

SIG Governing Board Meeting

April 12, 2024

In-Person Attendees
Tom Zimmerman – SIGSOFT
Jeff Foster – SIGPLAN
Jeanna Matthews – SGB
Lisa Brown – SIGUCCS
Alison Clear – SIGCSE
Brad Lawrence – SIGGRAPH
Jeff Jortner – SGB Past Chair
Adrienne Decker – SGB
Sudeep Pasricha – SIGDA
Jonathan Aldrige – SGB
Yannis Ioannidis – ACM President
Nehar Kumar – SGB, SIGCHI
Donna Cappo – Director of SIG Services, ACM
Jens Palsberg – SGB
Vicky Hanson – CEO, ACM
Christine Harvey – SIGHPC
Natalie Enright – SIGARCH, SGB
Ding Yuan – SIGOPS
Ray Trygstad – SIGITE
Mor Harchol-Balter - SIGMETRICS
Pat Ryan- Chief Operating Officer, ACM
Wayne Graves – Director of DL, ACM
Wei Wang- SIGAPP
Vanessa Murdock – SIGIR
Melisa Tanger-Brown – SIGUCCS ??
May Dongmei Wang - SIGBIO

Virtual Attendees
Vivek Sarkar – SGB
Tal Habin – SIGACT
Michelle Trim - SIGCAS
Matt Huenerfauth – SIGACCESS
Tei-Wei Kuo – SIGAPP
Peter Bosman -SIGEVO
James Schembari - Dir. of Finance ACM
Clément Pernet – SIGSAM
Huiling Ding - SIGDOC
Scott Delman – Director of Publications, ACM
Eelco Herder - SIGWEB
Catuscia Palamidessi - SIGLOG
Mona Kasra - SIGGRAPH
Andreas Tolk - SIGSIM
John Krumm - SIGSPATIAL

Agenda:	
• President’s Update	• SIG Best Practices/Due Diligence for Coop. Events
• Workshop Taskforce Discussion	• CARES Committees
• Request from CSTA	• DEI Council
• ACM Open Discussion	• Best Practices / Community Engagement
• Co-Sponsored Pubs, Events, & ACM Open	• Publications Report
• Conference Survey	• Sanction Database Query Process

1.0 Welcome, Introductions

The meeting began at 9am and Jens Palsberg welcomed everyone. Introductions were made around the room and by those attending virtually.

2.0 ACM President (Ioannidis)

Yannis addressed the group and reported on several items.

ACM 4.0 Status: Ten presidential task forces were created to look into the following areas:

Members

1. A new membership model.
2. Globalization, to increase our footprint around the world.
3. Youthification, to increase our footprint among the young professionals and students.

Society (How do we serve society?)

4. UN Social Development Goals.
5. Code of Ethics and Social Responsibility.

What do we produce?

6. Open Science, how do we serve our community in the methods of Open Science?
7. Product Portfolio

Our Internal Operations that support all this:

8. A new financial model
9. Updates to our Bylaws
10. Establishing regional offices around the world

These ten task forces are all in different stages of development. We should have a final report by the end of the year from the globalization and bylaws task forces. A survey has been developed and will be sent out to the world in multiple languages that seeks to understand what the world's awareness of ACM is. The results of this survey will be presented to the council in June.

The Membership model and the regional offices task forces are in the final stages of volunteer selection and the remaining task forces will be formed in the next month or so. The task force on Overall Service and Product Portfolio will be discussed with the SGB chair and other members. The Open Science task force was the most popular among volunteers, but it has been the most difficult to staff with volunteers who are aware of all the intricacies of open science. Yannis expressed his appreciation for those who have already volunteered.

Conference Visits: Yannis's plan to visit the 10 biggest ACM conferences during his term has been extremely beneficial for him, providing valuable insights into ACM's identity and concerns. Additionally, he has been invited to smaller but vibrant non-ACM conferences in the computing field, several of which are exploring ACM-ification.

Challenges such as Open Access and affiliation with other organizations need to be addressed. Financial implications surrounding Open Access should not deter decisions and we should find other pathways for people to join us within our principles. Conferences belonging to other organizations necessitate a clear understanding of expectations and what benefits the ACM community.

News from around ACM: The DEI Council created a demographic questionnaire that will be sent to every member and conference attendees to complete and submit. The goal of this questionnaire is for us to understand the landscape and diversity of colleagues that interact with ACM. The DEI Council will be collecting the data and sharing the information at the June SGB meeting.

Education: CS2023 is the next revision of Computer Science curricula. It is a joint effort between the ACM, IEEE-CS, and for the first time, the Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AAAI). Ethics and Profession are included in the knowledge areas planned for CS2023, and overall CS2023 strikes a great balance between knowledge and skills.

