

SIG Governing Board Virtual Meeting: October 21, 2022

In attendance

- Divyakant Agrawal
- Jonathan Aldrich
- Lisa Brown
- Peter Brusilovsky
- Donna Cappel
- Giuliano Casale
- Yiran Chen
- Alison Clear
- Sanmay Das
- Jack Davidson
- Adrienne Decker
- Natalie Enright Jerger
- Babak Falsafi
- Jeffrey Foster
- Wayne Graves
- Vicki Hanson
- Christine Harvey
- Jiman Hong
- Nicole Immorlica
- Jeff Jortner
- Neha Kumar
- Jim Larus
- Brad Lawrence
- Xye Liu
- Shan Lu
- Stephanie Ludi
- Jeanna Matthews
- Karyn Moffatt
- Vanessa Murdock
- Shawn Newsom
- Catuscia Palamidessi
- Jens Palsberg
- Kalyan Perumalla
- Lili Qiu
- Mirium Redi
- Cindy Riemenschneider
- Franz Rothlauf
- Pat Ryan
- Vivek Sarkar
- Prashant Shenoy
- Lisa Smith
- Karthik Swaminathan
- Tucker Taft
- Kim Tracey
- Wei Wang
- Milisa Tanger-Brown
- May Dongmei Wang
- Ellen Zegura
- Tom Zimmerman

Palsberg welcomed all and noted that there could be another SGB meeting prior to the expected Spring meeting. He introduced ACM CEO, Vicki Hanson and ACM COO, Pat Ryan and indicated that President Yannis Ioannidis would be joining.

Palsberg introduced Andrew Kun who is leading the SGB Task Force (TF) on SIG Overhead. Kun provided the names of the other members of the TF and reviewed the cohorts that they represented. Kun provided background – SIG Overhead (OH) is assessed on spending and can fluctuate. There is a reserve fund to smooth out year-to-year fluctuations. At this time, there is a severe shortfall in that fund. The SGB approved a new OH rate in the spring for FY'23 and the Task Force was named to explore issues/concerns related to OH. The timeline for the TF is to provide an initial report to the SGB at this meeting and in Spring to recommend proposed actions.

Ioannidis arrived and indicated it was his great pleasure to participate. SIGs are the heart of most activities at ACM and are the fermentation ground for issues across all members. He said he planned to be at all SGB meetings to inform the SGB leadership of ACM-wide actions.

Kun provided a sliding scale chart that included the range of potential expenses and their associated OH rate.

The questions the TF is exploring include rate, SIG needs and ACM services. They also want to strengthen fruitful collaboration, mutual understanding and transparency. What should change and what should remain? The next steps are to meet with SIG representatives. SIGs were tentatively placed in groups based on their similarities for these discussions. The TF will begin to reach out to each group. Kun ended his presentation and asked for questions.

Matthews - Suggests incentives for collaboratively evolving the menu of services. Would love a forcing function for SIGs to identify needs. It would be great if staff could fill in the gaps everyone is facing.

Brusilovsky – We need better support for hybrid conferences particularly the smaller SIGs that struggle. Co-location would be good across multiple SIGs. Perhaps we could cluster SIGs to do more. We need to redesign and rethink with ACM.

Immorlica – asked if there were services that could be cut.

Brown – asked if there was a list of ACM services?

Kun responded that part of the conversation is to share the list of services with the groups. The list is long and some of it is straightforward like securing a venue, some is infrastructure. Looking at the list, he didn't see a place where we can just cut because we're using these services a lot. He suspected that there are additional things we need. He made it clear that was his personal opinion.

Swaminathan – Questioned the groupings.

Kun indicated that they want to meet with everyone and there's a time constraint. Groups are just for the discussions in order to reduce the number of meetings.

Rothlauf – Prefers not to use the word overhead. Instead talk about the cost for shared services. The discussion at the last meeting was bad. This is a better way of doing it. He'd like more details on the financial flows, data on how the fund develops to get some idea of the cost associated with shared services. The next step is to think about the money we spend to understand the value. Once we have the data, we can say how many SIGs and how many members of ACM need these services. If services are used for only 1 or 2 SIGs we can decide which SIGs pay for those services.

Zegura – Need an understanding who is using which services and how. Suggest that we're missing a feedback loop on the quality and improving the quality. Do we have an opportunity to share constructively not in an adversarial manner? Agrees in keeping with the idea of evolving services.

Lu – Agreed with Matthews and all before. Need to understand services allowing ACM to put resources and staff effort into useful place. Big questions about increased OH and the SARF reserve fund being built in a short period of time. Building fund in 5 years is too pessimistic because of COVID.

Das – agrees with sentiment. We need more transparency regarding services. Concerned we're viewing this too transactionally. There's a lot of staff maintaining the DL. That doesn't happen at the SIG level but as a scholarly society. I'm appreciative of just what ACM does for the community. Concerned about the cost of holding conferences and them becoming too expensive. How can we hold down costs?

Immorlica – What SIGs and conferences have left ACM?

Cappo – None recently, that she's aware of.

