

Society Agility Council Zoom Meeting

April 12, 2021, 10:00 am Eastern

**Participating**

**Unable to Participate**

<b>Susan Troler-McKinstry</b> , Chair	<b>Ashley White</b> , Focus on Sustainability
<b>Shef Baker</b> , Publications	
<b>Babu Chalamala</b> , Topical Staging Task Force	
<b>Jenny Gerbi</b> , Industry Engagement Council	
<b>Lincoln Lauhon</b> , Meetings	
<b>Julia Phillips</b> , Topical Curation Subcommittee	
<b>Pat Hastings</b> , Director of Meetings	
<b>Eileen Kiley</b> , Director of Communications	
<b>Gopal Rao</b> , Chief Editor for Technical Content	

**Action Items**

Lincoln	Draft a proposal on implementing the creation of a SAC subcommittee to review partnerships and MOUs
Gopal and Pat	Explore SIG successes
Pat	Send Susan and Lincoln the report by Duane Dimos Search for a Task Force report on differentiation, if one exists

SAC Chair Susan Troler-McKinstry opened the call.

**STRAW MAN ON INTERNATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS Lincoln and Shef**

Oversight of collaborations was not included in the original SAC charter. Partnerships with international associations need to be addressed; agreements with other societies also need to be reviewed.

Is SAC the body to help with proposals, including partnerships with international organizations?

What are the outcomes? What do we want to see coming out of this process?

One of SAC's jobs is to assess Meetings, Publications, and partnerships.

Has the mechanism deciding what belongs to MRS and to other partnerships been worked out?

To what extent has the process been formalized?

Eileen Kiley said that, wherever possible, MRS is given right of first refusal; this was done for the S22 MOUs. When doing joint publishing workshops, the leadership built that language into the MOUs.

MRS co-sponsored a workshop in which the sponsors were speakers; if this event were reviewed by PDSC, it would have been rejected. How can SAC ensure that new agreements reflect MRS values?

Gopal Rao reported that two of speakers for the ACers event should have been flagged in the planning stage, although the talks themselves were not advertisements or marketing.

Jenny Gerbi pointed out that industry often wants to speak at an event they have organized. SAC needs to think about the different expectations and what it means in terms of being flexible.

Lincoln agreed that this type of forum needs to be intentional and discussed from the right perspective. MTGC has oversight over workshops to ensure quality and that piece has been ignored. The New Meetings Subcommittee of the Meetings Committee would have been part of this. But what belongs under SAC versus what belongs under MTGC?

*Discussion: Do the members believe that this is a SAC activity and how should it be implemented?*

Drawing a parallel to topical curation, Julia Phillips noted two levels:

- 1) overall principles and the high-level view of what should be included, and generalized guidance which is then implemented by other groups; and
- 2) SAC may be responsible for overseeing the overarching strategy and looking at a high level as to whether or not a sponsor might meet the MRS intent. Actual checking regarding sponsors as speakers ought to be at another level of MRS.

Propose to set NMSC to do certain tasks; if SAC approves of what's being done, this will continue, The Board has granted SAC the authority to create a new Subcommittee if one is needed.

Jenny noted that NMSC reviewed Meeting Application Forms; this still needs to be done. That's a separate role. Could there be a group that continues to review MAFs while the staff looks at MAFs strategically for partnerships?

Shel Baker perceives a volunteer aspect to maintaining the standards, but to the extent that Meetings and Publications are also produced by volunteers, as this spreads out to workshops, that oversight and promotion for doing this uniformly needs to be documented.

Who was consulted when an MOU was created? HQ Directors? HQ Directors plus the Operating Committee Chair? Meetings Committee?

What has been done? What is being done? What are the impacts?

SAC should develop a Partnership Oversight Subcommittee that provides quick decisions and oversight without this task being the focus of SAC as a whole.

**Lincoln will draft a process on implementation,** using ongoing partnerships extending back to 2015 as a starting point.

What makes SAC the right coordinating body for something that doesn't look like a standard meeting? How is it different? SAC has identified work that needs to be done.

