SIG Governing Board
Friday, March 27, 2009 Meeting

Erik Altman, SIGMICRO Chair
Florence Appel, SIGCAS Chair
Osman Balci, SIGSIM Chair
Barrett Bryant, SIGAPP Chair
Doug Burger, SIGARCH Chair
Donna Cappo, ACM Director of SIG Services
Mark Crovella, SIGCOMM Chair
Jack Davidson, SGB, ACM Council Rep.
Kathleen Fisher, SIGPLAN Chair
Lance Fortnow, SIGACT Vice Chair
Mark Giesbrecht, SIGSAM Chair
Virgil Gligor, SIGSAC Chair
William Griswold, SIGSOFT Chair
Brent Hailpern, History Committee, SGB
Liaison
Wendy Hall, ACM President
Vicki Hanson, SIGACCESS Chair, SGB EC
Robert Haring-Smith, SIGUCCS Chair
Julie Jacko, SIGCHI President
Dave Johnson, SIGMOBILE Chair
Richard Ladner, SIGACT Chair
Liz Liddy, SIGIR Chair
John McCormick, SIGAda Chair
Brad Mehlenbacher, SIGDOC Chair

Ethan Munson, SIGWEB Chair
Klara Nahrstedt, SIGMM Chair
Scott Owen, SIGGRAPH President
Barbara Owens, SIGCSE Chair
David Pennock, SIGecom Chair
Raghu Ramakrishnan, SIGMOD Chair;
SIGKDD Board Member
Darren Ramdin, Assoc.Dir., Office of Fin. Serv.
Han Reichgelt, SIGITE Chair
Patricia Ryan, ACM Chief Operating Officer
Pierangela Samarati, SIGSAC Vice Chair
Hanan Samet, SIGSPATIAL Chair
Janice Sipior, SIGMIS Chair
Doug Terry, SIGOPS Chair
Lothar Thiele, SIGBED Chair
Lauren Thompson, Admin Asst., ACM SIG
Services
Robert   Walker, SGB, SIGDA, ACM Council
Rep
John White, ACM Chief Executive Officer
Darrell Whitley, SIGEVO Chair
Carey Williamson, SIGMETRICS Chair
Alexander Wolf, SGB Chair

1.1 Welcome, Introductions (Alexander Wolf, Vicki Hanson)

1.2 Welcome (Wendy Hall)

ACM President Wendy Hall opened the meeting by stressing the importance of the international component of ACM. Hall reported that the Executive Committee is working to set up three task forces, one each for India, Europe, and China. The EC is working to figure out the issue of how to support members both inside and outside the U.S.

Another big item on the EC agenda is how ACM handles its chapters. There were some ideas presented to the ACM EC which would improve the program and all it can offer to the community and to ACM. More work is expected and will be shared with the SIGs.

ACM Membership continues to rise. In light of our internationalization strategy, how much do we want to grow membership? The EC will be looking down the line 10 years to answer these questions and will discuss at their retreat in June.

The ACM EC understands that the economy could hurt conference attendance. The SGB was urged to be prudent. The leadership should keep connected with their conference organizers; interaction should not end at approval of a conference budget. Hall stressed that there is no need to panic but there is a need to stay involved and keep aware of what's going on.

The EC also expects to work with the SIGs to look at ways to develop new areas of interest.

2.0 Report from the ACM CEO – (John White)

ACM CEO John White reported that ACM is strong and membership is increasing. The reach of the digital library continues to grow.
Membership numbers:
- 91,700 members worldwide (as of Feb. 29, 2009)
- 69,100 professionals, 22,600 students

There has been some concern about SIG membership levels and that is expected to be discussed later in the day.

ACM priorities include investing in a growing ACM publishing program (with new publications, digital library growth) and increasing the value proposition for ACM membership. White stressed that ACM is financially sound. FY '09 will be solid year. The major ACM general MPO (Membership, Publications, Operations) revenue streams are solid, but ACM is watching the SIG conferences carefully.

With regard to FY '10, ACM is being conservative; FY '10 looks similar to FY '09. While there are concerns, there is no panic. ACM will be closely watching the 5 large conferences in FY '09 (CHI, DAC, SIGGRAPH, SC and SIGGRAPH Asia). So far this year, most conferences are meeting their revenue; CHI is doing well, registration numbers on target (though there are more students than normal). With the conferences that will play out over the next few months, ACM is working with conference organizers to review financial plans. The Office of SIG Services is looking over hotel contracts, minimizing attrition and other penalties. The organization is strong, the SIGs are doing great things, and ACM wants to do everything to make sure they continue to do well.

