

# AMC SIGDOC Board Meeting 2020-02-11

Minutes of meeting via Zoom

Tuesday, February 11, 2020. Called to order by Dan Richards at 1:30 p.m. Eastern.

## Attendance

### PRESENT

Daniel P. Richards (chair), Sarah Read (vice chair), Emma Rose (immediate past chair), Susan Youngblood (secretary/treasurer), Derek Ross (editor of CDQ), Luke Thominet (communications manager), Stacey Pigg (2020 conference chair)

### DOUBLE CHECK (SPECIFIC COMMENTS NOT RECORDED)

Adam Strantz (website manager), Chris Lam (local co-chair), Sean Zdenek (access chair), Jason Tham (social media manager), Nupoor Ranade (student representative), Lisa Dush (member at large)

### ABSENT

Lisa Melonçon (organizational liaison), Manuela Aparicio (chair of EuroSIGDOC), Natasha Jones (member at large)

## Conference Updates

**Catering.** Stacey reporting. Initial estimate: 120 people; need 80 registrants. We don't have to pay for 120. Chris's initial idea is that as long as we have catering at \$2,500/day, we will have no charges for AV, etc. The overall financial health of SIGDOC is good.

**Hotel.** Need to fill 30 rooms on the first night, 40 on the second.

**Reviewers.** We have lots of reviewers (3x the number as of applicants).

**Proceedings and recruiting.** Emma, Luke, Sarah, and Stacey contributing. Proceedings are optional. Last year, 40% submitted to proceedings, and all but one were accepted. Reviewing was framed as pedagogical and constructive rather than gatekeeping.

If we see proceedings as an obstacle to submissions, we could put that in the deadline, but we need to be careful, though, because of the cultural norm of not writing up the paper among some conferences: We want proceedings, and we don't want to dissuade people from submitting. A panel with multiple authors submits one paper (a 2-pg extended option).

We could reach out to our reviewer list to solicit submissions.

**Attending remotely, etc.** We need to establish parameters for attending remotely or publishing without attending. ACM policy is that you can't publish if you don't present; when one colleague presented digitally, he paid and that way because he was in Honduras and could not make it.

Let's go without a concrete policy for the short term because of occasional special circumstances; we'll fall back on the ACM policy. Long term, do we want to have a virtual component? ACM is now positioning the conversation as carbon footprint. We need to frame

choices with the ACM policy in mind but also the viability of the conference. For now, we will have a loose application of the policy that depends on circumstances.

**Editors' roundtable.** Derek reporting; Stacey contributing. Many conferences have a successful, well-attended editors' roundtable. We will look into it.

## Conference Locations

**Updates on process.** Sarah reporting; Dan, Emma, Stacey, and Sarah contributing. We are moving toward a smoother succession system with conference locations. We looked at the form that we'd use to start a conversation with a prospective location. She talked to Lisa Dush (DePaul is on the list). The idea is to demystify the hosting process and to let prospective hosts know there's a support network of past hosts. We can write a letter to advocate for hosting, a letter to give to the chair and other administrators. Contact Dan or Sarah if you're interested in engaging in the hosting process.

**Problematic locations.** Emma and Stacey contributing. Some states will not fund travel to locations because of social policies. How does conference location impact our field? It affects travelers but also members of our field working in those prohibited states. Also, there's not a lot of evidence that these are things that are going to be resolved soon. Perhaps there's a creative solution. We need to see how the Texas location affects numbers this year.

## CDQ Updates

Derek reporting.

**CDQ health.** CDQ was largely solicited manuscripts and special editions (almost exclusively) prior to 2018. Submissions:

- 2018 – 11 submissions
- 2019 – 8
- 2020 – 3 already; 5 under R&R, one of which came back this morning; 3 are (under review?)

**Publicity, the website, and downloads/article access.** We would like to keep key articles visible via social media. On the day Luke sent out a new article FYI, we had a submission and inquiries. Keep CDQ "in people's faces" is good for the health of CDQ.

Online first is working well, yet it doesn't drive people to the Digital Library (which generates our article revenue). We had 300-400 views within 3 days. In first two days for Clay Spinuzzi's article, we had 20-30 downloads. We need to get people to the DL; need biometrics and money.

We are working on making the site "sticky."

**Interns and their work.** Last year, an intern did work inaccessibility, turned into a white paper, and we will come out with a research and teaching tool page as a result (non-peer-reviewed). Current interns are working on writing or contributing to a white paper.

## **Communication / Social Media Strategy**

Luke reporting. We're primarily hitting ATTW and CPTSC as audiences (for conference communication?) and using Facebook and Twitter. Jason created the public page and private FB group. He also used Customify to create the latest mockup.

## **Diana Award**

Dan reporting. Only one candidate is a long-term contributor to the field. We will revisit the potential awardees in the future.

## **ACM History Fellowship**

Dan reporting. \$4,000 grant to do oral etc. history. We will use the money to disambiguate who we are, what we value, and how we and our conference differs from others in the field, especially SIGDOC, design of communication. Others can join Dan's team to help if they'd like.