

INCOSE IS SUBMISSION REVIEW PROCESS FOR TUTORIALS

This document contains the proposed categories and rubrics for submissions to INCOSE IS. The categories are presentation only, tutorials, panels, and manuscript submissions revision process for INCOSE IS. For manuscripts two categories are proposed: Academic/Research and Practical/Applied manuscripts. There are two sections that cover the criteria and rubrics for each category.

Proposed Criteria:

1. [Originality](#)
2. [Relevance](#)
3. [Contribution](#)
4. [Educational Value](#)
5. [Acceptance](#)
6. [Confidence](#)

Originality

Please assess if this tutorial proposes new insights or a valuable, novel approach to attaining solutions to SE challenges. You may use the following three (3) questions as a guide in your evaluation process for the originality of the tutorial:

1. Will the tutorial lead(s) discuss new insights or valuable/novel approach(es) for existing SE related theories, methods, processes, tools, and/or practice?
2. Will the tutorial lead(s) make a case for why their insights can be leveraged to attain solutions to SE challenges.
3. Will attendees of INCOSE IS learn something that they didn't already know from this tutorial?

Scoring Grades for Originality

1—Not at all Original: This tutorial theme has already been sufficiently addressed by the community and no longer offers value to attendees.
2—Low Originality: This tutorial will present a small incremental improvement over past tutorials.
3—Minor Improvement: Similar tutorials have been presented before, but this proposed tutorial offers a new approach not yet presented or widely spread.
4—Major Improvement: This tutorial offers a significant expansion of a previously presented topic and offers a potential path towards attaining solutions to an SE challenge.
5—New/Novel Approach: This tutorial offers a promising and/or potential new approach to addressing SE challenges; examples include a dramatically different idea, methodology, tool, or approach; or provides a very promising approach at attaining solutions to SE challenges.

Relevance

Please assess how relevant this tutorial is to INCOSE IS. You may use the following two (2) questions as a guide in your evaluation process for the tutorial's relevance to INCOSE IS:

1. Is the tutorial proposed related to the disciplinary areas identified in the SEBoK, INCOSE Handbook, FuSE, TechOps, INCOSE initiatives, and/or of interest to SE?
2. Is this tutorial, regardless of its quality, better suited to other events or channels?

Note: If you mark this category low, please provide suggested alternative events or dissemination channels (or at least the appropriate topic area) in the comments area.

Scoring Grades for Relevance

1—Not at all Relevant: Does not belong at INCOSE IS.
2—Low Relevance: The tutorial is of low relevance to INCOSE IS.
3—Borderline Relevance: The tutorial has borderline relevance to INCOSE IS.
4—Relevant: The tutorial is relevant to INCOSE IS and/or INCOSE at large.
5—Very Relevant: The tutorial presents material that would be highly welcomed by INCOSE IS attendees and INCOSE's community.
COMMENTS (if marked low):

Contribution

Please assess if the tutorial lead(s) proposes a novel/relevant contribution to systems engineering and/or attendees to INCOSE IS. You may use the following two (2) questions as a guide in your evaluation process for the contribution of the proposed tutorial:

1. Do the tutorial lead(s) make a compelling case for how their tutorial may contribute to advancing INCOSE's mission 2035 or other needs of SE?
2. Are contributions clearly defined?

Scoring Grades for Contribution

1—Little to no Contribution: This particular topic/approach has already been sufficiently addressed by the community.
2—Some Minor Contributions: This topic/approach presents a small incremental improvement over past tutorials.
3—Minor Improvement: The same topic/approach has been presented before, but this tutorial presents a new approach or data that has not yet been presented.
4—Major Improvement: This proposed tutorial represents a significant expansion of previous tutorials.
5—New/Novel: This is a new topic in this area, a dramatically different methodology, tool, or approach.

Educational Value

Please evaluate whether the tutorial is teachable and likely to deliver a strong learning experience. Use the following four (4) questions as a guide in your evaluation process for the pedagogical quality of the proposed tutorial:

1. Will attendees interact through exercises, discussion, or activities?
2. Is the tutorial appropriate for mixed-experience and international audiences?
3. Will attendees leave with actionable skills or methods?
4. Are real-world SE scenarios incorporated?

Scoring Grades for Educational Value

1—No Pedagogy: This tutorial is not interactive, not appropriate for the audience, leaves attendees with no actionable skills, and no real-world SE scenarios are incorporated. Poor or no instructional design.
2—Weak Pedagogy: This tutorial is one (1) of the following: interactive, appropriate for the audience, leaves attendees with actionable skills, or a real-world SE scenario is incorporated. Instructional design is lacking.
3—Adequate Pedagogy: This tutorial is two (2) of the following: interactive, appropriate for the audience, leaves attendees with actionable skills, and/or a real-world SE scenario is incorporated. Some instructional design elements.
4—Effective Pedagogy: This tutorial is three (3) of the following: interactive, appropriate for the audience, leaves attendees with actionable skills, and/or a real-world SE scenario is incorporated. Moderate instructional design.
5—Excellent Pedagogy: This tutorial is all four (4) the following: interactive, appropriate for the audience, leaves attendees with actionable skills, and a real-world SE scenario is incorporated. Instructional design is exceptional.

Acceptance

Please indicate if this tutorial should be accepted for presentation at INCOSE IS.

NOTE: This is an international symposium, as such, we have many authors for whom English is not their first language. Please indicate in the comments section if you identify accessibility issues. : If you suggest moving the tutorial to another topical area, please indicate the domain you think would be the best fit below.

Scoring Grades for Acceptance

5—Definitely Accept: It meets all criteria (in some cases exceeding some) evaluated in this form.
4—Probably Accept: It meets most criteria in this form.
3—Borderline Accept/Reject: It fails to meet a few criteria in this form.
2—Weak Reject: It does not meet many criteria and/or may not be a good fit to INCOSE IS.
1—Do Not Accept: It does not meet any criteria in this form and/or is not a good fit to INCOSE IS
COMMENTS:

Confidence

As a reviewer, how confident were you within the knowledge area discussed in this submission?

Scoring Grades for Confidence

5—Very Confident: I am an expert in this topic.
4—Confident: I am well versed in this topic.
3—Some Confidence: I have some experience in this topic.
2—Low Confidence: I am vaguely familiar with this topic.
1—No Confidence: I am not familiar with this topic.