

CERME13 Guidelines for TWG leaders

The chief aims of ERME are to promote communication, cooperation and collaboration in research in mathematics education in Europe, in order to know more about research and research interests in different European countries, and to create opportunities for cooperation between researchers in collaborative projects. This conference is designed as a starting point in promoting these aims in a communicative spirit. Each Thematic Working Group (TWG) should aim to provide a good scientific debate with the purpose of deepening mutual knowledge about the problems and methods of research in the field.

Each TWG initially has four or five co-leaders (including a leader and a young researcher) from different countries, with interest and expertise in the theme of the group. One of these co-leaders, the designated TWG leader, oversees the work of the group, and is ultimately responsible for decisions and actions. To each TWG, a member of the International Programme committee (IPC) is assigned as Liaison between the IPC and the TWG. They are available to assist or advise the co-leaders, especially before the conference.

The TWG leaders' responsibilities are:

- (1) writing the call for papers for the TWG;
- (2) organizing the review of submitted papers, and poster proposals before the conference, including ensuring that all contributions respect the CERME template;
- (3) organizing the conduct of the Thematic Working Group sessions at the conference itself;
- (4) organizing the revision and collection of texts for the proceedings, and writing an introduction for these texts, once more ensuring that all contributions respect the CERME template.

Organizing the Review of Submitted Papers and Poster Proposals

1. Initial submission, reviewing and final submission: overview and timeline

The purpose of the CERME review process is to promote communication and collaboration through engaging participants in an in-depth analysis of a portion of TWG contributions, as well as to assure their scientific quality.

CERME13 uses [ConfTool](#) for the submission and review process of papers and poster proposals and will ensure its streamlined and efficient management. Please make sure that submissions, reviews, and submission status will run through ConfTool. In particular, do not allow for submissions to take place through email. The authors submit the initial version of their paper or poster on the website, indicating a TWG number. The TWG leaders have access to the submissions corresponding to their TWG through ConfTool. They will organize the internal review (see next section) within the TWG. The final versions of the papers and poster proposals will be directly submitted by the authors in ConfTool. The TWG leaders will check whether these final versions include the suggested revisions and use the CERME13 template, so that they can be included in the conference programme.

The review process takes place according to the following timeline, the deadlines of which should be taken very seriously.

- February 15, 2023: Submission deadline for papers and poster proposals
- February 16, 2023: TWG leaders can download all the submissions to their TWG and will also be able to see a table on ConfTool showing the corresponding author(s) for each paper, with their email address, the title of their paper, and the keywords
- March 1, 2023: TWG leaders assign reviewers: two TWG participants for each paper, two TWG co-leaders for each poster proposal
- March 22, 2023: Reviewers submit their reviews
- April 5, 2023: TWG leaders enter contribution status in ConfTool, and send a bulk mail to the authors to inform them about the review results, status of their submission and revisions requested
- April 26, 2023: The authors submit a revised version with a description of the changes made
- May 5, 2023: The TWG team takes the final decision and informs the authors, and, if needed, discusses with them the final adjustments to the papers
- May 17, 2023: The authors upload the final version of their submission
- May 19, 2023: The TWG leaders can check the submission list. After this, no further changes can be made

2. Managing the internal reviewing process for the papers

The internal reviewing process for the papers proceeds as follows, respecting the above timeline.

1. The TWG leaders distribute the papers more-or-less evenly between their co-leaders (including themselves), as far as possible according to common topics or methods. If the number of papers received per member of the TWG team (leader + co-leaders) exceeds 6, the TWG leaders may, in consultation with the IPC Liaison for the group, opt for additional co-leaders from among those who submitted papers. Notice that TWGs are cancelled if they receive less than 12 papers. If the TWG team considers that a paper is more appropriate to another TWG, they should contact their IPC liaison and the IPC Chair immediately.
2. The TWG leaders assign each paper submission to two TWG participants for review, making clear the deadline and the expectations, referring to the [Guidelines for Reviewers](#). These reviews are 'open' on both sides, i.e., both reviewer and author know each other by name. Situations where there is a close relationship between the author and the reviewer should be avoided. For example, a student's paper should not be assigned to be reviewed by their supervisor or vice versa. Inexperienced researchers should be included in the review process, but it is not advisable to assign more than one novice reviewer to any single paper. No author should have more than two papers to review. Some authors may have had feedback via the Early Bird Submission Process. TWG leaders will receive a copy of this feedback. Please ensure that reviewers are provided with this feedback.
3. The TWG co-leaders synthesize the two reviews for each paper into a decision, according to the options provided in the Guidelines for Reviewers. This synthesis includes the reasons for the decision, and a very clear statement of what modifications must be done before the paper is accepted for discussion at the conference. Please see the Appendix below for an example of a summary to accompany reviews. In difficult cases, co-leaders can consult with the TWG leader or another co-leader of their TWG.

