1) Call to Order and Introductions (Michael Newkirk)

Michael Newkirk, the Chair of USNC-URSI, called the meeting to order at 8:12 am MST. The following Members of USNC were present at the Executive Council Meeting:

In person:
Gary Brown, Branislav Notaros, Michael Newkirk, Jeanne Quimby, Alyson Ford, Ana Ferreras, Thomas Hanley, Jonathan Chisum

Online:
Ross Stone, Sembiam Rengarajan, Reyhan Baktur, Thomas Gaussiran, Mark Golkowski, Gregory Huff, and Asimina Kiourti.

2) Approval of the Agenda (Newkirk)

The agenda for the meeting was discussed and approved (M: Rengarajan; S: Brown).

3) Approval of the Minutes (Newkirk)

The minutes of the July 2021 Executive Council Meeting were approved (M: Stone; S: Brown).

4) 2022 NRSM: Final Statistics, SPC, Comments and Suggestions (Newkirk)

- There were 296 papers presented in 2022, 229 in 2021, and 341 in 2019. There were 384 (likely a record!) registrations in 2022, 361 in 2021, and 365 in 2019. There were 192 people registered as being "in-person" in 2022, however many attendees appeared to show up online instead of in person without informing us.

- The SPC results were presented. Interestingly, the student who won the SPC was the only online student (the rest presented in person).

- Discussions:

  - There were only 7 applicants for the SPC this year.

  - People who attended online last year and online again this year were not introduced to what USNC and URSI are. Maybe next year when people register we can provide them information about what USNC-URSI is, etc. Maybe the email from the NASEM should indicate that participants are "required" to attend the business meetings.

  - Online attendees seemed to have good interactions with those attending in person during the sessions. The room monitors asked if people wanted to keep the room equipment going after the session, which allowed for additional interaction between online and in-person attendees after the sessions.

  - It was nice that online attendees presented live, which provided a much better experience for everyone. There were some cases in which videos weren't uploaded and no one showed up online or in person. Colin was getting inundated with files at the last minute and these files didn't get uploaded to where they needed to go in

time. Perhaps next year we can have folders for each session, and then it's up to the presenter to get their file to the right spot. Another idea: every talk can have its own dedicated upload link (EUCAP had this).

- The audiovisual room monitors did an excellent job.

- Jeanne: Maybe we can have a student party/social. Mike: We had that idea, but it didn't make it into the schedule due to time constraints (since we went with the shorter NRSM).

- Branislav: The plenary session was outstanding.

- Maybe we should go back to two speakers during the plenary session instead of three so we don't feel rushed.

5) Commission Business Reports (Simpson / Newkirk)

- What is the difference between a regular and special session? Special sessions: What is the latest, greatest research going on in that area. Also, special sessions are focused and organized. Commission D is one of the smaller commissions, and special sessions are useful for increasing participation.

- It's not clear how to become a member of a Commission if the nominee does not know anyone in the Commission very well yet (might especially be a problem for recent online attendees). One idea: By default, the sponsor (nominator) can be the chair of the commission unless the nominee specifies someone else? Ross: We could allow self-nominations (or allow candidates to just apply to become a member) for early career members (but not for associate or full members), since they may not know people in the Commission as well.

  The nomination form needs to be updated and improved (for example, instead of asking for a "nominator," ask for the name of a current member who knows the nominee well, so they can vouch for them). There is delay from NASEM in getting nominations to the Commissions at the beginning of the triennium. This is due to the fact that the Chairs need to be confirmed and the emails need to be updated in the system.

  The nomination form needs to send an email confirmation saying the form has been received (or we should also send the received nomination to the person who submitted it).

- It would be nice to have the business meetings and tutorials hybrid in future years. We lost money this year even though we had record registrations due to the hybrid sessions. Hybrid allows for more inclusivity and diversity because it helps people who maybe don't have funds to travel or can't travel. Maybe we can submit a proposal to NASEM to support future hybrid NRSMs. Either way, there is a bigger question of whether conferences should be in person or online? Let's continue to offset travel costs so people continue to participate in person.

- For the 2023 plenary session, Reyhan suggested Pat Doherty as a speaker. Maybe we can have a topic from Commission K? Or from Commission B: the James Webb telescope. Maybe keep plenary speakers general and not specific to commissions. We should invite John Mather and figure out if he is a member of USNC-URSI.

- Tutorials: We should make the proposal writing tutorial / workshop an annual event. We can also ask every commission to come up with one idea, and maybe we can organize one tutorial / workshop for each commission. Tutorials are a great opportunity to provide people experiences with performing unique measurements. We need to keep some tutorials in person (measurements, etc.). Maybe offering tutorials should not provide a means for companies to have free advertisement (HFSS this year). However, we are a nonprofit, and we don't want to give the impression that sponsors are affecting the technical integrity of our conference. Tutorials / short courses should be open to everyone, not just students. To attract all attendees, maybe we should call them short courses.

