

SGB Meeting March 22, 2018 Notes

Sarita Adve, SIGARCH	Michael Mitzenmacher, SIGACT
Srinivas Aluru, SIGBio	Fred Niederman, SIGMIS
Paul Beame, SGB Council Rep	Rosemary Paradis, SIGAI
Dick Bulterman, SIGWEB	Oleg Sokolsky, SIGBED
Barbara Boucher Owens, History Committee	Simon Harper, SGB EC
Donna Cappel, ACM SIG Services	Jeff Hollingsworth, SIGHPC
Karla Carter, SIGCAS	Cherri Pancake, ACM EC
Yiran Chen, SIGDA	Pat Ryan, ACM COO
Jack Davidson, ACM Pubs Board	Marc Schoenauer, SIGEVO
Jason Flinn, SIGMOBILE	Amber Settle, SIGCSE
Laurie Fox, SIGUCCS	Sung Shin, SIGAPP
Roch Guerin, SIGCOMM	Alan Smeaton, SIGMM
Vicki Hanson, ACM President	Stephen Spencer, ACM Pubs
Jessica Hodgins, SIGGRAPH	Loren Terveen, SIGCHI
Jiman Hong, SIGAPP	Goce Trajcevski, SIGSPATIAL
Jeff Jortner, SGB EC	Will Tracz, SGB EC
Claire Lauer, SIGDOC	Shari Trewin, SIGACCESS
Kevin Leyton-Brown, SIGecom	Robbert van Renesse, SIGOPS
Margaret Loper, SIGSIM	Adam Wierman, SIGMETRICS
Patrick Madden, SGB EC	Tao Xie, History Committee
Jeanna Matthews, SGB EC	Steve Zilora, SIGITE
Kathryn McKinley, SIGPLAN	
Nenad Medvidovic, SIGSOFT	

Welcome

Patrick Madden opened the meeting and indicated that due to weather, Jeanna and Donna were unable to get to Chicago. Both will participate via video call as will Marc Schoenauer, SIGEVO and Michael Mitzenmacher, SIGACT. Patrick asked each participant to introduce themselves and there were around-the-table introductions.

Jeanna Matthews thanked all for being there and reminded attendees of the Best Practices link which is a living document for things going well. It was recently updated with SIG review information. She asked attendees to continue to update that before, during and after the meeting.

Report form ACM President

Vicki Hanson was introduced and mentioned that the 2017 Turing Award recipients were announced and they are Dave Patterson and John Hennessy.

Hanson then provided information on ACM membership which remains solid. There's a slight increase from student membership in India. Somewhat fewer than half the members reside outside US and growth is from countries outside US. A 2nd membership model was offered this year and gave universities the option to sign up all tenured track members at a reduced rate. 57 US and 1 European university joined and we have 894 new members resulting from the program.

ACM is very healthy financially and that derives from general activities like dues, subscriptions etc. Showing the comparable numbers for the SIGs, it looks like they're losing money but please be aware that not all conferences have happened for this fiscal year.

Hanson provided some details on the various ACM Councils. The China Council annual conference happened for the 1st time last year and was such a success, it will happen again in May. An interesting program they've started is the development of an editorial board. They were concerned that interested readers (non-academics) may have trouble reading English so they are taking CACM articles and doing 400 word summaries in Chinese. If individuals are interested enough they can then read the English version. Another big activity is that they're working with the new CACM editor on a regional insert that should be out this fall.

ACM Europe had their spring meeting last week. Their priorities include supporting ACM activities and working to support young people and practitioners interested in education and policy. They've developed 2 white papers and had a set of panels where EU commission members were invited. Our policy people have strong connections with government and hopefully this will allow them to forge future activities. Another interesting event is that it's 50 years since the founding of ACM's German chapter. In late September, the Europe Council will have their women in Europe event. ACM Europe will also be sponsoring another summer school related to Data Science. It was such a success last year that we will do it again for another 50 students.

