

*Note that this survey was administered interactively via surveygizmo.com and included branching logic that is not apparent in this flat-file version. In particular, responses to question 1 impacted which subsequent sets of questions were shown to respondents (e.g., people who did not indicate they were reviewers in Q1 never saw the section of questions about reviewing, etc.).*

\*\*\*\*\*

# ACM CSCW Community Survey

---

## Welcome

**This brief survey is a mechanism for eliciting feedback about recent changes to the ACM CSCW Conference from people who have submitted to, published at, reviewed for, organized, and/or attended CSCW. Your feedback will be valuable in helping the CSCW leadership team determine whether recent changes have been successful, and whether future changes are warranted.**

**1) Indicate which of the following roles you have held with respect to the CSCW conference series.**

	2011 or earlier	2012	2013	2014
Submitted paper(s) or note(s)				
Reviewed paper(s) or note(s)				
Served as a Program Committee member (AC)				

Attended  
(or plan to  
attend) the  
conference

---

## Authors: General Questions

**2) Since 2013, CSCW no longer imposes a page limit on Paper submissions. As an author, how do you feel about this no-page-limit policy?**

- I preferred the old policy (10 page limit for Papers and 4 page limit for Notes)
- I prefer the new policy (Papers can be any length authors deem appropriate, commensurate with contribution size)
- I would prefer a hard page limit, but I think 10 pages was too short. Something a bit longer, like 12, would be better.
- I think we should keep the 10 page limit, but not count references as part of the page limit.
- I have no strong feeling about the page limit issue - both the old and new policy seem OK.
- Other (explain): \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

---

---

---

---

**3) As an author, would you like to see CSCW revive a separate submission category for Notes (short papers with a very succinct contribution)?**

- Yes, I'd like to revive the explicit four page "Note" category.
- Yes, but perhaps a more flexible four-to-six page "Short Papers" category would allow for richer Notes.
- No, I think that the current "any length" Paper submission is adequate for handling shorter contributions.

Comments:

---

---

---

---

---

## Revise and Resubmit Process: Author Perspective

Since 2012, CSCW has used a two-round review process in which some papers are rejected after Round 1, while others are offered a chance to revise and resubmit for a second round of reviewing. The following questions seek your perspective as an author who submitted a paper under this new "revise & resubmit" system. If you submitted during more than one of the "revise & resubmit" years, answer the questions with respect to your most recent experience with this process.

**4) As an author who submitted Papers/Notes under the "revise & resubmit" reviewing scheme used for CSCW 2012, 2013, and 2014, which of the following describe the outcome(s) for the papers you submitted to CSCW 2012, 2013, and/or 2014?**

- Rejected in Round 1 (no opportunity to revise)
- Rejected in Round 2 (after revision)
- Withdrawn after Round 1 (offered the chance to revise but chose not to)
- Conditionally Accepted / Fast-tracked after Round 1
- Accepted after Round 2

**5) Do you think the final accept/reject outcome for your CSCW paper(s) from 2012, 2013, and/or 2014 would have been different under the earlier, single-round reviewing process?**

- I think the outcomes for (at least some of) my paper(s) would have been the same under both systems
- I think that (at least some of) my rejected paper(s) would have been accepted under the earlier system

I think that (at least some of) my accepted paper(s) would have been rejected under the earlier system

**The following questions ask you to indicate your level of agreement with a series of statements about this "revise and resubmit" process, from the perspective of an author. If you submitted during multiple "revise & resubmit" years, please focus on your most recent experience with this process.**

**6) The "revise and resubmit" process is burdensome for authors.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**7) The "revise and resubmit" process is an improvement over prior processes**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**8) The "revise and resubmit" process does not offer sufficient time for revisions.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**9) The "revise and resubmit" process has improved the quality of the feedback I receive as an author**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**10) I would prefer to return to the old, single-round reviewing process.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**11) The "revise & resubmit" process is a "fair" process.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**12) The earlier, single-round reviewing process was a "fair" process.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**13) The "revise & resubmit" process is incompatible with my summer schedule (vacations, etc.).**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**14) In general, as an author, how do you feel about this revise-and-resubmit process?**

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Neutral
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied

**15) As an author who submitted papers both under the old reviewing system (CSCW 2011 or earlier) and the revise & resubmit system (CSCW 2012 or later), how do you feel the two processes compare?**

