

**SIG Governing Board Meeting
Monday, October 26, 2009**

Erik Altman, SIGMICRO Chair
Florence Appel, SIGCAS Chair
Iris Bahar, SIGDA EC
Osman Balci, SIGSIM Chair
Elisa Bertino, SIGSAC Chair
Donna Cappo, Director, SIG Services
Naehyuck Chang, SIGDA EC
Ashley Cozzi, SIG Services
Jack Davidson, ACM Council Rep. to SGB
Bruce Davie, SIGCOMM Chair
Laurie Dillon, SIGSOFT Treasurer
Usama Fayyad, SIGKDD Chair
Joan Feigenbaum, SIGecom Vice Chair
Kathleen Fisher, SGB EC
Tim Foley, SIGUCCS Secretary
Lance Fortnow, SIGACT Chair
Irene Frawley, SIG Services
Greg Gicca, SIGAda Vice Chair for Liaison
Maria Gini, SIGART Chair
Wayne Graves, ACM IS
Adrienne Griscti, SIG Services
Brent Hailpern, History Committee
Wendy Hall, ACM President
Vicki Hanson, SGB EC
Brooke Hardy, SIG Services
Bob Haring-Smith, SIGUCCS Chair
Graham Hutton, SIGPLAN Vice Chair for
Conferences
Ginger Ignatoff, SIG Services
Yannis Ioannidis, SIGMOD Chair
Dave Johnson, SGB EC
Jeremy Johnson, SIGSAM Chair
Dan Joyce, SIGCSE Secretary
Joe Konstan, SGB EC
Paula Kotze, SIGCHI Vice President at
Large
Alexandros Labrinidis, SIGMOD
Secretary/Treasurer
David Lewis, SIGIR Chair
Anna Lysyanskaya, SIGACT
Secretary/Treasurer
Patrick Madden, SIGDA Chair
Diana Marculescu, SGB EC

Margaret Martonosi, SIGARCH EC
Brad Mehlenbacher, SIGDOC Chair
Patti Mitch, SIGUCCS Information Director
Ethan Munson, SIGWEB Chair
Klara Nahrstedt, SIGMM Chair
Maritza Nichols, SIG Services
Una-May O'Reilly, SIGEVO Secretary
Scott Owen, SIGGRAPH President
David Pennock, SIGecom Chair
Robert Pierce, SIGDOC Vice Chair
Darren Ramdin, ACM Finance
David Rosenblum, SIGSOFT Chair
Bernie Rous, ACM Publications
Pat Ryan, ACM COO
Hanan Samet, SIGSPATIAL Chair
Henning Schulzrinne, SIGCOMM Vice
Chair
Andrew Sears, SIGACCESS Chair
Sung Shin, SIGAPP Chair
Janice Sipior, SIGMIS Chair
Stephanie Smith, SIG Services
Fran Spinola, SIG Services
Alok Srivastava, SIGAda Vice Chair for
Meetings & Conferences
Robert Steele, SIGMOBILE Vice Chair
Mark Stockman, SIGITE Chair
Ricky Sward, SIGAda Chair
Doug Terry, SIGOPS Chair
Lauren Thompson, SIG Services
Gerrit Van der Veer, SIGCHI President
Philip Wadler, SIGPLAN Chair
Kelly Wainwright, SIGUCCS Vice Chair
Bob Walker, SGB EC
Roy Want, SIGMOBILE Chair
John White, ACM CEO
Carey Williamson, SIGMETRICS Chair
Alexander Wolf, SGB Chair
Marilyn Wolf, SIGBED Chair
Eric Wong, SIGAPP Secretary
Osmar Zaiane, SIGKDD
Secretary/Treasurer

1.1 Welcome, Introductions (Alex Wolf, Vicki Hanson)

1.2 Welcome (Wendy Hall)

ACM President Wendy Hall reported that ACM's membership is up and the conferences are doing well. The leadership is keeping a watchful eye on these areas. ACM's investments have stayed sound and the organization is strong.

A very important initiative to the ACM is internationalization. The EC is fighting hard to make ACM feel more international and has had significant breakthroughs. The newly appointed international council chairs came to ACM Council meeting to provide updates.

With regard to the SIGs, you'll see these councils start to initiate activity in the region they are responsible for to make the members feel more engaged with the ACM. Affecting the SIGs the most will be a push to attract big conferences to those locations, or develop new conferences.

ACM is particularly pushing ACM-W chapters even in regions where there are already student chapters. Hall asked SGB leaders to suggest women for the Athena award, which has been very successful in raising the profile of the women in the computing community. ACM-W is giving scholarships to support undergraduates to attend research conferences. Hall asked SIG chairs to help inspire young women to go into research by providing complimentary conference registration and conference mentors to ACM-W scholarship winners.

2.0 Report from the ACM CEO (John White)

ACM CEO John White reported overall satisfaction with the organization and that membership is at an all time high at 94,000 members, a 6 percent increase. This is the seventh consecutive year of membership growth for the organization.

