

Discussion on rankings

Western table

Morning breakout groups

Notes from Simon

Lin joined the group at the outset, and provided much clarification.

Concern was expressed about the lack of transparency in the decision-making. Yes, the community makes the recommendations, but the actual decision is made by a small group, and it's not clear who is in this group, or exactly what criteria they use for the decisions.

There was a suggestion of adding one person from each area, but it was clear that 'areas' would be hard to define, and that regardless of definition this could make the group unwieldy.

It was broadly agreed that a complete re-ranking was not feasible, and that adjustment was the best that could be asked. Nevertheless it was proposed that, to account for the variability in conferences from year to year, each conference be given a separate ranking for each year. This was dismissed as even less feasible than a complete re-ranking.

What do we want in the database?

Conferences, defined as having published proceedings, and review of full papers (not, for example, of abstracts)

It was agreed to leave dodgy conferences in the database, but leave them unranked. We would rely on external blacklists and general knowledge to know which were dodgy.

What tags do we want in the database?

Suggested additional tags were . . .

- * the year the conference began

- * a citation rate for the conference (which some suggested would be misleading)

- * a quality trajectory - does the quality appear to be falling, static, or rising, over, say, five years?

What objective criteria should we seek when asked for an adjustment?

The conference citation rate (tag 2 above)