

Rubric for the reviewers of workshops at SEFI conferences

| Criteria | Unacceptable | Adjustment(s) needed | Accepted, nice work/minor changes recommended* |
|--|--|--|--|
| Relevance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evidence-based relevance of the topic for engineering education and its development in Europe and/or the world. - Effective communication of the topic through title. - Elaboration of the context. - The target audience is specified, if needed. | The relevance of this workshop for the Engineering Education community is insufficient or unclear. | Please develop the workshop to increase its relevance to the participants. | The relevance of this workshop is clear. |
| Workshop objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objectives of the workshop are clearly stated. - Key topics are covered in a systematic manner. - Outcome of the work and documentation will be provided. | The workshop lacks clear objectives, and the design does not ensure meaningful outcomes. | Please revise the workshop design to increase clarity of objectives and outcomes. | The workshop has clear objectives, and the implementation ensures meaningful outcomes. |
| Interactivity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The workshop is designed around joint action and collaborative participation. - The participants are encouraged to engage and work together actively (e.g., facilitated group/peer discussions, problem-solving challenges, hands-on activities). - The design guarantees that the workshop will have an appropriate duration. | The workshop design does not foster participant engagement and collaboration. | Please revise the workshop design to assure engagement within the given timeframe. | The workshop design guarantees an engaging experience. |
| Presentation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate title, abstract. - Readability and language. - Compliance with the formatting requirements of the provided template for a workshop paper. | This paper is difficult to read and understand. | 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 workshop is rejected. | If one of the criteria needs adjustment, the workshop is accepted but revision is needed. | If all criteria are accepted, the workshop is accepted. |

* "Accepted, minor changes recommended": small adjustments are recommended but not required.