Publications: “Advances in Computing” is a new LinkedIn newsletter that is published biweekly. CACM debuted a new, completely open webpage, CACM.acm.org.

Tech. Policy: The European Technology Policy Committee, part of the Technology Policy Council which also includes Technology Policy US, responded to an AI regulation that the UK was preparing and 12 of its 13 recommendations were accepted in the final regulation. This was an amazing accomplishment. The world needs influence from nonprofit bodies that represent the community. ACM along with other sister societies should step up and play the role that policy makers are asking for and together be successful in influencing AI policies in parts of the world.

ACM India: The ACM India Council announced the launch of its flagship research networking event “Pingala Interactions in Computing Council”. This event is a new initiative to bring global students, young faculty, and researchers together for a 3-to-4-day intense cohabitation.

3.0 Workshop Task Force Discussion

A joint task force, comprising members from the SGB and Publications board, was established to explore the need and strategy for developing an ACM publication channel to publish high quality workshops in computing.

Their findings indicate the diversity of workshops in terms of type, publication methods, and review processes. An emerging issue is whether workshop papers should be considered for ACM OPEN and APCs based on length and prestige.

The task force made several recommendations:

1. Assume ownership for publications decisions associated with ACM-sponsored workshops.

- The SGB collectively should set guidelines for minimum standards and procedures.
- Individual SIGs may choose to set more restrictive guidelines.
- Determine options for workshop publication (e.g., part of conference publications, separate ACM publication, etc.).
- Determine whether ACM workshops should be able to publish outside of ACM DL.

2. Develop workflow for ACM conference workshop approval and publication.

3. Regularly review the compliance of SIG publications with standards for their publication types.

They also suggested assessing the impacts of ACM Open conversion on workshop attendance.

Aldrich proposed a vote be taken on whether ACM should forward with implementing these recommendations if decided there is support for these. He also suggested further discussions on forming a committee or working group to flesh out details and plan next steps. Yannis appreciated the careful framing of the recommendations, emphasizing the importance of laying out frameworks for future actions.

A few questions were discussed on the topic:

Workshop Evolution: How often do workshops grow to the point that it becomes a conference and what are the differences between the two?

SIGSOFT's successful workshops have eventually become conferences with distinctions in selectivity, character, size, and the desire to keep the workshop going in perpetuity.

Proceedings acceptance rates: Should there be different publication types and review standards for workshops, conferences, and journals? Recommendations include creating separate publication types for each category taking into account the issues of reputation and publication cost. We want to ensure we make this affordable for workshops. However, it is also true that the ACM DL must be financially stable. This is one of the areas we want the SIGs input on. How do we continue to make these workshops successful for all the SIGs as we transition to new financial models?

Decision Making: Who makes the decision to switch from a workshop to a conference?

Currently, SIGSOFT's parent conference will make the decision but there are discussions about shifting the decision-making process to the SIG level.

Impact on Existing Workshops: Would the proposed changes affect existing workshops whose proceedings are in the DL? The goal is to support a variety of workshop models while considering different review processes and clearer labeling distinctions within the DL. We do not want to foreclose anything that is being successful right now.

SIGOPS requested that page count be relaxed when considering publishing research from these successful workshops because successful workshops have a place in the DL.

Publication accessibility and value: Jeanna noted that every workshop should have a right to self-determination. Workshops offer the advantage of presenting papers with the possibility of inclusion in an informal proceedings allowing for editing and resubmission. However, if workshop papers are published, authors might lose the incentive to refine their work and move it forward in a beneficial way. Additionally, the ability to publish on platforms like archives could be cannibalizing the workshop submissions since authors could get their paper out immediately and still retain the same value. Jeanna shared that it is sometimes challenging to secure funding to attend a workshop from your industry because they misunderstand the value of these workshops.

Implementation steps: Jeanna proposed establishing a committee within the SGB to further develop these recommendations or establish a broader working group to implement them. She discourages against decisions that would restrict ACM workshops from being published outside the ACM DL, suggesting an approval process for official ACM workshops. Scott Delman explained that the task force was formed due to a significant increase in workshop submission requests to the ICPS series. These requests fell into three categories: independent workshops, workshops associated with ACM conferences lacking workshop proceedings, and workshops rejected from ICPS for resembling conferences. The group emphasized the need for standardized terminology to differentiate between workshops, conferences, and symposiums. They suggested separating presentation from publication and proposed the creation of a 'workshop publication' category in the digital library, marked as peer-reviewed, with the SIG Governing Board determining the review standards.

Motion: The SGB supports the formation of a Task Force to develop a plan to accommodate the 1st and 2nd recommendations from the Joint Task Force on Workshop Publications. They may address the 3rd as appropriate. The SGB will vote on the TF's recommended plan in the Fall.

Motion passes

Action Item: Palsberg will form the taskforce to develop a solution by the fall meeting.

