Minutes of the February 5th, 2007 SGB Meeting

Participants:

Erik Altman, SIGMICRO Chair
Florence Appel, SIGCAS Chair
Robert Brown, SIGAPL Past Chair
Barrett Bryant, SIGAPP Chair
James Callan, SIGIR Chair
Donna Cappo, ACM Director, SIG Services
Ashley Cozzi, Admin. Asst. SIG Services
Jack Davidson, SIGPLAN Chair /SGB EC
Vicki Hanson, Chair SIGACCESS / SGB EC
Lance Fortnow, SIGACT Vice-Chair
Maria Gini, SIGART Chair
Virgil Gligor- SIGSAC Chair
Erik Goodman, SIGEVO Chair
Kelly Gotlieb, Awards Committee
Albert Greenberg, SIGMETRICS Chair
William Griswold, SIGSOFT Chair
Julie Jacko, SIGCHI President
Dave Johnson, SIGMOBILE Chair
Norman Jouppi, SIGARCH Chair / SGB EC
Joseph Konstan, SGB Chair
Richard Ladner- SIGACT Chair
Edith Lawson, SGB-EC Small SIG Advisor
Leila Lyons, SIGUCCS Chair
Diana Marculescu, SIGDA Chair/SGB EC

Keith Marzullo, SIGOPS Chair/SGB EC
John McCormick, SIGAda Chair
Brad Mehlenbacher, SIGDOC Chair
Ethan Munson, SIGWEB Chair
Scott Owen, SIGGRAPH Pres./SGB EC
Gregory Piatetsky-Shapiro, SIGKDD Chair
Raghu Ramakrishnan, SIGMOD Chair
Darren Ramdin, ACM Assoc.Dir. Finance
Han Reichgelt, SIGITE Chair
George Riley, SIGSIM Vice-Chair
Martin Rinard, SIGBED Vice-Chair
Pat Ryan, ACM Chief Operating Officer
Pierangela Samarati, SIGSAC Vice-Chair
Fred Sampson, SIGCHI VP- Finance
Janice Sipior, SIGMIS Chair
Chris Stephenson, CSTA
Moshe Vardi, CACM
Emil Volcheck, SIGSAM Chair
Henry Walker, SIGCSE Chair
Robert Walker, SGB Past Chair, SGB Rep to Council
Michael Wellman, SIGecom Chair
John White, ACM CEO
Tilman Wolf, SIGCOMM Treasurer
Alexander Wolf, ACM Council Representative

1.0 Welcome

1.1 Welcome, Introductions and Voting Review (N. Jouppi, J. Konstan)

The meeting opened at 9:00 am with Jouppi and Konstan welcoming the participants. Konstan reviewed the weighted voting practices followed at SGB meetings as well as introduced all participants and reviewed the agenda.

2.0 Report from the CEO (J. White) [Slides](#)

White reviewed FY 06 performance and member satisfaction. Hi s report focused on initiatives and priorities for the upcoming year in the areas of Publications, the Professions Board, Education, and the India/China initiative.

Publications:
White discussed the Digital Library Advisory Group which met in the fall and their recommendations. The DL Bibliographic database passed one million entries. DL is expected

to continue to grow and do well; DL SIG revenue is projected at $1.6 million for FY'07.

Professions Board:
White discussed the Best Practices service which is composed of a network of trusted and experienced practitioners (ACM Members) seeking the best information on the web related to development and deployment of systems and having them bring that in a filtered way to ACM members. This will be an online publication, somewhat like Harvard Business review with a focus on case studies with perspectives

Education:
The Education Board is preparing a white paper which will discuss CS enrollment at the university level. The newly formed Education Council has met twice and the Education Policy Committee is expected to get the computing industry more involved in shaping education policy and is actively recruiting members.

China:
White reported on the first meeting of the China Task Force in Beijing and indicated that they are working on setting up the second meeting to take place in Shanghai. ACM is taking immediate steps in an effort to build a presence in China. We are looking to set up an ACM office in China to make it easier to work in there. ACM is also looking to translate some of ACM's most popular content into Chinese.