The initiatives of ACM include internationalization; promoting the image and health of the computing field (including increasing the percentage of children, women, and minorities choosing to study computer science); a new education policy committee; new *Communications of the ACM* (in its first full year, launched July '08). Anecdotally, everything ACM has heard so far about CACM is positive. Internationalization: With all of the great work going on as computing expands in India, China, and Europe, people wonder why ACM isn't involved more. A couple of years ago, ACM started working on this in India, China, Europe. In Europe (where 16% of membership comes from), people see ACM as "American Computing Machinery." White urged the SGB to focus on what it can do in the next 3 years to make a difference regionally in those areas.

With respect to India and China, the initiative is to build on ACM's high-quality technical activities. The India Council met in Bangalore to raise awareness of what will be ACM India. ACM needs individuals to help set up chapters. Many of the SIG conferences rotate in and out of the U.S., so ACM wants to try to get some of the big conferences to go to India at some point. The task force will also look into launching Indian versions of already established ACM/SIG conferences, such as EuroSys (a highly-regarded conference run by SIGOPS). ACM is considering the possibility of an ACM India national conference – sort of an India FCRC-type conference. This is a model that could play out in other areas as well. ACM wants to understand who the Indian ACM members are, where they reside, establish membership, and find volunteers. The people on the international councils know ACM and are connected. There is great possibility for growth. Fisher asked about the digital recording of conferences, as a way at least in the short term, to let people who can't attend conferences take part. She explained that SIGPLAN tried to do it but found it to be prohibitively expensive. She also wondered about whether the community would be fractured by different versions of conferences. Chesnais indicated that he was the new chair of the DMCC and explained that ACM is trying to see how to appropriately capture content faster and upload it. Owen reported that

SIGGRAPH has captured content, made it available, and is looking to have satellite streaming with live content, potentially at the conference in Shanghai.

SIGs were encouraged to continue international participation. Crovella reported that SIGCOMM's flagship conference is being held in Delhi next year, and it could be beneficial for SIGCOMM leaders to talk to the India Council to use the event to help get word out. Johnson added that MobiCom is in Beijing this year, and that it would be beneficial to get in touch with the Chinese counterparts.

Wolf thanked White and encouraged the SIG leaders to remind themselves about the budget theme. He understands how distanced the SIG leaders can get from the conference chairs because of steering committees and other such things. General chairs are going to be very resistant to making compromises that are going to have to be made in this economic situation. The bottom line is going to hit the SIG fund balances. He encouraged the chairs to ask the general conference chairs to work with Cappo and her staff on budget strategy. He asked the leaders make use of SIG Services, be very reflective on budgets, and think about things that can be cut to lower costs. Ultimately financial responsibility for sponsored conferences falls to the elected SIG leadership.

Action: SGB leadership needs to keep connected with activities of sponsored conferences both technically and financially.

3.0 History Committee Report – [Slides](#) (Brent Hailpern)
Brent Hailpern introduced himself as the new liaison to ACM History Committee (Mary Hall was predecessor). The purpose of the committee is to examine the history of ACM, not of the science, with a focus on how ACM/SIGS/conferences have evolved. However, he explained, this doesn't mean the committee can't provide resources for the history of the science as well.

A few SIGs are actively developing history programs:
- DA is looking to identify key founders, interview them, making a DVD
- MOD is getting comprehensive volunteer list, who they were, etc.
- PLAN reported the HOPL videos now in DL, incredible activity, password protected

What can the SIGs do? The SIG leaders should try to collect software, artifacts, machines on which they will run as they engage with colleagues who have interesting pieces. Without equipment to run it, some of the software will be lost. How the conferences, SIGS, etc. were set up will be lost once founders are gone, so Hailpern suggested the SIGs conduct interviews.
As a society, ACM has been good at archiving conference activities, proceedings in DL. Wayne Graves is working to capture conference websites. He's doing a trial run for 2-3 conferences.

Hailpern announced the new Turing Award Site. Each award site will have a curator. The idea is to start building up material associated with each of the Turing Award winners, starting with the initial set (3 from MOD, 3 from PLAN). Hailpern said they are looking for a curator-in-chief. This should be happening over the next few months and will be someone who is knowledgeable of these people/SIGs.

Hailpern also announced efforts to archive significant papers. Many conferences now have the most significant paper of the last 10 years. The committee wants to suggest to the publications board that they create a bookshelf in the DL to collect them, add commentary; Jack Davidson will be taking this to pubs board.