4. TWG co-leaders' decisions about the acceptance of papers are shared with the other TWG co-leaders and the TWG leader. The TWG leader must approve the final decision of accepting or not accepting for presentation and insert it in ConfTool. The decision regarding presentation is communicated via ConfTool to the corresponding author through a bulk email. The TWG leader then sends a composite decision list for all paper proposals to (a) all the co-leaders of their TWG, and (b) the Chair and the co-Chair of the IPC. TWG co-leaders can share the other review of each paper, as well as their own summary and decision, with the two reviewers of that paper. This is an excellent learning opportunity for all reviewers.
5. The authors upload the final version of their paper to ConfTool.
6. The TWG leader checks that the list of the final version of papers on the submission website is correct and next confirm the acceptance status in ConfTool. Please note that all authors will be informed via ConfTool of the inclusion of their papers in the conference programme.
7. The papers and posters will be available online. The TWG leader should remind the participants that members of a group are expected to read the provided papers before the conference in readiness for working in the TWG.

3. Managing the internal reviewing process for the poster proposals

The internal reviewing process for the poster proposals proceeds as follows, respecting the above timeline.

1. The TWG leaders distribute the poster proposals more-or-less evenly between the co-leaders (including themselves).
2. The co-leader in charge reviews the poster proposals. In difficult cases, they can consult with the TWG leader or another co-leader of their TWG.
3. The review is sent to the TWG leader.
4. TWG leaders insert in ConfTool the status of the posters.
5. The decision regarding presentation is communicated via ConfTool to the corresponding author.
6. The authors submit a revised version with a description of the changes made to ConfTool.
7. TWG co-leaders' decisions about the acceptance of posters are shared with the other TWG co-leaders and the TWG leader.
8. The TWG leader must approve the final decision of accepting or not accepting for presentation and send this decision to the poster author(s).
9. The authors upload a final version of their two-page proposal.

The conduct of the Thematic Working Group Sessions at the CERME conference

<TO BE ADDED>

Organizing the revision and collection of texts for the proceedings

<TO BE ADDED>

Appendix: Example of a summary to accompany paper reviews

corresponding Author: Alice Hulot

Title: The experience of the pre-service secondary mathematics teacher of school-based mentoring

Thank you for your proposal of a paper for CERME12 TWG84. The paper has been read by two other paper proposers and one TWG84 co-leader (John Mulberry). The two reviews are attached with this summary overview by the co-leader in charge. In light of these reviews, I am writing to inform you that the TWG84 team has decided to

ACCEPT your paper for presentation subject to the modifications detailed below

[Overview of the remarks]

Your paper is very well-written, interesting and relevant to the group theme. The theoretical framework and related literature are clearly outlined. You offer some original insights into the experience of these pre-service secondary mathematics teachers and related proposals for practice and for further research. Nevertheless, the two reviews offer some suggestions which you should consider for pre-conference revision. In particular, the review of von Neumann makes several points to be considered under Methodology (which needs more detail) and Statement and Discussion (do not lose sight of the mathematics).

[Recommendations for the revisions]

In the light of this overview and the two reviews – which we strongly recommend that you consider as a guide through the revision of your paper – we expect that the revision will address the following:

(a) to address the specifics of mathematics (and mathematics didactics) more thoroughly in the paper and

(b) to expand and foreground the implications for teacher education, which you touch on in the Discussion at the end of the paper. Also, please format the paper in accordance with the instructions given in the First Announcement. You do not appear to have used the CERME template. You must use this template, or your paper will not be accepted.

Please note that this outcome does not guarantee publication in the post-conference proceedings.

PLEASE SUBMIT YOUR REVISED PAPER [OR NEW SUBMISSION FOR A POSTER PRESENTATION] VIA THE ConfTool SUBMISSION SYSTEM BEFORE <DATE>, TOGETHER WITH A LETTER, IN WHICH THE CHANGES ARE CLEARLY INDICATED.

You will be informed of the final decision before ..., and will have to upload the final version on the submission website before

Thank you,

John

[On behalf of the TWG84 team]