

INCOSE PANEL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Panel Evaluation Criteria

A panel session generally consists of three parts:

- An introduction, by the moderator, which defines the theme. This includes the boundaries of the subject matter, and a definition of the issues regarding this subject matter that are to be debated and the intended outcome. (Whether this outcome is achieved will, of course, to a large extent depend on the participation of the audience.)
- Presentations, by the panellists, of relatively short position papers, that are definite (possibly even contrived controversial) enough to act as seeds for the discussion.
- The discussion of the issues and the positions, by the audience and led by the moderator.

Consequently, besides the general requirements that the panel shall not be used for the promotion of any commercial product or interest, and that the panel shall not be used to promote or voice an opinion on political or religious matters, the evaluation criteria for panels address all three of the above components. However, panel sessions should not simply be a presentation of several short papers followed by questions to the individual panellists, but should, as a result of the discussion, produce something of value beyond the position papers.

Also, since each panel proposal is only a proposal, review emphasis will be on the content of the proposal and not on its format or precise use of grammar. However, concepts presented should be complete and supporting information sufficient to enable a reviewer to assess the efficacy of a stated position. Review emphasis will be on the knowledge, experience and capabilities of the moderator and members of the panel as well.

Insight into each of the Evaluation Criteria is presented in the following sections to assist the moderator and panellists in achieving high quality of the submitted proposal, thus increasing the likelihood of acceptance.

1. The Panel Theme

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

2. The Organization

- The number of panellists is definite and each identified by name
- The time allocated to each part (moderator introduction, position paper presentation, and discussion) is appropriate to its role in achieving the intended outcome

3. The Position Statements

- The proposal contains a position statement for each panellist (even if this is in the form of an abstract)
- Each panellist takes a definite position on the theme issues
- The positions are clearly different enough to initiate a discussion
- The proposal reflect the panel organisation (in length and format)

4. The Moderator

- Has experience in managing a session of this nature and in moderating discussions
- Has adequate experience in a broad field of systems engineering centred around the theme
- Has been actively involved in INCOSE for some time and has an appreciation of current trends within INCOSE

5. The Panellists

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

Procedure for the reviewers:

- a. Read or refresh the reading of the evaluation criteria to ensure an understanding of what to review against.
- b. Access the Panel Review Database, and bring up one of the assigned panels on the screen, or download and print.
- c. Read the proposal through quickly to get an understanding of its objective and structure. A good proposal will enable the reviewer to easily comprehend the scope and intended outcome of the panel session.
- d. Re-read more thoroughly, jotting down comments.
- e. Grade each of the five groups of criteria using the following scale:
1 = Poor, 2 = Fair, 3 = Good, 4 = Very Good, and 5 = Exceptional.
- f. Assess overall contribution of the panel to the symposium and select one of the following recommendations: Accept as is, Accept with modifications, or Reject; the latter two recommendations require the reviewer to enter a corresponding justification.
- g. Each panel proposal moderator will have expended quite a bit of effort in producing the panel proposal for review. That effort should be rewarded with positive and constructive feedback. Limit comments to what it would take to make the panel a better panel. Opinions and conclusions of the reviewer, if a disagreement, should not be captured, unless made as a constructive "have you considered" statement. Comments might include examples 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.

Note:

It is not prudent to rate a proposal highly if panellists are identified as TBA and/or position statements are missing.