4.0 Request from CSTA – Conference Registration (Palsberg)

During a recent SGB meeting, a request was made to provide funding for K-12 teachers to attend a day of meetings at a discounted rate. Several SIGs already have a discount program, grants, and differential pricing based on location or dedicated days just for teachers to attend free workshops. ACM policy dictates that ACM members receive the lowest conference rate available. However, additional rates such as a K-12 rate for ACM Members can be introduced. It was suggested every conference offer an opportunity for individuals to explain why they wish

to attend but cannot afford to do so. The SIG would then review the requests and decide whether to approve the discounted rate.

5.0 ACM Open Discussion

Scott provided an update on ACM's transition to ACM Open. This transition is in response to external forces, from government mandates that exist around the world, ACM Members, and most importantly for the good for science and to remain consistent with ACM's mission. The aim is for a sustainable transition that enables us to continue to serve as a high-quality publisher.

Historically we generate about \$23 million in DL income with the total publication income a bit higher than that and the publications operational costs roughly matching our income by a relatively small margin. Ultimately one of the things we are trying to achieve with ACM Open is recovery of income / revenue so that we can cover all our expenses, not the least of which is of course SIG allocation. Although we do not expect to be 100% where we need to be by the end of 2025, we are projecting we will get to about 70% of that \$23 million with roughly 16 million in ACM Open Licenses formally DL licenses. There will likely be hundreds of institutions that do not transition over to ACM Open either because they can't afford to, or they don't see the value proposition when we open all the content. We are currently tracking what happens now we have revamped our CACM website, and CACM, which historically had been considered a major value proposition for ACM membership, is now open.

Since November we have grown from 800 to just about 1,300 + institutions currently subscribing to ACM Open and we foresee growth as things progress. Looking at the progression over the past 3-4 years, as we started transitioning institutions to ACM open, in the 1st year we went from about 4% to 10% in 2020, 15 % in 2021 and 22% in 2022 and last year we finished with about 32% of our research articles were open access as a result of ACM Open licenses.

We know that 50-55% of research articles that we publish are affiliated with current ACM Open members so projecting forward we expect this to be at least 45% when we look back at 2024. We are adding institutions every week and project that by the end of 2025, 70% of articles that are covered by ACM Open will not require APC's. The downside of that of course is 30% of the eligible articles that we publish are not covered by ACM Open and will require an APC or a financial waiver. Roughly 5% of the content we publish is covered by a waiver.

A trend we see is the number of tier 1 institutions has more than doubled. However, a big impact for us, out of the 43 institutions considered tier 1 today, twenty of those are based in mainland China which has no open access mandate. What's very clear is that ACM's reliance on China is growing and now represents 30% of the published research articles across all ACM venues.

There are two effective business models under the ACM Open umbrella. One is the Opt In model where an institution pays the tier price regardless of their location and the All-In model, which is essentially an algorithm that aggregates at the country or government level if the government is paying on behalf of the institutions.

We are looking at 3 main metrics in our projections for 2025. The percentage of articles we are publishing in 2024, the number of institutions that have migrated to ACM Open and Income. ACM Open has a 3-year minimum license so when an institution transitions, they are locked in for 3 years; this will help us to predict revenue year after year.

A big question mark is what percentage of our income will come from APC's? For 2024 we are projecting a minimum of 11.5 million based on contracts we have in place. We are projecting 11.5 million will become 16 million by the end of 2025, based on multi-year contracts because we've offered a gradual ramp up pricing. APC income can range from 1 million to 7 million annually depending on ACM open growth and loss of submission in ICPS and ACM publications.

Industry and Government Institutions

Instead of a tier structure, we are signing them to multiyear licenses based on what they pay us in their current read only environment; this has been a successful move. Our concerns are not the big corporations such as Google, Microsoft, etc., who are very actively publishing with us but with the corporations that typically pay more than an academic institution but publishing less than a tier 7. The question over what's the value proposition for those institutions / companies going forward?

Strategic risks

Because of the lack of progress in China, big institutions have yet to join ACM Open. We are talking to the Chinese institutions and have a dialogue with the government which is interested in the open access but has no mandate at this point. France has signed with us under the All-In model, and we are waiting for about 63 institutions to join that license. We also have an all-in agreement with India but those are one-year temporary deals, because there's a big nationwide open access model in India. Canada, Japan, and China still remain challenging markets for us.

Post 2026 risks

The level of all the mentioned risks will be clearer. IEEE is a significant risk because of the 40 or so co-sponsored conferences that come to about 2,000 articles a year.

We are thinking about mitigating long term risk by implementing a "freemium" model where we flip the value proposition. During the discussion, concerns and questions were raised regarding the implications for SIGs and ACM conferences post transition.

Will Sigs continue to receive the dl distribution after 2025? Yes, as long as ACM's publication program continues to be sustainable and financially viable at the levels we are currently at.

