

K-12 Division Abstract Review Rubric Atlanta 2013

Category/Points	1	2	3	4	5
How well is the abstract/proposed paper grounded in the relevant literature?	No previous research mentioned/listed	Missing most (over half) of relevant studies; very few mentioned or if mentioned, are very obscure references	Most major studies in the area mentioned (~75%) - no key omissions	All major studies in the area mentioned	All major studies in the area mentioned along with some new citations
To what degree does the work proposed/outlined in this abstract represent a new contribution to knowledge about K-12/Pre-college engineering education?	No new contribution	Good story but no meaningful contribution or findings	Good validation of previous findings/studies with a new insight or two	Great validation of previous findings/studies with a good number of new insights / directions for expansion/building	Potentially breakthrough research findings/contributions
To what degree is the proposed work likely to be of interest to Division members?	Not of interest at all (<10%)	Would interest 10 - 29% of the membership (some)	Would interest 30 - 59% of the membership (about half)	Would interest 60 - 89% of the membership (majority)	Would interest 90 - 100% of the membership (almost everyone!)
Does this proposed work involve the reporting and analysis of meaningful data and/or evidence?	No meaningful data or evidence available	Preliminary and/or limited amount of data available; recommend "work in progress" and/or poster	Data from 1 - 2 completed interventions with analysis and ideas for future data collection	Data from at least 3 completed interventions with in-depth analysis and tie-back to research question	Longitudinal/multi-year data with in-depth analysis and discussion regarding implications for research question(s)

K-12 Division Abstract Review Rubric Atlanta 2013

Is the abstract well written and easy to read?	10+ grammatical and/or spelling errors; awkward syntax; difficult to read and determine author's goal and/or research question	6 - 9 grammatical and/or spelling errors; somewhat awkward syntax; can be difficult to parse individual sentences; can make out author's goal or research question after some work	3 - 5 grammatical and/or spelling errors; syntax does not interfere with reading; goal/research question fairly clear	1 - 2 grammatical and/or spelling errors; good, clear writing and intent	No grammatical and/or spelling errors; very well written and easy to understand author's intent
Program Chair Information					
To what degree does the proposed paper focus on curriculum (what to teach)?	<10% curriculum focused; mentioned in passing, if at all	10 - 29% curriculum focused; limited treatment	30 - 59% curriculum focused; moderate treatment/attention	60 - 89% curriculum focused; major focus of the abstract/proposed paper	90 - 100% curriculum focused; (almost) total focus
To what degree does the proposed paper focus on pedagogy (how to teach)?	<10% pedagogy focused; mentioned in passing if at all	10 - 29% pedagogy focused; limited treatment	30 - 59% pedagogy focused; moderate treatment/attention	60 - 89% pedagogy focused; major focus of the abstract/proposed paper	90 - 100% pedagogy focused; (almost) total focus
What is the proposed paper's target faculty (e.g., K-5, MS, HS, college)	(no points assessed for this category)				
based on the rubric in the 10.25.11 email					