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Open Access Transition Update
Why flip the Digital Library to Open Access?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal &amp; External Drivers:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ACM member-led petition &amp; ACM Executive Council statement to transition sustainably by end of 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Government and funder mandates (Plan S, OSTP memo, and various national policies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beneficial to authors and the computer sciences community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Benefits:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Innovation</strong>: OA creates greater readership and citation of research, thus furthering the field of computer science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Sustainability</strong>: re-balances ACM’s revenues to better align with the most engaged institutions worldwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Impact &amp; Discoverability</strong>: Increased access -&gt; Increased usage -&gt; Increased citations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACM OPEN Original Vision

• Launched January 2020 Following 18 Months of Development with Institutional Partners

• A Model to Sustainably Transition ACM Publications to Open Access Over Next 5-10 Years

• Funded by Institutions – If 100% of institutions signed on, then no APCs would be necessary

• Sustainability Means Transitioning $21M+ in DL Income Annually + Inflation Over Time

• Major Challenge is to Rebalance $21M+ of DL Income from ~2,600+ institutions

• Launched as Optional Model in Early Years with Intention to Transition to 100% OA over 5-10 Years.

• Principles of sustainability, transparency, fairness, & equity

• Mandatory OA When Critical Mass Achieved. This changed!!!!

• After Full Flip There will be Only 3 Ways to Publish with ACM (ACM Open, APC, or Waiver)
June 2020: ACM Adopts a 5-Year Timeline to Sustainable Open Access

**PETITION UPDATE**

**Final Update: ACM Resolution**

Robert Rand  
College Park, MD, United States

21 JUN 2020 —  
On Friday, June 19th, the ACM passed the following resolution:

Council adopts the goal of opening the Digital Library within five years given that this can be achieved in a way that is sustainable for ACM and with the understanding that this may take longer due to the impact of COVID-19. Reports on the progress of achieving this goal will be provided to the Executive Committee and Council.

---

**ACM is moving rapidly towards Open Access!!!! Why?**

- Government Mandates in US, Europe, Elsewhere
- Authors, Librarians, ACM Members want research to be Open
- It Makes Sense and Data Shows the World Benefits from Open Research
  - Must be done Sustainably!!!!
The ACM OPEN Model

- **Institutional Model** – Ideally, costs shared between libraries, CS Departments, and “Dean of Research” budgets

- **One Annual Price** - No APCs or Hidden Fees for Authors or Institutions. Unlimited Read + Publish. Tier-based Pricing.

- **10 Tier System** - Tiers Determined by Average of Previous 3 Years of Corresponding Author Publication History (i.e. – APC Eligible Articles)

- **Rebalancing of ACM Publication Income** as transition from “Read” to “Publish” occurs. For ACM \( \frac{1}{3} \) of institutions will pay more and \( \frac{2}{3} \) will pay less

- **Multi-Year Agreements** – 3-5 Years for predictability for Institutions & ACM

- **Financial Transparency**. Goal is to Cover Publication Costs, not increase “profits” or “surpluses”. Annual Accounting for Community (i.e. – CACM article)

- **Funder Mandate Compliant** – Plan S, OSTP, UKRI, JST, etc.

- **Financial Waivers to Address Equity Concerns** – 3-5% of articles annually from 100+ countries (540 articles / year)
### ACM Open Model - Original Challenge

What happens to 68% of ACM DL Income When All Research Articles are OA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top # Inst. By Article Output</th>
<th># of Articles (cumulative)</th>
<th>% of 2019 Published Research Articles (Expenses)</th>
<th>% of DL License Income (~$20M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 100</td>
<td>6,874</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 250</td>
<td>11,119</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 500</td>
<td>14,354</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top 1,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,387</strong></td>
<td><strong>86%</strong></td>
<td><strong>32%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,218</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Would be good to present 2022 publication and financial data to compare progress…
Ultimate Goal – More Balanced Revenues & Expenses

