



Guidelines For Reviewers SEFI 2026 Submissions

The review process is one of the most important elements that ensures the quality of a conference and its proceedings. These guidelines are developed to support you as a reviewer such that you feel confident and comfortable during the review process. The quality of your feedback is important, so that authors can truly improve their manuscripts if necessary.

Introduction

There are four different **submission types**, each with their review criteria:

Research Paper presents original quantitative or qualitative research that follows the standard practices in engineering education research. It should include a theoretical background and literature review, as well as methods, analysis, and interpretations of the research. The paper should outline the contribution of the research to both engineering education research and practice.

There are four review criteria for research papers:

(1) Value of the contribution, (2) Relating to appropriate prior work, (3) Research design and (4) Presentation.

Practice Paper presents a practical contribution to engineering education by showcasing an intervention, method, or teaching approach grounded in real experience, with clear relevance and innovative potential. The paper should indicate the stage of development of the presented intervention/work and logically outline its set-up. It should also describe the adaptability of the intervention/work for other contexts and its potential impact on the engineering education community.

There are four review criteria for practice papers:

(1) Value of the contribution, (2) Relating to appropriate prior work, (3) Adaptability and impact and (4) Presentation.

Workshop Proposal outlines an engaging and interactive session that has a sound theoretical foundation and a practical application for engineering education. The proposal should be of interest to SEFI community members and must include a clear learning goal, a description of the theoretical foundation, and a plan for facilitating the workshop, ensuring that most of the time will be spent on active learning experiences for the participants.

There are four review criteria for workshops:

(1) Relevance, (2) Workshop objectives, (3) Interactivity and (4) Presentation.

Idea Market Presentation presents ongoing research or practical prototypes in engineering education. Authors may describe their current work and further plans or demonstrate their prototypes and present their application within engineering education. Idea market presentations are presented exclusively in the form of a poster. During the poster session, idea market presentations are intended to create a collaborative space for sharing ideas and networking, encouraging participants to discuss ongoing work.

There are four review criteria for idea market presentation:

(1) Value of the contribution, (2) Viability and clarity, (3) Adaptability and impact and (4) Presentation.

Review Criteria Evaluation Scale

Each review criterion has to be evaluated on a **4-level evaluation scale**:

Accepted, nice work: Reviewer feedback is highly valuable and can encourage further refinement of the manuscript.

Accepted, minor changes recommended: Reviewer feedback is highly valuable, small adjustments are recommended and intended to guide the author to enhance the quality of the contribution.

Note: This is a newly added level of the evaluation scale, it is intended for submissions that should be directly accepted, while actively signaling to the author that certain aspects could be refined to further improve the quality of the paper and to help them recognize areas for enhancement.

Adjustment(s) needed: Reviewer feedback is essential and it's treated as a requirement for improvement. Therefore reviewers, please make your feedback actionable such that the authors can truly improve their manuscript, keeping the length limit of the submission in mind.

Unacceptable: Based on reviewer feedback it should be clear to the author(s) that the quality of the submission needs improvement and that the reviewer estimates that this cannot happen within the limited time slot. By consequence the manuscript will be rejected.

Note: In case the reviewer only gives "unacceptable" for the review criterion "presentation", the submission is not rejected since a strong improvement might still be possible.

Find below an example of one of the criteria, specifically the Value of the contribution for a research paper:

Awarding of Points Based on Various Criteria

* **Value of the contribution** - Relevance for engineering education and its development in Europe and/or the world.
25% - Originality in treatment of the topic, bringing new perspectives.
- Innovative potential for engineering education.

- The value of this contribution is clear and well described.
- The value of this contribution is clear and well described but minor changes are recommended.
- Please develop the paper to increase its value to readers.
- The value of this contribution for the Engineering Education community is insufficient or unclear.

* **Comments on the value of the contribution**

Please explain your rating for this criterion and provide feedback or suggestions to the authors.

Note: The overall score is not considered and the indication of 25% per category is due to basic settings in ConfTool that cannot be changed. We do not use the numerical elements and therefore the weight of the criterion can be ignored.

Use Of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Tools

Authors are allowed to use generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process to improve readability and language of the work, but they should (1) carefully review and edit the results, and (2) disclose the use of it in their manuscript with a statement. Reviewers are tasked with monitoring this and possibly commenting in their feedback if there is a suspicion of improper use of AI.

Note: Reviewers should not upload a submitted manuscript into a generative AI tool since a submitted manuscript must be treated as a confidential document.

