



Welcome!

We look forward to seeing you all in Toronto in June! Please note the submission schedule below. We are also excited for a new type of submission – **Strategies for Hands-on Activities, Resources, and Engagement (SHARE)**.

[Julian Lippmann](#)

2027 Program Chair

[Jenn Campbell](#)

2027 Program Chair Elect

OVERVIEW

The Design in Engineering Education Division of ASEE paper invites abstracts for the **2027 Annual ASEE Conference in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, June 20 – 23, 2027**.

We strive to disseminate knowledge, learning, and best-practice experiences to improve the quality of engineering design education. We focus on *educational* and *research* activities relevant to the design engineering community and welcome educators, researchers, practitioners, from academia and industry including undergraduate and graduate students.

We accept **three types of submission**: Full, Work in Progress (WIP), and Strategies for Hands-on Activities, Resources, and Engagement (SHARE). All submissions should address topics relevant to the practice and research of engineering design in education. Please review [Thematic Areas](#) for details. A summary of the relevant steps is available in our [Quick Start Guide](#).

Important Author Due Dates:

- Abstract Submission: Wednesday, October 14, 2026
- Draft Paper Submissions: Wednesday, January 20, 2027
- Revised Paper Submission (if required): Wednesday, February 17, 2027
- Registration (required for presenting authors): Wednesday, April 7, 2027
- Final Paper Submission: Wednesday, April 28, 2027

To submit an abstract, go to ASEE's paper management system at nemo.asee.org.

Below you will find details on submission types, paper types, and themes as well as specific [Abstract Guidelines](#) and [Paper Guidelines](#).

If you are interested in submitting a workshop or special panel, please review the [Workshop and Panel Guidelines](#)

SUBMISSION TYPES

DEED is accepting the following submission types:

<i>Submission Type</i>	<i>Descriptions</i>
<i>Full Paper</i>	Full papers describe a completed research project or educational practice. Papers should include data and analysis to support conclusions on research questions and/or the efficacy of the educational practice along with connections to prior work and educational theory. Typical length is 6-10 pages but there is no maximum (excluding references and appendixes)
<i>Work-in-Progress (WIP)</i>	WIPs describe research that is not completed or fully implemented. When submitting, add “WIP” to the beginning of the paper title and select the “work-in-progress” checkbox in the nemo submission system. WIP papers are limited to 5 pages (excluding references and appendixes).
<i>Strategies for Hands-on Activities, Resources, and Engagement (SHARE)</i>	SHAREs describe the step-by-step implementation of a student or faculty learning activity in a classroom, lab, extracurricular event, or advising/mentoring session. The goal of a SHARE paper is to demonstrate and disseminate best practices in the DEED community. SHARE papers should include (1) motivation, challenge, or literature-based inspiration for the activity, (2) learning objective(s), (3) step-by-step details of implementation, and (4) discussion of situational factors affecting implementation by others. SHAREs should provide enough detail for others to adapt and implement the activity at their own institutions. When submitting, add “SHARE:” to the beginning of the paper title. Accepted SHARE papers may be invited to present in an Education Showcase or SHARE session. SHAREs are limited to 3 pages (excluding references and appendixes).

PAPER TYPES

Below are typical paper types that are presented in the DEED division. If your paper falls out of these categories, please contact the Chair for guidance. Make sure to indicate the paper type in your submission as it will determine the [rubric](#) that is applied.

<i>Submission Type</i>	<i>Descriptions</i>
<i>Research and Assessment</i>	Research studies that evaluate learning, teaching, methods, or systems in engineering design education. These papers report original empirical work using qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods. Submissions should clearly describe research design, data collection, analysis, and findings, and articulate implications for engineering design education.
<i>Survey</i>	Comprehensive reviews, meta-analyses, or integrative syntheses of literature relevant to engineering design education. These papers organize and interpret prior work to clarify the state of the field, identify gaps, and propose future research directions. Contributions should move beyond summary to provide critical insight and synthesis.

