

Minutes
Eastern States Section Combustion Institute
Executive Committee Meeting

Date: Sunday, October 13, 2013

Time: 3:30 – 5:30 PM

Location: Executive Board Room, Madren Center, Clemson University

Agenda – Final

Welcome of new members, Jackie Sung and Michael Mueller
Approval of minutes from the 8th National Meeting in Utah (attached)
Budget details (Yiguang), including travel allocations and support for 35th symposium in S.F.
Update on Award Presentations (Mike R.)
Latest budget and any issues for Clemson meeting (Chenning and/or Rich M.)
Report by Peter's committee on enhancing communications regarding importance of combustion (Peter)
Metrics to determine success of Special Seminar
Discussion on the viability of the ESS Fall Technical Meeting (all)
Potential hosts for the 10th National Meeting in 2017 (9th National Meeting: May 17-20, 2015, University of Cincinnati)
New business
Adjourn

Note: The items on the agenda were covered somewhat out of order during the actual meeting. The minutes below are approximately in the chronological order in which the topics were actually discussed.

Attendees (alphabetical by last name): Beth Bennett, Baki Cetegen, Med Colket (via phone), Dan Haworth, Yiguang Ju, Rich Miller, Michael Mueller, Mike Renfro, Bill Roberts, Peter Sunderland, Chenning Tong, Arnaud Trouve, Rich Yetter

CI Support: Barb Waronek (via phone)

Attachments:

8 slides relating to improving the visibility of combustion research
Minutes from Utah Meeting

Call to order: Meeting called to order at 3:39 PM, October 13, 2013, by Bill Roberts presiding as Chair of the ESSCI Executive Committee.

Welcome of new members, Jackie Sung and Michael Muller

Everyone introduced themselves and greeted Michael. (Jackie was unable to attend.)

Approval of minutes from 8th National Meeting in Utah

Dan moved to accept the minutes. Baki seconded. Minutes unanimously approved as submitted. (Minutes are attached, after the 8 slides relating to improving the visibility of combustion research.)

Treasurer's report (Yiguang)

The May balance in the bank accounts (Janus and Bank of America) was \$82K.

Utah Meeting in May: There were 39 student applications for travel support to the National Meeting. The amount of support per student will be \$250, which came to a total slightly less than \$10K. The ESSCI portion of the income from the National Meeting in Utah was \$23K. Thus the Utah Meeting gave us a net gain of \$13K.

Balance just prior to Clemson meeting: \$95,369.84.

One upcoming expense is the loss for the Clemson meeting, which was originally projected to be \$10K for 110 attendees. In fact, there are approximately 90 attendees, and the loss will be around \$5K (see bottom part of this page for more details).

Another upcoming expense will be student travel support to the 35th Symposium in San Francisco: \$800 per student x 25 students = \$20K. (Student must give presentation to be eligible for support.)

Near-future balance *including 35th Symposium student travel support*:

\$75,369.84 – Clemson meeting loss + 35th Symposium income (or loss, if Symposium loses money).

Update on the Clemson meeting

GE Tour: GE notified Chenning and Rich M. on the evening of Thurs., Oct. 10 to say that they had to cancel the tour that was originally scheduled for the afternoon of Wed., Oct. 16. They are willing to support a tour starting no later than 3:45 pm on Tues., Oct. 15. There was a loose consensus (after much e-mail discussion on Fri., Oct. 11) that there will be a 14-person limit on the Tuesday tour. It will take an hour to reach GE, the tour will take 75 minutes, and it will take an hour to return from GE, which means that anyone attending the tour will miss most of the General Business Meeting on Tuesday. Chenning has rented a 12-person van to drive attendees to GE, and 1 additional car may be needed if 14 people actually sign up for the tour. The situation will be announced on Monday morning to conference attendees, and there will be a signup sheet at the registration desk after that.

