

Board Resolution by Circulation 2008.2

Proposal:

The selection process for “best paper” and “runner up” of the papers presented at *CPRsouth3* shall be:

- 1.0 A total of 7 sessions shall be featured at *CPRsouth3*. Each session will have a maximum of 3 papers (out of a larger number of short-listed abstracts). The papers for each session will be reviewed and ranked by the designated moderator and the discussant. The moderator and discussant shall nominate the best paper of their respective session. A total of 7 papers (one from each session) will thus be nominated.
- 2.0 The winner will be selected through a combination of scores. The scores and their respective weighting is as follows:
 - Judges’ content score 40%
 - Judge’s presentation score 25%
 - Audience content score 25%
 - Audience presentation score 10%
- 3.0 Two of the 9 Board members (those who are delivering the Senior Scholar presentations at the event) will serve as judges. These 2 Board members will be exempt from moderator/discussant duties. The 7 short-listed top papers will be circulated to the judges prior to the conference. The content and presentation scores will be taken from the evaluation forms.
- 4.0 The scores will be tabulated in real time and the winner and runner up will be awarded on the last day of the conference.

Background:

- 1.0 An improvement was observed in the overall quality of papers presented in Chennai in comparison to Manila. The need to encourage further improvement and to maintain standards was stressed at the 2nd *CPRsouth* Board meeting. Creating a competitive environment is one mode by which quality improvements can be encouraged.
- 2.0 The papers presented are assessed on a number of attributes. Thus the need for a scoring system taking into account multiple criteria. The judges’ score will take into account both content and presentation as will the audience’s, but, of course, with different weights. This is to highlight the importance of presentation especially in the arena of policy and regulation.
- 3.0 Currently the only assessment of quality in place within *CPRsouth* is the evaluation. However, relying on evaluations alone may cause a bias. Therefore there is the need for a more comprehensive measure of quality of the papers presented. I believe the above proposed method would help assess and maintain the quality of the papers presented at *CPRsouth3*.