ascilite 2008 Melbourne

Hello! Where are you in the landscape of educational technology?

Call for papers information

Theme

Following highly successful conferences in Auckland'02, Adelaide'03, Perth'04, Brisbane'05, Sydney'06 and Singapore'07, Melbourne is the venue for ascilite's 25th annual conference. Hosted in Melbourne by Deakin University, ascilite 2008 will address many important questions of relevance to the ascilite community.

The ascilite 2008 conference theme is **'Hello! Where are you in the landscape of educational technology?'** The ascilite 2008 conference provides a set of critical and pressing questions to prompt you in your thinking and shape informed approaches. We invite you to reflect on past and current conceptions of the nature and dynamics of the educational technology landscape and ask you to consider your place in the following ways:

- Leading for unknown futures - who leads and for what purposes in the changing landscape?
- The emergence of Web 2.0 in the educational technology landscape - everybody's talking, is anyone learning?
- Who owns educational technology in the changing landscape - closed systems, open source, many agendas?
- How can students, educators, researchers and institutions act with integrity online in the educational technology landscape?
- What does it mean to be an online scholar in the educational technology landscape – who, what, when, where, how and why?
- Generation Why? Educational technology enabling learning for all students in the landscape.
- What are the changing relationships between people, the virtual and the physical, and objects in the educational technology landscape?
- The internationalisation and globalisation of the educational technology landscape - how far, how effectively, for what purposes?
- What counts as innovation in the educational technology landscape?

You are invited to develop proposals for full papers, concise papers, posters and workshops, noting a key date: the **submission deadline** for papers and workshops is **30 July 2008**.

To explore the range of topics and perspectives we expect to be represented at ascilite 2008, please browse ascilite's journal AJET and the proceedings from previous ascilite conferences that are linked to the ascilite conferences web page including:

- Singapore07
- Sydney06

Deadlines

The ascilite 2008 conference theme is **'Hello! Where are you in the landscape of educational technology?'**

You are invited to develop proposals for full papers, concise papers, posters and workshops for ascilite 2008. The submission deadlines for all papers and proposals are:

- **Deadline for full and concise papers - 30 July 2008**
- Deadline for all workshop proposals - 30 July 2008
- Deadline for all poster proposals - 15 October 2008
- Reviewing process - 20 August to 10 September 2008
- Completed reviews sent back to authors - 24 to 26 September 2008
- Revised papers due - 13 October 2008
- Workshops - 30 November 2008
- Conference presentations - 1 to 3 December 2008

Categories

Full papers
Full papers should not exceed ten pages. Page limits include references. In addition to the page limits, there is a file size limit for all categories: not exceeding 2 MB. Please refer to the formatting page for details of page size, margins and fonts. You are limited to one first authorship for a paper, although there is no limit on the number of times a person may appear as an author other than first. Full papers are expected to contain major reviews or to report on large case studies, evaluations, developments or projects.

Concise papers
Concise papers should not exceed four pages. Page limits include references. In addition to the page limits, there is a file size limit for all categories: not exceeding 2 MB. Please refer to the formatting

page for details of page size, margins and fonts. You are limited to one first authorship for a paper, although there is no limit on the number of times a person may appear as an author other than first. Concise papers may be accepted for full or concise presentation. Concise papers are intended to provide an avenue for work in progress, for pilot studies, small scale exploratory projects, reports on highly specialised topics or brief studies on recent developments. Concise papers also encompass presentations which review key new directions for developing research based best practices and for conducting research into practices in technology supported teaching and learning.

Posters

Poster presentation proposals should not exceed two pages. Poster display panels will cater for A1 size, 841 x 594 mm, and landscape orientation is recommended. Poster summaries will appear in the Proceedings. Posters do not count towards the limit of one first authorship for papers.

Workshops

Workshops constitute the Conference's most direct contribution towards staff development and professional development in educational technology and related topics. In many cases the workshops are derived from staff development activities conducted previously at the presenters' own institutions. Workshops enable participants to work with experts in specific areas to acquire knowledge, enhance skills and develop broader perspectives. These are not research presentations, although some workshops may include topics in research skills and techniques. Workshops are longer sessions, typically half day or full day, to enable detailed discussion and interactive consideration of substantial topics and issues.

