

# Computer Science Publication Venues Portal

This document is a proposal for the scoping of a portal that would assist computer science researchers and other interested parties in obtaining information about the quality of relevant publication venues.

## 1 Principles

1. The portal should be sustainable over the next 5-10 years without undue effort.
2. Additions should be able to be made relatively easily.
3. If rankings are provided, they should be customizable.
4. Algorithms and/or sources of information should be transparent.
5. The Portal should combine/include objective measures and human judgements.
6. All information should be time-stamped, especially that not gathered dynamically.

## 2 Some Possibilities (and potential issues)

1. Collect (and possibly combine) rankings from other online sources, such as Microsoft Academic Search, <http://academic.research.microsoft.com> and Arnetminer, <http://arnetminer.org/page/conference-rank/html/AI.html> Google citations ranking, [http://scholar.google.com.au/citations?view\\_op=top\\_venues&hl=en](http://scholar.google.com.au/citations?view_op=top_venues&hl=en)  
There are many other sites but unclear how many are useful. Many are not transparent as to how rankings are obtained. We must decide if we want to link to all/any of these less established sites. (Probably not?)  
There are also a few other national rankings (Finnish, Danish, Portuguese...)
2. Provide functions that collect data from the internet, such as h-index of program chairs.  
An issue is that such data will always be imperfect, so the SW would need to allow manual corrections that were then noted, time-stamped, etc.
3. Trip-advisor style peer voting system. (See 4.2.)  
An issue is who can vote. Should it be only Australian academics registered with CORE? Or anyone?
4. Existing CORE/ERA ranking() as a starting point, with ability to provide data and/or opinions that support/question that rating. Once we have an agreed process for making an initial set of ranking upgrades, that could be used in an ongoing manner, with the relevant documentation endorsed by CORE exec and placed on the system.
5. Links that quickly and easily take you to external ranking sites, or maybe the external ranking for a specific item. You provide a conference name, click on, say Microsoft Academic Search, and it brings up the page with your item.  
This would not have the potential issues with using other systems' data.

## 3 Questions to Explore

1. Which systems (Google, MS, Arnetminer), would give us an API and allow us to display their data?
2. Should we "go international"? Have an international committee? try to get a body such as ACM or IEEE to take it on to maintain it once developed?
3. Ongoing small amount of support via CORE?

## 4 First Steps

Hire a good student programmer, under guidance of a small group to do the following as a way of setting up the infrastructure, and providing useful functionality, without committing to new ranking activity.

1. Make a web portal including items from ERA 2010 and CORE 2008 lists, with both rankings available. ERA 2010 should be primary where both exist, but previous be readily accessible via a click. These would be the timestamps for the ranking.
2. Allow for rating comments (must be signed - register with email and verify). Would be good if these could also be part of a tripadvisor style system.
3. Allow for specified “objective” data that people could choose to obtain manually for conferences they cared about. Clear instructions should be given as to how to calculate, and entries must be “signed” and time-stamped. Examples include h-index of program chairs, rating on selected other systems, acceptance rate of full papers, etc. This data, when available, should be displayed along with rating.
4. Allow for rating changes (must have justification provided, and be approved by exec.). Change must be time-stamped. Old rating must be retained in history and accessible. Justification must be available on system.
5. Add sub-category information to ERA 2010 list and allow display by sub-category. This should conceptually be multi-level, even if we do only single level initially.
6. Provide stats on how many conferences/journals in each sub-category, and what percentage are at each rank.
7. Provide infrastructure to obtain additional information for a user identified venue. Use one of MS Academic Search, Arnetminer or Google citation comparison as example.

## 5 Current Status

It has been agreed to hire a student programmer, under the guidance of Alistair Moffat and Lin Padgham, for 1 month FT equivalent, to do steps 1 and 2 above, then evaluate.