IMS2501 Case Study: The International Conference on Heuristic Interfaces (ICHI) hosted by University of Callithumpia

After successfully hosting the 13th Annual International Conference on Heuristic Interfaces, the University of Callithumpia presented an impressive business case to the conference organisation, and were given the rights to host the conference on a permanent basis. Academics around the world working on user interface design, come to this conference to participate in stimulating debate on the latest in user interface design, and to soak up some rays on Callithumpia’s warm tropical beaches.

Professor Bob McDougal is head of the organising committee, and regularly plays golf with Kent Brewmeister, principal consultant of Ace Consulting Inc., an international systems development consultancy. Bob asked Kent to develop a system to help the committee to manage this process, as they were going to be running it permanently.

Ace Consulting finished a first cut of a prototype system in Microsoft Access – it is now capable of recording authors and their papers, keeping track of who is reviewing which paper and what the result of that review is. Unfortunately, due to a rather messy incident on the 14th green in one of their golf games, Professor McDougal and Kent Brewmeister have had a falling out. Professor McDougal has decided that he would prefer someone else to develop the production system. The first cut prototype (with very basic functionality) has been handed over to you. A manual system was used to run the conference in 2003, and had all the problems associated with a paper-based system – lost information, very time consuming, very difficult to retrieve information to create the reports we required, etc. Both of these systems can be used as a starting point for understanding what our requirements are.

System Description

The following is a preliminary description of the system. You will need to talk to our staff to ensure that you understand our detailed requirements. Please find attached the forms that we use in our manual system.

Manage Papers/Authors

Academic conferences consist of a number of sessions within streams, where academics present papers based upon their work. We need to maintain and access a range of information about submitted papers and their authors, via the author(s) details or the paper details. When draft papers are submitted to the conference, the authors submit a ‘Paper Submission’ form, which details all the information required by the conference organisers. This form is used to record the status of the paper, and notifications to the author(s).
If the authors are also willing to be reviewers, they fill out the ‘Reviewer Registration’ form.
If a paper is accepted after it has been reviewed, it is then revised (if necessary) and resubmitted ready for publication in the conference proceedings.

We would like to see a paper or a list of papers based on a range of criteria.
Manage Reviewers

The call to review papers goes out with the call to submit papers, and anyone interested in reviewing papers, submits a ‘Reviewer Registration’ form. Reviewers are not limited to authors submitting a paper to the conference. We need to maintain and access a range of information about reviewers. When we receive the reviewer registration form we determine the suitability of the reviewer for each nominated stream. It is essential that we can see what a reviewer’s allocation of papers is to manage the workload and the selection process.

Each reviewer is given approximately four papers to review. Conference organisers have to be very careful about keeping track of who has submitted which paper, and who is reviewing it. Organisers must be careful not to send any of the authors their own paper to review, and we prefer not to send it to reviewers working in the same organisations as the authors ideally.

We will need a range of information from the system to enable us to manage the selection of reviewers and their workload.

Manage Review

The ICHI conference, being one of the more prestigious in this area, has what is known as a ‘double-blind’ review process. This means that authors submit papers to the conference organising committee and these papers are sent to two reviewers who assess the paper. The user interface design academic community is fairly small, and it is quite likely that someone who has written a paper will also be a reviewer at the conference. This process has to be managed very carefully. The papers have all identifying information removed from them before being sent to the reviewers – in this way, the author doesn’t know who is reviewing their paper, and the reviewer doesn’t know who wrote it. This ensures that all reviews are fair and not biased by personal relationships or the status of the author – a professor’s paper is reviewed in exactly the same way as a student’s. Once the papers are assessed they are returned with one of four recommendations:

- Accept
- Weak Accept (minor changes needed)
- Weak Reject (major changes or the committee needs to think carefully before accepting)
- Reject

Once both reviews for a paper are received, the organising committee decides on the final status of the paper:

- Accepted
- Accepted with changes
- Rejected

The author is then sent an email detailing the organising committee’s decision.

It is essential to have a reminder system in place for reviewers, and we have sometimes had to re-allocate papers if a reviewer is unable to cope with the workload.
**University of Callithumpia**

**13th International Conference on Heuristic Interfaces (ICHI)**

**Paper Submission**

Paper Name: __________________________________________________________

Conference Stream nominated for paper:

- [ ] GUI Interfaces  
- [ ] Educational Interfaces  
- [ ] Designing Interfaces

**Author(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone no(s)</th>
<th>Postal Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Main Contact? Y/N

Speaker? Y/N

Comments:

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

**Office use only:**

Paper No:                Allocated Stream:                                                Draft submitted date: ___/___/___

**Reviewers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Re-allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sent</td>
<td>/ /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>/ /</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Status: A/WA/WR/R

Final paper status: A/AC/R ____________

Author informed: ___/___/___  Final copy submitted date: ___/___/___

Comments:

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________

All authors attending the conference receive a 10% discount
### University of Callithumpia

### 13th International Conference on Heuristic Interfaces (ICHI)

#### Reviewer Registration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surname:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Name:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Email:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone no(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Postal Address:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Papers submitted to conference? Y/N</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUI Interfaces</th>
<th>Office use only:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Reviewer experience:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A/WA/WR/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Interfaces</th>
<th>Office use only:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Reviewer experience:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A/WA/WR/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designing Interfaces</th>
<th>Office use only:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Reviewer experience:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Status</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A/WA/WR/R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Office use only:**

Reviewer informed of status: ___/___/___

Papers allocated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paper No.</th>
<th>Stream</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Manage Papers/ Authors

Academic conferences consist of a number of sessions within streams, where academics present papers based upon their work. We need to maintain and access a range of information about submitted papers and their authors, via the author(s) details or the paper details. When draft papers are submitted to the conference, the authors submit a ‘Paper Submission’ form, which details all the information required by the conference organisers. This form is used to record the status of the paper, and notifications to the author(s).

