



## ASEE Educational Research and Methods (ERM) Division 2025 Call for Papers, Workshops, Panels, and Special Sessions

---

Change for 2024: Page limits will be strictly enforced at the DRAFT STAGE as well as the Final Paper stage. Papers exceeding the page limits will be rejected.

Deadlines are set and enforced by ASEE; please refer to the ASEE website.

### Overview

The ASEE Educational Research and Methods (ERM) Division is now accepting abstracts leading to papers for the ASEE Annual Conference & Exhibition to be held in June 2025. ASEE is using the New Monolith (NEMO) as its paper management system. There are several stages of the submission process that require peer review. As common courtesy, if you submit to this division, you are expected to review for the division (commensurate with the number of submissions) to support the number of reviewers required for each paper (each author team reviews approximately three abstracts/papers for each one submitted). ERM upholds standards for professionalism and quality in engineering education research that is supported by a thoughtful, thorough, and constructive peer review process. These standards of excellence also extend to the presentation of papers at the conference.

The ERM Division's primary objectives welcome scholarship that cuts across topical areas and populations of interest and relate to any of the following:

- Promotion, use, and development of high-quality educational research and methodologies on engineering formation, learning, and instruction
- Spread of knowledge on the scholarship of engineering teaching and learning
- Research related to improving engineering instruction through the development of innovative materials and techniques, sound instructional design, novel programmatic structures, and improved evaluation methodologies.
- Research on diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice in engineering education

### Paper Categories and Lengths

Scholarship considered appropriate for the ERM division can fall into one of three categories pertaining to its impact on educational research and methods (see Table 1) and one of three lengths (Table 2). **Any of the three categories may be represented at any of the three lengths.** While ERM supports research across all populations and subdisciplines of engineering, authors studying specific contexts should consider the audience to be correspondingly broad.

**Papers submitted to the ERM division can be one of three lengths: Full paper, research brief, and work in progress** (see Table 2, includes templates). Each length has its own page limits (excluding references and appendices) that **will be strictly enforced** in order to reduce reviewer workload and enhance pathways to journal publications. Papers exceeding the page limits will be **rejected** at both the DRAFT and FINAL paper stages. We highly encourage concise writing to prompt authors to formulate and articulate their ideas in more powerful and useful ways. Consider submitting your work to the new Research Brief paper category, which is intended for work that has been accomplished but also has journal aspirations; this category is meant as a useful step toward journal

publication that presents a narrow portion of findings. **Paper templates** are provided for each paper length and are linked in Table 3. **Only Full Papers will be considered for the ERM Best Paper and Best Diversity Paper awards.**

**Table 1: ERM Paper Categories**

Paper Category	Description
Empirical Research Papers	Contributes new knowledge to the field of engineering education research based on the collection and analysis of data through a research study.
Theory or Methods Papers	Contribute a new understanding or application of theory / method within the field of engineering education research. Papers in this category may include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) reviews, meta-analyses;</li> <li>2) theory/method-focused work situated in the context of prior literature to reveal relationships, patterns or models, procedures;</li> <li>3) papers that extend or critique existing theories/methods through evidence</li> </ol>
Evidence-based Practice Papers	Contribute <i>new</i> practices (e.g., pedagogy, tools, interventions) to the field of engineering education with scholarly evidence. Present an analysis of one or more engineering education practices (e.g., teaching approaches, uses of instructional technologies, institutional strategies to support student success, etc.) and include rationale, assessment methods, evidence of effectiveness, and/or achievement of desired outcomes.

**Table 2: ERM Paper Lengths (cont. on p. 3)**

Length	Description	Page Limits**
Full Paper <a href="#">Access the Full Paper Template</a>	<p>Paper presents a full study or project, complete with all aspects of an engineering education research paper (see <a href="#">JEE guidelines</a> for elaboration on typical parts of educational papers). Can represent empirical research, methods or theory papers, or evidence-based practice.</p> <p>Full papers are useful for authors with complete studies who want to write a longer paper to capture complete findings. Full papers are eligible for ERM Best Paper Awards.</p>	<p>Range: 7-10 pages (10 max), Single-spaced, 12-point Font</p>
Research Brief <a href="#">Access the Research Brief Template</a>	<p>Papers describe narrower subset of findings from a completed study (rather than a concise version of full results) with the intention that a longer paper is in preparation for journal publication. Standard components of engineering education papers will be reflected (see <a href="#">JEE guidelines</a> for elaboration). Can represent empirical research, theory or methods papers, or evidence-based practice.</p> <p>Research Briefs are useful for authors with complete studies who would like to document progress at conference, but would prefer to save most findings from the study for a journal paper.</p>	<p>Range: 3-6 pages (6 max), Single-spaced, 12-point font</p>

