5. Revision of the S/TC-FEC Evaluation Form

The FSPS decided to change the current S/TC-FEC Evaluation Form with the goal of eliciting more informative evaluations from the S/TCs, while streamlining the form. As a secondary objective, the FSPS wanted to encourage S/TCs to perform a stronger selection preference among their nominees. To this end, the FSPS looked at using a sigmoidal ranking that will group Nominees into a smaller number of clusters than the current five (EQ, HQ, Q, MQ NQ).

In summary, the main rationale for changing this form was to:
1. Have the questions be more pointed/focused;
2. Explicitly request both favorable and unfavorable comments;
3. Obtain more "relative" information to supplement/justify the ranking; and
4. Understand the extent of knowledge about the nominee among the committee.

The subgroup chaired by Piero Bonissone was tasked to revise this form. The Subgroup had lengthy interactions over more than five months. The results of these interactions lead to the following changes to Section 1 in the S/TC-FEC Evaluation Form.

Section 2 of the Form was not modified.

The first question in Section 1 was rewritten to elicit a comparative evaluation of the Nominee. Since the Fellow elevation process is very competitive, it was the group’s sentiment that we should ask questions in a way that requires a comparative analysis.

1. In terms of accomplishments, how does the nominee compare relative to other recently elevated IEEE Fellows in your S/TC?
   1) Significantly more accomplished
   2) More accomplished
   3) About the same level of accomplishment
   4) Not as accomplished

The second question was rewritten to assess the evaluators’ familiarity with the nominee’s work. We rely on the S/TC Fellow Committee to provide in depth domain knowledge of the nominee’s work. Therefore, we felt necessary to assess the evaluators’ deep understanding of the same.

2. To what extent are the S/TC Evaluators of this nomination familiar with the nominee’s work independently of the nomination?
   1) Significant familiarity
   2) Some familiarity
   3) Little or no familiarity

The third question, divided into two parts, was rewritten to assess the nominee’s strengths and weaknesses. The main purpose was to introduce a critical analysis of the nominees, and create a sharper narrative by limiting the allocated number of words.

3. Clearly convey the strengths and weaknesses of the Nominee’s qualifications for elevation to Fellow, providing a *critical analysis* of the information contained in the Nomination form and Endorsements (if any), and a clear explanation for the rationale behind the assigned rank and rating

3.a What contributions are at or above IEEE Fellow standards? Why are these contributions extraordinary? Have these contributions made a significant impact on the profession or society at large? If so, how? (max 200 words)
3.b In what respect does the nominee fall short of IEEE Fellow standards, as understood by the Committee (max 200 words)

The fourth and fifth questions were rewritten with a focus on the nominees’ impact and the supporting evidence.

4. What specific research/application/education/leadership impact has the nominee had through her/his work? (max 200 words)

5. What evidence can you cite for the Nominee’s impact? (max 200 words)

5.1 The question on the Nominee’s degrees of qualification

Finally, the last question (#6) in Section 1 was rewritten to force a sigmoidal ranking. A sigmoidal ranking conveys a sufficient statistics to allow Judges to make informed and effective decisions about how to rank nominees. Basically, we hope to achieve the same result of score bunching (currently done by a small number of societies) by forcing the S/TC evaluators to squeeze nominees into a sigmoidal shaped ranking. For sigmoidal ranking to be meaningful, we need a reduced set of categories and we need S/TCs to allocate Nominees to all categories.

(Four categories, with scores for the top three)

6. Indicate your assessment of the degree to which this nominee is suitable for elevation to IEEE Fellow choosing one of the following categories. Rank and score Nominees in sets A, B, and C, but do not rank or score Nominees in set D.

Enter here <score> as a number in [60-100] for sets A, B, and C or 0 for set D.
A) Extremely Qualified (90.0-100)
B) Highly Qualified (80.0-89.9)
C) Qualified (60.0-79.9)
D) Marginally Qualified (0)
4.5  Annex S2: S/TC Evaluation Form (approved 10/2017)
(NOTE: It is expected to use this form starting with Fellow Class 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominee:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society/Technical Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Evaluation Section**

1. In terms of accomplishments, how does the nominee compare relative to other recently elevated IEEE Fellows in your S/TC?
   1) Significantly more accomplished
   2) More accomplished
   3) About the same level of accomplishment
   4) Not as accomplished

   Answer:___________

2. To what extent are the S/TC Evaluators of this nomination familiar with the nominee's work independently of the nomination?
   1) Significant familiarity
   2) Some familiarity
   3) Little or no familiarity

   Answer:___________

3. Clearly convey the strengths and weaknesses of the Nominee's qualifications for elevation to Fellow, providing a *critical analysis* of the information contained in the Nomination form and Endorsements (if any), and a clear explanation for the rationale behind the assigned rank and rating.
   a) What contributions are at or above IEEE Fellow standards? Why are these contributions extraordinary? Have these contributions made a significant impact on the profession or society at large? If so, how? (max 200 words)
      <Insert text here>
b) In what respect does the nominee fall short of IEEE Fellow standards, as understood by the Committee (max 200 words)
   <Insert text here>

4. What specific research/application/education/leadership impact has the nominee had through her/his work? (max 200 words)
   <Insert text here>

5. What evidence can you cite for the Nominee's impact? (max 200 words)
   <Insert text here>

6. Indicate your assessment of the degree of qualification to which this nominee is suitable for elevation to IEEE Fellow

   A) Extremely Qualified (90.0-100)
   B) Highly Qualified (80.0-89.9)
   C) Qualified (60.0-79.9)
   D) Marginally Qualified (0)

   <Insert numerical score here>

2. Recommendation Section

1. Which category do you feel best describes the nominee's accomplishments?
   Application Engineer/Practitioner
   Educator
   Research Engineer/Scientist
   Technical Leader

2. If you feel there is a better citation to describe the nominee's accomplishments, please state it below. (not more than 15 words)
   <Insert alternate citation here>