

# AUTHOR GUIDELINES FOR CEEA-ACÉG STRUCTURED ABSTRACTS

## Title of the Paper

### Abstract

Authors are invited to submit a **short, structured abstract (no more than 500 words)** in English or French via **Oxford Abstracts** by **November 18, 2024**. For **SCOPUS indexing**, there must also be an **English version of the abstract**. Each section of the structured abstract, as outlined below, must be labeled with the appropriate subheading. The total word count is limited to 500 words (excluding references). The sections do not need to be of equal length, as the word limit applies to the entire abstract. A clear, direct, and factual writing style is more suitable for structured abstracts than an expository, conversational style commonly used in single-paragraph, unstructured abstracts.

Submissions and reviews will be conducted through a double-blind (anonymous) process. **Please DO NOT include any author or affiliation information in the structured abstract.**

### Structured Abstract Sections for *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) Papers*

For *practice-based papers*, the structured abstract should follow these labeled sections:

- **Background:** Briefly describe the context and motivation for the work.
- **Purpose:** Summarize the purpose (aim) of the project on teaching / learning intervention or novel educational practice.
- **Approach:** Provide an overview of the project design, including the intervention or novel practice and how the impact of the intervention or novel practice is evaluated.
- **Outcomes:** Discuss the (anticipated) impact of the project, intervention or practice.
- **Conclusions:** Reflect on the (anticipated) learnings of the project, intervention or practice.

[Click here to make a submission for this type of contribution \(SoTL\).](#)

### Structured Abstract Sections for *Research / Literature Review Papers*

For *research or review papers*, the structured abstract should follow these labeled sections:

- **Background:** Describe the context and motivation for the study, research gap, and research question(s).
- **Hypothesis or framework:** Summarize the rationale for the hypothesis and/or the conceptual or theoretical framework for the study.
- **Design/Method/Methodology:** Provide details about how the research or review was conducted. For research papers, include an overview of the data sources, and data collection and analysis methods. For review papers, describe the methods used to identify and synthesize primary studies, and provide relevant details on the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- **Results:** Summarize the (anticipated) quantitative or qualitative findings.
- **Conclusions:** Discuss the key implications/contributions of the (anticipated) findings to relevant literature and practice.

[Click here to make a submission for this type of contribution \(EER\).](#)

### Keywords

Submissions must be labelled with *three to five keywords*. *Keywords can be multi-word phrases*. Authors are encouraged to select keywords from the [Engineering Education Research Taxonomy](https://taxonomy.engin.umich.edu/taxonomy/) (Regents of the University of Michigan, 2013, <https://taxonomy.engin.umich.edu/taxonomy/>), when appropriate, but may choose their own keywords as needed. The selected keywords should include terms beyond those used in the title or abstract.

## Notes for the Authors

### Research with human participants

Research involving human participants (e.g., survey responses, interviews, student grades, responses to learning assessments etc.) must receive institutional ethics approval, unless it is exempt from this requirement or if the perspectives or experiences reported are solely those of the author(s). It is the responsibility of each author to assess whether their work necessitates ethics approval. If you are uncertain, please refer to the [Tri-Council Policy Statement](#) or consult your institution's guidelines.

In your submission of the Structured Abstract, you will be asked to indicate:

- The study does require ethics approval, and approval has been granted.
- The study does require ethics approval, and approval is pending.
- The study does not require ethics approval.

Please note that if your study is required for ethics approval by your institution's ethics review board, by the time you submit the full paper your research should have been granted ethics approval.

### De-identifying the submission

As all the paper-based submissions will go through a double-blind peer review process, we require all the authors to remove any identifiable information from the submissions.

In your submission of the Structured Abstract and the full paper, you will be asked to indicate:

- I confirm that the submission has no identifiable information in it, for the purpose of the double-blind peer review. Identifiable information can include names of the authors, any references to their own work (replaced by “[Authors]” in the text and the reference list), and the institutional or program affiliation related to the study (replaced by “[Institution]” or “[University]”).

### Author Approval

In your submission of the Structured Abstract and the full paper, you will be asked to indicate:

- I confirm that this submission has been approved by all authors.

### Session Type (Presentation Mode)

In your submission, you will be asked to select your preferred session type (presentation mode) from the following three options. Sessions typically last about 90 minutes.

**Podium Talks (10 minutes presentation + 10 minutes Q&A):** These sessions allow authors to provide a concise overview of their work using presentation slides, followed by audience questions. Authors whose Podium Talks are accepted will need to submit a full-length paper.

**Lightning Talks (5 minutes presentation + 5 minutes Q&A):** This fast-paced format focuses on presenting key ideas and results, ideal for works-in-progress or early-stage research. Authors may choose to submit a full paper for publication in the CEEA-ACÉG proceedings if desired.

**Poster Presentation:** Ideal for extended, interactive discussions between presenters and attendees. Posters should visually convey ideas and results. Authors can also opt to submit a full paper for publication in the proceedings.

**Review Rubric for the Engineering Education Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) submissions** (both the structured abstract and the full paper)

**About the reviewer**

If you serve as a reviewer of this abstract or paper, do you see any conflict of interest? Possible conflicts of interest are personal or professional relationships with the author(s), and can include project collaborations or being a member of the same institution as the authors.