3.0   CACM Discussion (Vardi) New Directions for CACM   CACM Revamped

Vardi began by discussing past re-designs for CACM. In the 1980's CACM went through a re-design to become more of a computing magazine that would satisfy more readers. The re-design included regular columns, news analysis, hot technologies, interviews, case studies, tutorials, and research articles. There was another redesign in the 1990's that brought in shorter articles, a stronger focus on applications, and gave more responsibility to professional staff.

Why Another Redesign?
Research has shown some dissatisfaction with the current CACM. The design is over 20 years old. The last 20 years has shown an evolving membership, Internet, WWW, DL, Queue (2003). ACM has evolved, shouldn't CACM?

Vardi discussed the 2005 Task Force and their recommendations for the new design. Options include minor changes to the graphics and font to make CACM more attractive. There was also a discussion on CACM becoming a fully professional magazine (a la IEEE Spectrum); CACM is not completely run by professionals.

Vardi went on the discuss the "Science" model: a combination of a magazine and a journal with 51 issues a year requiring 100 staff members. This would make CACM a premier research journal and would include extensive news sections, perspectives (scientific or news), 15 scientific articles per issue, and other features (book reviews, policy, education, etc.).

Vardi posed the question of CACM becoming a research journal. Should it once again become a research journal? His response was no, CS is a conference journal and the journal review process is problematic. The task force solution is to include a "best of best" section with perspectives. The perspective will introduce papers to a broad computer science population as opposed to focusing on the audience of the specific SIG that it was written for. The new CACM will include news, columns, computing practices and a "Best of Best" section with perspectives.

Vardi posed the following questions and requested input from each SGB leader:

Is the "Best of Best" idea viable?
Can CACM be all things to all people?
Can/ Should ACM have a flagship publication?
Should there be one thing that goes out to all ACM members that will satisfy everyone?

Brad Mehlenbacher, DOC - Concerned about who would write perspectives

Bill Griswold, SOFT - Concerned about fragmentation although this is a good shot at it and a worthwhile experiment

Ethan Munson, WEB – ACM needs a flagship publication, best of best is a good idea but because SIGWEB is sometimes on the fringe he's concerned that they might have a hard time being included, needs a professional staff with management and strong consultation from academics. Computer not a bad model particularly in range of topics. Needs to focus on all parts of field

Hans Reichgelt, ITE – CACM is successful in the IS community and he's not clear we would keep the IS community on board. Need to be leery of it

George Riley, SIM – all things for all men not going to happen. We do need a flagship. Was concerned that articles would rely on review from conference and advised that additional peer review would be difficult but must be included in editorial process.

Erik Goodman, EVO - Great idea to reformat and best of best valuable and there must be flagship.

Lance Fortnow, ACT – Science uses professional science writers to write news section and use magazine to promote the industry and advance science in society. Get preview of articles before published so if splashy article gets published they have articles in media about it. How do we advance CS in society at large? Society is not interested in new algorithm or new black hole. Must be careful that it doesn't become biased so need to concentrate on balance.

Richard Ladner, ACT– best of best is a good idea but writing articles as we do wouldn't sell. We need to learn how to write articles for a general audience. Moshe indicated that the

perspective will go beyond the introduction and will be written to a more general audience. RL – We must learn how to do that kind of writing to a wider audience.

Henry Walker, CSE– the idea of one place to go for articles in a range of areas is important. Will need help in making tech articles readable even within the CS community. We speak in a specialized way with lots of jargon so the perspective is helpful but bringing the details together is the challenge. Wish you well in making it happen.

Tilman Wolf, COMM - Yes on flagship and best of best and perspectives but is concerned about selection process. Not sure enough people understand all fields of ACM. Perhaps each SIG should get a number of slots per year and have SIGs pick the papers each year.

John White – How do we find best of best and cover all areas of computing? It's more than a mapping of SIGs; not just best papers but those creating a real buzz.

