





that a number of Society members appear in the movie and will be credited as well. There was a round of applause from the BoG.

Elza next discussed the five-year IEEE Society Review that just finished. An in-person review was conducted in February and the report was finalized in April. The review made especial note of two things. The first was the success in the production of the Children's book , an initiative led by Anna Scaglione and Christina Fragouli. This project targets the youngest audience yet for the IEEE. The second  (i) -0e secos



that they are listening to those who courageously speak up to report their sexual harassment experiences.” The objective of the session is thus how ITSoc can improve our own organizational climate in respect to sexual harassment and bullying.

Elza next described how she planned to moderate the session. There would be three parts. (i) The first part involves a motion from Jeff Andrews. The goal of the motion is to assert the values of our society with respect to sexual harassment and retaliation and addresses the type of climate that we would like to have in our society. (ii) The second part involves statements from a number of ITSoc members and meeting attendees. The statements relate to the recent Title IX events at Princeton and to a letter that was sent to Princeton. Elza proposed to conduct this second part of the session in three rounds. In the first round Elza would distribute hardcopies of written statements that had been sent to her on the subject. Meeting attendees would have about 15 minutes to read these statements. In the second round, a number of people who had contacted Elza prior to the meeting would be given an opportunity to address the attendees. In the third round, Elza would ask the audience if anyone else in attendance would like to present their perspective and thoughts. In all three rounds Elza asked all attendees only to listen. This part of the session is not intended as a conversation or debate, but rather as an opportunity to hear and reflect on the perspectives of all our colleagues. At the end of the three rounds the conversation will pause. (iii) The third part of the conversation would, indeed, not be part of the BoG meeting, but rather would take place in a follow-up session on Wednesday. As with the BoG meeting, the Wednesday session would be open to all Society members. It would pick up from where we leave off today, after we have all had time to reflect on, discuss, and digest the perspectives presented here in the BoG meeting. The goal Wednesday would be to build on

The first question asked in the discussion was whether the IEEE already has a policy on sexual harassment. The response was in the positive. Not only does the IEEE have a policy, but the ITSoc BoG passed a motion to reaffirm the policy in the Feb. 2018 BoG meeting. However, while the IEEE does have a statement, it is embedded in IEEE documents. In contrast, this statement would come directly from the Society. Some discussion of the wording of the original motion were raised, e.g., whether the wording would commit the BoG to follow “best practices” that it currently had not read nor considered. Some changes to the motion were made (reflected above) to adjust this, e.g.,

could do better moving forward. Similar to a personal or family illness, as a society we are going through a tough period. This could be a teaching moment. She hopes that, going forward, we will become a better society than we would have been otherwise. She heard

Reviewing some other trends (e.g., a very slow decrease in membership revenue, income from conferences, and the cost of supporting schools) Aaron concluded that the drop in the profit from the Transactions (from \$600k USD in 2014 to \$400k USD in 2017) is the most important trend.

Aaron then recapped societal finances for 2017 and 2018. The Society ended 2017 with a surplus of \$30k USD. The forecast for 2018 is that ITSoc will end the year with a deficit of \$68k USD. The main cause of this predicted deficit is the decrease of \$85k USD in Transactions revenue just mentioned. Aaron asked all BoG members and committee chairs to limit expenses. Looking forward to 2019, the IEEE is requesting ITSoc to submit a budget for 2019 that will attain a surplus of \$22k USD. Aaron is working on the budget. The initial draft will be provided to the IEEE in early July.

Addressing the question of whether deficits are a real problem for ITSoc, Aaron noted that at the start of last year ITSoc reserves were \$4.3 million USD, and increased to \$5 million USD due to income from investments. However, while the reserves are large, the IEEE does not “officially” allow deficit spending, i.e., it is unclear whether the IEEE would approve a planned budget for 2019 that targets a year-end loss. He reminded the BoG that after a Society has deficits in any two years out of a three-year sliding window, the IEEE can step in. Finally there was a discussion of how the Society can access its reserves for new initiatives via the “3% Rule”. (Please see minutes of other BoG meetings for detailed discussion of the 3% Rule.)

Turning to planning, Aaron then asked whether the Society should take concerted action to address Society finances. On the one hand, ITSoc has not run a deficit for a long time, the reserves are large (and running a deficit is one way to tap into them), ITSoc was forecast to end 2017 in deficit and did not, so things often have a way of working themselves out. On the other hand, the structural trends are clear, it takes time to implement change, without income the Society has less flexibility, and were the IEEE to step in the BoG and the Society would lose some control. So, Aaron concluded, it’s a matter of being proactive versus reactive. BoG members asked some questions regarding comparison to trends in other societies’ finances (since we are all affected by click rates). One difference with other IEEE societies is that, since revenue from the Transactions was historically so large, the ITSoc BoG has, to date, asked conference to target very small profits.

Aaron then proposed the following motion on forming an ad-hoc committee.

Motion: “Whereas: The Society is expecting operational budget deficits in the future; The BoG wishes to form a strategic plan for how to alter its revenues and costs in response to the expected deficits; and The BoG desires input on the strategic plan from a diverse set of stakeholders.

