

# Reviewing SEFI 2024 papers

## Identify the type of submission and familiarise yourself with requirements

### Research papers

Research papers present original quantitative or qualitative research following the standard practices for engineering education research. It is expected they present theoretical background and literature review, as well as methods, analysis and interpretations of the work, and their contribution to engineering education research and practice. The length of the research paper is 6-8 pages (excluding references).

#### Research papers are evaluated on four criteria:

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

### Practice papers

Practice papers present ongoing projects and completed studies of practice in engineering education. Authors may present their work on how they practise engineering education, or how they have applied concepts within engineering education, or their review of literature and its application within engineering education. The length of the practice paper is 6-8 pages (excluding references).

#### Practice papers are evaluated on four criteria:

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

### Workshops

Workshops are an engaging and interactive session with a sound theoretical foundation and an attractive translation to the practice of engineering education. The length of the workshop proposal is 4-6 pages (excluding references).

The proposal will include a clear learning goal, a description of the theoretical foundations of the work, and a plan for facilitating the workshop in a way that ensures that the majority of the workshop will be spent with participants engaged in active learning experiences.

#### Workshops are evaluated on two criteria:

1. Relevance
2. Workshop design

The review process is one of the most important elements that ensures the quality of a conference and its proceedings. Therefore, the SEFI 2024 scientific committee has revised the review system completely. The goals of the changes in the review system are:

- a) to make reviews as constructive and useful as possible for authors;
- b) to make the review form clearer and simpler for reviewers and
- c) to make the review process more objective in the context of the best paper awards.

Therefore, it was designed to reduce the number of criteria evaluated, to describe the criteria and evaluation scales in a clear and distinctive way and to rely less on numerical input but rather focus on the quality of the feedback, so that authors can truly improve their manuscripts.

Very importantly, you provide **feedback, comments, or suggestions for each criterion in a mandatory text field**. The overall score will not be considered anymore.

An overview of all detailed definitions of criteria for the three types of submission, which you might want to print out for your review activity, can be found here:

<https://sefi2024.eu/wp-content/uploads/SEFI-2024-review-criteria.pdf>

### Important remark

Please note that the overall score is no longer 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.

<b>Evaluation scales</b>	<p>You evaluate the submission on each of the criteria on a 3-level evaluation scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>good</b> – in which case comments are treated as suggestions for improvement</li> <li>● <b>adjustment needed</b> – comments are treated as requirements for improvement</li> <li>● <b>insufficient</b> – which will result in the rejection of the paper, except when the criterion ‘presentation’ is evaluated as “insufficient”. In that case, a strong improvement is still possible contrary to the other 3 criteria</li> </ul>
--------------------------	---

<p><b>* Value of the contribution</b> 25%</p> <p>- Relevance for engineering education and its development in Europe and/or the world.          - Originality in treatment of the topic, bringing new perspectives.          - Innovative potential for engineering education.</p> <p><input type="radio"/> good (comments are treated as suggestions for improvement)  <input checked="" type="radio"/> adjustment needed (comments are treated as requirements for improvement)  <input type="radio"/> insufficient</p>	<p style="color: #0070C0; text-align: center;">Feedback, comments, or suggestions for each criterion in a mandatory text field are essential</p>
<p><b>* Comments on the value of the contribution</b></p> <p>- I suggest you...</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div> <p>Please explain your rating for this criterion and provide feedback or suggestions to the authors.</p>	

In the case you have evaluated one of the criteria as “adjustment needed”, meta-review recommendation will be crucial for the evaluation of the paper. You can suggest that the adjustments of the final paper need to be verified through a meta-review. This is not communicated to the authors.

**Meta-review recommended**  I recommend this paper to be considered for meta-review to determine acceptance or rejection. Selecting this box will add the submission to the pool from which a certain percentage will go to a meta-review phase upon submission of the final version. Please consider how you have evaluated the single review criteria. **If you have selected "adjustment needed" for any criterion, a meta-review should be recommended in the case that you judge the adjustments needed as strong and/or profound and thus needing to be verified by means of a meta-review.**

<b>Attribution of acceptance status and meta-reviews</b>	<p>The outcome of the review will result in the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All papers with “good” on all criteria by all reviewers will be <b>directly accepted</b></li> <li>2. All papers that were evaluated as “insufficient” for any criterion by any of the reviewers (except for ‘presentation’), will be <b>directly rejected</b><sup>1</sup>              Exception: All papers with only the presentation criterion evaluated as “insufficient” by any of the reviewers are <b>conditionally accepted</b></li> <li>3. All papers with any criterion evaluated as “adjustment needed” by any of the reviewers are <b>conditionally accepted</b></li> </ol>
--	--

From all “conditionally accepted” submissions, the final revised versions of a certain percentage will be sent for meta-review according to the availability of meta-reviewers in order to decide about acceptance. The pooling for meta-review will be informed by the reviewer recommendation for meta-review, the number of criteria evaluated as “adjustment needed”, and the comments on these criteria.

<b>Best paper</b>	<p>A final element is to identify candidates for one of the four possible best paper awards: Best student paper, Best Practice paper, Best Research paper and the Susanne Ihlen Award for papers on diversity, equity and inclusion. If you identify a paper that should be considered as a candidate, upon clicking the check-box, you will be asked to provide a rationale for your recommendation. Please justify your choice based on the review criteria.</p>
<p><b>Best Paper Award</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> I recommend this submission as a candidate for one of the best paper awards (best student paper, best practice paper, best research paper, Susanne Ihlen Award for papers on diversity, equity and inclusion).</p>	<p><b>* Rationale for Best Paper Award</b> Please provide a short explanation why this submission should be considered for one of the best paper awards (best student paper, best practice paper, best research paper, Susanne Ihlen Award for papers on diversity, equity and inclusion).</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; height: 40px; width: 100%;"></div>

<sup>1</sup> the program committee reserves the right to consider a meta-review in case of divergence between the two reviewers