

AUTHOR GUIDELINES FOR STRUCTURED ABSTRACTS

Authors are invited to submit a **structured abstract** in English or French via the paper management portal—Oxford Abstracts—by **November 17, 2025**. To meet the requirement of Scopus indexing, submissions in French must also include an English version of the abstract and the title. Authors will submit the components of the structured abstract, as outlined below, to the corresponding sections on an Oxford Abstracts form. The *total* word count for the abstract is limited to 500 words (excluding references). 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.

As a new approach this year, there are **three tracks for submissions**, instead of our usual two. Please read the description of each track carefully. All tracks are considered equal and have no bearing on the review process or on the allocation of presentation formats. Authors will determine the track that they will submit to. The three tracks are designed to better reflect the diversity of research methodologies, of pedagogical approaches, and of scholarship in the work of our members. All submissions must address issues in engineering education. Collectively, submissions will contribute to the improvement of educational practices in engineering schools, and the growth of engineering education research and scholarship of teaching and learning in engineering as fields of study.

1. **“Practice” track** – The primary goal of this track is to share an educational practice implemented in engineering courses, co-curricular activities, or engineering programs. These practices can take place inside or outside engineering classrooms. They can be educational interventions already implemented, or the design of a new educational method or tool for engineering students (but not yet implemented). They can also be about a new practice related to your role as an educator. These practices do not need to be entirely novel to engineering education communities but their description in the submission must be grounded in relevant literature to demonstrate that these practices make a valuable contribution to knowledge. Submissions in this track must include a clear goal and/or inquiry question related to the practice involved and a critical reflection on the practice. Papers in this track are strongly encouraged to include empirical evidence addressing success, failure, and/or challenges related to the practice. Authors who report data collected from human participants (e.g., students, faculty, staff, community members) must demonstrate compliance with their institution’s research ethics policies. See more details in the “Submission Involving Human Participants” section.
2. **“Research” track** – Papers in this track should involve systematic inquiry into topics in engineering education. These topics can include, but not limited to, how engineering is learned and taught; advancing equity, inclusion, and decolonization; evaluating educational outcomes and career readiness; and understanding the experiences and development of students and faculty. Papers in this track must be grounded in relevant literature, with an identified theoretical or conceptual framework; research questions; and appropriate methods that engage qualitative, quantitative, or mixed methods data, and that demonstrate sound research design. Authors who report data collected from human participants (e.g., students, faculty, staff, community members) must include the number of the research protocol approved by their institution’s research ethics board in their final paper.
3. **“Conceptual paper” track** – Submissions to this track are dedicated to discussing conceptual matters related to engineering education. Authors can present a position or idea that has seen limited discussion or is part of an ongoing conversation in engineering education. The

discussion of these conceptual matters can be based on existing theoretical perspectives, evidence-based observations of practice, or a review of the literature. Arguments in these papers must be sufficiently grounded in associated literature. Systematic or scoping literature review papers should be submitted to this track. Papers in this track are expected to demonstrate significance of the topic, use of scholarly literature, adequacy of interpretations, and coherence in conceptualization. Papers in this track typically do not report results collected from human participants; however, if authors did include empirical data they collected to support their arguments, they must demonstrate that their work complies with their institution's research ethics policies.

A structured abstract for the “Practice” Track should include the following components:

- **Background:** Briefly describe the context and motivation for the work.
- **Goal of the practice and inquiry question or hypothesis:** Explain the goal of the practice and/or an inquiry question or hypothesis.
- **Description of new practice:** Describe the educational intervention already implemented, a new educational method or tool designed, or other types of new educational practice. Use relevant literature to demonstrate how the practice makes a valuable contribution to knowledge.
- **Approach:** Where applicable, explain how the impact of the educational intervention or new practice was evaluated, or how the new method or tool was conceived or designed.
- **Discussion and Conclusions:** Discuss success, failure, observations, and/or challenges related to the practice and provide a critical reflection on the practice.

A structured abstract for the “Research” Track should include the following components:

- **Background:** Describe the context and motivation for the study and identify gaps in the relevant literature.
- **Research question and framework:** Explain the theoretical or conceptional framework underpinning the study and clearly state the research question(s).
- **Research design and methods:** Provide details about how the research was conducted, including research design, data sources, and data collection and analysis methods.
- **Results:** Summarize the (anticipated) research findings.
- **Discussion and Conclusions:** Discuss the key implications/contributions of the (anticipated) findings to relevant literature and practice.

A structured abstract for the “Conceptual paper” Track should include the following components:

- **Background:** Briefly describe the context and motivation for the work.
- **Goal of the submission and inquiry question:** Explain the goal of the submission and state an inquiry question.

- **Approach:** Explain the approach to achieving the goal, including use of theoretical perspectives, synthesis of evidence-based observations, and/or a literature review. For stand-alone scoping or literature reviews, describe the methods used to identify relevant literature, including the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- **Key claims or findings:** Summarize the key claims or findings from the review.
- **Discussion and Conclusions:** Explain the significance of the work and discuss the implications of the work for engineering education.

Keywords

Include three to five keywords for each submission, considering the context/focus/topic, purpose/target/motivation, and research approach. 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.