Moshe – It would be a good exercise for ACM to look at conferences. Could affect how we select best papers. Perhaps we'll do it better. Our track record is not very good if you consider the test of time awards. It doesn't mean that every year you take best papers and shove them in. We need to be flexible. Not every paper would have been published at an ACM conference; it's the best of the best of CS.

Dave Johnson, MOBILE – likes best of best but concerned about selection. SIGs need to be heavily involved – the volunteers and the buy-in from community. Look at IEEE Communications which looks much better these days. Computer seems to be having the same problems as CACM.

Vicki Hanson, ACCESS – yes to a flagship and encourage ACM to make articles readable to a more general audience. This is not just a best paper award contest. It will be a challenge to find what is the best.

Julie Jacko, CHI- The challenge is a process that allows all the SIGs to participate. It would be useful to have more discussions on how to best achieve that. Best of best is great idea but we need to put a process in place that enables representation from all SIGs and all of computing so it more accurately represents diversity; we're not all computer scientists but we are involved in computing.

Scott Owen GRAPH – best of best papers that create a buzz. Sometimes best paper might be voted best paper for tech reasons but not have greatest impact. Sidebar on why the paper was chosen, why substantial impact. Defragmentation of CS and perspectives can help. Articles written showing cross linkages and go after communities we are not looking for or ignoring like digital artists. Flagship? In a few years if CACM not successful should consider decoupling from membership.

Robert Walker, SGB Past Chair – supportive of best of best – great value because of time constraints the community has and for someone to point to one paper that should be read; that's of great value. Also indicating why it's important and why it should be read.

Joe Konstan, SGB Chair– ideas great – real cross fertilization is both ways how do you get my research to other people. How do we get researchers to read what's going on in industry where this cross fertilization occurs. Bunch of examples about what's happening in practice as a recurring feature – may have to hire people for not only CS it's computing. Must not just be ACM content – a requirement up front that not everything is ACM content. Don't like buzz which implies we're reactive. Board needs to identify why we're covering now. Konstan is against slots of any kind because quality goes down, open competition matters. Clear failure of most iterations of CACM has been a closed process because there's no published call. Not looking for everything open and public process, the core expertise is in peer review. We get some of the best papers out there. Perhaps some sort of retrospective for feedback from readers: issue by issue as we go along.

Norm Jouppi, ARCH – flagship good idea, Science good model; key is perspectives and news. Don't want articles watered down, Science doesn't do that and they can't be too old. Buzz thing is important but local buzz – few people in one SIG say this is important but hasn't reached all ACM or impacted world. Challenge – Science always has great cover art and that's always visually pleasing. Don't want to see slots but don't want it to degenerate for magazine for 2 SIGs. This could make ACM more global and bring together the profession.

Jamie Callan, IR- Do need to have SIGs involved in selection. Did Science feel like 51 issues per year was important to their success? Moshe indicated there was no down time so there was a pipeline and from production point of view you get used to it. Callan mentioned that a frequent pub rate seemed to be important and many will look at the odds of getting something into ACM as low. It may make sense to go to weekly format. Moshe responded that he doesn't know we have enough content. Does not believe we have quality to issue weekly. Will not be a place to publish. This will be a secondary publication – say 100 articles per year of the best of he best. It will be very different than conference competition.

Eydie Lawson, SGB EC – Best of best is very viable and valuable. It gives an opportunity to bring focus to articles without a huge search.

John McCormick, Ada – McCormick has gone more to science news where he reads every article. A bit watered down but understandable to all. He supports a flagship but to be more appealing you need to make it understandable.

Flo Appel, CAS – appreciated CACMs coverage of social impact issues in recent past and wants to see that continue. Remember that you can't please everyone. Interesting to see how editorial decisions are made, we must find the right balance. She suggested an extension of best of best on line with blogs.

Martin Rinard, BED – Integrate understandability in article. Quality of peer review process is questionable. Like best of best but important to have a flexible idea of best. Have a diverse set of goals for things we publish precisely for tech excellence, others for interest and others for perspective. Worried about amount of monthly content being a stretch. Support process may

require someone from outside the field to write articles for inside the field to make articles more accessible.

