

**CCSCNE – Board Meeting  
Providence, RI,  
April 26, 2003  
CHAIR’S REPORT**

**A. From National**

- (a) At the January meeting, I was asked to ask National to look into using something like PayPal for paying the conference fees. National thought it a worthwhile idea and will look into it.
- (b) The CCSC data base project is moving along nicely. The National board was given a demo.
- (c) Liz Adams reports from the SIGCSE Board. SIGCSE will provide up to \$1000 for each region to bring speakers from the SIGCSE Symposium. For the present, we send requests to Henry Walker.
- (d) The regional conference fee has been reduced from \$1500 to \$1000 for each region.
- (e) National is working on a formal procedures for establishing new regions.
- (f) National is looking at having templates for paper submission and publication. It was discussed whether we should have submission templates, similar to SIGCSE's. South Central's paper-submission system was recommended as one other regions should have a look at. They are willing to share it with other interested regions.
- (g) As requested by this board, I raised with National the following issues:

National Vendors vs. Regional Vendors.

- (1) At NE, we charge a local vendor (one that's not also a national vendor) \$200 to attend. Suppose we (NE) are interested in Vendor A and, in the absence of the national vendor program, would have been able to sign him up. In that case, NE gets \$200. But, suppose, because there is a national vendor program, vendor A decides to sign up with national. As a result, NE get only \$100, where we would have gotten \$200 had there been no national vendor program. We (NE) are therefore out of pocket \$100. What can National do to prevent NE (and other regions similarly affected) from loosing out on this? In other words, the recent introduction of the national vendor program is cost us (NE) money.
- (2) As things stand at present, NE has a dilemma: should we aggressively pursue local vendors (and get the \$200) while national is itself pursuing the same vendor, in which case both national and NE appear a little "flaky", uncoordinated and

unprofessional to the vendor (what if we both succeed?), or should we await the outcome of national's attempt to recruit the vendor, in which case, should national fail, it might then be too late for us? What can be done to address this? Can national set a reasonable time by which their attempt to recruit a vendor expires? To facilitate the discussion at the meeting next week, and to get the ball rolling, might I propose the following:

RE (1): One option would be to increase the amount National gives to each region when a national vendor is signed up. It's currently \$100; but it would need to be \$200 to redress Northeastern's loss. However, first, this would probably require us to increase substantially the fee National charges, and second, some regions have only ever charged their local vendors \$100 and would then profit "unnecessarily". An alternative is for National to award to each region an amount of a National vendor's fee that reflects the size of the region and its conference, so that larger regions/conferences get a larger percentage. The percentage could be based on the number of persons paying the full registration fee at the region's previous conference. The total for all of the regions could be set by the board, with the individual percentage for each region being determined by attendance at the region's previous conference. RE (2): Set a time frame within which National can attempt to recruit National vendors and after which National will stop trying to do so and let individual regions attempt to do so.

RE (1): The result was the following motion (based on a remark from Bill):

Regions are allocated \$100 from each national vendor. For each national vendor attending a regional conference, that Region is allocated an additional \$100. This change is to go into effect starting 2004-2005 Fiscal year.  
Yes-4; No-5. Failed.

The debate on this matter was genuinely contentious. It seems that National does not want to give us, the dominant region, anything they perceive to be a bonus. The argument generally marshaled against our position was this: all money ends up in National anyway, so there is no need to get anything extra.

Within seconds of the motion failing, National passed unanimously the motion reducing the regional fee from \$1500 to \$1000. I pointed out that, this too, should not be needed as "all money ends up in National anyway". The remark elicited giggles which only with difficulty could I interpret as embarrassment at the recognition of the hypocrisy.

RE (2): No discussion or action was considered.

Discussion, with an eye to reporting our reaction to National.

## B. Update on Future Hosts

- (a) 2004 – Union College is set. (Report is slated to be given.)
- (b) 2005 – Providence College is set. (Report is optionally slated to be given.)
- (c) 2006 – Wentworth Institute of Technology: update.