RoboSoft 2025 Workshop Reviewer Guidelines

Thank you very much for agreeing to review a workshop proposal to RoboSoft 2025. We appreciate your time and effort. To assist in and help standardize the workshop review process, we have developed seven evaluation criteria that correspond to the requests made in the call for submissions. Please find below a score sheet containing the criteria and some initial guidance on ratings for each criteria. This score sheet has also been published on the RoboSoft 2025 website, for use by the workshop proposers. Please note that strong proposals are not expected to exceed expectations in all categories, but should meet in all and exceed in some.

As always, feedback in long form comments are valued and strongly encouraged.

Criteria	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Relevance to the community	Topic is not expected to be of interest to the soft robotics community	Topic is expected to be of interest to some or many community members	Topic is expected to be of interest to majority of community members or highlights a neglected area of needed discussion
Evidence of preparation	Proposal is missing critical details or does not align with proposal requirements (i.e., schedule not given, missing required justification)	Proposal has clear communication of plan for workshop organization and meets all requirements from the call	Proposal displays preparation above expectations, including extensive details of how elements will be carried out, detailed website, etc
Appropriateness of Speakers/Format: Diversity Note: please consider that diversity can come in many aspects.	Proposal does not demonstrate speakers, activities or formats expected to attract and support a diverse range of attendees and ideas	Proposal includes diversity of speakers, activities, formats, etc., but the rationale is not highlighted	Proposal communicates efforts to encourage a diverse range of ideas and attendees through diversity of speakers, activities, formats, etc.
Appropriateness of Speakers/Format: Cohesiveness	Choice of speakers or activities do not seem in line with goals of the workshop, or no justification is given.	Choice of speakers or format seems to be generally cohesive with the goals of the workshop, and some justification is given.	Choice of speakers or format is highly cohesive with the goals of the workshop. Clear and relevant justification is given.

Appropriateness of Speakers/Format: Novelty	Proposal does not bring in new or less commonly selected speakers or new or uncommon elements. Alternatively, new or uncommon elements are proposed but are not described at all.	Proposal brings in new or less commonly selected speakers or elements not normally seen in a workshop. The goal of new or uncommon elements is described.	Proposal includes new or less commonly selected speakers or elements and justifies how they will help achieve the goals of the workshop. The goal and plan to execute new or uncommon elements is clearly described.
Interactive Elements	Proposal has no or limited interactive elements	Proposal has standard interactive elements (poster sessions, panel discussions, debates)	Proposal has tailored or novel interactive elements for the topic or communicates a plan to greatly increase interaction in standard elements.
Student Participation	Students are not specifically considered by the proposal; or, consideration is given briefly in text but not connected to specific plans.	Student participation is considered by the proposal through standard elements, such as poster sessions, Q&A and expert panel discussion.	Student participation is highlighted by the proposal and supported through specific activities expected to increase student opportunities for interaction with community