Erik Altman, MICRO. Altman likes the flagship concept because it is important to have a tangible benefit of membership. He also likes the on-line portion and useful for feedback perhaps on-line polling about articles (well written, quality) feedback for future issues. Best of best might be possible if professional writers re-write from a more lay point of view. Moshe responded that professional writers cannot write tech articles, generally difficult to do. Finally on the publication Altman leans toward more frequent. What's the cost breakdown for printing and shipping vs. professional staff? Moshe expects to find out following a meeting in NY.

Diana Marculescu, DA - Likes the idea and the best of best is great. She looked at this for a potential new publication for SIGDA. In Science people know the next breakthrough but not sure that there is something we're waiting for in computing. We're driven by technology so process of selection may be different depending on area. IEEE proceedings have a summary about articles and maybe that's something to look at as a model. Concern about using practitioners IEEE Spectrum has winners and losers. Perhaps we should look at different technologies.

Janice Sipior, MIS – hope or despair that MIS community is served by CACM has diminished over last several years and due to limitation of length quality perspective diminished greatly.

Bob Brown, APL– Likes idea of best of best for reasons outlined. Likes idea of lightweight. Tech news is big success for that reason. Beneficial to SIGs and cohesiveness of ACM as a whole.

Emil Volcheck, SAM– yes to flagship maybe not publication. Perhaps there is another way to look at the process. What do members want? Frame this question as how to improve or rework while looking at what we're already doing – TechNews, ubiquity, member news, DL. All goals for CACM delivered in separate collection of services. Piecemeal services address all your goals. Decide whether it needs to be print. Another flagship is notices of AMS news; instead of research articles there are research expository articles written for general mathematician not specialist. Select articles written for general audience and give indication of what is going on with new great theory.

Maria Gini, ART– Likes many of the ideas but broad concern. CACM isn't interesting because it's on specific and similar topics. When we think of diversity how do we achieve and do it. Need to find way of writing even to practitioners.

Alex Wolf, SGB EC– bad visceral reaction to best of best. 75-100 of these/year will be marginally better than mediocre masses. There aren't going to be 75 – 100 in our small discipline. Say there's research, there's discovery but best of best is a prejudgment. Second point is impact if this portion of CACM is successful then editorial boards selection is going to be influential and affect what future things will happen. A weakness of CS is that they haven't set an agenda for funding. If it doesn't have influence it hasn't been successful but if it does, there is a huge responsibility on how it shapes the agenda. Last point, issue brought up about

news is it is not going to be news because we already have that. The value add is the perspectives. What's the value add over the news we get anyway for each section given that material will be somewhere else? What's the value added?

Jack Davidson, PLAN – same reaction to best of best – let's have flagship magazine rather than journal – doesn't think you can be both in this field because we have a different model of publication. We're tremendously overwhelmed but do want to keep up so something lightweight. Why doesn't best of best work? How do you pick. On lots of program committees and reviewing is shoddy, bad stuff gets through. Science is good because it is original work. Stuff isn't original people that care have already seen it so, who will look. Some conferences are fast tracking best papers into journals so how many times will we publish things. What's the value added?

Raghu Ramakrishnan, MOD– best of best is appealing and likes the suggestion for on-line adjunct. Nervous because anytime you have best of best you're putting stamp of approval and the devil is in details of criteria. Criteria and process must be clearly articulated. We as a group have little input on transactions E-I-C has unilateral control as SIG dichotomy between TODS and SIG and what they can do to influence policies. If SIGs don't have oversight then CS has a forum in which individuals can decide what the rules are.

Gregory Piatetsky-Shapiro, KDD – We need flagship to unify field but would like to see on-line component like forums and blogs. Suggested functional grouping areas or functional areas.

Keith Marzullo, OPS – likes best of best. The field is too fragmented and likes ACM being a point of collection. Perhaps for dissertation award, people should submit their paper for publication. Programming Pearls was wonderful because of Jon Bentley, don't recreate but find Jon Bentleys.