ICAR Tour: Chenning is in the process of trying to arrange a tour of CU-ICAR, the Clemson University International Center for Automotive Research, located in Greenville. The tour will likely occur on Wednesday afternoon, so that attendees who chose later flights (to attend the original GE tour) can fill their time attending the ICAR tour. Instead of returning the rental van after the Tuesday GE tour, Chenning will extend the reservation by 1 day so as to reuse the van for the ICAR tour transportation. Although the tour will not be directly related to combustion, it will still be of interest to attendees. There will be a signup sheet at the registration desk.

Meeting attendance and budget (Rich M.): So far, there are 86 registrants for the Clemson meeting, and their registrations totaled \$18K. In general, we should expect 10% of the attendees to register on-site, according to Barb. So, we might expect an additional \$2K in registrations. The conference facility cost was \$4575, but the Hospitality Suite (Room 430) was free. Originally the cost of the registration services (if it had been handled by the university) would have been \$2K, but it was instead done through the CI for free. Also, \$500 had originally been budgeted for people to man the registration desk, but Clemson students will be doing it for free. These cost savings are helping to offset what would have been a larger loss for the meeting. The food is coming in "on budget" at around \$11.5K, and the final number will be based on the actual food consumed. The 4 award plaques (3 awards from UConn meeting plus Young Investigator Award from Clemson meeting) cost \$160, and copying and binding of the conference programs cost \$800. [Two weeks after the meeting, Yiguang noted that 31 students signed up for travel support to the Clemson meeting (\$150 per student), for a total of \$4650.]

Presentation of award plaques: After some discussion, it was decided that Bill will announce on Monday morning that the award plaques will be presented on Tuesday during the "announcements" time slot.

Future US Sectional meetings

Western States Meeting: At Cal Tech in Pasadena, CA, on March 23-25, 2014

Central States Meeting: In Tulsa, OK, on March 16-18

9th National Meeting: At University of Cincinnati (Cincinnati, OH) on May 17-20, 2015

Viability/usefulness of the ESSCI meeting

Bill opened the discussion by asking the Board whether the ESSCI meeting is still viable and useful.

Arnaud suggested that we rephrase the question and instead ask, "What's the success of the National Meeting?" Half of the presentations at the National Meeting are from students (which is great!). At the Clemson meeting, a few areas (such as Reaction Kinetics and Laminar Flames) are well attended, but for anyone interested in other topics, the meeting is not worth attending. For example, all of the Fire presentations are from the University of Maryland, so there is little opportunity to interact with other Fire experts at the ESSCI meeting (because they aren't attending). The fact that the attendance is decreasing is also a bad sign. Arnaud reminded us that the number of people doing combustion research is growing, so, if anything, the meeting attendance should be growing, not decreasing. Arnaud also said that at the meetings of the Executive Board of the Joint Sections (of which he is a member), there is a lot of resistance from the CSS and WSS to have a joint meeting *at the expense of sectional meetings*. He said that Chris Shaddix of the WSS suggested having a joint meeting of the WSS and ESS in the fall of odd-numbered years.)

Yiguang pointed out that things were fine before the National Meeting began occurring in 1999. He said that the motivation of going to the ESS meeting is two-fold: educate students and share research results. The timing of the ESS meeting is now bad: National Meeting in May, then ESS in October, and the Symposium deadline in December. (Dan and Beth pointed out that the SIAM Numerical Combustion meeting was in April, and Rich M. mentioned the ACS meeting in November, too.) Yiguang suggested that the ESS meeting should be moved to March of even-numbered years (i.e., March 2016), which would be shortly *after* the Symposium deadline. He also suggested combining it with a topic-specific workshop to make the overall meeting more attractive to attendees.

Baki agreed with Yiguang. He also commented that it would make no sense to have a 2-section meeting (such as a joint WSS/ESS meeting), because we might as well just have another National Meeting.

Bill suggested that maybe we should have fewer ESS meetings.