Basic Idea is that Most of Future Revenue Should Come from Institutions Affiliated with Authorship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top # Inst. By Article Output 2020</th>
<th># Articles (cumulative)</th>
<th>% of 2020 Published Research Articles (Expenses)</th>
<th>% of Future Revenue (~$24M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top 100</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 250</td>
<td>11,124</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 500</td>
<td>14,584</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top 1000</td>
<td>17,675</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21,304</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Took Very Conservative Approach with Minimal Reliance on non-publishing institutions*
Usage Benefit of Publishing OA in the DL

ACM compared the average number of downloads and citations for research articles published behind ACM DL Paywall to the average number of downloads and citations for research articles published on an Open Access basis in the ACM DL.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication Type</th>
<th>Usage Multiple</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>2.78x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>3.7x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>2.35x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on articles published in the ACM DL between 2013-2022 using DL download tracking system
### Citation Benefit of Publishing OA in DL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Type</th>
<th>Total Publications</th>
<th>Total Citations</th>
<th>Average Citations per Article</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>432,067</td>
<td>6,577,158</td>
<td>15.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>147,428</td>
<td>3,806,341</td>
<td>25.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on data from Dimensions taken May 8, spanning from 2013-2022
ACM's Global Publishing 2020-2022

~25,000 research articles published annually
ACM Open Global Participation
Institutions Subscribing to ACM Open (June 2023)

800+ institutions currently
## Snapshot of 2022 Publications – by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corresponding Author Region</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Asia &amp; Pacific</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe &amp; Central Asia</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asia</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East &amp; North Africa</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2023 ACM Open Progress by Tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier Levels</th>
<th>Article Range</th>
<th>Tier Pricing ($)</th>
<th>2020 # Institutions</th>
<th>2023 # Institutions</th>
<th>Institutions Transitioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>75+</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60-74</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40-59</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0-3</td>
<td>$6,000* ($2,500)</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions:**

- All Tier 10 institutions will gradually be reduced to ~$2,500 level as certain OA thresholds are met to mitigate the risk of short-term cancellations.

- Longer term cancellations of Tier 10 institutions remains the single largest risk for the ACM Open model.
Transition / Sustainability Risks

1. Lack of Progress in China, India, Canada, France, Japan = 41% of articles


3. Library Budgets Continue to Feel Pressure from Global Economy

4. Holdouts from Large and Mid-sized Research-Intensive Institutions – Will Join “When They Have To”

5. Long-Tail ACM Open Cancellations After Full Flip. Entire Model Intended to Mitigate This Risk

6. If ACM Delays Full-Flip Decision and Implementation, Risks from ACM Open Customers Not Supporting Model. Risks from Community.

7. Financial Impact on SIGs if Full Flip Too Early and Too Many Conference Authors Decide Not to Publish with ACM

8. Financial Impact on SIGs if Full Flip Too Late and Authors Decide to Stop Supporting ACM

9. Chicken or Egg Problem with Timing of Decision / Announcement of Full Flip
Strategic Risks

Pre-Flip Risks

- Lack of Progress in China (30% of Articles, including ICPS)
- ICPS – Quality / Quantity Risks. Closely Related to China Risk. (50% of ICPS from China)
- Lack of Progress in India, Canada, France, Japan (11% of Articles, including ICPS)
- Library Budgets Continue to Feel Pressure from Global Economy / COVID-19 – Cost Issue
- Holdouts From Large Research-Intensive Institutions – Will Join “When They Have To”? Will They?