What happens after the full transition for an author whose institution hasn't joined ACM open? There are two 2 options, you can apply for a financial waiver or a discount if you are in a country that qualifies for one or pay an APC pricing at a discount. There should also be a call to action for authors to go to their institution or department heads and encourage them to join ACM Open.

Will mandatory APCs for non-ACM open authors be bad for ACM conferences?

We don't know but there is good evidence to show that the computer science community in general is paying APCs to our competitors.

Why can't ACM be like other organizations, including USENIX, NeurIPS, AAAI, arXiv etc.?

ACM is a different organization than every one of those. All the long tail of expense generating goods and services that ACM provides are not provided by those other organizations.

Wayne Graves provided a report of articles each conference publishes with different categories for each conference and SIGs. APC eligible articles would count towards an ACM Open license, APC covered would be covered by ACM Open or eligible articles and articles not covered would need to pay APCs.

Jeanna thanked everyone for providing materials that can be used to encourage your university/institution to join ACM Open and get your professional society on your side; we need to get the information out to our societies soon so there are no surprises in 2026. She suggested the freemium model have a drop and go for each of the knowledge areas that teachers can grab and go and give them reason to subscribe. When you provide freemium things that will serve that places that are educating but not necessarily publishing, you give them a clear reason to still want to subscribe to that material.

Scott was asked to provide a clear message that each SIG Chair can use to influence their community on how much each group will need to bear the consequences.

A SIG may do better than others depending on the country you have the conference in and whether those countries have migrated to ACM open. A SIG's percentage will depend on how many articles the SIG or their conference publish from China versus Europe which has transitioned to ACM open.

Newsletters do not run through the same production or rights system as everything else on the conference or journal, magazine side. We do not track APC eligible articles published in Newsletters and they are not included in today's report.

Newsletters that do not contain research articles meeting the criteria for APC eligibility, yet remain within the Digital Library, will be published in the DL and made openly accessible, provided they aren't already, starting from 2025. No APC fees will be applied, and they will not be reported to ACM Open Institutions.

Archive is not free. Recently, there has been a significant surge in submissions to the archive. To manage this, an institutional fee structure based on the volume of submissions from universities has been introduced, stabilizing operations. Additionally, funding from private sources has been secured to sustain the archive. As a result, the organization now operates with a budget of approximately 2.5 million dollars, a substantial portion of which is contributed by universities.

6.0 Co-Sponsored Pubs, Events and ACM Open (Ioannidis)

In the typical research lifecycle, you pay to read; in open science, the research lifecycle remains the same, but everything is open, maintained, and kept, and you don't pay to read but you pay to publish.

ACM Open is only one aspect of open science as a model to implement open access. As Scott emphasized, in less than two years we will have institution participation, or you will pay APCs unless you are eligible for a subsidy from ACM.

Yannis emphasized that the ACM Open Model chosen by ACM is an innovation. The open science philosophy is to have larger entities shoulder the financial burden, sparing individuals from direct costs.

With open access seeming as an insurmountable obstacle for collaboration on co-sponsored events, Yannis suggested forming a task force with representatives from the most affected SIGs, in coordination with the Publications Board, to determine ACM's stance in discussions with IEEE. Yannis plans to meet with the IEEE president soon, hoping for a unified understanding of ACM's identity and objectives. We must approach this matter considering our community's needs rather than focusing solely on IEEE's stance or beliefs. Open access is non-negotiable; thus, we must find sustainable financial solutions while upholding our principles and values.

There are approximately 26 conferences co-sponsored with IEEE, and as of now, IEEE has not provided any indication regarding these events. Unlike the three journals affiliated with IEEE, none of these conferences are solely owned by IEEE. Given the absence of a decision, the question arises: what will be the fate of these conferences moving forward? Some conferences operate on a rotating responsibility model, where each organization takes charge every other year, thus preventing unilateral decisions. This situation affects nearly half of our community, with almost half of our SIGs participating in these co-sponsored conferences.

Palsberg initiated the formation of a task force and mentioned that it would include Nancy Amato from the ACM Council and Divesh Srivastava, who serves as the co-chair of the Publications Board, and Mohammed Zaki from SIGKDD, nominated by Wei Wang, and Palsberg himself. We will require additional representation to ensure all journals are adequately represented and ensure the task force can take meaningful action before Ioannis's meeting with the IEEE president next month. While the task force will initially focus on journals, discussions will also encompass conferences, primarily to manage relationships. We aim to prevent our members from being caught off guard by ACM Open. This initiative provides an opportunity for us to demonstrate to our community that ACM is actively working to align with their preferences. We encourage advocacy and support from members, urging them to engage with their deans, provosts, and other relevant stakeholders.

