

Meetings Committee Zoom Meeting
January 21, 2022, 1:30 pm Eastern

Able to Participate

Lincoln Lauhon, MTGC Chair
Clemens Heske, NMSC Chair
Stan Chou, MASC Chair
Ken Haenen, PDSC Chair
Paul Drzaic, IEC Chair
Eileen Kiley, MRS
Gopal Rao, MRS

Unable to Participate

ACTION ITEMS listed below and highlighted in the minutes	
HQ	Continue work with Pathable in advance of S22 to ensure platform usability and accessibility Develop a list of data that the Meeting Chairs would find valuable in putting the Meeting together
Stan	Break down geographic data for attendees Communicate with Eileen on the S22 Hybrid Meeting
Lincoln, Eileen, Gopal	Discuss the data and processes to generate useful data, analyze the data, and act on the analysis to differentiate Meeting content
Lincoln, Eileen	Bring suggestions on survey language relating to content differentiation from survey experts for the next MASC meeting
Ken	Consider what questions would be useful for MASC to add to the surveys
MTGC Members	Send Lincoln feedback on 2022 MTGC charges

Meetings Committee Chair Lincoln Lauhon opened the meeting.

Meetings Assessment Subcommittee

MASC Chair Stan Chou reported on the F21 survey results.

200 responses were received, the most in recent years, representing a good cross-section of attendees.

Responses: 50% in-person attendees; 50% virtual.

Gender representation: 56% male, 41% female attendees.

Government/Industry representation: 15% Academia: 83%

Key question: what is your motivation for attending?

Due to the current situation, whether someone can attend leans heavily on whether they're a presenter.

Positive scores for:

Meeting and technical sessions, hot topics, invited talks, tutorials

Networking

Poster sessions received positive scores, improved from past surveys

What's not working well?

The virtual site, Pathable: people continue to struggle to create their daily schedules and find specific sessions.

Stan asks HQ to have a conversation with Pathable to ensure that it's usable and accessible.

What was learned from the questions on differentiation?

Suggestions:

- 1) Reduce the optionality of these responses and force a choice or ranking
- 2) Request a response only from presenters

Lincoln suggested rewording the question:

How would you characterize the symposium you attended, more applied or more fundamental?

Meeting Attendance and Geography

Overall representation is 50% US, 50% international.

Is this where they're from or is this where they're residing now? Stan will break this down.

Interest in attending S22 in Hawaii

Will they have the option to attend? Are they likely to attend?

45% of respondents indicated that they will definitely not attend

35% probably want to attend or will attend.

50% virtually, 50% in person.

Whether they do depends on the state of affairs in the world.

Gopal pointed out that more 6800 abstracts were received, of which 750 at this stage want to do it virtually. The rest, over 6000, want to meet in person.

Survey Summary:

- The topics are going well
- Attendance went well
- Work is needed with Pathable
- Differentiation of topics will be figured out

Content differentiation:

The question about content was not as successful as the committee had hoped.

For the next MASC meeting, Lincoln proposes that he and Eileen should bring suggestions for rewording the question from MRS's marketing firm/survey experts. He would like the relevant SAC subcommittees to define what success would look like for any proposed interventions related to differentiation.

Other suggestions for arriving at better data were discussed. Lincoln noted that most attendees are contributors. Was there a specific effort to determine whether applied and fundamental? Program Development Subcommittee Chair Ken Haenen suggested that some of the uncertainty stems from the lack of specific materials science departments in European universities. Try linking differentiation to the type of department they work in and their degree. Comparing the departments to the label of fundamental or applied is hard data, not subjective, that may uncover the relationships.

New Meetings Subcommittee Chair Clemens Heske recommends making it less about the person and more about the symposium this person attends in this moment. He uses very fundamental methods to applied materials; it's more a question of setting than of person. One of the ways to improve the clarity of the responses is to force a response according to the talk.

Is Fall more fundamental because more chemists and physicists attend? Why is Spring more applied? There is more of an engineering flavor, but it has something to do with the topics as well.

Work is needed in linking up intent and surveys over more than a single year.