Workshop proposals should be no longer than 1,500 words (about three pages). Use the formatting page as a general guide, and include the following information:

- Length of workshop (specify half day or full day)
- Facilities required and maximum number of participants
- Intended audience and degree of expertise required by workshop participants
- Clear statement of the objectives of the workshop
- A detailed description of the workshop format including activities workshop participants will be expected to engage in
- A list of previous presentations (if any) of the workshop and web site or publication references (if any). Optionally, the proposers may nominate one or two referees whom the Committee may contact
- A summary of the workshop presenter's qualifications

Formatting

Use MS Word or compatibles only. Use Normal style only and do not use any templates. Refer to the guidelines for formatting your paper (linked below) for detailed formatting instructions. Whatever file name you use for your paper, the Conference's web based submission system, MyReview, will rename it.

Note that the advice in this section relates to the preparation of your paper for review, omitting author and affiliation details, acknowledgments and bio notes. Refer to the final submission guide when preparing a revised version if accepted, which will advise you to include these items.

[Guidelines for formatting your paper](#)

Submission

After a final proof reading of your paper, and immediately prior to submitting it for review, please check this web page for any additional instructions that may appear. Remember that your file has to be suitable for double blind reviewing without any editorial intervention. Ensure that you have deleted author and affiliation details from your file's properties (access File>Properties in the MS Word menu) and re saved. The ascilite 2008 conference paper submission system, MyReview will be linked to this page when submissions are opened in June 2008.

Presentation

Allocations of presentation format will be made by the Program Committee, taking into account the recommendations made by reviewers. Allocations of "traditional" and "short" presentation formats will not necessarily correspond to the category of acceptance for the conference proceedings (a full paper may be allocated a short session, and a concise paper may be allocated a traditional session).

Kind of presentation	Time allocation	Brief specification
Traditional	25 minutes	Presenters may select any conventional style of presentation, but are very strongly urged to allocate at least one third of the time to interactive discussion.
Short	15 minutes	Presenters may select any conventional style of presentation, but

		are very strongly urged to allocate at least one half of the time to interactive discussion.
Poster	Scheduled poster sessions	Poster presenters are expected to be present with their poster for the whole of the program period reserved for the display of their poster.
Workshop	Half day (3 hr) or full day (6 hr)	The time allocation does not include lunchtime (1 hr). We recommend that presenters adjourn for a 15-20 minute tea-coffee break at an appropriate stage.

A laptop or desktop personal computer will be available in all of the presentation venues, together with data projection and Internet access. Further advice on facilities and presentation style will be given when review process outcomes are advised on 24-26 September 2008.

Review procedure

All full and concise papers will be subjected to a double blind peer review process using an external panel of reviewers (per advice to reviewers). Having in mind the criteria outlined below, reviewers will assign ratings and make recommendations that will enable the Program Committee to prepare offers of acceptance or rejection to authors. The acceptance offers will specify a publication format and presentation format (options detailed above), and may include advice on mandatory revisions or desirable revisions. Owing to the tight timetable of only five weeks for the review and notification process, the Program Committee will not be able to provide specific, detailed formative feedback to authors who are not offered their first preference for publication and presentation formats, or to authors of declined submissions.

Reviewers and the Program Committee will be guided by criteria expressed in six categories.

Category	Description	Weight
Suitability	Interest and relevance to ascilite conference	20%
Originality	Meets the definition of research	15%
Lit review	Quality of literature review and research questions	15%
Method	Sound, documented methods, clearly presented results	15%
Analysis	Clear, logical findings, conclusions and implications	20%

	for practice	
Writing	Ease of reading, grammar, spelling, format, referencing details	15%

As with previous ascilite conferences, one of the purposes for the review process is to obtain DEST/DEEWR recognition of the work in the category "Conference publication" (DEST/DEEWR, 2008). To this end, we confirm that refereed proposals accepted for ascilite 2008 conference publication will:

- Meet the definition of research in relation to creativity, originality, and increasing humanity's stock of knowledge
- Be selected on the basis of a DEEWR compliant peer review process (independent, qualified expert review; double blind reviews conducted on the full articles, prior to publication)
- Be published and presented at a conference having national and international significance as evidenced by registrations and participation
- Be made available widely through … the Conference web site (DEST/DEEWR, 2008)

Papers submitted as poster proposals will be reviewed by the Conference Committee, but will not be eligible for DEST/DEEWR recognition, regardless of final, published length, because of the lack of external reviewing. Workshop proposals will be reviewed by the Conference Committee.

