

Minutes of the SIG Governing Board Meeting – November 7, 2025

Attendees:

Jonathan Aldrich	SGB Publications Advisor
Anastasia Anagnostou	SIGSIM
Jake Baskin	CSTA
Elisa Bertino	ACM Vice President
Angela Bonifati	SIGMOD
Lisa Brown	SIGUCCS
Matthew Chapman Caesar	SIGCOMM
Donna Cappel	ACM, Director of SIG Services
Z. Berkay Celik	SIGSAC
Samarjit Chakraborty	SIGBED
Marsha Chechik	SIGSOFT
Francisco Chicano	SIGEVO
Alison Clear	SGB EC New SIG Advisor
Adrienne Decker	SGB EC - Council Representative
Scott Delman	ACM, Director of Publications
Brian Dorn	SIGCSE
Funda Ergun	SIGACT
Nicola Ferro	SIGIR
Darin Grant	SIGGRAPH
Wayne Graves	ACM Dir of DL
Mor Harchol-Balter	SIGMETRICS
Christine Harvey	SGB EC Vice Chair for Operations and SIGHPC
Eelco Herder	SIGWEB
Yannis Ioannidis	ACM President
David Irwin	SIGEnergy
John Krumm	SIGSPATIAL
Neha Kumar	SGB EC Chair and SIGCHI
Brad Lawrence	SGB EC SIG Development Advisor and GRAPH
José Martínez	SIGARCH
Kathy McCoy	SIGACCESS
Andrew Myers	SIGPLAN
Jens Palsberg	SGB EC Council Representative
Juw Won Park	SIGAPP
Timothy Pinkston	ACM DEI Council Chair
Das Reetuparna	SIGMICRO
Maria Rivera	ACM Office of SIG Services

Daniel Roche	SIGSAM
Pat Ryan	ACM Acting CEO
Vivek Sarkar	SGB EC Council Representative
Christian Servin	SIGCITE
Jenifer Soale	SIGCITE
Luke Thominet	SIGDOC
Andreas Tolk	SIGSIM
Alan Tsang	SIGAI
Craig Van Slyke	SIGMIS
May D Wang	SIGBio
Wei Wang	SIGKDD
Ding Yuan	SIGOPS
Thomas Zimmermann	SIG Representative to Technology Policy Council

Welcome and Introductions

Neha opened the meeting by welcoming everyone and thanking the SGB and Donna Cappelletti. She reviewed the board's goals, including fostering dialogue, decision-making, and community building across SIGs. Neha mentioned all the meeting opportunities that take place besides the two SGB meetings per year; EC meetings on the first Friday of each month and coffee hours on the last Monday, asynchronous discussions via Slack, email, and surveys, with working groups and small group conversations supporting ongoing initiatives. A Slack link is available to join if you are interested.

We have several active initiatives: the SIG Structures Working Group, reviewing SIG structures and pathways; the Overhead Working Group, a key discussion item today; and the AI Summit, aiming for broad SIG participation. The election guidelines, led by Vijay Krishna Narayanan, have been approved by the ACM Election Committee and will be shared online—please distribute them to your SIGs for the upcoming election cycle. Overall, our goal is to build community, foster belonging, and create spaces for conversation and connection.

Introductions were made around the room and Zoom.

President's Remarks (Yannis Ioannidis)

Yannis provided an overview of ACM's organizational structure, including its boards, SIGs, and global regions, and highlighted the transition in leadership with Pat Ryan serving as acting CEO following Vicki Hansen's retirement. He thanked Pat for leading us during this strategic period and explained the process of finding a new CEO will take some time.

Yannis discussed ongoing initiatives such as the globalization task force, which has resulted in the creation of a new globalization board led by Sole Perra and George Neville Neal, and the open access policy for ACM publications by 2026. Yannis also emphasized ACM's efforts to strengthen relationships with international organizations like the UN.

There are 14 Presidential Task Forces whose goals are to investigate 14 separate aspects of ACM based on feedback from the community to explore changes to prepare ACM for the next 20 years. All are in different stages of development and he touched on the status of each.

