

Meeting of the JCDL Steering Committee, June 17, 2008

Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Present:

Erich Neuhold (Chair, TCDL Representative)
Edie Rasmussen (SIGIR Representative)
Richard Furuta (at large member)
Ed Fox (at-large member)
Gary Marchionini (at-large member)
Ingeborg Solvberg (at-large member)
Shigeo Sugimoto (at-large member)

Excused:

David Hicks (SIGWEB Representative)
Ian Witten (at-large member)

Guests:

Ron Larson (JCDL 2008)
Andreas Paepke (JCDL 2008)
Mary Lynn Rice-Lively (JCDL 2009)
Jane Hunter (JCDL 2010 proposal Brisbane)
Glen Newton (JCDL 2010 proposal Ottawa)

1. **Minutes** of the Steering Committee Meeting 2007 – passed unanimously (sent out earlier).

2. **JCDL 2007** reported by Edie Rasmussen
The final receipts have not been received yet, but a profit of about \$ 34K is expected. The conference was generally judged a success though there were some complaints about the lack of free network access in the conference rooms. (The cost for this, even after ACM intervened in negotiations on behalf of JCDL, was deemed to be unsupportable by the conference budget.).
The Steering Committee thanked Edie and her team for the effort and for the success of JCDL 2007.

3. **JCDL 2008** reported by Ron Larsen and Andreas Paepke
 - a) There were unexpected high costs of \$33K for Audio Visual and Networking. Of that about \$17K for networking alone; even so only \$1K was budgeted.
 - b) Lower than expected attendance, including at the tutorials and workshops. The collocation with the ACM hypertext conference may have led to some of this.
 - c) Publicity could be improved; that should be considered by those organizing future conferences. Example: Many CMU faculty members claimed they did not know about JCDL 2008 being nearby.

- d) IEEE registration worked well. Some attendees were confused when they learned that tutorials could be cancelled if numbers were low; but they were cordial. Some confusion arose if somebody only wanted to sign up for tutorials, since one had to complete the earlier registration form sections about parts of the conference that were not of interest.
- e) Sponsorship was low: \$7500 from Microsoft for Tuesday night was the only corporate sponsorship. The University gave \$5K. Elsevier paid \$200 to help since the conference is distributing some information for them.
- f) Because of the budget problems, Ron has been cutting back on food and other expenditures as much as was still possible.

As a consequence Ron expects a substantial budget deficit for JCDL 2008 (about the cost of the Wireless). Note for the future: Food at hotels is very expensive and it is not a requirement that it is included in the conference registration fee.

Discussion and recommendations for the future:

- a) Amount of food could be reduced. Breakfast and Lunches (except for the Town Hall meeting) could be eliminated by not promising them ahead of time and scheduling them only if the budget allows.
- b) Discuss having JCDL on a college campus instead of a conference hotel, if costs are lower.
- c) Ask ACM / IEEE-CS, when they engage in negotiations related to hotels, to be sure about the networking. It should be fast enough for the number of people coming. It should be tested well to ensure quality of service is high.

For the report by Andreas Paepke see his slides sent earlier. He had suggestions regarding the paper selection process; PC members should be allowed to rate from 1-7 not 1-5 so values can be spread out wider. He had good experiences with the START system. They are responsive to requests and help rapidly. The new version should be better than what was used for the PC meeting. It is a nice feature that one can load in the records from last year (e.g. information on PC members).

- 4. **JCDL 2009** - report by General Chair Mary Lynn Rice-Lively
 - a) Still working on the budget in light of the experiences of JCDL 2008. The pricing model is not yet finalized – it was finalized by the middle of August.
 - b) AT&T conference centre is the site selected for the conference. It is opening this August and is located on the university campus.
 - c) The JCDL 2009 Committee meets every 3 weeks
 - d) A suggestion has been made to run the conference by UT, not ACM, so we can benefit from the many discounts afforded to the UT. ACM has not agreed

so far. SIG chairs will need to get involved in this matter, to discuss with ACM HQ staff.

- e) A suggestion was made to learn from experience of this and past years, and to be more often in touch with the Steering Committee. A liaison person selected from the steering committee could be of help.