ACM is very healthy organization financially. There was a significant increase in conference revenue. Over \$2 million Digital Library revenue was distributed to the SIGs. For the next fiscal year, more DL revenue is expected to go to the SIGs.

There is a satisfaction amongst members with ACM. Surveys go out to 1/3 of ACM members each year. The survey focuses on main products and services within ACM, so the organization can really track how it's doing. Last year, there was a significant increase in satisfaction.

Satisfaction with CACM saw a tremendous increase (44% to 55%) among all groups. When asked how satisfied members are with the SIG they are most connected to, they reported they are very satisfied.

ACM SIG budget concerns: collective net for all SIG budgets, the SIGGRAPH loss and concerns with DAC and OOPSLA.

Actions – SIGGRAPH is working closely with the SIGGRAPH-CAG. ACM HQ is working closely with conference leaders on budgets for FY '10 conferences. White encouraged SIG leaders to exercise caution.

The ACM general budget is similar to last year with modest growth revenue. ACM is mainly concerned with the 5 large conferences.

Discussion:

Dan Joyce, SIGCSE Secretary, was surprised that the DL revenue is expected to go up because he had heard that wasn't the case. White explained that the consortia are growing in size. Joyce wondered if ACM had seen pressure to lower DL costs. White explained that the ACM DL is already the least expensive out there.

Another SIG leader wondered whether there was satisfaction among practitioners. White explained that there are 13 areas of ACM activities included in the survey. Either ACM surveys the right 1/3 of the organization, or there is increasingly satisfaction.

Another SIG leader asked whether the decline in the value of the US dollar had anything to do with financial losses. White doesn't think that was a reason.

White explained that the priorities of ACM drive and shape the organization on a daily basis and have been in place for last 5 years, and are held by EC, board chairs, and ACM senior staff. Initiatives are shaped by the EC and Council. ACM's priorities include increasing the value proposition for ACM membership, investing in and growing the ACM publishing program, supporting the profession and professionals/practitioners, and raising awareness. The initiatives are to maintain the image and health of the field and profession, internationalization, and membership growth. The internationalization initiative is to increase the relevance of ACM in international community. The approach is to form regional councils consisting of distinguished people in the field in certain regions. The council chairs are now part of ACM Council meeting discussions.

We want to become a source for volunteers from these regions. When searching for editors, the Publications board is trying to look outside U.S. The goal is to hold more conferences in Europe. White encouraged the SIG leaders to consider holding established or new conferences in Europe. There are currently very few student chapters in Europe which we hope to change. ACM recently held a launch event in Paris where ACM Europe was showcased.

The India Council has a good mix of industry and academia. It's will use a similar approach to the European committee; try to generate buzz for conferences in India. ACM has to register ACM India as a society. ACM has already started student chapters and professional chapters are to come.

ACM China Council is in the process of being rebuilt.

"New CACM" will disappear off the web page next year because it won't be new anymore.

There is a membership growth initiative – should ACM significantly increase in size? Task force set up, bottom line– thought ACM should grow, but not be a huge million person organization. The idea is to stick to what we know and stick to high quality, but reach to practitioners. How many computer professionals are out there in the world? We're expecting to grow in the research and academic community, but may not pull numbers.

Look at the U.S. ACM members who label themselves as researchers/academics – 27%. There are more researchers than practitioners. We did a comparison with other societies and realized we have to focus on practitioners.

Member initiative goal is to gain 10,000 new members each from India, China, Europe, as well as 10,000 new member from the researcher/academic community in North America and new practitioners (mostly from North America) for a total of 60,000 new members.

Each task force is looking to find out why initially people join ACM. The hope is that by end of FY in June, each task force will have realistic expectations and plans.

Discussion:

Marilyn Wolf, chair of SIGBED, asked whether ACM would open offices in the regions. White explained there is currently a small office in China and it's a possibility in the future.

David Lewis, chair of SIGIR, wondered if there are any worries of changes in the environment if ACM adds 60,000 members. White explained that ACM is not looking to hit all IT members, we're looking at our core target and trying to reach these people.

Sung Shin, chair of SIGAPP, asked if ACM is considering other countries in Asia besides China. White said ACM has quite a few members in Japan. ACM will have to see how the model will work with the first few countries. Wendy Hall said that topic will definitely be discussed at the Council meeting in June. It's very important to consider where to go next and what resources we have.

Florence Appel, chair of SIGCAS, wondered how the task force will interface with the SIGs. White said ACM is looking at the overlap and will be looking at who the material should be appealing to, and if it's not appealing to them, why not? ACM will still look at the SIGs as an incentive to join with products and services. Appel wondered if there are initiatives the SIGs can

take to support the internationalization. White stressed that the big thing the SIGs can do is to have more ACM activities there, including conferences in Asia. The more visibility we have, the more relevance we bring.

