

Editorial from the 2011 Program Committee

The ascilite 2011 program committee is pleased to report on the submissions, review and selection of full and concise papers, symposiums, workshops and posters for presentation at the Hobart conference. We are pleased with the levels of submissions and presentations this year particularly in light of a number of factors that we believe are influencing submission and presentation patterns across and beyond the ascilite community (See Tables 1 and 2). First, the current financial climate and its consequential impact on tertiary and other education sectors has made it difficult for some researchers to participate in our conference. Communication from authors has indicated that acute financial considerations in their own institutions have impacted on their capacity to attend ascilite and present their work. Second, associated with the financial situation is the need for most delegates to commit to increased travel costs associated with the conference being held in Hobart, Tasmania. Third, the increasing pressures on researchers to publish their research in premium journals combined with the contentious Australian Research Council (ARC) Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) (tiered) rankings appear to have had some impact, particularly on submission type, in the Australasian region. This is discussed more fully below in relation to table 2.

Table 1: No. of submissions and presentations at ascilite Hobart 2011

Category	Sub	Full papers		Concise Papers		Posters		Workshops/ Symposia		Reject	Withdraw After Acceptance
		Acc	Pres	Acc	Pres	Acc	Pres	Acc	Pres		
Full	88	73	66	9	9	-	-	-	-	6	7
Concise	79	-	-	74	69	-	-	-	-	5	5
Workshops	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	6	-	5
Posters	26	-	-	-	-	26	21	-	-	-	4
Symposia	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	11	-	-
Total	214	73	66	83	78	26	21	21	17	11	21

In 2011 (see Table 1), 88 full papers were submitted with 73 accepted and 66 presenting at the conference. Of the 73 accepted 30 were initially conditionally accepted, with the requirement being that the author(s) provided the program committee with a summary of how the feedback from the reviewers had been considered in the revised paper. All 30 papers were submitted with revisions made and evidence that the reviewers' comments had been well considered. Of the 88 submitted full papers 15 were rejected as full papers. Of the 15 rejected for this category 9 were accepted as concise (9 presenting), and 6 were rejected outright.

Of the 79 concise papers submitted, 5 were rejected outright. Of the 74 accepted 27 were initially conditionally accepted, with the requirement being that the author(s) provided the program committee with a summary of how the feedback from the reviewers had been considered in the revised paper. All 27 papers were submitted with revisions made and evidence that the reviewers' comments had been well considered.

The quality of proposed workshops, posters and symposia was high. All workshops, posters and symposia were accepted. Of the 10 accepted workshops, 1 was withdrawn before workshop enrolments opened and 3 were cancelled once it became evident that the number of enrolments to ensure costs were met were unlikely to be achieved. As with previous conferences, workshop

attendance required the registrant to pay an additional fee on top of the conference registration. Twenty-one (21) of the accepted posters were presented. The program committee was impressed with the range of symposium topics and the proposed format of sessions. It is felt that the symposium proposal template and the symposium proceedings template facilitated the development of symposia that aimed to engage the audience in the discussions consistent with the three conference sub-themes: equity of experience, engagement and evidence-based practice.

It is interesting that 12 papers and 5 posters were withdrawn after they were accepted for presentation. Whether this is more than in previous conferences is unknown. Whilst some withdrawals are to be expected the program committee recommends that future conferences continue to collect these statistics to assist in gaining a better understanding of the numbers involved and the reasons.

Table 2 compares the number of submission and presentation types at ascilite conferences since 2002 (excluding workshops, symposia and other interactive sessions). In 2011, the number of concise refereed papers that were presented exceeded the number of full papers presented. This is indicative of a trend that shows a decline in the number of full papers submitted relative to the number of concise papers submitted. For example, Singapore 2007 saw 109 full papers submitted to 63 concise (ratio 1.73), Melbourne 2008 saw 114 full papers submitted to 86 concise (ratio 1.31), Auckland 2009 saw 104 full papers to 87 concise (ratio 1.19), Sydney 2010 saw 82 full papers to 71 concise (ratio 1.15) and Hobart 2011 saw 88 full papers submitted to 79 concise (ratio 1.11). It may well be that refereed concise papers are increasingly preferred because they are less time consuming to write and yet still provide an opportunity to report on research work, get peer feedback and review and make connections across our academic communities. This course of action can be of great benefit during the process of writing a full journal publication. Certainly this submission preference is a trend to monitor across the tertiary education sector and may be worthy of further investigation.

