Review Rubrics for Submissions to the 2027 CEEA-ACÉG Conference

Peer reviewers will use the rubrics included in this document to evaluate submissions to the 2027 CEEA-ACÉG Conference. Authors can also use this document to better understand the expectations for their submissions. Note that the expectations for submissions to Practice, Research and Conceptual Paper tracks are different.

As the 2027 CEEA-ACÉG Conference offers two submission types—a structured abstract and a full paper, two sets of rubrics are used for reviews. These review rubrics were created to align with the description in the Guidelines for Submission Preparation in the Call for Submissions.

[Questions for reviewers]

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. When checked, you will not proceed to review the submission.

Does the submission address issues, questions, or practices that may be of interest to the Canadian and/or international engineering education communities?

❍ Yes

❍ No

Review Rubrics for Structured Abstract Submissions

Please rate the Structured Abstract submissions based on the following expectations.

Good: Meets the expectations, with little or no improvement needed.
Fair: Partly meets the expectations but needs more detail, clarification, or support.
Inadequate: Important information is missing or unclear, and substantial improvement is needed.

Expectations for abstract submissions to the "Practice" track	Good	Fair	Inadequate	Not applicable
Background: Describe the context and motivation for the work.	❍	❍	❍	
Description of new practice: Describe the educational intervention or practice that is new to the local context (e.g., the authors' own classroom or program). Explain the goal of the intervention or new practice and use relevant literature to demonstrate how the practice relates to existing knowledge and how it will contribute to improvement in the local context.	❍	❍	❍	
Assessment of the new practice: Where applicable, explain how the impact of the educational intervention or new practice was assessed.	❍	❍	❍	❍
Critical reflections: Critically reflect upon success, failure, and/or challenges related to the practice.	❍	❍	❍	

Expectations for <u>abstract</u> submissions to the "Research" track	Good	Fair	Inadequate
Background and research question: Describe the context and motivation for the study, identify gaps in the relevant literature, and clearly state the research question(s).	❍	❍	❍
Theoretical or conceptual framework: Explain the theoretical or conceptional framework underpinning the study.	❍	❍	❍
Research design and methods: Summarize how the research was conducted, including research design, data sources, data collection, and analysis methods. For stand-alone scoping or systematic literature reviews, describe the methods used to identify relevant literature, including the inclusion and exclusion criteria.	❍	❍	❍
Results: Summarize the research findings.	❍	❍	❍
Discussion and Conclusions: Discuss the key contributions and implications of the findings to relevant literature and practice.	❍	❍	❍

Expectations for <u>abstract</u> submissions to the "Conceptual Paper" track	Good	Fair	Inadequate
Background: Briefly describe the context and motivation for the work.	❍	❍	❍
Goal(s) of the submission and inquiry question(s): Explain the goal(s) of the submission and state the inquiry question(s) and the key concepts.	❍	❍	❍
Approach: Explain the approach to achieving the goal, including engagement with the literature, use of theoretical perspectives, and synthesis of evidence-based observations and secondary data, where applicable.	❍	❍	❍
Key arguments: Share the key arguments that are being presented/discussed.	❍	❍	❍
Discussion and conclusions: Explain the significance of the work and discuss the implications of the work for engineering education.	❍	❍	❍

Review Rubrics for Full Paper Submissions

Please rate the Full Paper submissions based on the following expectations.

Good: Meets the expectations, with little or no improvement needed.
Fair: Partly meets the expectations but needs more detail, clarification, or support.
Inadequate: Important information is missing or unclear, and substantial improvement is needed.

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.	❍	❍	❍	
Description of New 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 relates to existing knowledge.	❍	❍	❍	
Assessment of the New Practice (Note to reviewers: only assess this section if the paper includes an assessment of the practice, otherwise select NA)				
The method used to assess the impact of the educational intervention or new practice is clearly explained.	❍	❍	❍	❍
The assessment methods are appropriate.	❍	❍	❍	❍
The results of the assessment are clearly presented.	❍	❍	❍	❍
Critical Reflections				
Critical reflections on success, failure, and/or challenges related to the practice, and impact on student learning, where appropriate, are thoughtfully provided and situated in reference to relevant literature.	❍	❍	❍	
Communication and Flow				
The elements of the project (i.e., background, description of new practice, assessment of the new practice, and critical reflections, 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	

Expectations for paper submissions to the "Research" track	Good	Fair	Inadequate	Not applicable
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 have the potential to contribute to deeper understanding of issues, problems, and research relevant to the community.	❍	❍	❍	
The study is framed through a theoretical or conceptual framework and/or a thorough review of relevant literature.	❍	❍	❍	
Research Design and Methods				
For empirical studies, the study participants and data collection method (e.g., survey, interview, artifact) are clearly described and appropriate for the research question.	❍	❍	❍	❍
For empirical studies, the analysis methods (e.g., coding, statistical methods) are appropriate.	❍	❍	❍	❍
For stand-alone scoping or systematic literature reviews, describe the methods used to identify relevant literature, including the inclusion and exclusion criteria.	❍	❍	❍	❍
Results				
The findings are clearly presented.	❍	❍	❍	
The findings appropriately address 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 to existing literature, 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	

Expectations for paper submissions to the "Conceptual Paper" track	Good	Fair	Inadequate
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.	❍	❍	❍
Key concepts are defined and explained.	❍	❍	❍
Approach			
The approach to achieving the goal is clearly outlined. The approach can include engagement with relevant literature, use of theoretical perspectives, synthesis of evidence-based observations, and use of secondary data, where applicable.	❍	❍	❍
The approach/method is appropriate for the inquiry question.	❍	❍	❍
Key Arguments			
Key arguments are clearly stated.	❍	❍	❍
Key arguments are appropriately supported by evidence.	❍	❍	❍
Discussion and Conclusions			
Significance of the work is clearly explained.	❍	❍	❍
The paper contributes valuable insights to existing literature, and/or has valuable implications to engineering education practice.	❍	❍	❍
Communication and Flow			
The elements of the paper (i.e., background, goal and inquiry question, approach, key arguments, and discussion and conclusions) 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

[Below are review questions for submissions in all tracks.]

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 a statement indicating that their project is exempt from ethics review?
❍ Yes, the number of approved ethics protocol is provided
❍ Yes, a statement of REB exemption is provided
❍ No, but it should have been.
❍ Not applicable (i.e., the paper does not involve data collection from human participants)

Recommendation.
❍ Accept as is
❍ 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 provide constructive comments in the "Comments to the Author(s)" box AND provide an explanation of the rationale for rejection in the "Confidential Comments to the Editor and Associate Editors" box .

Confidential Feedback. Would you recommend this submission for the Best Paper Award for the track? Please consider this recommendation if you rate "Good" for all of the rubric items 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. You should not put the paper in any Generative AI tool, including any that run on private, closed, or corporate servers. You can use AI to help refine the language of your own review or to help make your review more constructive. 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, optional otherwise).

_____