Leila Lyons, UCCS – will there be a digital component? Moshe indicated that everything will be on-line.

Virgil Gligor, SAC– likes best of best and would like to see a historical perspective over field. Wants to see articles that are articulate and indicate what actually worked and to some extent, ideas that were good at time but didn't see light of day. Extremely popular ideas that don't work are often invented. Should have flagship although that will be difficult in the future. Can CACM be all to all? Possibly if we have issues dedicated to specialties important in time but random, may not work as well. Focused topics would be of interest.

Pierangela Samarati, SAC VC – not enthusiastic of best of best. What is best of best? Hope SIGs will be involved in selection process

Michael Wellman, ecom – likes the model sketched out as best of best. The way it is presented to the community is important. Not concerned about 75-100 papers but we don't know what they are. Don't buy the premise that Science knows. By definition papers at conferences are immature and speculative but nevertheless, there is value that there is a perceived broad outlet. Try to eliminate biases.

Barrett Bryant, APP – likes the ideas. He is familiar with what is in his field but this gives a chance to see what is happening in other fields.

Vardi likes the idea of "Best of Best" because it creates unity and makes keeping up to date with the general computing fields easier. Unlike JACM, CACM will be conference driven. It will bring prestige to selected articles- having your article selected for CACM will make it as prestigious as Science. It will also bring prestige to CACM.

Vardi discussed the next steps in this process including this discussion and three focus groups (Feb. 12 NYC, Mar.16 Palo Alto, Mar. 23 London) where they are hoping to get ideas and feedback on the plan as well as possible new ideas of what people want CACM to become.
> Goal: Content and business models
> Deadline: Early June- Council Meeting

Can we afford this? This will mean ACM will need to increase staff for CACM. Vardi believes the community needs to become involved for this to work. "CACM is going to be as good as we make it. It will be better if we collectively decide that we want it to be better."

Motion: The SGB thanks Moshe Vardi for his time, dedication, and creativity in leading the effort to revamp CACM. The SGB, on behalf of the SIG community, offers its support in helping move the revamp forward.

[Acclamation]

4.0   SIG Program Reviews

4.1   SIGACCESS : Slides Viability

Vicki Hanson presented the SIGACCESS program review. SIGACCESS has come out of transition. They are a small SIG but the numbers are improving. They are growing and their interest in running for office is growing as well as a growing interest in volunteering for the conference. The leadership recently took a chance and made their conference annual. Conference attendee numbers and submission of papers is going up. They are starting a workshop in Japan to test how international SIGACCESS is. They are starting small and making progress with their fund balance. The conference becoming an annual conference is helping and they are looking to take on a second conference. The newsletter is now current and has moved to become an online publication.

As a SIG they are focusing on student development, working hard on students being able to find faculty in the field. SIGACCESS is partnering with ACCESS COMPUTING, a program working to get students with disabilities into the CS field. They are also working on getting more people with disabilities involved with the SIG and attending the conference. The are expecting the 2008 conference to be international.

Motion: The SGB congratulates SIGACCESS on its program performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 3 years.

[Unanimous]

4.2   SIGCHI: Slides Viability

Julie Jacko discussed SIGCHI membership. There has been an increase in both professional and affiliate members but a decrease in students. The fund balance is over $800,000 for the end of FY06.

 For CHI 2006, the pricing model of the conference was changed. This was done to decrease costs. Conference Attendance has been increasing each year and they are excited for CHI to return to Europe, 2008 is being held in Italy.

SIGCHI is the number one SIG for downloads in the ACM Digital Library. This is thanks to the CHI proceedings as well as strong smaller conferences. CHI is looking into what they can do with their surplus. What types of interesting things can they do? Where can they travel outside of the US and Europe?

Motion: The SGB congratulates SIGCHI on its program performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 4 years.

[Unanimous]

4.3   SIGIR: Slides Viability

Jamie Callan discussed SIGIR being fairly stable in terms of finance. The SIG lost a little money last year because their conference was in Brazil and they sent many students to the conference from all over the world. They are not afraid to lose a little money. SIGIR is experiencing a trend of slow growth in membership. There was high attendance for SIGIR this year.