New History Committee Fellowships were also announced. The HC wants to encourage the creation of historical materials. There will be up to 2 per year for $2,500 for historical research on ACM-related activities. ACM members from graduate students to senior faculty are eligible.

Appel announced that SIGCAS is approaching 40th anniversary this year. Efforts include publication of a newsletter, interviewing past award winners, and reviewing past issues of newsletter. Hailpern said he would point her to resources.

Ramakrishnan reported he is working on getting an article together for CACM for the anniversary of SIGMOD and suggested that CACM is a publication that lends itself to this kind of stuff. Pennock asked if the history committee fellowships would be for history or computer science students. Hailpern said the committee would be open to any type of student. Owens suggested that retired individuals who have no funding and have a history of the SIG might be good for the project.

Action: Updates on SIG activities related to history should be forwarded to Hailpern.

Action: Any SIG leaders needing advice or guidance on history activities should contact Hailpern. (bth@us.ibm.com)

4.0 Viability Reviews
4.1 SIGSAC Program Review – Slides (Virgil Gligor, Chair)

Virgil Gligor, chair of SIGSAC, reported that between 2005-2008, the SIGSAC conference has doubled attendance. This activity is a main focus for the SIGS. The SIG also cooperates with a few events. In-cooperation status is granted based on a review of the committee, program, etc. SIGSAC is also involved with the ACM Transactions on Information Systems Securities, one of the top journals in the area.

Gligor indicated that membership has been fairly stable, but SIGSAC needs to do better. The leaders are seeking new ways to attract members.

The fund balance as of this year exceeds $200,000. SIGSAC has learned money saving techniques, such as holding meetings at universities which are cheaper than hotels. They are also being prudent when it comes to conferences.

Wolf asked about initiatives to make use of the fund balance. How does SIGSAC plan to invest in its future? Gligor responded that the SIG's intention is to attract new members, create new chapters in Asia, and to make sure that people understand that simply going to a conference doesn't make them a member of SIGSAC or ACM. The second initiative is to reestablish SIGSAC reviews publication. In 1997, the SIG stopped publication, and now leaders want to reestablish it, which could contribute to the attractiveness of the SIG.

Wolf questioned the scope of SIGSAC's volunteer development efforts. Gligor explained that one of the reasons the 2-year term rule is to allow SIGSAC members to have the opportunity to serve in leadership positions. This policy is to show members that they have a chance to lead SIGSAC and use their creativity to grow SIGSAC.

Recommendation from the SGB EC: The SGB EC congratulates SIGSAC on their program performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 4 years.

Motion: Recommendation accepted by the SGB
Unanimous.

Action: Frawley to update viability review schedule.

4.2 SIGMICRO [Program Review](#) – [Slides](#) (Erik Altman, Chair)

Chair Erik Altman reported that although SIGMICRO had trouble about 10 years ago, things are running smoothly and looking up. Altman was happy to report that everything seems to be in good shape. Things in 2005 jumped up, but that had to do with local attendance, geography of where the conference was held. The SIG just finished site selection for MICRO 2009 (New York, NY), where SIG Services worked to get good rates for the conference during these hard economic times.

Altman said SIGMICRO leadership pays very close attention to requests for in-cooperation conferences.

A few years ago, SIGMICRO had some significant trouble with its fund balance. Over the last 5 years, it has made $8-11,000 from DL, which it used to fund student travel to the conferences.

One of their worries is that student membership is declining. Students have dropped significantly, although the SIG does give travel grants. This decline in students is a problem the SIG needs to address. The SIG also recently launched an online newsletter, which will be a significant new member benefit.

A past and future challenge for SIGMICRO is maintaining and increasing membership through the newsletter, history project, student travel grants, conference sponsorships and discounts.

Wolf asked about SIGMICRO's volunteer development efforts. Altman responded that there are potential future leaders, such as the current webmaster, the people running newsletter, conference organizers, etc. who would want to move into leadership in the future.

Recommendation from the SGB EC: The SGB EC congratulates SIGMICRO on their program performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 4 years.

Motion: Recommendation accepted by the SGB
Unanimous.

Action: Frawley to update viability review schedule.

4.3 SIGSOFT [Program Review](#) – [Slides](#) (William Griswold, Chair)

Chair William Griswold reported that SIGSOFT is struggling with a membership drop of about 10%. The SIG's long-term retention rate is stable, and they have no trouble finding conference volunteers. They are trying to redirect volunteers to the newsletters. The town meeting format has energized the SIG's discussions. The SIG has recently been converting conference by-products to digital publication.