Advice to reviewers

The role of reviewers
Reviewers are pivotal in ensuring the quality of the papers and thus the conference. Reviewers provide an independent assessment of the quality of each submission. Whilst reviewers have considerable latitude, and a considerable responsibility, for interpretation of the concept of quality, we hope that the notes below will help us towards a reasonable uniformity of perception of quality standards, a fair, unbiased review process, and helpful, formative feedback for authors.

Papers under review and completed review forms are confidential and the contents are not to be revealed to other persons.

Double blind reviewing
The ascilite conferences use a double blind review process. That is, reviewers are not given the names and institutional affiliations of the authors, and authors are not given the names of the reviewers assigned to their article. If you feel that your objectivity as a reviewer has been compromised because you have identified an author, either

inadvertently through routine checking of references, or other avenues, please advise the Program Committee and we will seek a replacement reviewer.

The ascilite conferences commission at least two double blind reviews for each submission. These may be supplemented, if appropriate, with another double blind review by a third reviewer, or non-blind reviews obtained from members of the Conference Committee.

Selecting and appointing reviewers
Reviewers are appointed on the basis of their expertise and experience in areas relevant for the conference. It is an honorary role, being rewarded only by acknowledgment in the online and CD versions of the Proceedings. Each ascilite conference relies to a large extent upon reviewers commissioned for previous conferences. This has helped us sustain a uniformly high standard of reviewing over the years, as most of our reviewers are 'experienced'. The ranks of 'experienced' reviewers may be supplemented from other sources, such as AJET reviewers and authors. It is not necessary for reviewers to be members of ascilite, or to be registrants for the conference. ascilite conferences also have an established policy of encouraging the induction of 'novice' reviewers, who will broaden the reviewer pool, and be in line to become the next generation of 'experienced' reviewers. This policy is facilitated by ensuring that a review allocated to a 'novice' reviewer is also allocated to 'experienced' reviewers, and is backed up by Program Committee reviews, if appropriate.

The review process: Accessing papers and forms
We anticipate that each reviewer will be allocated two to three papers, usually a mix of full and concise papers, made available on 20 August, with a due date 10 September. You will be advised by email on your login name (it will be your email address) and password for your access to the conference paper review system, via the URL

Whilst three weeks may seem to be a tight deadline, it is similar to review process deadlines used for past conferences. Given that ascilite conferences offer authors the latest possible submission dates, it is essential that reviewers maintain good turnaround times. If you find that you must call for help and seek re-allocation of all or part of the reviewing assigned to you, it will be vitally important to inform the Program Committee sooner rather than later.

After downloading and reading the papers assigned to you, we recommend that you compose your 'Summary of contribution' and 'Detailed comments' (see below) in your word processor. Save in plain text format for doing 'copy and paste' entries during your next login to the conference paper review system.

Applying the review criteria

You will have to use your own best judgement on the six criteria listed in the review procedure, weighted as shown. For each criterion you will be asked to select a rating from the seven point scale:

Strong Accept   Accept   Weak Accept   Neutral   Weak Reject   Reject   Strong Reject

You will be asked to 'self rate' on a three point 'reviewer's expertise' scale.

Next you will find two free form text entry boxes:

1. Summary of contribution. Please provide one to several sentences summarising your overall impression and recommendation.
2. Detailed comments. In plain text format, these will be the principal formative feedback. Here you should specify revisions that are to be completed to improve the quality of the paper. You could give amplifying comments and brief, illustrative examples to help authors understand the summative judgments that you have given under review criteria ratings. Please remember that the aim here is to encourage authors to improve their work, not only for this conference, but also for future conference and journal submissions. It is a section in which you can emphasise 'how you may progress…', in contrast to emphasising 'your work is bad because…'. Another aim in this section is to alert the Proceedings editors to minor or major revisions that they should check, upon receiving a revised version from the authors. Owing to production time constraints, it won't be possible to send revised versions to the original or new reviewers.

This is followed by the Yes or No question, "Candidate for the best paper award?" This item provides the Program Committee with a basis for compiling a short list for determining one to several Outstanding Paper Awards. Both 'Full' and 'Concise' papers may be eligible.

