Submission, review, placement, and archiving guidelines

The following guidelines are based on extensive feedback from the thread chairs and the expectation that we will be using the xcd submission system that we have been reviewing. For many thread chairs the load without blind review seems unacceptable. The following is predicated on the belief that peer reviews 1) on average are helpful and 2) help build community. What seems clear from the Thread Chair responses is that if we want to drop peer review we will need to drop any expectations of authors receiving review comments.

Submission Types

1. **Research Papers** of approximately 5000 words (and not to exceed 7500 words) properly formatted with an abstract and bibliography. These papers are considered for all session types. Research papers will be subject to blind peer review, selection by Thread Chairs and have their disposition finalized by the Program Chairs. Comments by the Thread and Program Chairs are encouraged, especially for work not selected for standard presentation.

2. **Application Presentations** consisting of 10 to 30 presentation slides including an abstract slide (not for presentation) and a bibliographic slide. Application presentations are considered for all session types. Presentations will not be peer reviewed. Instead they will be selected by Thread Chairs and finalized by the Program chairs. When appropriate, the Thread or Program chairs should make a review comment on the work to help guide presentation.

3. **Work-in-progress Descriptions** consisting of extended abstracts (two-page document, plus a bibliography) describing the work being conducted and preliminary results, if any. Work-in-progress Proposals will be considered for Work-in-Progress Discussion Sessions, Poster Sessions, and Feedback Talks. Work-in-progress proposals are not peer reviewed. The Thread Chairs select them and this is finalized by the Program Chairs. No expectation for comments on these papers will be set, but Thread or Program Chairs may provide guidance for the authors as appropriate.

4. **Workshops** require an abstract (~250 words) and descriptions or information on: format, background expectations, and facility requirements. They are selected by the Workshop Chairs or Central Office with the approval of the Program Chairs.

5. **Model Exposition** consisting of an abstract (~250 words) describing a model exposition idea. Model exposition proposals are not part of the review process (i.e., blind review and Thread Chair evaluation), but instead are managed by the Central Office with the approval of the Program Chairs.

6. **Other Activities** based on an abstract (~250 words) for material that is of interest to the community but does not conform to the norms for conference presentations. This would include work done by K-12 students as well as the activities of chapters and SIGs.

This work will be considered for Specialized Presentations (roundtable, parallel, poster or other format). Other activities are not part of the review process (i.e., blind review and Thread Chair evaluation), but instead are managed by the Central Office with the approval of the Program Chairs.

All submissions in the first three categories should include 1) a clear statement of the dynamic problem or methodological issue; 2) why the author is addressing this important problem with SD or how the methodology will advance SD practice; 3) methods used (e.g., GMB, client process); 4) a bibliography; 5) research papers and application presentations should include results and outcomes. For work-in-progress submissions preliminary results are encouraged, but not required.

Session Types

1. **Plenary Sessions** for high-quality work that is of broad general interest. Each presenter will have approximately 20 minutes with 10 minutes for discussion.
2. **Parallel Sessions** for quality work that lends itself well to oral presentation. Each presenter will have approximately 15 minutes with 5 minutes for discussion. There would be 3 papers in a 1-hour session.
3. **Lightning Talks** for quality work that can be presented quickly. This can include updates to work that has been previously presented, simple model insight lessons, and proposed activities for which the presenters want to invite contributions. Lightning talks require strong moderation and a clear theme for the entire session. There would be up to 6 papers in a 1-hour session.
4. **Poster Presentations** for quality work and promising work in progress that lends itself well to interactive one-on-one discussion. There will be one or more times at which posters are presented.
5. **Work in Progress Discussion Sessions** for work in progress that is of general interest. There would be less time devoted to presentation and more time devoted to discussion relative to a parallel session. Work in progress sessions, even more than other presentation sessions, require a clear unifying theme, whether it be application area, methodological approach, geography, or something else the presentations have in common. The moderator would need to prepare remarks that help foster discussion both with members of the audience and with different presenters. The real goal of these sessions is to get groups of people working on related issues talking amongst themselves. There could be up to 5 presentations in a 1-hour session.
6. **Feedback Sessions** for work that needs support and guidance to bring it to the standards of the conference. All presentations will be done by a moderator with suggestions and ideas of things that might be done. Authors would be encouraged to attend. They will not present, but should have the opportunity to share in the discussion during the moderator's presentation. There would be up to 5 papers in a 1-hour session based on scheduling requirements.
7. **Model Exposition** for interesting models that can be shared with others interactively. These sessions would occur during specified times and be unmoderated.

8. **Specialized Presentations** (typically posters) may be made for material that is of interest but does not conform to the norms of other submissions.

Normally, all session types will be offered at a conference, though the Program Chairs and Conference Organizers may choose to drop some of them based on submitted material and logistical constraints. Plenary, parallel, and poster sessions will be offered at all conferences.

Selection Process
(only refers to Research Papers, Application Presentations and Work in Progress Descriptions)
All submissions will be to a predefined thread. Research papers will be sent out for blind peer review based on the selected thread. Thread chairs will review submissions and make recommendations for placement and session formation. Program chairs are responsible for final selection and session creation based on the recommendation of the Thread Chairs. Session scheduling is done by the Central Office with the approval of the Program Chairs.

Submissions not put into a Plenary, Parallel or Poster session (or a work in progress session for a work in progress submission) should have a written comment from either the Thread or Program chairs explaining the reason for the disposition. Feedback to authors will include a reiteration of the standard the different types of work are to be held to (someone needs to write that up).

Submissions that are unintelligible, plagiarized, or not related to system dynamics will be rejected by the Program Chairs based on the recommendation of Thread Chairs. Works not of sufficient quality or completeness for plenary or parallel presentation should be put into the appropriate session format to maximize the potential for authors to learn.

The Program Chairs will inform the Thread Chairs of significant disposition changes they intend to make, and discuss those changes. Significant changes include changing rejection status (i.e., newly rejecting submissions or re-introducing submissions into the program), movement into plenary session if not so recommended, or movement into or out of Work in Progress or Feedback sessions. The decision of the Program Chairs will be final, but they will in all cases consider the comments of the Thread Chairs. When the Program Chairs make a significant change to the disposition of a submission, they will provide written comments on it.

Comments from the reviewers, Thread and Program Chairs will be made available to authors when decisions are sent out. We should look into making it easy for the Thread or Program Chair to mark a peer review comment as not to be shown (or simply delete the review).

Invited Papers
The Program Chairs may invite authors to submit papers and presentations on specific issues. Such work will be submitted to threads, but will be marked as invited. The Thread Chairs understand that there are invited papers. The Thread Chairs may review the invited papers and

provide the Program Chairs with feedback but are not required to do so. Invited papers should conform to the standards of research papers or application presentations. Invited work will not be subject to peer review.

Conference Record

All material presented at the Conference will have the title, authors, and abstract included as part of the Conference record.

Research papers and application presentations presented in Plenary, Parallel, Lightning, and Poster sessions will optionally have a paper or set of slides (for application presentations) included in the conference record. Work from these sessions may also include models and other supplementary material useful for understanding the results presented along with a link to separately hosted content related to the author or paper.

Research Paper Format for Conference Record

It is recommended that research papers included the conference record be submitted as two page extended abstracts with an attached bibliography.

Motions to the Policy Council

Motion 1: Move to accept the Submission, review, placement, and archiving guidelines dated October 4, 2017 as the basis for managing the annual conference program.

Motion 2: Move to allow only two page abstracts with an attached bibliography, and not full papers, to be included in the conference record for research papers presented at the conference.