Nominations For Paper Awards

Reviewers are asked to identify candidates for one of the four possible best paper awards: **Best student paper**, **Best Practice paper**, **Best Research paper** and **the Susanne Ihsen Award for papers on diversity, equity and inclusion**. If you identify a paper that should be considered as a candidate for one of these awards, upon clicking the checkbox, you will be asked to provide a rationale for your recommendation. Please justify your choice based on the review criteria.

Susanne Ihsen Award

Since the Susanne Ihsen Award focuses on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion, it has a particular set of criteria for paper nomination and award decision. These criteria are **new this year** so please take a moment to explore the criteria [here](#).

Please nominate papers that you think meet any of the nomination criteria and are good candidates based on the award criteria (a paper does not need to meet all the criteria to be considered for an award).

The authors may indicate whether their submission has a DEI focus. You can see this at the very beginning of the review process, alongside the anonymized details of the paper.

This information can support you in identifying potential candidates for the Susan Ihsen Award.

Contribution Details

Submission Type / Conference Track: Practice Paper
Format: Paper talk

000

Organization(s):

Submitted by:

Created:

Last Update:

Presenting Author:

Topics:

Keywords:

This paper has a DEI focus (yes/no): Yes

Do you agree with your submission to be used in the CLEER study?

10 pages

CLEER-ACCURATE Study

All reviewers are invited to participate in the CLEER-ACCURATE research study, which compares anonymized SEFI 2026 peer-review outcomes with the outputs of the CLEER curation model. Participation is voluntary.

CLEER (Clearinghouse of Engineering Education Resources) is a curated database of peer-reviewed engineering education research. Its aim is to improve access to high-quality work by applying expert-defined quality criteria in a transparent and responsible way.

More information about the study is directly on the [SEFI 2026 webpage](#) and at <https://cleer.euroteq.eu/>

Outcome of the Review Process

Each paper will be reviewed by at least two reviewers.

- If all criteria are evaluated as “accepted, nice work” or “accepted, minor changes recommended” by all reviewers, the paper is **accepted**.
- If any of the criteria is marked as “adjustment needed”, the paper is **conditionally accepted** and requires revision.
- If one of the criteria (excluding presentation) is “unacceptable”, the paper is **rejected**.

Note: The LOC reserves the right to do an additional check in case of divergence between the two reviewers or in the case that no substantial feedback is given.

Step-by-step through ConfTool

<https://www.conftool.com/sefi2026/>

1. **Information on the Contribution, Submission Type**
 - a. Check the submission type you are reviewing so that you can apply the appropriate review criteria while reviewing the manuscript.
2. **Information on the Contribution, Contribution of the Submission**
 - a. Outline briefly the main contribution of this submission to the SEFI community (summary).
3. **Appreciation of Evaluation Criteria**
 - a. Evaluate the submission on each of the four review criteria on a 4-level evaluation scale.
 - b. Where provided, answer the guiding questions on specific aspects of the evaluation criteria.
 - c. Provide clear, criterion-specific comments in the respective “comments” field.
4. **Comments on the submission**
 - a. Explain your evaluation in a detailed and clear manner with regards to the four review criteria.
 - b. See below for a checklist to help you write feedback that is rigorous, specific, respectful and constructive
5. **Conference Track & Additional Information for the Program Committee**
 - a. Click the checkbox ‘Best Paper Award Nomination’ or ‘Susanne Ihnen Award Nomination’ if you recommend this submission as a candidate for one of the awards.
 - b. Provide a rationale for your recommendation. Please justify your choice based on the review criteria.
 - c. Decide whether you wish to opt-in the CLEER-ACCURATE Study.
 - d. Give feedback to the LOC. These are internal comments that will not be seen by the authors.
6. **Submit Your Review.**

Reviewer checklist

Writing feedback that is rigorous, specific, respectful and constructive

Before hitting submit on your review, please read through your comments to ensure that you:

- Critique the submission, not the authors.
- Use respectful, professional, non-dismissive language
- Identify strengths as well as weaknesses
- Give specific, constructive suggestions for improvement.
- Explain your concerns clearly using examples where possible, rather than making sweeping or vague negative judgments
- Be mindful of your tone. Avoid sarcasm, belittling language, or gatekeeping.
- Assume good faith on the part of the authors, and a sincere scholarly effort
- Comment on language issues respectfully and only if they affect clarity
- Aim to help the authors improve this submission, regardless of acceptance/rejection