**16) Any additional comments regarding your perspective, as an author, on the R&R process?**

---

## **Acceptance Rate: Author Perspective**

**The acceptance rate at some recent CSCW conferences (particularly the 40% acceptance rate at CSCW 2012 and the 35% rate at CSCW 2013) has been higher than in the past, when it was typically below 25%. (CSCW 2014's**

**acceptance rate will be somewhere in the 25% - 27% range once final decisions are made on a few "conditionally accepted" papers.) The following questions gauge your opinion, from an author's perspective, on the increased acceptance rate.**

**17) I believe CSCW's higher acceptance rates are justified by the increased quality of papers that make it through the new, two-round reviewing process.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**18) I am concerned that my tenure/promotion/job search may be negatively impacted by CSCW's higher recent acceptance rates.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**19) I am concerned that the tenure/promotion/job search of my junior colleagues or students may be negatively impacted by CSCW's higher recent acceptance rates.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**20) I think the CSCW conference program is better with a higher acceptance rate.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**21) I am concerned that my organization may no longer support submitting to and/or attending CSCW because of the increased acceptance rate.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**22) I think the CSCW community needs to develop alternative metrics to acceptance rate as a way of measuring and communicating the quality of the program.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**23) Increasing the number of papers at CSCW has reduced the quality of the conference program.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree



**24) I think that other criteria (e.g., citations, impact factor, h5-index) should be used in addition to, or in place of, acceptance rate as a quality measure for the CSCW conference.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**25) In general, as an author, how do you feel about CSCW's trend of higher paper acceptance rates?**

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Neutral
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied

**26) Any additional comments regarding your perspective, as an author, on acceptance rates?**

---

## **Revise and Resubmit Process: Reviewer & PC Member Perspective**

**Since 2012, CSCW has used a two-round review process in which some papers are rejected after Round 1, while others are offered a chance to revise and resubmit for a second round of reviewing. The following questions ask you to indicate your level of agreement with a series of statements about this "revise and resubmit" process, from the perspective of someone who reviewed papers and/or served on the Program Committee. If you reviewed papers during more**

**than one of the "revise & resubmit" years, answer the questions with respect to your most recent experience with this process.**

**41) I accepted fewer papers to review under the "revise & resubmit" process than I did under the earlier, single-round process, because I am concerned about workload.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**42) The "revise and resubmit" process is burdensome for reviewers/PC members.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**43) The "revise and resubmit" process is an improvement over prior processes**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**44) The "revise and resubmit" process does not offer sufficient time for reviewing.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree

- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**45) The "revise and resubmit" process has improved the quality of the feedback I give as a reviewer/PC member.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**46) I would prefer to return to the old, single-round reviewing process.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**47) The "revise & resubmit" process is a "fair" process.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**48) The earlier, single-round reviewing process was a "fair" process.**

- Strongly disagree

- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**49) The "revise & resubmit" process is incompatible with my summer schedule (vacations, etc.).**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**50) In general, as a reviewer and/or PC member, how do you feel about this revise-and-resubmit process?**

- Very Dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Neutral
- Satisfied
- Very Satisfied

**51) As a reviewer and/or PC member under both the earlier system and the "revise & resubmit" system, how do you think the two systems compare in terms of reviewer/PC workload?**

- Earlier, single-round review process was less work as a reviewer
- About the same workload under both processes
- New, "revise & resubmit" review process was less work as a reviewer

**52) As a reviewer and/or PC member under both the earlier system and the "revise & resubmit" system, how do you think the two systems compare in terms of quality of accepted papers?**

- Accepted papers were of higher quality under the earlier, single-round review process.
- Accepted papers are of about the same quality under both processes
- Accepted papers were of higher quality under the "revise & resubmit" review process.

