



**2021 Summer Council Meeting
July 27, 2021 11:00-15:00 EDT, via Google Meets**

Heather Lowers	(President 2020-2022)
Patrick Camus	(President-Elect 2021)
Chad Parish	(Secretary 2019-2021)
Dave Tomlin	(Treasurer 2020-2022)
Donovan Leonard	(Director 2019-2021, M&M Editorial Board)
Abigail Lindstrom	(Director 2019-2021)
Michelle Thompson	(Director 2020-2022)
William Bowman	(Director 2020-2022)
Angela Halfpenny	(Director 2021-2023)
Josh Tailon	(Director 2021-2023)
Steve Seddio	(Commercial Director 2021-2023)
Kerry Siebein	(AReS 2020-2023)
John Fournelle	(Archivist 2010-2023)
Brad De Gregorio	(Awards 2020-2023)
Anette von der Handt	(Computer Activities 2020-2023)
Jim Lebeau	(Education 2018-2020)
Tom Kelly	(Fellows 2017-2020)
Pete McSwiggen	(Finance 2021-2024)
Emma Bullock	(Membership 2020-2022)
Andrew Herzing	(M&M 2021 Co-chair)
Dan Ruscitto	(Social Media 2018-2021)
Vin Smentkowski	(Strategic Planning 2018-2020, M&M 2021 Co-chair)
Yoosuf Picard	(Topical Conferences 2020-2023)

Present on call:

Heather Lowers, Patrick Camus, Chad Parish, Pete McSwiggen, Brad De Gregorio, Josh Tailon, Michelle Thompson, Vin Smentkowski, Dan Ruscitto, Yoosuf Picard, Emma Bullock, Jim Lebeau, Kerry Siebein, Angela Halfpenny, Anette von der Handt, Tom Kelly, Stephen Seddio, Andy Herzing, John Fournelle

Action items

- **Everyone to check the possible emeritus members and update any incorrect information. Before October, we can vote by email on the list.**
- **A membership profile tool will be created.**
- **Everyone is to look over the draft survey prior to September.**

Call to order/Secretary's Report (Heather/Chad)

The meeting begins at 1102 EDT. Heather apologizes for the unusual timing of the meeting and suggests we will hold a virtual meeting ahead of time in 2022 as well. Not renting a room, A/V,

food, etc. for a physical meeting can save \$10K from the meeting coshare. We hope to have minutes approved in time to circulate to the membership before the business meeting. Heather calls for a motion to approve the agenda. Patrick moves, Emma seconds. All are in favor.

Heather mentions that the minutes from the last meeting were circulated. If there are no further changes, Heather calls for a motion to approve the minutes. Emma moves, Pat seconds. All are in favor. Minutes are approved.

Treasurer's report (Dave)

Heather begins the report for Dave. We won't vote to finalize until the end of the meeting, because items for discussion later today will need to be in the budget. Recent treasury activities were insurance, FY20-3Q, 4Q and 21 1Q reconciliation payments. Invoices were sent to award sponsors and checks sent to recipients. All obligations are current. The new accountants are setting up Quickbooks to make the IRS 990 forms more current. We joined TechSoup to get a nonprofit discount on Quickbooks at a steep discount. The 2022 proposed budget was prepared. Work is being done with MSA to better flesh out who does what and how to reduce meeting expenses. Our charitable funds took a major reduction in 2019, perhaps due to portal problems. We have added a separate link on the website and you can contribute at renewal on the portal. This membership renewal period, we will remind the membership that the links are there and what the funds cover (such as student travel). The latest balances were \$22K in checking, \$185K in savings. We don't know how the meeting costs will look this year so we haven't moved any funds. The Schwab account is doing well and the committee has us diversified against drops in the market. Pete comments we are taking a conservative to moderately conservative strategy so that we will not suffer the full brunt of a downturn. Liabilities in the budget are the strategic initiative, \$8.5K. We have the investment account to cushion any blows.

New initiatives were online Quickbooks, \$1500 to sponsor the student pre-meeting congress (we had planned \$5k when we had expected in-person meeting) and we plan \$5k for M&M22 student congress. We planned \$5k in new postdoc awards and will cover 50% of student travel to the next AMAS. Quickbooks will be utilized more and aligned to the Form 990. Line items will be better aligned in the spreadsheet, and Constant Contact via TechSoup is being studied.

