

**Review Rubric for the Engineering Education Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) submissions** (both the structured abstract and the full paper)

<b>About the reviewer</b> (conflict/expertise question first)	High	Moderate	Low
Reviewer's expertise on the topic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Structured Abstract Review</b>	Yes	No - Needs Improvement	
<b>Background (6/0)</b> Is the context of the work described? (3/0) Is the motivation for the work described? (3/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<b>Purpose (6/0)</b> Is the purpose of the project/intervention/practice clearly described? (6/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<b>Approach/Design/Method (6/0)</b> Is an overview of the project/intervention/practice clearly included? (2/0) Is the work connected to relevant literature? (2/0) Are appropriate methods being used for the project/study? (2/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<b>Results/Outcomes/Findings (6/0)</b> Is the (anticipated) impact of the project/intervention/practice clearly discussed?*(2/0) Are the findings discussed in relation to relevant literature? (2/0) Are alternative interpretations, counter arguments, bias, reliability, or validity discussed as appropriate? (2/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<b>Conclusions (6/0)</b> Do the conclusions follow from the analysis and the discussion?(2/0) Do the conclusions contribute valuable insights and/or have implications into teaching/learning/researching engineering education? (2/0) Are reflections on the (anticipated) learnings of the project/intervention/practice included in the concluding discussion? (2/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<b>Coherence among all the components (3/0)</b> Are the elements of the project/study (i.e., purpose, design, methods, etc.) aligned? (3/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<b>Overall quality (3/0)</b> Do the (proposed) method and analysis fit with the expectations of scholarly work? (3/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
	Yes	No -Needs Improvement	
Does the submission fit within the field of engineering education?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Does the submission connect to the conference themes (i.e., Stakeholders, Partners, Collaboration, Engagement, and Inclusion)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

\* "Anticipated impact of the project/intervention/practice" and "Reflections of the anticipated learnings of the project/intervention/practice" for the review rubric of the structured abstract;  
"Impact of the project/intervention/practice" and "Reflections of the learnings of the project/intervention/practice" for the review rubric of the full paper.

**Recommendation**

- Accept
- Accept as written, subject to minor changes – please suggest what to change in the “Comments to the Author(s)” box below.
- Needs major revisions – please detail what revisions are required in the “Comments to the Author(s)” box below.
- Reject – please explain the rationale in the Confidential Comments to the Organizing Committee and in the Comments to the Author(s) boxes below.

Comments to the Author(s) (required). Please include constructive and actionable suggestions for improvement to all areas noted as needing improvement above.

Confidential Comments to the Conference Organizing Committee (required if rejecting)

**Review Rubric for the Engineering Education Research submissions (both the structured abstract and the full paper)**

<b>About the reviewer</b> (conflict/expertise question first)	High	Moderate	Low
Reviewer's expertise on the topic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b>Structured Abstract Review</b>	Yes	No - Needs Improvement	N/A
<b><u>Background (6/0)</u></b> Is the context of the research described? (2/0) Is the motivation for the research described? (2/0) Is the research gap and/or contribution to the literature/field described? (2/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<b><u>Purpose (6/0)</u></b> Is the purpose of the study, research questions, or hypothesis clearly described? (6/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<u>Text label "Only answer for Research or Review Paper. Please use N/A to answer questions for the other type of paper"</u> <b><u>Approach/Design/Method (6/0)</u></b> (Research paper) Is a conceptual or theoretical framework clearly included? (2/0) Is the data collection method (e.g., survey, interview, artifact) clear? (2/0) Are the analysis methods (e.g., coding, statistical methods) appropriate? (2/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Approach/Design/Method (6/0)</u></b> (Review papers) Are the methods used to identify primary studies to be included clear? (2/0) Are the inclusion/exclusion criteria described? (2/0) Are the methods used to synthesize primary studies clear? (2/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Results/Outcomes/Findings (6/0)</u></b> Are the (anticipated) findings of the study clearly presented?*(2/0) Are the findings discussed in relation to relevant literature? (2/0) Are alternative interpretations, counter arguments, bias, reliability, or validity discussed as appropriate? (2/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<b><u>Conclusions (6/0)</u></b> Do the conclusions follow from the analysis and the discussion? (3/0) Do the conclusions contribute valuable insights and/or have implications into teaching/learning/researching engineering education? (3/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<b><u>Coherence among all the components (6/0)</u></b> Are the elements of the study (purpose, design, methods, etc.) aligned? (3/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<b><u>Overall quality (3/0)</u></b> Does the proposed method and analysis fit with the expectations of scholarly work? (3/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

	Yes	No -Needs Improvement	
Does the submission fit within the field of engineering education?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Does the submission connect to the conference themes (i.e., Stakeholders, Partners, Collaboration, Engagement, and Inclusion)?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

\* “Anticipated findings of the study” and “Discussion of the anticipated findings” for the review rubric of the structured abstract; “Findings of the study” and “Discussion of the findings” for the review rubric of the full paper

**Recommendation**

- Accept
- Accept as written, subject to minor changes – please suggest what to change in the “Comments to the Author(s)” box below.
- Needs major revisions – please detail what revisions are required in the “Comments to the Author(s)” box below.
- Reject – please explain the rationale in the Confidential Comments to the Organizing Committee and in the Comments to the Author(s) boxes.

Comments to the Author(s) (required). Please include constructive and actionable suggestions for improvement to all areas noted as needing improvement above.

Confidential Comments to the Conference Organizing Committee (required if rejecting)