Table 2: Numbers of presentations at ascilite Conferences 2002-2011

	Auck 02	Adel 03	Perth 04	Bris 05	Syd 06	Sing 07	Melb 08	Auck 09	Syd 10	Hob 11*
Total no. subs received	185	118	153	119	194	195	216	226	186	193
Total no. presentations	124	109	131	96	152	166	162	180	155	165
Full papers submitted	n/a	n/a	104	82	108	109	113	104	82	88
Concise papers submitted	n/a	n/a	44	29	72	63	86	87	71	79
Full Papers presented	76	60	68	56	69	80	76	72	57	66
Concise Papers presented	31	38	51	30	53	46	59	69	62	78
Poster Presentations	17	11	12	10	30	40	27	39	36	21

** The table does not record numbers of workshop, special session or symposia submissions and presentations. Melbourne 2001 numbers are from the Conference website. Numbers for others are from the printed Proceedings and the websites. There are some minor discrepancies between Programs and Proceedings, presumably due to cancellations, not detailed in this table.

Table 3, monitors ascilite conference submissions and acceptances on a regional basis.

Table 3: Origins of submissions and acceptance rates of full and concise papers by country

Countries or city (a)	No. Submissions	% of Submissions	No Accepted (b)	% Accepted
Australia	109	65.3%	102	93.6%
New Zealand	24	14.4%	23	95.8%
United Kingdom	5	3.0%	5	100%
Malaysia	3	1.8%	2	66.7%
Hong Kong	4	2.4%	4	100%
Singapore	12	7.2%	12	100%
USA	3	1.8%	2	66.7%
South Africa	2	1.1%	2	100%
Others (c)	5	3.0%	4	80%
TOTAL	167	100%	156	93.4%

a. Determined from address or home country of the first author.

b. Accepted as full or concise papers. (This includes the withdrawals that transpired post acceptance)

c. One each from Japan, Sweden, Switzerland, Qatar and Dubai.

Table 4 monitors acceptance rates for full refereed papers. The acceptance rates for 2011 are slightly higher than for 2010, and higher than usual for pre-2010 conferences. It is important to note that the review procedure was as rigorous as in previous years. Reviewers were appointed on the basis of their expertise and experience in areas relevant for the conference and the paper. This approach has facilitated a uniformly high standard of reviewing over many years. Most of our Reviewers are 'experienced' and it is not necessary for Reviewers to be members of ascilite or to be registered for the Conference. We also encourage the induction of 'novice' Reviewers, to broaden the Reviewer pool, and to produce 'experienced' Reviewers in the future. A reviews allocated to a 'novice' Reviewer is also allocated to an 'experienced' Reviewer, and is backed up by Program Committee reviews, if appropriate. All reviewers were provided with guidelines and each paper was at least double-blind reviewed according to the following criteria:

- Quality of research
- Originality and scholarly contribution
- Relevance and suitability to ascilite 2011
- Quality of written presentation

As with previous conferences, one of the purposes for the review process is to obtain Department of Innovation, Industry, Science and Research (DIISR) recognition of work, in the conference publication category, as articulated in the 2010 Higher Education Research Data Collection documentation. The Committee confirms that refereed papers accepted for ascilite 2011 Conference publication:

- meet the definition of research in relation to creativity, originality, and increasing humanity's stock of knowledge;
- are selected on the basis of a DIISR compliant peer review process (independent, qualified expert review; double blind reviews conducted on the full articles, prior to publication);

- are published and presented at a conference having national and international significance as evidenced by registrations and participation; and
- are made available widely through the Conference web site.

Table 4: Full paper acceptance rates for ascilite Conferences

Year	No. full papers submitted	No. of full papers accepted*	% acceptance
2011	88	73	83.0%
2010	82	66	80.5%
2009	104	77	74.0%
2008	113	81	71.7%
2007	109	81	74.3%
2006	108	71	65.7%
2005	82	58	70.7%
2004	104	69	66.3%

Average acceptance rate 2004-2011: 73.3%

* Does not include full papers that were accepted subject to revision to concise format

ascilite is privileged to attract such a large and diverse panel of volunteers for conducting double-blind peer review on full and concise papers (Table 5). The majority of reviewers received two papers. As review deadlines passed there was a need to reallocate some papers for which feedback had not been received from the allocated reviewer(s). Members of the ascilite executive committee, with a wealth of experiences, assisted by agreeing to review some additional papers. A total of 153 reviewers completed a review of at least one paper, and in most cases two.

