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- CHI Steering committee
- CHI management
- CHI Scientific aspects
- CHI organizational learning and documentation organization
- Proposal for functioning
- Current list of topics
- Other items
CREATION OF THE CHI SC

- First group of people invited and feedback received 3 main groups
  - CHI chairs for management aspect mainly
  - CHI TPCs and CHI paper chairs for scientific aspects
  - Specific aspects
    - ACM (Ashley, Farrah)
    - Accessibility (J Lazar not ok) – to be replaced
    - Student volunteers (Lindsay – not contacted yet)
    - CHI Asia connection (Jinwoo Kim)
CURRENT LIST OF MEMBERS

- Joseph A. Konstan konstan@cs.umn.edu
- Philippe Palanque palanque@irit.fr
- Scooter Morris scooter@cgl.ucsf.edu
- Matt Jones mattjonez@gmail.com
- Allison Druin allisond@umd.edu
- Tovi Grossman Tovi.Grossman@autodesk.com
- Clifford Lampe cacl@umich.edu
- Jinwoo Kim jinwoo@yonsei.ac.kr
- Kori Inkpen kori@microsoft.com
- Andy Cockburn andy@cosc.canterbury.ac.nz
- Carl Gutwin gutwin@cs.usask.ca
- Regan Mandryk regan@cs.usask.ca
- Stephen Brewster Stephen.Brewster@glasgow.ac.uk
- Ashley Cozzi acozzi@hq.acm.org
First meeting proposed around CHI 2017 TPC in Denver

- Only few people available
- I have the impression there is a need to join the TPC meeting to see how things are going and to get feedback
- Have a partial meeting and see for another one before CHI? – financial implications (maybe)

Sunday seems the best: Approval?
First meeting proposed around CHI 2017 TPC in Denver.

- Only few people available.
- I have the impression there is a need to join the TPC meeting to see how things are going and to get feedback.
- Have a partial meeting and see for another one before CHI? – financial implications (maybe).
- Sunday seems the best: Approval?
Tendency curve for CHI papers and notes submission/acceptance

\[
y = 3,7092x^2 - 72,67x + 447,05 \\
R^2 = 0,953
\]

\[
y = 0,9182x^2 - 19,512x + 125,18 \\
R^2 = 0,9437
\]

EVOLUTION OF PAPERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>CHI '04</th>
<th>CHI '05</th>
<th>CHI '06</th>
<th>CHI '07</th>
<th>CHI '08</th>
<th>CHI '09</th>
<th>CHI '10</th>
<th>CHI '11</th>
<th>CHI '12</th>
<th>CHI '13</th>
<th>CHI '14</th>
<th>CHI '15</th>
<th>CHI '16</th>
<th>CHI '17</th>
<th>CHI '18</th>
<th>CHI '19</th>
<th>CHI '20</th>
<th>CHI '21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>578</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>1532</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>2120</td>
<td>2435</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>2638</td>
<td>2836</td>
<td>3042</td>
<td>3255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Projection**
Evolution of Attendance

\[ y = 0.7249x^3 - 15.591x^2 + 201.96x + 1431.3 \]

\[ y = 1.5128x^3 - 30.711x^2 + 289.53x + 1566.5 \]

EVOLUTION OF ATTENDANCE
## Evolution of Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 444</td>
<td>3 288</td>
<td>2 579</td>
<td>2 504</td>
<td>3 159</td>
<td>3 192</td>
<td>3 399</td>
<td>3 641</td>
<td>3 920</td>
<td>4 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 616</td>
<td>3 443</td>
<td>2 997</td>
<td>2 850</td>
<td>3 624</td>
<td>3 752</td>
<td>4 105</td>
<td>4 533</td>
<td>5 045</td>
<td>5 650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projection 2 linear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 259</td>
<td>3 359</td>
<td>3 459</td>
<td>3 559</td>
<td>3 659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 724</td>
<td>3 824</td>
<td>3 924</td>
<td>4 024</td>
<td>4 124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RFP FOR CHI 2020 AND CHI 2021

- **RFP 2020**
  - RFP updated for CHI 2020 (taking into account current use for CHI 2016, evolution of paper acceptance (partly 1 more track out of 2 probable)
  - ACM (John Otero is in charge of sending it to the list of 5 cities (Seattle, Honolulu, San Diego, Phoenix, Los Angeles)

- **RFP 2021**
  - RFP for CHI 2021 to be processed by CHI SC until end of this year (or early 2017)
  - ACM is ok with the delay
Management of evolutions item per item

- Issue that if it is not done this year, it will never happen (the visibility window for one element is one CHI conference only)
- No place for discussing it and arguing on the long term (as argument is only based on the possible implementation in the coming year)
- No visibility of the past and the current requests and what will happen next