Yannis Ioannidis, SIGMOD chair, asked whether the goal is ACM chapters or SIG chapters growth. White stressed that ACM needs both, Bangalore chapter is general and very successful.

3.0 European Conference Activity (Alex Wolf)

SGB Chair Alex Wolf continued the international conversation, but moved it more toward Europe because it's up and running. India and China are coming soon.

Europe has significant amount of members. We have these initiatives in these regions including membership growth. How do we align ourselves with these initiatives? Try to leverage them/have them leverage us. In listening to John with all the activities that are going on at the ACM level, there is a tremendous amount of activity going on. It's easy to always be focused on your SIG and sometimes not have a large picture of what's going on in the ACM level. Being on SIG board was a revelation to larger ACM activity. Wolf challenged the leaders to find ways to inform the SIG membership that there are things going on.

Europe has a very well established research group. ACM is trying to get a feel for what associations are already in Europe. The goal here is not to replace them, but to work with them and help them to be able to do things they couldn't otherwise. SIGs need to be more willing to have our conferences in Europe. Some SIGs do that regularly and have a lot of experience dealing with currency. It is a standard practice to budget in local currency.

ACM has experience in dealing with venues/hotels and figuring out how to help volunteers. Be thinking about how we can encourage the leaders to hold events in Europe. There is an investment in some sense to take an event that's never been in Europe and putting it there. You have to ask yourself, is this the right time to make that investment? As John pointed out, dollar is weaker. You could increase attendance by going to Europe. Discuss with your executive committees, councils and think about what it means to be international.

Discussion:

Marilyn Wolf of SIGBED offered advice based on SIGBED's experience working in Europe that the key to successful European conferences is to have volunteers in those regions and keep in good communication with them.

White encouraged leaders to consider having a new conference or a European version of an existing conference in Europe. KDD has a conference with an increasingly low acceptance rate. 6 months out of cycle it's in different and warmer part of the world. Other SIGs are looking at adding SIG conferences in Europe

Chair Ethan Munson added that SIGWEB has more European than U.S. conferences.

Hanan Samet, SIGSPATIAL chair, brought up the issue of Value Added Tax and concerns about that as part of the expense budget. He asked if there were ways to reduce VAT perhaps by collecting the fees in the US.

Darren Ramdin, Associate Director of Finance at ACM, said when it comes to VAT, it doesn't matter where you collect fees, you still have to pay the VAT. We're trying to get exemptions whenever we can.

Samet wondered if you hold the event at university, can you can get a VAT exemption?

Hall explained that the account must be held by the university with all bills/registrations to the university bank account, and you need to have a dean involved to avoid any issues.

Lance Fortnow of SIGACT said his SIG tried to move their conference to Europe but had fewer people in attendance because there were already established conferences.

Alex Wolf agreed that shifting a conference to Europe can be disruptive. With SIGSOFT, there was already an established conference. So SIGSOFT eventually worked an alliance with the conference to alternate every year. Wolf also added there is no single solution.

Una-May O'Reilly of SIGEVO said the SIGs look upon ACM as experience and knowledge. She suggested that the SIGs need to share models and put them out there to see what each one has. SIGIR has made a deliberate effort to move to different other areas, but it took a lot of work from ECs, and they were all looked at as significant risks.

SIGGRAPH did something similar to SIGSOFT. Scott Owen explained that the SIG went to Eurographics to do small workshops that alternate between U.S. and Europe. If there isn't a European association, make friends, and alternate between U.S. and other parts of the world.

Joe Konstan said there should be a planning stage around figuring out the core identity. Figure out the local customs: if you're going to go into certain communities, it's a courtesy to have mayor to open meeting, get people who are local to be involved with the conference who know the history and culture of your conference.

Alex Wolf also mentioned the ACM Digital Library. Access to DL is a huge carrot and benefit to use in encouraging people. ACM members who are organizing conferences now should feel that the DL is a great umbrella for conference.

Gerrit Van der Veer, SIGCHI President said European conference should consider the fact that there are people who are loosely related them. We have local SIGs in Europe, they consider themselves part of SIGCHI, even though they pay fees only to the local SIGs. They are related to our community, we should go there, there's more than just making people members, there are people who are local groups.

Phil Wadler of SIGPLAN said their process of transitioning to Europe is to alternate every other year or every 2 years. Come on in, the water's fine.

SIGAda has great relationship with AdaEurope for 10 years. Scott Owen of SIGGRAPH is right about looking for established group and partnering with them. They sponsor and support travel to our conference and we reciprocate. We list them as an in-cooperation conference, but there is a boundary.

Alex Wolf wondered what the SIGs can do to encourage the ACM Europe member (15-16,000 people) to develop or bring conferences to Europe. There should be coordination with Europe events with respects to dates.

SIGMOD started going to the Europe 5 years ago. There are ACM SIGMOD chapters that may be popping up. Do chapters have the legal right to start conferences? John White answered that chapters can sponsor a conference. Who approves it is fluid right now. We're putting together chapter oversight. There are some very successful conferences.

