

Society Agility Council Zoom Meeting
June 1, 2021, 11:00 am Eastern

Participating	Unable to Participate
Susan Trolier-McKinstry , Chair	Ashley White, Focus on Sustainability
Shef Baker , Publications	Julia Phillips, Topical Curation Subcommittee
Babu Chalamala , Topical Staging Task Force	
Jenny Gerbi , Industry Engagement Council	
Lincoln Lauhon , Meetings	
Natalie Larocco , MRS Staff	
Michele Feder , MRS Associate Director	
Eileen Kiley , Director of Communications	
Gopal Rao , Chief Editor for Technical Content	

Action Items

SAC members	Email Susan with suggestions for populating the the Partnership Task Force roster
Lincoln	Check with NMSC Chair regarding representation in the Partnership Task Force
Susan	Draft Partnership Task Force charges and send roster to HQ
Michele	Check records for industry representation at tutorials
Gopal	Research how often the Spring Meeting includes an industry-based Meeting Chair
Eileen	Send PPT slides to Paula
Eileen or Susan	Distribute past work done on differentiation

SAC Chair Susan Trolier-McKinstry opened the meeting. Natalie Larocco, the newly appointed MRS liaison to Focus on Sustainability, was introduced.

HONORING PAT HASTINGS, DIRECTOR OF MEETINGS

This portion of the meeting was recorded so that SAC members could greet Pat and thank her for her work over the years. The recorded portion will be sent to her.

PARTNERSHIP TASK FORCE – PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP – SUSAN

SAC has the go-ahead to form the Partnership Task Force. Part of the work is following up with people to see what lessons were learned and what input would have been helpful.

Volunteers for Partnership Task Force

The recommended roster number is five. Lincoln and Shef will serve on the PTF. Todd Osman will be a liaison. The new NMSC chair will be added. Eileen Kiley will be on the roster due to her connection to both Pubs and Meetings; she can be an ex officio member if that's needed to keep the roster count in compliance.

Susan would like the Task Force to include volunteers who have another perspective besides US. Who has the strategic insight to determine whether partnerships are doing what MRS wants?

It was decided that Susan, Shef, and Lincoln should serve on this committee. Susan will draft potential charges and the roster and forward this to HQ to get it moving. Susan will send this to SAC before it goes to HQ.

Role of the Partnership Task Force

Thoughts about the type of work or the intensity it entails.

Potential board involvement so that this will move beyond “what didn’t work” tactics to see what is the strategic intent and whether the Task Force is fulfilling it.

Is a common intent needed for all MRS partnerships?

Past MRS Partnership MOUs

As MRS developed partnerships with other societies, joint publication opportunities were sought but not yet acted upon. Shef recalled that the original intent was to bring different groups into the MRS fold.

Past MOUs don’t indicate who reviews the event after it’s taken place, or who made sure the set-up was as promised. MRS structure may not be set up to capture this. How to answer if it worked without a mechanism? SAC can focus on the strategy but documenting what’s been learned is important. Set up a structure to make sure that operations and strategy are both included.

What awareness is needed for execution at the operating committee level if details had only been discussed at the Board level?

DIFFERENTIATION

Industry Engagement Council Chair Jenny Gerbi reported that IEC wants flexibility to continue small programming events; this works for Spring by seeking opportunities to do ad hoc programming.

iMatSci

iMatSci makes sense to be permanent for Fall and provides a steady way to learn about MRS. IEC bandwidth only exists to hold iMatSci once a year.

If someone comes to MRS for the first time, what follows that initial Fall introduction to iMatSci?

What at Spring takes those Fall participants to the next level? This should be part of differentiation.

Who is thinking about the strategies for those career arcs?

Is anyone stepping back to perceive pathways?

How do we keep people engaged when we’re programming events?

Most of the iMatSci teams are academic. To pull in industry people, Spring iMatSci would need something different; Spring differentiation could be more cutting-edge rather than fundamental.

Potential Spring Differentiation Topics and Expanded Industry Engagement

Fifteen years ago, the Board moved to intentionally grow the Spring Meeting; five years ago, the Board perceived the need for distinct Spring and Fall identities. One opportunity is to have some industry interaction at both Meetings, with the topical content more industry-flavored at Spring.

