

MEETING OF THE NHERI USER FORUM COMMITTEE

February 26, 2018

MEETING MINUTES

UF Members in Attendance: Russell, Nina, Elaina, Liesel, Stephanie, Jim, Erik, Ramtin, Adda

NCO Representatives in Attendance: Antonio (NCO), David Johnson (NCO)

Guests in Attendance: Kevin Johnson (Oklahoma State University)

1. Approval of meeting minutes from January 18, 2018 meeting

Russell motioned to approve the minutes, after Elaina corrects one miss-spelling of Antonio's name. The UF approved the Jan. 18, 2018 minutes.

2. Report from User Satisfaction Survey committee

Liesel gave an overview of the current version, V2.3, dated Feb. 12, 2018, of the User Satisfaction survey. The survey is currently open for comment from the UF, and such comments should be emailed to Liesel by the end of this week (March 2, 2018). Kevin Johnson joined the call; he is helping Liesel with the survey at OSU, and will be the one who uploads the survey online.

There are more open-ended questions this time around, and more space for comments to get more feedback from participants, as well as more questions to understand who is filling out the survey to compare responses to backgrounds.

Elaina asked if we could add more questions on the Science Plan, and use of it to the survey. Antonio, Liesel, and Elaina discussed the balance of adding more questions on the Science Plan. One question will be added to ask whether people are using the Science Plan. Liesel suggested a checkmark box question would be really useful here to see how else users may have used the Science Plan with the last box as 'other' in case we missed something as an option.

Antonio asked whether Liesel has submitted the survey for IRB approval. Liesel will get that process started this week.

Antonio asked if this would only be a web-based survey. Liesel said that they would also be doing telephone interviews. The subcommittee will reach out to the UF, NCO, ECO, Facilities Scheduling subcommittee, and EFs to get recommendations for who all to reach out to for these interviews. Kevin indicated that they aim to interview 10 – 15 people for more detailed feedback. These interviews will be performed around April 2018 during the same time as the online survey. The subcommittee will also

reach out to the various stakeholders to seek advice on what questions to ask, how much time the interviews should be, and how detailed of information should be sought.

Action item: Everyone, please review the current draft of the User Satisfaction survey, and email Liesel and Kevin feedback by the end of this week (3/2/18).

Action item: Liesel will start the IRB process at OSU for the survey.

3. Report from NCO representatives

Russell joined the 2/9/18 NCO call, and provided an update on the supplemental funding request. We needed to be more specific about who, what, and when in the proposal. We can resubmit the proposal for year 3. Russell discussed the timing issues with conferences since abstracts are submitted so far out, and we don't know at that point whether funding will be available for UF activities. For now, we can plan to submit abstracts to conferences we would already be attending for our personal research, for example. Antonio added that the request needs to be approved by the Council, who will then put together a proposal to the NSF. Four to five supplement funding requests were submitted this past time around, and Joy could only fund two. The ECO and the Science Plan proposals were funded. The Council will meet again on March 7, 2018 and April 4, 2018. If there is interest in resubmitting the UF's proposal, or interest in seeking supplemental funding for any other activities, it should be prepared and submitted to the NCO by April 4.

Nina attended the 2/22/18 NCO call. The ECO would like to get the NHERI leadership meetings scheduled during the Summer Institute. The Science Plan group indicated transformative and disruptive technologies (e.g., big data, new materials) in hazard mitigation should be emphasized during the workshop. A full proposal will be submitted to Joy for the Science Plan workshop, not just a supplemental award.

Antonio discussed the Summer Institute. Wed., June 6 afternoon has been set aside for NHERI leadership meetings. Will the UF meet together during that time? What other needs (e.g., coffee, projector, teleconference capabilities) do we have for that meeting?

Action Item: Everyone, send Elaina your availability and estimated flight cost and dates for attending the in-person meeting on June 6 in San Antonio.

Action Item: Elaina will collect information on attendance and needs for in-person meeting, and pass findings/requests along to Karina for scheduling.

4. Report from ECO representatives

Adda provided an update on ECO progress from the Feb. 6, 2018 ECO meeting. Discussions included REU applicant recruitment and Summer Institute applicant recruitment. REU application recruitment goals were met. Now the ECO is sending in their votes for Summer Institute attendees/awardees, and EF PIs will send in their requests for REUs.

