

=====

W4A Doctoral Consortium Review Form

=====

Please complete your review using the following guidelines for the scored categories.

Submission Requirements

Is the submission complete? Does the applicant meet the submission criteria? Does the paper comply with ACM template?

5 = Very strong: An excellent application with a very well-formatted paper with no errors. The applicant meets the eligibility criteria perfectly. The letter of support strengthens the application.

4 = Strong: A complete application with a correctly formatted paper with minimal errors. The applicant meets the eligibility criteria. Letter of support enhances the application.

3 = Borderline. A good application but could be enhanced, or applicant may not meet eligibility criteria. Paper has some minor errors in formatting. Letter of support is included.

2 = Mediocre: Some elements missing from submission or could be significantly better. Paper has noticeable errors in formatting. Applicant does not meet eligibility criteria.

1 = Poor: Submission is incomplete and/or paper is very poorly formatted.

Score:

Clarity

Is the two-page paper well-written and well-structured? Do the English or the mathematics need further editing?

5 = admirably clear

4 = understandable by most readers

3 = mostly understandable to me with some effort

2 = important questions were hard to resolve even with effort

1 = much of the abstract is confusing

Score:

Relevance and Appropriateness

Is the topic of the two-page paper relevant to W4A?

Note for reviewers: Consider the broadness of the theme and the complete range of the accessibility continuum. Submissions can be relevant to a range of platforms including web, mobile and wearable.

4 = appropriate for W4A and would add significant value to the conference

3 = possibly relevant to the audience and would add some value, although it does not break significant new ground

2 = only marginally relevant

1 = inappropriate

Score:

Awareness of Field

Does the applicant understand the field? Is the approach or idea supported by relevant literature?

(Bear in mind that this is a two-page paper, with limited room for references).

5 = Very high: the applicant is clearly very aware of the field, how their work fits, and their approach/idea convincingly supported.

4 = High: generally solid work, very good awareness of field and approach/idea well supported.

3 = Good: fairly reasonable work, awareness of field and reasonably well supported.

2 = Poor: low awareness with some obvious omissions and not well supported.

1 = Very Poor: poor awareness, significant omissions and poor support.

Score:

Originality

How original is the approach? Does this paper break new ground in topic, methodology, or content?

5 = surprising: noteworthy new problem, technique, methodology, or insight

4 = creative: relatively few people in our community would be aware of content

3 = somewhat conventional: a number of people could have come up with this if they thought about it for a while.

2 = rather boring: obvious, repeating previous research or techniques with minor differences

1 = significant portions have actually been done before or done better

Score:

Impact

What is the potential impact of this work? Is this well-articulated by the applicant?

5 = Ground Breaking: the impact of this work can significantly enhance the field or be of significant impact to users.

4 = High: this work enhances the field and would be of high impact to users.

3 = Potential: this work has potential but the true impact is not fully clear; the impact of the idea is not well articulated by the applicant.

2 = Reasonable: this work could have a reasonable impact, but it is not well understood or well-articulated by the applicant.

1 = Low: the impact of this work is low, or it is poorly articulated.

Recommendation

Should this student be awarded one of the six Google Doctoral Consortium Awards to attend W4A 2015?

5 = Definite yes: The student will benefit greatly from attending the conference and their work would add significant value to the conference. Attendees would benefit from the presentation of his/her research in the conference.

4 = Maybe yes: I believe the student's research would benefit from attending the conference and they would add value to the conference.

3 = Borderline: I'm ambivalent; there are other submissions I would accept over this.

2 = Probably not: I'd rather not recommend this applicant for the award.

1 = Definitely not.

Score:

Overall Score:

[Detailed Comments](#)