The proposed 2022 budget is presented in a spreadsheet. We have the actual data through July 15. Emma tells us we are doing well for renewals. The Sustaining Membership numbers may be reduced next year due to company mergers. The M&M meeting coshare this year is expected at negative \$1000. The number for 2022 is left blank because we do not yet know. This is hoped to be known by the business meeting next week. A Topical Conference is expected to bring in \$10k. Operating expenses are provided in a detailed spreadsheet. Heather asks if expenses lead to any questions. Angela asks what AReS TS is? Heather replies it is the tour speakers for local societies.

M&M Meeting expenses are broken down as a spreadsheet. In 2021 the in-person council meeting was budgeted for \$10k, but was not needed. In 2022 we will plan a virtual meeting to save \$10k. Meal With a Mentor is also expected to continue. Students will receive a \$20 GrubHub coupon for their meal this year. A few more items will be discussed later in the meeting.

ISO Presentation (Chris Moffitt, Kratos Analytical)

Chris is the ASTM (American Society for Testing and Materials) E42 chair. Chris will talk about the US Technical Advisory Groups (TAGs) to the ISO committees. ISO polls local groups via

ANSI (American National Standards Institute) and ANSI actually casts the US ballots. Committee E42 is on surface chemical analysis and predates the ISO TC201 on surface analysis. An audit by ANSI found some TAGs were not operating to the desired standards. ASTM is developing new software for a more auditable trail for reporting to ANSI. The TAGs can no longer just be the chair of the subcommittee, but require a full subcommittee. ANSI wants balance across the committees. Historically, NIST provided someone for these tasks. The current NIST person is not interested in continuing, and ISO has a fee for casting the US ballots. There are charges for committee votes and secretariats. TC202 has five memberships that come up annually. Some past fees were not paid by NIST. Now that ASTM is taking more responsibility, next year there will be a \$3k charge based on the number of standards. We need a structure for TC202. In the process, NIST wanted to relieve more fees. ANSI said that if the TAG exists, the fees exist. Without an operating TAG, the US loses participation in the ISO TC202. Many important standards are under this umbrella. ANSI would charge \$40K to control the TAG directly. Where it stands right now is if the US wishes to remain active in the TAG and if the US could provide funding or staffing?

Heather says an answer can't be given today, but we have more questions. Is this a three-year commitment? Chris says no, that's if an organization wishes to own a TAG. E42 has no budget and is run out of AVS (American Vacuum Society). TAGs are considered the operational side. It is a recurring commitment that will be there every year. Heather asks if the source of the funds matters? Chris replies no. Heather says that if MAS gets involved, it will be an effort to find people and funds. What are the advantages of having these ISO TAG committees? Chris replies it's to participate in the standards. Many labs report back that they adhere to these standards for calibration. If the mechanism is changed, the US would not be involved if the US wasn't on the committee. Current TCs will charge members proportionally, or on others, NIST covers the cost. Sometimes there are grants or cost shares. ASTM has begun closing TAGs that don't have US interest.

Angela asks if, from a user's point of view, don't the standards cost a lot of money? Chris replies it's possible to get them through ANSI if they are adopted as US standards. But yes, there is a cost to the ISO standards. Angela comments that many labs won't use ISO standards because of the cost. Chris comments that participants in the TAGs get to see the standards and draft. Vin comments that additionally, the TAG members get a say in the standard, but many organizations are concerned about a standard being incorrect but being required to conform to the standard. Pat mentions certain countries take this very seriously. Some delegations could be as many as eight, but the US seldom sends more than three. Most vendors and other nations' national labs are very involved and have full-time standards staff. For some actual standards, such as "Hyperdimensional data file specification," this is where the standard is defined. Does the US want a say? Even if we don't buy the standards, do we want a say in this? Chris comments MSA might have a stake in this as well. We are heavily outnumbered at these meetings because of the support from other countries' governments for their standards. Standards activity in the US is not rewarded and is much less than 20-30 years ago. Tom mentions atom probe. The field is less mature than SEM or TEM but is trying to catch up—for example, what's the definition of mass resolving power? This is still under discussion.

Heather asks if January 2022 is an important date? Chris replies that everything needs to be in place by then. Heather says will discuss between now and October to educate our members and sustaining members. Chris is happy to answer follow up questions. Joshua asks if this is a money or headcount problem? Chris replies both.

