

The Learning Confoederatio – Navigating (Digital) Change through Evidence



Zurich, Switzerland
August 10 - 12, 2026



2026 EARLI SIG 6&7 — REVIEW CRITERIA

All submissions should be blind peer reviewed by at least two reviewers, who are asked to take into account the criteria outlined below according to the type of the contribution.

Each reviewer is asked to score the quality of the proposal, indicating a score between 1 (very poor) - 10 (excellent) and to provide brief and constructive feedback in the designated text box. Both numeric scores and comments are communicated to the author(s) along with the final decision. Therefore, we ask our reviewers to be as constructive as possible, while also being considerate of the efforts invested in preparing the submission.

Symposia are evaluated as a whole, in terms of coherence as a whole and rationale, as well as at the level of for each individual paper (following the criteria for single paper submissions).

Submissions which clearly fall outside of the scope of EARLI, or which do not clearly demonstrate relevance for the field of learning and instruction should be scored “0” across all review criteria. This will result in an automatic rejection of the submission.

The Scientific Program Committee (SPC ; *i.e.*, The SIG 6 and SIG 7 coordinators and JURE coordinators) aims to support ongoing research. Therefore, paper and poster submissions may include incomplete data or indicate that data will be available by the time of the conference.

AI-use: When a reviewer identifies a submission that appears to be fully AI-generated, we kindly ask you to inform Juliette Désiron via email (juliette.desiron@unifr.ch). After consulting with the SPC she will let you know whether or not to proceed with the review.

Nb. this introductory text is only slightly modified from the EARLI 2025 – Review Criteria

SINGLE PAPER or POSTER (Empirical or Theoretical)

Rationale, Theoretical Framework (20%)

The submission includes a clear rationale explaining why the research is of interest. It presents a strong theoretical framework to support the claim(s) made. The research aim is explicit and clearly stated.

Methods (20%)

The methods followed – or that will be followed – are described clearly and in sufficient detail. They are appropriate and well aligned with the research aim introduced earlier.

Results and Discussion (20%)

Results, preliminary results or expected results pattern are clearly presented. When statistical analyses are reported, they include enough detail to evaluate their suitability for addressing the research aim. The results are discussed in relation to this aim.

Significance (20%)

The submission provides a convincing argument that the research will have a meaningful impact on theory, policy and/or practices.

Overall Quality and Originality (20%)

The submission demonstrates overall coherence, clarity, and scholarly rigor, as well as a distinct contribution to the research fields of SIG 6 or SIG 7. It presents a well-integrated and persuasive argument, with clear writing and a logical structure. Originality is reflected in the conceptual approach, methodological perspective, or interpretive contribution, offering added value beyond existing work.

Note: *Originality does not require the research to be radically new or revolutionary.*

SYMPOSIUM

Rationale, Theoretical Framework (60%)

The symposium presents a clear rationale explaining why the set of contributions is of interest and how they jointly address a meaningful topic. It provides a coherent and well articulated theoretical framework that connects the individual papers and supports the symposium's overarching claim(s). The overarching aim of the symposium is explicit and clearly stated.

Coherence as a whole (40%)

The symposium demonstrates a clear and meaningful coherence across its individual contributions. The papers complement one another and collectively address the symposium's overarching aim. Connections between the contributions are well articulated, showing how each paper adds to, extends, or contrasts with the others. Together, the set of papers forms a coherent and integrated scholarly discussion.

NO/NOT-SO-PERFECT-DATA (Empirical or Theoretical)

Rationale, Theoretical Framework (25%)

The submission includes a clear rationale explaining why the research is of interest. It presents a strong theoretical framework to support the claim-s made. The research aim is explicit and clearly stated.

Methods/ Theoretical model (25%)

The methods followed – or that will be followed – are described clearly and in sufficient detail. They are appropriate and well aligned with the research aim introduced earlier.

Quality and Originality (25%)

The submission demonstrates overall coherence, clarity, and scholarly rigor, as well as a distinct contribution to the research fields of SIG 6 or SIG7. It presents a well-integrated and persuasive argument, with clear writing and a logical structure. Originality is reflected in the conceptual approach, methodological perspective, or interpretive contribution, offering added value beyond existing work.

Note: *Originality does not require the research to be radically new or revolutionary.*

Considerations to Be Discussed (25%)

The submission clearly identifies aspects of the study that are still under development, such as incomplete data, preliminary analyses, or elements of the research design that require refinement. These work-in-progress components are described transparently and linked to the research aim. The submission also specifies what input, feedback, or discussion points the author(s) wish to bring to the audience during the conference.

TOOL AND EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY DEMONSTRATIONS

Rationale, Theoretical Framework (25%)

The submission provides a clear rationale for the development or use of the tool or technology, explaining the educational need or problem it addresses. It outlines the theoretical or pedagogical principles guiding its design and use. The aims of the tool and its intended contribution to learning and instruction are explicit and clearly stated.

Use Case/ Case Study (25%)

The submission clearly describes the context in which the tool or educational technology is used. The use case or case study is articulated in sufficient detail to understand the problem it addresses, the target users, and the practical conditions of implementation. The submission demonstrates how the tool operates in authentic or realistic settings and explains its relevance for learning and instruction.

Quality and Originality (25%)

The submission demonstrates overall scholarly quality and a meaningful contribution to the research fields of SIG 6 or SIG 7.

Note: Originality does not require the tool to be radically new or revolutionary but it should offer value beyond existing tools, practices, or understandings. Originality may be reflected in the conceptual approach, technological design, pedagogical innovation, or application to a new context.

Planned Demonstration (25%)

The submission provides a clear and feasible plan for the live demonstration of the tool or technology during the conference. It specifies what features will be showcased, how the demonstration will be organized, and what participants will be able to observe or try out.

REVIEW THRESHOLDS

The Scientific Program Committee (SPC), based on the proposal made during the 2025 members meeting in Graz, has set the following thresholds for accepting a submission at the joint 2026 EARLI SIG 6 & 7 conference:

	Accepted	Rejected	Split into Single Paper	Poster
Paper	$\geq 70\%$	$\leq 60\%$		$70\% < X < 60\%$
Poster	$\geq 60\%$	$< 60\%$		
Symposium	$\geq 70\%$	$\leq 60\%$	$70\% < X < 60\%$	
No-or-not-Perfect-Data	$\geq 75\%$	$\leq 60\%$		$75\% < X < 60\%$
Tool and Educational Technology Demonstrations	$\geq 65\%$	$< 65\%$		

Please note that the scores can range from 0 to 100% and refer to “combined review scores”, calculated as the average of the reviewer’s scores.

Whenever there is a discrepancy of 25% between two review scores for submissions falling under the split or rejection thresholds, the submission is sent to a third reviewer.

In the event of three review scores, preference is given to the two scores that are closest to each other, with consideration for the outlier being minimal or disregarded.

When only one of the reviewers is suggesting a change of format, the SPC reviews it. When all reviewers suggest a change of format, the suggestion is followed.

Please note that, unlike the procedure for the 2025 EARLI conference, symposium acceptance is determined by the overall symposium score rather than the scores of the individual papers. This means that a reviewer may recommend acceptance of a symposium as a whole even if one paper is of lower quality than the others. However, if any individual within a symposium falls below the 60% rejection threshold, its acceptance will be reviewed by the SPC.