SIGSOFT has a very diverse conference sponsorship program. Partnering is challenging because other organizations have different ways of doing things. Conferences are about 50% students, which may seem healthy, but SIGSOFT is finding that professors aren't coming, they are sending their students. It's had an impact. Some efforts to increase conference attendance include increasing CAPS program which subsidizes student fees and introducing a childcare program.

The SIGSOFT fund balance has increased substantially ($340K to $1M), with almost all of this growth due to the DL. SIGSOFT has a fairly substantial conference enrichment program underway and it will probably take some of the DL income and put it back into the conferences.
Some past and future challenges include sliding membership, aged bylaws, getting authors to reference ACM DL rather than self-publish (E-mail campaign to authors isn't really working), involving academics from developing regions (though SIGSOFT does have liaisons and a nice program going with India), and rising conference costs.

ICSE, SIGSOFT's big conference, has become unwieldy. It's hard to find organizers and coordinating with co-sponsors is difficult. The SIG is considering contracting with a "secretariat" of some kind.

Recommendation from the SGB EC: The SGB EC congratulates SIGSOFT on their program performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 4 years.

Motion: Recommendation accepted by the SGB
Unanimous.

Action: Frawley to update viability review schedule.

4.4 SIGMM [Program Review](#) – [Slides](#) (Klara Nahrstedt, Chair)

Chair Klara Nahrstedt reported that SIGMM membership has been steady during the last 4 or 5 years. One of the things that worries SIGMM leaders is a declining student membership. They are looking at the possibility of reduced fees.

Over the last few years SIGMM has started with new initiatives to get more people involved. The SIGMM editorial board is made up of a younger generation, which helps to build the new generation of volunteers.

SIGMM has increased its fund balance, and the ACM MM conference is going well.
A big initiative for SIGMM is trying to work with artists on how best to integrate them into this community. There's quite a bit of tension. Nahrstedt was curious as to how other SIG chairs incorporated interdisciplinary communities.

Because of Flickr, YouTube and others MM activities, the number of co-sponsored and in-cooperation conferences is increasing. SIGMM is providing the premier multimedia conference.
The past and future challenges include membership. People are usually members of ACM and wonder why they need a SIG membership. There is also the challenge of including new communities, such as the medical community.

Recommendation from the SGB EC: The SGB EC congratulates SIGMM on their program performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 4 years.

Motion: Recommendation accepted by the SGB
Unanimous.

Action: Frawley to update viability review schedule.

5.0 SIG Development Task Force (Julie Jacko)

The charge of the SIG Development Task Force was to identify several communities not served by current conferences/SIGs. The task force reviewed workshop lists, ACM publications, and brainstormed candidate ideas. They surveyed the SGB, and got tremendous input. The survey allowed the SGB to select two per year for development (under VC SIG development). The criteria was that it had to be an important area underserved by ACM, not necessarily unserved (some work with other conferences). All of these conferences would be under the direction of the SGB EC for first two years and would benefit from a quick launch. The areas include services, health care, sensors, social computing, cloud computing, sustainable computing. All but four SIGs had reported in by mid-March. In some cases there is substantial activity but in limited domain.

The next step is to determine which areas to focus on. The SIGs are encouraged to work individually or in teams to pursue these areas. Dave Johnson (SIGMOBILE) expressed confusion with sensors being on the list because there is already a sensors conference. Cappo (SIG Services) indicated that the problem is awareness since these were topics sent in by SIGs. Jacko explained that we need to start with something very flexible, very agile so it can morph into something more concrete if that's appropriate.

Wendy Hall reported that the EC was uncomfortable with the task force's top-down focus. When looking at the financial climate, the EC was looking for more of a balance, a bottom-up approach to build on what volunteers are doing already. The EC found a lack of balance in report. Hall asked what the process was for finding people to run these conferences. Jacko indicated that the VC of the SGB EC would serve as that point of contact. Hall indicated that many feel that some of those areas are already served. Jacko said she got the sense that there is a balance between top-down, bottom-up approach. Fisher explained that a bottom-up process exists; people in the community can already come to the SGB and start a SIG.

Wolf responded that the SGB has to be careful not to confuse SIGs, conferences, and communities. The process is one of identifying and voting on which few communities the SGB wants to develop. The task force hasn't addressed what happens when someone comes and wants to form a meeting or SIG. ACM needs a smooth process to streamline proposals and chartering.