Length	Description	Page Limits**
Work in Progress  <a href="#">Access the WIP Template</a>	Work in Progress (WIP) papers <i>raise awareness of future research and directions for the field of engineering education research</i> . WIP papers present preliminary findings from studies that are at an early to intermediate stage, for which authors seek feedback from the community.  WIP papers are useful for researchers who have preliminary data from research at an early or intermediate stage and are seeking feedback from the community.	Range: 2-4 pages (4 max), Single-spaced, 12-point font

\*\*Page limits do not include references and appendices

## Abstract Guidelines

**The first sentence of the abstract should indicate the paper category (i.e., Empirical Research, Methods/Theory, or Evidence-Based Practice) and the length of the paper (i.e., Full Paper, Research Brief, or WIP).** At the end of the abstract, identify *3-5 keywords for your paper to aid in the review process*. Consider employing the *EER Taxonomy* ([LINK](#)) to identify keywords. Evaluation criteria for the different paper categories is detailed in Table 3; paper length will not deeply affect the content of the abstracts, with the exception of WIP papers, which will summarize preliminary findings.

**Abstracts should follow the Abstract Format Guidelines provided by ASEE.** The abstract should contain sufficient information to enable reviewers to determine its suitability for presentation in the ERM Division, including the motivation for the study, the theoretical framework and methods employed, findings, and implications for the work. The ERM Division uses a double-anonymized review process when reviewing abstracts and papers, and it is the **authors' responsibility to ensure that the requirements for anonymized review are met**. Authors' names and institutions should **not** be included in the text, file name, or document properties of an abstract or paper submitted for review. Please ensure that any descriptive features about the context in which research was performed (e.g., if the research was conducted on a program at a particular university) are completely anonymized. Consider using pseudonyms or other placeholders for the program and the university (e.g., "A large mid-Atlantic public university").

**Table 3: Evaluation Criteria for Abstracts (cont. on p. 4)**

Paper Category	Abstract Evaluation Criteria
<b>Empirical Research Papers</b> Research papers contribute new knowledge to the field of engineering education research based on the collection and analysis of data through a research study.	The abstract will highlight the emergence of new findings situated in the context of prior findings, including motivation and background of the work, methods, results, and implications of the work and/or future directions for research.

Paper Category	Abstract Evaluation Criteria
<p><b>Theory Papers or Method Papers</b></p> <p>Theory papers or method papers <i>contribute a new understanding or application of theory /method within the field of engineering education research</i>: These papers include reviews, meta-analyses, evidence-based critiques, or other theory/method-focused work situated in the context of previous literature to reveal relationships, patterns or models, procedures, or extend/critiquing existing theories/methods.</p>	<p>The abstract should address the motivation and background of the work, theoretical/methodological framework(s) and sources, and significance.</p>
<p><b>Evidence-Based Practice Papers</b></p> <p>Evidence-based practice papers contribute new practices to the field of engineering education with scholarly evidence: These papers present an analysis of one or more engineering education practices (e.g., teaching approaches, uses of instructional technologies, institutional strategies to support student success, etc.)</p>	<p>The abstract should address the motivation for the educational innovation/intervention, a summary of the intervention or educational practice, and a summary of the methods employed to assess the effectiveness or achievement of desired outcomes. The abstract will include a summary of findings and implications for future scholarship of teaching and learning or engineering educators.</p>

## Paper Guidelines

**The first sentence of the paper should indicate the paper category (Research, Methods/Theory, or Evidence-Based Practice) and the length of the paper (Full paper, research brief, or WIP).** This procedure helps us select reviewers and helps the reviewers provide the best possible review in alignment with your goals for the paper. No author names or affiliation information are to be included in any category or length of draft papers, and the body of all manuscripts should be fully blinded for review. Submissions are reviewed anonymously.

### *Full Paper and Research Brief Guidelines*

**Full Papers:** Maximum of 10 pages, single spaced, 12-point font (not including references or appendices). **Research Brief:** Maximum of 6 pages, single spaced, 12-point font (not including references or appendices).