- We should add members to the Sponsors and Exhibitors Committee, update the existing package and approach more organizations for sponsorships.

- Early Career Leadership positions: We have a consensus that early career members (ECMs) should have leadership roles. Maybe we can call them Early Career Representatives (ECRs). ECRs could co-chair sessions. We should make ECRs uniform across commissions, so it is not confusing. International URSI has ECR-type positions and they are elected. It would be nice to implement this as soon as possible through an email vote. Should we allow ECMs and AMs to vote (not all are U.S. citizens or permanent residents)?

  Ana informed us that NASEM does not require citizenship or permanent resident status to become a member, but they do require it to become a lifetime member. USNC-URSI has control over the requirements for becoming members of commissions.

  Ross: The following was discussed years ago: If we have many foreign nationals that are full members, would they work in the interest of the U.S.? URSI also does not impose any requirements about citizenship. Ana said that U.S. citizens cannot serve on a committee in any foreign countries.

  From this discussion, we decided to keep the citizenship requirement for full members. Jeanne would like ECMs to be able to vote in commission meetings as a benefit for serving in the role. We asked Branislav to work with other chairs to come up with a plan for ECRs. Ross: We could have one of the 10 ECRs appointed to the executive committee. Later we could make it permanent. Ana will share forms from Chemical Engineering on how they select two categories of early career-type members.

- Post-Doc Travel Support: Maybe $3k for each commission can be used to support post-docs? Maybe we can advertise more to students that they can travel for free / registration.

- We should post the NRSM program to Whova earlier.

- We should give CMS a list of ideas on how they can improve the paper management system (for example, it takes a lot of clicks to look at each paper). Send specific ideas to Mike so we can send all of the ideas to CMS before next year.

6) **2023 NRSM Planning (Newkirk)**

- All of the items were discussed earlier in the week.

USNC-URSI Executive Council Meeting Minutes
8 January 2022

7) **Plans for Commission Websites and USNC Archive (Newkirk)**

   ▪ All Commissions should update the list of the Commission officers on the NASEM website. Minutes from the Commission meetings should also be posted. Also, membership list should be posted (names and affiliations only).

   ▪ Mike Newkirk will be posting the plenary and short course, etc. videos from the 2022 NRSM. All previous Student Paper Competition winners will be posted to the USNC-URSI archive website once we gather the information.

8) **Commission Membership Lists**

   ▪ All Commissions should send their membership lists to Jamesina Simpson so they can all be consolidated. Some Commissions are having trouble getting in touch with some of their members because emails are bouncing back. Commission B sent out an email to their members asking for them to help the Commission get in touch with them. Other Commissions might use this same approach. We don't need mailing addresses anymore. We just need name, affiliation, email, and a phone number.

9) **Other items for Discussion**

   ▪ Dr. Kumar Vijay Mishra is the current URSI Commission C Vice-Chair (this was missed earlier, perhaps by URSI) and has now been updated to include him on the USNC-URSI roster). We only have one chair and two vice-chairs of URSI Commissions, so we should nominate more from USNC-URSI in the future.

   ▪ The USNC-URSI awards were discussed again briefly. David Jackson will serve as the chair of the awards committee.

   ▪ A deadline of 30 June is proposed for the URSI awards, so the nominees can be sent to URSI by Aug. 15. The URSI award nomination form has not yet been updated and posted. It is proposed that David Jackson also oversee the URSI award nominations from USNC-URSI (but not serve as either the senior or junior awards committee chair). Commission members are encouraged to nominate colleagues. URSI will send out a call for nominations.

   ▪ Mike Newkirk proposed having another executive council meeting in July 2022 to discuss the status of award nominations, ECMs in leadership roles, and to discuss any other relevant business. We should make sure to not have it overlap with AdCom, the Joint Meetings Committee, or the Strategic Planning Meeting.

   ▪ We want more sponsors (we received $8k this year, but we will still have a deficit). Please provide suggestions for who can serve on the Sponsors and Exhibitor Committee (we need a new chair). How about John Volakis? How about Chris Hendersen? Chris Holloway? The material is ready for approaching potential sponsors. Potential sponsors just need to be contacted. Mike Newkirk may contact Satish Sharma to become the next chair.

   ▪ Mike recognized Christina Patarino, Colin Mahoney, Michelle Ambruz, and Lance Cotton for all of their help putting on the hybrid meeting.

10) **Adjournment**

   The meeting adjourned at 12:54 pm MST (M: Stone; S: Newkirk).