Report of the Systems Council Fellows Evaluating Committee (FEC)
Class of 2020
J. Schmalzel, Chair
R. Rassa, Vice-Chair

1. Overview

The Systems Council FEC completed its business for the Class of 2020 evaluation cycle by the 15 JUN 2020 deadline. A total of six (6) candidates were considered this cycle. (Four (4) candidates were considered for the Class of 2019). The distribution of the candidates is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Distribution of nominees by category.

Nomination Category	Number of Candidates
Research Engineer/Scientist	4
Application Engineer/Practitioner	1
Educator	1

2. Review Process

The review process involved 3-5 reviewers per candidate[i]. The reviewer inputs were consolidated to form the final summary score and rating.

3. Concluding Notes

Overall, the Fellow review process proceeded satisfactorily. However, a number of issues deserve attention to improve future review cycles:

(i) The IEEE Fellow website could use improvements including:

- The Fellow search tool provides access to the complete pool of IEEE Fellows to draw from for review purposes. However, once a Fellow has been selected from any of the nearly 100 pages of listings, the tool reverts to Page 1 instead of "sticking" on the current page. This is very inconvenient when a keyword search has been used to winnow down the general pool of Fellows to a specific category of Fellow. For example, if the keyword "Systems" is used to find Fellows with that keyword in their citation, it is inconvenient to have to reinitiate the keyword search after selecting a Fellow from the pared list.
- The user interface prompts for the main screen are unclear. The process of assigning reviewers to the Fellow candidates does not automatically trigger an invitation to review. This requires another (unnecessary) step, which can delay the invitations if not completed.
- There can be a substantial delay between completing and submitting a review action and finding that submission reflected in the Fellow summary table. Delays of up to eight (8) hours were experienced. This sort of delay causes a high degree of concern: "Is the system working? What happened to my submission?" It is not helped by the fact that the submission action just completed remains—seemingly—available to repeat. The response of the system is to treat it as an error. Much as if the left hand and right hand were not synchronized. Once a submit button has been pressed, there should be clear indication of that action with "graying out" of the trigger to avoid repeats.

(ii)   Reviewers
- Many of the invitations go unanswered—i.e., neither an accept nor a decline was received. Even after repeated re-invitations. A factor of at least three (3) times the number of required reviewers should be invited.
- Reviewer workload is an issue that must be balanced. Some reviewers tend to give very short responses; others give lengthy detailed responses. An average load of three (3) Nominees was assigned to each reviewer.

(iii)   Quality of the Nominee Packages
- The nominations for some of the Candidate packages were poor, which did not do the candidates justice.
- Some sort of training could help improve the quality of Nominee packages. Nominees often seek informal advice and guidance, but apparently they don't have access to quality guidance. Even something as simple as "how to pick a nominator," etc., could help.

---

[i] The minimum number of reviewers required for this cycle was three (3); however, in future cycles, the minimum of five (5) will be required in keeping with the total number of Fellows represented by the Systems Council.