SIG Governing Board Virtual Meeting: March 10, 2023

Palsberg welcomed the group. ACM President, Yannis Ioannidis was introduced and reviewed his ACM 4.0 vision. He discussed five elements of focus: products and services, finances, people, processes, and infrastructures.

He explained that when strategizing a framework, the process must consider a mission, and within the context of that mission, a vision, which is input for your strategy, values that an organization operates under, and a SWOT analysis. ACM has never had a SWOT analysis and needs one. For ACM's framework, its products and services are the focus, and everything else remaining (finances, people, processes, and infrastructures) support those two. This is an important point because some decisions are based on finances, and unlike a for-profit, where finances are the focus, ACM is a non-profit.

ACM Mission

Ioannidis reviewed the ACM mission and graded it. Noting that even the areas we are excellent at, could always use improvement.

"ACM is a global scientific and educational organization dedicated to advancing the art, science, engineering, and application of computing, serving both professional and public interests by fostering the open exchange of information and by promoting the highest professional and ethical standards."

ACM Vision

Ioannidis then continued to ACM's vision, which states that ACM "will continue to be the premiere global computing society", which ACM is doing very well at. However, he stated that this is not a vision but a result, a consequence of what ACM does, and he proclaimed that we need a real vision. The real vision of ACM is to change the world.

ACM Values

Ioannidis continued onto ACM values, which include technical excellence, education and technical advancement, ethical computing technology for positive impact, diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Ioannidis spoke about membership and indicated that there have not been dramatic differences in numbers for the past 15 years. While ACM members are about 113k, there are about 62 million (2023) computing professionals worldwide, meaning that only 113k of those worldwide have something to do with ACM.

ACM People

ACM people include four categories: members, volunteers, staff, and officers. He explained his diagram showing that members put requirements or needs on officers, officers and volunteers then design and plan to meet those requirements/needs, then officers, volunteers, and staff implement those designs and plans. Staff are always there to support everyone else (officers, members, and volunteers). Ioannidis pointed out three needs that need to be addressed: 1) interaction between officers and members need to increase (virtual townhall meetings, and Q and A sessions are in the making to meet

this need), 2) There needs to be an open call for more volunteers, while currently it's through word of mouth or connections, but there needs to be of a pull and not just a push for volunteers, and 3) ACM needs to hire more staff.

Ioannidis returned to the ACM organization structure from before (strategy, finances, process, mission, values, and so on), and explained that once we strip the mission, values, SWOT analysis, and vision, we must think about who we are trying to serve. He stated that we are serving ACM members and the entire society. Every company has members, marketing, finance, and HR/Admin as part of their organization structure. The components that ACM has established as board and councils are the Digital Library, SIG Services, publications, and what we produce, which are DEI, practitioners, education, and policy. The volunteer bodies structure is a little different and includes DEI, practitioners, the Digital Library, SGB, publications, education, and tech policy, and this is the current structure that is working.

Presidential Promises/Task Forces

Ioannidis discussed the promises he had made during his ACM presidency, where he promised 10 task forces on 10 items ACM members wanted. Three of those task forces have to do with ACM members: youthification (attracting younger generations because they typically don't care about joining organizations, but we need to give a computing community to them), globalization (expanding and capturing all computing areas), and membership. Two of those task forces are respect to the entire society: UN SDGs and code of ethics.

Additionally, two task forces have to do with ACM products/services: product portfolio and open science. We have a task force for finances, bylaws++ (bylaws was another task force), and regional offices.

Ioannidis continued to explain that many task forces will require a lot of liaising, input/dependencies from other task forces allowing other task forces to proceed. He looked back on the ACM mission statement and the grading on each point that he gave, and he pointed out that every single aspect of the ACM mission is affected by at least one task force, and almost all the task forces affect one or more mission point.

Plan & Timeline

Ioannidis then moved onto a plan and timeline slide, showing the steps for each month from Nov 2022 – Oct 2023, also stating that we are a little behind on these steps. In November the EC and Council voted on volunteer members for TF leadership roles, in December – February a search for leaders, February – March a search for TF members conducted, and September – October submission of reports.