**53) As a reviewer and/or PC member both under the old reviewing system (CSCW 2011 or earlier) and the revise & resubmit system (CSCW 2012 or later), how do you feel the two processes compare?**

**54) Any additional comments regarding your perspective, as a reviewer and/or PC member, on the R&R process?**

---

## **Attendees**

**Since 2012, CSCW has used a two-round review process in which some papers are rejected after Round 1, while others are offered a chance to revise and resubmit for a second round of reviewing. The following questions seek your perspective as someone who attended the CSCW conference before this new "revise & resubmit" system was introduced, as well as afterwards.**

**55) I think that the overall quality of the work I have seen at CSCW has improved since the introduction of the "revise & resubmit" process in 2012, as compared with earlier CSCW conferences.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**56) I felt there were too many parallel tracks of paper presentations at CSCW since 2012, as compared with earlier CSCW conferences.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**57) I think there is higher variance in the quality of the work I have seen at CSCW since the introduction of the "revise & resubmit" process in 2012, as compared with earlier CSCW conferences.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**We are aiming to improve the accessibility of CSCW. Please answer the following questions regarding accessibility issues that impact your experience at the conference.**

**58) Do you identify as having a permanent or temporary disability that limits your participation at CSCW?**

- Yes
- No

**59) My needs as a disabled attendee were well-met at CSCW.**

- Strongly disagree

- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**60) Unmet accessibility needs at CSCW resulted in physical pain or discomfort.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**61) Unmet accessibility needs at CSCW resulted in stigma or embarrassment.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**62) Unmet accessibility needs at CSCW resulted in my being unable to fully participate in the conference.**

- Strongly disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly agree

**63) Do you have any specific unmet needs or suggestions on how to improve CSCW's accessibility?**

**64) If you would like to be included on a CSCW accessibility mailing list for attendee information on accessibility, please include your name and email. This contact information will be separated from the rest of your survey responses and made available to CSCW's accessibility chairs for accessibility purposes.**

---

**65) Do you prefer attending sessions with three 30 minute talk slots (20 minute talk + 10 minutes Q&A) or with four 22-minute talk slots (17 minute talk + 5 minutes Q&A)?**

- I prefer the 30 minute slots
- I prefer the 22 minute slots
- I have no strong preference
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

---

---

---

---

**66) Any additional comments regarding the CSCW conference attendee experience?**

---

## **General Questions**

**67) Do you think that CSCW should explore the possibility of making all CSCW papers open access (i.e., no paywall required to access them from the ACM DL)?**

- Strongly Oppose
- Oppose



- Neutral
- Support
- Strongly support

**Comments:**

---

---

---

---

**68) Does the name "Computer Supported Cooperative Work" still adequately represent our community and attract the right participants, or should we consider changing it?**

- Don't change the conference name/acronym
- Keep the acronym as CSCW, but change the name to "Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing" (as was informally done on the website for the past two years)
- Keep the acronym CSCW, but make it stand for something new (provide suggestions, please!): \_\_\_\_\_
- Create an entirely new name/acronym (provide suggestions, please!): \_\_\_\_\_
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

---

---

---

---

---

## **Background Information**

**69) Where do you live?**

- North America
- Europe
- Latin America
- Asia
- Australia/Oceania
- Africa

**70) What is your current job?**

- University Faculty Member (pre-tenure)
- University Faculty Member (post-tenure)
- University Research Staff Member or Post-Doc
- Graduate Student
- Undergraduate Student
- Industry - Researcher or Post-Doc
- Industry - Practitioner
- Other (describe): \_\_\_\_\_

**71) For approximately how many years have you participated in the CSCW conference community (e.g., submitting to, reviewing for, organizing, and/or attending the CSCW conference)?**

- less than 1 year
- 1 - 2 years
- 3 - 5 years
- 6 - 10 years
- more than 10 years

**72) Indicate how often you attend each of the following conferences, and which you consider your "home" conference (the one you would attend if you were limited to attending one conference per year).**

	<b>Conference name</b>
CHI	
CSCW	
DIS	
ECSCW	
GROUP	
HCOMP	
ICWSM	
iConference	
Interact	
ITS (Tabletop)	
Ubicomp	
UIST	
WikiSym	

**73) Which discipline(s) does your work draw upon?**

- communication
- computer science
- electrical engineering
- information sciences
- management science
- psychology
- sociology
- Other

**74) If you have any other comments you'd like to share with us, please use this space to do so.**

---

## **Thank You!**

**Thank you for taking our survey. Your response is very important to us. To be apprised in a timely fashion of key changes in the CSCW Community, including future elections for community leadership, be sure to [join the CSCW Community List maintained by SIGCHI](#).**

---