Table 5: Origins of reviewers by country

Countries Or City Or Province	No	%
Australia (.au)	115	75.2%
New Zealand (.nz)	13	8.5%
Singapore (.sg)	6	3.9%
United Kingdom (.uk)	7	4.6%
Malaysia (.my)	5	3.2%
Other: Canada (1), Hong Kong (1), Japan (2), USA (1), Chile (1), Greece (1)	7	4.6%
TOTAL	153	100%

Editorial: Dr Gary Williams for the ascilite Hobart 2011 Program Committee

Data compilation: Dr Gary Williams (for 2011 data) and Dr Dominique Parrish (dom@ascilite.org.au) for pre-2011 data.

2011 Reviewers

Shirley Agostinho	University of Wollongong	Australia
Peter Albion	University of Southern Queensland	Australia
Rozz Albon	Bond University	Australia
Belinda Allen	University of New South Wales	Australia
Reem Al-Mahmood	University of Melbourne	Australia
Alan Anderson	University of Newcastle	Australia
Martin Andrew	Swinburne University Of Technology	Australia
Trish Andrews	The University of Queensland	Australia

Roger Atkinson	AJET	Australia
Stephanie Beames	Queensland University of Technology	Australia
Carolyn Beasley	Swinburne University of Technology	Australia
Robyn Benson	Monash University	Australia
Marsha Berry	RMIT University	Australia
Peter Blakey	Australian Catholic University	Australia
Claire Bradley	London Metropolitan University	United Kingdom
Dave Bremer	Otago Polytechnic	New Zealand
Chris Brook	Curtin University	Australia
Claire Brooks	La Trobe University	Australia
Mark Brown	Massey University	New Zealand
Matthew Butler	Monash University	Australia
David Cameron	The University of Newcastle	Australia
Chris Campbell	The University of Queensland	Australia
Dianne Chambers	The University of Melbourne	Australia
Shanton Chang	The University of Melbourne	Australia
Lee Chien Ching	Nanyang Technological University	Singapore
Eddy Chong	Nanyang Technological University	Singapore
John Clayton	Waikato Institute of Technology	New Zealand
Dawn Coburn	University of Otago	New Zealand
Thomas Cochrane	Unitec	New Zealand
Gráinne Conole	The Open University	United Kingdom
Linda Corrin	University of Wollongong	Australia
Pippa Craig	Australian National University	Australia
Geoffrey Crisp	RMIT University	Australia
Barney Dalgarno	Charles Sturt University	Australia
Kashmira Dave	University of Sydney	Australia
Shane Dawson	University of British Columbia	Canada
Phillip Dawson	Deakin University	Australia
Shanti Divaharan	Nanyang Technological University	Singapore
Kathryn Dixon	Curtin University	Australia
Iain Doherty	University of Auckland	Australia
Peter Donnan	University of Canberra	Australia
Ainslie Ellis	Monash University	Australia
Helen Farley	University of Southern Queensland	Australia
Malcolm Field	Hakodate Future University	Japan
Sally Firmin	University of Ballarat	Australia
Mark Freeman	The University of Sydney	Australia
Phillipa Gerbic	Auckland University of Technology	New Zealand
Carlos González	Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chil	Chile
Maree Gosper	Macquarie University	Australia
Elizabeth Greener	Queensland University of Technology	Australia
Sue Gregory	University of New England	Australia
Tim Griffin	University of Western Sydney	Australia
Paul Gruba	University of Melbourne	Australia
Margaret Hamilton	RMIT University	Australia
Boris Handal	University of Notre Dame	Australia

