1. Welcome (Whitton)  
   ● Meeting began at 11:00am EDT / 8:00am PDT via Zoom

2. Attendees (Whitton)  
   ● Barbara Boucher Owens (chair)  
   ● Vicki Almstrum (late arrival)  
   ● David Brock  
   ● Carol Hutchins  
   ● Roy Levin  
   ● Bernadette Longo  
   ● Sachin Maheshwari  
   ● Ursula Martin  
   ● Erik Rau (late arrival)  
   ● Mary Whitton  
   ● Jeffrey Yost  
   ● Chuck House (guest)  
   Not present  
   ● Kim Tracy  
   ● Amanda Wick

3. Minutes from November meeting (Almstrum)  
   ● November minutes were not discussed. Discussion / approval deferred to January meeting.

4. Status of Turing update (Levin)  
   ● The interview with Dana Scott will take place in multiple sessions. An additional interview has been completed and at least one more is scheduled.  
   ● David Jefferson was asked whether future interviews should be done as in the past or if it is acceptable to do (some) interviews via Zoom. Roy suggests a selective strategy, particularly for individuals whose poor health makes it ill advised to delay.  
   ● David Brock described the CHM approach. They created an interview equipment kit that includes equipment, including a camera that the interviewee hooks into the computer. The camera captures HD video locally. This kit could be used for interviews done collaboratively with the CHM, and there is the possibility of other agreements for using the equipment, with the constraint of limited availability for the kit.  
   ● Barbara asked whether the HC ought to create their own interview equipment kit that could be lent out in support of obtaining good quality interviews.
● ACTION ITEM: David will investigate the content and costs of an equipment kit.
● ACTION ITEM: Carol will follow up with someone who is building a similar type of kit.
● ACTION ITEM: Roy will follow up on the action item for an ad about the use of snippets in educational settings.

5. Web work (Tracy, Almstrum, Wick)
● Other than a few changes to the site by Kim, there has been very little progress.

6. Fellowship (Tracy, Rau)
● Kim was not present and Erik had nothing new to report. This will be an important point for the January meeting.
● Someone observed that for many programs, the number of applications was down during 2020. We speculated about how much of this is due to current restrictions.
● In the most recent round of applications to Hagley’s programs, the numbers have been close to normal. Earlier in the year, numbers were far reduced.
● Jeff Y. explained that CBI has received fewer queries during 2020. CBI has shifted their travel grants to be scanning grants.
● Jeff Brock mentioned that currently CHM has no travel grant program. For the research fellowships, CHM is still receiving many requests. They have found it a challenge to fulfill these requests due to restrictions on staff in the archive center.
● Jeff said that Linda Hall Library has made a change similar to that at CBI, that is, remote fellowships. Erik added that both Linda Hall Library and Hagley are part of the Independent Research Library Association ([irla.lindahall.org/]), where many institutions have adopted a similar model. The challenge with many of these requests is the scope of scanning that could be involved.

7. International (Martin, Maheshwari)
● International efforts:
  ○ Ursula would like to link at least some of the international work to efforts for the Heritage Project, in particular to advice for how SIGs can approach curating their own histories.
  ○ Ursula mentioned that she had developed some ideas a few months back, so Vicki will strive to get these from Ursula.
● India oral history project:
  ○ Sachin shared the sad news that Mr. F. C. Kohli passed away about a month ago at the age of 96 years old. That interview was never scheduled because it had to be conducted in person and this was not possible due to Covid restrictions. Fortunately, there are other sources that document his life.
  ○ Of the three names originally proposed for this project (Mr. Kohli, Professor V. Rajaraman, and Professor Ramaswamy), only the one with Professor Ramaswamy will be completed. (For reference, see the original India interview project proposal from May 2019).
  ○ At this point, four sessions with Professor Ramaswamy are complete, with a wrap-up session planned for early January.
Sachin is considering collecting interviews about the professor who designed the first solid state computer in India in the late 1950s. The project would encompass several sessions, each covering a distinct part of his life. The interviewees would include family members, collaborators, and a student who can explain the research.

Sachin asked whether ACM India should be consulted about putting the interviews on their website. We agreed that this would be a good idea.

Barbara brought up the goal of capturing more information about the history of ACM India. Sachin would appreciate ideas for which individuals in India should be considered. Barbara stressed the importance of having this information bubble up from the organization, rather than just being proposed from the “outside”.

