



print subscriptions effectively began about 7 years ago. Aylin indicated that the costs may continue to climb. Nick asked for further details on this. Elza asked whether other societies also subsidize print subscriptions. The answer is yes. Nick indicated that the break-even cost of print subscriptions will climb as fewer people subscribe. Michelle indicated that these costs may not climb linearly. Muriel suggests that print subscription costs are high (including paper, mailing) and differ according to where you live. Elza raised the issue of whether people will continue to be society members if print copies become too expensive to obtain. **To Do:** Aylin will propose an increase in price for print subscriptions.

Aylin mentioned that for DL program, the upper limit on reimbursement had been set at \$2000 per trip. She mentioned that there are now requests for more than \$2000 per trip. Gerhard pointed out that the annual budget for the DL program is \$25K, which can be allocated among talks. Currently, we have had only 2 DL trips so far for 2012, and 1 scheduled for 2013. So there does not seem to be a problem. Aylin mentioned that a \$100K budget is split among committee expenses, the student committee, and reimbursement for the DL program. Frank mentioned that the DL program was never designed to cover all trip expenses. Chapters are expected to share the cost. \$2000 per trip is guidance to the chapters for budgeting. Nick asked how the surplus from the \$25K DL budget is being spent. Aylin replied that the unspent part of the \$100K budget yields the surplus. However, she said that there are always unexpected budget items which arise.

4. Muriel presented the President's Report. The major items concern publications. The items consist of the report of the ad hoc committee on the growth of the Transactions, the report of the ad hoc committee on the production cost of the Transactions, scope of publications, and new proposed position of vice president of publications. This is followed by the review process update and updates on other activities.

With respect to the review process, input is being gathered and activities coordinated among officers committee members for the review at the TAB meeting in November, which will be very thorough. We should expect much feedback from that meeting. A document will be sent around to BoG members for comments. Covered areas are purpose of society, strategy and operations, conferences, publications, and education, membership, finance, governance.

In other activities, the ad hoc committee on outreach and education will present its report. A committee on the Tom Cover Dissertation Award has been formed, with Sergio and Giuseppe co-chairing. The award will be formalized and put into the bylaws.

Question from Abbas about the ad hoc committee on chapters and membership. Muriel answered that it has been established. **To Do:** Muriel will check on the level of activity for this committee and report at the next meeting.

#### 5. Bylaw changes

Muriel moved next to present proposed changes in the Bylaws for 2012, prepared by Giuseppe Caire.

First item. Proposed change to Article V: Standing Committees. Article 7 (Publication Committee). Add: "The Senior Past President of the Society shall serve as Vice President of Publications."

Muriel recapped the discussion from last BoG on this issue. There is a need for someone independent from the Publications Board to handle appeals above the EiC. Although these appeals occur very seldomly, there is a need to address this issue from a governance point of view. The proposed position of VP of

Andi Loeliger indicated that this is fine if it works as intended. However, could the role of the VP of Publications be interpreted differently in the future? Frank responded that the executive task list will indicate the role to be played by the VP of Publications, and so the limited scope of the role should be clear. The position is not intended to be the boss of the EIC.

Motion: approve change to Article V, Article 7. Motion was passed.

Second item. Proposed change to Article VII: Awards. Section 3 (The Information Theory Society Paper Award). Add: \No paper previously selected for an ITSoc paper award or a Joint ITSoc/ComSoc award shall be eligible for the ITSoc paper award. Normally in a given year one paper will be selected, but in exceptional circumstances up to two may be chosen. The committee may also decline to make any award, if they decide that no suitable paper has been nominated."

There is much discussion on the first sentence. Elza noted that the first sentence is vague. Alon asked why we would disallow a paper which has won the student paper award from winning the ITSoc paper award. Muriel indicated that this is currently possible. David said that as a general rule in the IEEE, winning a lower grade award should not preclude a paper from winning a higher grade award. Gerhard suggested that the first sentence be changed to "No paper previously selected for THE ITSoc paper award or a Joint ITSoc/ComSoc award shall be eligible for the ITSoc paper award." This would remove all ambiguity. Abbas, however, suggested that this would be redundant.

