

Society Agility Council Zoom Meeting
July 29, 2021, 9 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 Subcommittee	Jenny Gerbi, Industry Engagement Council
Lincoln Lauhon , Meetings	
Eileen Kiley , Director of Programs	
Gopal Rao , Chief Editor for Technical Content	
Natalie Larocco , MRS Staff	

Action Items

Babu	Record Task Force activities on an Excel spreadsheet Record the “asks” needed from Pubs
Subcommittees	Deliver reports to SAC on rotating basis
Susan, Jenny, Natalie, Ashley, Lincoln	Schedule a conversation on “in-between” events
Eileen	Send the Loyalty Research Center Survey out to SAC members who haven’t received it
Susan	Send Lincoln the slide deck she presented during the SAC meeting
SAC members	Email Susan with suggestions on ways to cover differentiation and curation at the next meeting

SAC Chair Susan Trolier-McKinstry opened the meeting.

Agenda:

1. Updates from each subcommittee
2. Task force examining partnerships approved
3. Topical differentiation

Subcommittee Updates

Topical Staging Subcommittee Chair Babu Chalamala

The individual Task Force chairs have been contacted. The Bio Task Force is doing well. Not having in-person meetings presents a challenge.

Chief Editor for Technical Content Gopal Rao noted that organizers Jonathan Rivnay, Joyce Wong, Roger Narayan, and Danielle Rochester are planning the four-day workshop Innovations in Biomaterials Science Workshop Series, jointly with Society for Biomaterials.

The F22 Meeting proposals were sent to all of the staging Task Force chairs for feedback; feedback has been received from the Artificial Intelligence Staging Task Force and Gopal is waiting for feedback from the remaining three Task Forces.

How are these groups feeding into the Meetings and Publications Committees? How do we ensure the chairs are aware of these activities?

Are webinars and in-between events well connected to the rest of the organization?

Publications Committee Chair Shef Baker explained that as staging groups develop activities, SAC discussion allows MTGC and Pubs to focus on the topics.

If SAC links a promoted topic with an activity, MTGC and Pubs promote it through their committees.

- Shef and Eileen can take things up with Pubs if the subject is linked in SAC.
- Gopal and Eileen are actively engaged with the Task Forces.
- Babu and Eileen meet monthly to discuss staging activities and progress.

Shef has two requests:

1) Babu to record Task Force activities on an Excel spreadsheet

2) Babu to create the asks, specific or general, that he wants from Publications.

Meetings Committee Chair Lincoln Lauhon is available to join Eileen's meetings with Babu if that would be helpful. MTGC's role is to oversee, review, approve, and assess all meetings, but this isn't being done. Meetings Committee assessments are more complex. How can MTGC know if the in-between activities are successful?

Susan wants a report from two Subcommittees for each meeting to review what is and isn't working.

Task Force Partnerships

CAN MRS Expo: Advanced Materials for a Sustainable Future

The Chemical Angels Network approached MRS about putting on a half-day expo on November 18. The expectation is for MRS to help with the logistics of the event including marketing efforts. CAN has already secured many of the speakers for the two panel sessions and keynote talk. This will not take place during F21.

The Meetings Committee has not seen this; without vetting, MTGC can't provide feedback. The Focus on Sustainability Subcommittee should be informed and should be organizational contributors.

(Update: On September 1, Lincoln, Jenny, Ashley, and Natalie met to discuss MRS' involvement with this event. All parties seem to support the idea of co-branding this event, and agree that this partnership would not only provide visibility for MRS to non-members/those who do not attend MRS meetings, but would also provide additional opportunities for members that will not be available at the Fall Meeting.)

The Chemical Angel Network has been made aware of MRS' involvement. Anyone registering for the event will receive 20% off the registration cost by using the code "MRS".

What is FoS Chair Ashley White's take on this event?

What are the benefits and issues?

How will MTGC's Meetings Assessment Subcommittee evaluate this?