7.0 Conference Survey (Kumar)

Nehar received an excellent response from numerous SIGs, totaling 57 responses collected throughout February and March. Her goal today is to discuss the challenges faced by various SIGs and share best practices.

The survey was inspired by a summit held by SIGCHI in February, where steering committee chairs from 26 conferences convened to discuss various aspects of conference organization. The topics discussed included knowledge sharing between conferences, improving peer review processes, addressing the burden of volunteering, exploring the concept of ACM Open, engaging early career scholars, and enhancing transparency regarding conference conversations and topics.

The Survey covered the following topics:

- Hybrid
- Sustainability
- Conference sites
- Publications, specifically ACM Open
- Finances
- Community Engagement

Hybrid events –

Conferences are exploring different degrees hybrid models, which blend in-person and virtual components, leading to increased volunteer workload. There's debate over how much volunteer involvement is appropriate versus paid services to manage the burden. Hybrid events have also resulted in unpredictable attendance and diminished attendee experiences. SIGCSE plans to host a fully online conference in December to accommodate those unable to travel and promote diversity by enabling broader participation. This decision allows other conferences to focus solely on in-person formats, simplifying their event planning.

SIGMETRICS has stopped hosting hybrid conferences due to lack of attendee participation. TCP meetings have remained hybrid, but there's a similar issue of low participation, affecting community building, particularly for junior faculty.

SIGACCESS offers a hybrid option as part of their commitment to accessibility. However, they too have seen a decline in attendee participation. They allocate twenty percent of their accessibility budget for hybrid events and despite challenges, they prioritize offering this option to fulfill their responsibility towards inclusivity.

Sustainability

Travel considerations, location and food choices and alternating between virtual and on site events emerged as concerns in the survey.

Some best practices shared by the Sigs include co-locating conferences and sustainability checklists when requesting bids for conference locations,

SIGIR appoints sustainability chairs who manage the conference sustainability checklist used in the bidding process. Post-conference are then able to compare the actual costs versus the carbon offsetting costs, if any, and whether they were successful in promoting green research. Their conferences do not distribute swag and opt for recyclable paper and utensils and cut down on excess food. These efforts have been ongoing informally for 6 years and formally for 4.

SIGENERGY and SIGPLAN also shared best practices initiatives. SPLASH is an annual conference comprising several related programming languages conferences including an anchor

conference that attracts numerous attendees. It has a couple of benefits such as attendees being able to participate in co-located events, paying their carbon cost once, and addresses the sustainability issue from the perspective of volunteers.

There needs to be a balance between sustainability awareness and building communities.

Conference Sites

Sharing conference site information among SIGs would be helpful in regard to awareness of safety, accessibility concerns, and visa issues. There's a concern about foreign students in the U.S. facing difficulties traveling to overseas conferences and suggesting hosting conferences within the country.

SIGAI, being an academic conference, benefits from hosting events at schools with a significant number of members, resulting in saving costs on audio/visual expenses and a minimal facility cost. In general universities are dynamite for accessibility.

SIGDOC, despite being small, tries to be inclusive in site selection by choosing schools and leveraging local conference chairs to reduce carbon costs and negotiating internal rates for hotels and conference costs. They are also exploring succession planning and cohort conference training.

Palsberg raised concerns about visa procedures outside the U.S. The issue is not early application, but re-entry for foreign students studying in the U.S. When a conference is not in the U.S, conference attendance is impacted. Yannis highlighted that the challenging political situations affecting international relationships are beyond the SIGs' scope to solve. The Globalization Task Force explored alternatives, identifying Honduras and Singapore as feasible conference locations. Local meetups were suggested as an option but will not work for conferences of all scales. He cited an article in the September/October 2023 ACM Interactions newsletter titled The Future of Conferences is Unconferences, regarding SIGCHI's experiment and results running CSCW as a highly interactive event. This may not be a solution, but perhaps something ACM should explore.

SIGKDD successfully addressed travel limitations by hosting satellite events in China and India concurrently with the main conference in the U.S. Visa letter issues were resolved by including both ACM and general chair signatures. Additionally, crediting universities with an in-kind contribution to the conference, helping universities achieve sponsor status.

There was an issue with some embassies requesting local signatures on the Visa Support letters. This was resolved by having two signatures, the ACM signature, and the general chair signature.

Pubs – ACM Open

Today we received additional information regarding ACM Open, but at the time of the survey, several SIGs expressed a lack of preparedness for ACM Open due to a lack of information on

how it is unfolding, it's potential impact on smaller communities and publishing related challenges.

SIGGRAPH questioned if they should raise fees to offset the costs or will ACM HQ help? SIGGRAPH has 3 endowments, an awards endowment, a student volunteer endowment, and an underrepresented travel grant endowment. The challenges with endowments lie in the fact that the companies meant to assist often don't seek out opportunities; instead, they prefer to teach you. Maybe as a community, we can collectively learn techniques such as letter writing, etc.