<i>Methods and Tools</i>	A new design methodology, framework, model, or tool. Submissions should describe the theoretical or practical basis of the contribution, demonstrate its application, and discuss evidence of utility, validity, or impact in engineering design education.
<i>Academic Practice & Interventions</i>	Descriptions and analyses of curricular innovation, instructional practice, or program structures in engineering design education. These papers document academic practice with sufficient context and detail to support adaptation by others. Submissions should connect the work to relevant literature or benchmarks and discuss observed outcomes or lessons learned.
<i>Concept Papers</i>	Develop conceptual frameworks, models, or theory advancing engineering design education. Contributions are grounded in relevant literature and articulate implications for research, curriculum, or practice. Their primary contribution is conceptual synthesis or theory-building, grounded in literature and prior empirical work, rather than a new study.

THEMATIC AREAS

All thematic areas pertain to engineering and product design, or related design specialties. Thematic areas are intended to be broadly inclusive. If you have questions regarding alignment, please contact the program chair (Julian Lippmann jxl2336@miami.edu).

THEME 1: EDUCATION PATHWAY ELEMENTS & TRANSITIONS

This theme addresses how learners are scaffolded through engineering and product design programs. This includes programs, curriculum, and courses targeting specific stages in the education pipeline. For example, pre-college programs, first-year engineering course sequences, upper-division courses, capstone design, graduate design sequences as well as bridge/transfer models..

THEME 2: TEACHING, CURRICULUM, PEDAGOGY

This theme addresses the broad topic of how engineering and product design is taught at the program and course level, inside and outside the classroom. This includes methods of teaching, implementation and study of learning objectives, methods of evaluation, instructor development, or design-based research or case studies that include measured student learning.

Theme 3: DESIGN METHODS, FRAMEWORKS, & MINDSETS

This theme addresses the pedagogical structures used to define, organize and understand the teaching and learning of engineering and product design. This includes areas such as design methodologies, design for X (DfX), requirements derivation and specification, systems thinking, human and user centered design, design thinking, ideation methods, decision making, entrepreneurial and innovation mindsets.

THEME 4: TEAMING PEDAGOGY & LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT

This theme addresses how student design teams are formed, supported, and evaluated. This includes teaming, peer and self-evaluations, basic project management, role and leadership development, decision making and gating practices, coordination and accountability (e.g., configuration control, traceability), and cross-cultural teaming.

THEME 5: TECHNOLOGY & MODALITY

This theme addresses the use of technology and non-traditional modalities to teach engineering and product design. Examples include computer aided design, instrumentation, data management practices, learning analytics for feedback, accessibility-related technology, as well as studio-based, experiential, remote, and hybrid-based teaching. The emphasis is placed on pedagogy and learning impact.

THEME 6: PARTNERSHIPS, COMMUNITIES, & CONTEXTS

This theme addresses how the teaching and learning of engineering and product design in partnered settings is taught and researched. This includes community-engaged projects, industry-sponsored projects, pedagogy, interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary collaboration, and global collaboration.

THEME 7: ASSESSMENT, EVIDENCE & RESEARCH METHODS

This theme addresses the measurement of learning and program impact within engineering and product design education. It explores how design knowledge, learning, and application are measured, assessed, and studied. This includes methods of data gathering and analysis, assessment of student learning outcomes, and student experience.

THEME 8: VALUES, JUSTICE, & ETHICS

This theme addresses the teaching and research of engineering responsibilities in engineering and product design courses and programs. This includes sustainability, safety and standards/compliance, academic integrity, justice-centered and inclusive design, belonging, and student-centered approaches.

DEED SESSION DETAILS

During the conference, DEED will hold several types of session. The type of submission (Full, WIP, SHARE) does not determine the type of session that is assigned. These choices are made by the chair based on availability, quality, and session theming.

<i>Session Type</i>	<i>Descriptions</i>
<i>Podium</i>	Podium sessions are traditional talks held during division technical sessions. Presenters have approximately 10 minutes to present and 5 minutes for questions and answers. Each 90-minute session includes about six papers.
<i>Poster</i>	Poster sessions provide a less formal means to present your work to all conference attendees. Presenters provide large format posters that are displayed in the main convention hall. During the session presenters stand by their posters providing opportunities to engage with attendees in one-on-one and group discussions. Posters are displayed throughout the conference to maximize exposure.
<i>Postcard</i>	Postcard sessions feature quick, conversational pitch style presentations of up to 5 minutes using two slides (front and back). Attendees can follow up with authors and revisit the postcards. Each session typically includes eight papers.
<i>SHARE Showcase</i>	The SHARE showcase involves live demonstrations of specific learning activity. Each presenter should bring visual aids, examples, etc. to help demonstrate their

*Special
Sessions*

activity in an engaging and informative manner. The number of presenters will be determined based on the submissions.

