

INCOSE IS SUBMISSION REVIEW PROCESS FOR PRESENTATIONS ONLY

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

Reviewers will score each abstract submission, based on the guiding questions in each section, using the following criteria/instructions. *Note: presentations will not be reviewed at this stage.*

Originality

Please assess if this abstract proposes any new insights into attaining solutions to SE challenges. You may use the following questions as a guide in your evaluation process for the originality of the work proposed in this abstract:

- Do the author(s) discuss new insights into existing theory, methods, processes, tools, and/or practice?
- Do the author(s) make a case for why their insights can be leveraged to attain solutions to SE challenges.
- Will attendees of INCOSE IS and readers of the proceedings learn something that they didn't already know from this submission?

Scoring Grades

Please select the option that best describes the originality of this manuscript:

1 Not at all Original - This particular work has already been sufficiently addressed by the community.

2 Low Originality - This work presents a small incremental improvement over existing published work.

3 Minor Improvement - The same problem has been examined before, but this presentation presents a new approach or data that has not yet been presented.

4 Major Improvement - This work represents a significant expansion of a previously investigated topic and offers a potential path towards attaining solutions to an SE challenge.

5 New/Novel Approach – This work presents 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 is this submission to INCOSE IS. You may use the following questions as a guide in your evaluation process for the relevance to INCOSE IS of the work presented in this manuscript:

- Is the work proposed in the abstract related to the disciplinary areas identified in the SEBoK, INCOSE Handbook, FuSE, TechOps, INCOSE initiatives, and/or of interest to SE?
- Is this submission, based on what the abstract depicts and regardless of its quality, better suited to other events or publication channels?

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

Scoring Grades

Please select the option that best describes the relevance of this manuscript to INCOSE IS:

1 Not at all Relevant - Does not belong at INCOSE IS.

2 Low Relevance - The submission is of low relevance to INCOSE IS.

3 Borderline Relevance - The submission has borderline relevance to INCOSE IS.

4 Relevant - The submission is relevant to INCOSE IS and/or INCOSE at large.

5 Very Relevant - The submission presents material that would be highly welcomed by INCOSE IS attendees and INCOSE's community.

Contribution

Please assess if the author, via the abstract, proposes a novel/relevant contribution to systems engineering. You may use the following questions as a guide in your evaluation process for the contribution of the work presented in this manuscript:

- Do the author(s) make a compelling case for how their presentation may contribute to INCOSE's mission 2035 or other needs of SE?
- Are contributions clearly defined?

Scoring Grades

Please select the option that best describes the contribution level of this manuscript to INCOSE IS:

1 Little to no contribution of value - This particular work has already been sufficiently addressed by the community.

2 Some minor contributions - This work presents a small incremental improvement over existing published work.

3 Minor Improvement - The same problem has been examined before, but this presentation presents a new approach or data that has not yet been presented.

4 Major Improvement – This proposed work represents a significant expansion of a previously-investigated topic.

5 New/Novel - This is a new topic in this area, a dramatically different methodology, tool, or approach.

Acceptance

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

This is an international symposium, as such, we have a large number of authors for whom English is not their first language. Please indicate in the comments section if you identify accessibility issues.

Scoring Guide

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

Please select the option that best describes your assessment below:

Note: If you suggest moving the abstract and subsequent presentation to another topical area, please indicate the domain you think would be the best fit below.

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.

Confidence

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

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.