Membership Committee Report (Emma)

Emma receives a full database pull once a month and can see new members at any time. We are around 650 members, but were only at 600 this time last year. Most members are joint, and about 76 are MAS-only. About 100 members are students. We need to be better about communicating to the membership about the renewal time period. Membership is January to December; after October, you are renewed for the next year, too. It's worth sending multiple emails late in the year. There is a document on the Google Drive with about 70 new member names. All names look legitimate. The two names not verified last time have been validated and can be approved this time. Emma moves to approve new members. Angela seconds. All approve, the motion passes.

Emma has compiled a spreadsheet of potential emeritus members. We have a list of MSA emeritus members who are regular MAS members, and honorary members. There is also a list of members since 2000. All are on the Google drive. Emeritus members must also be retired. Heather asks for help checking the list to find people who should be offered emeritus status. **ACTION ITEM: everyone to check the possible emeritus members and update any incorrect information. Before October, we can vote by email on the list.** Emma asks if the MSA emeritus members could be voted on for emeritus membership? Heather comments that we haven't voted on honorary memberships lately. This would require putting the names on the ballot for membership approval. Between now and September 1st, Heather will follow up with honorary members. Pat suggests Nestor Zaluzec and Barry Carter. Tom asks if the Fellow's position supplants Honorary? Heather asks if Fellows still pay the membership dues, unlike Honorary Members? Tom says that all Honorary Members were made fellows, but not vice-versa.

Emma reminds the committee that a membership hardship waiver was discussed last time. There were discussions about how this could be handled. This would require being a member in good standing (not a new member). Virtual Inc. says this would be trivial to implement in the portal. Joshua put together some possible verbiage. We would not require proof, but would take people at their word. Because networking is a major advantage of MAS, this would be a valuable service for members facing hardship. We would limit this to 5-10 per year, which would only cost us \$400/year maximum. There would be a google form on the webpage. No one would be eligible more than twice, and not in consecutive years. The individual with financial hardship would email the membership chair and only the chair would have these names. Emma asks if this should wait for a council meeting or could these requests be handled on a need-to-know basis? Heather suggests that Emma could approve the requests, up to ten per year, and then report the aggregate numbers at the next council meeting, without names attached. Anette asks why it's being capped at ten? The wording is rephrased to leave the cap on the total number per year at Council discretion. A standard form will be helpful for Emma to track. Chad mentions that records will need to be passed from one Membership Chair to the next Membership Chair to ensure no one gets two waivers in a row or more than two total. Heather calls for a motion to approve the hardship waiver. Emma moves, Josh seconds. All in favor. None are opposed. Motion passes.

Heather reminds Council that Constant Contact is used to communicate with the membership. With the last communication, there was a 43% open rate. Membership profiles and videos have been discussed. Heather presents a draft member profile. Heather asks for volunteers to develop the forms. Anette is happy to help, and also suggests that the entries have tags for easy searching. This will be interesting for students to see different career paths. **ACTION ITEM: a membership profile tool will be created.** Pat comments that previous categories of employment (academia, industry, government) would be useful. Anette agrees with this. Heather asks Will if he is willing to help. Will agrees. Heather says the last membership survey

was five years ago. **ACTION ITEM: everyone is to look over the draft survey prior to September.** We want to know who makes up our membership. Tom says he spoke with Emma, and the Fellow's committee would like to know what roles individual members have had for MAS. Tom would like to know what members' prior service to MAS was. Chad asks if the survey will be anonymized or member-tagged? Heather believes the last survey was anonymous but hopefully they could provide the list of tagged prior service. Anette says certain questions would have to be non-anonymous. There are different ways to handle this. Could we raffle off a gift card or swag to increase participation? Heather wants to keep it to 10-15 questions. Josh points out the questions are very similar to the M&M registration. Heather says that information is guarded. Tom comments his desired information could be harvested at renewal.

Strategic Initiatives (Vin)

Vin is interested in new committee membership nominations. There needs to be feedback from the 2020 funded initiatives, such as Science History Institute (SHI), Atom Probe, and Meet-a-member. Heather asks John if he is planning to ship everything to SHI by 1 November? John replies yes. Vin continues.

