**ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE)  
Review Form**

Version: 5 January 2016

## **Instructions to Reviewers**

As you read the paper, please keep in mind the journal’s editorial mission:

*The ACM Transactions on Computing Education (TOCE) publishes high quality, peer-reviewed, archival papers in computing education. Papers published in TOCE take a scholarly approach to teaching and learning, establish a clear connection to student learning, and appeal to a broad audience interested in computing education: instructors, researchers, curriculum designers, and administrators*.

In order to guide you in performing a helpful review, this review form includes three main sections. In the first section, you are asked to situate the paper and identify its audience. In the second section, you are asked to assess the paper’s impact, significance, and scholarship on a set of scales. In the third section, you are asked to provide a recommendation for the paper, along with a detailed rationale for your recommendation. This is also the place where you provide *constructive* comments for improving the work. Please maintain a *polite* and *constructive* tone in your review comments. We all know how hurtful a needlessly negative review can be, and how helpful a constructive one can be. Please bear that in mind as you are writing your review.

In Manuscript Central, you are given the option to attach your completed form to the review. We recommend that instead you **copy and paste** your completed review (Items 1-13) into the ”Comments to the Author” field in Manuscript Central, and copy and paste your response to Item 14 (if any) into the “Confidential Comments to the Editor” field. Thank you in advance!

## **I. Situate the Paper**

1. What type of contribution does this paper make (choose all that apply)?

[ ] Empirical

[ ] Theoretical

[ ] Review

[ ] Experience

[ ] Policy

[ ] Learning Technology

[ ] Other:

2. To what audience does the paper appeal? (Check all that apply)

[ ] Computing education researchers

[ ] Computing educators (post-secondary)

[ ] Computing educators (primary and secondary)

[ ] Computing curriculum designers

[ ] Computing education technology designers

[ ] Computing professionals in industry

[ ] Continuing professional development

[ ] Other:

## **II. Assess Impact, Significance, and Scholarship**

3. How specific are the paper’s results to a geographic region?

[ ] Results are specific to a school or locale

[ ] Results are specific to a country

[ ] Results are specific to a world region or continent

[ ] Results apply globally

4. How significant is the research question or problem that the paper addresses?

[ ] Highly significant

[ ] Significant

[ ] Somewhat significant

[ ] Not significant at all

5. How well grounded is the paper in relevant literature and bodies of knowledge?

[ ] Well grounded: all important references included

[ ] Reasonably well-grounded, but references could be improved

[ ] Not well-grounded; significant revision needed

6. How well does the paper use evidence to address its research questions?

[ ] Excellent use of evidence

[ ] Evidence used, but could be improved

[ ] Evidence not used; significant revision needed

7. To what degree are the paper’s chosen research methods appropriate to addressing the paper’s research questions?

[ ] Appropriate methods used

[ ] Appropriate methods used, but could be improved

[ ] Inappropriate methods used; significant revision needed

[ ] The paper does not use any research methods

8. Does the paper provide sufficient detail to evaluate the work?

[ ] Sufficient detail provided

[ ] Reasonably sufficient detail provided, but could be improved

[ ] Insufficient detail provided; significant revision needed

9.How well is the paper written and organized?

[ ] Well written and organized

[ ] Reasonably well written and organized, but could be improved

[ ] Writing and/or organization need significant revision.

10. How well does the paper adhere to accepted standards of style, usage, and composition?

[ ] Adheres to accepted standards of style, usage and composition; no improvement needed

[ ] Adherence to accepted standards of style, usage and composition could be improved

[ ] Does not adhere to accepted standards of usage, and composition; needs significant revision

## **III. Provide Recommendation and Rationale**

11. What is your recommendation for this paper?

[ ] Accept

[ ] Accept with minor revisions

[ ] Accept with major revisions

[ ] Reject

[ ] Other (Please elaborate)

.

12. Please summarize the contributions of this paper to the computing education research literature.

13. Please identify the strengths and weaknesses of the paper, and provide constructive comments on how the authors can improve the work. (Note: The more specific you can be with regard to what the authors need to change, and how they might change it, the more helpful your review will be to the authors.)

14. If you have confidential comments for the editor, please include them here.