

SSID: UofT
Username: acmeeting2018
password: cvpr2018



What we told CVPR 18 AC's

Slides edited by: DAF,
from slides by DAF, Ivan, Deva, Aude



Outline

- Quick reflections on our state
- What we told AC's
 - minus a bunch of housekeeping



Top Computer Science Conferences

Ranking is based on *Conference H5-index* ≥ 12 provided by Google Scholar Metrics

Show Due only

All Categories



All Countries



Search by keyword

<i>Hindex</i>	<i>Publisher</i>	<i>Conference Details</i>
1	158 	CVPR : IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR Jun 18, 2018 - Jun 18, 2018 - Salt Lake City , United States http://cvpr2018.thecvf.com/submission/timeline
2	101 	NIPS : Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS) Dec 3, 2018 - Dec 6, 2018 - Palais des Congrès de Montréal , Canada https://nips.cc/ Deadline : Tue 26 Jun 2018
3	98 	ECCV : European Conference on Computer Vision Sep 8, 2018 - Sep 14, 2018 - Munich , Germany https://eccv2018.org/ Deadline : Wed 14 Mar 2018
4	91 	ICML : International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML) Jul 10, 2018 - Jul 15, 2018 - Stockholm , Sweden https://2017.icml.cc/
5	89 	ICCV : IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision Jan 30, 2018 - Jan 31, 2018 - Istanbul , Turkey http://waset.org/conference/2018/01/istanbul/ICCV

Main challenges from scaling

- CVPR18=2xCVPR15; CVPR15=2xCVPR11; CVPR63=Entire population of US!
- Consequences
 - Demographics
 - most people haven't done X before (for any X)
 - balance is hard (CVPR 18 made errors, but we'll get it right in 21!)
 - Money and weirdness
 - Lots of money
 - naughtiest person in big community is really naughty
 - Loss of coherence
 - diddles on fiddles on twiddles
 - what are our key aspirational problems?

Strategies

- Regulation
 - we need principles, procedures, codes of conduct, etc., etc.
 - boring, but valuable; slowly happening
- Training
 - lots of people really try to help but don't know how
 - most URGENT: develop training materials for referees, and make all use
 - Industry can help - a little money to support
- Exposition
 - big picture expositions of vision are OLD
 - senior members of community should take on a project
 - **What should everyone know**
 - Industry can help
 - STOP HIRING SENIOR VISION ACADEMICS - **RIGHT NOW, DAMMIT!**
 - money to supply time

Outline

- Quick reflections on our state
- What we told AC's
 - minus a bunch of housekeeping



Our Principles

- we want to make the best decisions we can to serve the community.
- we want these decisions to be transparent to the authors.
 - While an author may not be happy with a decision, the author should understand why the decision was made.
- we want area chairs to understand what other area chairs are doing, so there is reasonable consistency across area chairs.
- we want points of policy to be understood by all area chairs.
- we want to minimize appeals.

Operating Practices

- all decisions based on reviews, CMT discussions and AC discussions
- all decisions will have consensus of at least two AC's.
- all decisions will have a summary setting out the basis for the decision.
- all summaries will have been checked by another AC using a checklist.
- we will raise and discuss points of policy at AC meeting
- no need to tell authors how to write their papers, or how to improve them

Operating Practices

- if all referees agree that a paper should be rejected, we expect the paper to be accepted ONLY if there are unusual circumstances: examples are
 - a major and obvious referee error
 - a compelling rebuttal that causes referees to change their mind.

- if all referees agree that a paper should be accepted we expect the paper to be rejected ONLY if there are unusual circumstances: examples are
 - a major technical error;
 - fraud or plagiarism not originally detected by referees.

Policy Issues: Plagiarism

Stealing text from another paper, written by other authors

Our procedure:

- DAF investigates, recommends to other PC's who vote accept/reject
 - use IEEE Intellectual Property office standards
- Outcomes:
 - Likely successful prosecution = note to AC, authors, desk reject and referral to IEEE
 - Not likely successful = note to AC, authors

Slow, but moderately effective

AC's: for any charge of plagiarism: refer to DAF, proceed as if charge is FALSE

Policy Issues: Self plagiarism

Reusing text from your own paper.

Our procedure:

- DAF investigates, recommends to other PC's who vote accept/reject
 - use IEEE Intellectual Property office standards
 - Which are confusing.... (essentially, it's improper, but they don't do anything)
- Outcome:
 - note to AC, authors, pointing out policy of IEEE, no further action
- Slow, but moderately effective

AC's: for any charge of plagiarism: refer to DAF, proceed as if charge is FALSE

Policy Issues: Conflicts and self reports

Hard conflicts: CMT helps us, and we enforce

- We have lots of rather squishy soft conflicts
 - Paper might be by a friend;
 - you might have started a collaboration;
 - you owe author a favor;
 - you owe referee a favor; etc.