Submissions involving human participants

According to the [Tri-Council Policy Statement](#), research involving data collected from human participants (e.g., use of survey responses, interviews, student assignments or grades, audio/video recordings of humans, students' responses to learning assessments, collecting data from devices placed on human participants, etc.) must receive institutional ethics approval, unless this is exempted by the authors' institutional research ethics board (REB). It is the authors' responsibility to consult with their institutional REB to ensure that their submission complies with their institutional research ethics policies.

Please comply with the following ethics expectations for projects that involve data collection from human participants.

For papers in the "Research" Track:

Authors who report data collected from human participants must have REB approval and include the research protocol number in the methods section of the final paper and on the presentation slides or the poster. If, by the time of full paper submission or poster/lightning talk presentation, your project has not received ethics approval, you must not present the data collected from human participants in your paper, poster, or presentation slides. This may mean that you must withdraw your submission from the Conference Proceedings or the Conference Program.

For papers in the "Practice" track (and in papers in "Conceptual Papers" track, if involving data collected from human participants):

- If your study requires ethics review by the research ethics board (REB) of the institution where data were collected from human participants, you must receive approval before collecting data from human participants. If you are using information originally collected for a purpose other than the research in your paper (e.g., learning assessments of your students), you must receive REB's approval for secondary use of the data. In both cases, you must include the research protocol number in the full paper and indicate having received approval from your institution's REB.
- If your project involved data collected from human participants but has been exempted from ethics review by your institution's REB, in the full paper you must include a note about the

exemption in the methods section of your paper. If you present your work without a full paper, you must include an exemption statement on your poster or in your presentation slides.

- If, by the time of full paper submission, your project has not received ethics approval or you have not included the exemption statement into your paper, you must not include the data collected from human participants in your paper, poster, or presentation slides. This may mean that you have to withdraw your submission from the Conference Proceedings or Program.

In all cases, when you are submitting your Structured Abstract via Oxford Abstracts, you will be asked to indicate:

- ☐ My project did not involve data collected from human participants.
- ☐ My project did involve data collected from human participants, is in the “Practice” or “Conceptual Papers” track, and has been exempted from ethics review by my institution’s research ethics board.
- ☐ Ethics review is required for my project, and the approval has been granted.
- ☐ Ethics review is required for my project, and the approval is pending.

In all cases, at the full paper submission stage, if you report data collected from human participants, you will be asked to provide

- the number of the ethics protocol that was approved by your institution’s REB.
OR
- proof from your institution’s REB indicating that your project is exempt from ethics review. The proof can be a letter, an email message, or the result from a self-administered screening tool provided by your institution’s REB.

If you cannot provide either of these, your paper will be withdrawn.

If your submission is a Lightning Talk or a poster without a paper, you will be asked if you will report data collected from human participants. If so, in your slides or poster you must include the number of the ethics protocol that was approved by your institution’s REB or a statement indicating that your project is exempt from ethics review based on your institution’s research ethics policies.

De-identifying the submission

As all the submissions will go through a double-blind peer review process, we require all the authors to remove any identifiable information from the submissions. Identifiable information can include authors’ names, publications, institutional or program affiliation, the study site, and other information that may reveal the authors’ identity. You can use the following methods, where applicable, to de-identify your submission:

- Remove or redact all author names, emails, and affiliations using the format [Author] or [Redacted]. For example, if you are redacting the name of the first author, replace it with [Author 1].
- Remove acknowledgements
- Anonymize or redact funding sources by stating “This work was funded by [details omitted for double-blind peer review]”.
- Redact any citations of your work from the reference list that would be identifiable.
- Use the third person for self-citations. For example, write “[1] showed ...,” not “we have previously shown in [1] ...”. In this case, you would not redact the citation from the reference list.
- Remove identifying information from the metadata in the PDF. To do so, check the document

properties information in the pdf file of your submission, select the fields you want to remove, and re-save.

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

☐ For the purpose of the double-blind peer review, I confirm that the submission has no identifiable information, such as authors' names and institutional affiliation.

Author Approval

When submitting the Structured Abstract and the full paper, you will be asked to indicate:

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

Presentation Options

Authors may choose to submit a full paper (5-8 pages, not including references and appendices) for publication in the Conference Proceedings, or not to submit a paper. Authors of submissions can present their work in the following formats:

- **Podium Talks (12 minutes presentation + 8 minutes Q&A):** These sessions allow authors to provide a concise overview of their larger or more in-depth work using presentation slides, followed by audience questions. Authors whose Podium Talks are accepted will need to submit a full paper.
- **Lightning Talks (5 minutes presentation + 5 minutes Q&A):** This fast-paced format focuses on presenting key ideas and results, ideal for smaller-scale, high-quality completed work, as well as works-in-progress or early-stage research. Submission of a full paper for publication in the CEEAA-ACÉG proceedings is optional, but strongly encouraged, for those requesting this type of presentation.
- **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.

In an effort to ensure that attendees can see a greater breadth of work by scheduling a reduced number of parallel sessions, we will be shifting our mix of talk lengths. **More submissions will be offered lightning talks and fewer podium talks will be scheduled.** Priority for podium talks will be given to larger or more in-depth works of broad interest. Lightning talks will be offered to many high-quality submissions, including smaller scale completed work with full papers.