Rubric for the reviewers of idea market presentations 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 of treatment of a problem, introducing new approaches/prototypes. - Innovative potential for engineering education.	The value of the contribution for Engineering Education is insufficient or unclear. Motivation and expected benefits aren't clearly defined.	Please provide a clearer articulation of the value and intended contribution of your idea/prototype.	The value of this contribution is clear and well described.
Viability and clarity: - The feasibility and viability of the presented approach/prototype in engineering education - Clarity of the motivation and proposed solution/prototype - Coherence and logical connection between the problem and the approach/prototype which serve as solutions	The approach/prototype appears incoherent, incomplete or does not demonstrate adequate viability.	Please provide a more detailed explanation, stronger rationale, or more detail to assess its feasibility.	The approach/prototype is well articulated, clearly motivated, and appears to be viable in engineering education.
Adaptability and impact: - The possibility of future adaptation to other contexts (for example classrooms, universities, etc.) is discussed. - 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 elaborate or clarify on the adaptability or impact.	The adaptability and impact are well developed.
Presentation: - Structure of the manuscript and coherence between individual parts. - The set-up of this intervention/work is clearly presented. - Clear and logical description of the presented approach/prototype. - Appropriate title, abstract. - Readability and language. - Compliance with the formatting requirements of the provided template for an idea market presentation.	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.