Detailed Schedule for SC related work (including AC tasks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon 9/15</td>
<td>Make travel arrangement for the PC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 9/15</td>
<td>Sign on to PCS and familiarize yourself with the interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 9/19</td>
<td>(Papers due from authors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 9/20</td>
<td>SCs call up reserve ACs based on actual submitted papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 9/20</td>
<td>SCs declare conflicts of interest in system and pass responsibility to alternate SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat 9/20</td>
<td>SCs assign primary AC for each paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 9/29</td>
<td>AC assignments released to ACs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 9/30</td>
<td>ACs look for conflicts and other difficulties, optionally swap problem papers for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 9/30</td>
<td>SCs track swaps and ensure all papers have 1AC assigned in the end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 9/30</td>
<td>ACs recruit three high quality external reviewers for each paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu 10/7</td>
<td>Rough target date for having all external reviewers signed up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu 10/7</td>
<td>ACs track review quality and follow up to ensure reviews are in on time as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu 10/7</td>
<td>SCs track reviewer assignments, find potential problems and work with ACs to resolve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 10/29</td>
<td>Reviews due back from reviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 10/29</td>
<td>ACs track missing reviews &amp; quickly resolve (possibly with replacement reviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 10/29</td>
<td>ACs Initiate reviewer discussion as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 10/29</td>
<td>ACs write meta-reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 11/3</td>
<td>Hard deadline for all reviews (including meta-, replacement, and additional reviews)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 11/4</td>
<td>Reviews and meta-reviews released to authors for rebuttal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 11/4</td>
<td>Preliminary &quot;discuss&quot; status determined (based on score cut offs and AC input)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 11/5</td>
<td>SCs assign &quot;discuss&quot; papers to 2ACs for review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 11/10</td>
<td>Author rebuttals due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 11/11</td>
<td>ACs initiate additional reviewer discussion as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues 11/11</td>
<td>ACs review rebuttals, possibly move papers to &quot;discuss&quot; and recruit 2AC reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 11/26</td>
<td>2AC reviews due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon 12/1</td>
<td>Updated meta-reviews and final &quot;discuss&quot; status due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu 12/4</td>
<td>PC meeting in Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 12/5</td>
<td>Post-meeting finalization of feedback to authors (done in Boston if possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri 12/5</td>
<td>SCs stay after regular PC meeting to form program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tue 12/8</td>
<td>Materials certified by ACs as ready to go back to authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed 12/9</td>
<td>Reviews and decisions returned to authors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relaying messages to your ACs / reserve ACs.

Because all ACs won't be in PCS until 9/20, we will occasionally ask you to relay messages to your ACs and reserve ACs. As soon as you get that message, please send it off to them. Delays can impact their ability to do their role. You may also want to have your own mail alias to send all your ACs email.

Navigating the PCS chairing interface

You will be using the PCS (https://precisionconference.com/~sigchi) chairing interface which you likely have not seen before.

Overall the part of the PCS system you use for your task of looking for conflicts and for assigning ACs is not as easy to use or as polished as the rest of PCS. The reason is that until now this has only ever been used by one or two "conference chairs" and it was never really designed for more than that, nor has it
gone through the usability improvements of other parts. In general, you should expect that the actions you need to do inside the PCS system will not be as intuitive as they might be, so keep this detailed instruction list nearby, and let me know if you run into difficulties.

You get to the main administration page by the links: myHome>Chairing>Chair CHI 2009 Papers & Notes. The main admin page is a big categorized list of links -- if you just see a name in the directions below, it's one of these links. The places we know you will need to look at at some point are: Submissions, List of Authors, Unassigned Paper Pool, Tentative Paper Assignments, and Declare Chair Conflicts.

Note that by default in several places you will likely be shown a display including all papers submitted to the conference. In almost all cases you will want to use a "view" that limits this to just papers submitted to your subcommittee. Views for spreadsheet-like reports can be applied using the drop-down menu at the upper left (just under the CHI 2009 logo).

(There should be predefined views in place for all the subcommittees for the main displays you will use. However, you could end up needing to define this view yourself at some. If you end up needing to do this, proceed as follows: Select "Create a new view" from the drop down. Fill in a name such as "Design Subcommittee" in the dialog box that appears and press "Create the new view". Next hit "Restrict Rows". In the dialog select: "Subcommittee Selection", "is equal to", "Design" (or whatever the short name for your subcommittee is, look in the spreadsheet to find the exact text). Finally hit "Record changes".)

**Mon 9/15 Sign on to PCS and familiarize yourself with the interface**
Log onto PCS. Follow the instructions above to generate a view of the papers submitted so far. This will give you a preview into what your committee will be receiving, and will help familiarize yourself with PCS. Note that authors can still modify these papers, and (in our experience) the vast majority of submissions will arrive a few hours before the deadline.

**Sat 9/20 SCs call up reserve ACs based on actual submitted papers**
After papers are in you can start looking them over to see what you have got (noon EDT Sat 9/20 would probably be safe, but we will try to send you a reminder note). Use the Submissions link, then apply your subcommittee view to just see your own papers. The number of papers will be listed under the second column ("Paper"). Your target should be to have about 1 AC for every 10-13 papers assigned to the committee. Try not to have less than 10 per AC. After declaring your conflicts (see below), you can browse through the titles then abstracts to see who you might want to call up and start forming an idea of who to give each paper to (see AC assignments below).

