EATAW 2021

SUBMISSION EVALUATION CRITERIA

Paper Presentation	Insufficient (1p)	Good (3p)	Excellent (5p)
1. Aim & Problem	The contribution is insufficiently motivated for the conference and the research question, problem formulation, or aim is incomplete or missing.	The aim, research question or problem are formulated and the relevance to the conference as well as the context of the contribution are articulated.	The aim, question or problem formulation are well articulated and are clearly relevant to the conference. The contribution articulates how it stimulates research or development in the teaching of academic writing.
2. Connection/ Relevance	The connection to relevant research or proven research is missing or vague.	The contribution is connected to relevant research or proven experience. The relevance to a conference theme is described.	The contribution is explicitly situated and supported in relevant research or proven experience via clear reference to theories, approaches, and communities. The relevance to one or more conference themes is clearly articulated.
3. Method	Methods or approaches are not sufficiently accounted for.	The contribution describes methods and approaches explicitly.	Methods or approaches are described and motivated relative the question or problem formulation of the contribution.
4. Findings	There is neither an indicative nor an informative account of the kind of results that the paper presents, or how these results adddress the aim and resarch questions.	There is at least an indicative description of the kind so results that the paper presents and how these results connect to the aim, main research questions or problem.	Results are described and clearly related to the aim, question or problem formulations of the study. Results are also clearly relevant to the chosen conference theme.
5. Communication	The contribution fails to argument and communicate in one or several of these areas: audience adaptation, language, structure, and referencing.	The content of the contribution is well communicated and argumented for. It is accessible to the audience in terms of language as well as structure. The contribution applies the guidelines.	The content is well communicated and accessible to the audience in terms of language as well as structure. The argumentation is convincing and adapted to the audience of the conference and the specific theme. The contribution applies the guidelines.

Modified according to Adawi, Bergviken-Rensfeldt, Gustafsson (2011)

Teaching Practice	Insufficient (1p)	Good (3p)	Excellent (5p)
1. Aim & Problem	The contribution is insufficiently motivated and the relevance of the practice problem/application is incomplete or missing.	The aim, question or problem are formulated and the relevance and context of the teaching practice are articulated.	The aim of the teaching practice and its motivation/problem are clearly articulated and the contextualisation is relevant to the conference. The contribution has the potential to stimulate pedagogical discussion in academic writing.
2. Connection/ Relevance	The connection to themes is missing or too vague.	The contribution is connected and relevant to one of the themes of the conference.	The contribution displays a clear relevance to one or more of the themes of the conference and is supported in relevant proven experience.
3. Audience	The contribution fails to offer a sufficient account of the intended audience.	The contribution describes its intended audience.	The potential contribution for the intended audience is clearly articulated.
4. Communication	The contribution fails to communicate in terms of language, structure, or argumentation.	The content of the contribution is argumented for and communicated in an accessible way.	The content of the contribution is communicated in an accessible, engaging and enthusiastic way. The argumentation of the contribution is convincing.

Symposium	Insufficient (1p)	Good (3p)	Excellent (5p)
1. Aim & Problem	The contribution is insufficiently motivated and the question or aim that motivates the symposium is incomplete or missing.	The aim, question and/or problem are formulated and the relevance of the symposium topic is described.	The aim, question or problem formulation are clearly articulated and the contextualisation is relevant to the conference. The contribution has the potential to stimulate pedagogical discussion and research, and clealy targets a relevant question in academic writing pedagogy.
2. Connection/Relevance	The connection to the conference and its themes is missing or vague.	The contribution is connected to relevant research/theory and to the conference themes.	The contribution displays a clear reference research and theory, and clearly motivates the relevance to the chosen conference theme(s).
3. Significance and coherence	The contribution of the symposium as a whole as well as the individual papers is not clearly described, and /or there seems to be a lack of coherence between the papers in the symposium.	The contribution describes the significance of the symposium format in relation to the topic and the conference theme, including that of the papers included	The contribution clearly argues for the need of the symposium format in relation to the topic and the conference theme, and persuasively explains how the included papers will collectively provide a contribution to the field and the conference themes.
4. Interaction/Audience	The intended audience is not accounted for.	The contribution describes a possible intended audience.	The contribution is well adapted to the format and to the intended audience both for the conference and the chosen theme.
5. Communication	The contribution fails to communicate in terms of language, structure, or argumentation.	The contents of the contribution are argued for and communicated in an accessible way both in terms of language and structure.	The contents of the contribution are communicated in an accessible way both in terms of language and structure. The argumentation of the contribution is convincing.

Workshop /	Insufficient (1p)	Good (3p)	Excellent (5p)
1. Aim & Problem	The contribution is insufficiently motivated and the question or aim of the workshop/roundatable is incomplete or missing.	The aim, question and/or problem are formulated and the relevance and activities/questions planned during the workshop/roundtable are adequately articulated in the contribution.	The aim, question or problem formulation are clearly articulated and the contextualisation is relevant to the conference. The contribution has the potential to stimulate pedagogical discussion and clearly describes the type of activities and the type of questions that will be discussed during the workshop/round table.
2. Connection/Relevance	The connection to practice and/or the relevance to the conference and its themes is missing or vague.	The contribution is connected to relevant practices and to the conference themes.	The contribution displays a clear reference to practice and possible applications, as well as a clear relevance to the chosen conference theme.
3. Interaction/Audience	Neither the activities nor the intended audience are accounted for.	The contribution describes the activity (workshop or roundtable) and its intended audience clearly.	The contribution is well adapted to the format (workshop or roundtable) and to the intended audience. It also outlines participant activities.
4. Communication	The contribution fails to communicate in terms of language, structure, or argumentation.	The contents of the contribution are argumented for and communicated in an accessible way both in terms of language and structure.	The contents of the contribution are communicated in an accessible way both in terms of language and structure. The argumentation of the contribution is convincing.

Poster	Insufficient (1p)	Good (3p)	Excellent (5p)
1. Aim & Problem	The contribution is insufficiently motivated and the question or aim of the poster incomplete or missing.	The aim, question and/or problem are formulated in the contribution.	The aim, question or problem formulation are clearly articulated and the contextualisation is relevant to the conference. The contribution has the potential to stimulate interest in relation to academic writing pedagogy.
2. Connection/Relevance	The connection to practice and/or the relevance to the conference and its themes is missing or vague.	The contribution is connected to relevant practices and to the conference themes.	The contribution displays a clear reference to practice and/or research and theory, as well as a clear relevance to the chosen conference theme.
3. Interaction/Audience	The intended audience is not clearly articulated.	The contribution describes its intended audience.	The contribution is well adapted to the format of the poster and to the intended audience.
4. Communication	The contribution fails to communicate in terms of language, structure, or argumentation.	The contents of the contribution are argued for and communicated in an accessible way both in terms of language and structure.	The contents of the contribution are communicated in an accessible way both in terms of language and structure. The argumentation of the contribution is convincing.