CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

The Canadian Engineering Education Association (CEEA-ACÉG) is calling for submissions to its annual conference to be hosted at Western University, London, Ontario, June 14–18, 2027.

Authors wishing to present at the conference must choose to submit either a full paper or a structured abstract (no paper) to one of the three tracks—Research, Practice, and Conceptual Paper. The deadline for both the full paper and structured abstract is **January 15, 2027** (NO extension). Full papers are 5 to 8 pages in length, excluding references, using the template in the Author Guidelines for Manuscripts (to be available on the Call for Submissions webpage). Structured abstracts are up to 500 words, excluding references. Both options are expected to include the components outlined under the "Guidelines for Submission Preparation" in this document.

Authors, especially who consider submitting a full paper by the January 15 2027 deadline, have an option to submit a structured abstract by **November 9, 2026** (no extension), *for formative feedback*, but they are not required to do so.

Key dates:

- The deadline for submitting an *optional* structured abstract for formative feedback: **November 9, 2026** (NO extension)
- The deadline for submitting a full paper or a structured abstract (no paper): **January 15, 2027** (NO extension)
- For authors of papers that require *minor* revisions, the deadline for submitting the final version of the paper: **March 26, 2027** (NO extension)
- For authors of papers that require *major* revisions, the deadline for submitting the revised paper: **March 26, 2027**; and the deadline for submitting the final version: **April 19, 2027** (NO extension)

All submissions must be made via the paper management portal—Oxford Abstracts (the link to be available on the Call for Submissions webpage). All deadlines are set at 11:59 pm, PST on the due dates. The submissions can be in English or French. To meet the requirement of Scopus indexing, paper submissions in French must also include an English abstract and title.

New to the submission process for the 2027 CEEA-ACÉG Conference:

- Authors who consider submitting a full paper are *not* required to submit a structured abstract for peer review prior to submitting the full paper; however, if they wish, they have the option to submit an abstract for formative review and feedback. This optional abstract step will have no impact on acceptance to the conference. The components of these optional abstracts are the same as structured abstract outlined under "Guidelines for Submission Preparation" section. Authors who are unsure about whether to submit a full paper could also use this

option to receive formative feedback. Note that all authors are still required to submit either a full paper or structured abstract by the January 2027 deadline, for peer reviews.

- Changes to the presentation mode: A single presentation length for all oral presentations will be piloted this year. (see more details in the Presentation Options section)

Themes:

Authors should select up to three of the following themes for their submission:

- Special 2027 theme: Building bridges between engineering education and practice, policy and community needs.
- Special 2027 theme: Classroom strategies that foster collaboration and develop engaged, responsible, resilient and socially responsive engineers.
- Special 2027 theme: Decolonization and incorporation of Indigenous voices and ways of knowing in engineering education.
- NEW: AI and Emerging Technology
- NEW: Wellbeing
- Program Evaluation & Accreditation
- Instruction & Pedagogy (incl. educational technology and Open Education Resources)
- Engineering Design (incl. design education, design thinking, design principles, etc.)
- First Year Programs
- Student Learning & Development (incl. theories and processes of student learning)
- Curriculum Design
- Recruitment & Retention
- Outreach & Community Engagement
- Social and Environmental Impact & Sustainability
- Equity, Diversity & Inclusion
- Professional Skills (incl. communication, leadership, entrepreneurship, systems thinking, ethics)
- Professional Practice & Industry Engagement (incl. career pathways, workplace culture, co-op, industry engagement, etc.)
- History and Philosophy of Engineering and Engineering Education (incl. broader perspectives on the ontological and epistemological development of engineering and engineering education as disciplines)
- Research Methods (incl. specific methods and data collection approaches in engineering education)

Presentation Options:

Accepted submissions may be presented in one of the following two formats. To facilitate finalizing the conference program earlier, a presenter of accepted submissions must register for the conference by the early bird registration deadline; otherwise, the paper will be removed from the program.

1. **Oral Presentation (7-minute presentation + 5-minute Q&A):** These sessions allow authors to provide a concise overview of their work using presentation slides, followed by audience questions. Authors who choose an oral presentation will submit either a full paper

for publication in the proceedings or a structured abstract, though a full paper is strongly encouraged for those requesting this type of presentation.