ACM India has an annual event and it was recently held. It is a 1 day event and this year they had 2 Turing laureates and it was a great day of talks. A few days before they hold other related events – women's conference, education meetings, etc. In addition, they started an education initiative called CSpashshala bringing computational thinking to schools. It's a big activity for grades 1-8 for students to think computationally. It is a giant undertaking that has trained 200 teachers. They realize that that there is much to do considering the number of teachers in India. This is a huge effort on the part of this committee and Council

Regarding the Education Board, the ACM EC asked for more geographic involvement and activities as they've been US centric. There was a meeting in London that involved the ACM Europe Council, Informatics Europe and BCS. They are developing curriculum and the first has come out on cybersecurity.

ACM is starting a new tech policy council to bring together policy efforts globally and share resources. US ACM will become the ACM US Tech committee, EU ACM will be the European and they'll be part of the Global Policy Council which will include a Chair, reps from the US and EU, 2 reps from the SGB and 2 members at large to coordinate policy for all of ACM.

The Practitioner Board is hosting a series of workshops at the intersection of AI and blockchain. They have a roadshow coming to a city near you. They'll be going to Montreal, Geneva, Paris, Tokyo, Singapore, Seoul, Los Angeles and other locations. Different people will be speaking at each depending on locations and they'll be practitioner oriented. They'll also be adding more speakers to the Distinguished Speaker Program. They're working hard to get more practitioners. In addition, they're involved in putting out the webinars. Some recent webinars included one on Quantum Computing and one with Robin Murphy speaking about robotics and disaster work.

There is an ACM Diversity and Inclusion Task Force which will look at a variety of diversity issues: gender minority, geographic diversity and accessibility. They've decided that their initial focus areas will be the current state within ACM, underrepresented minorities and accessibility. Hanson is aware that a lot of SIGs have started their own diversity efforts. She wants the SIGs and TF to make a connection so they don't get out of sync. People can write to Jeanna or Vicki or Valerie to share ideas with regard to activities in this area. ACM has policy against discrimination and harassment which is a legal policy. Knowing that there was going to be a session on this later in the day she suggested saving all questions until those discussions.

Hanson mentioned the ACM Future of Computing Academy put in place to involve the next generation and shape the ACM experience to make it more relevant for the next generation. ACM hopes to engender a sense of loyalty and leaders. The first intake started in June when 46 individuals were selected from 300. They've put together an EC, started a podcast, workshops and have a blog. There will be a 2nd intake soon, they should be getting new members every 18 months. Some people will naturally roll off and others will replace them. They don't have a balance of tech areas and she encouraged SGB members to pass the announcement onto their members to get a balanced representation technically. It's balanced in gender and geographically but not technically. If you're asked to read applications, please say yes or suggest members of your SIG to read them.

ACM is involved in related ethics activities and will sponsor a 2nd AI for Good in conjunction with the UN in Geneva in May. Silvio Micali will keynote and there will be an AI and Blockchain workshop. We're involved in the Partnership for AI to benefit people in society and have a rep to that organization. We're part of the Fairness, Accountability and Transparent AI and ACM is a co-sponsor of AIES. In addition, we're sponsoring an IOT day at Mobisys.

The Code of Ethics is being modified and we hope to have a new Code out by end of June. They're out for a 3rd round of review and discussion. There is a little bit of time for your comments left.

One of the things presented last time was interest in certificates of attendance. Seems important to students and junior faculty and there was general support if easy. Cappo indicated that a checkbox was being added to registration beginning in July allowing individuals to request a certificate. There was no way to set up an automatic PDF so, for the time being they'll be sent to the conference chairs to distribute at the event.

ACM is looking at tech directions and identifying gaps in current offerings. We're trying to keep current and modify offerings in pubs and conferences. The effort began in December when we sent FCA a survey followed by one to Fellows asking them what they saw as emerging important directions in computing. Since then we've visited different cities gathering key volunteers and discussing what we might be missing. The goal is to write a report and present it to the ACM Boards that have interest in new activities. Hanson sought the names of volunteers interested in helping. It's a chance for the SGB to see that the right areas are included and to name volunteers to help with new initiatives.

