

AMC SIGDOC Business Meeting 2022

Minutes

October 08, 2022. Called to order by Sarah Read at ~9:00 a.m. Eastern.

Attendance

PRESENT

- **Executive Committee:** Sarah Read (vice chair), Susan Youngblood (secretary/treasurer), Jordan Firth (editor of CDQ and sponsorship chair), Emma Rose (past chair); Note: Dan Richards listening by Zoom but not able to interact (see below)
- **Board:** Halcyon Lawrence, Nupoor Ranade, Timothy (Tim) Elliott (members at large); Sonia Stephens (communications manager; see also *2023 Conference Committee* below)
- **2022 Conference Committee:** Michael Trice (conference chair); Candice Welhausen & Donnie Johnson Sackey (program chairs); Daniel Hocutt (technical editor)
- **2023 Conference Committee:** Sonia Stephens (conference chair; see also *Board* above)
- **Members:** Rachel Atherton, Kaleigh Pears (industry), Derek Ross (past editor of CDQ), Andrew (Andy) Mara (past conference chair), Stan Doherty & Joe Bartolotta

ONLINE

- **Board:** Chris Lindgren (website manager)

ONLINE (NON-INTERACTIVE)

- **Executive Committee:** Daniel P. (Dan) Richards (chair) (present via Zoom but not able to interact)

ABSENT

- **Board:** Sherena Huntsman (access chair); Jason Tham (social media manager); Sahajiya Nath (student representative); Jennifer Greeve (industry liaison), Carlos J. Costa (chair of EuroSIGDOC)

Note

The topics in these minutes have been consolidated, so some items appear in a different order than mentioned in the meeting.

Welcome

Sarah Read (vice chair) and Emma Rose (past chair) briefly welcomed attendees over breakfast; when breakfast concluded, we swiftly transitioned to business.

Secretary/Treasurer's Report

Susan Youngblood, secretary/treasurer, noted that SIGDOC's overall financial health is good. Last year and the year before, our SIG ended the year with a little less than we began with. This year, we were projected to come out nearly \$2,000 ahead of where we began, but that may change based on the final conference costs. We still have an excellent cushion of funding. That cushion has largely grown over time, thanks to many people's careful stewardship. Credit also goes to

everyone who encourages participation in the conference and keeps CDQ thriving. Usually, we hover at a few thousand in revenue or expenses at the end of the year, often alternating depending on conference venue. Our reserves have been building over time, which has allowed us to dedicate a line in our budget to social justice work.

We are required to maintain a financial cushion that varies; that is, we are required to have a minimum balance in our account. That amount for the coming fiscal year (FY23) is \$24,695 (based on a formula using expenses [organizational and conference] and net income). Because of long-term care, our estimated final holdings for 2022 are \$115,544, which is almost \$91,000 over the minimum required.

ACM's fiscal years run July 1 – June 30. Our conferences alternate between generating revenue and tapping into reserves. Conference expenses for onsite conferences like this one include costs like rooms and food. Digital conferences of the past couple of years still have the expenses of technology, AV, accessibility, and so forth. Their revenue has exceeded expenses, but the conference is about much more than financial health, and we are glad to be back in person. We expect our conference expenses to vacillate between generating income and tapping into reserves.

Historically, SIGDOC's largest revenue and expense streams are our conferences, but we plan for them to be a revenue stream (with revenue exceeding expenses) only every other year. The pattern over the last few years gives sense of where we are. The FY 2021 conference (October 2020, so two conferences ago) had been expected to tap into reserves by a little over \$1,200 dollars as an onsite conference but instead was in the black. Last year's conference was also in the black. We are wrapping up the expenses for this year's conference, which is projected to dip into the red. But again, that's normal.

SIGDOC's typically second largest revenue stream is the digital library, but this year and last, it is our largest revenue stream. It again has exceeded projections thanks to the Communication Design Quarterly (CDQ) team's work and the promotion of articles online. The ACM Digital Library has grown from \$10,000/yr to \$11,175/yr (base revenue from access is set at \$10,000; any dollar amount in addition indicates higher access). We encourage faculty to have students download articles directly rather than access them as uploaded copies in a learning management system because it benefits the organization and it demonstrates use of the ACM Digital Library to our institutions, thus preserving access.

Our second largest expense is usually overhead, especially travel. In the last two years, that expense has been cut because we were not doing much travel, yet that changes this year.

As a special interest group within ACM, SIGDOC uses the expertise and infrastructure of ACM and incurs \$10K of overhead per year. JC Peeples (and Irene Frawley before him) serves as our contact, preparing the initial budget, calculating particulars, and keeping us within the guidelines of ACM. Also, we use the infrastructure of the digital library, and conference payment infrastructure that is separately billed to us.

Communication Team and Report

Sonia Stephens (communications chair) reported that communication is going well, including our Listserv. Chris Lindgren (website manager) reported that work with the website is going well, but more handoff documentation is needed. We had one unexpected hiccup: the security certificate expired on the 4th, without any notification. That was detected almost immediately, and now website is set to notify us of the next expiration.