Michelle suggested that the first sentence be changed to \No paper previously selected for THE Joint ITSoc/ComSoc award shall be eligible for the ITSoc paper award." David then raised the issue of what happens if the Joint ITSoc/ComSoc award is being decided at the same time as the ITSoc paper award. In that case, under the proposed change by Michelle, the outcome would be somewhat random. Gerhard suggested that if this happens, then the ITSoc paper award can be decided at an earlier date. Muriel pointed out that since the First VP is ex officio on both award committees, there is actually little room for randomness. She also pointed out that the timing of the ITSoc paper award is well defined in the Bylaws. However, the deadlines for the Joint ITSoc/ComSoc award can be changed. ComSoc does not have the timing in the Bylaws. David suggested that \previously" is vague and should be changed to "in previous years." Muriel suggested that the First VP should be able manage both awards so that one paper does not get both awards. Abbas suggests that the text should read \No paper shall win both the ITSoc paper award and the Joint ITSoc/ComSoc award." Aylin asked whether one paper can win both the student paper award and the ITSoc paper award. Ubli asked whether a paper can win a pure ComSoc paper award and win the ITSoc paper award. Gerhard responded that no previous winner of a purely ComSoc award (at the same level) can win the Joint ITSoc/ComSoc award. However, winning a lower level ComSoc award does not preclude winning the joint award.

Motion: Paul suggested that due to the potential complexities involved, we should table the issue of whether to change Article VII: Awards. Section 3 (The Information Theory Society Paper Award), and let the awards committee chair further the discussion. The award committee chair is asked to return a carefully worded change to the BoG. Motion was passed.

Third item. Proposed change to Article VII. Awards. Section 3 (The Information Theory Society Paper Award). Add: \An open call for nominations for this award shall be published in the Newsletter, with a deadline of March 15."

Motion: approve change to Article VII, Section 3. Motion was passed.

Fourth item. Proposed change to Article VII. Awards. Section 3 (The Information Theory Society Paper

Award). Amend: \By March 1, the Publications Committee Chair or designee shall forward to the Awards Committee Chair a list of at least five articles, published in the previous two calendar years, for the consideration of the Awards Committee. Each nomination shall be accompanied by a statement outlining the contribution of the paper."

Motion: approve change to Article VII, Section 3. Motion was passed.

Fifth item. Proposed change to Article VII. Awards. Section 7 (ISIT Student Paper Award). Add: \This author must be a registered student of an educational institution at the time of paper submission to be eligible for this award."

Gerhard pointed out that the change is necessary since it is not enough to be a student of life.

Motion: approve change to Article VII, Section 7. Motion was passed.

Sixth item. Proposed change to Article VII. Awards. Section 7 (ISIT Student Paper Award). Replace: \The ISIT TPC shall select between 8 and 12 eligible papers as finalists and notify the authors accordingly." to \The ISIT TPC, or a committee formed by the ISIT TPC, shall recommend between 8 and 12 eligible papers as finalists to the Awards Committee Chair. The Awards Committee Chair shall select up to 6 of these papers as finalists and notify the authors accordingly."

Gerhard pointed out that currently the award committee reduces the list of candidates from 8-12 to 6. 3 can win in the end. Abbas asked whether we can leave it to the committee to decide how many are awarded. Gerhard pointed out that in the two previous years, the committee wanted to award more than 3. Paul suggests that this discussion is beside the point right now. We can revisit the number awarded at a later time.

Motion: Gerhard moves to put this proposal back to committee, and then after further deliberation, it will be presented to the BoG. Ubli suggests that the issue of how many to award is separate. Motion is seconded. The motion did not pass.

Motion: approve change to Article VII. Section 7. Motion was passed.

Seventh item: Proposed change to Article VIII. Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest. This is a new article added. I would like to discuss that this discussion is on the agenda for the next meeting.

codify everything. This proposed change represents the first step toward codification. It's a substantive step. Our sister societies in the IEEE are undergoing the same process right now.

Paul asked who drafted the CoI statement. Muriel said it was the junior past president. Gerhard recounted the history: at the Paraty meeting, Frank put together the text. Paul noted that the text is very well written. He asked whether we should seek further validation from the IEEE Code of Ethics. Abbas asked Frank about the process of gathering information. Frank said that a main source is the IEEE Code of Conduct. Frank believes that even minor CoI should be declared. Others can dismiss the concern if they think it's okay. David was still concerned about the lack of specific examples of CoI. These would be useful as guidance to individuals. Muriel indicated that the IEEE Code of Ethics exists and can serve as a guideline for individuals. We can include an explicit pointer to the IEEE Code of Ethics from our website. Gerhard said that it is very hard to spell out all possible CoI examples. Abbas added that spelling everything can actually go in the wrong direction in the sense that if a potential issue does not appear on the list of examples, then the person concerned may not feel obliged to mention it, even though it may be a problem. Martin pointed out that CoI is a very important issue. David checked the IEEE Code of Ethics and found no specific examples. Frank mentioned that we could include the NSF guidelines on CoI. But these should be included in the officers' task list rather than in the Bylaws.

