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Abstract

Have you ever thought about submitting an article to CSEE&T? The process of research and article submission is fairly long and often complicated because people don't know what all the steps are and too often there really isn't much support available. In this workshop, we will examine that process and try to identify ways to improve the process to increase the number and quality of submissions to CSEE&T. Please join us in brainstorming, selecting, and then planning concrete steps to make the process of submission for CSEE&T delightful, instead of painful.

1. Rationale

We would like to improve the quantity and quality of submissions to CSEE&T. To do this, we would like to examine the process of developing submissions, and then consider ways to support, encourage, scaffold, and otherwise improve that process. Some of the key questions that this workshop will examine include:

1. What is the process of developing submissions for CSEE&T?
2. What can we do to improve this process?
3. Which of our ideas for improvement provide the best bang for the buck? We will prioritize looking at impact, effort, and time to pay off.
4. Select and commit -- we will pick key ideas, begin planning, and set up working groups to turn them into reality.
5. How can we report our results to other communities and call on them for collaboration and cooperation -- ICSE, ISERN, SIGCSE...?
6. How should we report the results to the CSEE&T community?

2. Planned Activities and Format (2 Sessions, 1.5 Hours Each)

The two sessions have been organized around two major questions: What should we do to improve the process? And What are the action steps we will take to implement selected actions? The workshops will be conducted as follows:

Workshop 1: What should we do to improve the process?

Start with a brief introduction to the process, followed by:

1. How can we improve the process?
   ■ Brainstorming in small groups
   ■ Collect results to form an affinity diagram
2. Prioritize
   ■ multi-vote with red dots to select top ranking items
   ■ small groups assess impact, effort, and time to get results for the top ranking items
3. What should we report to CSEE&T? How?
4. Review and reflect on workshop

Workshop 2: What are the action steps to implement our recommended actions?

1. Review results from first part

2. Next steps: Who will take responsibility? Working groups? Deadline for planning?
   - Small groups brainstorming
   - Collect results

3. Call for other communities involvement
   - Small groups, who should we ask, what should we ask, and how?
   - Collect results

4. What should we report to CSEE&T? How?

5. Review and reflect on workshop

3. Expected Outcomes

There will be several products of this process. First, we will collect and make available the lists of ideas from the small teams. Second, we will record the affinity diagram groupings and the ratings from the multi-vote. Third, we will collect and publicize the reports on the next steps, including the plans and publicity. I also expect that we are likely to need continuing workshops to develop some of the ideas.

Results from this workshop will be publicized to the entire CSEE&T community, first as part of the results session, and also during the closing session of the conference. We will also make materials from this workshop available on the CSEE&T website.

4. Expected Audience

This workshop welcomes anyone who is interested in improving the CSEE&T submissions process. That really is everyone at CSEE&T. People who have made submissions, people who are thinking about making submissions, people on the program committee who have reviewed submissions, people who have done research and didn't know they could submit—everyone has ideas that can help make this workshop more successful.
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