Hall said she wanted to see more explanation. She said she's personally more concerned about selecting and launching new things in this climate without examining if there really is a need. Griswold reiterated that there would be two per year to see how it goes, not all five at once. Whitley said he thinks this lightweight process makes sense. He said ACM has enough SIGs that any area could be under a few different SIGs and there are sometimes turf battles that slow things down and make people uncomfortable. He said the SGB needs to deal with these turf battles. Johnson added that he is uncomfortable with the idea, and that he'd rather see a structure that finds a home for the community or helps them start a SIG. Jacko responded that the intention is not to build a parallel body but to allow the SGB to serve as incubator. Johnson added that the incubator model doesn't make sense. Ramakrishnan agreed with Johnson and indicated that this is not a good time to start new conferences. There's an underlying concern that the way the field works is that as older fields mature, if the SIGs aren't involved, a lot of overlap happens. SIGs have to be involved in figuring out how that plays out.

Wolf concluded the session by explaining that part of the purpose of task force was to find out how to deal with new conferences. People come to ACM with ideas and want to form a SIG or conference. While there is a process for new SIGs, there isn't one for new conferences. Because of this ACM has missed the boat on several of these, including service computing. ACM gives a face that "this is the structure, you need to fit in," when really there needs to be more flexibility. ACM sees that there are

new communities, ideas, but these communities aren't aware of ACM as a home. This task force was trying to address this. As chair, Wolf wanted to take the report, look it over, talk it over with the EC, and figure out how to move forward. There is tension between the SIGs and the people who want to join the community. The publications board has been encouraging new journals, good example of growing new communities, growing new ways to provide services to the members. They made it clear that they were going to accept proposals. If you show that you are willing to do this kind of thing, people seem to come. The EC will discuss and figure out which direction to take.

Action: Wolf to review SIG Development Task Force Recommendations with the SGB EC.

6.0 Declining SIG Membership (Vicki Hanson)

Vicki Hanson delivered the Declining SIG Membership Task Force Report. The task force was formed to look at declining SIG membership and why it might be happening by studying the trends in SIG membership. There are less students and the SIG membership is not keeping pace with ACM membership. The SIGs lost over 3,000 memberships since 2001.

They discussed possible reasons for decline, which included the value of a SIG, cost, life of SIGs. 6,630 surveys were sent out to lapsed members for SIGs. 449 responded (6.8%), with 59 believing their membership hadn't lapsed. The report focuses mainly on the responses from the 390 people who knew they had a lapsed membership. It was a write-in survey. Some of the lapsed SIG members were no longer in the field (14%), changed to another SIG, retired, interests changed, couldn't find enough about SIG on the web before joining, not knowing what it was about. 17% said the membership was too expensive (companies no longer paying for memberships, unemployed or startup). 10% said there wasn't enough value beyond the ACM membership because they already have access to the DL. 12% said there was not enough practical value for a variety of reasons, including no longer being in research.

The renewal issues included meaning to renew but keep forgetting, difficulty renewing / paying (China, non U.S.), and not realizing they could be a SIG-only member.
Some people wanted to become a lifetime SIG member, just as you can as an ACM member
Other issues that surfaced included time – couldn't take advantage of the benefits; getting free membership with conference and wasn't interested in joining at first; complaints about junk mail; desire for print proceedings; and desire for no print.

Quality was only mentioned a few times.

When asked if they would consider rejoining, half said nothing could make them rejoin. (reasons include: SIG not relevant to them, current economy, don't miss it). Some said they would consider rejoining if there was a conference discount, a free membership for unemployed people, a SIG-only membership (not aware of the option), and the ability to renew online.

Liddy wondered if the task force found out why people join ACM. White indicated that the top two reasons are CACM and the DL. Liddy asked what more value there is in joining the SIGs. Wolf explained that they are looking at 15 years of declining membership, which is a very slow decline. The shrinking SIG community is supporting a larger and larger community of people engaged with ACM. What does that say? You take that to the extreme and you will have 34 people supporting thousands of people. Hanson added that several of the people who replied dropped one SIG, but would join another.

Wolf indicated that he doesn't think this is an issue of cost so much as value – is it the right constellation of SIGs? The SGB needs to think about it as a long-term strategic issue rather than have a short-term answer. Hall wondered what would happen if SIGs were free to all members because there seems to be confusion about whether you get SIG membership with ACM membership. Walker said they gave away free memberships. All people had to do was check a box, and they still wouldn't renew. He said they were trying to give the memberships away, but the members couldn't be bothered. Munson said there is a feeling of not being attached and the SIGs need to articulate the importance of being a member of an organization. Wolf added that it seems people are finding value with ACM, and not SIGs. Whitley asked how many SIG leaders stand up at their conferences and explain what it means to be a SIG member. No one raised their hand.