They are taking getting volunteers involved very seriously and have an aggressive recruiting process for people outside the US to run for office and get involved in Program Committees. They are currently working on revising the bylaws and are discussing co-sponsoring 2 additional conferences with SIGWEB. SIGIR has 3 good candidates for each elected position ready to run in the next EC election.

Motion: The SGB congratulates SIGIR on its program performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 4 years.

[Unanimous]

4.4   SIGMIS: Slides Viability

Janice Sipior reported that SIGMIS merged with SIGCPR in 2003. They have increased their fund balance and now exceed what is required. The leadership believes the decline in membership a few years was a result of the merger so membership should stabilize. SIGMIS gained a conference with the merger. The CPR conference will be traveling to different places in the next 4 years. They have secured conference chairs for conferences up to 2010.

SIGMIS releases a quarterly newsletter publishing peer-reviewed research is MIS. They are considering the possibility for a European chapter of the SIG.

Motion: The SGB congratulates SIGMIS on its program performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 4 years.

[Unanimous]

4.5   SIGSAM: Slides Viability

Emil Volcheck reported that SIGSAM's finances are on an upward trend. SIGSAM is no longer offering complimentary membership to non member conference registrants. Membership has dropped but leveled off due to not offering complimentary membership. They have saved money by sending out 2 double issues of their printed publication while still offering it quarterly online. They believe they have a stable core of around 300 members. Currently SIGSAM is seeking 2 conferences for in cooperation status as well as trying to promote the submission of formally reviewed articles.

Motion: The SGB congratulates SIGSAM for making progress on its financial performance and finds it viable to continue its status for the next 2 years.

Unanimous

Action: Frawley to update viability schedule for SIGCCESS, SIGCHI, SIGIR, SIGMIS and SIGSAM

5.0   Awards Discussion (Gotlieb)   Awards Slides

Calvin Gotlieb, Chair of the Awards Committee provided an update to the SGB. He explained that his committee reports directly to the ACM President. Awards may be given for merit, service, or best paper. Gotlieb discussed the process for the creation of new awards and reference the on-line awards page. New awards must be approved by the Awards Committee and in addition named awards must be approved by Council. He recommends getting requests for new awards in by August/September for the following year.

The function of the Awards Committee is to monitor progress of awards selection committees, advise on policy and new awards. They do not select award winners. The Committee meets once a year in conjunction with the Awards Banquet.

The Awards Banquet is held in a different city each year determined by Council. It is now a gala event with the ACM President presiding. It will be held this year June 9th in San Diego at the Del Coronado Hotel. Gotlieb explained that in order to be listed in the ACM Awards Program, an award must go through the formal approval process. It is important to have awards documented for the visibility of the awardees. If the paperwork is complete, the approval process is fairly easy etc…(look online for the approval process.)

Action: Cappo and Ryan to work with appropriate staff to make SIG Awards more visible on ACM web-site.

6.0   SGB EC Report/ Discussion and Recommendations (Konstan)

Konstan reported that President Feldman has charged a task force to make recommendations on the direction we should be taking with ACMW.

Konstan mentioned that it took a lot of work for some of the SIGs to come together for their elections this year. Elections sneak up on you. The SIG leaders also have elections for the SGB EC. Past Chair Walker informed the group that they'd be voting for 3 new SGB members at large and 2 SGB Reps to Council. They should expect to receive an electronic ballot in April.

Jack Davidson discussed SIGs becoming involved with the C5 Conference. Alan Kay is the organizer and IEEE is the sponsor. C5 is looking to get involved with some of ACM's SIGs. Davidson urges SIGs to look into the conference page or get in contact with him and he will put you in contact with Alan Kay.