2. **Poster Presentation:** Ideal for extended, interactive discussions between presenters and attendees. Posters should visually convey key ideas and results. Authors who choose a poster presentation will submit either a full paper for publication in the proceedings or a structured abstract. This year, the poster session will be expanded as a core conference event, with more space and time dedicated to these presentations and the discussions they generate. We hope this will make posters an especially engaging way for members to showcase and discuss their work.

Based on feedback from our conference surveys, we are piloting **a single presentation length for all oral presentations this year**. This change is intended to streamline the program, reduce the number of concurrent sessions, and create more space for member discussions during and after sessions.

Oral presentations are an opportunity to provide a high-level view of one's work, engage the audience, and spark conversations and connections that can continue outside the session. Even the longer length of podium presentations offered in previous years, did not allow for a comprehensive presentation of one's work, and their overall purpose remained similar. We recognize that some members would prefer longer presentations (we are, after all, educators and like to talk)! However, this change reflects membership and logistical feedback collected over several conferences. We will pilot the new format this year with the goal of creating a more interactive conference, while maintaining opportunities for members to showcase and discuss their work.

Tracks for Submissions

There are **three tracks for submissions** (the same tracks that were introduced for the 2026 CEEA-ACÉG Conference), from which authors must choose one. Please read the description of each track carefully. All tracks are considered equal, and the authors' choice of track has no bearing on the review process. The three tracks are designed to reflect the diversity of research methodologies, pedagogical approaches, and 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 to the growth of engineering education research and the 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 already implemented* in engineering courses, co-curricular activities, or engineering programs. Typically, this practice is new to the authors' local context (e.g., their own classroom or department) but does not need to be entirely novel to engineering education communities. The description of this practice in the submission must be grounded in relevant literature to demonstrate that the practice makes a valuable contribution to existing knowledge. Submissions in this track must include a clear description of the practice involved and a critical reflection on the practice. Where applicable, authors selecting this track are 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 in this document.

2. **"Research" track** – The primary goal of this track is to *extend knowledge* through a systematic inquiry into topics in engineering education. Papers in this track are typically empirical studies, but can also include literature reviews that involve a systematic selection and analysis process. All papers in this track must be grounded in relevant literature, with an identified theoretical or conceptual framework; research questions; appropriate analysis techniques that engage qualitative, quantitative, and/or mixed-methods approaches; and sound research design. Authors who report data collected from human participants (e.g., students, faculty, staff, community members) *must* include the research protocol number approved by their institution's research ethics board in their paper.
3. **"Conceptual Paper" track** – Submissions to this track are dedicated to *discussing conceptual matters related to engineering education*. Authors can present an idea that needs further discussion, or arguments that are part of an ongoing conversation in engineering education. The discussion of these conceptual matters should be critical, grounded in relevant literature and existing theoretical perspectives, and may also comprise secondary data or evidence-based observations of practice. Papers in this track are expected to demonstrate the significance of the topic, use of scholarly literature, adequacy in critical argumentation, and coherence in conceptualization. Papers in this track typically do not report results collected from human participants; however, if authors did include empirical data that they collected to support their arguments, they *must* demonstrate that their work complies with their institution's research ethics policies.

Works in an early to intermediate stage of a project, that is, work-in-progress, are strongly encouraged to be submitted as structured abstracts, instead of full papers.

Guidelines for Submission Preparation

A structured abstract submission must include the components outlined below for each track. Authors of a full paper should also include these components when preparing their manuscript, without having to use the exact wording as the headings.

When preparing a submission, authors are strongly encouraged to review the existing publications in the CEEA-ACÉG Conference Proceedings that discussed similar topics, and build upon the previous work through citations. These efforts will help improve the quality of individual projects.

Please see the details, including the formatting template and GenAI disclosure statement, in the document "Author Guidelines for Manuscripts" (to be posted on the Call for Submissions webpage). Note that structured abstracts (no paper) accepted for presentation at the Conference will *not* be published in the Conference Proceedings.

Components for submissions to "Practice" track:

- **Background**: Describe the context and motivation for the work.
- **Description of new practice**: Describe the educational intervention or practice that is new to the local context (e.g., the authors' own classroom or program). Explain the goal of the intervention or new practice and use relevant literature to demonstrate how the practice relates to existing knowledge and how it will contribute to improvement in the local context.
- **Assessment of the new practice**: Where applicable, explain how the impact of the

educational intervention or new practice was assessed.
- **Critical reflections**: Critically reflect upon success, failure, and/or challenges related to the practice.

