Criteria for review: Engineering Education Research (EER) contributions in CDIO

The EER track requires a full paper meeting criteria for **scholarliness** and **usefulness** for improving engineering education and supporting the goals of the CDIO initiative. In formulating the criteria below, the aim was to balance the aspects related to scholarliness and usefulness.

Overall relevance	Is the topic relevant, significant, interesting and timely for the engineering education community, and in particular for the CDIO Initiative?
Literature	 Is the paper informed by relevant theory and other literature? Is the paper informed by papers from previous CDIO conferences focusing on the same topic? Is it put into good use?
Aim or problem	 Is it clear what the paper is trying to achieve, what problem it addresses? Is it significant to the audience?
Research approach	 Does the paper adequately explain how the problem is approached and how the argument is built? Are limitations critically discussed?
Conclusions	 Do conclusions address the stated problem or aim? Are the claims credibly supported? Does the paper deliver a take-away message for the community?
Coherence and clarity	 Is the paper clearly and logically structured? Do the parts contribute to the whole? Can the reasoning be followed through the paper? Are the APA guidelines and other formatting requirements followed? Is the paper readable and language appropriate for the audience?

References

Bernhard, J., & Baillie, C. (2016). Standards for Quality of Research in Engineering Education. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 32(6), 2378–2394.

Edström, K. (2016). Aims of Engineering Education Research - The Role of the CDIO Initiative. In J. Björkqvist, K. Edström, R. J. Hugo, J. Kontio, J. Roslöf, R. Sellens, & S. Virtanen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 12th International CDIO Conference* (pp. 974-985). Turku: Turku University of Applied Sciences.