

NC STATE

Joel Trussell <hjt@ncsu.edu>

Final comments: EiC of IEEE Proceedings

1 message

Joel Trussell <hjt@ncsu.edu>

Mon, Jan 7, 2019 at 10:07 PM

To: Jose M F Moura <moura@andrew.cmu.edu>

Cc: hjt <hjt@ncsu.edu>

Bcc: Marian Pospieszalski <mpospies@nrao.edu>

Jose,

I wish to tell you personally of the disappointment in your actions. I expected Jim's reaction, since he is from the typical old-boys network in the IEEE. He admitted to me in his phone call 12/11/18 that he had only skimmed my letter and not looked at the documentation at all. You had indicated that you had read the documentation. So I expected more of you.

You quoted "4.1.3 PSPB Nominations and Appointments Committee Charter, states under C.4 "Make recommendations to PSPB for Editors-in-Chief of Proceedings of IEEE ..." But you did not quote, assuming that you read, the interpretation of this "recommendation." In my timeline, I note that Samir requested "a complete search of the [EIC selection] process used in the past." In an email to me he stated, "As soon as I receive the documented process, it will be shared with PSPB." That document is available in my online documentation. I attach here for easy reference. In it is found, "October. Teleconferences are arranged for the PSPB N&A members to review all slates. **Members of the PSPB N&A Committee deliberate on the submissions and select one recommendation that they consider is the best applicant for each Editor-in-Chief and each editorial board member position.** In the event that submissions for a position are not satisfactory, PSPB N&A support staff contacts the respective Editor-in-Chief and staff support person for an additional candidate. Consultation with each current Editor-in-Chief and appropriate department staff should also occur for questions regarding any applicant."

In the case of the EIC of PIEEE, the submissions that are deliberated upon are those that I submitted. Their recommendations should come from those nominated by the PIEEE Board. There is no reason to believe that section 4.1.3 should be interpreted as the NAC seeking nominations **unless they found the submissions unsatisfactory**. In which case, they are supposed to consult with me.

I noted in the timeline that Samir failed to share the document with the PSPB. I believe this was intentional and an attempt to conceal the fact that the leadership had failed to follow their own precedents and written procedures.

The online documentation lists several cases where the leadership failed to follow the opsmanual guidelines. This consistent inappropriate behavior leads to the obvious conclusion of blatant cronyism. The leadership would do what was necessary to "elect" their friend to EIC of PIEEE. Samir had told me that I would be given the opportunity to make my case at the PSPB meeting in November. He reneged on this by limited me to two minutes. This could hardly be interpreted as time to make a case that covered the extent of violations that occurred in the summer and fall. The manipulations of the election was only the final act in the play.

I had hoped that the IEEE leadership would seriously investigate, but was not surprised that there was only token attention paid to the matter. Since you had been elected as a petition candidate and had not come from the old-boys network, I hoped you would feel a need to change the system. Perhaps, you do. Perhaps, Tulay, Murat and Sankar and the PIEEE are simply collateral damage in part of a larger plan.

There is no need to respond to this. I realize that the emphasis on excellence that the leadership touts for the IEEE is for public relations. There will always be those within the IEEE who strive for excellence and achieve it on their limited scale. I wish those people well.

Regards,
Joel

On Thu, Dec 27, 2018 at 2:50 PM Jose M F Moura <moura@andrew.cmu.edu> wrote:

Marian

thank you for your email. I have deferred to President Jim Jefferies who has talked with Joel and has looked at the whole process of nomination of the EiC for the Proceedings. It is clear that the process needs clarification given the different interpretations that have arisen.

Quoting from the PSPB OpsManual:

While on

3.5.3 Appointment of the Editor-in-Chief The Editor-in-Chief of the PROCEEDINGS OF THE IEEE and the Editor-in-Chief of the IEEE PRESS are nominated by their respective boards. Their names shall be submitted to PSPB Nominations & Appointments Committee who shall in turn submit to PSPB for appointment.

On the other hand, on 4.1.3 PSPB Nominations and Appointments Committee Charter, states under C.4 "Make recommendations to PSPB for Editors-in-Chief of Proceedings of IEEE ..."

It is practice in IEEE that Nominations and Appointment Committees put forward a slate to the voting body, in this case PSPB, and then the voting body may or may not choose a candidate from this slate or choose a petition candidate or otherwise proposed candidate, for concrete examples, see how the Board of Directors chooses slates for IEEE President Elect (often chooses candidates that are not in the slate coming out of the IEEE N&A).

Thank you again.

Jose'

On 12/26/2018 4:20 PM, Marian Pospieszalski wrote:

Dear Professor Moura,

I served for the past 6 years on the IEEE Proceedings EB under Professor Joel Trussell. My final term expires at the end of this month, together with Trussell's tenure as the EiC. During the course of those six years, I have learned to appreciate his dedication, even-handedness and good judgment. This why I am troubled by the recent controversy concerning the nomination and election process of a new EiC of IEEE Proceedings. I trust you are already aware of this matter. My own record supports Professor Trussell's observation about little involvement of Professor Setti in EB activities over the course of the last six years. However, the PSPB, apparently having this information, still elected Professor Setti to be the next EiC of IEEE Proceedings. Properly conducted elections, have consequences, although I might feel sad for the other eminently qualified nominees whose strong involvement in EB proceeding was quite apparent.

Obviously, the controversy of this nature should have never arisen in a volunteer driven organization like IEEE "Advancing Technology for Humanity". Therefore, the reason for this letter is to seek your reassurance that you were satisfied with the process.

Let me take this opportunity to wish you a happy, and as an incoming IEEE President most successful, New Year.

Sincerely, Marian

--

Marian Pospieszalski, Ph.D., FIEEE
Scientist/Senior Research Engineer
National Radio Astronomy Observatory
NRAO Technology Center
1180 Boxwood Estate Road
Charlottesville, VA 22903-4602
e-mail: mpospies@nrao.edu
ph.: 434- 296-0350 (w)
ph.: 434-825-4812 (cell)
<http://scholar.google.com/citations?user=m1ORINKAAAAJ&hl=en>



PSPB NA Ed Bd Process 180919.pdf

19K