Comments for Program Committee (not shown to the authors) is another free form text entry box, where you may add any special, confidential comments for 'Program Committee eyes only', that may assist the Program Committee with the selection process, and in using its discretion when providing feedback to authors. Other matters that you may raise could include alerting the Committee to instances of excessive repetition of previously published work, or inadequate acknowledgment of the work of other writers.

Full papers and concise papers are to be reviewed using the same criteria, using your own best judgment about how well the authors have used their chosen length. The 'amount' of research represented in a concise paper may be about one third to one half the 'amount' in a full paper, but the quality is to be the same. However, with concise papers reviewers can allow a weighting towards the statement in categories of papers and proposals that concise papers are "an avenue for work in progress, for pilot studies, small scale exploratory projects, reports on highly specialised topics, or brief studies on recent developments… review key new directions for developing research based best practices and for conducting research into practices in technology supported teaching and learning".

In some cases, the reviewer may feel that it is appropriate to recommend to the Program Committee that the authors be offered a format differing from the format they nominated, e.g., an outstanding Concise paper may be given a 'Traditional' 25 minute presentation slot. However, please note that some changes of format cannot be offered. For example, changes from 'Concise' or 'Poster' to 'Full' in publication format cannot be offered. Also, changes from 'Full' to 'Concise' should be recommended only in exceptional cases where the paper could be substantially improved by a major revision with shortening. Papers submitted as 'Full' or 'Concise' which are recommended by reviewers for acceptance, but with the reviewers or the Committee changing the Presentation format to 'Poster', may be published in full if the authors so desire, upon accepting the 'Poster' offer from the Committee.

Submitting a revised version if accepted

Should your submission be accepted for publication, you will be asked to submit a revised version. The conference deadlines give authors only a limited time between 'Completed reviews sent back to authors' and 'Revised papers due'. In essence, you should aim to improve your paper as best you can, in the light of reviewer comments and other advice that may appear in the notification of acceptance of your submission.

In the revised version, you must add authors and affiliations (after title), and at the end, acknowledgments (optional), author contact details (mandatory) and brief bio notes (optional), to be placed after the references and before the 'Please cite as' box. The material appearing after acknowledgments, will be completed or adapted by the Proceedings Editors. It will be in the general form shown below, and is outside your category's page limit.

You will submit the revised version of your accepted paper, poster text or workshop in MS Word or compatible format directly to the Proceedings Editors. Your file name should be the first author's surname. Your Subject line should be firstauthorsurname revised ascilite paper. Please send to: rjatkinson@bigpond.com.

Publication of conference proceedings

The ascilite 2008 conference proceedings will be published on a CD and via this web site. There will be no printed version. The CD will be included in your conference satchel, delivered to you personally at the conference registration desk at Deakin University, Burwood Campus, Melbourne. The online version will be made available several days before the conference begins.

Editorial references

DEST/DEEWR (2008). Higher Education Research Data Collection. Specifications for the collection of 2007 data. [viewed 13 Mar 2008] http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/research_sector/online_forms_ services/higher_education_research_data_collection.htm

The Macquarie Dictionary (1997). 3rd ed. Sydney: The Macquarie Library.

Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (2001). 5th ed. Washington DC: APA.

Style Manual for Authors, Editors and Publishers (2002). 6th ed. Wiley Australia. (Previous editions were known with great respect and affection as the *AGPS Manual*).

Paper title in sentence case Arial 16 bold

Author 1   *In the cases of full and concise papers for review, omit these lines*
Department or Centre
Institution

Author 2   *In the cases of full and concise papers for review, omit these lines*
Department or Centre
Institution

Place your abstract here ... no more than 250 words … in Times New Roman 10, indented 1.0 cm left and right margins, left aligned. Title, author details and abstract are the only parts of your paper that will appear in the Conference's printed program booklet. Title and abstract are the most critically, vitally important parts of your writing!

Keywords: One line of key or focus terms by which your paper can be indexed.

First level heading in Arial 12 bold

Body of your paper … use Times New Roman 10 point, left aligned, single spaced. Blank lines before and after headings and paragraphs are to be sized the same as text lines, i.e., 10 point (Times NR).

For paragraphing, use a single blank line between each paragraph, and no indents. Do not use *Spacing Before* or *Spacing After* your paragraphs.

Second level heading in Arial 10 bold

Put a blank line before and after the second level heading.

Third level heading in Times New Roman 10 point italic
Do not include a blank line after a third level heading. Use bulleted or numbered lists in preference to third level headings where possible.

> [This is a quotation] Use Times New Roman 10 point, left aligned, single spaced, indented 1.0 cm left and right, not italicised, without quote marks, one blank line before and after. Indents may be varied slightly from 1.0 cm to improve the fit. Referencing for the quotation may be given in the running text immediately before the quotation, or may be appended to the end of the quotation. In general, very short quotations using only a few words should be given with quote marks in your running text, whilst only longer quotations using a line or more should be formatted as quotations. (reference)

This is a bulleted list:

- Times New Roman 10 point
- left aligned, single spaced
- no indents except a hanging indent 0.5 cm. Indentation may be varied slightly to improve the fit.

This is an ordered list:

i. Times New Roman 10 point
ii. left aligned, single spaced
iii. no indents except a hanging indent 0.5 cm. Indentation may be varied slightly to improve the fit.
iv. select only from these kinds of ordering: 1., 2., …; i., ii., …; a., b., … Do not use any other kind.

Do not use page breaks or sections breaks. Where necessary or desirable, use several carriage returns to obtain a page break.

Figure 1: Sample of a figure (legend is below figure, centred, bold)

Figures must be placed in their correct, appropriate locations in your running text. All figures should be included in your Word file, and not in separate graphics or drawing packages. Labeling should be consistent with the fonts used in the text of your paper, i.e., Times New Roman. Number sequentially, Figure 1, Figure 2, etc. Do not use variations such as Figure 1a, 1b.

Table 1: A sample table (title is above table, centred, bold)

Location	Tables must be placed in their correct, appropriate locations in your running text
General	In general use Times New Roman 10 point and other body text specifications for all text within a table and its title, though 9 point may be used as required for narrow columns. In general all tables should have a title with consecutive numbering (e.g.: Table 1: Title of the table), bolded, using sentence case, centred, and located at the top of the table. For headings within tables use sentence case, with bold and centering optional.
Format	Centre each table and select appropriate widths for the table and for each column, using percentages. Use of borders for all cells ('All', with style '1/4 point') is recommended, mainly because borders seem to be helpful for on screen reading. In columns of numbers, use centre or decimal point alignment.
Explanatory text	If your table requires explanatory text that is inappropriate for placing in your running text, place it at the bottom of the table, formatted to the same width as the table.
Other features	Cell background colouring or shading may be used, but check that grey scale printing (600 dpi) is not impaired, and note that when a web version file is created, the Proceedings editors may use a standard background colour for the first row or other elements of a table.

References

In your reference list please use APA 5th edition style. This style prescribes alphabetical order by first author. Use Times New Roman 10 point, left aligned, hanging indent 0.5 cm, with no blank lines. Wherever possible, insert URLs for references. However, do not insert URLs for publications which offer only *pay per view* or *institutional subscriber only*, *on campus only*, access to full text. Date of viewing may be omitted for journal and proceedings URLs considered to be of high reliability. The following list provides examples of referencing for the main kinds of publications.

Burgess, J. (2006). Blogging to learn, learning to blog. In A. Bruns & J. Jacobs (Eds.), *Uses of blogs* (pp. 105-114). New York: Peter Lang.

Freeman, M., Bell, A., Comerton-Forde, C., Pickering, J. and Blayney, P. (2007). Factors affecting educational innovation with in class electronic response systems. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, 23(2), 149-170. http://www.ascilite.org.au/ajet/ajet23/freeman.html

Herrington, J. & Oliver, R. (2000). An instructional design framework for authentic learning environments. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 48(3), 23-48.

Kearsley, G. (2004). *Explorations in learning & instruction: The theory into practice database*. http://tip.psychology.org/ [viewed 13 Mar 2008].

Laurillard, D. (2002). *Rethinking university teaching: A conversational framework for the effective use of learning technologies*. London: Routledge.

Oliver, R. (2007). Using mobile technologies to support learning in large on campus university classes. In *ICT: Providing choices for learners and learning. Proceedings ascilite Singapore 2007.* http://www.ascilite.org.au/conferences/singapore07/procs/oliver.pdf

ascilite Melbourne 2008 © 2008 Institute of Teaching and Learning • Deakin University