

# ACM History Committee Meeting Minutes, February 18, 2019 (v. 2)

---

## 1. Welcome (Rau)

- Meeting began at 8:00am PST via Zoom

## 2. Attendees (House)

- Erik Rau (meeting leader)
- Vicki Almstrum (minutes)
- Carol Hutchins
- Roy Levin (Turing oversight) (arrived late due to illness)
- Bernadette Longo
- Sachin Maheshwari
- Len Shustek
- Kim Tracy
- Mary Whitton
- Jeffrey Yost

Committee members not attending:

- Barbara Boucher Owens (chair)
- Ursula Martin
- Tao Xie (SGB rep)

Guest

- Chuck House (Key Persons project)

## 3. Minutes from January meeting (Almstrum)

- Correction of Tom Haigh's last name spelling, then approved.

## 4. Budget update (Whitton, House, Levin, Len, Hutchins)

- Mary circulated the proposed budget. She mentioned that she would still like to look at the Exemplar Projects and how that aspect should be funded.
- Discussed whether a total budget of \$70,000 is too much of an increase. Someone observed that the committee usually underspends its budget. Discussed spending this year to date and the expenses that will be coming during the spring.
- Mary suggested considering a bundle of activities that run across two or more years. Adding to the category of grants and awards, rather than travel.
- Erik had a suggestion for the funding for the bridge years between major workshops. Going forward, should plan for associated activities carried out during the "off" years and rolling off of the workshops.

## 5. Status of Turing project (Levin)

- Roy had spoken with David Jefferson over the weekend. The last few catch-up projects are proceeding as quickly as they can, with only two that must be completed at this point. David is having a hard time reaching Andy Yao, so is working on reaching him from several angles. The Dick Karp interview will be accomplished by licensing an existing interview through the Simons Institute.
- Question: Does this mean the project has caught up? The original proposal from 2015 identified many individuals for whom there was no existing interview. For other award winners, other interviews existed from perhaps 20 years ago. The Turing interviewee committee should return to that list of potential interviewees and revisit the follow-up actions proposed at that time. In some cases, Mike Williams had investigated obtaining rights to earlier interviews.
- The original project was proposed in 2015 and was expected to take three years. We now know it will take closer to four years.
- At this point, the Turing website does not include a page for every award through 2015. Would be appropriate for the committee to look at the status of the website and project and strategize for the next steps?

## 6. Status of Key People videos project (House)

- Chuck: The project has just gotten underway. He has a list of 25 people as candidate interviewees over the coming six months. No interviews have been completed yet. Chuck anticipates completing about 12 interviews this year.
- Most interviews will be Zoom videos. For each interviewee, Chuck will explain the purpose of the program and that we are focusing on the interviewee's activities related to ACM. He will work with each interviewee to determine the most appropriate interview leader(s). Chuck will be available for the interview leader role when needed. He has sensed initial excitement about the project.
- Roy: Do you hope to get answers to some standard set of questions? Is there a template to share? Chuck: In general, these are winners of some particular award. The focus is to look at their ACM service in general, although some awardees are not members of ACM. The questions will strive to gain insights into the interviewee's commitment to the society, what they did to earn the award, the impact of the award for them personally. Question Chuck has discussed with Pat: Can the awards receive more "life" through these interviews?
- Suggestion was that each interview should include a 5-minute retrospective on the award winner's career to set the context. By including a brief background even for broadly interviewed folks, each interview will be more self-contained.
- Chuck is developing instructions to help each interviewee know how to prepare the computer, lighting, sound quality, and background to ensure good quality for the recorded interview.

## 7. Workshop progress (Hutchins, Yost, Longo, Tracy, Whitton)

- Jeff reported that we have a good variety of SIGs represented in the applications. Seems to be exactly the sorts of people we had hoped for.
- Deadline for applications was February 1<sup>st</sup>. Are we still open to additional attendees? Bernadette reported that, based on her initial reading of the proposals, we have received a wide variety of proposals based on several factors. Her conclusion is that we have an interesting spread of different areas among the applicants.
- Mary moved to approve all ten proposals, with the proviso that we be cautious in the budgetary details regarding the proposals that include two individuals.
- Someone must write acceptance letters that state the conditions and a deadline for formal acceptance. Jeff volunteered to draft a letter that he will circulate for comments, with the goal of distributing it by the end of this week.
- Need to contact participants for two reasons.
  - The number of participants affects the booking. We discussed whether the facilities will be crowded with this number of people (attendees plus committee members plus CBI staff). Jeff replied that the room we have booked can accommodate 21 comfortably, so as this should be fine long as the committee does not feel it is too daunting to proceed with the full list of applicants (12, including two pairs) plus the committee members who are able to come (7), plus CBI employees.
  - Amanda Wick wants information from the attendees about who they are and what they hope to gain as background to help ensure the workshop program is as helpful as we can make it.
- Idea that came up during budget discussion: Roadshow to help spread the workshop ideas and encourage additional exemplar projects. Could be addressed to specific SIGs and Committees that have ideas and would like the training.

## 8. Fellowships

- Jeff: No information at this time.
- Deadline for fellowship applications is April 1. The meeting to discuss the fellowships and select among them will be our April 15 meeting via Zoom.

## 9. Web HC-operations (Tao, Tracy, Almstrum)

- Vicki: No progress. The situation has been delayed due to a combination of factors, including poor timing and unclear instructions for the technical process for setting up the WordPress presence.
- Kim: Work with the minutes is on hold for now. We must define the process of developing and posting the formal minutes.

## 10. New topics

- Mary: SIGGRAPH has added their History committee as a regular standing committee with 5-6 members. The committee will have an advisory group to plan activities and a

budget to support their work. A key part of the SIGGRAPH History Committee's charter is to document the impact SIGGRAPH has had on the development of the field.

- Mary: Dr. Brooks has agreed in principle to sit with her an hour or so to talk about the dissertations they have advised.

#### 11. Next meeting March 18, 2019, 8:00 am PST via Zoom

- Erik will miss next meeting due to attending the business history conference in Cartagena.

#### 12. Conclusion 9:00am PST