Alex Wolf closed the discussion by encouraging expansion to Europe and eventually extend this discussion to China, India, and other regions as they come along.

4.0 History Committee Update (Brent Hailpern) [Report](#)

The History Committee is a group with a mission and not many resources other than our own excitement and passion about history. The goal is to keep track of and preserve the documents and information about the organization from people and the artifacts. If there are things going on in your SIG, we can feature them in the website. There are historians and people on the SGB and staff on the history committee.

There is a SIG History Wiki. It started when the HC became aware of a really great page that SIGOPS did, which included history of the SIG, awards, etc. Maybe other SIGs could have a similar thing. With the help of the staff at HQ, we have a history wiki now created that the SIG ECs can update. Each SIG who wants to start creating history or a timeline can do it. The HC has a style you can use or use your own style.

You can get volunteers to create the website. Of course getting any of these things started requires a template. Hailpern pulled together some preliminary information for SIGPLAN. A number of the pages didn't have the front matter, who was on the EC and when the conference was going on. SIGs need to find volunteers for this. Just recently, he received an email from

SIGUCCS. They've been working on a history webpage and it's beautifully done, and not in wiki format. So you can do whatever style you want. SIGSOFT has already established a site.

There were two history fellowships given out. They received travel and other research expenses. Alex Wolf asked how the HC attracted these students. Hailpern said a press release was sent out to history departments and the HC worked through the SIGs.

Babbage Institute will be willing to take early SIG documents and preserve them. There are a few unpublished documents that are being circulated. There's no real venue for collecting these important documents. We can put them in the DL, but some are manuals are too large for that venue. What venue would the SIGs like to have?

Wendy Hall reminded the SGB that 2012 is the 100-year anniversary of Turing's birth, and it's a useful time to raise this issue of doing something for the celebration. ACM is commissioning an improved Turing award website and are in the process of trying to get an editor in chief, curator in chief in charge of that.

A SIG leader wondered how copyright would be handled for these historical documents. How do we modify these historical manuscripts/papers to get in the DL? Hailpern explained that the Pubs board is open to doing creative things when loading historical documents in the DL. Once copyright transfer is done, notice can be worked out. That's needs to be worked out.

Alex Wolf added that he's very happy to have these things preserved and reiterated that the Turing site should be up and running by the 2012 Turing celebrations.

5.0 Viability Reviews

5.1 SIGAPP [Program Review, Slides](#) – Chair Sung Shin

SIGAPP's fund balance has increased 17%. Membership and volunteer development is strong, membership has increased by average of 19% over last 3 years. Attendance for SAC conference has averaged approximately 485 over last 4 years, increasing approximately 20% from 2006-2009. There are a record number of submissions for 2010.

Member benefits include reduced registration at conferences, CD of SAC proceedings, student travel grants totaling \$30,000. SIGAPP is doing a SIGAPP newsletter.

Challenges include increasing membership numbers, retention rate, and non-presenting attendees at SAC conference.

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

Discussion:

A SIG leader wondered what SIGAPP is doing to increase education efforts. Shin answered that SIGAPP tries to encourage students to come to conferences, especially students from developing countries. A SIG leader commented that a lot of people get into computer science through APP, so do you do anything to get K-12 or educators involved. Shin indicated that they did not. John White wondered what the breakdown is of who attends the conference? Academics, practitioners? Shin says 70-80% of the attendance is academia, less than 30 % is industry. Hanson asked Shin to explain the issue of non-presenting attendees. Shin said there has been a lot of discussion among the EC, and to be honest, they don't have a solution yet. If the SGB has suggestions, SIGAPP would like to hear them.

David Lewis, SIGIR, asked if only people whose papers are accepted come to the conference. Shin says the number of papers accepted is 370-380. About 100 people not presenting come to the conference.

A SIG leader noted that SAC has many tracks and wondered how SIGAPP balances these tracks. Shin says 80% of the tracks are established tracks and they are even trying to develop new tracks.

Usama Fayyad, SIGKDD, wondered if SIGAPP required attendees to be members. Shin explained that free membership is given to all conference attendees. Dave Johnson, SGB EC, asked how many of the attendees are co-authors and if anyone comes who is not associated with a paper at all. Shin said they have no figures for that. Lance Fortnow of SIGACT wondered what besides the conference is the purpose of SIGAPP. Shin answered that people can attend and present their papers and the mission is applied areas, instead of implementation. SIGAPP had a newsletter until 2002. There are plans to restart the newsletter and they are considering other publications. SIGAPP may have to start another conference because SAC is getting bigger and bigger.

Motion: Recommendation accepted by the SGB with one abstention

Action: Frawley to update viability review schedule.

