

AMC SIGDOC Business Meeting

Minutes

October 21, 2024. Called to order by Huiling Ding at 4:30 EST.

Attendance

PRESENT

- **Executive Committee:** Huiling Ding (chair), Luke Thominet (vice chair), Dan Richards (past-chair), Chen Chen (secretary/treasurer)
- **Board:** Morgan Banville (social media manager), Daniel Hocutt (technical editor), Chris Lindgren (website manager), Jason Tham (member-at-large), Bradley Dilger (SRC co-chair), Allegra Smith (SRC co-chair), Quan Zhou (member-at-large, online)
- **Conference Committee:** Dan Card, Chakrika Veeramoothoo, Ashley Hardin, Nupoor Ranade, Mckinley Green
- **Members:** 6

Note

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

Welcome

Introductions in the room.

Overview of agenda and introductions (Huiling)

Huiling Ding gave an overview of the agenda.

Conference 2024 updates (Nupoor and Mckinley)

Nupoor and Mckinley gave some advice for future conference chairs:

- start the local process early
- work closely with the EC about the conference budget from the beginning and try not to make changes closer to the conference.

Final registrants: 183, almost 90% of the total membership (200). Good attendance!

Program Committee updates (Dan Card, Chakrika Veeramoothoo, Daniel Hocutt)

Dan and Chakrika confirmed that prior documentation was helpful. The timeline was very challenging, and it was difficult to work with some reviewers because they ghosted.

Dan Richards suggested moving up the timeline by 6-8 weeks, which would be immensely helpful. Daniel Hocutt concurred, suggesting to get the CFP out really early, at the previous conference or December.

There's a general consensus in the room for removing themes for future CFPs, which would help with a more speedy timeline. Allegra suggested we could look at how/whether other ACM SIGs used themes in their conference CFPs.

Daniel Hocutt reminded us that the minute the metadata have been set (the moment the TMRP is set), everything starts moving with proceedings. All data should be consistent across, such as location for the conference.

SRC Updates (Bradley Dilger and Allegra Smith)

This year saw a 6-fold increase of undergraduate student participation and a small decrease from grad student participation (16 to 10). Dilger and Allegra thanked reviewers and judges.

Suggestions for the future: coordinate the call with the conference CFP instead of issuing a separate call later. This was concurred by Daniel Hocutt.

Dilger and Allegra shared plans for improving local participation in the future: reaching out to local institutions for student participation (Director of Undergrads, Director of Grad Studies, etc.), in other departments beyond English. They already have an infrastructure (list of institutions). They also plan to revise and clarify the rubrics for judges.

Each participant was given \$380 for travel reimbursement this year.

Dan Card suggested that program chairs can work better with SRC chairs, such as inviting people to review, etc.

There was a question about why only 3 groups were advanced to the second round, instead of 5. Dilger and Allegra shared that time constraint was the issue. In the future, they suggested planning for a longer session (or 2 separate sessions) for the second round.

Secretary/Treasurer's Report

Chen Chen, secretary/treasurer, noted that SIGDOC's overall financial health is facing some challenges. Our budget year begins in July, so the past budget year is FY2024 which began in July 2023 and the current budget year is FY2025, beginning in just this July. The estimated organization net is about \$1,000 for budget year FY24. We actually projected a loss of \$7k, but the current calculations show that we may come out about \$1000 ahead. Historically, we hover at a few thousand in revenue or expenses at the end of the year, often alternating depending on conference venue.

This year, just based on last year's estimates, we still budgeted for about \$7k loss in organization net income, but it probably won't come to that either. I think we can probably maintain the historical record of net gain. The conference committee and EC have been working very hard trying to save money where we can, without sacrificing conference experiences. For example,

committee members always try to prioritize their institutional fundings for travel reimbursement before using SIGDOC funds.

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 current fiscal year (FY25) is \$47,326 (based on a formula using expenses [organizational and conference] and net income). We've started this FY25 at \$54,653 in our funds reserve. But some of you may know that our organizational overhead to AMC increased by 150% in fiscal year FY23 (You can see more about this in [past Chair Dan Richards' update](#)). Every year, we're tapping more into that balance with this overhead costs. So we will need to actively search for ways to significantly reduce costs and increase income.

There will also be some financial impacts from the Open Access changes that Huiling and Dan will talk about next. Given these financial challenges, there may be some changes in the future.

Tim Amidon asked: ways to negotiate with ACM to adjust our overhead cost? Dan Richards answered that there is potential room to push back on that a bit.

The EC will meet to work on ways to reduce costs and increase income. Some potential ideas: adding other professional engagement opportunities beyond the conference; small increase of membership; cutting meals at conferences, etc.

Organizational Update: ACM becoming Open Access and Possible Impacts (Huiling and Dan Richards)

ACM started talking about transitioning to open access 5 years ago, responding to global market (push from Europe). They wanted to make sure the publications are accessible to global communities. ACM is aware of the financial risks that come with this change. There's a 10-tier system, depending on how many articles an institution publishes. You can check out [here](#) to find out which tier your institution is at. Huiling suggests we talk to our institutional partners, library, computer science departments, engineering folks, leadership, to find support to make the institution to make it to tier 1 (which supports 75+ articles). The corresponding author (rather than the lead author) has to be at a university that's part of the Open Access list. Huiling explained that NC State would have to pay over \$50k in addition to make it to tier 1 category, for example. The library suggested that they could potentially pay for individual costs (\$1k per article; \$700 per proceedings paper). Huiling also suggested reaching out to your institutions in your local region to see if it's possible to negotiate with ACM for a reduced cost for multiple institutions in a consortium.

We still don't have a lot of details about this future change yet, such as how this will impact alumni who lose their institutional emails.

Nupoor is concerned about having all SIGDOC research open access (this was not considered by ACM; Huiling will give ACM feedback).

Derek Ross: strong concerns about institutions (which are not part of the Open Access list) lose access to publication opportunities (echoed by Ashley Hardin). CDQ right now is still technically a newsletter, so not impacted by this.

Communication Team and Accessibility Report (Chris/Morgan)

Morgan: social media engagement looks good: 1140 followers of SIGDOC on X right now. Morgan suggests we need a new listserv (hard to use, Morgan doesn't want to be the gatekeeper because only she can post to the list, she wants other members to be able to send to the list as well). She also mentioned that future announcements should mention that AI-generated transcription services need to receive consent from speakers.

She's also open for suggestions for other services, such as Google announcements (like Traci Gardner's example).

Luke: ACM had offered help in the past, but if we open up the list, we'd need moderating guidelines per ACM standard from 5-6 years ago. Michelle Eble suggested ATTW listserv works with moderation.

Jason suggested we pick up the discussion about the ethics of using X again (is it worth the usability issues)? Others echoed similar ethical concerns.

Chris: asking members for opinions about the usability of the website (using post-conference survey to ask for feedback). He's also inviting feedback on conference site structures.

Communication Design Quarterly (Huling)

Suggestions from Jordan for people interested to apply for CCQ editorship: negotiate with your institution for support, financial and editorial assistance.

SIGDOC 2025 Plans and Updates (Jason)

Clarification from Jason: CPTSC and SIGDOC will be co-located but NOT joint. Everything such as CFP and costs will be separate for the two conferences.