The starting point is the Meeting Chairs. The challenge is translating our content and their acceptance of the changes.

Lincoln thanked Stan for putting the report together.

Program Development Subcommittee

Chair Ken Haenen reported on the last PDSC meeting with feedback from the Meeting Chairs.

People were very happy to attend in person where it was possible for them to do so. He's hearing that if the next meeting is hybrid and they can't attend in person, they may not attend. Tolerance for virtual meetings is wearing time.

Is MASC having an impact on programming decisions? The data are analyzed beyond anecdotes. MTGC's goal is to design the process to specify what information to provide for the Meeting Chairs. This is what the Meeting Chairs would find valuable when putting their Meeting together:

- How many attendees in the different symposia?
- When judging proposals, is there a history of this topic at the Meeting?
- What are the attendee numbers on a certain topic over several Meetings?
- How do certain topics do with the number of attendees and abstracts?
- Does attendance increase or decrease?
- Are trends reflected in the numbers?

With this level of data, Meeting Chairs could discern trends to decide whether to promote certain topics. What data and processes, including data analysis, are needed **to differentiate Meeting content?** Lincoln would like to discuss this with Eileen and Gopal.

Some of this information is recorded and would be easy to compile. Gopal has helped to track symposia based on titles and explore the topics at a deeper level. **MRS can develop a checklist of specific information to provide for the Chairs.** A discussion is needed on how to gather more difficult data.

This would design a process that's smarter than doing it Meeting Chair by Meeting Chair. Historically, PDSC was to look for missing topics. The Topical Curation Subcommittee is charged with not losing communities, then integrating the information into the PDSC process.

Julia Philips asked whether the Meeting Chairs do anything with the information that's provided from the Topical Curation Subcommittee.

The Topical Curation Subcommittee overview of topics encompasses multiple symposia. If a niche is missing, go find it. If the Topical Curation Subcommittee doesn't think of it, it may be missed.

One option is keeping Fall to Fall, Spring to Spring, then comparing the list of past symposia with the list of proposals. What is missing? If a topic had 100 attendees, why is it missing? Why didn't the Symposium Organizers submit?

Ken can suggest questions for Stan to ask of the Symposium Organizers. The questions will be useful to future Meeting Chairs.

Lincoln's vision for MTGC is on running processes, getting strategic input from SAC, and optimizing data to know if something needs to be changed.

Update on NMSC

With the changes in governance, parts of MTGC, namely IEC and NMSC, have been in flux.

PDSC does bottom-up execution with the Meeting Chairs and can incorporate material from NMSC. If this happens, NMSC will be looking at what doesn't come through PDSC's proposals to do new things MASC assesses feedback.

Lincoln, along with the Society Agility Council, continues to work on the governance changes as they affect NMSC. The Collaborations Task Force will redefine NMSC and determine its role.

Industry Engagement Subcommittee

IES is now with the Society Agility Council; Paul Drzaic is the IES chair.

A system isn't set up for doing things with industry. The Topical Curation Subcommittee has a role in industry engagement by tracking leading-edge topics. Paul wants to promote their success by biasing toward some kind of measurement.

We have a lot of symposia; more flexibility in allowing play-around space without breaking the overall Meeting would be a great tool.

What would constitute success that can be measured? When the charges and tasks are broken down, what is the definition of success? This is what he wants from the Society Agility Council and the Topical Curation Subcommittee. MTGC is going to try to achieve it.

Industrial participation and its influence on Meetings are more a question for SAC. That's less important than understanding how the parts are supposed to work together.

IES is integral to Meetings but how is the Meeting impacted by the work IES is doing? Lincoln wants everyone to work together to build a common understanding of the issues.

Lincoln will follow up with an email request to give written feedback on the Meetings Committee 2022 slides that he sent out.

What is the progress on PDSC and MASC working together?

What's important for the next MTGC meeting?

The Collaboration Task Force hopes to meet soon. Stan will keep in contact with Eileen regarding the hybrid Spring Meeting.

The next MTGC meeting will be after the next SAC meeting and Collaboration Task Force meeting.