5. **JCDL 2010** - presentation by Jane Hunter for **Brisbane**

- a) Jane promised to send the slides used for the presentation in Pittsburgh – it was done.
- b) Timing could be in April on up through June. Some sentiment was voiced not to move JCDL too much from its current time slot.
- c) A discussion developed on the collocation logistics, quality differences, and financial models, including a single budget for both conferences – many questions were not resolved.
- d) The proposers expect high sponsorship support.
- e) 450 as the total number of attendees seem possible but high as compared to the attendance for the last few years.. How many will be from Down Under? Be careful with the Budget!
- f) They plan to have an experienced conference organization team from the University that will help with running the conference.

6. **JCDL 2010** - presentation by Glen Newton for **Ottawa**

- a) Glen promised to send the slides used for the presentation in Pittsburgh – it was done.
- b) NRC Conference Services has been handling small to very large conferences for more than 20 years.
- c) The University Campus is very close.
- d) Ottawa has offered to run JCDL 2011 if they are turned down about 2010
- e) Budget details are not worked out yet. Hotels are likely to cost \$150-\$175 in Canadian dollars (at the moment close to 1:1 to USD)
- f) They will need at least 18 months before the conference to get things approved and managed in time.

7. **Election** of STC members:

- a) By the end of the year 2 slots for Members at Large will become open:
 - i) Gary Marchionini's term is up; he has declined serving again (suggests we need "new blood")
 - ii) Richard Furuta's term is up; he is willing to serve again
- b) A Nominating Committee has been appointed: Erich, Shigeo, Ed. Nominations will close by July

- c) Election will occur electronically in September with Claudia handling the logistics

----- This Meeting ended at 1:35 with plans to continue at 8pm

----- The Meeting started again soon after 8pm and ran till almost 9:55

8. **ISSN being assigned to the JCDL proceedings**

- ➔ Ingeborg will explore this issue. She will talk with Lisa Spiro (editor for IEEE TCDL Bulletin, which has an ISSN) and her supervisor, Geneva Henry. She will also talk with Bernard Rous at ACM HQ (NYC) and with John Daniels at IEEE-CS HQ (DC).

9. **General discussion about how to decide about future meeting sites**

The Issues that need to be considered include:

- a) Quality of the conference that would result.
- b) Quality of the proceedings that would result.
- c) Benefit to the evolution of the worldwide DL community, including its growth
- d) Scope of topics to be covered.
- e) Communities served, e.g., from CS, Library Science, Information Science, ...
- f) Interest in theory, research, development, case studies, policies, ...
- g) Location, especially if inside North America or outside of North America.
- h) Joint meeting, with other groups and organizations.
- i) Financial model and predictions of financial situation -- profit/loss.
- j) Cost for attendees – not only the registration fee.
- k) Note that if there is a loss in 2008 (as currently envisioned), then we must be sure not to have another loss soon after – the conference series will be endangered.
- l) Currency changes can have a large effect – budget in local currency not USD!
- m) Likely number of attendees, including from local regions.
- n) Expected number of people from North America, from Europe, from Asia-Pacific, etc.
- o) Quality of the organizing committee.
- p) Good local infrastructure.
- q) Proposal covering all the key issues we must consider, and not being either over or under specified.

- r) Suggestion: We need to talk with ACM and IEEE people to see if registration can be paid in the local currency. In case of IEEE that was allowed, at least in the past.

10. Decision regarding 2010

Basically the Steering Committee favours the Australian proposal but it asks Brisbane to present a report by September 1, 2008. On the basis of that report the decision to go to Brisbane will be made by the end of September.

- a) A committee was established, made up of Erich, Shigeo, Jane, Shalini, and Ed.
- b) That committee must ensure that a report is prepared by 1 September.
- c) Based on that report a decision will be made by the Steering Committee as to the location of JCDL 2010.
- d) The plan (of a joint conference and their organization) must be approved also, preferably by 1 September, by ACM SIGIR, ACM SIGWeb, ACM HQ, TCDE, and IEEE-CS ----- It was pointed out after the meeting that it will be easier to go to the various boards after the updated proposal is available rather than with the unfinished information available now.
- e) There should be separate financial models and budgets by each of ICADL and JCDL.
- f) There should be separate proceedings managed by each of ICADL and JCDL.
- g) People should be able to register for both events, or for just one event, or just for workshop(s).
- h) Tutorials should be free to those who sign up for either or both events.
- i) Workshops should be managed organizationally by JCDL, but the content should be handled by the individual workshops – JCDL has overall quality control.
- j) Details of how things are split, how the collocation works, how the program is organized, etc. should be specified in the report due on September 1.
- k) One possible way to arrange the collocation is:
 - Day 1: tutorials
 - Days 2-4: conferences
 - a. Keynotes would be in sessions open to people attending either conference. In addition each day:
 - b. At least one parallel track would be managed by JCDL
 - c. At least one parallel track would be managed by ICADL