- Yes
- No (If selected, please do NOT proceed to review the submission)

Based on your academic and professional background, do you find yourself qualified to review this abstract or paper? Qualified reviewers for submissions to the CEEA-ACÉG annual conference are experienced engineering educators and/or researchers with an active CEEA-ACÉG membership and have some knowledge about the topic of the reviewed paper. The keywords provided by the author(s) can be used to obtain a quick understanding of the topic of the reviewed paper.

- Yes
- No (If selected, please do NOT proceed to review the submission)

<b>Expectations for a structured abstract or a full paper</b>	Good	Fair	Not included
<b><u>Background</u></b>			
The context of the work is clearly described.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The motivation for the work is clearly explained.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Purpose</u></b>			
The purpose of the project on teaching / learning intervention or novel educational practice is well articulated.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Approach</u></b>			
A clear overview of the project on teaching / learning intervention or novel educational practice is provided.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The work is reasonably connected to relevant literature.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The methods being used are appropriate for the project / study.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Outcomes</u></b>			
The (anticipated) impact of the project is clearly discussed.*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The findings are discussed in relation to relevant literature.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alternative interpretations, counter arguments, bias, reliability, or validity are discussed as appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Conclusions</u></b>			
The reflections are well supported by the findings and the discussion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The conclusions contribute valuable insights and/or have implications to engineering education practice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Coherence among all the components</u></b>			
The elements of the project / study (i.e., purpose, design, methods, etc.) align well with each other. In other words, there is good internal coherence among the elements of the project / study.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Overall quality</u></b>			
Overall, the paper fits well with the expectations of scholarly work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

\* “The anticipated impact” for the review of the structured abstract; and “The impact” for the review of the full paper.

Does the submission fit within the field of engineering education? (If not, the author(s) might need to consider submitting their work to another venue.)

- Yes
- No

**Recommendation**

- Accept
- Accept as written, subject to minor changes – please suggest what to change in the “Comments to the Author(s)” box below.
- Needs major revisions – please detail what revisions are required in the “Comments to the Author(s)” box below.
- Reject – please explain the rationale in the Confidential Comments to the Organizing Committee and in the Comments to the Author(s) boxes below.

Comments to the Author(s) (required). Please include constructive and actionable suggestions for improvement to all areas noted as needing improvement above.

Confidential Comments to the Conference Organizing Committee (required if rejecting)

**Review Rubric for the Engineering Education Research submissions** (both the structured abstract and the full paper)

**About the reviewer**

If you serve as a reviewer of this abstract or paper, do you see any conflict of interest? Possible conflicts of interest are personal or professional relationships with the author(s), and can include project collaborations or being a member of the same institution as the authors.

- Yes
- No (If selected, please do NOT proceed to review the submission)

Based on your academic and professional background, do you find yourself qualified to review this abstract or paper? Qualified reviewers for submissions to the CEEA-ACÉG annual conference are experienced engineering educators and/or researchers with an active CEEA-ACÉG membership and have some knowledge about the topic of the reviewed paper. The keywords provided by the author(s) can be used to obtain a quick understanding of the topic of the reviewed paper.

- Yes
- No (If selected, please do NOT proceed to review the submission)

<b>Expectations for a structured abstract or a full paper</b>	Good	Fair	Not included
<b><u>Background</u></b>			
The context of the study is clearly described.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The motivation for the study is clearly explained.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The research gap is identified.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The research questions are clearly stated.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Hypothesis or Framework</u></b>			
The hypothesis and/or the conceptual or theoretical framework is provided.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Design/Method/Methodology</u></b> (Research paper)			
The data collection method (e.g., survey, interview, artifact) is clearly described.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The analysis methods (e.g., coding, statistical methods) are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Design/Method/Methodology</u></b> (Literature review papers)			
The methods used to identify the relevant literature for review are clearly described.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The inclusion/exclusion criteria are clearly explained.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Results</u></b>			
The (anticipated) findings of the study are clearly presented.*	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The findings are discussed in relation to relevant literature.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Alternative interpretations, counter arguments, bias, reliability, or validity are discussed as appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Conclusions</u></b>			
The conclusions are well supported by the findings and the discussion.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The conclusions contribute valuable insights and/or have implications to engineering education practice.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<b><u>Coherence among all the components</u></b>			
The elements of the study (i.e., purpose, design, methods, etc.) align well with each other. In other words, there is good internal coherence among the elements of the study.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

<b>Overall quality</b>			
Overall, the paper fits well with the expectations of scholarly work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

\* “The anticipated findings” for the review of the structured abstract; and “The findings” for the review of the full paper.

Does the submission fit within the field of engineering education? (If not, the author(s) might need to consider submitting their work to another venue.)

- Yes
- No

**Recommendation**

- Accept
- Accept as written, subject to minor changes – please suggest what to change in the “Comments to the Author(s)” box below.
- Needs major revisions – please detail what revisions are required in the “Comments to the Author(s)” box below.
- Reject – please explain the rationale in the Confidential Comments to the Organizing Committee and in the Comments to the Author(s) boxes below.

Comments to the Author(s) (required). Please include constructive and actionable suggestions for improvement to all areas noted as needing improvement above.

Confidential Comments to the Conference Organizing Committee (required if rejecting)