Rubric for the reviewers of research papers at SEFI conferences

Criteria	Unacceptable	Adjustment(s) needed	Accepted, nice work
Value of the contribution, for instance: - Relevance for engineering education and its development in Europe and/or the world. - Originality in treatment of the topic, bringing new perspectives. - Innovative potential for engineering education.	The value of this contribution for the Engineering Education community is insufficient or unclear.	Please develop the paper to increase its value to readers.	The value of this contribution is clear and well described.
Relating to appropriate prior work: - Contextualizing the purpose of the research, substantiating statements. - Awareness and clear attribution of the work of others.	The content does not sufficiently build on appropriate prior work or contextualize the purpose.	Please develop (further) context or links to prior work.	The context and the link to prior work is established.
Research design: - Clear research aims, objectives, research questions, or hypotheses. - Appropriate research methodology (quantitative and/or qualitative), consistent with the research questions. - Well-planned collection, reporting and analysis of empirical data (if applicable). - Well-developed discussion and conclusion - Ethical permission is obtained, if necessary.	The research design is insufficient to qualify this paper as a research paper.	Please (further) develop the description of the research design.	The research design is well developed and explained.
Presentation: - Structure of the manuscript and coherence between, e.g., research questions, methodology, analysis, discussion, and conclusions. - Appropriate title, abstract. - Readability and language. - Compliance with the formatting requirements of the provided template for a research paper.	This paper is difficult to read and understand due to structure, word choices, or grammar/spelling errors.	Please develop the format, structure, word choices, or grammar and spelling.	The paper is fully readable: it's clear, well structured, with satisfactory language.
Conclusion	If one of the first three criteria is unacceptable (not remediable within the provided time), **the paper is rejected.**	If one of the criteria needs adjustment, **the paper is accepted but revision is needed.**	If all the criteria are accepted, **the paper is accepted.**

"Accepted, minor changes recommended" is assigned to papers for which all reviewers recommend conditional acceptance and where only one criterion requires adjustment, assessed as minor. Small adjustments are recommended but not required.

When the four criteria are accepted as 'nice work', the reviewer can also nominate the paper for one of the Best Paper Awards.