5.2 SIGOPS - [Program Review](#), [Slides](#) – Doug Terry, chair

Chair Doug Terry reported that SIGOPS membership has been slowly decreasing over the past 4 years. He doesn't believe this is a cause for concern. The dues are low, and there are enough people to do the mission that SIGOPS is trying to accomplish.

SIGOPS has a thriving set of conferences. SOSP is the flagship event with record attendance at 500+. SOSP had a Turing award winner there. EuroSys is being held annually in Europe.

SIGOPS cooperates with USENIX on conferences. SIGOPS and SIGMOD are co-sponsoring the new event on cloud computing (SOCC) to be held in Indianapolis in June 10-11, 2010. It was just approved 2 weeks ago.

SIGOPS finances include a healthy budget. It's important to the SIG to have students at conferences, so they use the DL revenue to pay for student travel grants.

Organizers had planned for a loss at SOSP '09, but the conference made money with record attendance.

In terms of benefits, SIGOPS has a newsletter that is sent out to members. They no longer have paper proceedings in an effort to go green..

The EOC for TOCS is not yet appointed.

SIGOPS is working to increase its outreach to the rest of the world through various efforts, including co-location with the USENIX conference.

Discussion:

Henning Schulzrinne, SIGCOMM, wondered if SIGOPS has any programs to encourage education. Terry indicated that there currently aren't any programs.

Phillip Wadler, SIGPLAN, asked if SIGOPS felt pressure to accept more papers. Terry said they have about 300 attendees and 36 papers accepted to a conference that meets every other year. They don't feel pressure because the conference is only every other year and the quality is known to be very high.

Recommendation from the SGB EC: The SGB EC congratulates SIGOPS 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.

5.3 SIGUCCS - [Program Review](#), [Slides](#) – Robert Haring Smith

Chair Robert Haring-Smith explained that SIGUCCS has two primary conferences, which are the main activities of the SIG. The conferences have lost money this year, but attracted very enthusiastic audiences.

One of the big successes of SIGUCCS is the volunteer development. There are a group of helpful volunteers. Membership is up, but was slightly down last year.

Benefits and services include discounted registration, proceedings CD, DL access, discussion lists, professional development, travel grants, and Penny Crane award.

The SIGUCCS fund balance is at an all time high.

SIGUCCS has a policy of not raising registration fees over the years, so they must now rely on reserves during period of lower conference attendance.

The challenges include marketing SIGUCCS, decreased budgets, having a contract that was drawn up 2 years prior and the hotel wouldn't reduce room block. Going forward, SIGUCCS is paying close attention to the room blocks. SIGUCCS plans to broaden the services offered beyond in-person conferences and to find a way to make those services financially viable. SIGUCCS is also altering the conference offerings in response to participant demand. SIGUCCS may start an UCCS conference in Europe in the future.

Discussion:

Ethan Munson, SIGWEB, asked that Haring-Smith speak briefly to the connection between EDUCAUSE and SIGUCCS. Haring-Smith said people in the UCCS community sometimes attend both conferences.

Another SIG leader noticed that a large portion of members were SIG only members.

Recommendation from the SGB EC: The SGB EC congratulates SIGUCCS 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.

5.4 SIGWEB - [Program Review, Slides](#)

Chair Ethan Munson reported that membership for SIGWEB has been rising since 2006, with now about 700 members. There was double the expected attendance for Hypertext.

Financials are positive overall with a fund balance approaching half a million. The budget is at a surplus.

Member benefits include conference discounts, newsletter, e-mail list, and web site. There was declining membership through 2005, but free membership at conferences and new conference sponsorships made the membership go up.

The SIGWEB Advisory Board is considering changing the name from SIGWEB and the mission.

There are plans to create new student travel awards and new SIG awards.

Discussion:

Scott Owen, SIGGRAPH, wondered how SIGWEB provides free membership. Munson indicated that the SIG is worried about this in the long term. The financial impact for SIGGRAPH would be much greater. It's important to manage the budget. Munson said he thinks the model of 1-2 years of free membership is a viable model. Let people try it.

Recommendation from the SGB EC: The SGB EC congratulates SIGWEB 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.

6.0 SGB EC Activity Reports

6.1 BIO and Cloud, presented by Joe Konstan

Over the course of the past year and a half or so, the SGB has had questions about how to serve communities that aren't covered by SIGs. A new conference on cloud computing, Symposium on Cloud Computing (SOCC), will take place this year, and a conference on bioinformatics, Bioinformatics and Computational Biology (builds on IJBCS 09 from Shanghai) will take place August 2-4, in Niagara Falls, NY.

The two communities (cloud computing and bioinformatics) have discussed becoming a SIG and decided to take the next step. The SGB wants to continue informal efforts to invite outside groups to start new SIGs or join communities.

Discussion:

A SIG leader wondered how fast the SGB would grow. Would there be 200 SIGs in 20 years? Konstan replied that the SIGs would have to restructure things if that happens with regards to governance, but he doesn't suspect the growth will be that fast.