Conference Finances

The SIGs face multiple areas of concern, including inflationary pressures, rising registration fees, industry sponsorship, affordability, volunteer workload, ACM Open considerations, impacts on membership, cost-sharing, increased overhead, and various miscellaneous expenses. Even SIGs with large budgets require sustainable solutions due to finite resources. Additionally, companies under financial strain and experiencing layoffs are increasingly hesitant to invest in conferences and are reluctant to pay for staff to attend hybrid events, impacting conference finances negatively.

8.0 SIG Best Practices (Palsberg)

Palsberg shared a link for SIGs to provide information about their conference management systems. The intention is to address the possibility that SIGs might be using multiple or uncertain tools for conference management.

9.0 CARES Committees (Palsberg)

The purpose of CARES committees is to facilitate the reporting of complaints to the appropriate channels. While ACM has policies against misconduct, individuals often feel that ACM's size makes it difficult to know where to turn with complaints. SIGs with CARES committees assign representatives to each conference, providing attendees with a designated contact for filing complaints and putting a friendly face to the complaint process.

Vicky shared that there are training materials available on the ACM website for CARES committees, accessible through the conference planning section. She intends to contact all SIG chairs and presidents to gather information on existing CARES committees. Palsberg emphasized that CARES committees are primarily meant to assist complainants in navigating the process rather than investigating incidents. Their focus is on implementing measures to prevent future occurrences.

10.0 DEI Council

Stephanie Ludi, Chair of the DEI Council along with DEI member Chris Stephenson provided an overview of their recent activities. The DEI council is inclusive of everyone, regardless of age, location, LGBTQ+ status, technical background, etc. The council has launched several initiatives aimed at disseminating information and facilitating dialogue, not only within ACM but also reaching out to the wider community. They also maintain a webpage featuring DEI initiatives as

they pertain to different times of the year. The DEI Council would like to start a conversation with the SIGs to discuss the great things SIGs are doing in the area of DEI. This would be an ongoing conversation where SIGs best practices and success rates can be highlighted on the DEI webpage throughout the year. The objective would be twofold: to elevate the work of SIGs and to amplify it to other SIGs interested in initiating similar efforts but unsure of where to begin.?

The DEI council would like to seek guidance from the SGB on updating this information efficiently to avoid adding burdens to SIG chairs. Stephanie noted that while some SIGs include this information in their annual reports, not all do, hence the need for outreach to gather more comprehensive data. They aim to streamline the process to ensure it is not overly burdensome for SIGs. Donna proposed a method similar to how member benefits are updated, suggesting she could facilitate the process of collecting DEI practices for each SIG and each year as she does with member benefits, send the list out for updates.

Action Item: Donna will collect DEI initiatives from the SIGs

11.0 Best Practices (Kumar)

The conference survey also brought up the topic of Community Engagement and the issues surrounding inclusivity, attendee demographics, logistical challenges hindering participation, geopolitical issues, and volunteer burden. Peer review is also viewed as becoming difficult, more intense, and also meaner. The question posed by the SIGs is what are some ways you have been engaging people within your communities and what are some ways in which you would like to be able to engage?

SIGCHI has been working diligently over the last several years to engage their community through virtual sessions and in person events such as summits.

For SIGARCH one of the biggest issues is around early career researchers. During the pandemic, folks who started their tenure track positions missed the opportunity to network and meet senior leaders in the community. They would be interested in best practices on how to have better engagement of those researchers.

In addition to their flagship conference, SIGCHI has smaller conferences where early career scholars are nurtured, and the focus can be around doctorum consortium.

SIGACCESS is seeing an issue with volunteers stepping up for the more substantial roles, like conference chair. However, there seems to be a trend in the last few years where requests for roles that previously were done by one person be split into two, such as co-chairs. Another request that seems to be trending is to provide a professional management service to undertake conference elements that are traditionally volunteer oriented roles; this may be cost prohibitive for some of our conferences. Kumar pointed out another growing pressure is that the laborious nature of peer review has resulted in smaller conferences, related or adjacent to larger ones, struggling to secure reviewers.

Several best practices regarding acknowledging volunteer contribution were shared. PACM PL notably showcases all paper reviewers on their website, which serves as a valuable resource for tenure committees seeking verification of academic involvement and provides clear credit. SIGHPC hosts a thank you dinner for core volunteers and gives every technical paper reviewer a t-shirt, although this practice is being reconsidered due to declining interest. Additionally, SIGHPC publicly acknowledges volunteers by displaying their names during the opening session and on their website, and also lists a volunteer organization's logo in different places as well.

SIGDA recognizes their best reviewers in different tracks at conference ceremonies.

