Note to Authors: The review rubrics for the full papers were updated in January 2025 by the CEEA-ACÉG Editorial Board after further considerations of the different expectations for SoTL and EER papers.

Review Rubric for the Engineering Education Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) Full Paper Submissions

About the reviewer

If you serve as a reviewer of this paper, do you see any conflict of interest? Possible conflicts of interest may arise from collaborative or competitive personal or professional relationships with the author(s), including being affiliated with the same institution and/or having connections to the project, intervention or practice discussed in this paper.

❍ Yes (If selected, please do NOT proceed to review the submission)
❍ No

Based on your academic and professional background, do you find yourself qualified to review this paper? Qualified reviewers for submissions to the CEEA-ACÉG annual conference are experienced engineering educators and/or researchers with an active CEEA-ACÉG membership and have some knowledge about the topic of the reviewed paper. The keywords provided by the author(s) can be used to obtain a quick understanding of the topic of the reviewed paper.

❍ Yes
❍ No (If selected, please do NOT proceed to review the submission)

Expectations for a full paper	Good	Fair	Not included
Background The context of the work is clearly described. The motivation for the work is clearly explained.	❍ ❍	❍ ❍	❍ ❍
Purpose The purpose of the paper on a teaching/learning project, intervention or novel practice is well articulated.	❍	❍	❍
Approach A clear overview of the teaching/learning project, intervention or novel practice is provided. The work is reasonably connected to relevant literature. The methods used to assess the outcomes of the project, intervention or practice are appropriate.	❍ ❍ ❍	❍ ❍ ❍	❍ ❍ ❍
Outcomes The outcomes of the project, intervention or practice are clearly presented. The outcomes of the project, intervention or practice are discussed in relation to relevant literature. Limitations in the methods or outcomes are discussed as appropriate.	❍ ❍ ❍	❍ ❍ ❍	❍ ❍ ❍
Conclusions The reflections are well supported by the outcomes and the discussion. The conclusions contribute valuable insights and/or have implications to engineering education practice.	❍ ❍	❍ ❍	❍ ❍
Coherence among all the components			

The elements of the paper (i.e., purpose, approach, outcomes, discussion, and conclusions) are all logically connected.	❍	❍	❍
Overall quality Overall, the paper fits well with the expectations of scholarly work (e.g., using an academic writing style, demonstrating thoughtfulness and critical analysis, and referencing academic publications).	❍	❍	❍

Does the submission fit within the field of engineering education? (If not, the author(s) might need to consider submitting their work to another venue.)

❍   Yes

❍   No

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 (EER) Full Paper Submissions

About the reviewer
If you serve as a reviewer of this paper, do you see any conflict of interest? Possible conflicts of interest may arise from collaborative or competitive personal or professional relationships with the author(s), including being affiliated with the same institution and/or having connections to the research in this paper.
❍ Yes (If selected, please do NOT proceed to review the submission)
❍ No

Based on your academic and professional background, do you find yourself qualified to review this abstract or paper? Qualified reviewers for submissions to the CEEA-ACÉG annual conference are experienced engineering educators and/or researchers with an active CEEA-ACÉG membership and have some knowledge about the topic, paradigm, and methods of the reviewed paper. The keywords provided by the author(s) can be used to obtain a quick understanding of the topic of the paper. The abstract should include the methods used in the research.
❍ Yes
❍ No (If selected, please do NOT proceed to review the submission)

Expectations for a structured abstract or a full paper	Good	Fair	Not included
Background The context of the study is clearly described. The motivation for the study is clearly explained. The research gap or significance is identified. The research questions are clearly stated.	❍ ❍ ❍ ❍	❍ ❍ ❍ ❍	❍ ❍ ❍ ❍
Hypothesis or Framework The hypothesis or the conceptual / theoretical framework is provided and explained.	❍	❍	❍
Design/Method/Methodology (Research paper) The data collection methods (e.g., survey, interview, artifact) are clearly described. The data analysis methods (e.g., coding, statistical methods) are appropriate. The ethics approval process is described.	❍ ❍ ❍	❍ ❍ ❍	❍ ❍ ❍
Design/Method/Methodology (Literature review papers) The methods used to identify the relevant literature for review are clearly described. The inclusion/exclusion criteria are clearly explained.	❍ ❍	❍ ❍	❍ ❍
Results The findings of the study are clearly presented. The findings are discussed in relation to relevant literature. Alternative interpretations, counter arguments, bias, limitations, reliability, validity, generalizability, or trustworthiness are discussed as appropriate.	❍ ❍ ❍	❍ ❍ ❍	❍ ❍ ❍
Conclusions The conclusions are well supported by the findings and the discussion. The conclusions contribute valuable insights and/or have implications to engineering education knowledge or practice.	❍ ❍	❍ ❍	❍ ❍
Coherence among all the components The elements of the study (i.e., research questions, hypothesis / framework,	❍	❍	❍

research design / methods, results, discussion, and conclusions) are all logically connected.			
Overall quality Overall, the paper fits well with the expectations of scholarly work (e.g., using an academic writing style, demonstrating thoughtfulness and critical analysis, and referencing academic publications).	○	○	○

Does the submission fit within the field of engineering education? (If not, the author(s) might need to consider submitting their work to another venue.)

○ Yes

○ No

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)