Action: Wolf to review the lapsed member information with the SGB EC.

7.0 Publications Advisor Report (Jack Davidson)
Jack Davidson said the goal of the Publications Board is to try to make the Digital Library the preferred publisher for computing research literature. The strategies include development of content and services in the ACM DL and Guide to Computing Literature, aggressive development of high-quality research journals, and acquisition of quality proceedings

The ACM History Committee suggested that conference awards be included in the DL. The Pubs Board was supportive of the proposal. The Pubs Board wants to know what the SGB wants to see in the DL, so they can figure out what to do. Some of these awards have citations about why the paper won. The Pubs board would like to include that in the DL in some way. The SGB leaders will be hearing from some member of the Pubs board to figure these things out.

Davidson asked how many SGB leaders are familiar with AICPS (only a couple of hands went up). AICPS was initiated in 2002 to provide a venue for publication of quality conferences and workshops proceedings not formally sponsored by ACM or a SIG. In 2008, 69 volumes were included in the AICPS
http://portal.acm.org/browse_dl.cfm?coll=PORTAL&dl=ACM&idx=SERIES10714&linked=1&part=series).
Many of the proceedings included in AICPS are in-cooperation conferences. With AICPS, there's no financial support or legal responsibility and no editorial involvement. The selection of proceedings to include is done on an informal basis. The proceedings are either published by ACM or other organizations, and the copyright can be held either by ACM or another organization with ACM having a perpetual distribution license. Sometimes the ACM logo is displayed with it. The Pubs board thinks it has been a success – look at the DL and it's all about traffic. There have been 400 volumes published since its inception. It has not been aggressively marketed and has been managed informally. So now they wonder if it's time to rethink AICPS to try to make this a brand that's recognized like other publication series.

Questions include: How close of an affiliation with the ACM should the AICPS maintain? Should the AICPS contain ACM brand, should ACM be in the name? Should ACM be the official publisher? Is this the right direction for the AICPS? What mechanism should be used for SIG input on decisions involving a proceedings being included in the AICPS? Appointed members of Editorial Board? Separate SIG advisory board? Through SGB Publications Advisor? Because the vision is for ACM to become the preferred publisher for computing research literature, ACM must enhance visibility and status of the AICPS through citation and branding, create separate entity for AICPS on the DL home page, and create a logo for tagging AICPS content. ACM must proactively use the AICPS as a mechanism for bringing proceedings content into the DL in new and emerging areas and develop formal mechanisms.

Davidson asked for comments and/or suggestions. Johnson asked for the difference between being in DL and AICPS. Davidson responded that the main difference is the editorial control. Johnson asked who is vouching for the content since there is no editorial control for AICPS. White explained that there has been editorial oversight through this series, but it's mostly checking that the program committees are known in the field. Johnson said that even though AICPS is less carefully controlled and less carefully reviewed, he worries it could be perceived by some as equally/more prestigious than SIG proceedings. Klara Nahrstedt added that when European conferences publish in LNCS, there is a view that LNCS is more prestigious than a university printer. ACM needs to figure out what kind of label to give the content in the DL because it is attractive for people to publish in this way. Owens asked if there would be 3 designations to include in-cooperation conferences. Davidson replied that there would be no designation for that type of thing. Potentially there could be another designation.

Ryder indicated that when the DL was launched, ACM really thought it could become the source of knowledge in the field. She saw this proposal as trying to enlarge the set of information ACM tries to capture and allow people to have access to it in one place. She added that the discussion was intertwined with everything else the SGB discussed in the morning concerning how ACM is going to grow, etc. She urged the SGB to think about how the DL has become the face of the organization and look upon the DL encompassing more information, labeled correctly, as a plus, and not a weakness. Munson added that the Brazilian Computing Society doesn't have the resources to maintain a DL, so they like to publish in the ACM DL. He warned that ACM needs to be careful about branding. If ACM takes the ACM name off of non-ACM things, it would address the concerns of the SGB. Fortnow said he heard a lot of complaints over the years about other publishers and thought that something like AICPS is a golden opportunity because there's a huge need for this out there. He thinks it's a great idea.
Davidson concluded by saying that SIG involvement in AICPS is key and invited chairs to email more feedback.

Action: Davidson to report SIG concerns to publications board regarding AICPS program.

