IEEE Signal Processing Society
Sensor Array and Multichannel (SAM) Technical Committee
Minutes of the SAM2014 Meeting
A Coruña, Spain
June 24, 2014; 12:30-13:45

Present TC Members: Monica Bugallo, Maria Sabrina Greco, Dominic K.C. Ho (Chair), Martin Haardt, Marco Lops, Pascal Larzabal, Geert Leus, Marius Pesavento, Lee Swindlehurst, Peter Willett (Vice-Chair).

Present Associate Members: Sergiy Vorobyov
Other Guests:

This was an informal (and delicious) lunch meeting, and no quorum was present to vote on items. Nonetheless it was useful to discuss items of TC interest with those present. Much of the discussion related to presentation material from TC Chair Ho, which is also provided with these minutes.

§1. Membership

- Member diversity was an item called out by the last TC review. In fact, diversity has somewhat improved over the last year (2013 to 2014).

    o Industrial/Lab TC membership has increased from 3 to 4. Female TC membership has also increased from 3 to 7. There remains a need to increase membership from Region 10. Region 10 provides a great deal of our technical content.

- There appears to be a thrust of interest in microphone arrays, and it appears that we do not have TC membership to reflect that. It was proposed that the Chair contact the Audio and Acoustic Signal Processing (AASP) TC to ask if retiring members might be interested in posing for election in the SAM TC.

- The Chair noted that the SAM TC will, in the current election cycle, implement a "two step" election procedure to encourage diversity. Specifically, with 12 open slots, let us assume for this illustration that there are more than 12 candidates who are neither industrial/lab, female nor Region 10 (nor other under-represented region): the first round of election will winnow that list to 12. The second round of election will include those "surviving" 12, plus the remaining (under-represented category) candidates.

§2. Awards Process

- The Chair expressed concern that the current awards nomination procedure be too onerous for the TC members, in that the field of nominable papers be very wide, and also that it seem to require detailed study of many papers. Lee Swindlehurst (who is on the SPS Awards Committee) was sympathetic, but noted that the SAM TC has been quite successful with awards: perhaps change of SAM TC process is a bad idea. Sabrina Greco (who is also on the SPTM TC) offered that in SPTM *all* members are asked to review *all* papers – taken in comparison to our procedure (we have subcommittees) the SPTM task is far more work.
- There was some discussion of the new SPS edict that TCs cannot nominate papers for awards if an author is a current TC member. There is, of course, some concern that this rule excises many good papers from the nomination pool; and that there might even be some discouragement from TC membership as a result. The Chair offered two suggestions: (i) that

1

he contact other related TCs to see if they would be interested in nominating a paper written by SAM TC members; and (ii) that he contact TC associate members to nominate papers that might be deserving of an award. Lee Swindlehurst noted that the SPS Awards Committee feeling was that TC membership is a service obligation for an engaged researcher, and that there must be an unfortunate but not unexpected by-product that if one serves as a TC member one "takes a hit" for that period in terms of awards. Ultimately it was felt both that the requirement must be observed (and not evaded); but also that the present awards procedure should continue as it has in the past. That is: if a paper is identified as award-worthy but is also authored by a TC member, then the Chair and Vice-Chair will see what avenues are available to secure a nomination.

- Two new award categories are of interest: of Sustained Impact, and of Overview. As for the former, the Chair offered for consideration the highly cited ESPRIT paper from Roy & Kailath. For the latter, it was felt that a candidate from the Proceedings might be useful to pursue.

§3. Associate and Affiliate Members

- The Chair noted that the SAM TC presently encompasses about 70 Associate Members, and asked whether this was too many. There was some discussion related to removal of inactive Associate Members, the level of activity being reasonably measured by participation in the ICASSP review process. The Vice-Chair noted that the SAM TC currently reviews approximately 200 papers each ICASSP. With 4 reviews per paper this would amount to 800 reviews total: with 8-12 reviews per TC member (this is very variable) the Associate Member pool might be considered very reasonable.
- There was also some concern about the incentive to be an Associate Member (apart from the pleasure of submitting ICASSP reviews). What is offered to them? Marius Pesavento suggested that Associate Membership might be a "fast track" to full TC membership. It was also discussed whether a lunchtime ICASSP meeting might be offered, or else reduced fees at workshops (like SAM); but both of these were thought too expensive.
- However, it was felt that the SAM TC's own workshops might be appropriate venues to offer something. Hence it was proposed to offer lunch to affiliate and associate members at SAM and CAMSAP workshops – a joint "business" meeting with regular SAM TC members to strengthen the connection with the affiliate and associate members.
- The SAM TC has approximately 75 affiliate members, plus (again approximately) 25 students. Apparently IEEE SPS wants to encourage affiliated membership. The Chair suggested that these might be drawn from the conference attendance lists – this was met with cautious approval.
- The Chair suggested that the SAM TC might consider a Facebook page might be a useful way to interact with affiliate members. A Facebook page subcommittee was proposed.

§4. SAM versus CAMSAP

- There was some concern from some TC members that the level of overlap between the SAM Workshop and CAMSAP might be too great: the original purposes of the two workshops were somewhat different, with CAMSAP expected to concentrate more on algorithmic aspects. It was opined that some degree of overlap was not unexpected, since the workshops were alternating biennial meetings.
- It was suggested that this might be a topic for discussion in the full SAM TC, presumably at ICASSP15 in Brisbane.

§5. Invited Sessions

- There was some discussion about the way that invited sessions as SAM and CAMSAP are and ought to be managed. Specifically, there were some concerns that some papers in invited sessions in recent workshops were afforded an unusual benefit: several rounds of review, as opposed to the accept/reject decision familiar to those with "regular" papers. It was noted that "invited" papers might well and perhaps should have some special treatment: especially that it was reasonable to expect that session organizers have a voice in the eventual decision (especially since rejection of an invited paper might be rather embarrassing). There is a need to formalize the process, and this is an action item for the Chair and Vice-Chair.

§6. Close of the Meeting

- The meeting was adjourned at 13:45.