This includes workshops, panels, roundtables and other alternative session types. If you have an idea for a special session, please review the [Proposal Guidelines](#). Special sessions proposals are **not** submitted through nemo.

ABSTRACT GUIDELINES

1. Abstracts should be 300-750 words not including references.
2. WIP and SHARE papers must include the appropriate label at the beginning of the paper title.
3. Abstracts should follow the guidelines specified in the ASEE author's kit.
4. Abstracts should address the points typically covered by a full manuscript. For Full papers and WIPs this includes Background, Methods, Results, Discussion. For a SHARE paper, include Motivation or Challenge, Learning Objectives, Implementation, and Situational Factors.
5. Identify what [paper types](#) and which [theme\(s\)](#) your submission falls under at the end of the abstract. Note: DEED strives to be inclusive so if you have questions about how your paper aligns with the paper types or themes, please contact the program chair (Julian Lippmann jxl2336@miami.edu).
6. Manuscripts should follow the [General Guidelines](#) listed below as well as those specified in the 2027 ASEE author's kit. Check conference website for latest version. For reference: [2026 ASEE author's kit](#).
7. There should be no reference to the authors' names or institutional names in the abstract or references. Use descriptive language instead (e.g. "large public university")
8. Reviewers will evaluate your abstract based on the criteria in the appropriate [rubric](#).
9. If the Chair determines that your work does not meet the requirements of a full paper, it may be reclassified as a work-in-progress. This decision will be made at the abstract acceptance stage.

PAPER GUIDELINES

1. Authors that have accepted abstracts will be invited to submit manuscripts for evaluation. Please look for emails from ASEE and the program chair.
2. See submission types for paper page length requirements.
3. WIP and SHARE papers must include the appropriate label at the beginning of the paper title.
4. Manuscripts should follow the [General Guidelines](#) listed below as well as those specified in the 2027 ASEE author's kit. Check conference website for latest version. For reference: [2026 ASEE author's kit](#).
5. Manuscripts must be complete at submission and meet scholarly writing standards, including editing, reference formatting, and inclusion of all results.
6. There should be no reference to the authors' names or institutional names any part of the manuscript. Use descriptive language instead (e.g. "large public university")
7. Reviewers will evaluate your manuscript based on the criteria in the appropriate [rubric](#).

8. If a revision is required based on reviewer feedback, no substantial changes except those responding to reviewer are allowed.

WORKSHOP AND SPECIAL SESSIONS PROPOSALS GUIDELINES

Workshops and special session proposals are NOT submitted through Nemo. Instead, email your proposal directly to the program chair (Julian Lippmann jxl2336@miami.edu). Proposals should include the following information:

- A description of the workshop/session, including title, a brief description, learning objectives, expected outcomes. It should identify the intended audience and estimated headcount.
- A list of presenters/facilitators/panelists, a brief biography of each, their role in the session (e.g., moderator, speaker, panelist, etc.), and their contact information.
- A proposed schedule. Workshops are 2:30 hour sessions are 90 minutes.
- A list of materials (with rough costs) and if there are any special requirements from the facility (extra sound equipment, workshop style seating etc.) Outline proposed sources of funding for workshop materials and facilities fees (e.g., NSF grant number, corporate sponsorship, division funding, etc.)
- Identify any similar prior ASEE workshops/sessions.
- **For workshops:** List potential divisions within ASEE or external organizations that can collaborate on this workshop. Collaboration is not required, but multi-divisional workshops have a higher likelihood of acceptance.
- **For sessions:** session type and reason (e.g., “Panel” or “Roundtable,” etc.) and provide a reasoning for the specific format type
- A public facing workshop/session description for NEMO (if the proposal is accepted and scheduled).

