

Rubric for the reviewers of practice papers at SEFI conferences

| Criteria | Unacceptable | Adjustment(s) needed | Accepted, nice work |
|--|---|---|---|
| Value of the contribution, for instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Contextualizing the purpose of the work substantiating statements. - Awareness and clear attribution of the work of others. - Approach to related discourses within the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL). | The content does not build on appropriate prior work or related discourses within SoTL literature. | Please develop (further) the link to prior work or related discourses within SoTL . | The link to prior work or related discourses within SoTL is well established. |
| Adaptability and impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The work is readily adaptable to other cases (for example classrooms, universities, etc.) to allow for rapid implementation in the learning environment. - The extent to which the work can be applied to a variety of contexts is clear. - The impact on the engineering education community is clear. | It's not clear how this work can be adapted to other contexts, or the impact is unclear. | Please develop the adaptability or impact. | The adaptability and impact are well developed. |
| Presentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Structure of the manuscript and coherence between, e.g., goals, discussion and conclusions. - The set-up of this intervention/work is clearly presented. - Clear indication whether this is work is recently initiated, work in progress, or completed work. - Appropriate title, abstract. - Readability and language. - Compliance with the formatting requirements of the provided template for a practice 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 Paper Awards.