If the authors are also willing to be reviewers, they fill out the ‘Reviewer Registration’ form.

If a paper is accepted after it has been reviewed, it is then revised (if necessary) and resubmitted ready for publication in the conference proceedings.

We would like to see a paper or a list of papers based on a range of criteria.

**Detailed functionality (to be provided at interview):**

- Maintain information about papers and authors (Create, Modify, Delete) – see ‘Paper Submission’ form for details
- Access to paper required via partial Paper name and Author name.
  - If the author has submitted multiple papers – allow selection of specific paper if required
- Record date of draft paper submission, final paper submission
- Record final status of paper (Accept – A, Accept with changes – AC, Reject – R)
- Record author notification of acceptance/rejection of the paper
  - If accepted, record stream allocation based on Author(s) request and Reviewers opinions.

A comment field to just highlight any issues would be very useful.

We want to be able to see/check if an author is a reviewer

**Link to Reviewer details (if exists).**

**Link to Reviews for the paper.**

**Reporting:**

- A list of papers via Conference stream, Paper No. and Author
- A list of papers via their final status – showing the author informed date, and the final copy submission date
2. Manage Reviewers

The call to review papers goes out with the call to submit papers, and anyone interested in reviewing papers, submits a ‘Reviewer Registration’ form. Reviewers are not limited to authors submitting a paper to the conference. We need to maintain and access a range of information about reviewers. When we receive the reviewer registration form we determine the suitability of the reviewer for each nominated stream. It is essential that we can see what a reviewer’s allocation of papers is to manage the workload and the selection process.

Each reviewer is given approximately four papers to review. Conference organisers have to be very careful about keeping track of who has submitted which paper, and who is reviewing it. Organisers must be careful not to send any of the authors their own paper to review, and we prefer not to send it to people working in the same organisations as the authors (much harder to achieve).

We will need a range of information from the system to enable us to manage the selection of reviewers and their workload.

_Detailed functionality (to be provided at interview):_

- Maintain information about reviewers (Create, Modify, Delete) – see ‘Reviewer Registration’ form for details
- Access to reviewer required via partial Reviewer name.
- Display if reviewer is author
  - Link to all submitted papers
- View Reviewers total allocation of papers for review within streams
- Determine reviewer status for each specified stream and record:
  - Accept
  - Weak Accept (will use if we do not have enough reviewers in the area)
  - Weak Reject (will use if we are desperate)
  - Reject

_Reporting:_

A list of available reviewers for a particular conference stream, showing the no. of papers they have been currently allocated in the stream, their total allocation and their experience.

A list of available reviewers, within their reviewer status for a particular stream together with the no. of papers they have been currently allocated in the stream, their total allocation and their experience.

This information will help us advertise for reviewers in particular streams if required.
3. Manage Reviews

The ICHI conference, being one of the more prestigious in this area, has what is known as a ‘double-blind’ review process. This means that authors submit papers to the conference organising committee and these papers are sent to two reviewers who assess the paper. The user interface design academic community is fairly small, and it is quite likely that someone who has written a paper will also be a reviewer at the conference. This process has to be managed very carefully. The papers have all identifying information removed from them before being sent to the reviewers – in this way, the author doesn’t know who is reviewing their paper, and the reviewer doesn’t know who wrote it. This ensures that all reviews are fair and not biased by personal relationships or the status of the author – a professor’s paper is reviewed in exactly the same way as a student’s. Once the papers are assessed they are returned with one of four recommendations:

- Accept, Weak Accept (minor changes needed), Weak Reject (major changes or the committee needs to think carefully before accepting), Reject

Once both reviews for a paper are received, the organising committee decides on the final status of the paper:

- Accepted, Accepted with changes, Rejected

The author is then sent an email detailing the organising committee’s decision.

It is essential to have a reminder system in place for reviewers, and we have sometimes had to re-allocate papers if a reviewer is unable to cope with the workload.

Detailed functionality (to be provided at interview):

After all papers submitted, we need to allocate papers to reviewers, using the list of available reviewers in a conference stream. We cannot send a paper for review to any of the co-authors, and we prefer not to send it to reviewer working in the same organisation, but will do so if we have no choice. We note the dates the reviewer was sent the paper and returns the paper, and the reviewer’s status for the paper.

A reminder email is sent to each reviewer 5 days before the reviews are due. A comment field is essential if the reviewer has sent us information telling us if they are going to be late and when we can expect the review. If a reviewer cannot get their review done on time, we need to be able to re-allocate the paper to another reviewer, and note the re-allocation.

Once both reviews are received for a paper, we would like to see both decisions together with a link to their comments document to help us make the final decision.

Reporting:

- A report detailing all papers and their review status from each reviewer together with the comment field.
- A report detailing all reviewers who have not sent in their reviews by the due date so that we can chase them up.