

Annika Wolff

From: Haley MacLeod and Stefan Manojlovic <chi21j@precisionconference.com>
Sent: perjantaina 11. joulukuuta 2020 22:02
To: Annika Wolff
Subject: Decision on CHI 2021 Case Study Submission 6285

Dear Annika Wolff:

Congratulations on the acceptance of your submission 6285 "Designing SciberPunks as Future Personas for More than Human Design" for the CHI 2021 Case Study track!

The Case Study decisions on all submissions were made after careful consideration of each paper. Despite many strong Case Studies, we were only able to accept 21% of submissions.

Please be sure to take reviewer comments (below) into account when preparing your final version of the Case Study.

Please read the following instructions carefully. You need to follow these steps:

1. Update your extended abstract to be the "publication ready" version of your Case Study and submit it to PCS by December 22, 2020 12pm (noon) PT - Pacific Time 2. Prepare a short video preview for promotion of your Case Study at CHI. Further instructions are below. This is optional but strongly encouraged.
3. Submit any accessibility requests for your presentation ASAP

1. UPDATE AND SUBMIT YOUR CASE STUDY TO PCS (Deadline: {December 22, 2020 12pm (noon) PT - Pacific Time})

Please upload your final materials for publication to PCS before the deadline. For instructions on how to submit your final materials, please see: <https://chi2021.acm.org/for-authors/publication-ready-author-instruction>. Please read these instructions carefully, as they have changed from previous years. If you have questions, please contact the templates chairs (templates@chi2021.acm.org).

2. VIDEO PREVIEWS (Deadline: January 29, 2021)

You are encouraged to submit a Video Preview -- a 30 second video which describes your work. The video previews will be made available through different media before, during and after the conference. They will also be archived and embedded on the abstract page of the ACM Digital Library. Any video preview should be submitted using the same PCS page as the final version of your submission. The deadline for submitting your video preview is *January 29, 2021*. Instructions for producing your video preview are available on this web page: <https://chi2020.acm.org/video-previews/>

3. ACCESSIBILITY

If you have any accessibility requests for your presentation (e.g. sign language interpretation, volunteer assistance, digital accessibility support), please contact accessibility chairs (accessibility@chi2021.acm.org) now. It is often late to do so at the time of registration.

CHI 2021 will be an online virtual conference to ensure the safety of our global HCI community. We will update you in the coming months on the nature of this conference and instructions for preparing your presentation.

We are looking forward to meeting you at the conference.

Congratulations again!

Haley MacLeod and Stefan Manojlovic
CHI 2021 Case Study Chairs

+++++++ REVIEWS AND/OR COMMENTS +++++++

Note that the Case Study track uses a more lightweight review process than full papers. Although many reviewers have given detailed comments, you should not expect the same level of feedback that you would get for a full paper. Where you have been provided with suggestions for improvement please consider them for your final revision.

AC review
score 4/5

Review

I am pleased to recommend this Case Study for acceptance at CHI 2021.

This case study describes a compelling process using arts-based methods towards creating future personas that channel environmental perspectives. Reviewers found the work to be very creative and an interesting story of a real-world experience of interest and importance to the CHI community.

This submission could be strengthened prior to the final submission by:

- Adding additional details about methodology, including the timeline, context of the study (part of an educational program?) and whether participants knew each other already.
- Incorporating reflection or speculation on how these personas could be used in design practice.

To make space for these changes, the authors might consider summarizing section 5.1 with greater brevity, given that these themes were already known to reviewers and, presumably, the CHI community.

The authors might also consider including a glossary of terms, perhaps as supplementary material.

Comments to Authors

(blank)

Reviewer 1 review
score 3/5

Review

This paper describes a drama and creativity based activity aimed at developing personas. The context is the use of data to develop environmental sensitivities in

future scenarios.

I enjoyed the creative aspects of the paper, and I appreciate the efforts made by the authors to cope with the constraints that 2020 has presented to us all. The activities seem to have been enjoyable and productive for the facilitators and participants. The motivation and background is presented well.

However there are a few issues with the paper, some are to do with presentation and these can be addressed to make the paper stronger.

Some of the practical aspects of the case study could be expanded on in order to “set the scene”. The case study seems to have taken place over several weeks, this timescale could be discussed further in section 4 of the paper. As the participants were students, was it undertaken as part of an educational program? Did they already know each other before the activity?

Addressing the lessons and contributions of the paper, these are rather weak and I’m not sure that this can be easily remedied. Firstly, there is discussion about the experience of working and co-designing online, and there are some useful insights here, but these are mostly quite well known and documented already. This discussion would have been stronger if there had been more participants involved, however due to the restrictions and the online format this is an understandable limitation. Secondly, there is the discussion of novel types of personas. Again there are some good insights here, and plenty of creative work, but there could be more speculation perhaps on how this aspect could be used in design practice as this does not seem to be the focus of the particular study, or alternatively to focus on the process as an educational practice.

In section 5.1 I found the identified themes to be rather weak, and the thematic analysis process is not fully described. This may be a weakness in the analysis process, but it seems likely that the limited number of participants and the small scale of the study has affected the richness of the data collected. The authors use thematic analysis to understand the data, and both deductive and inductive methods are used. Some further description of the theory behind these approaches and the reasons for their use would be useful.

Overall, I think there is good work here and I would very much like to see further development of the project, but currently I am not sure how much researchers can learn from the study as presented.

Comments to Authors

The presentation of the themes could be clearer in order to separate out the descriptions of the identified themes and the discussions around the implications and recommendations associated with those themes. Perhaps a table format would have helped the presentation. It is not clear whether some of the concepts described are general recommendations, or whether they are reflections upon this single case study process. For example, the statement “need for novel methods that can enable online playfulness” is ambiguous as it could refer to a general lack, suggesting that they don’t currently exist, or simply that the case study facilitators need to find these methods for future instances of the workshops.

Reviewer 2 review
score 4/5

Review

The case study attempts to explore and describe the evolution of a new method for creating future personas for use in sustainable city design scenarios. The authors embed their work using mixed methods through multiple engagements across modes, presenting and engaging with participants using a joined-up and alternative stakeholder approach to examine environmental data. The authors present new and alternative scaffolding and methods to embed 'more than human design', perspectives and applications.

The positives of this case study are its mapping and inclusion of non-human stakeholders within this process, additionally, a strength of the case study lies in the care that has been undertaken in terms of wider design consideration incorporating the 7th sense and making the case for why this is needed, along with non-human stakeholders, often overlooked within the field.

Given the complexity and alternative standpoint of the case study, presenting the insights gained from such an endeavour would add value to the CHI community, demonstrating principles and methods and their applications in real-world and digital settings, drawing out interesting lessons the CHI community may find useful, with the potential to build on the development of more harmonious design approaches and reflections on the process undertaken. With regards to persuasiveness from a reader perspective (from a different subfield), a glossary may be useful to support the key terms and frameworks used such as empathy and the thematic underpinning of this; this includes further explanation of the eco-system mentioned which will help the reader better engage with the text. I deem the work relevant for the community, the case study has the potential to inspire others and to build on the lessons learned and I encourage the authors to develop this further as described above.

Comments to Authors

Glossary of terms would be positive.