Ethan Munson, SIGWEB, indicated the emphasis on becoming a SIG stems from the feeling that that's the path to have a conference.

Klara Nahrstedt, SIGMM, said when inviting new communities, usually when they are communicating, some of these emerging communities want handouts.

Konstan agreed that if someone's notion of what they want from ACM is a check, that's probably not the relationship the SGB wants.

6.2 SIG Membership Taskforce (Vicki Hanson) [Slides](#)

Vicki Hanson, SGB EC, presented a preliminary report on a very new task force on membership. ACM memberships are doing well, but SIG membership declining. Fewer and fewer people are electing to become members of SIGs.

While ACM is doing well, SIGs are not. So the questions for the task force include deciding if there's something we need to do.

SIGs generate valuable DL content, and computing as a discipline is changing. So ACM is trying to view ACM SIGs in this context. What's the value of having a SIG?

The main thing SIGs are good for: conferences, newsletter, local chapters, and outreach. So the task force asked the question: is membership important for these?

They talked about increasing visibility of SIG activities. Within the CHI communities, there are local SIGs and interest areas; SIGDA has technical interest areas, web-based groups.

The task force considered the measure of the reach of the SIGs; maybe the way we're capturing the member numbers doesn't take into consideration the chapters, DL, conferences, or impact of ACM curriculum or impact of policy.

Recommendations:

We should look at ways to determine the reach of the SIG. Find out who is the core of the community (not the people getting a free membership for one year).

Look to people who come to conferences more than once. These people are probably pretty aligned with the community, but would benefit from the SIG.

Start new conferences or SIGs

Use the viability reports to measure SIGs against their own goals (task force members) rather than each other.

Have the SIGs really think about what make them successful. Instead of measuring the success on by membership numbers, could measure their own success based on goals.

Alex Wolf asked the SIGs to think about what the reason is for a SIG and why are we the way we are now. The SIGs have members who vote for leaders to take budgetary responsibility. One direction from that is to look at the discussion to increase membership of the ACM. So much of the benefit of the organization comes from SIG benefits.

When IEEE CS sponsors a conference and there are extra funds, they go into a broader place. It's the process of trying to figure out how to be sustainable without breaking what we've got, which is actually very good.

Discussion:

Marilyn Wolf, SIGBED, said one thing that the IEEE societies have a lot more say in is publications. They control the selection of an editor in chief. It was explained that the publications board seeks direct feedback and interacts heavily with SIG leadership on the appointment of editors.

Florence Appel, SIGCAS, said she'd be remiss not to raise the question of underrepresentation of certain populations in the computing fields: i.e. women and minorities. She said the SGB could turn this into an action to encourage individuals to join if they can devise creative approaches to do so.

Henning Schulzrinne, SIGCOMM Vice Chair, wondered if SIGs have an ever smaller SIG running the communities, is there are a correlation because you don't have to take the extra step of paying and joining? Is there some other role for membership? The dues don't help most SIGs with their budget. Free membership doesn't make people feel like they are part of the SIG.

Ethan Munson, SIGWEB, said people aren't making an active choice if they become a member for free. There is also the complex issue of what is the SIG? The DL used to be the reason, but now it's because you are part of the community that you should join.

David Lewis, SIGIR, said their conference attendees are given free memberships, but they are not sure how many members are retained from that.

Eighty percent of people who are benefiting are doing so without paying membership or registration fees.

Joan Feigenbaum, SIGecom, asked if there is a freeloader problem, and if so, what the problem is. There is a freeloader situation, but what is the problem if the membership dues are not significant. ACM has the sub communities that are active and people who have an interest. The people doing these activities are doing them anyway, why are we doing this?

Joe Konstan explained that the answer is different for different SIGs. SIGCHI provides a magazine for every member. That's a decision. The bigger issue is the faith in a democratic process. It doesn't work unless you can define the constituency. If it's too expensive, it excludes parts of your community. This task force is about figuring out what's best for your SIG. Maybe we shouldn't agonize over our numbers being down, but whether the number we actually do care about is up or down. The SIGs may not need dues but they need members.

Hanson indicated that the task force would continue to look at the issue.

7.0 Publications Advisor Report (Jack Davidson)

Jack Davidson explained that the publications board formulates policy, works on developments of the Digital Library, and other publication activity. Davidson showed the statistics of the publications (6 journals, 31 transactions, etc.).

There are new publications to fill gaps on areas not covered: ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems (TMIS), Transactions on Computing Educations (TOCE), Inroads Magazine (a magazine that will better serve community).

Sometimes the pubs board goes out and solicits different things. Mostly people are excited about something and come up with a proposal to pitch for new transaction or publication. If you have ideas/see places where there's not a place to publish materials, anybody on the pubs board would be happy to usher you through the process.

The pubs board also deals with the ACM copyright policy and its relationship to open access. Two roads to OA: "Gold" – journals provide OA to their articles (either by charging the author-institution for referring/publishing outgoing articles instead of charging the user-institution for accessing incoming articles. "Green" – ACM's copyright policy specifically is green: green light to self-archive pre-print and post-print. People do have open access to the scholarly work.