Day 5: workshops

This plan for exploring the collocation of JCDL and ICADL in 2010 was approved unanimously.

11. The **Town Meeting**

12.

It was decided that at the Town Meeting, the following would be reported:

- a) JCDL 2009 is well along in its planning, with the UT-based group actively working on making it a success.
- b) We are exploring holding JCDL 2010 in Brisbane, AUS, co-locating it with ICADL 2010.
- c) The decision about that will be made on or before Oct. 1.
- d) If JCDL 2010 won't be in AUS, it will be in Ottawa, Canada.
- e) If JCDL 2010 is in AUS, then one proposal that will be considered for JCDL 2011 is to have it in Ottawa.
- f) We look for other proposals for sites and organizing committees for JCDL 2011.
- g) We look for proposals for sites and organizing committees for JCDL 2012.

Note that all proposals should be submitted early to the Steering Committee, to be sure they cover all that should be discussed, which includes recommendations of the general chair(s) and the program chair(s)

Special Concern:

There was some confusion concerning the responsible body for each of the JCDL#S and we believe it was decided (because of earlier mistakes) that

- ACM handles 2009-2011 to make up for prior out of turn sequence
- IEEE handles 2012.
- The 3 year cycle will continue with ACM in 2013 and 2014, then IEEE, then ACM for 2 years, ...
- Monetary issues are 1/3 each to TCDL, SIGIR, and SIGWEB as has been the case since the start of JCDL in 2001.

NOTE: The Town meeting took place on Thursday June 19, at Lunch time

The following Notes were taken by Gary Marchionini (they are not part of the S.C. meeting minutes):

- 1) Ed Fox (for the Steeing Committee) and Jose Borbinha (for TCDL) convened the meeting.
- 2) A Facebook group called digital libraries is available, also LinkedIn and Second Life DL groups are available and people are encouraged to participate.
- 3) An ECDL wiki will be available in a week; PhD students and advisors were encouraged to get involved in the conference and the web presences.
- 4) Bonnie Wilson invited people to submit proposals for special issues of the Bulletin (new editor is Lisa Spiro at Rice U.), e.g., events and cases from around the world. Doctoral consortium papers from JCDL 2008 will come out in next issue.
- 5) Straw Poll on Electronic proceedings for 2009: vast majority wanted electronic rather than paper. A few preferred paper. One person suggested having abstracts in the printed program. Many conferences have that, if there are no printed proceedings.
- 6) Poster session for next year: tracks for case studies in addition to regular posters? There was general nodding and agreement from audience.
- 7) Proposals for future conferences. Steering committee has none for 2112, is deciding on 2010 and has one for 2011. How many would go to Australia in 2010? A bit less than half raised hand, some enthusiastic, some half-raised hands.
- 8) Jane Hunter summarized the proposal mentioning ICADL, Brisbane, weather, air routes, scenery.
- 9) One person suggested that one of the DL conferences be held in Africa (Ghana).
- 10) One person (Barbara Wildemuth) suggested that doing one with ICADL one year, then with ECDL the next year.
- 11) Jose noted that ECDL will be held in Denmark this year and in Corfu in 2009.
- 12) Ed asked for Volunteers and suggestions for workshops and tutorials.
- 13) One person (George Buchanan) suggested that because attendance in workshops has declined in the last couple of years that we should do more early involvement and publicity for workshops. Rick Furuta encouraged established related communities to contact him for next year...don't wait, in fact, propose for 2010, and aim for repeating patterns of workshops.

- 14) Was the food here good? Applause
- 15) Ed noted that the curriculum site for DLs - will be linked to the TCDL site.
- 16) Best thing at the conference? The people!
- 17) Carolyn and Ron were acknowledged and applauded.