Motion: approve change to Article VIII. Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest. Motion was passed.

#### 6. Proposal: Naming and Endowment of the ISIT Student Paper Award

Paul Siegel gave a presentation on the proposal to rename the ISIT Student Paper Award in honor of Jack and Toby Wolf. The renaming is to be accompanied by a funding campaign to endow the award (with the idea of possibly increasing the amount of the award). The Bylaws would be amended accordingly. Paul noted that Jack Wolf's profound contributions to information theory and the IT Society have been recognized with some of our most distinguished awards (IT Paper Award, Claude E. Shannon Award, Aaron D. Wyner Distinguished Service Award). He also noted that Jack was passionate about teaching and mentoring of students. This has been recognized by the UCSD Distinguished Teacher Award and the IT Society Padovani Lectureship. Toby Wolf has also been an important member of the community.

Paul noted that Jack was very proactive in creating mechanisms for recognizing and honoring student achievement. Examples of this include endowment of Shannon Graduate Fellowship (UCSD), contribution to Schultz Prize for Excellence in Graduate Student Research at UCSD, establishment of a number of scholarships and fellowships at UPenn, and service on the original board of the Marconi Society Young Scholar Award. Jack and Toby were enthusiastic proponents and supporters of the establishment of the IT Society's ISIT Student Paper Award. Renaming the ISIT Student Paper Award in honor of Jack and Toby would be a nice way to recognize the counsel, encouragement, and support they provided to generations of information theorists and electrical engineers. Endowment of the award would ensure its funding in perpetuity. A target of 100K would support 3 lucrative awards or 4-5 awards at current level.

Paul noted that Jack strongly supported the establishment of the student paper prize. There is a good chance of near-term success in fund-raising. For instance, over \$1M was raised in 5 months to support the establishment of the Jack Keil Wolf Endowed Chair in Electrical Engineering at UCSD last year. The fund can be managed by the IEEE Foundation (\$20K minimum). In terms of next steps, the BoG is asked to vote to approve the renaming of the award and the endowment campaign for funding it. It is proposed that an ad hoc committee be formed to address the following issues: the method of informing Toby and others, the timing and venue to publicly announce the naming, the identification of the fund-raising coordinator, and the Bylaw revision.

Following Paul's presentation, there was discussion. Abbas asked whether the student paper award has the prestige to warrant a name such as Jack Wolf. He would like to see the society add to the number of awards, rather than merely renaming. It is noted that Alex Vardy emailed in support of the proposal. Michelle Eros voiced her enthusiastic support. David Tse suggested that efforts should be made to make the student paper award more prestigious. The question is how. Ubli Mitra suggested that Jack would have been very enthusiastic about endowing the award. Ubli also mentioned that there won't be a dearth of names for other awards. Gerhard indicated that the BoG should give a charge to the ad hoc committee addressing this issue. Aylin mentioned that the IEEE Foundation is the right venue for managing the fund. They are eager to work with the IT Society on such matters. Alon suggested that the prestige of the student paper award will increase over time, with increased selectivity and monetary award value. Muriel asked how large the ad hoc committee should be. Paul said perhaps three. Abbas agreed that the formation of an ad hoc committee is a good idea.

Frank suggested that the ad hoc committee should be formed first, and then after deliberations, a motion can be made to rename the paper award. Michelle and Andi Loeliger agree. The conclusion is that Muriel will form the ad hoc committee with Paul being the chair. The committee will then consider the proposal presented by Paul. There is therefore no need to vote at present.

7. Martin Bossert presented the conference committee on behalf of Bruce Hajek. The only item for discussion is whether IT Society will support NetCod 2014. Muriel mentioned that Daniel Lucani has sent a message indicating that he will make the proposal for supporting NetCod 2014 at a later BoG meeting. Martin indicated that there are no other issues for discussion at present.

#### 8. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Future of IT Transactions

Frank presented the report. The ad hoc committee consisted of the following members: Helmut Bolcskei, Emmanuel Candes, Abbas El Gamal (Chair), David Forney, Bruce Hajek, Frank Kschischang, Madhu Sudan, Alexander Vardy.

