Feedback on "The Future of Reviewing in the ACL Community"

The ACL Reviewing Committee has written a document (https://www.cis.lmu.de/~hs/acl22/futurereviewing.html) covering a range of aspects of reviewing. This form is for the community to provide feedback on the document.

This form will be accepting responses until June 15th (extended from the earlier deadline of 10th).

. . .

* Required

Demographic Information

These questions are so we can see if there are important variations in opinions across specific parts of our community. All questions have the option to decline to answer.

1. Are you a current/previous member of ACL? *

   ◯ Yes

   ◯ No

   ◯ Not Sure

   ◯ Decline to answer

2. For how many ACL conferences have you been an: *

	0	1	2	3-5	6+	Decline to answer
Author	○	○	○	○	○	○
Reviewer	○	○	○	○	○	○
Area Chair	○	○	○	○	○	○

3. For how many ACL conferences have you been a: *

	0	1+	Decline to answer
Senior Area Chair	○	○	○
Program Chair	○	○	○

4. For how many review cycles of ARR have you been an: *

	0	1	2	3-5	6+	Decline to answer
Author	○	○	○	○	○	○
Reviewer	○	○	○	○	○	○
Action Editor	○	○	○	○	○	○

5. For how many commitment deadlines + decisions have you been an: *

	0	1	2+	Decline to answer
Author	○	○	○	○
Senior Area Chair	○	○	○	○
Program Chair	○	○	○	○

6. What is your career stage? *

Select your answer ⌄

7. In which region are you based? *

Select your answer ⌄

8. Gender (optional):

Enter your answer

Next

* Required

Feedback on Recommendations

The document (https://www.cis.lmu.de/~hs/acl22/futurereviewing.html) contains a range of recommendations, which we would like your opinion on. For the full details and context of each recommendation, please see the document.

At the end of the survey there is space for open comments.

Definitions:

Rolling Review: Frequent deadlines for submission of papers, revise-and-resubmit etc.; rolling review requires an integrated reviewing system.

Integrated Reviewing System: The reviewing for all ACL conferences is handled by a single system. This system requires an infrastructure of the type that was created for ARR.

Infrastructure: The infrastructure created by the ARR tech team. See the "Infrastructure" section of the document for a summary of what the infrastructure provides.

9. What is your opinion of these overall options? *

	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Support	Strongly Support	No Opinion
Keep rolling review and an integrated reviewing system, with improvements / modifications	○	○	○	○	○
Do not keep rolling review, but do have an integrated reviewing system, with improvements / modifications	○	○	○	○	○

Do not keep rolling review or an integrated reviewing system	○	○	○	○	○

10. What is your opinion of these specific recommendations from sections 1-4? *

	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Support	Strongly Support	No Opinion
ACL should support the reviewing infrastructure by paying for 1 Full-Time Equivalent employee.	○	○	○	○	○
If ARR is continued, it should focus on the major ACL conferences (ACL, AACL, EACL, NAACL, EMNLP) for now, though workshops may choose to accept reviews from ARR.	○	○	○	○	○
The review cycle (time from submission to receiving reviews and meta-reviews) should be 8 weeks, with a fair amount of discretion to suit timing of conferences.	○	○	○	○	○
Have a commitment deadline following every review cycle. Conferences can choose to have two commitment dates.	○	○	○	○	○
It should be easy to ask for a new set of reviewers when submitting a revised paper.	○	○	○	○	○
It should be easy to ask for a new Action Editor when submitting a revised paper.	○	○	○	○	○

11. What is your opinion of each of these options from the "Decoupling of reviews and acceptance" section? *

	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Support	Strongly Support	No Opinion
Return to a system where reviews and meta-reviews are written and used for just one conference	○	○	○	○	○
Use a rolling review system for reviews, but not meta-reviews (which would then be handled by an Area Chair within the conference)	○	○	○	○	○
Use a rolling review system for reviews and meta-reviews, with explicit instructions to write them as if this paper is being considered for one of the major conferences	○	○	○	○	○
Use ARR as originally designed, where reviews and meta-reviews discuss strengths and weaknesses of papers without a specific venue in mind	○	○	○	○	○

12. What is your opinion of these specific recommendations from sections 6-10? *

	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Support	Strongly Support	No Opinion
Keep 4 reviewers per paper until on-time completion rates improve	○	○	○	○	○
Extend the functionality of the ARR infrastructure (e.g.	○	○	○	○	○

	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Support	Strongly Support	No Opinion
to require that someone who submits more papers has to sign up for more reviews).	○	○	○	○	○
At least one reviewer for every paper should be a senior reviewer.	○	○	○	○	○
No two reviewers for a paper should be from the same research group.	○	○	○	○	○

13. What is your opinion of each of these options from the "Tracks" section? *

	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Support	Strongly Support	No Opinion
If a rolling-review system continues, introduce tracks. Authors specify a track, each track has associated Senior Action Editors and Action Editors.	○	○	○	○	○
Authors do not specify a track, but introduce Senior Action Editors and have each Action Editor handling papers for a single Senior Action Editor.	○	○	○	○	○
Authors specify a track, which is used to inform assignments, but do not have a strict structure.	○	○	○	○	○
No tracks, but try to improve reviewer assignment (either with better automatic matching or better processes for action editors).	○	○	○	○	○

14. What is your opinion of these specific recommendations from sections 12-16? *

	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Support	Strongly Support	No Opinion
Develop mentoring for both reviewers and action editors	○	○	○	○	○
Allow papers to be committed to a conference even if there are missing reviews or meta-reviews.	○	○	○	○	○
By default, authors sign up to be considered for reviewing assignments. They must opt-out if they are unable to review.	○	○	○	○	○

15. Any comments / other feedback?

Enter your answer

Back   Submit