Viability Reviews Cont'd
4.5 SIGSAM Program Review – Slides (Mark Giesbrecht, Chair)

SIGSAM Chair Mark Giesbrecht reminded the SGB that SIGSAM is the largest international organization supporting and promoting research in computer algebra and symbolic computation and its application since 1966.

The annual conference is ISSAC which is often held outside the US, showing the SIG doesn't have a problem with internationalization. SIGSAM has launched a new website. The financial status is good with a fund balance increase from 2005 to 2008 from $8,887 to $40,135.

Giesbrecht reported that it took some time to hammer out the sponsorship details for ISSAC but it appears to be on track.

For SIGSAM, membership decline has been an issue. The leaders are talking about what to do. They brought up the idea of automatic membership for ISSAC attendees. Giesbrecht reported that the number of people attending SIGSAM conferences is going up, but membership rate is not and the trick for them will be to address that.

Recommendation from the SGB EC: The SGB EC congratulates SIGSAM on their program performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 4 years.

Motion: Recommendation from the SGB EC
Unanimous.

Action: Frawley to update viability review schedule.

4.6 SIGSIM [Program Review](#) – [Slides](#) (Osman Balci, Chair)

SIGSIM Chair Osman Balci reported that the SIG's membership has declined and stabilized at 500. SIGSIM no longer publishes its newsletter because of the DL era. Balci wants to change this and has a plan of action to provide the newsletter as a benefit to the members. The leadership came up with a new venture to provide a multimedia knowledge repository with added multimedia content. Balci said there is a lot of potential for more members of SIGSIM by expanding the scope of SIGSIM and with the repository. There are also the loyal followers to WSC (SIGSIM's biggest conference). SIGSIM also recruited four in-cooperation conferences to publish their proceedings.

The current fund balance is at $191,338.92, but the balance will increase to more than $230K in April 2009. More than 20 percent of the income comes from DL. Balci's new project, building the MM Knowledge Repository, will focus on practitioners. SIGSIM wants to recruit them to join because the repository will only be available to the members of the SIG. SIGSIM would make the decision of how much would be in the DL and the repository.

The biggest challenge for SIGSIM is increasing membership. One of the chairs asked if IASTED is an appropriate society to cooperate with and also wondered about the quality of conferences SIGSIM is cooperating with. Balci said he went with the reputation of the society, when approving in-cooperation requests.

Wolf indicated that the EC was impressed by the repository idea, but worried about upkeep. There should be an editor for this as there would be an editor for a newsletter. Balci said he plans to establish an editorial board eventually, but was keeping up the responsibilities himself.

Recommendation from the SGB EC: The SGB EC congratulates SIGSIM on their program performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 4 years.

Motion: Recommendation from the SGB EC.
Unanimous.

Action: Frawley to update viability review schedule.

4.7 SIGMOD [Program Review](#) – [Slides](#) (Raghu Ramakrishnan, Chair)

SIGMOD Chair Raghu Ramakrishnan explained that for SIGMOD, the DL has been a big boon. As of December 2008, SIGMOD has 2,021 members. The conferences (MODS/PODS) are doing well. The SIG also maintains SIGMOD Record, online/print publication.

The initiatives of SIGMOD are outreach, including sending two senior members of the MOD community to visit university campuses around the world for about two days doing lectures,

discussions. Another initiative for SIGMOD is membership streamlining. Ramakrishnan reported that the SIG's online memberships are working well.

SIGMOD wants to have a way to let members of SIGMOD reference all relative publications. To get to that end, Ramakrishnan said, ACM must cut a deal with IEEE. He said SIGMOD can't take that next step without ACM support.

He added, in reference to earlier discussions, that having SIGs is important because not everyone can become a member of a Stanford, or a Microsoft, but everyone can be a SIG member and use the resources. That's the value of a SIG.

Recommendation from the SGB EC: The SGB EC congratulates SIGMOD on their program performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 4 years.

Motion: Recommendation from the SGB EC.
Unanimous.

Action: Frawley to update viability review schedule.

8.0 SGB EC Administrative Report (Wolf)

SGB Chair Wolf began his report by mentioning that although there is not necessarily a problem with the DL being the main source of revenue, it can make people blind to other areas of the budgets that need to be addressed. He asked the SIG leaders please monitor these things.
Wolf explained that ACM has a group that's looking at chapters (location-based groups) to try to coordinate better with the activities going on in the SIGs. Given that there are high-level people on the task forces in India and China, the SIG leaders should be recruiting and facilitating interactions in these places.

