



Minutes – Teleconference – March 7, 2006

Participants: Dan Arnold, Jim Bacher, Henry Benitez, Daniece Carpenter, Ted Freeman, John Freudenberg, Richard Georgerian, Murlin Marks, Rich Pescatore, Dan Roman, and Ken Thomas.
Guests: Irving Engelson, Jin Jiang, and Mike Sherman.

Introductory Remarks

- Henry opened the meeting at 2:04 pm PST, and went over the agenda. Henry welcomed Mike Sherman, Irv Engelson, and Jin Jiang to our meeting. Mike is our Journal Editor-in-Chief, Irv will be our mentor/advocate, and Jin is a professor at West Ontario in Canada and Associate Journal editor.

PSES Tab Issues

- Henry discussed the recent TAB meeting. Our Journal and our financial structure were a concern. We were offered a \$50K financial grant that was put into a motion at the TAB meeting, which was a surprise to Henry. Also, there was a proposal to change the fee infrastructure applied to societies, essentially increasing these fees in 2007 more than our \$50K grant this year, with no assurance of a grant in 2007. There are many concerns with this.
- Regarding the Journal, TAB management expects us to “fill the pipeline” with solid papers. They want us to meet the IEEE journal caliber. They want a minimum of four issues per year, perhaps with the basis that our journal will be mailed (and thus eligible for publication rates) rather than mostly electronic, as planned.

Mentor/Advocate (Irv Engelson)

- Irv said that he is member of the TAB Management Committee, and has been assigned the mentor/advocate role for the PSES, within the IEEE policies/guidelines. He suggested that we concentrate on where we are now to achieve optimally our goals.
- A new algorithm has been developed, moving toward funding totally from income. This is hitting a number of societies hard, not just the PSES. Societies seeing an increase will see this new burden as not good, but it is a best effort to be “fair.” We cannot be guaranteed a grant for next year because they can’t put into next year’s budget yet. TAB does feel an obligation to ensure PSES success. If we do well this year, Irv would anticipate support for next year. We need a solid flow of eighty pages four times a year for our journal; we aren’t there yet. The question is what is our relationship with the Reliability Society (RS.) It should be set up as win/win. Irv thinks our working with the RS could develop into a good relationship. Irv used the example of how drugs are developed in the U.S. A drug must be proven for both efficacy and safety. This is analogous to a possible relationship between our two societies. Henry said that it is not our intent to merge with the RS; some would like to consider this a “shotgun” marriage. Ted (also on the RS BoD) said that there may be a problem with their budgeted journal page limit, but Irv said that he would go to bat to ensure that the RS won’t be hurt by working with the PSES. Ted said that although there is strong support on the part of some of the RS leaders, there is a faction that feels strongly that the PSES should be discouraged because the PSES is within the RS discipline.

Journal Strategies

- Henry discussed suggested approaches for publishing with the RS:
 - Simply integrate PSES articles within the RS Journal,
 - Set up a PSE section with perhaps two articles per issue, four times a year,
 - Set up a separate PSE issue for the RS Journal.

Option 2 seems best, giving us exposure and minimizing structural changes for the RS Journal. All our papers must be peer reviewed.

- There was a discussion of our more applied engineering approach verses the typical journal academic (theoretical) background. Irv said that there is growing sensitivity for the need for good papers of relevance to the engineering community rather than simply serving “publish or perish” academia.

- Henry said that later this month he would talk with the RS BoD about getting formal approval for our working with them. Irv pointed out that we should cover any additional expenses from adding our articles and benefit from any increase in revenue.
- Mike said that he had been outraged when he heard indirectly about the (at least temporary) demise of the PSES Journal. Henry agreed that that communication was unfortunate, and not under his control. The BoD agreed with Mike that all efforts should be made to keep our authors aware of the Journal status before they hear it through the grapevine. At least one of our papers has a time urgency, so arrangements must be made quickly or the author should consider other publications. Mike said this article should be of high interest to many in the engineering community, a selling point to consider in boosting the RS Journal. Mike should be able to put together summaries/abstracts of the papers on-hand in time for Henry's presentation to the RS BoD.
- Prior to leaving the teleconference, Rich Pescatore indicated his support for working with the RS, and the importance of working through this with our authors in a positive manner.

Motion: Dan Roman made a motion, Murlin seconded, for Henry to negotiate with the RS to develop a program to incorporate PSE papers. Motion passed without dissent.

2006 Conference

- Richard Georgerian gave a brief update. A revised 2006 budget has been sent out. Richard thanked Dan Arnold for his help in fine-tuning it. Richard would like BoD votes on the budget by Friday (3/10.)

Final Comments

- Mike pointed out that his first read of rules for PSES survival require a lot of publishing. Irv explained that "hits" for on-line articles are very important for explore.
- Our website should be updated. It still shows Henry as president-elect.

Next meeting: Our next teleconference will be on April 4, at 4pm CST.

Our next meeting will be on June 25 in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Hotel info should be forthcoming by the end of March.

Adjournment: 3:23 pm PST.

Murlin Marks
Secretary