We did get some feedback on the way ACM does business. It was suggested that conferences consider having a practitioner track. There's a strong sense that we haven't been involving practitioners enough in our conferences. They need another way to participate other than paper writing. There could be a curated track with invited speakers. SIGHPC has done some state of the practice tracks and they'd be happy to share. In other conferences, it's common for papers to be submitted for editorial review rather

than full blown review. Papers are invited based on the merit of the topic rather than quality of paper. SIGGRAPH has a lot of production sessions aimed at practitioners. SIGCOMM has a demo session for industry. SIGEVO has a track as well. SIGSOFT has software engineering in practice tracks where papers are typically co-authored by industry and academia. The incentive structure is completely different and they're trying to figure out how to balance it. It does require a caretaker on the academic end and that's not what they want. Might be an idea to look at conferences outside ACM like WWW. Sometimes the industry track has a lower status and managing that status is difficult. Hanson explained that there are 2 goals: to make contact between the academic and practitioners side and a general attempt to serve our practitioners better. SIGPLAN now has a whole track on industrial speakers where they don't have to write a paper but get to have a verbal report on systems programming languages and implementation parallel to the tech track. It's been successful in bringing in a mix of attendees. They have an abstract but not a full paper. SIGUCCS presenters are 100% practitioners and sometimes paper is a barrier. They'd be happy to provide their expertise and guidance to ACM.

Hanson was asked if there are any plans for Africa, SA, Australia or New Zealand Councils? She is extremely supportive of doing something in other regions but the council structure carries a high overhead so we may not want to replicate that. We are looking at ways to work with other societies. Leaders were asked for contacts so that we can figure out how to do something with them. She is talking with Latin America and more nations in Asia. Nothing in Africa but if people can put her in touch, she's more than happy to start the conversations.

Building an Inclusive Community

Madden introduced Adve to talk about building an inclusive community. Diversity includes gender, race, institution and academic lineage. Diversity doesn't stick without inclusion. Some analysis was done on events in the architecture community. Study showed poor gender ratios in keynotes, PC chairs and award. The diversity statement is read at each conference and SIGARCH has developed SIGARCH Cares to help report harassment. The plan is to have broader engagement with ACM, CRA, NSF, IEEE and other organizations. SIGARCH has developed a Blog which is a digital meeting space for the community. Change in large organizations is hard but small steps matter and much work remains but the impact is already visible in hallway discussions, panels, keynotes and bias busting workshops. Adve thought that SIGARCH was doing a lot by providing careful policies for program chairs and SCs as well as strong oversight of flagship events. There still is much room for improvement. There have been no ISCA keynotes from women, only one career award and few program chairs. There are anecdotal reports of harassment. Adve spoke of the role of SIGs in conference governance and providing guidance to steering committees, program chairs, program committees, award committees and for the review process. She asked SIG leaders to consider these items for the breakout session.

Adve then spoke about harassment and discrimination and the importance of reporting, investigation, remedial action and enforcement. She suggested that during the investigation it would be helpful to better understand the COPE timeline and methods. A CARES like support system during investigation would inspire more confidence to report. She suggested remedial actions could include exclusion from participating including publishing, public disclosure and informing others in the offender's influence. It was suggested that the policy include how remedial action will be enforced. AGU requires candidates for governance/honors to disclose formal complaints or findings related to professional conduct. A lot still needs to be done. The current policy requires the complainant to report to the conference chair or ACM

