused	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Somewhat relevant, but not focused	Not relevant
Language and Expression:	Excellent, exemplary use of language	Good, appropriate	Reasonable, may need	Poor language, unlikely that it can be	Very difficult to understand

Rate and assess the organization, language and English expression used in the submission.	enhancing the quality of the submission	as is	some revision	sufficiently improved	
Context: *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.*	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
Scholarly Quality: *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.*	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
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: *Please indicate your level of expertise related to the content of this submission.*	Expert	High	Medium	Low	None
OVERALL EVALUATION: *This should reflect the combination of the individual section's evaluations.*	Accept		Accept with revisions		Reject

Short Paper

Short paper (i.e., Work-in-Progress) innovative practice submissions should outline the innovation and how it improves upon prior practice. Short papers should introduce new ideas and encourage a discourse

that can potentially advance the field in some way. The phrase "*Work in Progress:* " must be the first words of the abstract.

      ○

	5	4	3	2	1
Innovation: *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.*	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
Significance: *Rate and summarize how this submission is important and makes an important contribution to engineering education.*	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
Relevance: *Rate how and explain how the work advances frontiers in education within the context of FIE.*	Highly relevant	Clearly appropriate and well focused	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Somewhat relevant, but not focused	Not relevant
Language and Expression: *Rate and assess the organization, language and English expression used in the submission.*	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
Context: *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.*	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
REVIEWER'S CONFIDENCE: *Please indicate your level of expertise related to the content of this submission.*	Expert	High	Medium	Low	None
OVERALL EVALUATION: *This should reflect the combination of the individual section's evaluations.*	Accept		Accept with revisions		Reject