Post-Flip Risks

- Level of Above Risks Will be Clearer, but Most Are Likely to Remain at Some Level
- Mandatory APCs For Authors Not Affiliated with ACM Open Institutions May Have an Impact on ACM’s Publishing Program, including Conference Publication & Registrations
- Will Long-Tail of Non-Publishing Institutions Cancel After All Content in the DL is OA?
- Will Smaller Institutions with Less Publishing Activity Cancel After All Content in the DL is OA?
ICPS: The ‘Early Flip’

In January 2024, International Conference Proceeding Series (ICPS) will transition to **Gold Open Access**

- All articles in this series will transition to Open Access
- Authors will need to pay an article processing charge (APC) or be affiliated with an institution participating in ACM Open
- 9,500 ICPS articles published in 2022

Communications are underway

- [FAQs](#) for authors and conference organizers
- This is a big step towards transitioning our portfolio, and more is to come

ACM will be the first major computer sciences publisher to transition to 100% Open Access; we believe this will benefit authors and the community, but risks exist

---

*Association for Computing Machinery*

*Advancing Computing as a Science & Profession*
ACM Publications Finance Article
Published Open Access in Communications of the ACM

BY WENDY HALL, DIVESH SRIRAVASAI, AND SCOTT T. DOLMAN

ACM Publications Finances for 2021

IN THE SPRING OF 2020, ACM began a multi-year transition to become a fully Open Access (OA) Publisher. One of the publicly stated requirements for that transition was to develop and implement a sustainability plan to ensure that ACM Publications could continue to operate at a high-level with the quality of its publications and the services it provides to the community, including the ability to invest in new initiatives such as library programs, membership, and events. The sustainability plan is based on a comprehensive analysis of the financial health of the ACM in past years and future prospects. As a public benefit non-profit organization, we are committed to providing trusted and essential information services to the ACM community, including journals, conferences, books, and websites. The sustainability plan is designed to ensure that the ACM can continue to operate at a high-level with the quality of its publications and the services it provides to the community, including the ability to invest in new initiatives such as library programs, membership, and events.

When ACM launched the OA model in January 2020, we committed to the computing community to provide our traditional high-quality publications at a single price. Our goal was to make ACM publications available to all. ACM provides significant ongoing benefits with ACM publications, and the ACM will continue to invest in the sustainability of its publishing programs.

As a result, the sustainability plan is designed to ensure that the ACM can continue to operate at a high-level with the quality of its publications and the services it provides to the community, including the ability to invest in new initiatives such as library programs, membership, and events. The sustainability plan is designed to ensure that the ACM can continue to operate at a high-level with the quality of its publications and the services it provides to the community, including the ability to invest in new initiatives such as library programs, membership, and events.
# 2022 Calendar Year Pubs Finances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Type</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DL “Read-Only” Consortia, Govt, Corporate Licenses</td>
<td>$18,600,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACM Open Institutional Licenses</td>
<td>$4,391,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL Article Pay Per View</td>
<td>$62,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Membership Dues</td>
<td>$316,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A La Carte Subscription Revenues (inc. SIGs)</td>
<td>$864,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIG Hardcopy Magazine Subscriptions (Interactions/InRoads)</td>
<td>$123,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital SIG Packages</td>
<td>$135,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>$1,024,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICPS Proceedings Fees</td>
<td>$366,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC Revenue</td>
<td>$227,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other Pubs Revenue (ACM Books, etc.)</td>
<td>$291,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,404,456</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2022 Calendar Year Pubs Finances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenses</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>$4,502,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>$5,915,594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proceedings</td>
<td>$6,597,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Library</td>
<td>$6,404,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents / Cost of Sales</td>
<td>$3,106,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications / DL Boards</td>
<td>$166,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenses</strong></td>
<td><strong>$26,693,184</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Publishing Program Net**  
$(288,728)$ or -1%
### 2022 Calendar Year Pubs Finances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2022 Article-Level Expenses</th>
<th>Magazines</th>
<th>Journals</th>
<th>Proceedings</th>
<th>DL, Cost of Sales, &amp; Volunteer Boards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2022 Cost</td>
<td>$5,915,594</td>
<td>$4,502,039</td>
<td>$6,597,559</td>
<td>$9,677,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of APC-eligible articles</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>3,246</td>
<td>21,394</td>
<td>24,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing cost per article</td>
<td>$23,107.79</td>
<td>$1,386.95</td>
<td>$308.38</td>
<td>$388.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL cost per article</td>
<td>$388.00</td>
<td>$388.00</td>
<td>$388.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost per article</td>
<td>$23,495.79</td>
<td>$1,774.95</td>
<td>$696.38</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Timeline to Full-Flip

2023

(1) 2020-2023 Progress to 35%
(2) China, India, Canada, France Risks (41%)
(3) ICPS 10K Risk
(4) CACM flipping to 100% OA in 2023
(5) New Staff Hired
(6) Technical Infrastructure / Reporting Systems etc.