ACM 75 Years

Ioannidis came to his closing slides, pointing out that ACM has 75 years in the past and asking the question of how we will move forward. Ioannidis looked back to ACM's target audience and explained from bottom up, that there are members, customers, students, beneficiaries, and potentials. ACM Members are those 4.6k members who voted in the last election, customers are those who buy the Digital Library or tickets to conferences, and beneficiaries are none-members who benefit from ACM. Ioannidis explained that ideally you want potentials to become beneficiaries, to customers, then to members, and you want to grow the students. Each growth requires a different message on growth,

services, and helping. Ioannidis asked the question, what is the right message that we want to give? He ended his presentation by stating that he wants to start a discussion around ACM's membership model.

Questions

Falsafi asked about how these numbers look for other societies, such as the IEEE CS. Ioannidis indicated that the members of CS are half of ours, about 50-55k, and as whole for IEEE about 300k.

The SGB noted that across all professional societies, a very small percentage vote and Ioannidis agreed.

Tysgard indicated that many members employed within the computing field are in the field of IT but feel excluded when the term computer science is used or caused confusion when computing is used in other contexts in ACM publications and on webpages. Members see ACM as a computer science organization, a field that they aren't in. Could we make use of the term computing more often and consider policy that holds a preference for the term rather than computer science or information technology?

Ioannidis indicated that ACM uses computing as a general term, evident in the name (Computing Machinery). We should use the more general term because words matter, as we are a global society.

A question was posed whether the growth in CS majors has impacted on the growth in ACM members. Ioannidis indicated that growth in CS majors in US has been exponential, but the growth in CS majors in ACM has been affected very little. There are many things we can do to make everyone aware of ACM, serve new generations, and change our services. Perhaps having officers in roles that are not scientific roles (innovation roles), this structuring applied to ACM would have an impact.

There was some focus on how a very low percent get involved, but just as in the context of universities, they also have a low percentage who get involved in shaping the organization. Is this really a problem, as it's standard to see low percentages of individual involvement.

Ioannidis – In a Greek university, 80%, 90% of faculty vote for the board and such, so there are differences in culture. There are different categories of computing professionals and the way they are related to ACM. We need to think about who the members are, who pays for services, are there are different kinds of members, and so on. Let's map all this into a model that reflects reality.

The code of ethics, by definition, is related to individuals and about individuals. We have social responsibilities. How do we make the code a part of us and how does it affect us, how can we make it work in bigger contexts (e.g., company, government). What are our social responsibilities, are there activities around the code of ethics (e.g., legal entities either public or private), how is our computing affecting society? This is what the task force will look at.

In discussing the membership model, people feel allegiance to SIGS, not ACM, we have only SIG or chapter members. I think there should be one membership, an ACM membership. Often you see the SIG, but not ACM name. So how do we change all of this? Via the membership model effort.

In the past those in research could create and not worry about how they are affecting society, but now we can't afford to do this. Given the role that ACM has, we have to think about the ethical aspects of what we do, not to stop innovations, but have ethics next to them – ACM has a big role to play in this.

Palsberg thanked Ioannidis for his presentation and Introduced Andrew Kun, Chair of the SGB Overhead Task Force.

Overhead

Kun introduced his report as the 2022-2023 SGB Task Force to ACM Overhead. The TF was formed as a result of the recommendations made to the SGB by the Presidential Task Force on OH. Kun's task force members came from SIGs of varied size and activities.

Kun began by mentioning that ACM provides a whole host of SIG Services (e.g., reimbursing travel expenses, booking hotels, signing contracts…) These services cost money, so the SIG must reimburse these expenses by paying overhead. The system that's been in place for over 20 years now, is that we assess overhead on spending, meaning for every dollar spent, there is a percentage assessed to reimburse ACM for OH. An overhead reserve fund was set up to smooth out year-to-year fluctuations.

