

RULES OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Xth Conference of the World Mediation Forum

1. Nomination of President:

The President of the Scientific Committee is nominated by the organizational committee of the conference.

2. Role of the President of the Scientific Committee:

- a- appoint members of the Scientific Committee;
- b- issue evaluation instructions to members of the Scientific Committee;
- c- establish and follow-up the schedule of the abstract/proposal evaluation process;
- d- assign abstracts/proposals to members of the Scientific Committee (about 20 to 25 proposals per member);
- e- receive the final evaluations from evaluators;
- f- forward completed evaluations to the Conference Coordinator.

3- Process:

- a- proposals are sent to the Conference Coordinator;
- b- Conference Coordinator forwards the proposals to the President of the Scientific Committee;
- c- President of the Scientific Committee forwards the unnamed proposals to members of the Scientific Committee; each proposal is sent to two evaluators;
- d- where evaluators cannot agree on a final evaluation, the President can make the final decision;
- d- once they have completed their allocated proposals, members of the Scientific Committee return them to the President, who returns them to the Conference Coordinator;
- e- the Coordinator notifies each participant of the outcome of the evaluation of their proposal.

4- Deadlines:

The deadline for sending proposals to the Xth Conference of the World Mediation Forum is **January 20 2019** ;

- a- Within four weeks of receiving a proposal for evaluation, a member of the Scientific Committee must complete the evaluation and notify the evaluation outcome to the President of the Scientific Committee;
- b- Priority should be given to proposals from participants requiring a visa.

5- Criteria and evaluation form

There are two evaluation forms: one for academic proposals, and one for all other proposals.

EVALUATION FORM FOR ACADEMIC PROPOSALS

Title of the proposal:

Proposal No:

Evaluator's name:

Criteria	Excellent	Acceptable	Inadequate	Not applicable
Relevance and link with the themes of the Conference				
Title				
Abstract coherence				
Research/Theory/Practice perspective				
Outlined methodology				
Originality, contribution, quality of analysis				

Results	Evaluator's choice	Comments
Accepted		
Accepted with modifications		
Refused		

EVALUATION FORM FOR NON-ACADEMIC PROPOSALS

Title of the proposal:

Proposal No:

Evaluator's name:

Criteria	Excellent	Acceptable	Inadequate	Not applicable
Relevance and link with the themes of the Conference				
Title				
Abstract coherence				
Originality and contribution to Practical/Theoretical knowledge				

Results	Evaluator's choice	Comments
Accepted		
Accepted with modifications		
Refused		