ICSE 2014 – Program Board Guidelines

Thank you again for agreeing to serve on the ICSE 2014 Program Board (PB). The work of the PB involves three different phases: review period, online discussion, and PB meeting. The CyberChair section below provides a summary of the functionalities offered to support your tasks during each of these three phases.

Based on a bidding process, you will be assigned a set of papers for which you will serve as the discussion facilitator. You will particularly help ensure the quality of the reviews, trigger and moderate the discussion of papers assigned to you during the online discussion with the PC members, and lead the discussion of those papers at the PB meeting. You will also be a second PB reader for some of the papers being discussed in the PB meeting.

Phase I: review period

- It is essential that we ensure the quality of reviews to enable rational decisions at the PB meeting. Hence, please read each paper (ideally, early in the review period) and then read all the reviews as they are submitted.
- If you identify any review that needs improvement, please contact the corresponding reviewer requesting them with specific suggestions as to what is missing in the review or might need to be reworded or clarified. Please ask them to submit a revised version of the review by the review deadline.

Phase II: online discussion

- Please initiate and moderate the online discussion of each of the papers assigned to you. Only you and the PC members assigned to the paper will be able to contribute to this discussion (and indeed, none of the other PB or PC members will be able to view the discussion at this time).
- Moderating means that you actively monitor all your discussion threads, and contribute when necessary. In particular, please focus on the following:
  - Help reviewers focus on reasons to accept papers. Try to steer the discussion in a positive direction.
  - Remember that ICSE 2014 is not a journal, and so the priority is to publish timely, worthwhile contributions. Demanding perfection within the time and space limits of a conference is not reasonable.
  - Make sure reviewers take into account the selected paper categories when discussing a paper.
  - Avoid discussions to become personal or drift away from rational arguments.
- Aim at obtaining consensus among the PC reviewers, though this is in no way compulsory. This, naturally, may involve one or more of the reviewers changing their reviews and recommendations based on the discussion.
  - Note that you do not write a review of your own and, as previously discussed, we should respect the PC in their reviews and opinions. PB members should therefore remain light-handed and guide the discussion, for example by asking questions, rather than driving it, for example by expressing strong opinions in an authoritative way.
- Though we should respect and value the reviews of our PC members, you may have concerns about a paper or its reviews. You should first voice those with the reviewers themselves. If the issue cannot be resolved, but you believe it can be addressed during the PB meeting, save the issue for then. If not, please bring it up with the program co-chairs as soon as possible.

- For each paper, please add a summary of the discussion using CyberChair. This summary will serve as the basis for discussion of the paper at the PB meeting. This summary should focus on the primary reasons why a paper is suggested to be accepted, suggested to be rejected, or still undecided (provide the 'key argument').
- Some of the papers will hereafter be rejected; for those papers, the summary will also serve to inform the authors of the nature of the discussion and the key arguments for rejection at this time.

PB meeting

- For each of the papers you have been assigned as PB member, please be prepared to summarize the contribution of the paper (very briefly), the reviews, and the key arguments emerging from the online discussion, and make a recommendation.

- For papers where you have been assigned as a second PB reader, please be ready to discuss whether the reviews, summary of the online discussion, and recommendation provide an accurate view of the paper, in your opinion.

- Based on the discussion of the PB and the eventual outcome (accept or reject), please update the summary of the discussion using CyberChair so that the authors can better understand the final decision. This summary should focus on the primary reasons why a paper is accepted or rejected (the 'key argument').

- All BCC and lower papers will be excluded from discussion. However, a PB member can ask to have any of these papers discussed. If one of these is assigned to you, please ask the proponent of the paper for a clear justification.

CyberChair

Your papers are accessible through your CyberChair's reviewer page. When logging in you will see the list of papers for which you are a discussion facilitator. Here's a summary of the functionalities after logging in:

- Bidding: as usual. You will receive separate instructions when it is time to bid.

- Review period: you will receive a copy via e-mail of each review that concerns one of the papers that you have been assigned. Please read these carefully. You can also see the reviews online by clicking on a paper number. The list of reviews that have already been completed will show up on the left.

- Online discussion: use the 'online discussion' link (visible on the left after you have clicked on a paper number) to initiate a conversation with the reviewers of each paper. Please request each of the reviewers to use the same link for discussion, so a record is kept of the arguments back and forth.

- Decision summary: CyberChair is currently being extended with additional functionality through which you can insert a discussion summary, first as based on the online discussion and later as adjusted based on arguments at the PB meeting. We will keep you posted on exactly how to do that as soon as the functionality is complete and tested.

- Rapports: a special link 'Rapports' is available in your main menu, which takes you to a new page with the list of papers with their review state and a list of the reviewers assigned to the papers. If you need to contact a reviewer individually, you can use the links displayed; it is preferred, however, that you use the 'online discussion' link for your papers, so that all of the reviewers (who have already submitted a review) will get a copy of your correspondence. Use the e-mail facility of the Rapports page sparingly, especially since no

copy is kept in the system.

Timeline
The dates that are particularly relevant to the PB members are highlighted in bold.

September 16-19, 2013	Bidding
September 27, 2013	First round assignments distributed
September 27- November 1, 2013	Monitor the reviews received for quality, and contact PC members if improvements are needed
November 7, 2013	Second round assignments distributed
November 7-22, 2013	Monitor the additional reviews received, and contact PC members if improvements are needed
November 28-December 20, 2013	Online discussion
January 8, 2014	Pre-workshop for Program Board
January 9-10, 2014	Program Board meeting
January 17, 2014	Author notifications

For questions or further comments
Many thanks for all the hard work and time you are willing to dedicate to ICSE 2014. If you have any further comments or questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Lionel Briand, lionel.briand@uni.lu
André van der Hoek, andre@ics.uci.edu