Yannis has achieved his goal of attending each of the top 10+4 ACM conferences at least once. The experience has been incredibly valuable for him, providing opportunities to connect with the community and gain insight into what's happening across the field. From the feedback he's received, the SIGs, conferences, and committees also find these visits mutually beneficial.

As part of his conference tour, a video series has been launched, currently called *ACM President On the Road*, to capture interesting moments and people in short, 60–90 second unedited clips. The videos are spontaneous, offering a snapshot of the community's pulse, and some will be available in multiple languages.

Yannis reported that he continues to participate in several UN events to help strengthen the relationship between ACM and the UN as global organizations.

Yannis also provided on the status of ACM Open, noting that as of January 1, 2026, all publications will be open access. A three-year transition plan will be implemented, including geographic and financial hardship waivers, supported in part by SIG contributions.

During the first year of the transition, APC costs will be offered at a significant discount. In the second year, discounts will continue but will be adjusted based on the number of authors paying APCs.

Recap and Vote on New Overhead – Jens Palsberg

Jens thanked all members of the overhead working group for their participation and expressed appreciation to Neha for initiating the group's efforts. Following a vote in which all but two SIGs participated, a new overhead formula was approved. Prior to the pandemic, overhead totaled \$4.7 million. During the pandemic, the overhead rate increased from 10% to 14%. Under the new formula, the rate will return to 10.1%. From the task force's perspective, this approach is sustainable, and the formula will be reviewed again in four years.

The SGB adopted the overhead calculation method based on expenses as outlined in the SIG Overhead Working Group report, dated October 23, 2025 and summarized here:

- Minimum contribution of \$10K

- Variable rate per \$250K

- Rates start at 15%, decrease by 1% every \$250K, and have a minimum of 5%.

- The calculation method will be approved by the SGB in 4 years.

SORF Surplus – Jens Palsberg

The goal of this working group was to discuss how best to use the surplus that has built up in the SIG Overhead Reserve Fund.

SIGs receive 30% of net income from the DL based on a formula that calculates the number of downloads for distributing the money to the individual SIGs. However, DL income has been dwindling because of increased expenses, specifically 1.4 million less. In FY'24 the SIGs received 3.8 million in total, and for FY'26, they will receive 2.4 million in total. The minimum an individual SIG will receive is \$10,000.

There is a reserve fund called SORF, SIG Overhead Reserve Fund. This fund currently has 3.4 million in the account, about 800k more than required.

There are a few options regarding how the surplus in this fund can be used:

Calculate the “extra overhead” that SIGs have contributed since the last overhead (OH) was imposed in FY23, and give this back to each SIG.

Keep the surplus as is, saving it for a rainy day, especially since the new OH calculator only brings in \$150K more than the required amount. If there is significant underspending, we may fall short in a given year. In addition, the required SORF will increase by 3% each year.

Create an “ACM Open Fund” for 2027 and beyond to offset APC fees. We cannot, however, subsidize the fees forever, or the push back will be more when the subsidies end.

Augment the DL returns to bring them close to the FY'25 number.

Some combination of the above or something completely different.

There will be a vote over the next couple of months during our coffee hours and through surveys. SIGs can also add their input in the [SORF Plus worksheet](#).

Working Group Updates

SIG Structure Working Group Update – Adrienne Decker

This working group is looking at issues created by changes in overhead and ACM Open. The group is looking at other structures that can support different types of communities and will have something available for the April SGB meeting.

ACM Open Working Group (Jonathan Adler, Tom Zimmerman)

The working group has been collaborating with SIG communities on the transition to ACM Open. Additionally, discussions are underway regarding Digital Library (DL) revenue, including whether alternatives to download counts should be considered as the basis for SIG revenue allocation from the DL.

Peer Review and Publishing – (PreP) Working Group (Vivek Sarkar)

The PreP working group was charged with identifying challenges and opportunities to strengthen publishing and peer review practices across our community. The group is focused on:

- Quality and quantity
- Publication policies
- Review integrity
- Best practices

To kick off this charge, a survey was emailed to all SIGs in October 2025. The response options in the survey appear to have resonated well with the SIGs. To encourage input from all 37 SIGs, the survey remains open and can be accessed here: <https://forms.gle/vHbDpeDEuZjcYsob6>.