2024

(1) ICPS early flip: 9.5k / 25k articles annually flipping to mandatory OA
(2) 18 Months to Announce & Prepare for Full-Flip
(3) Community Outreach
(4) Continued China Engagement

2025

(1) 60-70% of articles will be OA
(2) % of DL Income Transitioned Becomes Most Important Metric
(3) Positive Impact of APC Income from ICPS TBD?
(4) GO / NO GO decision by ACM Council June 2025

2026

(1) 100% articles OA
(2) What Happens After Full-Flip?
(3) Impacts All Authors Submitting Articles to ACM Publications after 1/1/23
(4) Impact of Mandatory APC Policy on ACM Conferences & SIGs?
(5) How to Fund Potential Shortfall?

Full flip on 31 December 2025
ICPS: The ‘Early Flip’

- In January 2024, International Conference Proceedings Series (ICPS) will transition to Gold Open Access
  - All articles in this series will transition to Open Access
  - Authors will need to pay an article processing charge (APC) or be affiliated with an institution participating in ACM Open
  - 9,500 published articles in 2022

- Communications are underway
  - FAQs for authors and conference organizers
  - This is a big step towards transitioning our portfolio, and more is to come

ACM will be the first major computer sciences publisher to transition to Open Access; we believe this will benefit authors and the community
Considerations for SIGs

• By 12/31/25 it is expected that 60-70% of ACM Conference and ACM Journal articles will be published as part of ACM Open multi-year licenses.

• Remaining 30-40% of articles will require an APC of $700 / $1,000 in 2026 if not eligible for economic / financial waivers.

• What is less certain is the % of DL revenue will be transitioned and secure by that time.

• Best way to reduce the % of authors impacted by this full-flip being required to pay APCs is writing to department heads and university librarians urging them to sign ACM Open licenses with ACM.

• What will happen with Joint ACM / IEEE Conferences? Need Community engagement!

• What will be the impact on ACM Conferences? Concerns raised about authors not feeling like they are “double-charged” for registration, conference presentation, and APC fees.

• What is impact on SIGs that depend on $3.5-$4.0 DL allocation?
Actions for ACM Staff, SIG Leaders, Community

- Address potential confusion around APCs, Sheridan conference paper fees, presentation fees for authors, and conference registration fees

- Engage Membership, Authorship, SIGs to actively lobby institutions to join ACM Open as soon as possible before full-flip

- Staff to conduct SIG / Conference focused Webinars on OA / ACM Open in November. More to come...

- ACM/IEEE Co-sponsored conferences and journals is an important question. IEEE approach to OA is very different than ACM’s. ACM leadership is engaging with IEEE leadership about how to address. Need Community Support!!!!!

- Staff and Volunteers to Engage with China and Other High Risk Countries

- Council and SIGs to Start Considering Impacts of Potential Shortfall

- Actively develop DL Value Proposition to mitigate the risks of non-publishing institutions canceling over longer-term post flip

- Regular Quarterly Progress Updates to the Executive Committee

- Other actions? – suggestions welcome
Introduction

• E+P Committee established in 2012 by Publications Board to investigate and adjudicate allegations of ethical misconduct in the Publications process.