Participatory aspects (see below)

- CHI 2016 proposed the call for AC
- No individual feedback was given
- People were directed to Jofish blog and to the list of ACs on CHI 2016 website

CHI SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS
CHI ORGANIZATIONAL LEARNING AND DOCUMENTATION ORGANIZATION
CHI processes

Site selection
Site Selection Process

• Based on detailed discussion with Ashley and then phone call with John and Farrah

• Our standard practice is to provide the meeting requirements, have the cities propose their recommended space, conduct a site visit where we shift the space based on experience and ideal flow, contract that space, CLC and the Tech Program Chairs sometimes re-shuffle that space once the program is clear, and then we can re-shuffle that again once we have a better idea on registration projections. This of course all depends on maximum capacities in each room. CLC works with the Tech Program Chairs to do this.
Pros and cons of proposals

Selection of location

Location and date selected, contract to be processed

Contract signature

Sumissions, program construction

Contract

Space reshuffling

Contract updating

Program implemented on location
PROPOSAL FOR FUNCTIONNING
Pre-process information and propose for a vote (as Aaron for the specialized conferences, grants, …)

- Currently everything goes to the EC flat (i.e. not pre-processed in terms of data, history, arguments, …)
- Every point is discussed by email (each email bringing a new point)

Loren could do the allocation of tasks to the various people in the EC with a proposed date for feedback

Approval? Other options?

PROPOSAL FOR FUNCTIONNING
CURRENT LIST OF TOPICS ON THE TABLE
CURRENT LIST OF TOPICS ON THE TABLE

- CHI DC extension
- CHI 2019
- TPC carry over for mc for CHI 2018
- Symposiums at CHI conference
- Antti blog post about the evolution of CHI
CURRENT LIST OF TOPICS ON THE TABLE

- CHI DC extension
  - There is an EC
  - to deal with a larger number of student (proposal is double the number)
  - How to ensure the same output as currently done (for students)
  - Quality of the role of DC is questioned (not helping the students who would need more help)
CHI 2019
- Taking opportunity of the historically low value of the GBP
- Issue of contracting too early (changes more difficult if something happens)
- Expenditures on the wrong FY
TPC carry over for mc for CHI 2018

- Promise from enrolment for CHI 2017
- Argument that she refused other jobs because of this commitment
- Was offered Paper chair + advisory role to TPC 2018
- Still under negotiation (bigger group involved Loren, Aaron, Cliff, me, ...)

CURRENT LIST OF TOPICS ON THE TABLE
Symposiums at CHI conference

- New this year as a specific item
- Main points: avoid the workshop procedure (submission, evaluation, EA summary) and avoid workshop fee model (registration WS + 1 day conference registration)
- Proposed fee model to be higher than WS but without the registration to one day conference
- Currently: Decision at CHI conference chair level
CURRENT LIST OF TOPICS ON THE TABLE

- Antti blog post about the evolution of CHI
  - This is the core problem of CHI SC
  - We need to tackle all the points and to identify a clear strategy for the future
  - Issues of low quality and small increments in publications
OTHER ITEMS TO ADD TO DISCUSSION
Volunteer development for CHI - ACs

- Crowdsourcing ACs
  - At CHI 2016 Jofish decided to have an open call for ACs
  - Question was raised about candidates not getting feedback
  - Jofish decided and implemented a public posting of results made up of
    - List of accepted ACs visible on the CHI 2016 conference website
    - Blog post about the overall result
    - No specific feedback as this would be too much work for SCs
  - Looks very similar to not send the reviews of papers to authors but only to display the program on the conference website
    - What about ways of people to improve their CV or their application (not enough information)
    - What about rebuttal?
    - Is there a submission format?
Volunteer development for CHI – main roles

• To be validated and selected from a list by SIGCHI EC
  • Chairs, TPC chairs, Paper chairs
  • Balance
  • Timing availability

• Other venues
  • Currently entirely appointed by chairs
  • How to grow people (multiple year programme proposed by CHI SC) might be in conflict with chairs desires (define a ratio of selected by chair/appointed by CHI SC)
Volunteer development for CHI – SCs

- To be validated and selected from a list by SIGCHI EC?
  - Number of SCs
  - Chairs of SCs
  - Evolution of SCs
  - Monitoring of SCs
  - Data collection

- Current practice
  - Based on keywords of submissions
  - Possible to have tentative numbers refined according to actual submissions
  - Currently entirely appointed by paper chairs
  - How to grow people (multiple year programme proposed by CHI SC) might be in conflict with chairs desires (define a ratio of selected by chair/appointed by CHI SC)
QUESTIONS