Yiguang suggested that maybe we shouldn't have an ESS meeting when the symposium is in the U.S. (The symposium is in the U.S. every 6th year.)

Bill reminded us of the history of the name of the U.S. National Meeting. Originally it was called the "Joint Technical Meeting of the U.S. Sections of the CI," because there was concern about offending non-U.S. sections who might view a "U.S. National Meeting" as too strong a meeting.

Arnaud mentioned that travel is less expensive than it was a few years ago, so it is less expensive to send students to the National Meeting.

Yiguang asked whether the other U.S. sections want the U.S. National Meeting to be held every year.

Arnaud responded, "Maybe, if the individual sections stop holding their meetings."

Bill said that the problem with having a National Meeting every year is site selection. It is hard to find an inexpensive location that is large enough for the National Meeting yet easily accessible for people to fly to. The advantage of the ESS meeting is that we can keep costs low by having meetings at slightly less accessible locations.

Barb said that none of the U.S. sections will be having a meeting in the Fall of 2014 because of the Symposium being in the U.S. in the Summer of 2014.

Dan pointed out that at the last ESS meeting, the majority of the talks were on laminar flames and reaction kinetics, and the same is true at this meeting. Nowadays people want a small meeting that is topical

(such as the SIAM numerical combustion meeting), so here is an idea. We could have a focus for each future ESS meeting (such as laminar flames or reaction kinetics) – basically we could formalize a trend that is already occurring.

Barb said that if the ESS meeting moves to the spring of even-numbered years, we need to be careful not to conflict with the CSS meeting. The last CSS meeting was in Dayton and was very successful. (It was a last chance for students to practice their talks before the Symposium.) On the other hand, the WSS meeting last week in Colorado had only 50 attendees; the WSS meetings are always poorly attended when they are outside California.

Peter suggested a totally new idea: why not have just two U.S. sections (ESS and WSS, for example, and split the CSS between the ESS and WSS)? Right now, with three sections, our national voice is diluted compared to other countries.

Dan moved that we have a spring ESS meeting in the future. He also said we ought to propose to the national committee (the one that Arnaud is a member of) that each section's meeting should have a focus and be combined with a workshop. (A focus and a workshop would both enhance attendance.) We should also discuss the idea of having a national meeting every year.

Yiguang offered Princeton as a possible site for the next ESS meeting or for the 10th National Meeting in 2017. Yiguang and Michael M. agreed that a particular campus building (or hotel?) that is currently under construction would be completed by then, which would make it easier to have a conference at Princeton.

Everyone discussed briefly when the next ESS meeting would be. The consensus was that it would be approximately 2½ years from now, in March 2016. (The 2016 Symposium [36th Symposium] is in Seoul, Korea, by the way.) Previous ESS meeting attendance was reviewed: 150 people were at the UConn meeting in 2011, and 150 people were at the Maryland meeting in 2009. If Princeton hosts the 10th National Meeting, then they can't also host the next ESS meeting, so where would the next ESS meeting be? Someone suggested Hilton Head, and Bill recalled that Med had coordinated the 2001 meeting there.

Med said that in order to reduce costs of a Hilton Head meeting, it is necessary to have it in the late Fall, because October and November are expensive times due to the golfing season. Unfortunately, March is expensive for the same reason. Getting a good deal at a hotel or conference center requires doing legwork on-site.

Peter said we could have the next ESS meeting at a ski resort or a casino, as those types of venues are usually inexpensive.

Dan suggested that we ask for volunteers to host the next ESS meeting (March 2016) during the General Business Meeting on Tuesday afternoon. Everyone agreed that this idea was a good one.

Enhancing communications regarding importance of combustion (Peter)

Peter has been leading a three-person committee (other members are Med Colket and Nick Cernansky). The charge to the committee was to identify ways to improve funding and visibility of combustion research in the U.S. The committee looked at ways to reach out to Congress and the executive branch. They gathered input from several people including Arvind Atreya, Don Hardesty, Ed Law, Julian Tishkoff, Barb Waronek, Phil Westmoreland, and a former AAAS Senatorial Fellow. The committee has now identified 6 possible activities for further consideration.

Each activity below is **described in more detail in the attached slides**. These slides are a subset of the slides that Peter prepared for the Board Meeting. Below is the discussion that ensued at the Board Meeting.

Activity 1: *Invite key executive branch personnel (e.g., Program Managers [PMs]) to speak at technical meetings.* Some previous ESS meetings have had PMs (or the Undersecretary of Energy) give plenary talks. Baki pointed out that some of those talks were useless and had no technical content – just some canned slides. Someone else suggested that instead of “wasting” a plenary slot, we could have a PM as

a banquet speaker. General discussion brought out the point that the higher-ups are the ones that decide the focus of funded research (not the PMs), so we should invite the higher-ups instead. In fact, it would be best to invite them to the National Meeting, not the ESS meeting, to make a better impression regarding the breadth of combustion research in the U.S. and the number of people involved in it. Med reported that Julian Tishkoff said that inviting PMs to meetings is very important because it facilitates exchanges between new (young) PIs and PMs.

Activity 2: Arrange DC congressional visits by teaming with setcvd.org. This organization is affiliated with the ACS (American Chemical Society). It only costs \$100 to work with setcvd.org, which is very inexpensive. It sounds like a good deal – all we need to do is to find 5 or 6 ESS members who are willing to volunteer to undergo the short training and then spend 2.5 days in Washington. Bill suggested that we ask for volunteers at the General Business Meeting on Tuesday afternoon.

Activity 3: Identify and/or prepare materials summarizing the beneficial impacts of combustion research. It would be great to have a set of prepared materials (such as a white paper or a slide set or a glossy brochure) to emphasize the benefits of combustion research in the U.S. Katharina Kohse-Höinghaus (CI President) is in the process of preparing a slide set, and we can use that as a starting point. It would be best to do this activity in conjunction with the other U.S. sections, but perhaps with ESS taking the lead since Washington, D.C., is part of our geographical jurisdiction.

Activity 4: Organize letter writing an in-state congressional office visits. This activity should also be coordinated with the other U.S. sections.

Activity 5: Arrange high-level meetings with the executive branch (e.g., DOE, DOD). People from industry can't approach Congress, and university people are not allowed to lobby but they can still talk with Congress members. (There was a brief discussion about the definition of lobbying, and it was concluded that lobbying entails encouraging a Congress member to vote yes or no on a specific bill.) Arnaud suggested that we find out who at the big professional societies (APS, AIAA, ACS, etc.) already talks with people in Washington. We could then invite those bigwigs from APS, etc., to come talk to us (at an ESS meeting or at the National Meeting) about strategies for improving our communications with Washington.

Activity 6: Improve public relations and media coverage. The problem with “uncontrolled” or “unintentional” media coverage is that sometimes an unimportant research result can “go viral” and get national attention, while other much more impressive results get no media coverage at all. Therefore, it would be nice to have a controlled means of releasing research results to the media.

After the general discussion about these activities and a brief review of the “Impact and Ease Table” (see attached slides), the Board agreed with the list of recommendations made by Peter's committee. The recommendations (detailed in the last attached slide) are to proceed with the first three activities and to wait on the remaining activities. Action items are to encourage the organizers of the 9th U.S. National Meeting in Cincinnati to invite PMs or other executive branch staff, to seek ways to involve other U.S. sections, and to identify key members of Congress (and then to contact CI members from these states so they can communicate with those members of Congress).

New business

Arnaud mentioned that while at the National Meeting, he learned that the CI office is planning a change in the fees that they charge to support conferences. (Support consists of handling registrations and typesetting the program.) Up until now, they have always supported U.S. meetings for free, while not providing a similar service to non-U.S. sections. In the future, they will charge a fee to U.S. sections in order to be fair to all sections. The fee will be proportional to the number of hours they spend on support activities.

Peter brought up another new topic. He asked whether we should continue to have “papers” (i.e., extended abstracts) at the ESS meeting, because journals are becoming more strict about copyrights. For example, journals will not publish something if it has already appeared in print.

Dan stated that *Combustion & Flame* uses plagiarism detection software for submitted papers. The software checks for all plagiarism, including self-plagiarism.

A few people were skeptical that the quality of the ESS meeting could be maintained if we no longer required the submission of extended abstracts. Baki pointed out that without extended abstracts, people might be inclined to present “last week’s results” rather than putting any effort into it. As a counterexample, Dan and Beth mentioned that the SIAM numerical combustion meeting requires only a 75-word abstract but the quality of work presented there is extremely high. Of course, without any ESS extended abstracts, then we wouldn’t be able to have the Best Paper award.

Yiguang reminded everyone that for the purposes of training students, it is good to have them write ESS “papers,” because they get the experience of writing up their results before having to write a journal article.

The consensus was that we should go back to the 4-page limit. It is an extra “bar” to force people to jump over, beyond just having them submit a short abstract. (That way, as Arnaud pointed out, we will be able to weed out people who are unlikely to come to the meeting *earlier* in the process, rather than including their presentations in the program and then having them cancel at the last minute.) Also, a 4-page limit is better than a 6-page limit, from the point of view of getting into copyright problems.

Metrics to determine success of the Special Seminar

Bill reminded everyone that the objective of having a Special Seminar (such as the communications skills seminar on Monday afternoon) is to enhance what students get out of the ESS meeting.

Yiguang suggested that after the ESS meeting ends, someone needs to e-mail all the student attendees to ask them for their opinion and comments about the Special Seminar. (Barb confirmed that she can filter the list of attendees to sort out the students only.) This same e-mail can also ask students for suggestions for the topic of the next Special Seminar and/or ask students to volunteer to serve on a committee that will choose the next Special Seminar speaker. In fact, it would be good to have one of our At-Large Members be a Student Liaison, and he/she can work with the student committee.

Michael M. volunteered to be the Student Liaison, and everyone agreed.

Update on awards presentations (Mike R.)

The 3-person awards committee that determined the awards for the UConn meeting (and also the Young Investigator Award for the Clemson meeting) consisted of Mike R., Bill Green, and Jerry Seitzman.

The new 3-person awards committee will consist of Mike R., Jackie S., and Rich Y. They will determine the Best Paper and Best Student Presentation Awards for the Clemson meeting and the Young Investigator Award for the next ESSCI meeting.

Peter S. suggested that we should get 3 students to volunteer to be part of the Best Paper Award committee, and everyone agreed that it was a good idea.

Closing comments (Bill)

Bill stated that after the end of the Clemson meeting, Dan will become the new Chair. Other officers will be as follows. Arnaud will become the Vice Chair / Chair-Elect, and Mike R. will become the Program Chair. Beth and Yiguang will maintain their current positions of Secretary and Treasurer, respectively.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Beth Anne V. Bennett, Secretary
Eastern States Section

1. Invite key executive branch staff to speak at technical meetings

Details: Invite PMs from AFOSR/ARO/DOE/NSF/ONR to give short talks at technical meetings on their focus and proposal process. Invite cabinet-level staff to give plenary lectures.

Pros: Perhaps the most positive and effective activity. Requires little or no investment of money or time.

Cons: Unlikely to increase the total funds available for combustion research.

2. Arrange DC congressional visits

Details: Visit Congress, targeting Members in key leadership positions and from eastern states. A clear message is needed, with printed materials. A minimum of 5 researchers would spend 2.5 days in DC. Setcvd.org (or equivalent) will coordinate and provide the high-level message.

Pros: Little training is required. Many peer communities participate. Students benefit from visits. Members may contact us when a need arises. Low costs (~\$100 + travel/year).

Cons: Congressional earmarks have largely disappeared, such that the executive branch now sets most funding priorities for each agency.

3. Identify/prepare materials on the benefits of combustion research

Details: Materials will highlight the importance of US combustion science and applications to the economy, safety, humanity, etc. Major past and anticipated achievements should be discussed.

Pros: Materials will help communicate to a broad population and to varied constituencies. K. Kohse-Höinghaus will release new materials in Dec., 2013.

Cons: While the message will be important and impressive, the ESSCI may lack resources to complete alone.

4. Organize letter writing and in-state congressional office visits

Details: Individual PIs (with students) will visit congressional offices in their states and request a letter of support, e.g., to NSF or OMB. The letter would be signed by a Member and request increased funding for combustion/energy research.

Pros: Your congressman wants your vote; staff members will listen. Letters from Members could influence agency internal allocations. Can target key Members.

Cons: Congressional earmarks have largely disappeared, such that the executive branch now sets most funding priorities for each agency. Will require extensive coordination across USCI sections, with a single common letter.

5. Arrange high-level meetings with the executive branch

Details: Arrange meetings between CI senior researchers and high-level executive branch staff (e.g., Secretaries, Undersecretaries, Program Managers, etc.).

Pros: Provides a broad reach and high-level interactions. Gets our message to the level where detailed budgets are formulated.

Cons: May be difficult to arrange, and tough to get results. Many others are competing with us.

6. Improve public relations and media coverage

Details: Publicize combustion research. An example is recent press on UCSD microgravity combustion work; NASA initiated this, the PIs pushed, and the UCSD PR department helped.

Pros: Free advertising for combustion research. We are already doing this on a small scale. Many universities, government agencies, and companies have PR staff.

Cons: Requires efforts by many researchers. Relatively minor advances could steal the spotlight. Press releases are often not noticed by the media.

Impact and Ease Table

Recommendation	Activity	Impact	Ease	Comments
✓	1. Executive branch talks at technical meetings			Easiest, but does not influence budgets
✓	2. DC congressional visits			Exploratory; should be sustained
✓	3. Materials on benefits of combustion research			Coord with CI - need to proceed
✓	4. Letter writing and in-state office visits			Coordinate with other sections
	5. High-level meetings with executive branch			Difficult to coordinate and execute
	6. Improve public relations and media coverage			Difficult to coordinate; need creativity

Recommendations

1. Invite key executive branch staff to speak at technical meetings.
Definitely proceed. Coordinate with 2015 Cincinnati meeting.
2. Arrange DC congressional visits.
Proceed. Join setcvd.org and try for at least one year.
3. Identify/prepare materials on the benefits of combustion research.
Proceed. Adapt the CI materials for US and supplement with other white papers.
4. Organize letter writing and in-state congressional office visits.
Wait for 2 and 3. Team with USCI to plan and find volunteers.
5. Arrange high-level meetings with the executive branch (e.g., DOE, DOD).
Reassess after 2 and 3.
6. Improve public relations and media coverage.
Encourage individual efforts but do not pursue collectively.

Minutes
Eastern States Section Combustion Institute
Executive Committee Meeting

Date: Thursday 16 May
Time: 9:00 – 10:00 AM
Location: Meeting held via WebEx

Agenda – Final

Approval of the Minutes from the Warsaw Meeting
Budget details (very briefly from Bill R.; Yiguang to provide detailed report later)
Review awards to be given at Fall Tech Meeting in Clemson (presented by Baki for Mike)
Update on plans for Clemson meeting (attached, Chenning or Rich)
Update on elections for new board members (Baki)
Including Canadian section in next national meeting (Arnaud)
Enhancing communications regarding importance of combustion (Peter)
New business
Adjourn

Attendees (alphabetical by last name): Beth Bennett, Baki Cetegen, Catalin Fotache, Bill Green, Paul Papas, Bill Roberts, Peter Sunderland, Rich Yetter

CI Support: Barb Waronek (absent)

Attachments:

Minutes from Warsaw Meeting
Plans for Clemson meeting

Meeting called to order at 9:03 AM, 16 May 2013 by Bill Roberts presiding as Chair of the ESSCI Executive Committee.

Minutes approved as submitted.

Treasurer's Report (presented briefly by Bill R. in lieu of Yiguang)

Transition from old Treasurer (Harsha) to new Treasurer (Yiguang) is more or less complete. Yiguang is currently traveling and will send Treasurer's Report in the next few days. According to Bill R., Yiguang received a check from Harsha for \$14,116 on April 1st. There have been 39 student applications for travel support to the National Meeting. The amount of support per student will be \$250, which comes to a total slightly less than \$10,000. Janus Money Market Fund currently has approximately \$80,000.

Review of the awards to be given at the Fall Tech. Mtg. at Clemson (presented by Baki/Bill R. for Mike)

Need to solicit nominations for the Glassman lecture. Solicitation e-mail will go out after the Utah meeting. Based on a decision made at the Warsaw meeting, the award amount has been increased to \$1000 travel plus a \$500 honorarium, instead of just travel. The awards committee will remain the same for the fall (Mike Renfro, Bill Green, and Jerry Seitzman).

At the Clemson meeting, plaques for the UConn meeting's best paper award (and best presentation award) will be given out. Presentation of the plaques needs to be added to the agenda, and the plaques need to be ordered.

For the Clemson meeting, the program needs to be set up such that session chairs do not chair their own papers, in order to make the nominations for best paper and best presentation cleaner.

Best paper award: There was some discussion about re-imposing a page limit on the extended abstracts in order to make judging for best papers fairer. Last time around some papers stuck to the historical 4-page limit, while others were 15 pages; the latter were obviously more detailed and thus more likely to win. During the discussion, it was mentioned that 4 pages may be too short to allow enough content for accurately judging best paper, but 6 pages or 8 pages entails more work for the session chairs who will have to read the papers. In the end, it was decided that we will impose a 6-page limit for the extended abstracts at the Clemson meeting.

Mike R. says (via Bill R. and Baki) that metrics are needed for judging the presentations and papers. Beth volunteered to forward to them some examples of judging forms that she has come across previous while judging presentations and posters at local universities and for ASME. These will provide a starting point for the awards committee to develop forms for the session chairs to fill out at the Clemson meeting.

Workshop for students on presentation skills at the Clemson meeting

This topic was not originally on the agenda but was an outgrowth of the discussion about the best presentation award.

Bill R. suggested that a good use of our resources would be to have a series of workshops (first one to be held at the Clemson meeting) on skills that would greatly benefit grad students, such as how to give a good presentation, how to write a technical paper, how to prepare for an interview, etc. The workshops would provide coaching on topics that students apparently are not getting at their home institutions.

Catalin immediately agreed that the ability to give a good presentation is the number one skill lacking from nearly all new hires that he sees.

Further discussion fleshed out the workshop idea. The workshop at Clemson will likely be on presentation skills; it will be held during a dinner/networking session for students. Usually 70-90 students attend the Eastern States Meeting. The workshop will add value to the meeting.

Catalin volunteered to coordinate with Arnaud in order to schedule the workshop into the program for the Clemson meeting. Someone (Catalin?) will have to investigate getting a speaker to lead the workshop.

Update on plans for Clemson meeting (attached, discussion led by Bill R. in lieu of Chenning and Rich M.)

Neither Chenning or Rich M. could attend, so Bill R. ran through their PowerPoint slides (attached) and discussion ensued.

Airports: Closest airport is the Greenburg/Spartanburg [GSP] airport (45-min. drive from Clemson), followed by Charlotte [CLT] (2-hour drive from Clemson), and Atlanta [ATL] (2¼-hour drive from Clemson). Baki mentioned fluctuations in ticket prices, based on his experience visiting family in the area, and pointed out that attendees may not be able to choose GSP (due to cost) even though it is the closest airport. Regardless, there are apparently no shuttles available, so attendees will have to rent cars in order to get from airports to Clemson.

Venue: Venue will be the Madren Conference Center, which has a restaurant (Seasons Restaurant), and an adjacent hotel (Martin Inn), all of which are apparently owned by the university. Other restaurants are a 5-minute drive away, which should not be a problem since most attendees will have to rent cars anyway.

Facilities: There was some discussion as to whether the 140-seat auditorium will be large enough, and it's not clear how many 40-seat conference rooms are available. Everyone concurred that even if some people have to stand at the back of the auditorium, that is OK. More details will be forthcoming from Rich and Chenning.

Schedule: The draft of the 2.5-day schedule is standard (ending at 12:30 p.m. on Wednesday).

Banquet versus an extra reception: The minutes at the Warsaw meeting indicated that there was some flexibility regarding whether to have a banquet (at which attendees get to meet a few people in-depth) or

an extra reception (at which there is more chance for networking). It was pointed out that a good speaker would be needed for a successful banquet. The decision of banquet versus an extra reception will be left up to Arnaud and the local organizers.

Tour: If there will be a tour of BMW or GE (one of which is near the GSP airport), it would be good to have it on Wednesday afternoon so that it wouldn't coincide with any talks.

Budget: Budget details for the meeting are still needed.

Update on elections of new board members (Baki)

Six nominations (some of which were self-nominations) were received. The nominating committee, chaired by Baki, then requested a brief vision statement and a brief CV from each nominee.

Barb sent an e-mail to ESSCI members asking them to vote. As of last week, 37 people have voted so far.

Given that the ESSCI has about 350 (?) members and that 10%-20% response rate for a survey is deemed excellent, we are doing well. Voting will be open until the end of May. Baki will request that Barb send another reminder e-mail to members, since some people may have renewed their memberships since the 1st e-mail was sent a few weeks ago.

The two new board members will be installed at the Clemson meeting.

Including Canadian section in next national meeting (Bill R. in lieu of Arnaud)

A possibility of including the Canadian section (and perhaps the Mexican section) in the U.S. National Meeting to make it a "North American Meeting" had been discussed at recent meetings. The ESSCI had thought it was a good idea.

Arnaud, who is a member of the Executive Committee of the U.S. Sections of the Combustion Institute, recently heard back from Larry Kostiuk of the University of Alberta. Larry stated in an e-mail that "the discussion at both the Board of Directors and the General Business Meeting of the Combustion Institute Canadian Section was broadly negative to the idea of having joint meetings with the combined US Sections Meeting." The two main reasons were that no one would want to organize a huge meeting, and that it is extremely difficult for students to obtain visas to go from Canada to the US for meetings.

Enhancing communications regarding the importance of combustion (Peter)

Peter said that one way of making the government more aware of the importance of combustion research (and thus potentially to allocate more funds for combustion) is for the US Sections of the Combustion Institute to become more active in Washington. Given that Washington is within our geographical jurisdiction, it would make sense for the ESS to take the lead.

Living in Washington, Peter has found it easy to go to Capitol Hill with a group of students to speak to members of Congress. He says that letter writing is effective, too.

Peter suggested that we hire a professional to enhance our communications with the federal government. A brief discussion brought out the concern that professionals are not cheap, especially in Washington.

Peter said he will speak with Cindy Martin-Brennan, who has been hired by AIAA, to find out what her rates are. He will report back at the Utah meeting.

New business: None

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 9:57 AM.

Respectfully submitted,
Beth Anne V. Bennett, Secretary
Eastern States Section