For many reasons, including Covid, we ended up with a shortfall, where the overhead reserve fund was exhausted. This was an issue that was addressed by the previous task force, and ultimately by the new rate the SGB voted and approved last year that's in place now. The current task force was created to further explore issues related to overhead. Questions like the rate – should it be kept, changed? What do the SIGs need as a whole and separately? How does this relate to ACM services, and how do we have fruitful collaboration, mutual understanding, and transparency with our colleagues who work at headquarters ACM? What should we change, keep in relationship to SIG services and how much should we pay for services?

Task force Processes

Kun had preliminary conversations with Jens Palsberg and Donna Cappo. The task force had four 60-minute meetings that introduced the issues. Following that, they charted a path forward.

Kun and the task force had Alain Chesnais (former SIGGRAPH President, SGB Chair and ACM President) visit during one of the meetings, where he described the process that took place in 2000, the original overhead process, where they talked to each of the SIGs. That inspired us to do something similar with our task force, so we set up 8, 60 min meetings with SIG representatives to gather feedback to determine how to move forward.

- Kun created a status report and presented it at the last SGB meeting.
- Individual task force members reviewed notes from SIG meetings with SIG representatives.
- The task force had a fifth 60-minute meeting, where they finalized recommendations based on the feedback collected from each of the meetings with the SIGs.
- Lastly, Palsberg and Kun had set up additional meetings with SIGs, where one has been completed and one being scheduled.
- For the meetings, the task force grouped each of the SIGs into 8 groups according to their likeness in activities, spending, and so on.

Kun thanked SIG representatives for their time and detailed feedback.

SIG Feedback

Kun reported the following feedback from SIG representatives:

Positive observations
- SIG leaders appreciate the work by ACM on our behalf,
- Change in overhead was not a major issue for many SIGs,
- Keep planning/adjusting for post-covid, such as continuing hybrid conferences

Problems
- lack of transparency, communication:
- what are ACM SIG Services,
- how much do they cost,
- how are ACM finances overall tied to the SIG,
- how do SIG leaders explain costs to our community, given lack of transparency access to this information
- Costs: shortfall that happened with covid could happen again,
- smaller SIGs that have little to no revenue are hit hard because of the change in the min overhead rate, going up from 10k to 25k
- all SIGS now have increased costs at a sensitive time
- services: some said there should be fewer services, some said there should be more, no strong mechanism is in place to discuss new services or updates to services that exist

Goals
- See increase in transparency/communication,
- reimburse ACM,
- and refill overhead reserve fun that has been exhausted,
- reduce overhead costs at the earliest possible time

Suggested approaches
- Transparency/communication: see more videos and written material on services and communicate to community better, like a list of services, meetings are useful because there are always new elected leaders and this info would be useful for them
- Cost: use list to pick services for each SIG, use list to cut services, provide updates on finances and use these to decide when to reduce overhead
- Services: connect to transparency and setup strong mechanism for collaborative decision making between ACM staff and SIGs

Task Force Recommendations
Kun stated that the task force recommendations are what we think should be done but leaves the question of how it should be done for future deliberation.

Kun reviewed the following recommendations:

1. Overhead rate policy should be maintained, as voted and approved last year by the SGB.
   a. The SGB EC should work with SIGs that are struggling to pay their overhead expenses and continue conversations.

b. The SGB should be provided an annual report on the performance of the current overhead policy, including
   i. The ability of the 38 SIGs to reimburse ACM for total SIG related annual expenses, and
   ii. Our progress towards replenishing the Overhead Reserve Fund on an annual basis.
c. The SGB should conduct a formal review of the overhead rate calculation every 5 years (next review in FY '27).

2. Institute additional communication channels between ACM headquarters and the SIGs
   a. SGB EC should work with ACM to provide formalized information channels to SIG leaders, members, and communities on what services ACM provides and the role of overhead in the operation of SIGs and ACM.
   b. The SGB EC should develop formalized mechanisms for SIGs and ACM to discuss changes in services.