Sarkar emphasized that within our community, there's a widespread need for assistance beyond just career advancement – particularly in obtaining evidence of service. Many individuals require this documentation for green card or visa applications. Sarkar pointed out that beyond practical concerns, there are deeply human reasons for acknowledging people's service, highlighting the importance of recognition.

Being transparent about volunteer compensation is helpful in terms of volunteer burden. They encourage local participants as conference teams and express appreciation by sending thank you letters to department heads and deans ensuring visibility and recognition. Additionally, they provide social media visibility to their team and list all the reviewers in conference programs for department heads reference if needed.

SIGEVO provides travel grants to students, on the condition that recipients volunteer. Last year they introduced a small token of appreciation for the best reviewer award in various tracks at their conference. This gesture does not seem to incentivize people to review longer on average, but it demonstrates an effort to acknowledge the importance of good reviewing.

Matthews proposed the concept of developing a volunteer service portfolio. Individuals can utilize this portfolio when applying for a green card or tenure. Moreover, it serves as an additional method to garner support from one's professional society.

Palsberg requested the SIGs to fill out a spreadsheet labeled "Programs," listing the systems they utilize for managing their conference webpages and conference programs. This data collection aims to gather information that Wayne might not already possess.

Yannis asked about the SIGs' reluctance to switch from their current CMS or publication system to an ACM-owned one if it were available.

SIGGRAPH responded that it would be highly beneficial if the system had the capability to fulfill their requirements, and it would alleviate the need for them to bear the cost themselves.

SIGMETRICS raised the question: what problem are they aiming to solve?

Palsberg recounted a time when ACM lacked a central contract for submission systems leading to various SIGs adopting recommended systems independently. To save time and money on multiple contracts, ACM considered a single contract approach. Palsberg's data gathering aimed to assess if many SIGs were using a specific system, prompting consideration for a central contract. Graph envisioned improved integration with ACM systems if a single system were adopted. Wayne emphasized potential cost savings through negotiated pricing and enhanced integration, with ACM exploring additional features like integrity checks. Ioannis expressed optimism about the potential benefits of centralizing submission and review systems.

12.0 Publications Report (Aldrich)

Aldrich wanted to discuss the increasing blurring of conferences and journals. One important initiative is PACMs (Proceedings of the ACMs) – journals that publish one issue per conference in a given area. Essentially, PACMs incorporate a conference review process while offering authors the chance to revise their papers, ensuring the quality that is expected of a journal publication. Apart from enhancing quality through review cycles, mature PACMs are beginning to be indexed, benefiting individuals and institutions globally whose funding, promotion, tenure, or hiring evaluations rely on publications in indexed journals. This assistance extends to communities grappling with rigid administrative frameworks.

The Publications Board seeks input from SIGs on the status of PACMs. What challenges are being encountered? Presently, PACMs target the premier conferences in each field, but should more conferences be invited to existing PACMs? Alternatively, should a second tier of PACMs be established in certain areas? Is this a model worth expanding, and if so, how should it be approached? Finally, is there a need for improved communication regarding PACMs?

Some SIGs expressed interest in establishing PACMs and inquired about the process. To join a PACM, one must submit a proposal to the Publications Board. Following PACM guidelines increases the likelihood of approval. Information on submitting a PACM proposal can be found under the publications tab on the ACM website. For more details, visit <https://www.acm.org/publications/pacm/submit-a-pacm-proposal>. Additionally, Tom is willing to share their recent PACMSE proposal; contact tzimmer@microsoft.com. Similarly, Mona is open to sharing the PACMCGIT proposal; reach out to Mona.siggraph@gmail.com.

A question regarding the management of interdisciplinary conferences raised the possibility of multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary PACMs, a decision that communities would need to make. Solutions for these scenarios should be explored, with the assurance that no reasonable proposal will be rejected.

One significant concern is the shift from conference proceedings, where paper submission typically implied presenting the paper, to journals where attendance isn't mandatory. For PACM PL submissions, it's now explicitly stated that presentation is strongly encouraged but not

mandatory. Another point of discussion is the comparison between TOPLAS, a long-standing journal in programming languages, and PACM PL. The key difference lies in PACM PL's more frequent publications throughout the year. TOPLAS offers more in-depth reviews, with the possibility of retaining the same reviewers through revisions. Another question that was raised was if you don't require attendance to present at a particular conference, can you go to a different SIGPLAN conference to present your paper? The SPLASH conference initiated a SIGPLAN track post-pandemic, allowing authors to present papers missed due to the pandemic. Some conferences like PLDI and SPLASH have consistently offered this option. There's also interest in standardizing aspects across conferences, such as page length. With the PACMPL format, resubmitting rejected papers would be more straightforward with a unified standard format.