President, CEO or COO. SIGARCH Cares is a new committee to help in the reporting process. Respected and approachable people in the architecture community will provide guidance to move to next steps allowing ACM to investigate complaints. The complainant still needs to be the one to file an official complaint (if desired). The committee is not involved following that. Via SIGARCH Cares, individuals are more likely to report if familiar colleagues are available for support. CARES members will be chosen for their commitment on the issue. An established committee inspires trust with committee members and will be physically present at main events. This is expected to signal no tolerance as well as deter bad behavior. Adve noted that CARES has a very limited mandate. They cannot help after complaint is filed, they have no window into investigation, remedial action or enforcement. COPE is the ACM body that runs the investigation and determines the remedial actions. It is understandable due to legal issues. CARES committee has no training and Adve asked if ACM could provide training, expand the CARES mandate and expand to other SIGS. A lot of work still needs to be done, they are encouraged that various organizations are coming on board and thankful to ACM to get CARES going. They are starting to engage with other organizations. An SGB member asked if there would be blacklist and how would you get off? Hanson indicated COPE makes recommendations for remedial action as well as length of time. There are no cases where someone has been cited and now is a conference leader. That's true at ACM but what about other organizations. An SGB member reported that theory blogs recently had an anonymous posting of serious incidents which was a shock to all. They realized how bad the situation is with respect to policies and visibility of reporting. The theory community is trying to do something across leaders of all major conferences. Related to the sharing of information between ACM and IEEE, the FOCS conference just got IEEE approval that they can communicate information to ACM and that's an important piece because the theory community crosses organizations. Many are unaware of policies, RegOnline pages link to policies but how can we publicize on conference web pages. How do we make ACM policy clear? People should check off and agree to policy before registering. Hanson indicated she was there to listen and would be taking their comments back. ACM is not sharing information with employers or other organizations at this time. An SGB member asked about selecting committee members, what should the workflow be to be sure they're not appointing someone they should not. Hanson indicated that ACM would maintain database, not going to report what someone did but you can give ACM a list. Pat has talked to woman from AGU to possibly secure a training program for volunteer leaders. Cappo let leaders know that conference leaders need to acknowledge the policy to submit TMRP and it is included in the approval letter. Hanson indicated that more will be discussed in the EC and an update will be made to the policy follow-up materials.

Breakout Session

Matthews introduced the breakout session and indicated there were time constraints. She asked someone in each group to take notes and send them back if there was no time to report back. Matthews indicated that the topic for the breakout session is multifaceted. Important developments have come out of the MICRO and ARCH communities and they are touching on other communities. It's important that SIG leaders are aware. She reemphasized that this is about many aspects of diversity including academic lineage, geographic, academics, practitioners. What are our policies for populating these leadership roles, policies for governance? In SIGOPS there weren't a lot of public procedures. Without formal procedures what recourse do people have? We want to gather information regarding what formal procedures exist across the SIGs. Is representation elected, appointed? Do we want to produce

best practices regarding these activities as well as and recommended ways to deal with these issues? The groups assembled to discuss.

ACM Publications Board Conference Committee

Stephen Spencer was introduced to discuss publications. Stephen is member of the pubs board and was recently asked to chair the conference committee of the pubs board. A survey was sent to leaders to share with conference organizers. The Committee is looking for new challenges. What parts of pubs area are pain points that the committee can help you with in order to make the conference process smoother. He has a dozen responses to the survey and is looking for more feedback to make the experience better. Adve suggested HOTCRP and other reviewing systems collect demographic information from authors. Cappo indicated the submission systems are collected data. PACM is an awesome idea but some conferences are co-sponsored with IEEE. Any movement on doing it jointly with other organizations? Right now, pubs board perspective is to have PACM achieve a steady state status before embarking into things considered red flags. In a year, the answer may be different. Beame indicated procedures and options for organizers in terms of publishing and rates are poor. It would be good to have more alternatives. ACM is looking at changing the workflow of production. Hodgins – ACM doing a great job in terms of open access and OpenTOC. Think through how to provide access in broader and general way so authors don't put papers on their own pages. Journal papers don't run through same open access and they need to. Excited about PACM but it doesn't have corresponding EasyChair for the review process. They'd like ACM to provide support through their licenses with EasyChair. Recent changes to style files have been difficult for authors. We should secure input from community before making changes. Harper raised point of publication format. Suggested moving to prime resource as HTML and more accessible and PDF secondary artifact. Moving toward storing XML making it easier to get to other formats. Moving toward submission of source and that will be converted to XML. Believes this will be available later this year. ACM templates are an issue – particularly the word template, accessibility is a big issue. PACM isn't quite done, there are a lot of interesting issues like the relationship of PACM to sponsoring SIGs. When different SIGs are involved it can be confusing. There is a PACM co-sponsored by MOBILE and CHI and continues to be a problem. Guerin indicated that the PACM steering committee will be discussing. Group was asked to e-mail further suggestions to Spencer.

Publications Report and SGB Discussion

Matthews reminded group of best practices document. She'd like to see people add to that based on today's discussion. Davidson was introduced to give an update about various access measures mined out of DL. PB strategically looks at 6 principals – sustainability, access, author choice, quality, service and community choice. Currently there are new pubs under consideration including ACM Transactions on Computing for Healthcare. New proposals are handled by new pubs committee and work closely with proposers. The committee always solicits feedback from the SIGs and the widest possible community. Another in the development pipeline are Transactions on IOT and ACM Government Informatic Research and Practice. These are part of a new pubs genre, that bridges 2 communities – the practitioner and academic community. Another is Digital Threats Research and Practice. There is also a Transaction on Middleware and Distributed Systems. They are trying to speed process up and being more proactive when they see a gap. Reaching out to get things started. Moving to a new pubs platform so that articles are accessible and run on any device and will be part of new workflow. Working to integrate submission

systems to feed directly into DL. This should address some of the service issues mentioned earlier. In conversation with ARXiv to integrate with new DL where authors can choose to have articles deposited in a preprint server. They continue to work on increasing gold OA publications. If you know EICs in your community they'd like to talk to them about that and how to make transition. Trying to be proactive. FCA is interested in publication and a member was asked to serve on the pubs board. Interested in making policies clearer and summarizing them so that if you want to find a piece of information you get there quickly. They're going to take that on and would like to work on COI policies. Survey will go out to understand what people are doing. A lot of us know the norms but for young researchers it is not so clear. There's opportunity with submission systems as we integrate into our normal workflow. Davidson provided some statistics for the DL.

Matthews thanked Davidson for pulling information together. We've increased the menu of options to make content open in a way that the community feels is appropriate. Are SIG leaders generally happy? Speak up or send Matthews e-mail. There was a lot of angst about making options available but it has turned out well and made everyone in community happy about their participation. We're providing so many options but they take away incentive to become members. Worry about long term viability perhaps incentive is providing a personal portfolio. That's the downside to these very positive actions. This has been talked about for a long time. This isn't an ACM only problem, every society like ours is having a problem and it's with the younger generation. That's why we started FCA – they want missions they can agree with. We should continue to be encouraged by good numbers but not complacent. Leaders were asked if the current options and situation are healthy. Most indicated they were comfortable but some felt they weren't sure. How do we attract younger generation? CS students are engaged and involved. Activities they can rally around but vast majority go to industry. When they graduate ACM is gone, what do we need to do to keep them involved. Right now we don't have an answer.

EIGs – Where Do We Go From Here

Harper was introduced to talk about EIGs. He reminded the leadership of the EIG process and mentioned the proposals that have been submitted and where they are in the process. The proposers of the EIG on Connected Health were asked to resubmit their proposal expanding the scope of the EIG and explain how they will work with the overlapping SIGs. They were also asked to include volunteer leadership from outside the US And connect with SIGCHI leadership for suggested participants that can help to bridge the EIG with the SIGs.

The EIG on Energy has been approved with the understanding that the EIG leaders will work with the Chairs of SIGBED and SIGARCH and continue to work with SIGCOMM to involved their communities in the EIG's structure. Adhering to the collaboration will determine if the EIG should eventually move to SIG status.

The EIG on Digital Forensics was not approved because the SGB EC believed the overlap with existing SIGs was too heavy to proceed. They suggested that the proposer contact the leadership of SIGSAC, SIGGRAPH and SIGMM to discuss volunteer opportunities and start in an activity under one or all of those SIGs.

The EIG on Smart Connected Communities was approved. Harper asked the group to ping him if there were any additional questions.