Questions

Matthews - One model I advocated for is if a SIG would like to see a service if there is formalized way to ask headquarters for that service, if not, then request a trial run for that service, and if there many SIGs who'd like would like to see that service, then those experiments move up importance, test it out and get feedback on. Also, another advocate for, SIGs pay a percentage of what they spend, and there are SIGs that pay for services outside of ACM, if you pay for a service outside ACM that ideally it would be a service ACM provides to all SIGs, then a different overhead rate for that, there should be a way to collaboratively say it's a service you'd like to see.

Kun responded that there should be a mechanism to talk about these things. Palsberg asked leaders to talk to him if there are ideas for services and he will pass it on to Donna and company. Kun reminded members that the link is a document of notes from the meetings, and all have commentor access.

Palsberg - So there are two classes of recommendation: keep overhead rate as it is and transparency and communication in services and connection to headquarters about services.

Das - Suggestions on breaking down overhead with respect to services would be helpful. I did not see this as part of the recommendations. Kun responded that a document was distributed to SIG leaders with estimated ACM expenses with respect to services provided. Das asked if the overhead could be broken down with respect to the services that a SIG needs, instead of having a minimum or lump sum? Kun responded that was one of the suggestions that came up, as a task force, they don't recommend because we are having a hard time finding specific services that wouldn't be used, we don't' necessarily know. And which services are used changes year to year, making it more difficult. Truly finding that services we don't use and finding the actual cost that you should pay less for, doesn't make much sense.

It was noted that the increase to the min overhead fee was particularly significant from 10k to 25k, putting increased pressure on smaller SIGs. What decision has been made and is there a chance to revisit? Kun explained that the current recommendation is to leave in place the formula suggested by the last task force suggested. None of this is intended to make a SIG go out of business. Our conferences also do this where one year they may have a loss, but they keep going and come back the next year and do this again. It's true that it serves as an incentive for activities that have spending, and the last task

force did do that, which is why this was included. There are SIGs where the spending is lower, which is a discussion that should be had. Should there be an exception for that SIG?

Brusilovsky – during the group meeting the TF had with the SIGs, it was pointed out that the last 4 years they were financially volatile and it's hard to predict a good new rate based on those 4 years. He suggested trying out a rate for a year or two and then plan again. Kuns agreed. For a while the SIGS were not able to reimburse ACM. The overhead increased with a plan that over 5 years, have that fund go up 50% of annual expenses, about 4 million, so over 5 years, we'd end up with 2 million in that fund. This isn't a quick increase. We are on track for that this year. This is why it's important to provide those reports every year. If we do have 2 million in the bank next year, then by all means we may wish to drop the percentage back down. Palsberg commented that Hanson and Ryan plan to give a report on how things are going with the overhead reserve fund. They confirmed that the SIGs would have an understanding with regard to the overhead following the [March EC] meeting.

Brown – I'm worried about the 5 years, minimum of 25k, which could mean that our SIG could be eliminated. We are hoping to rebuild our community after Covid and I don't see us making much of a profit over the next 4 years. Palsberg asked Brown to have a conversation with him to discuss.

Falsafi – SIGARCH is growing to the point where we need to hire services with conference organization. Palsberg asked him to send an email to him for further discussion. He said it was a very concrete suggestion that he can help refine, as he as experience with this from SIGPLAN.

Mathews - my goal is to set up processes and incentives for healthy evolution in services. Processes by which a SIG can say I want to request X, other SIGS can do plus 1, then a concrete plan or offer to experiment with service X that can be scheduled and can get reported back on the results.

Immorlica: Is it the case that we are going with unchanged rates, and we can ask for discussion if we are about to go bankrupt? Palsberg indicated that the TF recommendation is to keep the rate unchanged. Those that have concerns about finances can talk to him about what can be done.

Immorlica: I feel entrapped here, there is nothing that I can do, I can't say no. Palsberg said that you can say no. We can always amend the recommendation, have a vote, we need something concrete to consider.

Immorlica: In the meetings we had separately with task force, I was hoping to see comparison of costs, alternative ways to generate the services, we discussed things like using AI for tasks that humans are paid for. I didn't see any of that. Palsberg explained that this is a timing question, to consider what you are suggesting and in the recommendation from the task force, this will take time. We are in the planning part of the year, where ACM will get a budget and plan for the next FY, there isn't enough time do another process to consider this next phase question. Next task is considering services, cost of services, and more on what we've been debating.

