

## John Long

---

**From:** John Bourne <john.r.bourne@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 23 January 2019 1:25 AM  
**To:** John Long  
**Cc:** Carol Johnson; Don Spicer  
**Subject:** Acceptance of paper

Hello John:

I am pleased to report that all the reviewers of your paper recommended acceptance of your paper and I am pleased to accept it today. I include the review from a normally highly critical reviewer who really liked your paper and also recommended publishing "as is". I simply include the review so you can have a nice day thinking about how good the paper is!

Best wishes,

John

John R. Bourne, Ph.D  
Editor-in-Chief, International Journal on Innovations in Online Education



One review:

This paper has a thorough description of work by CE and ME engineering faculty at Deakin University faculty to migrate courses to newer styles of engineering education (which they describe as PODBL), and to assess the outcomes from offering these courses. They then go on to describe results mainly for one course (SEJ201) which they offered both on-campus and online.

For readers of IJIOE, the most interesting parts of the paper concern results achieved from offering SEJ201 in these ways. Basically, the authors are able to show that student outcomes are very similar for on- campus- or online learners.

To re-cap: this paper:

- Describes how a new pedagogy for engineering courses (P ) was migrated to an online environment, e.g.
  - o including such important elements as group work, a must for any practicing engineer
- Describes objectives and assessment factors for the online and classroom versions, and how these were carried out.
- Describes results achieved and how these were measured
  
- Describes results achieved i.e.:
  - o Higher academic performance for online learners vs traditional
  - o Slightly higher dropout rates for online vs traditional
  - o Higher student satisfaction for online vs traditional

Overall, the points above are sufficient for me to conclude that the paper has enough innovative content to be published in IJOIE. The engineering field need more focus on the areas these authors address and their contribution will be appreciated and read by engineering faculty with interest in online offerings. I'd like to see a follow-up paper down the road, and where they evaluate more courses in this way, plus where they do more to understand the reasons for the differences in results for online vs traditional. They do give reasons in this paper, but they are rather off-hand. I'd suggest adding an experienced ethnographer who can interview a student sample. Those results would be extremely useful. In summary, I recommend publish this paper as is. I also suggest that the editor add a note that although this paper is most useful for engineering educators, the results will be useful to a much wider range of disciplines, and that educators in other fields are encouraged to read the paper and possibly skim the portions that are very engineering-specific, but focus on methodology and results.