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**Introduction**

Concerns have been voiced that current approaches to research in educational design and technology lacks value and practical application (see Baughman, 2008; Bichelmeyer, Boling, & Gibbons, 2006; Gutiérrez & Penuel, 2014; Merrill & Wilson, 2011; Reeves, 2011; Winn, 2003). Educational Design Research (EDR) is an emerging approach that attempts to bridge the demand for rigorous research with the development of relevant solutions to educational problems, particular those that involve technology.

EDR constitutes a family of design-oriented approaches to educational research, including but not limited to design-based research (DBR; Barab & Squire, 2004), design and development research (DDR; Richey & Klein, 2014), and design-based implementation research (DBIR; Penuel, Fishman, Cheng, & Sabelli, 2011). Despite a surge of literature in the mid-2000s (e.g., Barab & Squire, 2004; Bell, Hoadly, & Linn, 2004; Reeves, Herrington, & Oliver, 2005; van den Akker et al., 2006), however, there remains uncertainty and criticism regarding the value and application of evidence produced through design research (Anderson & Shattuck, 2013; Shavelson et al., 2003; Dede, 2004) and of research methodologies that lack the qualities associated with exclusively experimental methods (Yoon et al., 2007; Reimann, 2011). This uncertainty is not unwarranted - the quality of research within EDR studies can vary greatly from iteration to iteration, as well as case to case (McKenney & Reeves, 2014; Reimann, 2011). Even though the same can be said for educational research in general, scholars remain skeptical that the potential of EDR can be fully realized.

In response to this skepticism and to advance the field, McKenney and Reeves (2014) and Reimann (2011) suggested the need for clear set of high quality EDR exemplars. Others have noted the need for examples to highlight the affordances of various design-oriented approaches (Richey & Klein, 2014; Nieveen et al., 2006) and examples that demonstrate systematic variation and testing of specific design features over repeated interventions (Reeves, 2011; McKenney & Reeves, 2014). Developing and sharing exemplars that are of high quality, portray rich variation, and clearly explore the extent and limits of generalization constitutes an important step towards bridging the tension between research and design in a way that promotes innovative, research-based solutions to our educational problems that work in the real world.

 **Special Issue Focus**
The purpose of this special issue is to advance EDR by showcasing exemplars of high quality design-oriented research in technology-supported post-secondary educational settings. We seek manuscripts that detail EDR projects involving the use and/or development of educational technology in tertiary education (higher and further), lifelong learning, and training. Manuscripts should therefore promote research and scholarship on innovative instructional designs that integrate technology in those settings, promote effective practice, and help inform policy.

The special issue paper set will present a variety of high quality EDR studies that explore the extent and limits of generalization across a spectrum of maturity – that is, at various stages, with varying degrees of implementation and spread (see Figure, below). Manuscripts should detail EDR project work during the main phases of 1) analysis and exploration, 2) design and construction and/or 3) evaluation and reflection. Examples include:
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| Figure. *McKenney and Reeves (2012) model of EDR.* |

* *Analysis & Exploration*: Focus on understanding an educational problem through analysis of the literature, stakeholders, and/or setting, (e.g., Agyei & Voogt, 2011; Lucero, Valcke, & Schellens, 2013).
* *Design & Construction*: Present design frameworks along with the theoretical and empirical grounding that gave them shape, (e.g., Herrington & Oliver,
2000; Raval, McKenney, & Pieters, 2010).
* *Evaluation & Reflection*: Primarily describe the formative and/or summative evaluations of designed interventions, and the practical and scientific implications of the findings, (e.g., Bakah, Voogt, & Pieters 2012; Ley et al., 2014).

Special issue topics will include reports of: single studies; multiple studies; and/or repeated studies. Conceptual papers that critique or expand upon theoretical and methodological issues in EDR (e.g., generalizability; conceptual frameworks; etc.) are also encouraged.

All papers, including conceptual papers, should include specific EDR examples. Submissions will be screened for meeting the aims and scope of the special issue, specifically: reporting on or grounding conceptual work in one or more EDR examples (current projects and/or previously published) concerning technology integration in post-secondary education. Then, submissions will be ranked on the following criteria:

* Appropriate theoretical perspectives given the goal of the study or paper;
* Transparency of design thinking and related inquiry; e.g., through figures or logic models (McKenney & Reeves, 2012) or conjecture maps (Sandoval, 2013)
* Methodological rigor (e.g. validity, reliability, credibility, trustworthiness)
* Overall contributions to scientific understanding and relevance to practice (Gutiérrez & Penuel, 2014)

Finally, submissions will be characterized for their stage of development. The final paper set will include papers that were highly ranked and ideally, as a set, represent a variety of EDR phases across different stages of project maturation.

**Submission instructions**

*NOTE: When submitting manuscripts, please note in ‘Comments for the Editor’ that it should be considered for the special issue on Educational Design Research.*

Proposals should be submitted through the AJET online submission system (http://ascilite.org.au/ajet). Please go to ABOUT to consult the author guidelines prior to submission for information about the required format. Information about peer review criteria is also linked from the ABOUT page.

**Deadlines for authors**

28 February, 2015: Deadline for submission of full manuscripts

27 April, 2015: Decisions / reflections on submitted papers sent to authors

26 June, 2015: Revised manuscripts due

24 July, 2015: Final manuscripts due for publication in October 2015 Special Issue
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