The committee charge mentions that "The IT Transactions is the premier publication in the field of information theory and ranks among the top IEEE publications in terms of the number of citations and eigenfactor. However, the size of the Transactions has been steadily growing in recent years, which raises the questions of whether this growth can be managed, and whether it is hurting quality. Furthermore, the Transactions has not been attracting the best papers in closely related fields, such as cryptography, complexity, learning, quantum information, and network science."

(2), it is found that measures include page limits, spin-off of new journals, more fast-rejects, use of on-line supplements, and all-electronic publication. For (3), it is found that browsability is not an issue because journals are nowadays searched, not browsed. Few comments were made about timeliness. For (4), it is found that T-IT is best journal in its field, more prestigious than any other IEEE journal. T-IT is the most mathematical of the IEEE journals (except possibly T-AC). It is more concerned with technical virtuosity than with impact. The quality of papers ranges widely, and therefore it does not give the quality stamp that other journals and conferences (e.g., FOCS, STOC) do. For (5), it is found that there is little or no sentiment for splitting the Transactions, spinning off new journals, or narrowing the scope. Some actions are under way: raise minimum acceptance threshold, reject incremental papers, avoid special issues. Some discussion items: IT does not have mechanism for pointing out the papers that everyone should read, either in T-IT or ISIT. Other fields have highly selective journals or conferences. Perhaps we should start a magazine along the lines of the Signal Processing Magazine.

Summarizing journal policy, it is noted that no other journal in our survey is contending with the growth that we are. Other IEEE journals have had success with instituting Senior Editors. *Physical Review Letters* (PRL) is an interesting model of a highly selective journal. It features short papers announcing major results from all branches of physics. It is widely read and one of most prestigious journals in any scientific discipline. The *Journal of Machine Learning Research* (JMLR) provides an interesting model for an online, open access journal. It was formed in 2000 by Kluwer Machine Learning Journal editorial board. It has a large staff of associate editors, and separate large editorial and advisory boards, with many top people. The journal makes commitment to rigorous yet rapid reviewing, with final versions of papers published electronically immediately upon receipt. JMLR also maintains an archive of open-source software for machine learning.

reviews, which would appear in some ephemeral but timely medium, e.g., IT Newsletter, IT website, or an IT blog. (3) Announce IT Prize Paper Finalists. This would be a formal responsibility of the Awards Committee. (4) Divide the T-IT into Part A (top) and Part B (archival) papers. No consensus on how to do this could be reached. (5) New, highly selective, interdisciplinary journal in the information sciences. The committee enthusiastically recommends IT Society support of the committee that has been created to explore the feasibility of such journal.

A working group consisting of E. Candes, G. D. Forney, Jr., M. Sudan, and M. Vetterli was formed to further discuss the possible creation of new journal of information sciences. It is noted that other fields have journals (Science, Nature, PRL) where the very best work is highlighted. We don't. Within the information sciences, there is much interest in understanding developments in related fields. We lack good means of doing so. Preliminary suggestions include (1) core scope should include mathematically-grounded information sciences areas (theoretical CS, IT, statistics, signal processing, etc). (2) Title of the journal would probably include the word information. (3) The sponsor would preferably be new non-profit organization. (4) Modest funding from government, industry, and universities. (5) Endorsement (probably without financial support) of societies, e.g., ACM, ITS, SPS, SIAM, IMS, AMS, INFORMS, with no dominant community. (6) Online, open-access model along the lines of JMLR is attractive. (7) If online



website.

Muriel raised the issue of whether we should have review and discussion papers in the Transactions. Sergio

XML, but sticks to PDF. On the other hand, XML gives standardized way of handling journals across

do not get to comment on the XML. Thus, the XML produced is not trustworthy. Currently ComSoc produces pdf only using editing outside of IEEE. IEEE currently funds conversion of ComSoc articles to XML, but authors do not get to comment on the XML. By the end of 2013, ComSoc will have to comply with the process currently applied to IT and most other IEEE societies.

Moving on, Helmut discussed the option for "moderate editing" of IT Transactions papers. Thus far, this was not an option for us because the quality of the math editing would not have been acceptable for

and the IEEE light editing process.

Muriel said that due to time constraints, the report by the outreach committee by Michelle E. Ross will be tabled until next meeting. Michelle has put up the presentation on the IT website. Perhaps the next meeting can take up this issue first.

Muriel thanked the outgoing BoG members, Martin, Frank, Andi, for their service. She said it has been a honor to serve as President of the IT Society this year.

The meeting was adjourned at 7 PM.