Accessibility

Sonia Stephens and Donnie Johnson Sackey (program co-chair) reported (on behalf of Sherena Huntsman [access chair]) that accessibility remains a focus. This year, Sherena and Donnie worked for the accessibility for the conference materials.

We need to increase the accessibility budget for our conferences. We didn't have the funds to make all of the conference accessible: we couldn't do anything for panels. CART services (captioning) is a heavy technical burden, and in-person services are more expensive.

Communication Design Quarterly

Jordan Frith recently took over as editor of CDQ. Derek Ross (immediate past editor) was also present. Proofs for the second special issue (Jordan Frith and Sarah Read) are out. The issue will come out Oct 20 if authors respond promptly. Another issue is scheduled for December, meeting our goal of four issues this year.

CDQ is always looking for submissions, including more interdisciplinary submissions. We are adding industry insights, which will be editor reviewed. We have changed experience reports to make them much shorter than other articles (3,000-5,000). Jordan continues outreach to generate submissions and is happy to talk to grad programs.

CDQ has a new website separate from SIGDOC's site. The site likely will soon have a link directly to ACM's Digital Library (DL). We will continue to support online first but will ask readers who can to follow the link to the DL to support our metrics. Online first articles will be archived after 18 months.

Newsletter label and tagging. The meeting turned to the issue of the labeling of our publication as a newsletter rather than a journal. Linking directly to the ACM library highlights that our publication is classified by ACM as a newsletter, which limits our outreach strategy. Derek revealed the backstory of the label, and Emma Rose (past chair) elaborated. We used to have a journal, which failed in the early 1980s. We broached the newsletter/journal issue about 5 years ago; our proposal was peer reviewed by other SIGS and "warmishly" received. But becoming a journal has disadvantages: for journals, ACM installs editor every three years, goes through the ACM process of selection, and changes the nature of content (which then would have to be computer technology). In essence, we would lose control. The recent decolonial piece would never get published. It's critical that we don't use the word "journal" to describe our publication. An email with word journal in it, from ACM's perspective, would be fraudulent labeling.

ACM organizes articles by CCS concepts (their keywords), which don't match to what we do. Multiple journals already deal with HCI, so don't tag work with HCI to give ACM reason for

denying journal status in the future. Computer-supported cooperative work might be more effective. Halcyon Lawrence (past program co-chair) and Jordan noted that there may be room to have a conversation with ACM in the future create tags that are more specific to our work.

As the author of the article, you can link to the article and its open access version. Proceedings are open access for a year. Use those links. ACM also allows you to put your work in your institutional repository and on your personal website.

Conference Report/Debriefing

Michael Trice, conference chair, debriefed attendees.

Key Points from Chair (and Commentary)

- **Hotel:** ACM took over contracting for hotel pricing. ACM is very good at enforcing regulations and getting a good deal. ACM worked with the short list and did the groundwork, we selected, then they worked out the entire contract. The result is that we got our rooms at about half the normal rate rooms
- **Hotel vs. university venue:** This time, there was no way to plan for using a university. Sarah noted that this is an open conversation issue (each has pros/cons). See below under Conversation.
- **Proceedings:** We were a bit more selective for proceedings (balance between grad-student friendly and selectivity for T&P). That has pros/cons, too. We have a good process with the program.
- **SRC and students:** Microsoft pulled the funding for the Student Research Competition (SRC). We had 12 entries in the SRC even so.
- **Attendance and factors affecting it:** Attendance was 120 and generated \$27,000 in revenue from registration, placing us second to Portland in size. (Registration income is critical to offset expenses.) Our big issue this for attendance this year was that 2 mos after we announced, UXPA announced their conference scheduled for next week. Then SCC Boston announced its online conference scheduled for yesterday. Both affected our industry attendance. Possible solution: Maybe reach out to those organizations (UXPA and the nearby major SCC) earlier to coordinate before setting a date. Jordan and Donnie wondered if ATTW remaining in the summer and remote might open up more travel funding for attendees to come to SIGDOC. Plus several people suggested also considering C&W, 4Cs, CPTSC, and ProComm in the mix of conferences when planning.
- **Presentation formats:** We had about a dozen remote presenters (and about 4 were individual, not part of a team); reduced rates were not on table for remote presenters this year.

Conversation

- **Integrating remote access:** We need to consider how to integrate remote access (as an access, experiential, and economic issue).

- **Chair role and possible assistance from EC vice chair:** Sarah: Consider changing the conference chair role; maybe move the CEO aspect into the vice chair on the EC (Executive Committee), thus centralizing the bureaucratic side of the planning into the EC to solve the labor issue and making it an easier to host a conference. She proposed making the vice chair a member of the conference committee. The old model was local chair, conference chair, and program chair.