• 2017 Committee started reporting high-level statistics on the types of cases it has investigated

• Since 2017 Committee has investigated ~225 cases

• 40-50 active cases under investigation currently

• 50-55% of these cases result in proven violations with range of penalties

• Over last 3-4 years there has been a noticeable increase in allegations
  – Related to ACM Conferences
  – Related to ICPS Conferences
  – Better tools exist to support investigations
  – ACM has invested more resources for investigations – systems, legal, etc.
  – Community sees more action and claimants appear more willing to come forward
Oversight / Governance – Pubs Cases

- Publications Board
  - Wendy Hall, co-Chair
  - Divesh Srivastava, co-Chair

- Ethics & Publications Committee –
  - Michael Kirkpatrick, Chair
  - Shan Lu, Vice Chair

- Program Committee Chairs for pre-publication cases

- HQ Staff
  - Scott Delman, Director of Publications
  - Barbara Ryan, Intellectual Property & Rights Manager

- ACM COPE for cases that overlap or get referred

- Investigations and Decision Making is governed by established ACM Publications Policies and ACM-wide Policies
ACM Publications Policies
https://www.acm.org/publications/policies

• Policy on Publication Rights & Licensing (formerly Copyright Policy)
• Policy on Authors
• Policy on Readership
• Policy on Inappropriate Content
• Policy on Peer Review
• Policy on Plagiarism, Misrepresentation, and Falsification
• Policy on Research Involving Human Participants and Subjects
• Conflict of Interest Policy
• Policy on Coercion and Abuse in the ACM Publications Process
• Policy on the Withdrawal, Correction, Retraction, and Removal of Works from ACM Publications and the ACM Digital Library
• Penalties for Publication Violations
• Software Copyright Notice
• Etc.

• At any given moment, ACM is investigating ~40-50 cases of potential misconduct
• https://www.acm.org/publications/policies/ethics-and-plagiarism-update
Investigations

• Starting point for all investigations is Report a Violation web form

• All allegations must be accompanied by evidence for action to be taken

• All allegations reviewed by co-chairs of E+P and HQ Staff to determine if initial evidence provided is credible and substantive. If so, investigation is launched. Also decided what will be the Decision Making Authority (DMA)

• ACM joined international Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) in 2019, which provides guidance and best practices for investigating allegations of publishing-related misconduct across entire scholarly publishing world

• Investigations take between 3-12 months on average, which is far too long, but is largely a function of volume of cases and bandwidth of staff and volunteers

• The results of all investigations are subject to ACM Disclosure Policy….what information can and can not be disclosed publicly and to employers
Types of Cases

- Plagiarism
- Paper Mills
- Collusion Rings
- Peer Review Misconduct
- Undeclared Conflicts of Interest
- Gift Authorship
- Simultaneous Submissions
- Machine Generated Papers
- Falsification of Research Data / Fraudulent Publication
- Coercion, Abuse, Harassment – often involve advisers and graduate students
Investigations / Tools / Process

• ACM currently utilizes various types of tools / systems for investigations
  — iThenticate for plagiarism related allegations
  — Guillaume Cabanac “Problematic Paper Screener” for detecting tortured phrases that are trust indicators of fraudulent publication
  — Experimenting with suite of Trust Marker identification tools to identify various types of misconduct, including citation-related irregularities, AI generated text, plagiarism, tortured phrases, etc.
  — Retraction Watch to identify previous retractions of authors under investigation

• Will be experimenting with STM Integrity Hub, which identifies Paper Mills and New Integrity related services being developed in industry

• ACM is building a Conflict of Interest Service to identify relationships between participants in peer review process (i.e.- authors, reviewers, PC members, etc.)

• Retracted Papers as a result of decisions are public in the DL and registered in the Crossref CrossMark service.

• Depending on nature and complexity of case, ACM may involve legal counsel and private investigators to conduct interviews of confidential witnesses, gather evidence, translate non-English documents and evidence, etc.

