

Rubric for assessing quality of the Research Article contribution

	Insufficient	Good	Excellent
Aim and problem	The contribution is insufficiently motivated and the question or problem formulation is incomplete or missing.	The question or problem is clearly formulated and the contribution is reasonably contextualised.	The question or problem formulation is clearly articulated and the contextualisation is relevant. The contribution has the potential to stimulate pedagogical discussion or development in higher education.
Scholarly contextualisation	The connection to experience or research is missing or vague.	The contribution is connected to research or experience.	The contribution is explicitly situated and supported in relevant research or experience via clear reference to theories, approaches, and communities.
Method	Methods or approaches are not sufficiently accounted for or are not appropriate to the research question or target group.	The contribution describes appropriate methods and approaches but lack sufficient information to be transparent. An appropriate ethics statement is included.	Methods or approaches are described and motivated relative to the question or problem formulation of the contribution. Methods are transparent. An appropriate ethics statement is included.
Findings	The accounts of results and data are missing or critically insufficient.	Results and data are accounted for in relation to the question or problem formulation.	Results and analyses of data are related to and develop the aim, the question or problem formulation, the methods, as well as the research and experience.
Discussion and reflection	The results or experiences are not analysed or discussed in relation to the question or problem formulation.	The contribution contains discussion or reflection relative to the question or problem formulation.	Results and experiences are discussed in relation to the question or problem formulation. Critical connections or recommendations for future study are developed. The discussion contributes to a broader understanding of teaching and learning in

			Nordic STEM higher education.
Communication	The contribution fails to argue and communicate in one or several of the following: audience adaptation, language, structure, or reference handling.	The contents of the contribution are well communicated and argued for. It is audience-adapted for accessibility in terms of language as well as structure. The contribution applies the APA style for referencing.	The content is well communicated and audience-adapted for accessibility in terms of language as well as structure. The argumentation is convincing and adapted in order not to exclude relevant groups. The contribution applies the APA style for referencing.