

The SASEE Biennial Conference is focussed not only on giving experienced scholars a platform to engage with their peers around issues in engineering education, but is also an opportunity for scholars new to the field to write about the work that they do and present this for discussion. Given the formative approach adopted, there is a two part review process for research to be accepted for presentation at the conference.

First round of review – extended abstracts

The initial requirement is for all interested researchers to prepare a 1000 word extended abstract – to be submitted by 20/02/2013. The conference's academic committee will remove from the extended abstract all references to the author(s) and submit these for blind peer review. The reviewers will consider the following criteria in their consideration of the submitted extended abstracts:

- Clarity, coherence and organisation of writing;
- Potential to stimulate discussion among conference participants;
- Scholarly and research-based nature of the paper (key challenges and current issues raised are scholarly and research-based, or analysis of practice-based work is robust and evidence-based); and
- Contribution to scholarship and/or innovative practice in engineering education.

There are three options available post review and author(s) will be informed of their outcome accordingly:

1. The reviewers can recommend that the extended abstract is appropriate to be developed and submitted as a paper to be further peer reviewed and included in the conference proceedings.
2. The reviewers can recommend that the author(s) be invited to resubmit their extended abstract – taking the reviewers comments into account – and that this extended abstract then forms the basis for a presentation at the SEESA 2013 conference. In this case, only the updated peer reviewed extended abstract will be included in the conference proceedings.
3. Should the reviewers be of the view that the work is not appropriate for the conference, the extended abstract will be withdrawn from further consideration.

Should you be invited to have your extended abstract included in the conference – and thus the conference proceedings – you will be required to submit your reworked extended abstract by 15/04/2013. This final submission must include a schedule of changes where the author(s) describe how they have made changes to their extended abstract based on feedback received from the reviewers.

Second round of review – full papers

For those author(s) who are invited to develop a full paper from their extended abstracts, they will need to submit these by 15/04/2013 for peer review should they wish to accept this invitation. Authors will receive detailed feedback within three weeks of this date and will be required to submit the final version of their paper and

reworked extended abstract by 20/05/2013. The reviewers will use the following criteria for their review¹:

- Is the research question or purpose clearly stated and is its importance justified?
- Does the paper draw on the latest and most relevant research findings on the topic? Is it located within a relevant theoretical framework?
- Taken as a whole, is the paper consistent? For example, is the methodology appropriate to the question and is the question answered in the conclusion?
- Is the design and execution of the methodology adequate in relation to the question? (Depending on the design, this question may have to be answered in a number of ways. In qualitative designs issues of dependability and interpretation are important. In quantitative designs, issues of reliability and validity should be considered.)
- Where applicable, are the results clearly and correctly presented? Are they consistent with the methodology?
- Are the conclusions justifiable in terms of the methodology and/or the results (where applicable)? Does the discussion of the results show insight and originality? Does it suggest implications and/or make recommendations that are applicable and useful?
- Does the paper satisfy accepted criteria for academic writing in terms of coherence, grammar, layout and organisation? Do the references adhere to APA standards?
- Is the title appropriate and does it reflect the gist of the paper?
- Is the abstract (included as part of the paper) adequate and precise in its summary of the paper as a whole?
- Is the paper original, and does it contribute towards scholarly debates in the field?

Based on feedback from the reviewers, authors will receive one of the following outcomes:

- The full paper will be accepted 'as is' with no further editing required. However, there may be instances where reviewers have made editorial and/or other comments that authors may wish to consider before submission of the final version of the paper for publication.
- The full paper will be accepted subject to authors making changes as required by the reviewers. Authors are required to make these changes before resubmission of the final paper for publication. When submitting the updated paper, authors must include a schedule of changes where they describe how they have made changes to their paper based on feedback from the reviewers
- The full paper may be considered by the reviewers to not be at the level required for publication in the proceedings. Although the paper will thus not be included in the conference proceedings, the author(s) will none-the-less be accepted by the conference organisers to make a presentation of their work during a formally scheduled session as per the acceptance of their extended abstract in the first phase of peer review.

¹ Sincere thanks to the Southern African Association for Research in Mathematics, Science and Technology Education (SAARMSTE) for permission to adapt their paper review template.