Harvard has put in place a policy to foster open access. Bernie Rous, ACM Publications Director, said initially Harvard was asking its authors to attach this to anything they signed. Harvard backed away from that because no one was getting published. There have been a few publishers that have signed the Harvard-Publisher Agreement.

OA and ACM copyright – what the pubs board is trying to do is strike a regional balance between access and the money it takes to maintain the infrastructure. Patrick Madden, SIGDA, said his concern is if ACM opens the door for one addendum, everyone will want one. Maybe come up with something reasonable and then have everyone use it. Davidson agreed and indicated that it is important to be able to maintain this repository and to make sure that it stays available. More and more he sees that people are using metrics from the DL. Downloads count. It is great to have everything in one place. David Lewis, SIGIR, said the money being charged for DL is more than it takes to maintain the system because we have a lot of revenue coming from it. Lewis said it's not sustainable in the long run, and the SIGs shouldn't get addicted to it. Davidson added that what ACM charges is reasonable. Alex Wolf concluded by bringing the issue back to the SIG board: the way we divide up the money is attributed to the download clicks. You're in competition with each other to get downloads. How does this model of open access work within that?

8.0 SGB EC Administrative Report (Wolf)

Wolf explained the role of the SGB Chair to the new leaders: the Chair of the SGB sits on the Executive Committee of ACM. There are discussions that relate to the SIGs such as the predicted loss in 2010. Wolf encouraged leaders to think about budgeting conferences prudently. It's important not to drastically change the SIGs fund balance. SIGs tend to be in a special position because grants were in place for attendees to participate in conferences. He guessed that the leaders will start seeing some fallout because the grants are running out. Big cuts are coming. Don't trust what others say about the recession being over.

Wolf concentrated this discussion on conferences, but we also need to encourage internationalization, not just for the conferences, but for all SIG activities. 2010 Visions conference that began with BCS and decided to make it more international, so now it's ACM/BCS Visions conference. Last year it attracted 7 Turing award winners. It's not sponsored by any SIG, but by the ACM organization itself.

ACM-W has sent out requests for the SIGs to sponsor young women who are considering careers in research. The cost is low for the SIGs and it really helps them. Please consider this.

9.0 Cooperating Conference Activity (Wolf) [Slides](#)

There are issues and challenges to discuss regarding cooperating with outside organizations and events. The benefit is that it's a lightweight process and allows SIG members to be involved in the community and get reduced registration fees at the events.

The event organizers get credibility and exposure. They get to use your SIG logo. They get ready access to the ACM publication program. There is cause for concern because of uneven and questionable practices.

Requests for cooperating status sometimes come in after ACM is already publicized as the publisher.

There are cases of a status being rescinded by a SIG after finding out that other SIG leaders chose not to cooperate.

Cooperation is being granted to events sponsored by organizations producing events of “uneven” quality.

There was one case where a chapter was chartered by an individual who worked for a conference management firm and began requesting cooperating status from various SIGs to promote the proceedings as an ACM publication to increase attendance the chapter was placed on probation and the individual offered his resignation)

Members and volunteer leaders are reporting ACM-branded non-approved events to ACM leadership and staff.

Which events should we cooperate with? We need to reexamine our efforts. Share best practices.

Criteria – are you competing with yourself? Is there potential overlap of audience? Is it a good time of year? Who is taking the financial risk? Is there a profit or other financial motive? Are there other sources of funding? Is the sponsor for-profit?

Organizational quality – are the organizers and sponsoring organization credible in the technical area? Do you know the organizers or person, do they have time to make this a success? There are some SIGs that have cooperated? Are you familiar with the members of the program committee?

Action items: review and renew your policies for considering in-cooperation status, document the policies and process (make them visible on your web site, provide them as part of your yearly report), designate a point person for executing the process. The best thing to do is cut out the things that don't make sense.

A SIG leader asked why should they look at the organization's finances? Wolf said the reason is to make sure the organization doing the sponsoring is on the up and up. Technically we're not supposed to cooperate with for-profit.

Diana Marculescu, SGB EC, said SIGDA had a process in place for many years and always had people overseeing approval to be sure it met SIGDA criteria.

Wolf said it doesn't hurt for SIGs to do this. It's useful.

David Lewis, SIGIR, asked what percentage of the in-cooperation conferences end up using the DL.

Wolf said some SIGs make the conference publish. If you don't give them access to the material, what's the point of having an in-coop event?

10.0 New SIG Development (Kathleen Fisher) [Report](#)

Kathleen Fisher – went through the process of chartering a SIG. People are interested in forming a community. They find information on ACM's website, submit proposal, review, proposal is revised and resubmitted, it's reviewed again and if appropriate it's brought to the SGB EC. If EC thinks it's a viable idea, full proposal is presented to SGB.

