Review Rubric for Paper Submissions to the "Practice" Track

Review Request
Dear reviewer,
As a professional community, we rely on the expertise of peer reviewers to maintain the quality of the submitted abstracts and full papers. We highly appreciate your contribution to the peer review process.

If you indicated being willing to review the full paper developed from the structured abstract that you reviewed at the abstract review stage, you have been assigned as a reviewer of the same submission. Would you be willing to review this paper that the authors submitted to the PRACTICE Track?
❍ Yes, I will review this submission and provide my responses to the following review questions by the deadline specified in the email; and I will not use an LLM to generate feedback as per the CEEA-ACÉG Generative AI Policy: https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/PCEEA/generative-AI-policy-statement
❍ No, I'm not available to review this submission.
❍ No, I don't think I have the expertise to review this submission.

Conflict of interest. Possible conflicts of interest may arise from collaborative or competitive personal or professional relationships with the author(s), including being affiliated with the same institution and/or having connections to the project, intervention or practice discussed in this paper.
❏ If you have a conflict of interest, declare it here.

Please indicate your current *primary* role in the engineering school of your affiliated postsecondary institution.
❍ Master's student
❍ Doctoral student
❍ Postdoc
❍ Contract or Sessional Instructor
❍ Assistant Professor
❍ Associate Professor
❍ Full Professor
❍ Research Staff
❍ Administrative Staff
❍ None of the above, please specify your role below

Other role in your affiliated organization:
_____

Does the paper address issues, questions, or practices in engineering education that may be of interest to the Canadian and/or international engineering education communities?
❍ Yes
❍ No

Please rate the paper submission based on the following expectations. These expectations are outlined in the "Author Guidelines for the Structured abstract" document posted in Call for Submissions.

Expectations for paper submissions to the "Practice" track	Good	Fair	Inadequate	Not applicable
Background The context of the work is clearly described.	○	○	○	
The motivation for the work is clearly explained.	○	○	○	
Goal and Inquiry Question The goal of the practice is well articulated and has the potential to contribute to deeper understanding of issues, problems, or teaching approaches relevant to the community.	○	○	○	
An inquiry question or hypothesis is clearly stated and well-grounded in the literature.	○	○	○	
Description of the Practice The practice (e.g., an educational intervention already implemented, a new educational method or tool designed, or other types of new educational practice) is clearly described.	○	○	○	
Relevant literature is used to demonstrate how the practice makes a valuable contribution to knowledge.	○	○	○	
Approach How the impact of the educational intervention or new practice was evaluated is clearly explained and is appropriate for the inquiry question.	○	○	○	○
How the new method or tool was conceived, or designed, is clearly explained.	○	○	○	○
Results The outcomes / results of the intervention or practice, where applicable, are clearly presented.	○	○	○	○
Discussion A critical reflection on success, failure, observations, and/or challenges related to the practice and/or inquiry approach is thoughtfully provided.	○	○	○	
If results/findings were presented, the critical reflection, discussion, and conclusions are well supported by those findings.	○	○	○	○
Conclusions The conclusions contribute valuable insights and/or have implications to engineering education practice.	○	○	○	
Communication and Flow The elements of the project (i.e., background, goal and inquiry question, the description of the practice, approach, and discussion and conclusions, where applicable) align well with each other. In other words, there is good internal coherence among the elements of the project.	○	○	○	
Overall, the paper is well written, with no or very few grammatical errors.	○	○	○	
The format of the paper fully complies with the Author Guideline for the CEEA-ACÉG paper submissions.	Yes	No	Unsure	

Research Ethics. If the paper reports data collected from human participants, have the authors provided the number of the ethics protocol that was approved by their institution's Research Ethics Board (REB) OR proof from their institution's REB indicating that their project is exempt from ethics review? Note that the proof can be a letter, an email message, or the result from a self-administered screening tool provided by the authors' institution's REB.

❍ Yes, the number of approved ethics protocol is provided
❍ Yes, a proof about the ethics review exemption is provided
❍ No
❍ Not applicable (i.e., the paper does not involve data collection from human participants)

Recommendation.
❍ Accept
❍ Accept, subject to minor changes – please suggest what to change in the "Comments to the Author(s)" box below.
❍ Resubmit for review, with major revisions – please detail what revisions are required in the "Comments to the Author(s)" box below.
❍ Reject – please explain the rationale in the "Confidential Comments to the Editor and Associate Editors" box below.

Confidential Feedback. If the paper was submitted for a podium talk, would you recommend it to be presented as a lightning talk? At the 2026 Conference, more paper submissions will be offered lightning talks and fewer podium talks will be scheduled. As outlined in the Call for Submissions, a Podium Talk (12-minute presentation + 8-minute Q&As) is more suitable for larger or more in-depth work; a Lightening Talk (5-minute presentation + 5-minute Q&As) is more suitable for smaller-scale, high-quality completed work, as well as works-in-progress or early-stage research.
❍ I'd recommend this paper to be presented as a Lightening Talk.
❍ I'd recommend this paper to be presented as a Podium Talk.