8. ACM Award Video Series (House)

- Chuck provided a thorough report about the status of this project. Appendix A includes PNG images of the nine pages of Chuck’s presentation. The PDF of the presentation is available separately in the ACM HC Operations Minutes folder for this meeting.
- Chuck concluded by proposing three possible extensions of this project:
  - Create snippets from the ‘best of the set’ (similar to the work for Turing).
  - Extend the original coverage from 72 awardees to, say, 100 awardees. The original pool included about 260 individuals, so Chuck has achieved about 28% coverage so far. Adding to this number would round out the collection of interviews nicely.
  - Define a process for adding new awardees.
- Mary brought up the question of future budgeting for this project. One possibility is for it to continue as a special project (with the goal to continue doing “catch-up” interviews with earlier awardees). The second possibility is consider this a standing budget item, with the intention of capturing interviews with the latest awardees each year. Erik discussed how to keep the two aspects cleanly separated.
- ACTION ITEM: Chuck, Erik, and Mary will discuss the budgeting approach.
- ACTION ITEM: Chuck will create a proposal for the next steps in this project.

9. Other business

- Mary discussed how budget practices might change during the year ahead.
- Carol mentioned the podcast series that ACM is doing and how the HC might contribute to this and help highlight results from HC projects, providing helpful publicity for the History Committee. (learning.acm.org/bytecast; currently 8 episodes in the archive).
  - This would involve collaboration with the ACM staffers doing the project. For example, the HC could suggest audio extracts from important interviews.
  - Erik described a similar project at Hagley to share great stories. They created a series of four podcasts, which took MONTHS to produce. The process involved searching for needles in haystacks to find gems and develop the story.
  - Erik suggested carving out a podcast fellowship from the committee.
  - ACTION ITEM: Carol, Chuck, and Barb will work on a first pass suggestion fo award winner interviews that include good stories for the podcast.
  - ACTION ITEM: Carol will seek information about ACM’s goals with the podcast project.
10. Upcoming meetings
   Monday, January 18, 2021, 11:00 am EST via Zoom

11. Conclusion 12:00 pm EDT / 9:00 am PDT

Appendix A: Chuck House’s report on the ACM Award Interviews Project
Added here as PNG images taken from the PDF version, which is available separately.

ACM Award Interviews project
2020 Year-end Status report

Chuck House
December 21, 2020
### ACM Award honorees interviewed to date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>$$$</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Qual</th>
<th>Int’v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRIZE</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thacker</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopper</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athena</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanellakis</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlstrom</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newell</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACM Awards that this project does not include

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>$$$</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Qual</th>
<th>Int’v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turing</td>
<td>$1M</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTA Hi School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Sys</td>
<td>$35K</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC Fellow</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Dissert</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Covered by ACM HC Turing interviews**
- **“Teams” Might be worth inclusion later**
- **Young researchers, no established career**
- **SIG Awards project will cover this area**
- **FELLOWS and Distinguished MEMBERS**
How do you prioritize?

- Age (have to hurry with some of these folk)
- “Value” of the award ($$$)
- Individual vs. group

- ACM only vs. co-sponsored
- Total number of awards
- Number of extant interviews other places

- Outside ‘counsel’ (e.g. ACM ExeCom and Staff, ACM HC, friends)
- Interviewee Desire
- Interviewer preference

The Process, once an interviewee is selected

60% don’t answer the first time; 70% do answer eventually

NO ANSWER

Selection

Invite

YES

Prep

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

NO

NO

Interview

YES

Virtually NO ‘no shows’ can do ‘repeat’

FLAWED TECHNOLOGY

POOR LIGHTING

Glare on classes

Connection?

Recorder?

Garbled audio

Accent issues

Thirty percent want to schedule it ‘later’

Very few have formally declined

Reasons: ill, ‘forgotten what I knew’

One declined upon seeing the questions
Immediate Issue

- Don’t we need to file ‘soon’ for the 2021-2022 Fiscal Budget?
- If we miss this cycle, there will be at least a one-year gap
- I will propose extensions of this project in three ways
  
  A. Creating snippets from the ‘best of the set’
  
  B. Extending the original coverage from 72 to, say, 100
  
  C. There should be a process to include new awardees