Huenerfauth - is there a financial rational for why there is a flaw on the overhead with this increase from 10 to 25k? The choice seems targeted at the smaller SIGs and the detrimental impact seems severe for some of them. How much money do we make given a raised floor. It seems to have a negative impact on smaller SIGs. I understand there may be a motivator, there is a policy choice to try to encourage activity, but it's wrapped up that policy choice into the overhead calculation in some sense. Or is there a financial choice, so for example, if your SIG isn't spending, you're still having communications, other

benefits that you're receiving from ACM and so the rationale of the rate is essentially there is a fixed cost for being a SIG. From a practical perspective, for smaller SIGs it doesn't sound like they raise a lot of money, but it may help this conversation understand the economics behind why there is a floor. Palsberg explained that the 10k was settled more than 20 years ago, when we were revising the adjusted inflation comes out to about 25k rounded off, anything less than 25k would be a radical change in terms of what we've been doing the past 25 years in terms of the floor. This is the math answer.

Huenerfauth - I'm wondering if the math rate is the answer. Palsberg said, absolutely, in many ways the overhead that came out of the task force was a math answer, we need this certain amount of money paid to ACM and we ended up with a table of costs that's still the same but with the numbers updated to fit the need for this payment. What we ended up doing was much like before but with updated numbers to make the total right.

Small SIGs were paying nothing because they were guaranteed at least min 10k from the digital library, essentially had a zero sum, unless they made more than that. The small SIGs were affected by the increase in the minimum more than just the percentage, the middle SIGs were okay with everything, and the large SIGs were unhappy due to the huge increase in costs that came across. I like the suggestion from Jenna to take a hard look at what are those services, particularly the larger SIGs, outside the bounds of what ACM is doing, and ask if those are services we can do in ACM, or should we look at different rates for them. These two suggestions may help us identify what we can address quickly in the short term.

Rothlauf - is there a schedule when ACM increases transparency/communication? Palsberg - No, we are working on a schedule for the upcoming period. I'll keep you updated on what schedule we can work out.

Rothlauf - how did overhead develop in 2022? Schembari indicated that for the current projection for FY 22 we see the SIGs making overhead amount of $4.3M, plus making contribution to the reserve fund for about $500k. It's in line with what the task force came up with and what was approved last June. Palsberg asked if 2M is what we are going for the reserve fund? Probably a little more? Schembari said that the actual calculation is 50% of the previous 3 years: the average of the last 3 years, 50% of that. Palsberg asked if this means we are on track to fill the overhead reserve fund with that amount in another 4 years? Schembari indicated that if everything goes like this year, then yes.

SIGSIM is one of the small SIGs previously under the old system, essentially had all overhead covered by the digital library fee. I always thought it was odd that we didn't have to pay anything, of course we didn't complain. I understand the need to cover these increased costs and I understand your answer before on the 10k went to 25k based on inflation calculations, but inflation is a gradual process over 20 years, whereas this was like a jump from 10 to 25 k, like a big bang, and it seems unrealistic that any SIG could increase its activities so quickly. I don't oppose the broader picture that SIGs must cover the cost, but I would like to request that this aspect of the minimum fee be considered in a bit more detail and if it does need to go up, it should so gradually. Palsberg asked him to come and talk to the SGB EC. He would rather have a hard rule and work out the exceptions.

Palsberg - about a year ago we set up a task force to work out how we think about overhead. Thank you, Andrew, and the rest of the task force. I didn't realize how much work this was going to be. Promise: For the next period we will go into this discussion with costs and services and transparency more and we will figure out the right way to approach this and will work as fast as we can over the next year.

There was a query with regard to the OH formula - was the vote last year just for FY'23? Yes, confirmed. The SGB was required to determine how to move forward for FY'24 and beyond.

Palsberg - Based on the recommendation of the task force, and in contrast to last year, this year we will vote on keeping these rates for the time being until we explicitly change them. That's my suggestion. Do we have a motion?