Confidential Feedback. Would you recommend this submission for the Best Paper Award for the PRACTICE track? Please consider this recommendation if you rate "Good" for all the expectations listed above.
❍ Yes
❍ No
❍ Unsure

If you checked Yes to the question above, please provide a brief explanation for your recommendation.
_____

Comments to the Author(s) (required).
Please provide constructive and actionable suggestions for improving this submission. Consider what parts of the submission are effective for the purpose of the submission and why; and what parts of the submission need improvement, and in what ways. No AI tool should be used to help generate your feedback. Refer to the CEEA-ACÉG Generative AI Policy. For your reference, here is a resource for some guidelines on effective peer review feedback.

_____

Confidential Comments to the Editor and Associate Editors (required if rejecting).
_____

Review Rubric for Paper Submissions to the "Research" Track

[All the other sections, including the order of their appearance, are exactly the same as those for the "Practice" track submissions, except the following table and the question on research ethics.]

Please rate the paper submission based on the following expectations. These expectations are outlined in the "Author Guidelines for the Structured Abstract" document posted in Call for Submissions.

Expectations for paper submissions to the "Research" track	Good	Fair	Inadequate
Background The context of the study is clearly described.	○	○	○
The motivation for the study is clearly explained.	○	○	○
The gaps in the relevant literature are identified.	○	○	○
Research Question and Framework The research questions are clearly stated and has the potential to contribute to deeper understanding of issues, problems, and research relevant to the community.	○	○	○
The theoretical or conceptual framework underpinning the study is clearly explained and linked to the relevant literature.	○	○	○
Research Design and Methods The study participants and data collection method (e.g., survey, interview, artifact) are clearly described and appropriate for the research question.	○	○	○
The analysis methods (e.g., coding, statistical methods) are appropriate.	○	○	○
Results The findings of the study are clearly presented.	○	○	○
The findings appropriately answer the research questions.	○	○	○
Discussion The findings are discussed in relation to relevant literature and the framework used for the study.	○	○	○
The discussion is well supported by the results.	○	○	○
Conclusions The conclusions are well supported by the findings and the discussion.	○	○	○
The conclusions contribute valuable insights and/or have implications to engineering education practice.	○	○	○
Communication and Flow The elements of the study (i.e., background, research question, framework, design and methods, results, and discussion and conclusions) align well with each other. In other words, there is good internal coherence among the elements of the study.	○	○	○
Overall, the paper is well written, with no or very few grammatical errors.	○	○	○
The format of the paper fully complies with the Author Guideline for the CEEA-ACÉG paper submissions.	Yes	No	Unsure

Research Ethics. If the paper reports data collected from human participants, have the authors provided the number of the ethics protocol that was approved by their institution's Research Ethics Board (REB)?
❍ Yes, the number of approved ethics protocol is provided
❍ No
❍ Not applicable (i.e., the paper does not involve data collection from human participants)

Review Rubric for Paper Submissions to the "Conceptual Paper" Track

[All the other sections, including the order of their appearance, are exactly the same as those for the "Practice" track submissions, except the following table.]

Please rate the paper submission based on the following expectations. These expectations are outlined in the "Author Guidelines for the Structured Abstract" document posted in Call for Submissions.

Expectations for paper submissions to the "Conceptual Paper" track	Good	Fair	Inadequate	Not applicable
Background The context of the work is clearly described.	❍	❍	❍	
The motivation for the work is clearly explained and grounded in relevant literature.	❍	❍	❍	
Goal and Inquiry Question The goal of the paper is well articulated and has the potential to contribute to deeper understanding of issues, problems, and research relevant to the community.	❍	❍	❍	
An inquiry question is clearly stated.	❍	❍	❍	
Approach The approach to achieving the goal is clearly outlined. The approach can include use of theoretical perspectives, synthesis of evidence-based observations, and/or a literature review.	❍	❍	❍	
For stand-alone scoping or literature reviews, the methods used to identify relevant literature, including the inclusion and exclusion criteria, are clearly explained.	❍	❍	❍	❍
The approach/method is appropriate for the inquiry question.	❍	❍	❍	
Key Claims or Findings Key claims or findings are clearly explained and well supported by evidence from relevant literature, practice, and/or argument.	❍	❍	❍	
Findings from stand-alone scoping or literature reviews are well supported by relevant literature reviewed.	❍	❍	❍	❍
Discussion and Conclusions Significance of the work is clearly explained.	❍	❍	❍	
The conclusions contribute valuable insights and/or have implications to the engineering education community.	❍	❍	❍	
Communication and Flow The elements of the paper (i.e., background, goal and inquiry question, approach, key claims or findings, and discussion and conclusions, where appropriate) align well with each other. In other words, there is good internal coherence among the elements of the paper.	❍	❍	❍	
Overall, the paper is well written, with no or very few grammatical errors.	❍	❍	❍	
The format of the paper fully complies with the Author Guideline for the CEEA-ACÉG paper submissions.	Yes	No	Unsure	