



# INCOSE International Symposium Panel / Roundtable / Debate Evaluation Criteria

## Overview

This document provides instructions and guidance for reviewers to assess panel, roundtable, and debate proposals submitted for consideration for the Annual INCOSE International Symposium. This document is also intended to help authors achieve high quality submissions, increasing their likelihood of acceptance.

Note that for panel, roundtable, and debate proposals a single-blind review process is followed. This means that the reviewer's identity is concealed from the submitter but the reviewer can see the identity of the submitter.

## Evaluation Criteria

The subject matter of the submission must address or have a clear connection to systems engineering. Submissions that are only concerned with other areas, for example, software development or project management, are not acceptable.

A panel, roundtable, or debate session generally consists of three parts:

- **Introduction:** The moderator introduces the theme of the session, describes the boundaries of the subject matter, and defines the issues that are to be discussed or debated and the intended outcome. (Whether this outcome is achieved depends to a large extent on audience participation.)
- **Presentations:** The session members present relatively short position papers, which are definite enough to act as seeds for the discussion or debate (and may even be intentionally controversial).
- **Discussion:** The moderator leads discussion with the audience on the issues and positions with the focus on achieving the desired outcome.

Sessions should not simply entail a presentation of several short papers followed by questions to the session members, but should result in thought-provoking discussion beyond the value of the position papers.

Since the submission is only a proposal, reviewers should focus on the content of the proposal and not its format or grammatical correctness. However, concepts presented should be complete, and sufficient supporting information should be provided to enable a reviewer to assess the efficacy of a stated position. Review should also take into consideration the knowledge, experience, and capabilities of the moderator and session members.

Submissions must not be used for the promotion of any commercial product or interest, and further must not promote or voice an opinion on political or religious matters. The material must not have been previously presented to INCOSE; if it has been previously presented elsewhere, this should be noted.

The following sections provide further insight into the evaluation criteria for panel, roundtable, and debate proposals.



## 1. Theme

- The subject matter is clearly defined.
- The subject matter is appropriately bounded.
- The issues that require exposure and that make this theme interesting are clearly defined.
- The target audience is identified and represents a significant segment of the INCOSE membership.
- The session is likely to attract a majority of the target audience participating in the conference.

## 2. Organization

- The number of session members is definite and each session member is identified by name. It is recommended that each session include a moderator and no more than 4 additional members.
- The proposal addresses the session organization (including length and format), and the time allocated to each part (introduction, presentations, and discussion) is appropriate to its role in achieving the intended outcome. It is recommended that approximately half of the session duration be reserved for discussion with the audience.

## 3. Position Statements

- The proposal contains a position statement for each session member.
- Each session member takes a definite position on the theme issues.
- The positions are clearly different enough to initiate discussion or debate.

## 4. Moderator

- The moderator has experience in managing a session of this nature and in moderating discussions.
- The moderator has adequate experience in a broad field of systems engineering centered around the theme.
- The moderator has recognized involvement in the practice or research of systems engineering.

## 5. Session Members

- The session members have experience appropriate to their roles. For example, if the intended outcome is to gauge the audience's attitude toward a particular issue, the session members must be able to put forward definite and varied (opposing) views on this issue.
- The session members have sufficiently diverse backgrounds and viewpoints to support a discussion within the boundaries of the theme.
- If possible, the session members represent the international nature of systems engineering.



## Procedure for Reviewers

Follow the instructions below. For additional details on accessing EasyChair and submitting a review, see the “EasyChair Instructions for Reviewers” available in the Downloads section of the INCOSE IS website: <https://www.incose.org/symp2020/contact/downloads>.

1. Familiarize yourself with the above evaluation criteria.
2. Log into EasyChair and access the review database for **panels**. If you already have an EasyChair account from another conference, you can use that account. If you do not have an EasyChair account, follow the instructions to create a new account.
3. Select **Reviews > Assigned to me** to access panel submissions that have been assigned to you for review and open an assigned submission.
4. Read the submission quickly to get an understanding of its objective and structure. A good proposal makes it easy to comprehend the scope and intended outcome of the panel, roundtable, or debate.
5. Re-read the proposal more thoroughly, jotting down comments.
6. Assess the extent to which the proposal meets each of the evaluation criteria described above and the overall contributions of the session to the symposium. Select one of the following recommendations:
  - 3 = Strong accept
  - 2= Accept
  - 1 = Weak accept
  - 0 = Borderline
  - 1 = Weak reject
  - 2 = Reject
  - 3 = Strong reject

**Note:** A proposal should not be rated highly if session members are identified as TBA and/or position statements are missing.
7. Provide constructive comments. Limit comments to suggestions on how to improve the submission.
  - Opinions and conclusions of the reviewer should not be captured, unless made as a constructive “have you considered” statement.
  - Comments might include recommendations such as “the section on xyz should be shortened” or “the position put forward by XX is not sufficiently differentiated from that put forward by YY. I suggest...” Be specific.
  - Words of encouragement such as, “This is a great proposal; looking forward to participating in the discussion” are always welcome when deserved.
8. Identify a confidence rating regarding your expertise in the subject areas of the submission using the following scale:
  - 1 = None
  - 2 = Low
  - 3 = Medium
  - 4 = High
  - 5 = Expert