The first question is if there should be a technician award or MAS poster awards? Heather thinks the technician award would be for an MAS member who doesn't usually attend the meeting to travel. An MAS member in good standing would nominate someone to attend M&M. Pat asks if MSA has a similar award? Heather says the MSA Technologist award is presented to someone who presented at M&M. Dan received an MSA technologist award: it is for a presenter who doesn't fall into the student category. MSA waives the registration fee. Angela says she is a technician, so she can't apply for university travel funds. This could make a big difference to people in a similar situation. Dan comments that a travel award still means the person will need their time covered regardless of travel funds. Maybe it should be for presentations. Anette comments that while an employer has to provide the time, that's more likely with the award in hand. It would be useful if self-nominations were allowed for people who don't work directly under a PI, but travel funds will make it easier on the recipient. Dan agrees. Heather summarizes that there could be a self-nomination process and a form to ask if the employer will provide time to attend the conference, and a letter from someone attending the conference. These could be collected by January 1st with a decision by February 1st so that they can decide if they wish to submit an abstract. Vin will draft text about this. Heather suggests it could cover registration and reimburse up to \$1000 in travel based on receipts. Dan asks if this is a "grant" or "award"? Are you required to present? Heather says presentations would not be required but encouraged. Pat asks if "technician" is a membership category we want to add? How will the awardees be chosen? What are the criteria? Heather suggests that we should only support one or two for M&M2022. Anette says that letters, such as for Goldstein, would be a good approach.

Heather mentions the possibility of poster awards. Will they be presented at the meeting or at the next meeting? Would we reward complimentary techniques, one for student, postdoc, industry? Or what? Anette mentions that posters are technically part of the present awards. How will we cull the number of posters under consideration? Brad comments that we don't explicitly mention that "posters are included" in the present calls for nominations. Josh mentions that "most techniques" might not bias towards the *best* posters. Emphasizing students will bias away from the pre-existing talk awards. Vin says that a checkbox on abstract submission may be helpful. Heather asks when people will know if they have a poster? Anette comments that the self-nomination for the award could be in the post notification. Having self-selection will reduce the load on the committee. Heather summarizes the poster awards will target students and the self-nominations will be open until about a week before the meeting. What should the

dollar amount be? Could it be swag from the booth? Vin will discuss logistics. Pat suggests that instead of “student” we could offer “first time presenter at M&M” (on the honor system). Angela suggests that instead of another committee, what about like the image competition and have web voting? Let the attendees decide? Chad wonders if “first time M&M” and “first time ever” posters could be categories. Brad asks what the student registration fee is for reimbursement? Pat comments that reimbursement of the registration fee helps the university, not the student. Heather asks if we could give a gift card equal to the fee? Dan thinks a gift card would be best since actual cash can cause tax headaches. Anette says a gift card is easier for foreign attendees, and a plaque or certificate might be nice, too.

Heather suggests that we try the technician and poster awards once (2022) and see how it goes. We don't have to continue if the workload is too much.

Vin continues that projects such as MAS vetting of Wikipedia pages, etc., need champions to take over these efforts. Dan needs help growing the social media presence. “Elevate your paper” is an example. We need Goldstein award follow-up stories. We need input about job postings; this is not as easy as it sounds. Should we ask for lessons learned from the COVID era? This would also require a champion. Past MicroNews and Council meeting minutes for the website need to be collected. Heather says minutes are available and will be uploaded. Heather asks about the interviews—are those ready for the website/YouTube? John replies release forms are required from the interviewees. The transcripts stand alone from the interviews. Some of the interviews are close-captioned. At least some will be ready soon. Heather asks if there are standard release form templates? John says having access to the lawyer via MSA would be useful. Anette thinks that someone up to date on intellectual property and copyright is needed; university libraries often have this expertise. Nicholas sent Anette a link to meeting proceedings dating back many years, but the copyright questions are still unresolved. It would be good to make them available if possible. Anette wonders if we could have “special content” on the website for registered users. People might register who are not members and we would be getting their contact info.

Vin wants to keep the webinars going forward. Virtual get-togethers will stay important, even post-COVID. Heather comments it would be good to cross-reference invited M&M speakers with MAS members to find more webinars. Vin asks if microscope learning kits could be sent to the AReS. Heather asks if AReS might have outreach kits via their local or home universities. Kerry mentions MSA has an outreach program and we could talk to them. Anette mentions that the new MAS LAS chair has coordinated meetings and this might be a good place to bring this up.