A final report will be shared at the April 2026 SGB meeting.

Five breakout groups were formed to discuss:

1. Quality and quantity (led by Vivek Sarkar)
2. Publication Policies (led by Jonathan Adler)
3. Review Integrity (led by Nicola Ferro)
4. Best Practices (led by Neha Kumar)
5. Gaps and Opportunities (online group led by Eelco Herder)

Each breakout group gave a 1 min summary of their topic.

Breakout 1

Participants brainstormed strategies related to publication venues, including ways to manage and reduce reviewer burden, encourage authors to fulfill reviewing responsibilities, and incorporate AI tools. The discussion also highlighted significant growth in ACM publications, with total articles rising from approximately 30,000 to 38,000 annually, driven in part by the creation of new journals. This growth presents opportunities to better support increased volume while maintaining and enhancing publication quality.

Breakout 2

The group discussed review models, noting that double-blind review is encouraged but not mandated, and that there is currently no policy on open review, which remains an area for

experimentation. They also discussed the influence of CS rankings, recognizing that ACM does not control them but that they impact the community, and suggested the possibility of developing an ACM ranking better aligned with its communities. The discussion focused most heavily on AI use in reviewing and authorship, acknowledging the difficulty of enforcement and yet noting the value of having policies in place. Views ranged from more restrictive approaches to more liberal policies that see AI as a tool to enhance human work, with agreement that further community discussion is needed.

Breakout 3

The group focused primarily on the use of AI in the reviewing process and shared experiences from other venues, such as AAAI, where AI is used for first-tier reviews and to summarize human reviews under human supervision, with final decisions still made by people. The discussion emphasized that a controlled and transparent use of AI can help manage review scale and workload and reduce problematic reviewing behaviors and is preferable to ad hoc or unsupervised use of AI to generate reviews.

The group also discussed approaches to addressing poor reviewing behavior, including policies used by venues such as ACL and NeurIPS, while noting concerns about fairness, role separation between authors and reviewers, and the constraints of tight review timelines. Limitations of AI-assisted reviewing were highlighted, including training data, potential bias, and the risk that clearly stated limitations in well-written papers could be misinterpreted as weaknesses.

Additional topics included alternative review models, such as abstract-level screening and revise-and-resubmit approaches to discourage repeated submissions without substantive changes. The discussion also addressed the impact of leaderboard-driven evaluation cultures and possible alternatives, such as pre-registration and methodology-first or results-blind reviewing, which could help support the publication of well-designed negative results.

Breakout 4

The group discussed best practices with regards to reviews and how to disseminate those online, through videos, or webinars and how to incentivize those.

Breakout 5

The group discussed the need to focus on the review process, which has been identified as problematic, particularly for journals and larger conferences. Challenges include difficulty finding reviewers, assessing reviewer credibility (especially for journals), frequent delays in journal reviews, and low visibility of reviewers within the community. The group discussed possible ways to address these issues and provided a more detailed summary in the shared document.

ACM Open: Next Steps (Jonathan Aldrich and Tom Zimmerman)

The goal of the ACM Open working group is to make sure that SIG leaders, conference leaders, and SIG members are informed about the latest updates to ACM OPEN and prepared to take next steps. A list of resources were distributed to SIG Chairs prior to the meeting.

Jonathan outlined the post-ACM Open submission workflow for authors. A corresponding author will submit the paper, and if it is accepted, it will proceed through the e-Rights system. The corresponding author will be responsible for completing the required license, metadata, and related forms. He then raised the question of how publishing costs will be covered.

There are 3 options:

1. ACM Open
2. Financial hardship waiver (FHW)
3. Author payment

There was a review provided of APC discounts for 2026, author communication and payment, conference presentation considerations and operational concerns and tooling.