Konstan reported that SIGAPL is currently in transition: To officially dissolve a SIG, the process can take up to a year. SGB EC is bringing forward a recommendation to dissolve the SIG. This will be posted to the membership of ACM so that members have the opportunity to turn it around. In the SGB meeting a year from now 3 things could happen:

- ❖ The SIG will have demonstrated that they have improved and corrected issues
- ❖ They have decided to do something else with the SIG- take it in another direction
- ❖ Take further action as to discuss the dissolution

The SGB EC met in different groups at Sunday's meeting to discuss issues concerning cooperating conferences, conference leadership and conference series, Digital Library issues and By-Law issues. Each group was asked to create a few slides including possible resolutions to be presented to the SGB.

In-Cooperation Conferences: Alex Wolf

We have more than 120 In-Cooperation conferences each year. This is only slightly less than the 140 sponsored/co-sponsored conferences. In-Cooperation events have no financial implications but "most" civilians and many SIG leaders do not recognize the difference. Some concerns surrounding In-Cooperation events have to do with the quality control. Branding

issues- are we proud to have the ACM name on them, follow through, paperwork (insurance and liability), proceedings issues, and paper review.

SIG Services assumes SIG Leaders will check for
- ❖ Credible organizations are sponsoring the event
- ❖ Appropriate technical content
- ❖ Time Overlap with Conference

The SGB EC discussed policy suggestions that included requiring In-Cooperation conferences to include content in the ACM DL, access to attendee lists, branding requirements, and continuous In-Cooperation agreements with long standing conferences.

Motion: Each SIG must document its criteria for awarding In-Cooperation status to non-ACM events. Such documentation should be on file with SIG Services, as well as available to the organizers of prospective In-Cooperation events.

After 1 July 2007, no new In-Cooperation events will be approved without documentation of the SIG's criteria

[31 for, 2 Opposed, 0 Abstentions]

Motion: Any event including an In-Cooperation event, using the ACM name must clearly communicate to prospective participants its policies on submissions, review and selection of submissions, and attendance.

Effective immediately, SIGs are responsible for ensuring compliance with this policy before approving In-Cooperation status with a conference.

[31 for, 2 Opposed, 0 Abstentions]

Action: SIG leaders to forward their criteria for granting cooperating status to conferences to Cozzi at ACM HQ by June 30, 2007.

Action: Davidson and Cappo to develop 1-3 templates for cooperating status criteria.

Digital Library Issues: Keith Marzullo

Keith Marzullo presented slides discussing issues that many are facing with the DL. SIGs would like access to downloading information for verifying and auditing purposes. The search tool for the DL is not all that it could be. Many SIGs find themselves using Google Scholar as an alternate search engine for DL articles. Are there new types of content that SIGs want to be included in the DL?

The group discussed the possibility of providing access for PC Chairs. This could help them look for potential plagiarism and duplicate submissions and should not be counted as a download.

Can the existing *submit corrections* function be improved? Should we have a SGB subcommittee/ Pubs Board meeting for these issues? The number and spread of the issues might make it better than funneling through a single representative.

Action: Konstan to put together DL task force to work with Publications Board on SIG related issues.

Conference Leadership and Series: **Conference Leaders and Series**

It was suggested that a program be started for an early conference call or phone call with new Conference Leaders. Both ACM and Volunteer Leadership will need to make it clear that the first step is to have a phone call between the conference chair and ACM to let them know who they need to talk to about what and what can be done for them. It is very important for conference leaders and ACM HQ to know about each other. Konstan stated that new conferences might not have any idea how to do something well until it is too late.

Konstan and Cappo suggested a possible "Letter of Introduction" that includes each point of contact for certain parts of conferences. Make it clear "what not to do" before coming through ACM. For example: Do not let a site know that you are selecting it and that you can afford… before you bring it to ACM and ask them to negotiate the contract. This letter should come from John White or Stuart Feldman.

> *Congratulations, we are so happy you have decided to hold this conference…*
> The letter should be a mix of appreciation that will also outline who their point of contact is for certain things.
> > *Ex: Donna Cappo- Director of SIG Services*
> > *Maritza Nichols- Budget*
> > *Adrienne Gistci- Publication and DL*

There was discussion of developing a 2 page TMRF, a reader friendly version with less text and more bullets for simple conferences. What is the definition of simple conferences? Simple conferences do not have workshops, tutorials, trade shows, exhibits, and are not co-sponsored outside of ACM.