Computing4Change

Cherri Pancake was introduced to discuss Computing 4Change. This is a new student competition, a new approach for a contest to attract more students to computing, through data science/analytics. Traditional contests focus on programming skills and judge on software performance to attract students on making them see the real value of data science and analytics and making it more socially relevant. Teams of students apply analytics to address a societal problem (immigration issues, climate change, pandemics, cyberterrorism, sustainable food/waste/energy.... Students gather data, perform analyses, visualize results and present their findings. They're judged on originality, quality, clarity and potential impact. 2 have been done. The first was at SC 16 on the violence & rhetoric around BlackLivesMatter and the 2nd at SC17 on immigration issues. A formal evaluation process proved its success. Computing4Change is hosted at a computing conference. Prior to the event, students apply individually. It's open to all undergrads but some preference is given to women/minorities, other disciplines, early undergrad levels. Individuals participate in monthly online training sessions for key skills. At the conference, they are formed into teams of 4-5 students with an advisor assigned to each. They are trained in team-building, presentation skills and messaging. The teams perform their analyses and present results to panel of judges. SC is already a host conference and they're looking for another for the late fall or next year. Each competition can have a different theme and they would work with the conference to determine the theme. Pancake was asked how many participants they were targeting, and she indicated 20. She suggested teams of 4-5 is the sweet spot in terms of team size.

History Committee

Boucher Owens was introduced to discuss SIG Heritage. She spoke about why we should be preserving ACM's history. ACM was founded in 1947 and there is a lot of history and we're not keeping it. Reaching out to the SIGs because each has its own perspective and the way each evolved is different. SIGs are key to preserve and protect information that tells their part of the story. The ACM HC SIG Heritage project allows each SIG to develop and carry out their own plans for collecting that SIGs history. Each SIG should put a SIG Historian in place who would be the main point of contact. The History committee is producing a website with tools, resources, and examples to build upon existing work. There will be a workshop in May of 2019 on building a historical record, identifying and collecting, conducting oral histories, and archiving case histories. They will pay transportation and housing everything your historian needs. This will help SIG historian understand what is involved in building a historical record. Several SIGs acknowledged having an upcoming 50, 40, 30 and 20 year anniversary. The ACM History Committee mission is to foster collection, preservation, interpretation of ACMs history and its role in the development of computing. The SIGs are ACM. Please name a historian.

CACM

Matthews delivered some information from new CACM Editor in Chief Andrew Chien. Andrew is going to start regional special sections in a global rotation. About 25 pages to include an introduction, hot topics, big trends and themes. Looking for people that want to be a part of this. First will be a China special section. Final content ready in June and published in fall 2018. The second will focus on Europe and they're actively inviting leaders to participate. They need volunteers for sections and editorial board and

CACM needs more paper nominations for research highlights. This section of CACM is unique and highly valued. Please submit papers for this section.

Breakout Report Highlights

Group 1

Term limits for committee members were supported but there was concern that could hurt diversity. One solution is to have a committee elders that oversees the steering committee so that you can bring in junior members to be mentored.

Collect historical data on diversity

Diversity in leadership should reflect the community or alternatively should create role models

Improve diversity in pipeline

An SGB member made an objection to committee of elders term. Would rather have young people watching over field. It was explained that the term was meant to move out steering committee members in blocking roles.

Group 2

Strict term limits, time for people to move on

Good to have SIG reps on steering committees

Have an annual meeting where SC chairs meet with SIG leadership for 2-way communication

Rep of SC on EC for 2-way communication

Award nomination process requires heavy lifting need way to balance process

While often hesitant to have SGB or ACM to create policies some SIGs felt being able to point to a policy was enabling and empowering; not too many but a few critical ones.

Group 3

Like fixed term limits. Might be prudent to have an ACM wide policy or a best practices/guidelines document.

At SIG EC meeting invite representation from a TC to attend for better communication

ACM would be a great place to get data for authors and conference participants.

Mixed feelings about quotas for authors and PCs. Having a floor might be good but mandating something else too strict

ACM keeping community wide statistics would be best

Term limits good idea

Write conference organization policies – SIGPLAN has a template of common best practices

One of the important aspects of building community is welcoming young people some SIGs have doctoral symposiums, domain specific workshops for new graduates and PhD students

Senior attendees mentoring new people.

SIGPLAN leadership asked that the SGB review 2 links:

<http://www.sigplan.org/Resources/EmpiricalEvaluation/>

PLMWs

<http://www.sigplan.org/Conferences/PLMW/>

Matthews thanked everyone for coming and encouraged attendees to add to best practices document.

Patrick was thanked for all his help and the meeting was adjourned.