There was discussion on length of time for the recommended method before the next review. The TF suggested 5 years. Comments included doing a review every year, voting every year, voting every 3 years, every 5 years, report out annually.

Zagara we've spent a lot of time on this and it's unclear to me if context from one conversation conveys into another in full form, even with the same people. The point about context is super important how we can carry state forward, or we are revisiting things multiple times, as some people haven't gotten a satisfactory resolution, sometimes it's we are all busy and forget stuff. Some method preservation of history would be a good idea, and required reading for those who enter the later convos. I also think that There are intertwined issues of SIG services and what we pay, we might do well to try separating them for purposes of understanding and deciding what would be best because when we tie what we are paying to the service that we are getting in a way that's closely couple but wouldn't have to be and creates/feels an adversarial relationship with ACM. Andrew and Jens both had a desire to keep in mind a collaborative working together is the better way to go. This yearly check feels like when we have an employee and we're not sure if they are going to work out. Jenna, to the point of evolution, I support healthy evolution goal. I don't think revisiting every year is a good use of time and sets up adversarial relationships that are hard to offset even when not intended.

Palsberg - We have a timing problem for this meeting because there are other items on the agenda we must cover. At this point I'd like someone to make a motion. I've seen 3 different motions: the task force recommendation (5 years), Jenna 1 year, and some said 3 years. I think the recommendation from the task force, modified with at least one of these motions, is roughly what we are talking about. Who wants to make a motion, and can we have a second?

Harvey - it's not bad to revisit each year, and I've seen the work Andrew puts in, and I've been on the task force, keep in mind that someone works to put out does the analysis and someone report to put out. It's like a lawyer that puts a will out for you and have them explain your bill they will also bill you for those hours too, so if we keep asking ACM staff to explain exactly where everything comes from, we are adding to their overhead and adding to the time to put on them to come up with this every single year. It's not a bad idea, but it's not cost neutral to do this every year.

Motion: The SGB accepts the TF recommendations amending 1c to indicate every year.
(Immorlica, Lu)
(10 yes, 12 no, 1 abstain) – motion failed

Palsberg asked for another motion. He verified the group was voting on the whole task force recommendation but amending 1C.

Jortner – even if we vote for 3 years, then we look at how the recommendations were put into place in a year or 2. We look at how the recommendations have evolved.

Motion: The SGB accepts the TF recommendations amending 1c to indicate three years.
 (Zegara, Clear)
(20 yes, 4 no, 2 abstain) – motion passed

Palsberg - Motion passed. 1C will be amended to 3 years.

Bylaws

Palsberg – A TF led by Elisa Bertino was put in place to review and modify ACM Bylaws for Council approval. 2 items are SGB related and Palsberg has been in discussion with the SGB about them. He gathered questions from the SGB and responses from the TF. They'll be reviewed and a decision from the SGB will allow him to report back and have them finalized by Council .

Bylaw 3 – there are two sections for us to discuss: Section 5, SGB Nominating Committee and Section 11, Limited Terms of office.

Proposed:

Section 5: SGB Nominating Committee, which outlines the nominating committee and rules.

> The past Chair of the SGB will serve as the Chair of this SGB nominating committee and will nominate two additional ACM members to serve on this SGB nominating committee for approval by the SGB. All members of the nominating committee will serve for 2-year terms expiring June 30 of even numbered years. SGB consideration of the nominees will take place as soon as July 1 of even numbered years.

Section 11: Limited Terms of office

> All elected positions should have a specified definite term.
> The expiration date of the term shall be specified at the time of election.
> An individual may be considered for election to a subsequent term.
> All elected volunteer positions shall be limited to two full consecutive terms in the same position.

Section 11 generated questions which were passed onto the TF. Their responses were presented to the SGB.

The section of limited terms of office 3.11 is reasonable. Can a volunteer be elected for additional terms after a break e.g., two terms, break, another term?

> Reply from task force:
> Yes, a volunteer can serve two terms in a given position, then take a break from one term, then serve again in the same position. Note, one may serve in different positions without breaks.