AC's:

- please self-report uncomfortable situations,
 - We'll figure out how to cope
 - Self-report even if you think you can manage

Policy Issues: Don't write papers for authors

Script: Referee/AC reads paper, sees ways in which it could be better, recommends changes which authors refuse to adopt.

Suggested solution: Authors' problem. Also, if it's not acceptable without changes, reject it.

Theory: you can't stop fools from being fools, and it's not worth trying.

We make the best decisions we can based on info, but if you make a suggestion that makes their paper look good, and they want to leave it out of final paper, they really haven't read the memo.

Policy Issues: Extra experiments

Script: Referee asks for extra in rebuttal; author supplies; now there's more material, and we're not sure what will go in paper.

Suggested solution: Authors' problem.

Theory: you can't stop fools from being fools, and it's not worth trying.

We make the best decisions we can based on info, but if they have info that makes their method look good, and they leave it out of final paper, they really haven't read the memo.

Policy Issues: Anonymity and Format Violations

This is all a bit squishy: use your judgement.

- Huge anonymity violations are a desk reject, but small stuff is better just noted in summary.
 - Anonymity theory: we don't want big organizations or famous people bullying referees, but it's rough to reject for being inept at anonymity
- Huge format violations are a desk reject, but small stuff is better just noted in summary.
 - Format theory: we don't want people submitting too much, but it's rough to reject for being bad at LaTeX or English

Policy Issues: Secret datasets

Script: Referee/AC rejects paper as “unscientific” because it’s evaluated on a dataset that can’t be/won’t be/hasn’t been published, so can’t be replicated.

Solution: You really can’t do this. There is no such policy, and you shouldn’t invent policies. Judge situation on its merits.

Theory: You can’t invent policies

If an issue comes up that looks like a matter of policy, raise with a PC and we’ll advise or bring it up in plenary. CVPR generally has very few binding policies, and they’re obvious (no plagiarism; no dual submission; no fraud; math needs to be right; etc).

Policy Issues: Summaries and Checklist

There will be about 3000 summaries. You will check each others summaries. To simplify, there is a checklist:

Key principle:

- **Would a reasonable author object to the summary as a basis for the decision?**

Policy Issues: Summary Checklist

- Does the summary mention reviews or referees?
- Did the referees agree?
- If all referees agree, is the summary consistent with that consensus?
 - (if not, it may be OK, but should be scrutinized very carefully, as if the referees disagree; in this case, we expect multiple AC's to be involved, and the summary to be a clear record as below)
- If referees disagree, or make borderline recommendations:
 - Was there a rebuttal?
 - Does the summary mention the rebuttal?
 - Was there a discussion?
 - Does the summary mention the discussion?
 - Does the summary give the main points used to reach the decision?

You can't get away with this...

This sort of thing has been done for years and needs to stop

Paper describes a method that has been known for a while

Majority of reviewers vote X

Two of three reviewers vote reject and there is a rebuttal and I agree with majority

Three borderline reviews, discussion is mixed, there is a rebuttal, but I don't like paper

Policy Issues: Summary Checklist

- Does the summary mention reviews or referees?
- Did the referees agree?
- If all referees agree, is the summary consistent with that consensus?
 - (if not, it may be OK, but should be scrutinized very carefully, as if the referees disagree; in this case, we expect multiple AC's to be involved, and the summary to be a clear record as below)
- If referees disagree, or make borderline recommendations:
 - Was there a rebuttal?
 - Does the summary mention the rebuttal?
 - Was there a discussion?
 - Does the summary mention the discussion?
 - Does the summary give the main points used to reach the decision?

Sample Distributions

Be aware pools differ. History says the accept rate will be about 25%. We have 108 ACs. This means:

- about 70 AC's between .17 and .33
 - about 5 papers in 30 to about 10 in 30
- about 12 AC's have accept rates from .33 to .41
 - about 10 in 30 to about 12 in 30
- about 12 AC's have accept rates from .08 to .17
 - about 2 in 30 to about 5 in 30
- a few AC's have accept rates greater than .41 OR less than 0.08

Not a license to run wild, but many will have funny pools. We'll keep an eye on progress and update.

Summary

- Scale makes everything a lot harder
 - weirdest event is very weird indeed
- We MUST
 - avoid unforced errors
 - build policy and procedural frameworks
 - recognize almost everyone is doing X for the first time
 - train them in our expectations
 - inspire intellectually ambitious talent
 - by expounding a coherent view of what we do
 - What should I solve to get famous?