

Innovative Practice Category Review Criteria (2016)

The innovative practice category is for scholarly proposals of reflective or novel practice in the area of engineering and/or computing education. Excellent proposals are well situated in prior literature on teaching and learning, and outlines an innovation of value and interest to engineering and/or computing educators.

Abstracts: Innovative Practice Abstracts should be 300-500 words and should clearly present the paper's relevance to engineering education and how the work is innovative. In addition, each abstract should be identified as a "Full" or "Short" paper track proposal, and define (minimally) one topic keyword.

Each abstract must briefly state the specific contribution of the paper to the innovative practice of engineering and/or computing education. Contributions may be made in various forms, and should include a description of what is unique about the innovative practice, how the innovative practice differs from and builds on previous practice as documented in the literature, and new ideas that conference participants would take away from this paper. The abstract should describe the setting for the innovative practice in the broad context of engineering and/or computing education, (not necessarily the particular institutional context), motivations for the innovative practice, and the results obtained. Abstracts must present the paper's relevance to engineering and/or computing education and how the work is innovative.

Innovative Practice Abstracts	5	3	1
Innovation: <i>Rate how this submission makes a novel/innovative and/or significant contribution to engineering/computing education</i>	Highly original, thought provoking, significant and/or novel	Some originality; Useful extension to established work and/or small impact	Not original or innovative; limited contribution
Relevance: <i>Rate how the submission is relevant to the conference topic(s) and engineering/computing education</i>	Highly relevant	Appropriate and reasonably focused	Not relevant
Track accuracy: <i>Rate how well the submission meets the full or short category criteria</i>	Paper appears to be in proper track	Paper could be in either track	Paper appears to be in wrong track