“Be it resolved: That the president shall appoint an A -
with a charge to review all aspects of the Society’s finances and report recommendations on changes the Society should make in response to anticipated deficits; and That the committee shall consist of members representing publications, conferences, schools; someone who has served or is serving as Society treasurer; and others that the president may select.”

Aaron made the motion and it was seconded by Suhas Diggavi. The motion was passed unanimously

In conclusion, Aaron asked for proposals for “new initiatives” for 2019. It was discussed that new journals and magazines do not classify as new initiatives. That said, while the funding

for new publications must be drawn from operating revenue (rather than from reserves), the IEEE does understand that the cost of launching a new publication will outweigh revenues for the first few years. The IEEE will take that into account if the Society ends up with losses for the first few years of the launch.

- 4) Nominations and Appointments (N&A) Committees:** Nominations and Appointments (N&A) Committee Chair Alon Orlitsky began by reviewing the committee members (himself, Gerhard Kramer, Amos Lapidot, Rüdiger Urbanke, and Raymond Yeung) and the set of nominations and appointments that the Committee oversees (External Nominations, Awards, Massey, Cover, Shannon, Outreach Chair, IEEE Fellows, Executive Editor, Wyner, and the BoG Slate). Alon recapped appointments and nominations made by the N&A and Membership committees at the February 2018 BoG meeting. The nominations were also confirmed at that meeting by the BoG. These include Stark Draper as Chair of the Schools Committee, Antonia Tulino to membership of the IEEE Fellows Committee, Yony Murin as the ITSoc Young Professional Representative, Vincent Tan as Outreach Subcommittee Chair, and Igal Sason as Executive Editor of the Transactions. In addition since the last meeting the chair of the External Nominations committee had to step down. Last year's chair, David Neuhoff, has agreed to step in for the rest of 2018. Finally the Committee assembled a slate of 12 candidates for election to the ITSoc BoG. The election will be conducted by the IEEE. Alon then reviewed the statistics of the current BoG and the procedure followed to assemble the slate. The current BoG has 27 members, 20 men and 7 women; 20 members are from the US, 3 from Europe, 2 from Canada, and 2 from Australia. Of the 8 BoG members retiring all are male, 6 are from the US, 1 is from Canada, and 1 is from Australia. The considerations the Committee weighted in assembling the slate was qualification (in research and past contributions to ITSoc), balance (amongst levels of seniority and geographic diversity), and goals (increased involvement — only those retiring BoG members actively involved in activities were asked to stay for a second term — and acceptable attendance — all candidates were asked to attend at least two BoG meetings in person annually). He then reviewed the slate of 12 candidates, the bios of whom had been circulated to the BoG two weeks prior to the meeting. (Coming out of the committee, the slate of candidates did not need to be voted on.) Alon next reminding the BoG that revisions to the ITSoc Constitution and Bylaws are typically discussed and voted on in the October meeting. Alon next turned to the election of the ITSoc officers. At the BoG meeting names are proposed, with voting cond1 0 0 Tm 2 (vo) -0 -0.2 (e-0.2(s) 0.2(i).2 (t) 0.2 (o) -0.2o) -0.2o

Communications Society / Information Theory Society Paper Award. The Awards Committee had distributed a report on the Information Theory Best Paper Award to the BoG three weeks prior to the meeting. She talked through the nominations for the best paper award and the process followed by the Committee.

Motion: "To accept the report of the Awards Committee." The motion passed.

Motion: "To award the paper per the recommendation of the Awards Committee." The motion passed.

- 6) Membership Committee:** Membership Committee Chair Helmut Bölcskei focused his report on the proposed reorganization of the Membership Committee. There are three main changes. First, the School Subcommittee would be moved into the Conference Committee. The Student and Outreach Subcommittees would be combined and would consist of two regular members (with staggered two-year terms) and two student or post-doc members each serving one-year terms. Finally, the number of regular members of the Membership Committee would be reduced from four to two; one would serve as chapters liason, one would serve as WITHITS liason. There is also one other member, the Young Professionals Representative. He also reviewed who would be the voting members of the committee and the processes for appointing the various members to the subcommittees. These proposed changes need to be incorporated into the Bylaws prior to adoption.
- 7) Fellows and Massey Committees:** Helmut Bölcskei next turned to the Fellows and Massey Committees, both of which he also chairs. Helmut reported that this year there were eleven strong nominations for IEEE Fellow. The evaluations were submitted to the IEEE in mid-June, with decisions by Nov. 2018. He thanked the members of the Committee (Antonia Tulino, Ning Cai, Max Costa, Pramod Viswanath, Emanuele Viterbo, Hirosuke Yamamoto) for their work. He next turned to the Massey Award Committee. This committee received eight strong nominations. He thanked the members of the Committee (Tara Javidi, Erdal Arikan, Vivek Borkar, Tom Fuja, Krishna Narayanan) for their work.
- 8) Conference Committee:** Conference Committee Chair Emanuele Viterbo first reviewed the makeup of the committee (himself, Salman Avestimehr, Elza Erkip, Albert Guillén i Fàbregas, Brian Kurkoski, Chen Li, Alfonso Martinez, Emina Soljanin, Daniela Tuninetti, and Aaron Wagner). Emanuele reported that ISIT'17 Aachen closed with a 10% surplus. There is nothing to report about ISIT'18 Vail. ISIT'19 Paris accepted an offer to use the Conference Management System (CMS) for a three-year period. At the moment this contract is being processed by the IEEE. ISIT'20 Los Angeles has nothing to report. ISIT'21 Melbourne is now registered with IEEE. A presentation from an organizing committee to hold ISIT'22 in Helsinki, Finland, was to follow later in the meeting. There has been an expression of