If you have any questions on proposal preparations, do not hesitate to contact the chair.

PANELS

- A description of the workshop, including title, a brief description, learning objectives, expected outcomes. It should identify the intended audience and estimated headcount.
- A list of presenters/facilitators/panelists, a brief biography of each, their role in the session (e.g., moderator, speaker, panelist, etc.), and their contact information.
- A proposed schedule for the 2:30 hour workshop.
- A list of materials (with rough costs) and if there are any special requirements from the facility (extra sound equipment, workshop style seating etc.) Outline proposed sources of funding for workshop materials and facilities fees (e.g., NSF grant number, corporate sponsorship, division funding, etc.)
- Identify any similar prior ASEE workshops.
- List potential divisions within ASEE or external organizations that can collaborate on this workshop. Collaboration is not required, but multi-divisional workshops have a higher likelihood of acceptance.
- An explanation of why the special panel format is needed for your session.
- Panels are 90 minutes.
- A public facing session description for NEMO (if the proposal is accepted and scheduled).

If you have any questions on how to prepare the proposal, do not hesitate to the chair.

GENERAL GUIDELINES

PUBLISH TO PRESENT AND REVIEW TO PUBLISH CRITERIA

In addition to the ASEE “Publish to Present” requirements, DEED requires the support of its authors in “Review to Publish” at both the abstract and manuscript stages. Reviews will be given 2-3 abstracts in mid-to-late October. These reviews should be completed by October 28th. Blind manuscript reviews will be assigned in early late January, and reviews will be do early February. If revisions are required, Revised Draft reviews may be assigned in March.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Authors may use Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools, including Large Language Models (LLMs), to support aspects of manuscript preparation such as editing, grammar checking, language refinement, brainstorming, or code development. However, authors remain fully responsible for the accuracy, originality, integrity, and scholarly content of all submitted work.

Any use of AI tools in the development of a manuscript must be clearly disclosed in the paper. Authors must identify the AI tool(s) used and describe the nature and extent of their use in an acknowledgment, methods section, or other appropriate location within the manuscript. Failure to disclose the use of AI tools may be considered a violation of conference publication ethics. Authors should also cite the AI tool used in the references section using an appropriate format.

An example IEEE-style citation is shown below:

[1] OpenAI, "ChatGPT (GPT-5)," Large Language Model, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://chat.openai.com>. Accessed: Aug. 20, 2026.

Example Disclosure Statement Full Paper

Portions of this manuscript were developed with assistance from ChatGPT (GPT-5, OpenAI) for language editing and brainstorming. The authors reviewed, verified, and take full responsibility for all content presented in the manuscript.

Official disclosure can be omitted from the abstract submission (for length considerations), but it is assumed that authors take full responsibility for the content of their submission.

AWARDS

DEED Strives to promote excellence and recognizes this through the following awards:

- **Best-in-DEED.** This award recognizes the overall best paper accepted by the division. These papers should advance engineering design education and reflect DEED’s purpose.
- **Best-in-DEED Undergraduate.** This award recognizes the best paper with an undergraduate lead author accepted by the division. The work should advance design education.
- **Career Impact Award.** This award recognizes sustained efforts over time to advance the mission of DEED through instruction, curriculum, scholarship, or leadership in engineering design education.
- **Outstanding Service Award.** This award recognizes members who have provided outstanding service to the division.

Awards will be presented at the DEED Business Meeting during the ASEE Annual Conference

RUBRICS

EDUCATION RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT / ACADEMIC PRACTICE & INTERVENTIONS / CONCEPTUAL RUBRIC

Use this Rubric For: Education Research and Assessment / Academic Practice & Interventions / Conceptual