Andy Mara (past conference chair) noted that the title of conference chair is important and also that a lot of the burden is on the program chairs because of the proceedings, and those roles are already separated out. His experience was that the conference chair is less CEO and more hospitality manager. Michael said to maybe think of an infrastructure that includes a type of technical editor for the conference itself. Michael described his role as ringmaster and said he might have needed more time to deal with the volume of duties and to wrestle with EasyChair. It's hard as a lecturer with a small time release (had only a third of a course release [50 hrs] over the course of a year to organize). Think about that when recruiting other NTTs / Lecturers. Emma: There's so much variation, esp. on academic campuses, and we don't want to place too much burden on the EC.

Michael: Also, an additional EC role in the conference would add extra meetings. (But see Long-term planning below about how the vice chair could facilitate long-term planning.) Some members expressed that the conference organizers aren't designated to be on the EC, so perhaps the EC shouldn't be as directly involved in the conference. Jordan noted that the vice chair's model isn't well defined, which is part of the issue.

- **Siting:** Like this year, next year will be in a busy location: Orlando; the following year may be Chicago, which is accessible from all air markets in US with one hop (lowering the cost and increasing access) (talked with Tim from DePaul). We tend to alternate between east and west locations (or in the middle) to make sure we're not putting an undue burden folks from on one coast. Sarah mentioned the possibility of choosing a location before choosing a chair if doing long-term planning, and Susan pointed out that it's possible not to have someone who is willing and able at a given location. Derek emphasized the role of siting in spotlighting local industry connections, including in places that are not considered major industry hubs.
- **Venue:** Dan Richards (chair) likes the hotel model because it makes it easier to host, but is open to hosting on university campuses as well. Tim Elliott noted that DePaul wants to use the hotel model. Derek pointed out that institutions have specific rules you have to play by (like one expensive venue that must be used, such as Auburn's Dixon Center), and a university siting also must content with football scheduling.
- **Longer-term planning:** Michael: It's hard for folks to plan long term to become a conference chair because of the variables in academic life. Nupoor Ranade (board) commented that she wants to help out in the programming and managing in the future, but noted that delegation is sometimes harder than doing it yourself, plus adds meetings; perhaps making a panelist the moderator is helpful, but there's another step of logistical work. Sarah: Looking at future for three years, including ACM's role in helping negotiate

contracts, could allow a chair to assemble a local committee, if the vice chair of SIGDOC were to take that long-term visionary role. Andy suggested that potential chairs must ask, “What is this going to do for my career?” It poises you for leadership and visibility. Once you have that settled, you can incorporate your local group and have you more time to get your site together.

- **Documentation and knowledge transfer for conference chair:** We have documentation, but Emma is not sure how it’s kept up and handed off. Halcyon noted that it’s baptism of fire and then you’re done and you have all of this knowledge that has the potential to be lost (leading to another baptism by fire), which is why she offered to serve as a resource (in an advisory role) for the program chairs for two years. That’s similar to the vice chair advising the Executive Committee for three years to create continuity.
- **Proceedings:** Michael noted that Daniel Hocutt had an enormous role as technical editor for the program. Emma commented that the program committee worked so well that it’s been much easier for people to participate. In the past, we had people not even participate because of the onerous nature of submitting their manuscripts. Is the current model sustainable? Daniel called it “not awful,” especially prefaced on Candice and Donnie’s work. Susan suggested making it clear to potential submitters that the process is far easier than in the past.

The process: Michael handed off 39 papers downloaded from Easy Chair on a zip drive. Dan Richards took half the papers, and Daniel took 31 papers in total once the SRC part was factored in. Halcyon and Candice Welhausen (program co-chair) commented that the editorial role was minimized when they were uploading and formatting. They had to soften some reviews, but didn’t have capacity to fully edit. They relied heavily on reviewers. Donnie said they had only one instance of a review that didn’t sit right. They would have liked to have a little bit more capacity for editing.

Membership and Bylaws

Sarah: Membership is holding around 170. [For reference, it was 163 last year.] Stan _____ noted that we could create an outreach program to get industry people with a background in teaching to provide resources. Probably 200 writers and 20% have had an active role in teaching already. That approach works for other organizations (including large ones). People from the industry side could come in as an ad hoc committee, then provide a directory/catalog of speakers and workshops and reach out to more people in the industry. If ACM is willing to sponsor as a little working group, we can build a network to reduce the gap between what we’re hiring for and what academics can realistically provide as resources. Emma and Sarah encouraged reaching out to let the EC know of other ideas, opportunities, and structures that would support or grow our community and get members at large more integrated (not just involved in the conference). Make sure you CC Emma on communications.

Emma: We updated the bylaws, which hadn’t been updated since the 1980s. It was a long process. Major changes: The EC terms went from two to three years, and editor of CDQ was written in as a member of the EC, and a term limit added for that editor position.

Nominations

The terms for the following current EC members conclude this year: chair, vice chair, and secretary/treasurer. Please self-nominate. If you're interested in the secretary/treasurer role, know that the secretary/treasurer does not handle checks and has an excellent support system. Also, please feel free to reach out to any officer for details.