Related to internationalization, particularly in Europe, Wolf said ACM wants to know what other organizations are operating in the SIG fields, i.e. what corresponds to the SIG in Europe. There are a very large number of these organizations, and they tend to be country related. ACM wants to at least get an idea of those and be very sensitive not to step on toes as the SIGs move forward.

One of the chairs wondered if there would still be a relationship with IFIP. Wolf said the general consensus is to continue the policy as before (each individual SIG decides for itself whether it wants to provide support for representative). He added that at the moment, the EC doesn't see any reason to change that consensus. There are SIGs that do get benefit from the IFIP participation and those SIGs should feel that they can continue to do this.

Action: Cappo to issue request to SGB leaders for counterparts in Europe.

9.0 Best Practices Session (Walker)

An email received by one of the SIGs sparked the best practices session on openness regarding nominations and financial reporting to membership.

Walker (SGB ACM Council Representative) explained that when it comes to nominations, often times the current chair will appoint a chair of a nominating committee by looking around the SIG to see who is active. But to outsiders, it looks like people are choosing their friends. There are a few SIGs that have open nominations. A member also requested details of a SIG's finances. Some

members want to know about how their dues are spent. The required fund balance or the allocation to conferences, etc aren't easy to explain but perhaps there could be some summary that leaders could give to the members on a regular basis. Walker asked the SGB to share their experiences in these areas.

Most SIGs don't do open nominations or share finances. Walker invited those who do have open calls for nominations to tell the SGB how they manage this in a reasonable way.
The responses are as follows:

- SIGACT – We just had an election this year, in fact, this is my last meeting. Appointed a nominating committee (myself included). We did an open nomination process through surveys using university resources.
- SIGUCCS – no comment
- SIGSIM – have completely open nominations.
- SIGMICRO – show charts at business meetings for finances at conference, we help people understand.
- SIGCAS – completely open nomination process – it's flawed. Surprises me how many people nominate themselves or agree to be nominated, but don't volunteer to do anything else otherwise. We receive nominations and have a committee that vets them.
- SIGIR – put together board that people will vote on. Share financial information at annual meeting, but not in great detail
- SIGDOC – has an open call for nominations
- SIGSPATIAL – no election yet, just started
- SIGPLAN – closed nominations – the past chair and current chair choose people to run because there is a fear that no one would run. We report financials at an open meeting once a year and post on the web.
- SIGBED – committee for elections – publically announced, but first they ask around and have a rotating scheme. The one or two members that have experience get the chair.
- SIGSAM – With one percent of the SIG membership, you can be added to the nominees the committee chooses. We show finances at the annual conference.
- SIGMM – currently do it by letting the past chair of the EC nominate people. They go out and look at various conferences and see who is invested and selects nominees. We present finances at MM conference at lunch, and upload a published report on MM website.
- SIGGRAPH – broken nominations process few years ago. It was closed and secretive. Now it's open. Financials have been reported
- SIGEVO – works through a nominating committee
- SIGKDD – governing board of six people
- SIGMOD – I appoint chair to nominating committee. The people who are involved most discuss first round of nominees, get more recommendations.
- SIGWEB – closed process, single nominating chair finds 3 candidates and 1% rule. We are very hesitant to have completely open nominations because it is important that potential leaders understand the operations.
- SIGAda – just like SIGWEB
- SIGCSE – needs to be wider spread, financial reporting at business meeting with summary of financial state, not been putting it on the web, had previously been in the newsletter.
- SIGMETRICS – like SIGSAM – one candidate per position, hard part is arm twisting people to run, full disclosure at meeting, nothing goes to members for finances. Considering stealing page in quarterly newsletter to report these

- SIGMIS – past chair serves as chair of nominating committee. This year used another person. Finances at business meeting
- SIGSAC – nominating committee
- SIGSOFT – closed process, interested in opening a bit
- SIGAPP – each candidate applied for certain positions, distributed those positions out. One position we had 3 candidates. We have pretty detailed discussion at business meeting. Fairly transparent
- SIGCHI – with respect to financials, CHI has open policy – finances reviewed with committee. Past president chairs nominating committee. We typically get 2-3 candidates per position, they are both
- SIGOPS – finances: dispose finances at business meetings, nominations: European chapter holding elections. Had a nominating committee and solicited open nominations from membership. WE received 0 from open call, not a single one
- SIGMOBILE – closed nomination process – whether not enough people nominated, too many people nominated, didn't want 4 or 5 people running, so we went with closed. Compromise of showing pie charts of numbers, no raw numbers

Walker concluded by thanking the leaders for their feedback and encouraged them to use the information shared.

Vicki Hanson adjourned the meeting.