To enter a new AC in the system click on "Committee" (from the main admin page), fill in the name, then press the "Add a Committee Member" button. The text box and "Add a Committee Member" button are near the top right of this page (which you get to from the main admin page via the "Committee" link near the top). You may have to search for your ACs name in a longer list, and if per chance someone is not registered, you may need to register them.

You will need to do this for all your definite ACs as well as each of the reserves. Please send us a message with a final list of ACs once that's set.

**Sat 9/20 SCs declare conflicts of interest in system and pass responsibility to alternate SC**
You will need to explicitly declare conflicts to the system so it can hide the right things. (This is quite a bit more cumbersome than we would like, sorry). The first (long) step to do this is to create a list of the
paper numbers for every paper you are in conflict with. To do that we suggest you use the "List of Authors" link to get the spreadsheet with all authors. Sort it by institution and find all the authors you have institutional conflicts with. Their paper numbers are in the first column. Then sort by name and find any ad hoc conflicts you have.

The second step is to create a subset list of conflict papers that are assigned to your own subcommittee. Once you have the list of papers use the "Submissions" view to find these.

Once you have your two lists, you will need to send the smaller list of papers in your subcommittee to be handled by another SC. Send that list to the SC whose committee seems most like your own (or the one listed on the web site after yours if you are stumped). Finally, you will need to enter the longer list of all papers that you have conflicts into the system with using the "Declare Chair Conflicts" link (the very last one on the admin page).

When/if you receive a conflict paper list from another SC, first check each for conflicts with yourself. If you are conflicted send it to yet another SC. (Hopefully we have no papers which are conflicted with all SCs or we will have an infinite loop here. :¬). If you are not conflicted then look at the AC list for the committee the paper was originally directed to and pick an initial 1AC for the paper. If you are confident of your pick make the assignment (see below). Otherwise, send mail to that potential 1AC and have a dialog with them about who the best 1AC would be. When you make the final 1AC choice, be sure to drop them a note and warn them that this assignment is a conflict so they know not to write to the regular SC to ask questions about it, etc. (Direct questions that would have gone to the SC to us: mailto:papers@chi2009.org).

Special note on conflicts inside the system: Since this a complex procedure, involves moving papers to other SCs who may have more difficulty dealing assigning them well, and because there is one level of indirection here between you and reviews or discussion of the papers, we would like to use a slightly loosened definition for conflict of interest here which avoids some of the more tenuous connections of the full policy. For declaring conflicts inside the system we suggest you declare "core conflicts" only:

- Papers you (co-)author
- Papers with an author at the local branch of your institution
- Papers (co-)authored by current close collaborators
- Any paper you feel you either can't judge impartially, or which you feel it would be very difficult not to tell the author details that they wouldn't normally hear about if they asked, or otherwise represents a conflict you feel you really should declare.

Sat 9/20  SCs assign primary AC for each paper
This is a central and critical job. THE most important thing in the review process is getting good reviewers assigned and that starts with getting an AC highly knowledgeable about the topic of each paper assigned, so despite the size of the task, please take this assignment process very seriously.

To assign an AC a list of 1AC papers, click on their name in the Committee list and type the paper numbers separated by spaces into the "add/remove" textbox in the resulting dialog. Be sure to double check that each resulting assignment is for the right paper (e.g., has the title you expect) and is listed as "AC" (rather than "2AC"). You can also assign the AC to a single paper by clicking on the paper title in the Submissions display and assigning the AC as a reviewer (again check that you see "AC" in the result). Note: please DO NOT send ACs notifications for these assignments at this point -- we need all ACs to start their work together on 9/29.
Note that if you do these individually, the system will make it look like you are signing the person up as a reviewer of the paper. Just press on past that and you will see that they are actually an AC. Also, be sure NOT to send them the email message that the system tries to get you to send them.

**Mon 9/29** AC assignments released to ACs
The papers co-chairs handle making this happen automatically at the right time, so be sure your AC assignments are done on time.

**Tues 9/30** SCs track swaps and ensure all papers have 1AC assigned in the end
Periodically look into the "Unassigned Paper Pool" where papers to be swapped go. If it's getting very far into the process and you have one or more papers left you should make a forced 1AC assignment (if they are not conflicted, then the AC who put the paper in is the most likely victim).

**Thu 10/7** Rough target date for having all external reviewers signed up
Thu 10/7 SCs track reviewer assignments, find potential problems and work with ACs to resolve
Somewhat after the target date, ping ACs who haven't gotten all their reviewers lined up for a status report as a means to make sure they are working on it. (It's not clear this is a realistic target date, so use your judgment about how hard to push when). We really need 3 external reviews for every paper going into rebuttal on 11/4.

**Wed 10/29** ACs track missing reviews & quickly resolve (possibly with replacement reviews)
Track the status of papers and ensure that some AC doesn't have a pattern of problems. Prod ACs for status on replacement reviews if needed. Again, we really need 3 external reviews for every paper going into rebuttal on 11/4.

**Thu 12/4** PC meeting in Boston
**Fri 12/5** SCs stay after regular PC meeting to form program
More about the details of the meeting will be coming as we get closer. We would like you to stay later Friday afternoon to help form sessions since we will not know enough about what is in the accepted papers to do this without you.