

Instructions to Reviewers:

Please provide a numeric rating on a 5-point scale for each question, along with a brief rationale for each numeric rating. In doing so, please discuss both the strengths and the weaknesses of each paper so that the editors and authors can understand your reasoning. Please phrase your reviews politely; even 'bad' papers represent a lot of work on the part of the authors. The review may be the basis for further revisions of the paper or the work that the paper reports. We all know how hurtful a needlessly negative review can be, and how helpful a positive one can be; please try to bear that in mind when you are writing yours.

1. Your name:
2. Conference name:
3. Paper name:
4. Paper author:

Confidential Comments to the Subprogram Chair:

Comments to the Author:

1. Can the content be directly applied by classroom instructors or curriculum designers?

[5] Directly and obviously applicable

...

[1] Not applicable to classroom instruction or curriculum design

2. Does the work appeal to a broad readership interested in engineering education or is it narrowly specialized?

[5] Broad ... [1] Narrow

3. Does the work address a significant problem?

[5] Significant ... [1] Insignificant

4. Does the author build upon relevant references and bodies of knowledge

[5] Relevant and sufficient references to existing bodies of knowledge

...

[1] Few if any relevant references

5. If a teaching intervention is reported, is it adequately evaluated in terms of its impact on learning in actual use?

[5] Excellent evaluation ... [1] Inadequate evaluation

6. Does the author use methods appropriate to the goals, both for the instructional intervention and the evaluation of impact on learning?

[5] Appropriate methods ... [1] Inappropriate or unclear methods

7. Did the author provide sufficient detail to replicate and evaluate?

[5] Sufficient detail ... [1] Insufficient detail

8. Is the paper clearly and carefully written?

[5] excellent [4] very good [3] acceptable [2] weak [1] unacceptable

9. Does the paper adhere to accepted standards of style, usage, and composition?

[5] excellent [4] very good [3] acceptable [2] weak [1] unacceptable

Summary Rating:

[5] strong accept [4] accept [3] neutral [2] reject [1] strong reject

Summary Comments: