Dear SABER,

This is the official Call for Abstract Submissions for the 2022 Annual SABER Meeting. We are asking for abstracts for short talks, long talks, posters, roundtables, and workshops this year. All the information is below and will be up on our SABER website shortly! The rubrics are attached and will also be available on the website.

Window for Submissions: February 19 - March 4

SABER Abstract Submission Guidelines (Long Talks, Short Talks, Roundtables, Posters)

The Society for the Advancement of Biology Education Research (SABER) invites you to submit abstracts for the annual National Meeting. Review these guidelines when preparing and submitting your abstract. In the three sections below, you will find:

1. A summary of the four presentation formats for which you may submit an abstract
2. An overview of the evaluation criteria used by reviewers to select abstracts
3. Additional instructions and considerations for preparing your abstract

It is the responsibility of the individual submitting an abstract to review the guidelines below. Please remember to renew/register your SABER membership!

Do not include identifying information in your abstract. To maintain a blinded review process, the title and main text of your abstract, as well as any files that you submit, **cannot include the names of researchers or institutions involved in the study**. If any identifying information is included, your identity will be revealed to the reviewers and may bias their review. The integrity of this blinded review process is a community effort, and we are relying on authors to submit blinded abstracts. Members of the abstracts committee are volunteers and do not have the time to remove identifiable information from abstracts.

The review process is blinded in three ways to minimize bias. First, the authors do not know the identity of the reviewers. Second, the reviewers do not know the identity of the authors. Finally, the abstract committee makes decisions on abstracts based on reviewers' scores before any identities of authors or reviewers are attached.

A. Presentation Formats

Abstracts may be submitted for one of four possible presentation formats described below. The character limit for your abstract is determined by the presentation format you choose. While a broad range of projects are likely to be suitable for a poster presentation, roundtable, or short talk, long talks are intended to synthesize multiple projects (published or close to publication) focused on big ideas in biology education research. If we are unable to accept your abstract in your preferred format based on reviewer recommendations, it may be selected to be presented in an alternative format. You will have an option to indicate other preferred formats in the submission process.

1. **Long Talks** | Abstract word limit: 10,000 characters (including spaces)
   Long talks are restricted to faculty. These 50-minute talks are intended to be a synthesis of multiple projects over several years that have been completed and/or are nearing publication and that tell a cohesive story about a central theme. The most successful long talk abstracts will have made a substantial contribution to the DBER discipline. *Abstracts submitted for long talks may be recommended during the review process for short talks, roundtables, or poster presentations, as per the author's preference.*
2. **Short Talks** | Abstract word limit: 5,000 characters (including spaces)
   These are 15 minute talks with 5 minutes of questions. They are intended to showcase results that are being prepared for publication. Emphasis is on communicating robust findings (i.e., appropriate and thorough, triangulation of diverse data streams), tried and tested instruments and protocols, and other developed work. *Abstracts submitted for short talks may be recommended during the review process for roundtables or poster presentations, as per the author's preference.*
3. **Roundtables** | Abstract word limit: 2,500 characters (including spaces)
   Roundtables are one-hour, small-group presentations and discussions on similar research projects. Each presenter has approximately 10 minutes to present their work, with the remaining time for feedback, suggestions, and larger group discussion from all presenters and non-presenting participants. The short presentations are used as a springboard for interaction, discussion, and critique. Presenters are encouraged to prepare a one-page summary, including focused discussion questions, to share with session attendees. *Abstracts submitted for roundtables may also be recommended during the review process for poster presentations, as per the author's preference.*
4. **Poster Presentation** | Abstract word limit: 2,500 characters (including spaces)
   Poster presentations are ideal for sharing a new or developing project or gaining specific advice on a particular set of data. Projects that are still early in development are encouraged, including studies with promising, yet minimal, outcomes data, or studies with inconclusive results.

B. Evaluation Criteria

All abstracts for long and short talks will be reviewed by multiple reviewers from the SABER community. These reviewers will recommend abstracts based on the abstract rubric established by the SABER Abstract Committee and final decisions will be made by the Abstract Committee. A copy of the rubric for both long talks and short talks/posters is posted on the SABER website.

If we have enough reviewers, we are hoping to provide reviews for posters as part of the educational experience. *All posters will be accepted.*

Be sure to consult the correct rubric for the chosen presentation format. While different considerations will be applied to each presentation format, all formats will be evaluated in four areas; **PLEASE NOTE: Your abstract should include each of these headings followed by a colon so that reviewers can easily find them, e.g., "RESEARCH DESIGN: For this project, we investigated…":**

1. **Study Context:** Strong abstracts will clearly describe the study's context and/or literature base, including a few key in-text citations in author, year format. Do **not** include a reference list. A sound rationale (e.g., gap in the literature) should be provided as well as an appropriate model, theoretical framework, or philosophy of the study.

2. **Research Design.** Strong abstracts will provide a clear description of the research question and/or education problem being addressed. The abstract should provide enough information to demonstrate that the study's design and methods are appropriate and well-aligned with the research question or problem being investigated.

3. **Analyses and Interpretations.** Strong abstracts will clearly describe the analysis of the data, include a description of key results (e.g., numerical results and/or examples of qualitative data as appropriate to the study), and provide some interpretation of the findings. All claims made in the abstract should be clearly supported by evidence and appropriate to the focus of the study and its methodology. Reviewers will also consider the appropriate level of completeness of the project based on the presentation format selected. While long and short talks are expected to have more thorough analyses (e.g., appropriate statistics, example quotes and codes, inclusion of diverse data streams, closer to publication), roundtables and poster presentations may include more preliminary data analyses.

4. **Contribution.** Strong abstracts should add to, refine, or refute the literature base in biology education. The abstract should provide clear implications for teaching, learning, or research in biology. Reviewers will also consider whether the study is likely to be of general interest to SABER attendees.

C. Additional Instructions

1. Do not include figures or a reference list in your abstract (in-text citations in author, year format are appropriate).

2. You may submit as many abstracts as you would like, but:
    a. Any one individual can only be a presenter for a single talk (long or short).
    b. A maximum of **three** abstracts will be accepted as talks (long or short) from any single lab in order to promote diversity at SABER. A research lab is defined as a group of individuals working under a PI (where a PI is an individual eligible to serve as PI/Co-PI on an NSF (or similar) grant). A collaborative proposal across research groups will count as one of these three abstracts.
    c. If an individual submits more than one talk abstract or has their name as an author and/or listed as PI for more than three talk abstracts.the abstracts sent out for review will be decided at random.
    d. It is expected that multiple PIs working on a common project will submit no more than 2 abstracts related to this project.
    PLEASE NOTE: The purpose of limiting abstracts from individuals/lab groups is to increase the diversity of presentations at SABER. We believe that <u>you</u> serve as a better gate-keeper in making decisions about the best work to put forward than the reviewers do. So we kindly ask you to consider carefully the submissions to be made and limit your submissions on your end (rather than having reviewers determine this). We appreciate your help in this effort.

3. It is expected that all abstract submissions will be "new" work that has either not been presented at SABER or will be significantly novel compared to work previously presented at SABER.

5. When you are ready to submit your abstract online, carefully follow the instructions detailed on the submission site for uploading your abstract.

4. After adding your abstract information, you will be taken to a screen with all of the abstract reviewers (titled “Edit Conflicts of Interest”). Please check off all individuals who would have a conflict of interest with your submission, including colleagues from your institution and collaborators on this or other projects.

6. If you would like an email confirmation of your submission after submitting your abstract, please click the “email” button at the top right corner of the submission system after submitting your abstract.

All proposals will be reviewed by multiple reviewers from the SABER community. These reviewers will recommend proposals based on the rubric established by the SABER Abstract Committee and final decisions will be made by the Abstract Committee (rubric is available on our website).

We are finalizing the details for Workshop submissions and will send out a separate call for those which includes a rubric.

Good luck, everyone! We cannot wait to see the amazing research you all will present this year!

2021-22 SABER Abstract Committee

Anita Schuchardt (chair)
Sara Faust
Grant Gardner
Mary Pat Wenderoth
Lisa McDonnell
Melissa Aikens
Petra Kranzfelder
Kendra Wright

The Society for the Advancement of Biology Education (SABER) Abstract Review Rubrics

CONSIDERATIONS SPECIFIC TO EACH PRESENTATION FORMAT
Long talks are restricted to faculty. These 50-minute talks are intended to be a synthesis of multiple projects over several years that have been completed and/or are nearing publication and that tell a cohesive story about a central theme. The most successful long talk abstracts will have made a substantial contribution to the DBER discipline. Abstracts submitted for long talks may be recommended for short talks, roundtables, or poster presentations.
Short talks are 15-minute presentations intended to showcase results that are being prepared for publication. Emphasis is on communicating robust findings (i.e., appropriate and thorough, triangulation of diverse data streams), tried and tested instruments and protocols, and other developed work. Abstracts submitted for short talks may be recommended for roundtables or poster presentations.
Roundtables are one-hour, small-group presentations and discussions on similar research projects. Each presenter has ~10 minutes to present their work, with the remaining time for feedback, suggestions, and larger group discussion from all presenters and non-presenting participants. The short presentations are used as a springboard for interaction, discussion, and critique. Presenters are encouraged to prepare a one-page summary, including focused discussion questions, to share with session attendees. Abstracts submitted for roundtables may be recommended for poster presentations.
Poster presentations are ideal for sharing a new or developing project or gaining specific advice on a particular set of data. Projects that are still early in development are encouraged, including studies with promising, yet minimal, outcomes data; or studies with inconclusive results.

The Society for the Advancement of Biology Education (SABER) Abstract Review Rubric
SHORT TALKS, POSTERS, & ROUNDTABLES

Each abstract is evaluated according to the following four main categories. Within each main category, the abstract is given three sub-scores using this guideline: this component is not present/clear at all or is only briefly mentioned **(score 1)**, this component is present but not clear or complete **(score 2)**, or this component is present and clear and complete **(score 3).** This rubric is applicable to mixed methods, qualitative, quantitative, and theoretical studies. Note that space for written comments within each category is provided in the online system. Written comments are required and we encourage you to make these as specific and clear as possible.

CATEGORY	QUESTIONS	Not present/ clear or only briefly mentioned	Present, but not clear or complete	Present, clear and Complete
Study Context	Is the study ***context and/or literature base*** clearly described with key citations (author, year).	1	2	3
	Is there a sound ***rationale*** for the project?	1	2	3
	Is there an appropriate **model, theoretical framework or philosophy**?	1	2	3
Research Design	Is a clear ***research question and/or educational problem*** in biology education described?	1	2	3
	Are the ***research design and methods*** clearly described?	1	2	3
	Are the design and methods ***appropriate and well-aligned*** with the research question or problem?	1	2	3
Analyses and Interpretations	Are the ***analyses*** clearly described?	1	2	3
	Are claims supported by ***evidence and appropriate*** given the focus of the study and the methods?	1	2	3
	Are the analyses at an ***appropriate level of completeness*** given the desired presentation format?	1	2	3

Contribution	Does the study ***add to, refine, or refute*** the literature base in biology education?	1	2	3
	Is the study likely to be of ***general interest*** to SABER attendees?	1	2	3
	Does the study provide ***clear implications for teaching, learning, or research*** in biology?	1	2	3

The Society for the Advancement of Biology Education (SABER) Abstract Review Rubric
LONG TALKS

Each abstract is evaluated according to the following four main categories. Within each main category, the abstract is given three sub-scores using this guideline: this component is not present/clear at all or is only briefly mentioned **(score 1)**, this component is present but not clear or complete **(score 2)**, or this component is present and clear and complete **(score 3)**. This rubric is applicable to mixed methods, qualitative, quantitative, and theoretical studies. Note that space for written comments within each category is provided in the online system. Written comments are required and we encourage you to make these as specific and clear as possible.

CATEGORY	QUESTIONS	Not present/ clear or only briefly mentioned	Present, but not clear or complete	Present, clear and Complete
Study Context	Is the study ***context and/or literature base*** clearly described with key citations (author, year).	1	2	3
	Is there a sound ***rationale*** for the project?	1	2	3
	Is there an appropriate **model, theoretical framework or philosophy**?	1	2	3
Research Design	Is a clear ***research question and/or educational problem*** in biology education described?	1	2	3
	Are the ***research design and methods*** clearly described?	1	2	3
	Are the design and methods ***appropriate and well-aligned*** with the research question or problem?	1	2	3
Analyses and Interpretations	Are the ***analyses*** clearly described?	1	2	3
	Are claims supported by ***evidence and appropriate*** given the focus of the study and the methods?	1	2	3
	Are the analyses at an ***appropriate level of completeness*** given the desired presentation format?	1	2	3

Contribution	Does the study ***add to, refine, or refute*** the literature base in biology education?	1	2	3
	Is the study likely to be of ***general interest*** to SABER attendees?	1	2	3
	Does the study provide ***clear implications for teaching, learning, or research*** in biology?	1	2	3
Scope	Does the project ***integrate multiple smaller projects that address a central theme****?*	1	2	3
	Is the research ***journal-quality*** *and published or close to publication?*	1	2	3
	Does the research make a **substantial contribution** to the DBER discipline?	1	2	3