Full papers and research briefs can present findings on empirical research, theory or methods, and evidence-based practice. Papers must follow the ASEE formatting guidelines provided by ASEE, and the page limits set by the ERM Division (see page range and templates in Table 2. Following best practices for publishable and quality educational scholarship, most papers will include a review of relevant literature to motivate the research questions or objective, theory, methods, findings or results, discussion and implications, and conclusions. Do consider addressing the positionalities of the author team to contextualize research decisions and choices.

### *Work-In-Progress Guidelines*

Maximum of 4 pages, single spaced, 12-point font (not including references or appendices).

Manuscripts are understood to be at an early to intermediate stage of research papers and, thus, shorter in length than a full paper. The purpose of the WIP papers is to allow researchers to get feedback on early-stage research projects that may not have substantive results yet. WIP papers may not exceed 4 pages in length (not including references) and must provide sufficient information for the reader to understand the potential significance of the work and the approach being used. Authors are strongly encouraged to provide preliminary results or initial findings. WIP papers will be evaluated on the following: motivation and background of the work, methods, results (or anticipated results), significance, and potential interest to the ERM community.

### *Evaluation Criteria for Draft Papers*

- The paper must be **complete** (not an outline), polished, and professional to read, adhering to all standards of scholarly writing (based on the type of paper), including editing, reference formatting, and inclusion of all results. The authors should not expect to make substantial additions or changes to the manuscript outside of those responding to reviewer comments.
- Authors should comply with the page limit maximums (not including reference or appendices) commensurate with the length of paper selected.
- The research, theory, methods development, or evidence-based practice is likely to interest a broad group of engineering education researchers and/or practitioners.
- The work builds on relevant references, including bodies of knowledge from diverse authors.
- Papers are grounded in the appropriate use of theory and quality methods (and selection of methodology), as per standards of engineering education research.
- The findings or ideas presented are generalizable or transferable to other settings.
- The paper is clear and coherent.
- The study is original and innovative.
- The study advances engineering education research and/or practice.
- The authors use non-biased language (refer to APA Manual 7th edition).

We expect authors to avoid perpetuating deficit narratives, associations of race or gender as a predictor for discrepancies in achievement or discuss discrepancies based on race, culture, gender, sexuality, or disability as an expected finding without clear discussion regarding the underlying issues that would cause such discrepancies. In addition, we ask authors to report participant demographics, when appropriate, and the associated limitations and implications based on the participants studied. For more information, please refer to ASEE resources on anti-racism and equity [\[LINK\]](#).

### **Revision Procedures**

After undergoing peer review, papers are either accepted, require revisions, or are rejected based on the consensus of the reviewer comments and synthesized by the program chairs. Authors whose manuscripts are accepted are strongly encouraged to consider reviewer feedback and comments to further strengthen their papers before uploading the final camera-ready document into the NEMO system by the deadline. Papers that have revisions requested must appropriately and fully revise their documents in response to reviewer comments, with the understanding that there is no guarantee that the paper will be accepted in the second round of review. Revised drafts will be resubmitted to the NEMO system and will undergo a second review before final decisions are released. Authors are welcome to submit responses to the reviewers within their revised drafts that are not included in the

final paper or the page count to aid in the re-review process. These submissions are also reviewed anonymously. No author or affiliation information is to be included on draft revision; all papers must be fully anonymized for review. If your revised paper is rejected and you would like to contest the rejection, ERM has a formal appeal process.

## Final Paper Upload

After acceptance, it is the authors' responsibility to upload final camera-ready versions of their papers by the deadline. At this time, all anonymous indicators must be removed, all co-authors should be confirmed, and authors should be registered for the conference (indicating who the presenting author will be). No changes to papers can be made after this submission. At this time, authors should also ensure that their biographical information is up to date in the NEMO system so that papers accurately pull names, titles, institutional information, and biographies.

## ERM Authorship Guidelines

ASEE currently has a copyright and plagiarism policy for all authors. However, there are no standard ASEE guidelines for authorship or requirement for author contribution statements. To assist authors, the ERM Directors developed the following set of recommended authorship guidelines. Authors should satisfy four criteria:

1. Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
2. Drafting the work or reviewing it critically for important intellectual content; AND
3. Final approval of the version to be published; AND
4. Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Contributors who do not satisfy all four criteria can be acknowledged in the publication but should not be listed as authors. Examples of contributing activities that should be acknowledged include: Conceptualization; Methodology; Software; Validation; Formal Analysis; Investigation; Resources; Data Curation; Visualization; Supervision; and Project Administration; Funding Acquisition. Those acknowledged should be aware and have granted permission.