DAS – AGENTS 20 years ago because of OH. SIGAI tries to give back surplus in the form of travel grants.

Palsberg – does the dwindling volunteer pool resonate with other SIGs?

Zegura - Workload is high and it seems wrong even if people are willing to do it.

Enright Jerger – concerned about volunteer overload.

Matthews – volunteer burnout everywhere. A collaborative willingness to try new models is essential and becoming more and more essential. SIGs should be able to try things not on a menu.

Chen – IEEE has similar issues.

Lu – echo Matthews. Can we pay more? ACM resources should be aligned with conference organizers needs.

Brusilovsky – Burden to come to agreement. Very helpful for conference site selection. Would like to expand services to make the work of the general chair easier.

There was a discussion regarding Submittable. Kumar indicated that it is a way to solicit applications – Awards, volunteers, etc. Keeping transparency and documentation. CHI has been using and paying for it for 2 years.

There was discussion on the DL. The SIG is interdisciplinary and allows conference papers to not have a proceedings version making the DL unuseful. They link to archive instead and eventually goes to a journal. DLE is not right version of the paper and also adds friction to authors. Not happy with Sheridan.

Zegura – The DL is a repository for scholarly work to people all over the world. Less thought of it as a service because of scale, reach and purpose. The DL is incredibly valuable.

Immorlica – Wouldn't set up a centralized service

Palsberg asked for final comments.

Ioannidis – When I was a member of the SGB. Meetings had an hour at the end where we exchanged experiences. Allowing SIGS to bring back information to all SIGS and broader ACM. That should be a regular feature.

We should not transactionalize the issue of costs. For a scholarly society, that is not the correct way to think. We need to look at this in a broader context and he would like to explore a matrix of all happening in ACM. Costs and financing. Do we want these things to be happening. Data will be required with help from ACM HQ.

Palsberg thanked Kun and introduced Jim Larus to discuss CACM and Research Highlights.

Larus indicated there will be a new website, new space, richer, videos along with articles and links to websites and software. No longer limited by the constraints of paper. This allows more to be published as part of CACM. There will be a reduction in turn-around time.

With no page constraints, CACM can include more than 2 Research Highlights papers per issue. Some communities are great about sending in papers, others are less active. He'd like to see more come in and encouraged the SIG leaders to engage their communities. Asked the SGB for suggestions. Immorlica

asked why non-ACM pubs were not considered. Larus wasn't sure there was a good reason for that restriction when paper constraint is gone. In the future they can probably be more open. He asked Immorlica to contact him.

The new website will reduce turnaround time. Web-first will have articles on the website and it will be much quicker. When thinking about what gets people to the website regularly, it's pretty much news. Ioannidis mentioned that when Research Highlights came out, SIGMOD collected chosen papers to recommend. They were choosing papers outside ACM and it was difficult to deal with copyright. Palsberg thanked Larus and introduced Jack Davidson, Chair of the Digital Library Board and Wayne Graves Director of the DL Department.

Davidson reported that the Board was established in 2021. It is organized around projects that are managed by Board members. They have project teams that create working groups to carry out projects. The working groups are supported by staff and outside vendors as needed and are disbanded upon completion of the project.

He reviewed the relevant projects completed. Those included the workflow and process for name change requests and they've established a process for engaging with authors when various events occur – just accepted, paper published, paper now open access, and significant DL updates. The Board has updated the E-rights workflow to include validation by corresponding author and they've got a ticket and tracking system.

2 more projects completed include an author curation tool and reference linking.

There are some ongoing projects as well. In development is a conference view to improve the visibility of main conference proceedings on the conference landing page and to improve navigation of ancillary conference material. They're working on the author experience and readying a DL product survey. Other projects include author affiliation normalization and a conflict of interest service. Relevant to the SGB are projects on automated artifact badging DL workflow, making artifacts in the DL more discoverable, Integration of CALCO into the DL, Article type cleanup and a DL status dashboard.

In summary the Board has completed some key data quality projects. They have lots in flight and good progress is being made. The market survey will be very helpful in formulating strategic directions and projects. They're working to create an advisory board to the DL and Davidson will be reaching out to the SIGs for ideas of people you know that we could approach about this.

Palsburg thanked Davidson and wondered if people had comments on if the DL had this, it would be better. Brusilovsky commented that there are all kinds of possibilities and some low hanging fruit – making recommendations and other services that can be built. Graves said they're discussing possibilities with Group called Trend MD. Segura made an ask that as you investigate keep an awareness of the biases that are in the data.

The Co-Chairs of ACM's Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Council, Stephanie Ludi and Lisa M. Smith were introduced to the SGB. The strategy is focused on enhancing the governance, programs, activities, et. To drive a more inclusive culture within ACM and the global community they serve. Over the past year a lot of events and activities were held to listen to experience of others. They've extracted all recommendations from various ACM sources and categorized recommendations into focus areas of People, processes & procedure and culture. The Council has determined the challenges (i.e. connection,

agenda, decentralization, governance, scope and scale) associated with each recommendation and identified the short and long-term solutions for addressing each recommendation. They then prioritized those recommendations, assigned leaders and supporters from the ACM DEI Council to execute the work.