The issue of Conference series came up and how to document governance structure for conference series. The importance is for HQ and SIG leadership to know.

Motion: The SGB finds that early orientation of conference chairs is a critical step to ensuring high-quality conference operations, and adopts as a policy the requirement that chairs have an initial orientation and planning discussion with appropriate SIG Services staff.

[33 For, 1 Opposed, 0 Abstentions]

Motion: The SGB asks SIG Services to develop a set of novice-friendly materials for chairs of logistically simple conferences, specifically a scaled-down TMRF and a quick-start web page on running an ACM conference

[Unanimous]

Motion: The SGB recognizes the value and importance of conference series, and feels it is important to formally establish series as a recognizable entity with documented succession practices. Therefore, we establish a policy that SIGs shall document for each conference series they sponsor the governance structure of that conference, including the process for chair selection. This documentation shall be in place for all conference series by June 30, 2008.

[Unanimous]

Action: Cappo to develop procedures for early orientation of conference leaders via conference call.

Action: Cappo to develop set of novice-friendly materials for chairs of logistically simple conferences specifically a scaled-down TMRF and a quick-start web page on running an ACM conference.

Action: SIG leaders to forward outline of governance structure to include succession practices of all conference series sponsored by their SIG by June 30, 2008 to Cozzi.

SIG Bylaws: **SIG Bylaws Changes**

Lately, there have been no ACM Bylaws changed without the authority of the ACM EC. This is because SIGs are not getting enough of a return when distributing to their membership requiring approval by the ACM EC. It was recommended that a streamlined practice be developed for changes that could be made without going to the membership.

Motion: In the interest of encouraging SIGs to adopt best practices in governance, the SGB enacts a streamlined practice for approving SIG by-law changes:
- ❖ For specific changes requested by a majority of a SIG's elected officers, pre-authorized by the SGB, and approved by the SGB EC
- ❖ In lieu of a membership vote, these proposed by-laws will be announced to the membership, and unless 3% of members object …
- ❖ By-laws will be forwarded directly to the ACM EC for adoption

The SGB authorizes streamlined by-law changes for SIGs as outlined in the minutes of the February 5, 2007 meeting.

[Unanimous]

7.0   CSTA Update (Stephenson)   [Slides]

In 2007, CSTA will transition into an entirely elected Board of Directors with representatives at every education level. There are currently over 6,800 members of CSTA. They are currently working on developing member benefits that will appeal to their diverse membership. They are concerned with enrollment but are working hard to develop new programs that will make institutional membership more valuable. There is a need to stress the importance of supporting K-12 computing education to post-secondary educators.

How do they use the money they have to have the greatest impact possible? The CSTA believes that computing is a discipline in crisis. CSTA is looking to attract creative and flexible revenue sources. ACM and the SGB are a crucial support to CSTA. They would not be able to afford to produce the materials that are having the impact they are having now.

This year, CSTA has produced four new issues of the "CSTA Voice" and increased their number of workshops across the country. The CSTA poster is now in 17,000 classrooms They are currently working on the development of a new edition of the *ACM Model Curriculum for K-12 Computer Science.*

Action: The SGB congratulates CSTA on its successes to date and reaffirms the earlier motion to fund CSTA for 3 years; with this (FY'08) being their 3rd year of funding.

[Acclamation]

Action: Ramdin to incorporate CSTA funding from SIGs into FY'08 budget.

8.0   Best Practices/ Q&A Session

Should we engage with the Pubs Board in a discussion about the fact that an Editor can put into place some pretty radical policies? They almost have unlimited power. Is it the role of the editorial board to check into these things? Ramakrishnan would like the editorial board to have to vote in terms of policy changes. He suggested that the pubs board discuss this.

USACM- Slides from Emil Volcheck

American Competitive Motion-new Congress and the committees are recommending increases for FY07. USACM was involved in giving comments on federal identity theft issues. USACM continues to be involved in voting policy- voting machine issues.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.