Category / Points	3 - Excellent	2 - Good	1 - Satisfactory	0 - Needs Improvement
Originality / Contribution	Content contains a highly original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains some original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains a moderately original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains a minimal original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic
Research Approach	The research approach is novel and/or sophisticated and appropriate for the purpose of the paper and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, or more specific).	The research approach is advanced and appropriate for the purpose of the paper and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, or more specific).	The research approach is basic, but still appropriate for the purpose of the paper, and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, or more specific).	The research approach is inadequate and/or not appropriate for the purpose of the paper.
Results	Data collection and assessment results are very clear and logical, strongly supporting the goals of the paper.	Data collection and assessment results are clear and logical, supporting the goals of the paper.	Data collection and assessment results are somewhat clear and logical, moderately supporting the goals of the paper.	Data collection and assessment results need improvement
Scholarship / Literature Review	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a significant extent.	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a moderate extent.	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a limited extent.	Content does not review and build on appropriate prior work.
Relevance	The paper makes a highly significant contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority of DEED members and is applicable to the DEED mission.	The paper makes a significant contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority of DEED members and is applicable to the DEED mission.	The paper makes a moderate contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority of DEED members and is applicable to the DEED mission.	The paper makes a minimal contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority of DEED members and is applicable to the DEED mission.
Goals	The goals are strongly developed and explicitly stated.	The goals are developed and explicitly stated.	The goals are not fully developed and/or stated.	The goals are not developed and/or stated.

Order	The order in which ideas are presented is explicitly and consistently clear, logical, and effective.	The order in which ideas are presented is reasonably clear, logical, and effective, but could be improved.	The order in which ideas are presented is occasionally confusing.	There is little apparent structure to the flow of ideas, causing confusion.
Conclusions	The conclusions are very well formulated and are strongly supported by the data.	The conclusions are well formulated and are supported by the data.	The conclusions are moderately effective and are only partially supported by data.	The conclusions are minimally effective and do not seem to be supported by data.
Style	The paper is clear, concise, and consistent. It is easily understandable and a pleasure to read.	The paper is mostly understandable, with occasional inconsistencies that could be improved.	Multiple sections of the paper are difficult to read/understand. The paper could be better structured or more clearly explained.	The paper is difficult to read/understand due to sentence/paragraph structure, word choices, lack of explanations, etc.
Mechanics	The writing is near perfect with little to no grammar or spelling errors.	Minor grammar or spelling errors are present but do not detract from the content. The content is clear.	Some grammar or spelling errors are significant and detract from the content. Paper requires further editing.	Pervasive grammar or spelling errors distort meaning and make reading difficult.

SURVEY/LITERATURE REVIEW RUBRIC

Use this Rubric For: Survey/Literature Review

Category / Points	3 - Excellent	2 - Good	1 - Satisfactory	0 - Needs Improvement
Originality / Contribution	Content contains a highly original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains some original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains a moderately original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains a minimal original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic
Research Approach	The research approach is novel and/or sophisticated and appropriate for the purpose of the paper and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, or more specific).	The research approach is advanced and appropriate for the purpose of the paper and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, or more specific).	The research approach is basic, but still appropriate for the purpose of the paper, and is consistent with the perspective (quantitative, qualitative, mixed, or more specific).	The research approach is inadequate and/or not appropriate for the purpose of the paper.
Scholarship / Literature Review	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a significant extent.	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a moderate extent.	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a limited extent.	Content does not review and build on appropriate prior work.
Synthesis	Synthesis integrates and summarizes key insights or gaps in prior work to reveal significant new understanding	Synthesis integrates and summarizes key insights or gaps in prior work to reveal moderate new understanding	Synthesis integrates and summarizes key insights or gaps in prior work to reveal limited new understanding	Synthesis of target research is absent
Relevance	The paper makes a highly significant contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority of DEED members and is applicable to the DEED mission.	The paper makes a significant contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority of DEED members and is applicable to the DEED mission.	The paper makes a moderate contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority of DEED members and is applicable to the DEED mission.	The paper makes a minimal contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority of DEED members and is applicable to the DEED mission.
Goals	The goals are strongly developed and explicitly stated.	The goals are developed and explicitly stated.	The goals are not fully developed and/or stated.	The goals are not developed and/or stated.
Order	The order in which ideas are presented is explicitly and consistently clear, logical, and effective.	The order in which ideas are presented is reasonably clear, logical, and effective, but could be improved.	The order in which ideas are presented is occasionally confusing.	There is little apparent structure to the flow of ideas, causing confusion.

Conclusions	The conclusions are very well formulated and are strongly supported by the data.	The conclusions are well formulated and are supported by the data.	The conclusions are moderately effective and are only partially supported by the data.	The conclusions are minimally effective and do not appear to be supported by the data.
Style	The paper is clear, concise, and consistent. It is easily understandable and a pleasure to read.	The paper is mostly understandable, with occasional inconsistencies that could be improved.	Multiple sections of the paper are difficult to read/understand. The paper could be better structured or more clearly explained.	The paper is difficult to read/understand due to sentence/paragraph structure, word choices, lack of explanations, etc.
Mechanics	The writing is near perfect with little to no grammar or spelling errors.	Minor grammar or spelling errors are present but do not detract from the content. The content is clear.	Some grammar or spelling errors are significant and detract from the content. Paper requires further editing.	Pervasive grammar or spelling errors distort meaning and make reading difficult.

METHODS AND TOOLS RUBRIC

Use this Rubric For: Methods and Tools

Category / Points	3 - Excellent	2 - Good	1 - Satisfactory	0 - Needs Improvement
Originality (Contribution)	Content contains a highly original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains some original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains a moderately original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic.	Content contains a minimal original treatment of, or a new perspective on, the topic
Design Methodology	The Design Methodology is novel and/or sophisticated and appropriate for the application in design-based teaching.	The Design Methodology is advanced and/or sophisticated and appropriate for the application in design-based teaching.	The Design Methodology is basic, but still appropriate for the application in design-based teaching.	The Design Methodology is inadequate and/or not appropriate for the application in design-based teaching.
Technique & Tool Description	Techniques and tools are very clear, logically explained and demonstrated. Readers are able to take the method and apply to their own course.	Techniques and tools are clear, logically explained and demonstrated. Readers are mostly able to take the method and apply to their own course.	Techniques and tools are somewhat clear but may not be logically explained and demonstrated. Readers may be able to take the method and apply to their own course with significant additional work.	Techniques and tools are not clear, not logically explained and demonstrated. Readers are not able to take the method and apply to their own course.
Scholarship (Literature Review)	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a significant extent.	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a moderate extent.	Content reviews and builds on appropriate prior work to a limited extent.	Content does not review and build on appropriate prior work.
Background and Need	The background and need is very clearly articulated leaving the reader fully understanding the need and purpose of the methodology. Need is strongly backed up with data.	The background and need is clearly articulated leaving the reader with a good understanding of the need and purpose of the methodology. Need is backed up with data.	The background and need is somewhat articulated leaving the reader with some understanding of the need and purpose of the methodology. Need includes minimal data.	The background and need is poorly articulated leaving the reader with little understanding of the need and purpose of the methodology. Need does not include any data.
Relevance	The paper makes a highly significant contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority of DEED members and	The paper makes a significant contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority	The paper makes a moderate contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority of DEED	The paper makes a minimal contribution to the field of engineering education. The paper will interest the majority of DEED

	is applicable to the DEED mission.	of DEED members and is applicable to the DEED mission.	members and is applicable to the DEED mission.	members and is applicable to the DEED mission.
Order	The order in which ideas are presented is explicitly and consistently clear, logical, and effective.	The order in which ideas are presented is reasonably clear, logical, and effective, but could be improved.	The order in which ideas are presented is occasionally confusing.	There is little apparent structure to the flow of ideas, causing confusion.
Conclusions	The conclusions are very well formulated and are strongly supported by the data.	The conclusions are well formulated and are supported by the data.	The conclusions are moderately effective and are only partially supported by the data.	The conclusions are minimally effective and do not appear to be supported by the data.
Style	The paper is clear, concise, and consistent. It is easily understandable and a pleasure to read.	The paper is mostly understandable, with occasional inconsistencies that could be improved.	Multiple sections of the paper are difficult to read/understand. The paper could be better structured or more clearly explained.	The paper is difficult to read/understand due to sentence/paragraph structure, word choices, lack of explanations, etc.
Mechanics	The writing is near perfect with little to no grammar or spelling errors.	Minor grammar or spelling errors are present but do not detract from the content. The content is clear.	Some grammar or spelling errors are significant and detract from the content. Paper requires further editing.	Pervasive grammar or spelling errors distort meaning and make reading difficult.