Is a MAF needed for this?

Lincoln regards this freestanding event as an opportunity to understand MRS membership and the demographic engaged around this topic. This would give informed strategy to MTGC's future work.

How HQ, MTGC, and the volunteers will do things is still unresolved. If this is all curated content with invited speakers, it's easier to do ads, etc. Ethical issues regarding speakers and sponsors arise. It's necessary to be deliberative about it so that people understand what they're seeing.

Susan recommends a conversation with Jenny, Ashley, Natalie and possibly Lincoln.

Shel Baker questions what this activity's relationship is to the MRS mission?
What if people attend this rather than an MRS Meeting?

Lincoln proposes asking questions about other events MRS is running that would come under the former MTGC charter. Lincoln feels an OpsCom-like evaluation might highlight the desired outcomes in terms of strategic, effectiveness, and core rubrics.

The Executive Committee approved the creation of the Task Force to assess whether partnerships are working. As the meetings go forth, Susan will report back to SAC. She thanked Lincoln for the heavy lifting involved in the process.

Topical Differentiation

The Topical Curation Subcommittee wants to know what guidance to give to the Meeting Chairs:

What topics should appear in any given MRS Meeting?

When can TCSC note that a missing area needs to be included?

They feel strongly that their Subcommittee isn't the right vehicle for this.

Eileen will send the Loyalty Research Center Survey results to SAC members who haven't seen it yet; Lincoln asked to see the LRC survey slide deck that Susan presented.

90% of responses in 2017 saw too much topical overlap, making them less likely to attend both the Spring and Fall Meetings. This was the origin of the decision to establish differentiation, which can be done in different flavors: demographics of desired attendees; topical areas; services.

SAC was asked by the Board to identify clusters that should be concentrated in either the Fall or Spring Meeting, with emphasis on fundamental in the fall and applied in spring. The Fall Meeting is to move from emerging to more cutting-edge; Spring Meeting to move toward applied.

Susan presented germane slides from the LRC survey. The survey showed that many attendees felt MRS doesn't have enough cutting-edge science and focuses too much on established topics.

Spring and Fall have modest amounts of overlap. There's a sense from the Board and the Task Force that there should be a mix of fundamental and applied topics at both.

Since S19, the Chairs have been instructed to bring in more applied content. Sessions identified by MTGC as applied have greater attendance.

Susan referred to an extensive set of definitions in Task Force documentation regarding what constitutes "applied" content. Eileen will include those definitions when she sends out the Task Force documentation.

The trend for more applied or industry-focused research has continued for over a decade. But if the goal is to increase industrial participation, this survey may not have captured their needs and interests.

Enduring symposia have not been successfully implemented. Industry participation didn't increase. Many symposia are exclusively academic.

Gopal confirmed that going back to 1998, there were 30 Meeting Chairs with direct or indirect industry connections. Lincoln pointed out that Vice President Carolyn Duran is being deliberate about finding

industry representation. The Chairs can help but the top-down process, along with the Board Nominating Committee, has everyone working together.

ACS, APS and TMS strongly overlap with the MRS Spring Meeting, which may explain why fewer chemists and physicists and metallurgists attend MRS for the Spring Meeting.

Shel noted that no MRS topic can promise to be programmed forever. Topics and researchers need a home where they can meet their community. MRS isn't paying attention to the surrounding landscape.

Missing areas: Metallurgy, polymers, cements, rare earth, nuclear repository

Susan asked whether there's traction on metallurgy in the fall. MRS can't compete in the spring with TMS but these topics aren't captured at Fall either. Lincoln asked why, if metallurgists have a home in TMS, would they go to MRS? MRS should be about frontiers.

Eileen pointed out that some of the biggest journal topics aren't seen in MRS Meetings. *MRS Communications* is covering polymers, metallurgy is covered in journals.

Susan asks SAC members to send emails on how to structure the next meeting to cover differentiation and curation.