

# Research in Engineering Education Symposium-2024

Jan 4-6, 2024, Hubballi, India

## Full paper Review criteria

		Good	Satisfactory	Needs Improvement
<b>Content</b>	Originality	Content contains highly original treatment of, or new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains moderately original treatment of, or new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains minimal original treatment of, or new perspective on, the topic.
	Scholarship	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a significant extent.	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a limited extent.	Content does not review and build on appropriate prior work.
	Relevance	The paper makes a highly significant contribution to the field of engineering education.	The paper makes a moderate contribution to the field of engineering education.	The paper makes a minimal contribution to the field of engineering education.
	Research Approach	The research approach is novel and/or sophisticated and appropriate for the purpose of the paper and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, or more specific).	The research approach is basic but still appropriate for the purpose of the paper and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, or more specific).	The research approach is inadequate and/or not appropriate for the purpose of the paper.
	Results	Data collection and assessment results are very clear and logical, strongly supporting the goals of the paper.	Data collection and assessment results are somewhat clear and logical, moderately supporting the goals of the paper.	Data collection and assessment results need improvement.
<b>Focus</b>	Goals	The goals are strongly developed and explicitly stated	The goals are not fully developed and/or stated.	The goals are not developed and/or stated.
	Order	The order in which ideas are presented is explicitly and consistently clear, logical and effective.	The order in which ideas are presented is reasonably clear, logical and effective but could be improved.	There is little apparent structure to the flow of ideas, causing confusion.
	Conclusions	The conclusions are very well formulated and are strongly supported by the data.	The conclusions are moderately effective and are only partially supported by the data.	The conclusions are minimally effective and do not appear to be supported by the data.
<b>Language</b>	Style	The paper is clear, concise, and consistent. It is easily understandable and a pleasure to read.	The paper is mostly understandable, with occasional inconsistencies that could be improved.	Multiple sections of the paper are difficult to read/understand. The paper could be better structured or more clearly explained.
	Mechanics	The writing is near perfect, with little to no grammar or spelling errors.	Minor grammar or spelling errors are present but do not detract from the content. Content is clear	Some grammar or spelling errors are significant and detract from the content. The paper requires further editing.