Jenny foresees a huge solar presence in the future as government money is spent on it; it may make sense for it to be a Spring theme. Growing fields include energy, space, computation, quantum, and AI and if those continue at Spring, it’s a good spot for developing proactive industry. Lincoln sees electronics, computing, and microLEDs as symposia that industry might find interesting, but academics in that area may attend a smaller topical focus conference.

Babu Chalamala recommends looking historically at areas, such as spectroscopy, that may still have interest.

Does differentiation cap the growth of traditional topics?

Are we providing alternative space?

What about Fall? Does MRS grow to cover the topics that need to be there or niche player?

Lincoln proposed having a fifth Meeting Chair in charge of an industry-focused cluster. Is this what people want? The analysis may need to change.

These issues need to be solved. If MRS wants an industry venue, we must offer it.

Michele Feder cautioned that the member journey needs to be woven into all that we do. MRS has good entry points but needs a better way of keeping members engaged.

Eileen noted that in the differentiation analysis prepared by former PDSC Chair Beth Stadler and former MTGC Chair Terry Aselage, electronics and energy are in both meetings, but had a different flavor for Spring and Fall.

There's not enough information on Soft Materials and Biomaterials.

5G isn't well represented.

What are the frequency ranges?

How far up the 5G spectrum can we go? What is the potential to try and capture this area?

Is there an obvious Meeting destination for people to attend that says how to make and characterize new materials and turn them into devices?

Can success result if academics decide the direction of MRS while the intent is for more industry focus?

How, if the industry focus is in Spring, does this mesh with the abstract submission process? Lincoln suggests a parallel stream for proposal review with a different group to help.

Can IEC and Meetings initiate programming in a more compelling fashion by starting an experiment with a 10% change of topics area of the meeting and get traction? Jenny explained that IEC lacks the bandwidth to do this. It should be driven by the strategy of differentiation; she'll get back to SAC on this.

The Chairs and the Board don't feel that differentiation is their job, leaving it to SAC to define.

Differentiation will be the topic of the upcoming SAC calls.

What information is needed for SAC to make good differentiation decisions going forward?

Sustainability and industry split or not?

Was the mapping done by Beth and Terry one-to-one with the Calls for Papers?

Is what constituted differentiation in the past the same now?

Michele Feder will collect data on what members of industry attend tutorials. Gopal Rao will research how often the Spring Meeting has a Meeting Chair from industry.

Eileen will send the PowerPoint slides to Paula. Eileen and Susan have Pat's summary of the work that was previously done and this will be distributed.

F21 HYBRID MEETING COMMUNICATION PLAN

Eileen and Lincoln are putting together a communication plan with a consultant. The plan will continue as a living document. Michele and Gopal also contributed to the plan. MRS is meeting with the Chairs,

the staff, volunteers, vendors and a consultant to sketch this out.

When the submission site closes after June 22, SAC and TCS will be updated on the decision points as feedback is needed.

TOPICAL CURATION SUBCOMMITTEE REPORT

Substituting for Julia Phillips, Gopal Rao provided a report.

F21

TCS formed too late to provide substantive guidance.

S22

The S22 Meeting whittled 127 proposals down to 65.

Will any S21 proposals be picked up for S22? Gopal said that the proposals were excellent; there are some adjustments involved in bringing them to 65. S22 will not have a different flavor as a result of the topics, but will feel like a large Fall Meeting.

20% were rejected due to quality. There was quite a bit of overlap in the rejected proposals. TCS found that in the topic of 2D Materials, 14 proposals came in from different angles and needed to be combined. Approximately 10 to 20 percent were tossed which would otherwise have been accepted. But entire communities are not tossed out.

Industry participation was poor in terms of a proposal presence. There is a strong recommendation to ensure more industry and a brand statement.

F22

The TCS met with the F22 Chairs; Julia provided initial guidance regarding TCS suggestions; the Chairs were receptive. The Call for Proposals deadline was last week; TCS will compile the proposals before they're sent to the Chairs in a week or so.

S23 and F23

Chairs have been finalized. TCS will engage with them.