Vin continues that a list of MAS roles people have played will be necessary. A virtual quantitative EDS event in the autumn is being considered. Several topics are under discussion. Anette found a spreadsheet of past council members, and wants to expand on the MAS history on the webpage. Heather asks if Council feels good about pursuing the possibility of the virtual meeting? Yoosuf asks who the chair and co-organizers are. Heather agrees to chair, and asks for co-organizer volunteers. Yoosuf suggests that once all the questions are answered, we can approach sponsors. Vin asks what other topics, such as big data / machine learning, are possible? Chad wonders if a virtual big data meeting could be “Hyperspectral Imaging III”? Yoosuf says HI3 could be a different big event with the virtual as a preview.

Yoosuf volunteers to champion the Wikipedia project.

Tom gives a summary of the LEAP preservation. The first LEAP was shipped to ORNL in 2002

and ran until 2015. Tom and John Panitz organized a GoFundMe and purchased the tool for \$3100 in October 2019. It was transported to Cameca and Cameca replaced some missing parts. COVID complicated the situation. Last August, Tom transported it to STEAM instruments. The LEAP will leave Madison in August 2021 to Albuquerque. It will be housed at the Atom Probe Field Ion Museum. New GFM being organized to fund the move. SHI could not accept larger instruments at this time. A budget is presented for the move cost at about \$5800. Tom will request \$1000 each from MSA and MAS, and CAMECA has committed \$1000. Heather asks if any of this cost was in the \$8500 of strategic initiative funding last year. We will have to check records. Heather clarifies that this would be \$1000 from this year's society management budget. We can get back to Tom, but there may be funds this year because of reduced in-person activities. Tom has to log off early but asks for any questions about the Fellow's committee report. No questions are asked.

M&M 2021 Updates (Andy/Vin)

Andy says little has changed since the June meeting. It was decided to go virtual back in April. We avoided most penalties by agreeing to return to Pittsburgh in a few years. The virtual registration this year was \$300, compared to the discounted \$75 rate last year. The interactive features will be much improved. There will be spatial chat sessions to simulate the coffee breaks. The virtual poster sessions will be exciting. Numbers are down compared to in-person years due to reduced exhibitor participation. We are tracking last year, but the higher fee means higher revenue this year. Please spread the word about the meeting with your social media. One of the plenaries had to withdraw due to a family emergency, but a replacement will be announced imminently.

Vin thinks Andy covered everything. Spread the word.

Nominating Committee (Pat)

Pat thanks the committee for their work. Owen Neill will stand for secretary. Assel Aitkaliyeva, Thomas Lam, John Panitz, and Tommi White will stand for Director. John was found by querying the sustaining members. Heather doesn't know when chairs are ending their terms; let Heather know if you don't wish to continue, and help Heather out by finding your replacement. Heather calls for a motion to approve the slate of candidates. Emma moves, Josh seconds. All in favor, none opposed. The slate will be presented to the Business Meeting, and the floor will be opened to additional nominations.

Consent Reports

Heather hopes everyone has read the consent reports. Email the chairs with questions.

FIGMAS report (Emma)

Emma reminds Council that `FIGMAS` is the focused interest group on microanalytical standards. The mission is to evaluate, find, and create new standards. There are currently 44 members. At the moment, FIGMAS is open to only MAS or MSA members. It is hoped that members of MAS-affiliated international societies could be eligible. A letter is being sent to Heather. This may require some re-wording of bylaws, so FIGMAS is bringing the idea to the attention of the council.

Heather isn't sure how to deal with the bylaws and the portal. Heather supports this and will take the letter to MSA and see what happens.

Finalize Budget (Heather)

So far, only the Technician Award (M&M Registration plus \$1000 travel) and student/poster

award (cost of registration) were added. Heather will talk to Dave about ISO participation and \$1000 for the LEAP movement. We are still waiting to hear from MSA for the meeting revenue and possible co-chare loss. Heather says that with the large unknown, we cannot yet approve a budget, so we will need to finalize a budget by email. Heather will check the bylaws and see if a budget must be approved before the Business Meeting and asks if everyone is comfortable with waiting.

Conclusion (Heather)

The meeting was adjourned at 1410 EDT.