For SGB nominating committee 3.5, there may be cases where the past chair of the SGB is unable to serve as chair of the committee. It would be useful to specify what happens in this situation.

Reply from the task force:
in this case, the past-past chair would serve. Note, there could be corner cases, like that the past chair and the past-past chair are unable to serve, such cases would be unlikely. However, if such a case were to arise, the President (ACM president) in consultation with the SGB executive committee can appoint someone, like someone who has recently served in the SGB, like a past SIG chair.

Some SGB people said that limiting the max number of terms to two is inappropriate and will cause problems. Ex: a treasurer who needs two terms to become aware of all relevant aspects. I think this is different for different SIGs. What degree of freedom do we have to grant exceptions case-by-case?

Reply from task force:
From what I have seen for most SIGs, chair, vice chair, and treasure serve a term of 3 years (and according to 3.11 they can serve two terms). In the case of the treasurer example, it would seem strange that one would need 6 years to get familiar with the budget, but there are always exceptions as SIGs are different from each other.

Note: SIGs can adopt different solutions. People often remain but in different roles, as such they can help the new incoming person, like a treasurer becoming a vice chair can help the incoming treasurer. The SGB can provide materials on budget management of the SIGs.

There was a query regarding how this would work for SIGs that run a board that then self-elect their position rather than individual positions. If you run for a board it allows you to run for a variety of positions after being elected to the board.

A question was asked about how this related to appointed terms. It was noted that appointed terms are slightly different, there is more flexibility.

Matthews commented that this could prevent continuity and is ill-advised. Immorlica indicated that it was difficult to get anything to happen in short term limit. There should be some kind of limit but something longer than 1-2 years. It was mentioned that several SIGs now have 3 year terms which would allow for 6 years in a single position. Perhaps some SIGs should consider increasing the number of years in a single term.

Palsberg urged the group to either agree and vote or come up with an alternate suggestion. It was suggested that there be a vote and if it doesn't pass, other suggestions could be considered. He responded to a question about this being a rule for all of ACM. He indicated it would and included the role of SGB Chair. There was a question about whether the SGB Chair term could be changed to 3 years and Jens replied it could. An SGB member asked if there was a rule on length of terms and Jens indicated that he was unaware of any policy.

Palsberg was asked about transition period. Ioannidis indicated that the Council can vote a transitioning period of X. That can be put into the voting. The transition period is very important. The 2-term limit was a part of our policies, so it's not as strong as the bylaws, but it was there, not something that just came out of the blue. The feeling was that it needed to be in the bylaws, so it's not a completely new thing.

Palsberg - Trying to write the ACM bylaws so it accommodates all 38 SIGs, is the wrong way to go. There needs to be some top-level rule and we need to organize ourselves around it. If the top-level rule is a good one, then we can organize ourselves well. The transition time is clearly important because to get something moved from the policy manual to the bylaws cannot be done quickly. The main practical suggestion I have heard today is to bring to the ACM council that there needs to be a transition in place for some SIGs. I don't have a clear picture how many SIGs would need that transition period, so I would call for those to email me if your SIG is likely to need a transition period, and we can gauge how big this problem is.

The SGB asked if staggered terms were permitted. Yes, staggered terms are possible.

Palsberg asked to move the meeting along in order to get to two more agenda items: ACM Europe was promised a chance to speak and Jeanna has agreed to lead a Disclosure discussion, but we won't have time for it. So, Palsberg will call another SGB meeting principally about disclosure.

Palsberg then went with Jortner's suggestion to support the two bylaw suggestions as written. He asked for a motion.

Motion: The SGB supports the modifications to Bylaw 3, section 5 and section 11 as outlined by Jens Palsberg in the 3/10/23 SGB Meeting.
(Clear, Foster)
(6 yes, 9 no, 7 abstentions)

Palsberg indicated motion failed. It was suggested changing it to roles instead of position. Matthews suggested that the SGB defer crafting a new language to another meeting because we don't' have a lot of time left.