Concerns were raised about the workload placed on proceedings chairs, especially at large conferences and given annual volunteer turnover. Wayne reported that a new administrative dashboard is now available to support both financial hardship waiver (FHW) review and overall proceedings management, with early feedback being positive. The process is still evolving and feedback is encouraged.

The rationale for having SIGs approve waivers was discussed. Because SIGs cover the cost of approved waivers, they have a direct stake in how waivers are handled and wanted the ability to customize waiver decisions to meet the needs of their communities. An online resource is available that outlines what information is collected in a waiver request and provides guidance to help SIGs make informed decisions. It was noted that there is an automatic policy in place for geographic hardship waivers.

Waivers are funded from the SIG budget, and the SIG Chair is responsible for determining who handles waiver decisions. This responsibility may be delegated to conference leadership or to individuals at the SIG level. For conferences that are co-sponsored by multiple SIGs, responsibility is shared and costs are allocated according to the co-sponsorship agreement. The lead SIG is responsible for making the waiver decisions, as outlined in the FAQ.

Neha suggested that each SIG designate volunteers to handle waiver decision-making. It was also suggested that assigning this role to a steering committee chair, rather than a general chair, could provide greater continuity. The SIG Chair retains discretion over how the required worksheet is completed to best meet the SIG's needs.

Action Items:

1. Complete the spreadsheet by identifying the individual responsible for approving or denying all financial hardship waiver requests for your SIG.
2. Communicate with your conference leaders and SIG members, linking them to items 1–4 and referencing items 5 and 6.

Please note the SIG Chair is currently listed by default, but it is the Chair's responsibility to delegate this role to another SIG member or a conference leader, if appropriate.

About the DEI Council (Timothy Pinkston)

The ACM DEI Council, established around 2019, serves as a cross-cutting group to coordinate diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) efforts across the ACM organization. Its mission is to coordinate and promote ACM's DEI policies and practices, establish new activities, and recommend policies to improve DEI. The Council oversees institutional diversity, including within ACM's governance structure and among leaders and participants in ACM programs and activities.

This year, the ACM DEI Council has focused on developing DEI best practices for use by all members of the ACM community and SIGs. A checklist for SIGs, originally developed by SIGIR in 2020, serves as a reference. Another ongoing project is improving geo-diversity and inclusion across ACM activities.

The Council continues to advance the *Words Matter* initiative, which raises awareness of language that may be non-inclusive. In addition, the Council is supporting efforts to celebrate the broader community through awareness month campaigns. SIG members interested in participating in this initiative were encouraged to contact Timothy.

A draft of the ACM demographics report is being finalized and may be published as a CACM report. The ACM-W program, which falls under the DEI Council, has continued to perform well, with over 5,000 attendees at its conference and the creation of several new chapters.

Discussion focused on questions to guide visioning and planning of Council activities to better serve the SIGs. Regarding the *Words Matter* initiative, it was clarified that different regions have different sensitivities, and the initiative focuses on words that could be offensive. The review process can potentially flag such language, and the DEI Council is available to work with conference organizers and authors to raise awareness. These guidelines are not mandatory but provide options for more inclusive language. ACM has a policy on inclusive language, which is advisory, and a separate policy on restricted content that can prevent a paper from being published.

The Council also provides accessibility guidelines on its website, which SIGs can adopt and share with conferences. The DEI Council maintains a globally diverse membership and collects input on non-inclusive language through the *Words Matter* website.

About CSTA (Jake Baskin)

The Computer Science Teachers Association (CSTA) focuses on pre-university space. Originally founded in 2004 as a project of ACM, CSTA now operates as a separate 501(c)(3) organization. It currently has 9,000 members and 60 chapters across 50 U.S. states, along with a handful of global pilot chapters. The standards released by CSTA have been widely adopted as K–12 computer science standards.

CSTA leads the Impact Fellowship and is a recognized leader in developing and updating CS education standards. This summer, the organization released an AI learning report outlining priorities for K–12 AI literacy, developed with input from a broad set of stakeholders. CSTA acknowledged ACM for financial support and emphasized its efforts to share resources with SIG communities.