of these ideas. A question was raised about the trouble some students have in acquiring visa to attend ISIT'18 Vail. It seems visas can be a problem regardless of the country in which a conference is located.

Muriel Médard next presented the proposal to hold ISIT 2022 in Helsinki, Finland. This was a revision of a previous proposal to hold ISIT in Helsinki that had not been chosen. Muriel reviewed the experience of the organizing committee, some details about the location, ISITs previously held in Scandinavia (Sweden in 1976 and Norway in 1994), and quickly focused in on the question of venue. The organizing committee had identified two possible locals: Finlandia Hall in central Helsinki or The Otaniemi Campus of Aalto University, which is a ten minute subway ride from downtown. The former option would result in a 10% surplus, the latter is less expensive so the surplus would be 20%. The organizing committee requested feedback from the BoG on which venue was preferable. After a discussion on the proximity of lecture rooms relative to one another, the availability of on-campus housing options, and whether lunch would be included (lunch is included in the Aalto campus option), the following motion was made.

Motion: "To hold ISIT 2020 in Helsinki." The motion carried unanimously.

To provide feedback to the organizers on the choice of venue the BoG held a straw poll. There were 4 votes to hold ISIT in Finlandia Hall in downtown Helsinki. There were 13 votes to hold ISIT on the Aalto University Campus. There were 3 abstentions.

- 9) Schools Subcommittee:** School Subcommittee Chair Stark Draper first reviewed the Committee membership (himself, Helmut Bölskei, and Parastoo Sadeghi), the schools already held or planned for 2018 (ESIT'18 in Berinoro, Italy; NASIT'18 in College Station, TX; and India'18 in Mumbai, India), and school planned or proposed for 2019 (ESIT'19 in Sophia Antipolis, France; NASIT'19 in Boston, MA; Australia'19 in Sydney, Australia; and India'19). Stark asked all organizers to contact him early in the year prior to when the school is to be held to let him know of the intent to make a proposal. With the current severe constraints on ITSoc's budget and without sufficient notification there may not be budget available to support a school. Motions to support should be submitted to the BoG roughly one year prior to when the school will be held. Stark also discussed that one task of the Committee is to formulate "best practices" to help organizers arrange and run schools as well as to collect data on attendance. There is interest to have ITSoc support a new school in East Asia. This year ITSoc was not able to support a school in Taiwan due to budgetary constraints. The Committee aims to be able to support such a new school as a new initiative for the period 2020-2022 (new initiatives can last for up to three years). Regarding attendance at schools the BoG asked how the proliferation of "schools", beyond just those

In the discussion of the motion the treasurer indicated that the Padovani fund now does not only support the travel and accommodations of the Padovani lecturer (the lecture is delivered at NASIT), but also contributes an additional \$10k USD to spend on student activities at NASIT. It was asked whether this was included in, or was in addition to, the \$15k request. Stark indicated that he was not aware of this \$10k USD from the Padovani fund. As the Treasurer indicated that the 2019 budget is due in early July, Stark told the BoG he would work with the Treasure to determine the funding level for NASIT'19 (and the other schools) taking into account the Padovani Funds, bringing a motion back to the BoG for email vote later in the summer. He therefore modified his original (above) motion as follows:

Motion:

Following the conclusion of Prakash's report, Elza stood up to thank Prakash for all his work,

sobering statistics on women in the workforce worldwide as well as in academia in particular. This format will be continued here at ISIT'18 with a lunch event "Know your stats". Lalitha and Natasha then looked to the future. They are both ready to step down from their roles and need new volunteers. They foresee that with the nascent move of WITHITS to within the Membership Committee the process of hand-off could be regularized. Elza then stood to take the opportunity to thank Natasha and Lalitha for their work. She emphasized that the events are not just for women and are more interesting when the attendance is diverse. The BoG applauded Natasha and Lalitha.

13) Ad-hoc Committee on Diversity and Inclusion: Elza Erkip next presented an update on the Ad-Hoc Committee on Diversity and Inclusion, the creation of which was approved at the Feb. 2018 BoG meeting. She first reviewed the membership of the committee: herself (chair), Stark Draper, Sid Jaggi, Tara Javidi, Muriel Médard, Emanuele Viterbo. In arranging

departing ISIT'18 early to present the Phase I proposal to the IEEE TAB and Periodicals

educational videos that the committee is producing are aimed towards high school students while, on the other hand, the lectures developed for ITSoc schools (and therefore the videos thereof) target an expert audience.

17) Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 7:00pm local time.