Criteria	Computing Education Research (CER)	Experience Reports & Tools (ERT)	Position & Curricula Initiative (PCI)
Motivation Evaluate the submissions clarity of purpose and alignment with the scope of the SIGCSE TS.	• The submission provides a clear motivation for the work. • The submission states a set of clear **Research Questions or Specific Aims/Goals.**	• The submission provides a clear motivation for the work. • **Objectives or goals** of the experience report are clearly stated, with an emphasis on contextual factors that help readers interpret the work. • ERT submissions **need not** be framed around a set of research questions or theoretical frameworks.	• The submission provides a clear motivation for the work. • **Objectives or goals** of the position or curricula initiative are clearly stated, and speak to issues **beyond a single course or experience** • Submissions focused on curricula, programs, or degrees should describe the motivating context before the new initiative was undertaken. • PCI papers **may or may not** ground the work in theory or research questions.
Prior and Related Work Evaluate the use of prior literature to situate the work, highlight its novelty, and interpret its results.	• Discussion of prior and related work (e.g., theories, recent empirical findings, curricular trends) to contextualize and motivate the research is adequate • The relationship between prior work and the current study is clearly stated • The work **leverages theory where appropriate**.	• Discussion of prior and related work to contextualize and motivate the experience report is adequate • The relationship between prior work and the experience or tool is clearly stated	• Discussion of prior and related work to contextualize and motivate the position or initiative is adequate • The relationship between prior work and the proposed initiative or position is clearly stated
Approach Evaluate the transparency and soundness of the approach used in the submission relative to its goals.	• Study methods and data collection processes are transparent and clearly described. • The methodology described is a valid/sound way to answer the research questions posed or address the aims of the study identified by the authors. • The submission provides enough detail to support replication of the methods.	• For tool focused papers: Is the design of the tool appropriate for its stated goals? Is the context of its deployment clearly described? • For experience report papers: Is the experience sufficiently described to understand how it was designed/executed and who the target learner populations were? • For all papers: To what extent does the paper provide reasonable mechanisms of formative assessment about the experience or tool?	• The submission uses an appropriate mechanism to present and defend its stated position or curriculum proposal (this may include things like a scoping review, secondary data analysis, program evaluation, among others). • As necessary, the approach used is clearly described. • PCI papers leveraging a literature-driven argument need not necessarily use a systematic review format, though it may be appropriate for certain types of claims.
Evidence Evaluate the extent to which the submission provides adequate evidence to support its claims.	• The analysis & results are clearly presented and aligned with the research questions/goals. • Qualitative or quantitative data is interpreted appropriately. • Missing or noisy data is addressed. • Claims are well supported by the data presented. • The **threats to validity** and/or study limitations are clearly stated	• The submission provides rich reflection on what did or didn't work, and why • Evidence presented in ERT papers is often descriptive or narrative in format, and may or may not be driven by explicit motivating questions. • Claims about the experience or tool are sufficiently scoped within the bounds of the evidence presented.	• PCI papers need not present original data collection, but may leverage other forms of scholarly evidence to support the claims made. • Evidence presented is sufficient for defending the position or curriculum initiative • Claims should be sufficiently scoped relative to the type of evidence presented.
Contribution & Impact Evaluate the overall contribution to computing education made by this submission.	• All CER papers should advance our knowledge of computing education • Quantitative research should discuss generalizability or transferability of findings beyond the original context. • Qualitative research should add deeper understanding about a specific context or problem • For novel projects, the contribution beyond prior work is explained • For replications, the contribution includes a discussion on the implications of the new results–*even if null or negative*–when compared to prior work	• Why the submission is of interest to SIGCSE community is clearly explained • The work enables adoption by other practitioners • The work highlights the novelty of the experience or tool presented • The implications for future work/use are clearly stated	• The work presents a coherent argument about a computing education topic, including, but not limited to curriculum or program design, practical and social issues facing computing educators, and critiques of existing practices • The submission offers new insights about broader concerns to the computing education community or offers guidance for adoption of new curricular approaches.
Presentation Evaluate the writing quality with respect to expectations for publication, allowing for only minor revisions prior to final submission.	• The presentation (writing, graphs, or diagrams) is clear • Overall flow and organization are appropriate	• The presentation (writing, graphs, or diagrams) is clear • Overall flow and organization are appropriate	• The presentation (writing, graphs, or diagrams) is clear • Overall flow and organization are appropriate