Components for submissions to the "Research" track:

- **Background and research question**: Describe the context and motivation for the study, identify gaps in the relevant literature, and clearly state the research question(s).
- **Theoretical or conceptual framework:** Explain the theoretical or conceptional framework underpinning the study.
- **Research design and methods**: Summarize how the research was conducted, including research design, data sources, data collection, and analysis methods. For stand-alone scoping or systematic literature reviews, describe the methods used to identify relevant literature, including the inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- **Results:** Summarize the research findings.
- **Discussion and Conclusions**: Discuss the key implications/contributions of the findings to relevant literature and practice.

Components for submissions to the "Conceptual Paper" track:

- **Background**: Briefly describe the context and motivation for the work.
- **Goal(s) of the submission and inquiry question(s):** Explain the goal(s) of the submission and state the inquiry question(s) and the key concepts.
- **Approach**: Explain the approach to achieving the goal, including engagement with the literature, use of theoretical perspectives, and synthesis of evidence-based observations and secondary data, where applicable.
- **Key arguments**: Share the key arguments that are being presented/discussed.
- **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, then research approach. Keywords can be multi-word phrases. Authors are encouraged to select keywords from the Engineering Education Research 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, student evaluations of teaching, etc.) must receive institutional ethics approval or explicit exemption from 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 and to demonstrate this in their submission

to the CEEA-ACÉG Conference.

For submissions to the "Research" Track:

Authors who report data collected from human participants for "research" work *must* have REB approval and include the research protocol number in the methods section of the paper or structured abstract when they make their submission by the deadline in January 2027.

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

- If your project requires a review from your institutional REB or if you are using information originally collected for a purpose other than the research in your paper (that is, secondary data), you must include the research protocol number in your paper or structured abstract submission by the deadline in January 2027.

- If your project involves data collected from human participants but has been explicitly exempted from ethics review by your institution's REB, you *must* include a note about this in your full paper and structured abstract submission by the deadline in January 2027. Note that you *must* provide 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. (A statement of the TCPS2 guidelines on quality assurance (QA) does not satisfy this requirement, nor does a link to your institution's website about research vs QA).

In all cases, when you are submitting your full paper or structured abstract via Oxford Abstracts by January 2027, 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, and its ethics approval has been granted by my institutional research ethics board.

❍ My project did involve data collected from human participants and has been explicitly exempted from ethics review by my institution's research ethics board.

De-identifying the submission for peer reviews

As all the submissions during the formal submission stage (i.e., by the deadline in January 2027) will go through a double-blind peer review process, we require all the authors to remove any identifiable information from the submissions. Identifiable information includes 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]. If you are redacting the institution that has provided ethics approval or exemption, replace it with [Institutional REB].
- 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 using the format [Author] or [Redacted].
- Use the third person for self-citations. For example, write "[1] showed …, " not "we have previously shown in [1] …".
- 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.

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

All authors listed must approve the submission. When submitting the structured abstract and/or the full paper, you will be asked to indicate:

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

Reviews of the structured abstracts and full papers

Review rubrics will be created, based on the description and expectations for each track outlined above in this document. These rubrics will be posted on the Call for Submissions webpage. At least two reviewers will independently complete the review of each submission. Decisions regarding individual submissions will be made based on the reviewers' feedback.

Revision Procedures:

The decision about each submission will be one of the following options:

- Accepted, with minor revisions
- Major revisions required
- Rejected

Authors whose papers are accepted with minor revisions are strongly encouraged to consider review feedback to further strengthen their papers before uploading the final version to Oxford Abstracts by March 26, 2027. Authors whose papers required major revisions must thoroughly revise their papers in response to reviewer feedback and resubmit their revised paper by March 26, 2027 for another review. Only if the revisions are found to be satisfactory will these papers be accepted and included in

the Conference Proceedings. Authors of papers requiring major revision that are accepted after the additional review must upload the final version to Oxford Abstracts by April 19, 2027.

Reciprocity in Submissions with Reviewing Duties

The submissions to the CEEA-ACÉG Conference have been growing every year. We deeply appreciate our members dedicating their time and expertise to support the peer review process. To ensure that peer reviews are completed on time, we will require authors who submit to the 2027 Conference to review others' submissions. We will aim to make the number of reviews equitable across members.