

**Discussion stream review rubric for 2024 CEEA-ACÉG
workshop/collaboratorium/panel
submissions**

(Draft: November 27 2023)

About the reviewer (conflict/expertise question first)	High	Moderate	Low
Reviewer's expertise on the topic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Structured Abstract Review	Yes	No - Needs Improvement	
<u>Learning Outcomes (6/0)</u> Are the learning outcomes clear? (2/0) Do the learning outcomes have implications for teaching/learning/researching engineering education? (2/0) Do the outcomes relate to the conference themes (i.e., Stakeholders, Partners, Collaboration, Engagement, and Inclusion)? (2/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<i>Please answer the following questions for workshops & collaboratoriums:</i> <u>Learning Activities (6/0)</u> Is a clear overview of the activities (workshop) or engagement strategies (collaboratorium) included? (3/0) Are the activities/strategies related to the learning outcomes? (3/0) <i>Please answer the following questions for panels:</i> <u>Panelists (6/0)</u> Are the panel members and their roles clearly described? (2/0) Is relevant information for each panel member provided? (2/0) Are the motivation and context for the session clearly described? (2/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<u>Session Description (6/0)</u> Does the session description have clear details of participatory activities (workshop) or main topics of discussion (collaboratorium and panel)? (2/0) Are the goals important and of potential interest to conference attendees? (2/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<u>Session Timeline (6/0)</u> Is a clear activity plan and timeline provided? (3/0) Are the times allotted for activities reasonable? (3/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
<u>Overall quality (3/0)</u> Do the proposed activities clearly fit with the expectations of a participatory and scholarly event? (3/0)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	