



WEEF & GEDC / AEEA 2022: peer review rubric

<p>Criterion 1: Background & Motivation Why was the work done? Why is the topic worth researching?</p>
<p>1.1 Are the rationale and context for undertaking the research explained? 1.2 Has the relevance of the research to the field of engineering education been discussed? 1.3 Is the research situated within the current literature related to the research topic?</p>
<p>Criterion 2: Aim & Research Question What exactly is being researched? Which problem is being addressed? What are the authors trying to do?</p>
<p>2.1 Is the aim/objective of the research clearly communicated? 2.2 Is the research question(s) clearly stated or indicated? 2.3 Does the research question(s) (explicitly or implicitly) align with the stated background and motivation?</p>
<p>Criterion 3: Methodology Are the research question, theory, and methods aligned? (Note, not all papers need to have methods and/or theory)</p>
<p>3.1 Is the study linked to theory and/or guided by existing theoretical and/or analytical frameworks? 3.2 Are the methods used (or to be used) for designing the study and/or collecting and analysing data thoroughly explained, where applicable? 3.3 Are the methods used appropriate? I.e., is there an alignment between the research question(s), theory, and research methods?</p>
<p>Criterion 4: Findings What are the key results? Are the conclusions interesting and justified?</p>
<p>4.1 Are the findings from the study described? (If the data collection / analysis is still going on, are the preliminary or tentative findings described?) 4.2 If the findings are complete, are the implications of the findings for research and/or practice explained, and are the findings situated in the current literature or broader context? 4.3 If the findings are incomplete, are the potential implications of the findings discussed?</p>
<p>Criterion 5: Presentation How clearly is the research communicated?</p>
<p>5.1 Is the title of the paper appropriate for the research? 5.2 Is the abstract well-structured, concise, and easy to read? 5.3 Is the language and editing of an appropriate academic standard?</p>
<p>Additional mandatory questions</p>
<p>6. Is this work appropriate for the conference purpose and themes? Relevant / Marginal / Not relevant</p>
<p>7. Overall recommendation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Sound research outline. Invite to submit full paper. ● Needs significant improvement. Provisionally invite to submit full paper¹. ● Reject.

¹ Authors may submit a full paper, but unless there is clear indication that reviewer feedback has been taken into account and the content has been significantly improved, the paper will be rejected with no opportunity for revision.