Ludi reviewed the 2022 ACM DEI Priorities of the focus areas. People – Increase visibility of DEI Advocates, Transparency, Awards. Processes & Procedures – Data collection & analysis tools, social justice: publications, reviews, awards, & research, embedding best DEI practices across ACM and Culture – Highlighting ACM’s DEI global footprint and internal and external communications. All will be addressed at various levels.

Moving forward through various channels on development of demographic questions to help get a better picture of ACM’s DEI composition. It is intended that these demographic questions appear in registrations for ACM membership and activities.

With regard to Awards, the goal is to partner with the ACM Awards Council to execute a new program to increase the number of nominations from the underserved and/or marginalized community by providing support to the nominators as they navigate the award submission process. Identified shepherds to provide guidance on Athena Lecturer, Grace Murray Hopper and Karl V. Karlstrom Awards.

Smith discussed the climate survey pilot. To collect data around the environment experience of conference participants. To bring awareness of existing behaviors and provide data to shape education, future programming and interventions, to aid in creating a more inclusive and safe environment for those attending computer science academic conferences. She requested assistance from the SGB to identify task force members from the SGB Chair community to aid in identifying key questions based on global published initiative. To identify 2 to 5 ACM conferences that they could target for climate survey pilot to be delivered using a 3rd party partner and to publish the summarized and anonymous results to the SGB community and identify initiatives for future strategies.

Smith reviewed the CS202X DEI Instructional Practices initiative. Determine a key “Instructional Practices” that will combine the science with DEI principles for academia Faculty education. Seeking participants to aid in creating the content for an article for publication during January/February 2023.

Smith shared the publicly available DEI content. In her closing remarks, she indicated that help is needed with real-time awareness of the DEI strategies and/or initiative across all SIGS. Please share experiences.

Palsburg indicated that there has been a lot of discussion as to how this could work. He opened the floor for and comments. Does it seem like the right time to get a 3rd party in?

Zegara – SIGCOMM did a survey and will share with Lisa. The results were just shared so she has not had time to review them yet.

Clear – SIGCAS did a survey and came up with 6 recommendations: 3 short-term and 3 long-term. She will share that with Lisa and Stephanie and SIG would like to talk off-line with them. Just a reminder that DEI is inclusivity for everyone. Please be aware that some people are not aware of small words that others understand.

Foster – Recently agreed to do a climate survey within SIGPLAN and will discuss with SIGPLAN leaders and is very supportive of this.

Das indicated that SIGAI has been talking about this a long time and is coming up with guidelines for organizers for recommended practices. He's happy to share those with others. He encourages people to recognize participation isn't necessarily easy for everyone.

Clear said that SIGCSE discussed this at length and has lots of ideas on DEI and other issues that cause people to feel alienated.

Riemenschneider indicated that SIGMIS has requests for various levels of registration based upon where people live and they are exploring that.

Palsberg thanked Smith and Ludi. He introduced Enright Jerger to discuss SIG Awards. A year or so ago ACM revamped their awards processes. There's been a call for the awards processes across all awards. There are 140+ SIG Awards and we need to understand the processes of how committees are formed, are there open calls... Want to figure out the SIGs are doing and then disseminate best practices. TF will be getting in touch with your SIG soon. Then the TF will make some recommendations on how we can improve. Palsberg was surprised that there are 150 awards some are defunct, some don't have descriptions so the awards committee has some clean up to do.

What's turnaround time for proposing new award? Cappo responded 4- 6 months going to SGB EC avoids advisor for comments, then SGB EC who may have comments, then SGB for comments and after SGB goes to ACM awards committee.

Does ACM have guidelines on review of SIG Awards. How do you get a diverse candidate pool? Hanson wrote a bulletin in August and the DEI Council will be getting information out shortly. Awards co-chairs have worked hard to increase diversity of awards committees.

Palsberg pushed for more mentoring at ACM and put up a google doc allowing the SGB to share their mentoring practices. Asked SGB leaders to put in a few lines and link to what your SIG is doing to inspire and learn.

SIGPLAN has mentoring workshops at the 4 main conferences. Also has 1 day and long term mentoring program. Connected 1/month and has 300 pairings.

CHI focused on mentoring across stages – Set up futuring committee getting more junior members to work with senior members for community service for CHI. Thinking about SIGCHI summit to come together and do knowledge sharing.

COMM supports N2Women Group runs workshop 1 each year well attended and co-located with major conferences. Great way to get group together for formal and informal mentoring. Have a top 10 of women to watch in networking.

The RecSys conference made a series of pre-conference talks advising others about careers. Part of it was a mentoring session.

Palsberg closed saying that there would be a meeting in the Spring in early April in order to have a vote on the OH. We'll settle on a date and let you know. May have another meeting before that.

Matthews indicated she's chairing SGB nominating committee and wanted people to think about running. Asked people to reach out if they wanted more information.