Preliminary information provided: subject, audience, what would the SIG do?, overlaps?, list of people who say they would be in the SIG and be leaders. We've noticed several proposals that

blur the line between ACM and IEEE. – ACM and IEEE aren't same organization, existing conferences belong to the sponsoring organization.

In the Pipeline: BioInformatics, Dev (computers in the developing world), Game, EC (Economic and Social Computing), Wireless Health (computers in healthcare), Services, Logic

SIGMOBILE wondered what would happen if there was some overlap with subject material.

Fisher said the EC would contact the SIG.

Dave Johnson indicated that SIGMOBILE has held successful workshops on some of these topics.

Fisher said the task force would come to the SIG when there is a coherent proposal for the SIG to review. Any other SIGs that are relevant would be contacted too.

Scott Owen, SIGGRAPH, added that the people applying usually have a successful meeting or conference already. The Game's workshop originally came to the SGB to charter a SIG with the goal of running a conference. They were encouraged to develop within SIGGRAPH and they co-located the conference with the annual conference. After the first year, they were ecstatic and now they want to stay with SIGGRAPH.

Fisher said following receipt of a proposal, the SGB EC talks about the community and determines how best to deal with it.

11.0 Best Practices Session (All)

Philip Wadler, SIGPLAN, said several newly involved leaders would like a Wiki set up for best practices. We should be recording and sharing ideas. Right now SIGPLAN has one wiki for each conference, we might do something else. Setting up a Wiki immediately following this meeting will help the leadership discuss issues. It must be done immediately so that we can begin using it. Una-May O'Reilly, SIGEVO, said GECCO has always been a very large conference. We're receiving a lot of feedback from our members. Our granting agencies are being very selective about which conferences they sponsor. We want to keep our acceptance rate down and quality up. They we would experience a dip in attendance. SIGEVO would like to push acceptance rate down.

Joe Konstan, SGB EC, said from the three conferences he worked with, they have created other forms through which people can feel like they published. In two of those conferences that was short papers, in form of posters. Workshop papers (I hate workshops that are mini-conferences, but they work very well to explore preliminary areas). There are different strategies – some abstracts in the proceedings, but they always make it very clear.

O'Reilly added that SIGEVO does offer tutorials and all that, but they need more. They don't want people to be able to make it seem like they have a long paper in our conference when they don't.

Alex Wolf added that people have tried to have separate volumes, but that kind of thing disappears in the electronic world where everything looks equally credible. We've been asked when the DL will revamp its proceedings presence. It needs to be rethought and organized. Right now it's organized a list of proceedings over the past year. It's a big effort and there are many things to do in the DL, but we need to worry about bibliometrics and click counts.

Fisher added that she went to the ICFP page a few weeks ago. All the workshops were listed with the conference proceedings as if they were the actual proceedings

Henning Schulzrinne, SIGCOMM, wondered if other communities have seen uptake in plagiarism cases and double publications.

John White said ACM actively pursues plagiarism. There is increased collaboration with cross publishers to catch these things early on.

Marculescu, SIGDA, said DA has developed a database for detecting plagiarism.

Wadler said several years ago SIGPLAN put together its own publication policy, which says if you're in doubt, contact the chair. Every CFP linked to this policy. We've greatly reduced it by using this process.

Lewis said he was tasked by the SIGIR chair to look into this. Is there an ACM policy and yours (SIGPLAN's) is a clarification?

Wadler answered that people have to obey the SIGPLAN and ACM policy.

Marculescu said currently the system is for DA conferences (12 events). If others would like to share, let her know. SIGDA is able to discover quite a few cases of doubling. They do have issues with other SIG conferences that potentially overlap in topics with SIGDA.

Owen said SIGGRAPH has a way to deal with publication issues in general. The perception is that a lot of SIGs have a director of publication who stays for 3 years, and then you have a new one. Our person now has been doing it forever, so he knows very well the process. So anytime SIGGRAPH has any issues, he brings them up and is experienced to smooth over the issues and handle them.

Yannis Ioannidis, SIGMOD, asked if there are any SIGs that have experience with remote participation (over the web, wikis) for people who can't attend a conference because SIGMOD is experiencing a lower attendance.

Wolf said Joe Konstan is leading a task force at Council level on data capture. The task force is trying to figure out a cost model for that.

Munson, SIGWEB, said conferences in most fields are a networking events primarily.

Margaret Martonosi, SIGARCH, said after the first 20 years, acceptance dropped. Since that point, we do double tracks instead of single track. Aside from the scheduling process, there is no assessment that the quality has dropped.

Carey Williamson, SIGMETRICS, wondered about the advertising program offered to the SIGs and whether or not some SIGs were seeing large sums of revenue.

Donna Cappel, indicated that the publications dept. did try to sell advertising for the SIGs, but there wasn't a lot of success with the downturn in the economy.

Vicki Hanson closed the meeting.