John Hannon	La Trobe University	Australia
Neil Harris	Griffith University	Australia
Michael Henderson	Monash University	Australia
Jan Herrington	Murdoch University	Australia
Tony Herrington	Curtin University	Australia
Kian-Sam Hong	Universiti Malaysia Sarawak	Malaysia
Henk Huijser	University of Southern Queensland	Australia
Azilawati Jamaludin	National Institute of Education	Singapore
Romina Jamieson-Proctor	University of Southern Queensland	Australia
Athanassios Jimoyiannis	University of Peloponnese	Greece
Diana Jonas-Dwyer	The University of Western Australia	Australia
Anthony Jones	The University of Melbourne	Australia
Deborah Jones	The University of Melbourne	Australia
Terry Judd	The University of Melbourne	Australia
Matthew Kearney	University of Technology, Sydney	Australia
Benjamin Kehrwald	University of South Australia	Australia
Jo-Anne Kelder	University of Tasmania	Australia
Oriel Kelly	Manukau Institute of Technology	New Zealand
Shannon Kennedy-Clark	The University of Sydney	Australia
Mike Keppell	Charles Sturt University	Australia
Giedre Kligyte	University of New South Wales	Australia
Gerry Kregor	University of Tasmania	Australia
Paul Lam	The Chinese University of Hong Kong	Hong Kong
Tay Lee Yong	Beacon Primary School	Singapore
Geraldine Lefoe	University of Wollongong	Australia
Tan Li Peng	Tunku Abdul Rahman College	Malaysia
Andrew Litchfield	University of Technology, Sydney	Australia
Jason Lodge	Griffith University	Australia
Claire Macken	Deakin University	Australia
Lina Markauskaite	The University of Sydney	Australia
Stephen Marshall	Victoria University of Wellington	New Zealand
Kenn Martin	The University of Western Australia	Australia
Mark McMahon	Edith Cowan University	Australia
Margot McNeill	Macquarie University	Australia
Nona Muldoon	Central Queensland University	Australia
Robyn Nash	Queensland University of Technology	Australia
Leanne Ngo	Deakin University	Australia
Angela Nicolettou	Swinburne University of Technology	Australia
Maria Northcote	Avondale College	Australia
Mark Northover	Auckland University of Technology	New Zealand
Sheena O'Hare	Curtin University	Australia
James Oldfield	Unitec	New Zealand
Ian Olney	University Of Western Sydney	Australia
Stuart Palmer	Deakin University	Australia
Linda Pannan	La Trobe University	Australia
Elaine Pearson	Teesside University	United Kingdom
Heather Petrie	NPS: Better choices, better health	Australia
John Pettit	The Open University	United Kingdom

Robyn Philip	Queensland University of Technology	Australia
Rob Phillips	Murdoch University	Australia
Catherine Pocknee	Swinburne University	Australia
Greg Preston	The University of Newcastle	Australia
Kevin Pyatt	Eastern Washington University	United States of America
Rosanne Quinnell	The University of Sydney	Australia
Lynnae Rankine	University of Western Sydney	Australia
Petrea Redmond	University of Southern Queensland	Australia
Diane Robbie	Swinburne University of Technology	Australia
Stephen Rowe	Southern Cross University	Australia
Gayani Samarawickrema	Deakin University	Australia
Leanne Sandor	Australian Catholic University	Australia
Michael Sankey	University of Southern Queensland	Australia
Eunice Sari	Edith Cowan University	Australia
Mark Schier	Swinburne University of Technology	Australia
Ingrid Scholten	Flinders University	Australia
Sandra Schuck	University of Technology, Sydney	Australia
Lou Siragusa	Curtin University	Australia
Mark Smithers	RMIT University	Australia
Emma Somogyi	Queensland University of Technology	Australia
Caroline Steel	University of Queensland	Australia
Cherry Stewart	University of New England	Australia
Trudy Stoddard	Tabor Adelaide	Australia
Katrina Strampel	Edith Cowan University	Australia
Jennie Swann	Auckland University of Technology	New Zealand
Denise Mary Sweeney	University of Leicester	United Kingdom
Zaidatun Tasir	Universiti Teknologi Malaysia	Malaysia
Rosemary Thomson	University of Western Sydney	Australia
Mary S. Thorpe	The Open University	United Kingdom
SueTickner	University of Auckland	New Zealand
Rhondda Tilbrook	Murdoch University	Australia
Janet Toland	Victoria University of Wellington	New Zealand
Geraldine Torrisi-Steele	Griffith University	Australia
Neo Tse Kian	Multimedia University	Malaysia
Michael Vallance	Future University Hakodate	Japan
Thea van de Mortel	Southern Cross University	Australia
Deborah Veness	The Australian National University	Australia
Elena Verezub	Swinburne University of Technology	Australia
Peter Vitartas	Southern Cross University	Australia
Lyndon Walker	Swinburne University of Technology	Australia
Mary-Helen Ward	University of Sydney	Australia
Jenny Waycott	University of Melbourne	Australia
Nicola Whitton	Manchester Metropolitan University	United Kingdom
Julie Willems	University of New England	Australia
Greg Williams	Charles Darwin University	Australia
Lisa Wise	Swinburne University of Technology	Australia
Lung Hsiang Wong	National Institute of Education, Singapore	Singapore

Jon Yorke
Loi Yaw Yuen
Lynette Zeeng

Curtin University
Tunku Abdul Rahman College
Swinburne University

Australia
Malaysia
Australia

