reVISe Updates: Amendments & More Info

Oct 23, 2019

Amendments

Process

As part of the conditional approval of the original reVISE proposal (from 13 Oct 2019), the following amendments were passed by VEC vote on 21 Oct 2019.

Amendments, I

- **Terminology:** The reVISe committee will go through areas (and keywords) and make sure that Visualization and Visual Analytics are represented in each
- **Conference Name:** The conference name will remain IEEE VIS. The top level conference description, tag line, website headline and branding is "Visualization & Visual Analytics" e.g., the premier forum for advances in Visualization & Visual Analytics.
- **Area Names:** The reVISe committee will refine area names and descriptions to ensure that names are clear and indicative
- **Body Names:** Visualization Council becomes VIS Steering Committee, VIS Executive Committee remains the VIS Executive Committee

Amendments, II

- **Elections:** The reVISe committee will clarify election eligibility criteria, to consider self-declaration, encouraging participation, practicalities, legalities, and checks and balances.
- **Papers Chairs:** Move to 3 OPCs
- **Committee Structure:** VIS Steering Committee will consist of 9 people rather than 7, with two new appointed positions
- **Vice Chairs:** Both committees (VIS Steering Committee and VEC) will have at least one vice chair, appointed by the chair.

Amendments, III

- **Appointments and Ratifications:**
  - VIS Steering Committee appoints short papers, workshops, posters, DC, panels, tutorials
  - VEC still appoints Best Papers Committee
  - VIS Steering Committee ratifies papers and short papers Program Committees
  - VIS Steering Committee ratifies call for papers / short papers, which come from papers chairs

Additional Information

Review Assignment Process Overview

The review assignment phase includes the following steps:

1. Remove Incomplete Submissions
2. Conflict Declaration
3. Bidding
4. Automatic assignment
5. Manual assignment

What follows is a proposal of how to deal with each step in the new process.

1 Removing Incomplete Submissions

This is a manual process that should be completed by each pair of area chairs.

It involves opening each paper marked as "incomplete" by PCS to check what is causing it to be labeled as "incomplete". Simple misses of checkboxes can be followed up with authors, missing papers/titles/abstracts etc. leads to manual deletion of the paper from the pool of submissions.

Removed papers do not get counted towards official submission counts.

2 Conflict Declaration

Who: Overall paper chairs (OPC), area paper chairs (APC), the program committee

What changes: The conflict declaration in this process will be more tedious than in previous years for OPC and APC as the author pool will be larger.

Support in PCS: the interface for declaring conflicts in PCS has improved somewhat between March 2019 and now. It is now easier to select authors from a specific affiliation. Also, conflict declarations are propagated between conferences (even between CHI and VIS, etc.).

However, more improvements could be envisioned such as:
- connection to DBLP to automatically extract co-authors
- a better filter/sort...

3 Bidding in the New Area Model

Bidding is an integral part to how the assignment will work across one shared program committee. Bidding involves the program committee choosing which papers they would (not) like to review. In order to facilitate bidding and improve the way the program committee can find papers of interest the reVISe committee also developed a new set of keywords to use.

Who is involved: the program committee, OPCs

What changes: The program committee will now have a much larger number of papers to bid on. The OPCs need to closely monitor bidding to make sure all PC members bid and choose a good number of "want" and "willing" papers. OPCs are responsible for nudging PC members to bid.

Required changes in PCS:

- Implementation of the new keywords set (incl. descriptions)
- Improvements to the bidding interface
  - Already done between VIS and CHI this year: PC members can start out by setting all papers to "reluctant"
  - Required: better filtering of paper list by keywords (e.g. only show papers requiring expertise in "graphs/network data") in addition to filtering by match scores
- Compute keyword match scores on the fly (right now, OPCs have to click a button to have match scores recalculated)

Potential further changes:

- Discuss adding another bidding category "outside of my area of expertise" in order to mark papers as a stronger negative than "reluctant", to indicate a category that do not have any expertise about.
- Adding back the author list to the bidding interface (but was removed for more anonymous bidding, so needs consideration)

4 Automatic Seeding

PCS includes a mechanism to automatically assign PC members to papers based on a combination of matching score (between PC member expertise and author-selected keywords) and bids.

Who: OPCs
What changes: At this step nothing changes. OPCs would seed assignments based on a percentage of bidding and matching score (Step 6 in the image on the right: The InfoVis chairs this year seeded assignments 100% by bidding.)

Changes for PCS:

- For the automatic assignment PCS currently does not take into account whether PC members share an affiliation and whether they have conflicts declared between themselves. This leads to a large number of swaps that have to happen to avoid people from the same institution or former supervisor+student serving as primary+secondary on the same paper. The problem should be solvable by adding a conflict declaration phase among members of the program committee.
- It needs to be verified if OPCs can seed the assignment across papers submitted to different areas (=subcommittees in PCS language)

5. What are the minimum and maximum number of submissions assigned to a person? Does this override the person's volunteered maximum?

The quality of assignments is very sensitive to the **minimum** number of submissions per person. If the minimum is too high, some people will

	Minimum	Maximum	Override	
Committee	6	7	☑	Assign up to this maximum, regardless of the person's stated maximum.
Reviewers				Assign up to the person's stated maximum.

suggest

6. What are the relative weights of bidding and matching?

Bid	1.0
Match	0.0

Make automated assignments   (Existing assignments will not be changed; only additional assignments will be made.)

5 Manual Assignment

After the automatic assignment seeds each paper with a primary and secondary reviewer the area paper chairs have to step in, check assignments, and manually make adjustments. Based on the quality of the bidding and initial seeding changes can be minimal or extensive and we recommend to give more time to the process in the first few years. Currently this process spans three days; we would extend this period to one week. During that intensive week the papers chairs will need to be in close contact, both within and across areas, but this work can be done with remote collaboration tools rather than an in-person meeting.

Who: OPCs, APCs

What changes: Reassignments made in one area now affect possible assignments in other areas. The pool of choices for each assignment is larger (the full PC). We recommend for APCs to make swaps such that people who bid on a paper and have few assignments get papers added first while people with a larger number of assignments get papers removed first. Should this not be possible, bids should go before assignment counts. Towards the end of the process OPCs should coordinate with APCs to help equalize load for PC members by suggesting changes.

Changes required for PCS:

- Potentially already possible: area chairs need to be able to see assignment counts for all PC members
- Better view on who bid what for a specific paper (right now the info needs to be traced across a huge cumbersome table). This would ideally be a button that will show "alternative assignment suggestions:" and list PC members who bid "want" or "willing" ordered by their current assignment counts. In addition, a warning should be issued if a PC member who bid "reluctant" is added to a paper.

A similar process should be followed for swaps that have to happen after the assignments get sent to the PC.