5. Report from Facilities Scheduling representatives

Stephanie provided a report out for the subcommittee. In their recent meeting, on February 9, they discussed the top "pain points" in the NCO scheduling process. This mostly revolved around unimportant information being requested from the Site Utilization Request Form and the Equipment Site Policies Compliance Check. Suggestions were made about how to improve both. We also discussed the communication challenges between researchers in coordination with the Facility Managers and the NCO around scheduling. The question of "when is the appropriate time for a researcher to fill out the appropriate forms" kept coming up with many opinions on when was appropriate (EF says before proposal is even submitted). Ultimately, it was suggested that the User Forum could (and should) serve as the liaison between the researcher and the EF to determine which facility is most appropriate for proposed research and to help researchers submit the appropriate forms at the appropriate time.

6. Report from Technology Transfer representatives

Jim provided a report out. Late last year they had a kick-off call with their large, diverse group. The first task is underway to look at the outcomes of the NEES program to see if there are any learnings from that technical program that should have made its way into practical adoption but have not yet.

Elaina shared one NEES program output that hasn't been adopted into practice or practical guidance: PBSB of light frame wood buildings. She reported that the SEI Subcommittee on the Design of Wood Structures is currently working on this, however.

7. EF interaction with the UF – goals and who is involved

Antonio reminded that last time we discussed the Facilities Scheduling representatives would be a good place for our team to start this engagement since that subcommittee is already connected with the EFs.

Stephanie shared that a draft email to the facilities was discussed, where the email would seek EF interests in engagement with the UF. This topic was briefly discussed on the Facilities Scheduling call. Things are changing right now, but they expect to have more time to move forward on this during the next meeting. Russell reminded that the overall goal is to remind the EFs that we are available to help them do something for measuring and improving User Satisfaction, so if we send the email and they don't respond because they do not have any concerns, then that is okay. We don't want to create a problem when there

isn't one. Antonio suggested the email should also indicate that if they do have concerns they can join one of our UF meetings.

Action Item: Facilities Scheduling will draft an email to the EFs to seek their interest in engaging with the UF.

8. Other

a. Membership: UF has been in operation for one year, and should establish rules for succession.

Russell started discussing this item. We were all elected to the UF, but it was never discussed how membership would roll over. Russell suggested that three members remain on, but everyone else stays on for only one-year terms. The one year mark is coming up in a few weeks.

Antonio shared that the UF does not need permission, for example, by the NCO or others, that the UF governs itself. He suggested that a one year term seems a little too short because it takes a few months for members to get up to speed and ready to make progress. Antonio suggested a two-year turn around would be better, with approximately half of the committee turning over each year. Erik agreed that two-year terms with approximately half of the committee turning over each year is a good approach. Antonio suggested it would be good for this committee to attend the Summer Institute together again, and possibly start holding elections at the end of the summer or in the fall. Antonio suggested we could also add members, instead of replace, for the third year. Elaina suggested we add this onto the agenda for the in-person meeting to see who is interested in staying on for a third term. Jim agreed with the approaches discussed thus far. He also suggested leadership terms might be longer, either the whole time in a leadership role, or only part of the longer term being in a leadership role with the intention of stability and continuity of the committee. Russell noted that NHERI is currently only approved for 5 years in total, but agrees that a portion of the leadership stays in place, or those with experience on the committee move up into the leadership is a good idea. Antonio suggested the leadership could have a different rotation term length.

Action Item: Elaina will add 'Rules for Succession' as a discussion item on the in-person meeting agenda.

b. Plan for 2018: Summer Institute, participation at conferences, organize webinars, etc.

Russell confirmed the date of the in-person meeting as June 6, and asked if this afternoon block is for us to meet with ourselves, or with other leadership groups. Antonio said the block from 1-5pm has been reserved for leadership meetings. The NCO discussed whether it would be useful for them to meet with other committees, and decided it was best for them. The UF needs to discuss what it wants to do, and can

suggest to meet with other committees. Russell shared that last year worked out well, where we had a separate meeting room where we met as a group, a separate space to meet with EFs, the meeting with the council, and the informal gathering with the Summer Institute attendees. Antonio said the meetings are funded by NSF, and that this committee could request another happy hour/informal meeting with the Summer Institute attendees again, for example. Russell said the big thing is whether it is convenient – we definitely don't want to impede on the Summer Institute's schedule. Elaina shared an old draft of the Summer Institute schedule to see where we might find the time to meet with participants. Antonio suggested we reach out to Karina and express interest, as applicable.

Elaina, Russell, and Antonio discussed logistics, and organizing a budget for the in-person meeting. Everyone will stay at least two nights, but people can stay longer to participate in the Summer Institute.

Russell adjourned the meeting at 2:16pm CT.