

Practice Paper Review Criteria and Rubric

Criteria	Insufficient	Amendment Needed	Good
A. Value of the Contribution Originality, significance, and relevance to engineering education practice.	Limited or unclear relevance to engineering education. No identifiable originality (routine practice with no new insight, adaptation, or perspective) Significance of the contribution not demonstrated.	Relevant topic but originality not clearly articulated. Some new insight, adaptation, or perspective present but underdeveloped. Significance implied rather than clearly explained.	Clearly relevant to engineering education. Demonstrates identifiable originality (new insight, meaningful adaptation, fresh perspective, or novel application in context). Contribution is significant for informing practice and/or advancing understanding. The value of the contribution is clearly articulated within the scope of the paper.
B. Relationship to Existing Knowledge Appropriate engagement with relevant literature and/or established concepts in engineering education and related SoTL discourse.	Minimal or no engagement with relevant literature or established concepts. Work not situated within engineering education discourse. Practice presented without reference to prior knowledge.	Relevant literature or concepts mentioned but weakly connected to the practice described. Limited explanation of how the work relates to, builds on, or applies existing knowledge.	Engages appropriately with relevant literature or established concepts. Clearly situates the work within engineering education practice and/or SoTL discourse. Uses literature to frame, inform, or interpret the work. Level of engagement appropriate to scope
C. Adaptability and Impact Transferability and broader implications beyond the immediate educational context (e.g. educational environment)	No discussion of applicability beyond the immediate educational context. Unclear how the work could be used, adapted, or interpreted by others in other educational contexts. No articulation of the value or relevance of the work for educational practice.	Describes the educational context but does not clearly explain how the work may be applied or adapted to other educational contexts. Suggests potential relevance to other educational contexts but does not explain how or under what conditions or constraints. Implications for educational practice are mentioned but unclear, generic, or weakly connected to the work.	Clearly explains how the work may be applied, adapted, or interpreted in similar or related educational contexts. Identifies relevant conditions, constraints, or enablers that may influence applicability. Articulates clear, actionable recommendations, insights, or implications for educational practice, appropriate to the scope of the work.
D. Ethics Statement	The manuscript does not include an ethics statement in the designated 'Ethics Statement' section.	An ethics statement is included in the designated 'Ethics Statement' section of the manuscript but lacks sufficient detail (e.g., it is missing approval reference or institution name), or appears to be inaccurate (e.g., where human data are involved but this is not reflected in the statement).	Where the work involves systematic collection and analysis of data from human participants, formal ethics approval (or equivalent institutional clearance) is clearly stated in the 'Ethics statement' section of the manuscript. Where the work does not involve systematic collection and analysis of data from human participants, the 'Ethics Statement' section of the manuscript clearly states that ethics approval is not required.

Criteria	Insufficient	Amendment Needed	Good
<p>E. Presentation Clarity and structure of writing, logical flow and readability, and adherence to page limits and formatting guidelines.</p>	<p>Difficult to understand due to structure or language. Poor logical flow. Major formatting or page limit violations.</p>	<p>Structure or clarity requires improvement. Minor language or coherence issues. Minor formatting inconsistencies.</p>	<p>Clear and logical structure. Coherent and readable writing. Clear alignment between aims, description, and conclusions. Adheres to formatting and page limits.</p>