At submission, authors should disclose any use of artificial intelligence (AI)-assisted technologies (such as Large Language Models [LLMs], chatbots, or image creators) in the production of the submitted work and how they used it. AI-assisted technologies should not be listed as authors because they cannot be responsible for the accuracy, integrity, and originality of the work.

Draft submissions made to the ERM division should have a complete authors' list. ERM does not monitor changes (addition or removal) of authors between the draft and final submissions. The authors share collective responsibility, determining that all authors meet all four criteria at all stages of their submission. It is not the role of ERM to determine who qualifies or not for authorship or to intervene in authorship conflicts.

## Call for Proposals: Special Sessions, Panels, and Workshops

ERM is soliciting proposals for Workshops (2-4 hours usually on the first day of the conference during the conference workshop time slot), Special Sessions, and Panels (both held during a 90- minute technical session time slots). **Applications will open September 1, 2024 and are due by October 15, 2024.**

### *Special Session and Panel Proposals*

**Maximum 2 pages** (not including references). Proposals for Special Sessions or Panels submitted through the ERM Division should be submitted via this Google Form (<https://forms.gle/Mz1SR4UCzuB54XWF7>) and **NOT** through the New Monolith (NEMO) system. Proposals should include the following information:

- **A description** of the session/panel, including its purpose, format, learning goals, content, and activities.
- **An explanation** of why the non-traditional/panel format is needed to accomplish the learning goals.
- **A list of presenters/facilitators/panelists**, a brief biography of each, their role in the session (e.g., moderator, speaker, panelist, etc.), and their contact information. Also include a brief justification for their ability to successfully accomplish the stated goals.
- **A public facing session description** for NEMO (if the proposal is accepted and scheduled).

Proposals will be reviewed and selected by the ERM leadership team **to be forwarded for further consideration by ASEE, which makes the final decision.** Acceptance of a Special Session or Panel proposal by ERM does not guarantee that it will appear in the final program.

### *Workshop Proposals*

**Maximum 3 pages** (not including references). Proposals for Workshops submitted through the ERM should be submitted via this Google Form (<https://forms.gle/Mz1SR4UCzuB54XWF7>) and **NOT** through the NEMO system. Proposals should include the following information:

- **A description** of the session, including its purpose, format, learning goals, content, and activities.
- **A schedule** of workshop activities.
- **An explanation** of why the non-traditional format is needed to accomplish the learning goals.
- **A list of presenters/facilitators**, a brief biography of each, their role in the session (e.g., moderator, speaker, panelist, etc.), and their contact information. Also include a brief justification for their ability to successfully accomplish the stated goals.
- **A public facing workshop description** for NEMO (if the proposal is accepted and scheduled).

All workshops have a \$150 fee. If the workshop is approved by the ERM leadership team, it is then submitted to ASEE by the ERM Division Program Chairs. The submission to ASEE will include additional information such as estimated attendance, estimated ticket cost, and responsible party to subsidize the expense if tickets don't cover the entire cost of the event (ASEE charges for the room, audio-visual, etc.), expected food and beverage requests, and audio-visual needs.

## Closing Comments from the 2025 ERM Program Chairs

We are looking forward to seeing you all at ASEE 2025 in Montreal. As you prepare your papers and presentations, consider best practices in verbal communication, presentation, and if you wish, you may consider embedding novel or interactive components into your talks. While some may feel comfortable with non-traditional presentations, we also recognize that conferences are a place for graduate students and others to learn to give formal technical presentations, so we encourage folks to consider their message and audience as they design their presentations.

If you have questions, please contact the ERM 2025 program chairs by emailing [jessica.deters@unl.edu](mailto:jessica.deters@unl.edu) and [cassandra.mccall@usu.edu](mailto:cassandra.mccall@usu.edu). Please copy both program chairs on any emails to facilitate a faster response time.

We are looking forward to a productive year and coming together around great scholarship!

Your 2025 ERM Program Chairs,

Jessica Deters, Ph.D. and Cassandra McCall, Ph.D.

