



Dear SDTC Members:

I've had input from various members regarding the coordination and review of the student papers submitted to this year's SDM2000. I thought it would be useful to provide a summary and review of the student paper competition for SDM2000.

I was not able to attend the planning meeting in Atlanta, and I would again like to thank Phil Beran for presenting a summary of the student paper sessions at that time.

In summary:

- 1) A total of 14 student papers were received. Two have been rejected and the remaining 12 papers have been organized into two sessions entitled

SDM-17 Dynamics, Control and Modeling
SDM-31 Composites, Fatigue and Modeling

Whether one believes that faculty should be able to serve as a co-author on a student paper can certainly still be debated. But the results are clear: the idea allowing full time researchers to serve as co-authors has resulted in a significant number of participants during the its first attempt. While we can certainly improve on the logistics of how the review process proceeds in the next year, I think Manohar and Firdaus deserve credit for re-vitalizing the student paper competition at SDM2000.

- 2) There was little to no "advertisement" of the new rules regarding the student paper competition. In part, this was intentional; we did not want the student paper competition to grow beyond reasonable limits. Given how little emphasis we was placed on the new rules, a number of participants were quick realize the import of the changes. We should anticipate at least a modest increase in participants next year.
- 3) Several related problems could be identified with this year's process:
 - i) The due date for the student papers was set for September 29. It was scheduled, apparently accidently, after the SDM planning meeting. We were committed to accept abstracts that arrived after the planning meeting. Out of the 14 abstracts received, ~6-7 arrived at my office after the SDM planning meeting.
 - ii) Several student participants exploited the late due date, and several of these students had advisors that were well-aware of the SDM abstract review process.
 - iii) While other SDTC members were focussing on getting abstract reviews for the main body of submissions, we were still waiting for the student abstracts to trickle in. A uniform review process is impossible with the current choice of a late student abstract date.

- iv) With such a late submission date, it was impossible to distribute the student papers “transparently throughout” the regular sessions as planned.
- v) We were very lucky indeed that the student papers fell in two nearly even categories: dynamics or composites. This enabled us to simply create two student paper sessions. We should not count on being so lucky in the future.

In summary, then, I would suggest the following for future student paper competitions:

- i) Continue the policy of allowing (1) faculty member / researcher to co-author a student paper.
- ii) Make the due date for student paper abstracts identical to that for the regular papers.
- iii) Disseminate student abstracts through the same review process as regular papers: make the review process uniform.
- iv) Distribute the student papers throughout the regular sessions: have no sessions that are recognized as "dedicated to" student papers.
- v) Rename the “Student Paper Competition” to the “Student Paper and Presentation Competition” to emphasize the importance of both the paper (with seasoned co-author) and presentation by student.

I would be glad to assist anyone who takes over the student paper competition next year.

Best Regards,

Andy Kurdila