Initiatives include creating “CSTA Spotlight” moments at ACM and SIG conferences, connecting SIG members with K–12 teachers and classrooms, inviting CSTA members to SIG conferences, and highlighting connections between new standards and SIG focus areas through publications and speaking opportunities.

In terms of teacher support, CSTA focuses on ongoing professional development. Most teachers learn alongside their students or slightly ahead, supported through online professional learning, the annual conference, and year-round chapter programs. Resource needs include funding to expand these efforts. While primarily English-language focused, CSTA has global chapters and is beginning to see coordination among them to extend the reach of its programs.

Envisioning SIG and ACM Futures (Yannis and Neha)

This agenda item was introduced at the October ACM Council meeting to discuss ACM’s future growth and to identify new growth opportunities from the perspective of the SIGs. The discussion focused on new operational models, scholarly communication, conferences, and emerging growth areas. See slides here: [Envisioning SIG and ACM Futures](#)

Action Item

- **All SIGs are requested to complete the growth input form** to identify new areas of growth for ACM from the SIG perspective:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1MTcCe94OHEAXOnNacBAaTAkcYjCVvSN_PbNGXbD1sBU/edit

ACM AI Leadership Summit (Elisa Bertino)

Elisa presented a program overview for the upcoming ACM AI Leadership Summit, scheduled for August 31 through September 2026 at the Hyatt Regency in Atlanta, GA. The summit is intended to foster a community-wide conversation about AI, and its motto—*Innovation. People. Impact.*—reflects the idea that innovation is created by people to make a meaningful impact on the world.

The overall summit program will be geared towards helping our younger community, PhD assistant professors, industry principal, practitioner, and so forth. The summit will include a keynote event, poster event, proceedings and a PhD program for students.

SIGs are encouraged to help by providing nominations for keynotes, panelists, panel chairs, (self-nominations are welcome), organizing the 3rd day multiple tracks, contributing to questions for various panels and promoting participation to the summit by junior researchers.

ACTION ITEM:

SIGs interested in participating in the AI Summit should add their SIG to the bottom of the page at:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1MTcCe94OHEAXOnNacBAaTAkcYjCVvSN_PbNGXbD1sBU/edit?tab=t.idndryz7iu

Housekeeping and Best Practices – Christine Harvey

Housekeeping

Christine Harvey led a session focused on gathering ideas and recommendations related to

1. what information SIG leaders need readily available to effectively lead their SIGs
2. how information and resources can best be shared and organized.

SIG representatives were asked to record their suggestions in a shared [Google document](#). Christine provided an overview of existing resources, including the SGB intranet site supported by a Google Drive, which contains meeting materials and agendas, ACM Open resources, SIG listings, awards guides, and the SIG Officer's Manual. Additional resources are also available on the ACM website.

For the first question—what information is needed to lead a SIG—several suggestions were offered. Participants recommended creating an organizational calendar for incoming officers that outlines major milestones and timelines so new leaders know what to expect and when actions are required (e.g., starting an RFP process months before a contract expiration).

The second discussion topic focused on how information can best be shared and resources organized. Current channels include

- Twice-yearly SGB meetings
- Monthly Coffee Hours hosted by Neha
- Google intranet site
- Google Drive
- ACM website resources
- Slack

Additional suggestions included increased use of Google Drive, sharing links early and often, providing clear deadlines with each task or survey, and moving older notes and materials into the Google Drive.

Best Practices Sharing

As a follow-up activity, SIGs were asked to use the [Google document](#) to share best practices and examples of what they are proud of within their SIGs, including individuals, roles, committees, initiatives, or unique practices that other SIGs might find useful.

Good of the Order – Neha

Neha led a discussion about where we are today and where we want to go as a group. We plan to continue having monthly Coffee Hours and Working Groups. SIGs were asked who they would like to hear from and what topics they would like covered in future Coffee Hours, and to add their suggestions to the Google document. Suggestions included inviting conference chairs to speak about ACM Open and inviting the Globalization Board.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30. Neha thanked everyone for joining.