A summary of issues: One potential problem with a PACM is the necessity of finding long-term editors, unlike conferences where roles are typically one-year terms. At PACM PL, the editors are the current conference program chairs, and associate editors are from the previous year, essentially reusing program chairs for this role. To describe how PACM PL operates, a public document titled "The Procedures of PACM PL," was created. You can access it on the SIGPLAN website.

SIGCSE offers two options for publishing: if your research meets the quality standards for journal publication, then you are submitted in parallel to the conference and published in the journal with all credentials and peer reviews, but presentation at the conference is required to ensure the best papers are presented. This approach has been well received. Aldrich sees this as an example of the "Journal First" model, where submissions undergo the regular journal submission process, with expert reviewers selected by an associate editor. Authors are later invited to present at a conference. Aldrich encourages students to consider this model for its predictability and the opportunity to refine their papers. TOPLAS experienced increased submissions, partly due to this model. While exciting, challenges remain, such as obtaining timely reviews from journals and securing presentation spots at high-quality conferences.

A question was raised on whether SIGs receive DL revenue from PACM papers as they would for conference papers? PACMs utilize conference Article Processing Charge (APC) pricing, currently set at \$700 per paper for ACM members. Downloads from a journal contribute to a SIG, whether for conferences or PACMs, with no penalty imposed on SIGs for PACMs.

Another publishing model is the Article-first model which is more experimental but potentially very promising. It works by uploading your paper to a repository where it is then reviewed by the Community and when your program chair decides your article reaches a certain level of quality you can be invited to be a part of an overlay journal and together with that invitation or independently be invited for presentation at a conference. While promising, this model is untested, and questions remain about how it aligns with ACM's open financial model and ensures a level playing field.

Another model to consider, potentially as part of an existing journal, is Registered Reports. In this approach, submissions undergo review for research questions and methods, with the journal

committing to publication regardless of the results. This setup eliminates the incentive to avoid publishing negative results.

Aldrich reminded the group that PACMs came into existence because someone proposed and advocated for this model.

13.0 Sanctions Database Query Process (Lawrence)

The sanctions database was initiated by CEO, Vicki Hanson, in response to the revision of harassment policies and the recognition of the necessity for imposing sanctions. If you are nominated for a conference volunteer position, your name should be cross-checked against the sanction database. Only the conference, SIG, and program chairs have access to the database. The question at hand is how effectively this system is functioning.

Conference chairs and SIG chairs are requested to input the names of all their volunteers into the sanctions database, which generates a spreadsheet with any relevant results. Additionally, when submitting a paper for a conference, individuals are automatically added to the sanctions database. Another challenge arises when someone registers for the conference. Currently, conference chairs must download the daily attendee list for a daily check once the conference begins. This process is expected to change soon, with the provision of an API to the conference management or registration group. This will enable a daily check to be conducted seamlessly.

The principle here is “no news is good news” if you don't receive a reply from the database that’s good. However, what action should you take if you do receive a reply? Vicki clarified that instances of individuals violating their bans are rare. Still, if a chair feels uncomfortable escorting them out of a conference, security can handle the situation. The sanctions process aims to prevent such incidents proactively.

Violating publication policies, code of ethics people, harassment at an ACM event are sanctionable infractions. Once reported, an investigation will be done and the individual will be notified of the imposed sanction. Sanctions are for a period of time and not a lifelong sentence.

Concerns of collusion in reviewing were raised, but have not found one name when looking in the database, what is missing? The challenge in proof of collusion being hard to obtain and without it people can't be sanctioned. SIGIR's approach to solve collusion in reviewing was to run the automatic assignment pipeline and then re-balance the papers so reviewers were from different regions, and at least one senior and only one person who had been involved on the paper. This seemed to be effective, but the process was time-consuming, taking approximately 80 hours to complete.

Just a few weeks ago, the ACM Council voted on the disclosure policy, committing to an article to explain the new policy to the community and create a website with a landing page linking to all three committees. Part of the disclosure policy includes yearly reports detailing the types of sanctions imposed. However, there was a request for descriptions of these sanctions that could

provide educational value to the community, including reports detailing the infraction along with the corresponding sanction. Vicki clarified that providing details that could potentially identify individuals would violate GDPR regulations. Matthews emphasized the importance of understanding what transpired and the severity of penalties. She suggested removing identifying traits and focusing solely on the actions and consequences. She encouraged SIGs to advocate for the inclusion of such information in the yearly reports based on the interests of their respective communities.

Yannis emphasized that regardless of the format, these reports serve multiple purposes: they can serve as warnings for potential victims and respondents while also preemptively educating people. The primary objective is not just punishment but education. In terms of collusion, even if we manage to confine and address the issue within a particular venue or conference, individuals tend to spend a lot of energy devising ways to beat the system. If we have the knowledge graph of everyone's activities and it is openly available, many of these problems can be detected, or individuals may realize that their actions will be exposed.

Palsberg thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting.