Sample SIGCSE Special Session

1st Author	2nd Author	3rd Author
1st author's affiliation	2nd author's affiliation	3rd author's affiliation
1st line of address	1st line of address	1st line of address
2nd line of address	2nd line of address	2nd line of address
Telephone number, incl. country code	Telephone number, incl. country code	Telephone number, incl. country code
1st author's E-mail address	2nd E-mail	3rd E-mail

Categories and Subject Descriptors

• **Information systems→Database management system engines** • **Computing methodologies→Massively parallel and high-performance simulations.** This is just an example, please use the correct category and subject descriptors for your submission. The ACM Computing Classification Scheme:

http://www.acm.org/about/class/class/2012. Please read the HOW TO CLASSIFY WORKS USING ACM'S COMPUTING CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM for instructions on how to classify your document using the 2012 ACM Computing Classification System and insert the index terms into your Microsoft Word source file.

Keywords

Keywords are your own designated keywords separated by semicolons (";").

1. SUMMARY

Instead of an abstract, provide a summary of the session here.

2. OBJECTIVE

Describe the topic of the special session and explain how the session will be organized (e.g., as a committee report, tutorial, hands-on exercise, …). Indicate why the proposed session is important.

3. OUTLINE

Organize this section by subtopics, activities, or a similar scheme. If more than one participant is involved, label each section of the outline with the name of the participant who will be presenting that section. Note that in the case of a committee report, the presenters might be a subset of the authors. You have 75 minutes total and we suggest that you allow at least 40 - 50% of the time for questions and answers or other interaction with the attendees. A sample outline might look something like this:

• Introduction (10 mins) – Speakers will introduce topic of the session with examples

• Demo of topic (20 mins) - Blah, blah, blah

• Small Group Brainstorming (15 mins) – Attendees will brainstorm ideas relevant to the session

• Etc.

4. EXPECTATIONS

State the intended audience. Indicate how much the session will cover and what the audience should learn. This is particularly important if your proposed special session is a tutorial. If feedback from the audience is desired, indicate how it will be elicited.

5. SUITABILITY FOR A SPECIAL SESSION

Include a brief description that justifies the inclusion of this presentation as a special session. Explain why the proposed presentation is better suited for a special session than a paper or panel.

6. REFERENCES

[1] Bowman, M., Debray, S. K., and Peterson, L. L. 1993. Reasoning about naming systems. *ACM Trans. Program. Lang. Syst.* 15, 5 (Nov. 1993), 795-825. DOI= http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/161468.16147.

[2] Ding, W. and Marchionini, G. 1997. *A Study on Video Browsing Strategies*. Technical Report. University of Maryland at College Park.

[3] Fröhlich, B. and Plate, J. 2000. The cubic mouse: a new device for three-dimensional input. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (The Hague, The Netherlands, April 01 - 06, 2000). CHI '00. ACM, New York, NY, 526-531. DOI= http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/332040.332491.

[4] Tavel, P. 2007. *Modeling and Simulation Design*. AK Peters Ltd., Natick, MA.

[5] Sannella, M. J. 1994. *Constraint Satisfaction and Debugging for Interactive User Interfaces*. Doctoral Thesis. UMI Order Number: UMI Order No. GAX95-09398., University of Washington.

[6] Forman, G. 2003. An extensive empirical study of feature selection metrics for text classification. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 3 (Mar. 2003), 1289-1305.

[7] Brown, L. D., Hua, H., and Gao, C. 2003. A widget framework for augmented interaction in SCAPE. In *Proceedings of the 16th Annual ACM Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology* (Vancouver, Canada, November 02 - 05, 2003). UIST '03. ACM, New York, NY, 1-10. DOI= http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/964696.964697.

[8] Yu, Y. T. and Lau, M. F. 2006. A comparison of MC/DC, MUMCUT and several other coverage criteria for logical decisions. *J. Syst. Softw.* 79, 5 (May. 2006), 577-590. DOI= http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2005.05.030.

[9] Spector, A. Z. 1989. Achieving application requirements. In *Distributed Systems*, S. Mullender, Ed. ACM Press Frontier Series. ACM, New York, NY, 19-33. DOI= http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/90417.90738.

Columns on Last Page Should Be Made As Close As Possible to Equal Length