Susan proposed that, as the board meeting is coming up, the board should be notified that SAC is looking at partnerships, their strategic intent, what has been successful and what hasn't been, anticipating that a new Subcommittee might need to be created.

Lincoln is charged with updating the MTGC charter to fit with the SAC charter; he has drafted a memo to the board explaining MTGC's progress to date. Susan can review the memo for consistency. At this point, it doesn't touch on Publications. He'll pull out this discussion, thinking about what NMSC on paper is supposed to do.

#### **TOPICAL STAGING TASK FORCE REPORTED ON THE STRAW MAN FOR TIMELINE EXTENSIONS—Babu Chalamala**

The staging groups have been proactive. Quantum has been very active. Others are not at that point.

Autonomous Materials has been in existence since 2019, Bio, AI, Quantum for four years.

Developing a social media group hasn't worked as well.

Growing the connections to Publications is in development but not fully engaged.

Active with the Meeting Chairs and symposia.

Collaborations; Workshop with Kavli

What are the quantitative metrics for success? How should the staging Task Forces graduate?

Lincoln said that in terms of Meetings, when the Task Forces are successful they can be sunsetted when the community sees MRS as a good home. It may not be quantitative but if MRS becomes essential in that community, it needs to be representative of that group at MRS Meetings. If it's happening organically, it's success.

Julia's subcommittee is thinking about how to maintain it.

Babu said that these are qualitative; he needs more tangible metrics.

Where do you provide homes for sustainable communities?

How do keep them engaged?

Identifying areas to bring into MRS and sustain them over time was the reason SAC was started. Task Forces were used because there wasn't another structure. When they're up and running, SAC could come up with a longer-term strategy for when they're no longer task forces.

A level of topical oversight allows communities to be maintained because attention is paid to this. For the past several years MRS has made decisions on new topics by kicking out other topics.

Julia regrets that Meeting Chair autonomy to search for new topics is lost; that was one of the best things about being a Meeting Chair. The ability to have that initiative is important.

A more high-level group with a list would be useful documentation.

Gopal reported that for F21 and S22, input was received from the staging groups and was incorporated into a spreadsheet that the Chairs used. The staging groups used to meet with the Chairs but he doesn't know how well it worked. Having the Topical Curation Subcommittee talk with the Chairs is one avenue for collecting.

Babu needs quantitative metrics before deciding on the extension of the groups.

Julia said that if individuals aren't brought into MRS who see the value in having a particular topic as a continuing component, it won't thrive at MRS over the long term.

How to transition some of the key members of the community more into MRS volunteer mold not only in programming but so that they are MRS people?

While the topical area is critical, Julia believes that having the right people on the Task Force makes it work. If the right people remain engaged, the task force will self sustain. Julia noted that many of the names on Babu's list are long-time MRS people; they're in AI now, but they weren't before. Get the right people and follow them on their technical journeys.

One of the discussions around these task forces is a middle path with a technical oversight committee for a topic that exists as long as they meet the society's technical criteria.

### Attention to the Volunteer Experience

There are generational changes in how to organize conferences. If people will stay, we have to think about the path. Those groups are the Special Interest Groups according to the consultant, not committees. How do we make that work? Gopal and Pat will take that forward to move toward the SIGS and what makes them functional where it's done well.

Consider whether some of the communities responsible for maintaining are nontechnical, defined by the workplace. This is a topic for a future meeting.

### **DIFFERENTIATION**

Ashley White wants sustainability as a topic in both meetings, but where the emphasis on sustainability is placed may change.

Working on differentiation and providing feedback to PDSC and TCSC on Fall/Spring differentiation—what is needed to provide good guidance going forward?—Lincoln, Beth Stadler and Terry Aselage did some work on this. Get that in the form of a Task Force report. If there's a Task Force document of record, Pat will send it.

Pat will send Susan and Lincoln the strategic meeting initiative document from Duane Dimos to help.

### **DISCUSSION ITEMS FOR NEXT SAC MEETING**

Identifying and engaging communities defined by workplace or identity

Should IEC focus on the Spring or Fall meeting?

What information does SAC need to guide the Fall/Spring differentiation?