• Depending on nature, complexity, and seriousness of allegations, DMA may involve E+P Chair and Vice Chair with Staff, full E+P Committee, or full Pubs Board

• Accused and Claimants are notified of decisions with limited information about penalties shared with claimants, but they are informed of decision

• Serious violations result in bans, which include authorship, peer reviewing, PC participation, editorial board participation, etc. Bans stored in a confidential Violations DB.
Observations

- Collusion Networks do exist and it does appear different communities are aware of some of them

- Large power dynamic differences between faculty and students publishing papers

- Some misconduct is a result of bad actors with unethical motivations

- Some misconduct is a result of cultural differences and lack of education of what is considered acceptable standards of good behavior

- Goal is to protect integrity of scholarly record, correct breaches of integrity, prevent future violations, educate community (one by one if necessary)
Recommendations to SGB

• ACM has developed an infrastructure for investigating and adjudicating allegations of misconduct, but the CS community has a responsibility to educate global community about acceptable standards of good behavior for ACM Conference publication.

• Program Committee Chairs should utilize violations database before PC invitations go out to ensure they are not inviting violators to participate.

• PCs need to clearly communicate policies and acceptable standards of behavior in Calls for Papers and PC and Reviewer Instructions

• ACM will launch a Peer Review Portal with an “online course” to educate PC members and reviewers about acceptable practice for conducting peer review

• Encourage, but not pressure or coerce, community to act. (i.e.- claimants, witnesses, etc.).
Interim Report Highlights of the Joint Task Force on Workshop Publications

Joe Konstan, Chair Task Force
Scott Delman
Should ACM Publish Workshop Proceedings? And if so, how?

- This question was raised during a year in which the interim EiCs of ACM’s International Conference Proceedings Series noted that a substantial number of workshops were being submitted to ICPS for publication, including:
  - Independent workshops and workshops associated with independent conferences
  - Workshops associated with ACM conferences that don’t directly publish the workshop proceedings
  - Independent entities that call themselves conferences, but in fact run more like workshops

- This is an evolving situation – at one time most workshops would not consider publishing proceedings; today publishing a paper at a workshop confers some status and may be the ticket to funding to attend the associated conference.
Task Force Charge

• For obvious reasons, Joint Task Force Created!

• TF Charge:
  
  “Explore both the need and strategy for developing an ACM publication channel to publish high quality workshops in computing, to complement our existing publication channels for ACM journals, ACM conference proceedings, and ICPS”

  Answer key questions such as:
  
  • how do we define a workshop and distinguish it from a conference?
  • How do we deal with ACM workshops currently published in ICPS?
  • How do we want to deal with non-ACM workshops?
  • What are the minimum peer review standards for ACM published workshop proceedings?

• This Interim Report being distributed to SGB and Publications Board. Request for feedback no later than December 1, 2023

• Publications Board will also receive Interim Report

• Final Report to be distributed with proposed action items to both Boards by 12/31/23
Joint Task Force Composition

The Board chairs appointed members representing the two boards:

- **Pubs Board Co-Chairs Appointed the following members:**
  - Joe Konstan, chair (Publications Board)
  - Beng Chin Ooi (Publications Board)
  - Lin Uhrmacher (Publication Board)

- **SGB Liaison to Pubs Board:**
  - Jonathan Aldrich (SGB and Publications Board)

- **SGB Chair Appointed the following members:**
  - Sayan Ranu (SGB)
  - Saket Saurabh (SGB)
  - Johanne Trippas (SGB)
  - Dakuo Wang (SGB)
Findings

On the distinction between conferences and workshops

- **Line Between Conference & Workshop is thin** - The term “workshop” is applied very broadly. It includes events with papers, review processes, and selectivity comparable to high-quality conferences. It also includes events where most papers are short, review seems to be very light, and all or nearly all submissions are accepted.

- The same is true for events that use the term “conference.” While most ACM conferences maintain high selectivity and a strong review process, computing conferences outside ACM have widely varying review processes.

- Many ICPS conference submissions have papers that are only 4-5 pages and seem to accept nearly all of them, not very different than many ACM workshop papers that are presented but not published by ACM.
Findings

On the purpose of workshops at conferences, cont.