It was suggested that the bylaw be changed to allow the SIGs to develop their own term limits within their own bylaws. However, term limits for ACM, would apply to the SIGs.

Palsberg will talk to ACM EC and will work with the SGB EC prior to the deadline to come up with language that captures SGB concerns including a transition period

Disclosure

Matthews indicated that there is an article in CACM that the SGB should read. As SIG chairs you should make comments. It's exciting that ACM is inviting us to weigh in on a big policy decision, balancing big issues like harm prevention in our communities versus legal liability. Many times, these decisions have been made without consultation from SIG chairs or the membership at large. This article, this opportunity is a big step in changing that pattern. Even if you don't feel strongly about this issue, and you do feel strongly about members being able to weigh in on big policy decisions. Please say something. If you have a SIGs CARE committee, please contact them personally, you have until April 9th to comment.

Palsberg then introduces Panagiota Fatourou, Chair, from ACM Europe and invites her to present.

ACM Europe

Fatourou introduced her presentation on ACM Europe Research Visibility (RAISE) Working Group, to give insight into why a working group was established.

Fatourou - The population of Europe is larger than the US, the workforce and ICT specialists percentages are similar between US and Europe, but the percentages for ACM membership is much lower for Europe. So, we think there is a large potential for growing European ACM membership. That would require a change to the European perception of ACM and make ACM activities relevant to European computer professionals.

Based on this observation, the ACM Europe Council in 2021 has created a RAISE mission to achieve greater visibility of European computer science research and ensure due recognition for the achievement of Eruopean scholars. One of our first tasks we took was to come up with strategic document proposing specific direction of work to achieve the goals and then to implement some proposed activity after setting priorities and evaluating outcomes. This document was released during the Oct. 2022 meeting and includes statistics, analyses, assessments, evaluations of existing practices, stakeholders, and so on.

The first goal is to boost visibility of European research by increasing ACM Award nominations. We have contributed to the call for nominations in Dec. 2022, and have nominators for Dec. 2023 too. I'd like us to discuss how we can collaborate with the SIGs to promote European researchers, create a network of nominators from different regions, disseminate calls widely, and discuss ways to gradually change the culture regarding participation of European researchers. I think there is a stronger participation in activity in the US.

Goal 2, highlight the role of Europe as a hub of research by organizing and promoting events. Possible suggestions include organizing more conferences in Europe, organizing focused research events in Europe, and empowering PhD students through targeted events. To do this, it's suggested that a task force created to ensure that all SIG conferences rotate among different geological areas, collect date on locations of conferences and publicize them, ensure that the Committees of conferences are geographically diverse, and support live translation/transcript in conferences to facilitate non-native English speakers.

We have already started planning activities to organize focused research events in Europe through a series of events called Building Bridges for the future of CS, where we bring leading researchers from two or more different communities to identify overlaps and synergies and suggest research problems to join forces in the 5 years. The outcome of this could be a paper submitted to the ACM Europe Council for endorsement and to well-known magazines or journals for publication and we envision this to take place in Europe and to be co-organized by ACM Europe RAISE and some of the SIGs.

The first Building Bridges event will be on "Data Management and Environmental Sciences/Climate Change." We have ensured SIGMOD participation for this event and EC member Angela Bonifati has agreed to serve as coordinator. Currently, we are looking for suitable contacts from the Environmental Sciences world. We'd like other SIGs to contribute as well.

One proposal for immediate action is for each SIG (or at least the larger ones) to designate a European liaison, which doesn't have to be the SIG chair but a well-respected and active member of the SIG from Europe, and to organize meetings between liaisons and the Europe Council/RAISE. Ionannidis mentioned

earlier that ACM does poorly on globalization, so we believe that in our report there are many ideas for enhancing this part of ACM, so please go and read it

Fatourou closes her presentation by thanking all members of RAISE and contributing to the activities and creators of the report, and headquarters for their support. Any comments and feedback would be highly appreciated.

Palsberg thanks Fatourou for presenting and everyone for attending the meeting. He then comments he'll call for a meeting on disclosure before the deadline.