• Several reasons were identified that contribute to the interest in publishing papers in workshop proceedings:
  – The increased pressure for publication (and expectations of increased numbers of peer-reviewed publications)
  – The difficulty of getting funding to attend conferences without having a work to present at the conference
  – Indeed, some (non-ACM) conferences organize workshops specifically to fit the rejected papers of the conference program

• The nature and scale of workshops at conferences varies widely, but many conferences have vibrant workshop programs with multiple days, large numbers of workshops, and workshops with keynotes, panels, and papers.

• Some conferences include them in proceedings…..many do not….
Findings

On the archival nature of workshop papers

- While workshop papers were once intentionally non-archival in CS (so authors could later publish the work when it was complete), most authors today seem more interested in getting their work archivally published.

- There are open questions about the re-publish-ability of work published at workshops. The general practice seems to be that workshop papers can be turned into conference or journal papers later with sufficient new content. In the case of submitting an extended workshop paper to a conference, there is often no formal process for annotating submissions to indicate the prior publication (and double-anonymous peer review may preclude citation).
Findings

On the value of workshop papers being in the ACM DL

- Task force members were divided on the value of workshop papers being in the ACM DL
  - Some members felt the most important role of the DL is to be comprehensive; any relevant literature in the field should be found through the DL
  - Other members felt the most important role of the DL is curation; only work that has been properly vetted (e.g., through a rigorous peer review process) should be found in the DL

- Task force members agreed that both authors and workshop organizers valued having workshop proceedings published in the DL

- Note that today many ACM workshops publish outside the DL (e.g., in C-EUR).
Findings

On the peer review of workshop papers

• Workshops (and particularly workshops at conference) often have much looser standards for those in charge of carrying out the peer review process.
  – It is common for graduate students (even at times those who’ve never published in the field) to propose and chair workshops
  – There are rarely standards imposed by the sponsoring conference on the minimum criteria for being a program chair, program committee member, or reviewer for a workshop

• The task force recognizes that this flexibility has developmental value, but also may undermine the confidence one should have in the published works
Findings

On the changes likely in view of ACM Open

- Task force members felt that treating all workshop papers the same as conference papers under ACM Open could cause significant problems:
  - Few authors at non-ACM Open institutions would consider publishing a workshop paper worth the ACM Open APC charges associated with a conference paper
  - Even authors at ACM Open institutions may be concerned about the institutional cost of moving up in subscription tiers due to workshop papers
  - Workshop organizers, realizing this, would likely choose to publish elsewhere rather than continue publishing through ACM

- Task force members did not want to drive workshops away

- But perhaps putting the cart before the horse.....ACM Open business models for Workshops can be addressed
Findings

On the publication of workshop proceedings from ACM conferences in ICPS

- The task force did not feel that the process under which workshops at ACM-sponsored conferences are published through ICPS makes sense.
  - It creates duplicate effort, with the conference leadership deciding whether to accept the workshop into the conference and ICPS editors having to perform a separate evaluation for publication.
  - The ICPS editors lack the proximity to the community and expertise to evaluate the workshop in the way conference leadership could.
  - It moves the decision from the SIG to Publications, which seems inappropriate for conference activities.

- Current vision of ICPS is to be independent / non-ACM sponsored events.

- Though we did not examine this case in detail, the same argument could apply to ACM chapter conferences.
Principles Driving Recommendations

• Provide a variety of options to workshop organizers and sponsoring SIGs – no one size fits all solutions.

• Keep the locus of authority where it currently lies. The Publications Board should set standards for publication types; the SGB should oversee events and ensure that their publication products comply with policy.

• Accept a wide range of quality publications into the ACM DL but ensure that the markers of quality are readily identifiable and usable as search criteria.
Each recommendation is framed in terms of the Board to which it would be made. If the Boards are generally in support of these recommendations, the task force is willing to provide guidance on suggested details (or is happy to allow the Board to address the recommendations within its own processes).
Recommendations

Recommendations to the Publications Board (which will require cooperation with the DL Board and SGB)

- Define an explicit article type for a workshop paper. In particular, be explicit about the number of reviews, the qualifications of peer reviewers and program chairs, and the length of papers.

- Evaluate whether conference paper and journal paper should also be different article types.

- Extend ACM’s policy covering self-plagiarism to be explicit about how workshop papers can be extended into research articles (conference and journal papers).

- Revise the ICPS charter to include non-ACM workshops, not just conferences.

- Determine whether ACM wants to publish non-ACM workshop paper abstracts (e.g., where there are no full-length papers or where full-length papers are published in arXiv, etc.); if so, this specific case might warrant a sub-brand of ICPS known as ICPS Abstracts. Pubs Board needs to decide, but would like feedback from SGB

- Publicize these decisions and mechanisms once made.
Recommendations

Recommendations to the SGB (which will require cooperation with the Publications Board and staff)

- Assume ownership for publications decisions associated with workshops associated with ACM-sponsored conferences.
  - The SGB collectively should set guidelines for minimum standards and procedures.
  - Individual SIGs may choose to set more restrictive guidelines.
  - Determine options for workshop publication (e.g., part of conference publications, separate ACM publication, etc.).
  - Determine whether ACM workshops should be able to publish outside of ACM DL (currently allowable but should be reconsidered).

- Develop workflow for ACM conference workshop approval and publication.

- Regularly review the compliance of SIG publications with standards for their publication types.
Recommendations

Recommendations to the Publications Board and Business Working Group

- Develop an OA pricing model for workshop proceedings that can support ACM’s continued publication of such proceedings. Suggestions include:
  - offering an option of publishing workshops with abstracts-only (which would not be an APC-eligible publication)
  - providing a discounted APC appropriate for workshop papers that fit within a target length (perhaps 6 pages or fewer); evaluating whether those would be applied to institutional subscriptions on the same or different basis
  - publishing fully peer-reviewed research articles (which would be treated the same as conference papers)
Recommendations to the SGB and Business Working Group

- Assess impacts of ACM Open conversion to conference publication and attendance (in particular workshop attendance) to inform both BWG discussions on pricing and SIG planning for ACM Open.
Recommendations to the DL Board (which will require cooperation with the Publications Board and staff)

- Implement an article type for workshop papers (may want a different term) in conjunction with Pubs definition.
- Implement clear identification of article types on article landing pages and on rendered publication displays.
- Implement clear identification of venue types (including ICPS, ACM conference, ACM journal, ACM workshop) on article landing pages and rendered publication displays.
- Implement (and disseminate training on) search features to allow searchers to search for / exclude workshop papers.
- Implement interface to allow workshops (and ICPS volumes) to specify article types for each article. Conferences have this interface.
- Ensure that reviewing statistics are displayed within an article type.
Recommendations

Recommendations to ACM EC and/or Council

- Formally adopt guidelines and standards for workshop publication to apply to all non-SIG ACM-sponsored events with publications (e.g., Board and Council-sponsored conferences and workshops).

- Determine whether ACM chapter events should continue to be published through ICPS or should have a different “direct path” to publication through an ACM entity authorized to vet and oversee publications from those events.

- Decide the broader policy question of what ACM unit content must be published by ACM, which may be published by ACM or outside, and which (if any) can only be published outside. This becomes increasingly important in the context of ACM Open. Can ACM India / China publish their content with Elsevier?
Newsletters

- Newsletters have historically operated outside the range of “Centralized Services” that conferences, journals, and magazines operate within, such as production and rights assignment.

- Due to the relationship between production, article tagging, funding data, rights assignment, OA, funder mandates, and DL platform services, it is becoming more important that Newsletters that are publishing research articles flow through some of the same production and eRights workflows that conferences and journals flow through.

- There are currently 14 ACM Newsletters that regularly publish peer reviewed research articles (hundreds annually), but the peer review process is not transparent, article type tags are often inaccurate, and these papers do not flow through the regular eRights workflow, so they will not be counted as part of ACM Open or have the appropriate rights assigned.

- Rights Management staff and ACM Production staff will be working on these issues over the coming months.