

MINUTES

Division of Analytical Chemistry, 231st National ACS Meeting
Atlanta, GA

ANYL Executive Committee Meeting
Saturday, March 25, 2006, 1:00 – 5:00 pm
Georgia World Congress Center, Room B213

Members present: Brian Bidlingmeyer, Henry Blount, John Callahan, Bonner Denton, Paul Edmiston, Chris Enke, Britt Erickson, Catherine Fenselau, Alanah Fitch, Roland Hirsch, Cindy Larive, Laurie Locascio, Steven Petrovic, Al Ribes.

1. Call to Order: The meeting was called to order by Chris Enke at 1:07 pm.
2. Approval of Minutes: The Fall 2005 minutes were approved (Callahan/Enke motion).
3. Officer Reports:
 - 3.1. Chair: Chris Enke provided a programming overview of the sessions sponsored by the Division (thirty sponsored and co-sponsored sessions) at the spring ACS meeting in Atlanta. This program has a strong component from the award winners. The award winners themselves had sufficient industrial contacts such that money was raised to help support the award symposia. Both Novotny and Caprioli raised \$500-600 plus complimentary tickets to dinner, and their registration was covered as well.
 - 3.1.1. The San Francisco meeting was also covered by Chris. There are 21 sessions scheduled, including the symposia for the Division award winners: Andy Ewing is the recipient of the Chemical Instrumentation Award, Joe Wang is the recipient of the Electrochemistry Award, Mary Wirth is the recipient of the Spectrochemical Analysis Award, Neil Kelleher is the recipient of the Findeis Award, Alanah Fitch is the recipient of the Giddings Award, and Ted Becker is the recipient of the Service Award. Paul Edmiston is working on the symposium to honor Ted Williams, the Division is looking for support for the symposium and it is Chris' intent to invite Yvonne Williams to the SF meeting. Paul mentioned that he already has \$1000 in commitments for supporting the symposium. Susan Olesik is organizing the Subdivision programming.
 - 3.2. Chair-Elect: Laurie Locascio postponed discussion of Chicago until New Business.
 - 3.3. Secretary: Steven Petrovic discussed the 2005 Annual Report. Steve mentioned that the DAC asked for different types for information in the current Annual Report than in the 2004 (or 2003) annual report. This year, the DAC was interested in Division investment with respect to the longevity of volunteer service and activity, in addition to Division activities. Bonner made one correction regarding the 2005 annual report – he had sent a letter to David Pinkston's supervisor acknowledging David's service to the Division (that was not indicated in the 2005 report). The Division is active and strong (membership is relatively constant). Based on changes in Annual Report emphasis, Steve suggested that the list of past Chairs, Secretaries, and Treasurers (published in Spring 2003 Division newsletter) be expanded to include Councilors. John Callahan added that a list of candidates also be constructed so that the Division knows who has volunteered to run for office. Also, Steve mentioned that he nominated the Division for Chemluminary awards based on the recent establishment of electronic balloting and on our support of regional meeting programming.
 - 3.4. Treasurer: Al Ribes reported that we finished 2005 with a \$39,000 deficit. Most of this is based on our investment in Pacificchem (\$25K). Al also reported that we should be in better shape based on increased dues and increased efficiency with respect to administrative expenditures. Al also mentioned that Division award sponsorship (\$10,400) was covered in 2005 by the Division instead of external sponsors. Al believes we are in good shape. Al also suggested that we have enough liquid assets to transfer \$20,000 from savings to an investment fund to increase the rate of return for Division assets. Al then made a motion that he transfer \$20,000 from savings into the investment fund. John Callahan seconded the motion. Motion passed.

- 3.5. Councilors: Catherine Fenselau mentioned that the Councilors tried to get the Society to talk about the initiatives to address the way programming is done at ACS meetings (organizing programming around 2-3 central themes). John added that this subject has been discussed at length with the Divisional Activities Committee, and that the ACS wants to have a concerted effort with respect to Division programming around a central theme (e.g. Homeland Security and Response to Disasters) . Unfortunately, Catherine said that this was not discussed at Council. Alanah mentioned that the Divisional Councilors Caucus talk about these themes peripherally and her impression is to “fight” for resources for the Division. John mentioned that Divisions are the main reason for these National meetings, and more resources should be passed through Divisions for programming. and that since Division money is used anyway for programming, why would Divisions need incentives? John mentioned that incentives such as cross-listing of Division programming or who gets credit for programming would be an incentive if the Divisions received a greater return from ACS for attendance. Alanah asked about what ANYL receives from ACS. Al said that in 2003, we received \$3,000 for attendance at symposia and attendance at poster sessions in the Exposition.
4. Subdivision of Chromatography and Separations Chemistry: Brian Bidlingmeyer presented the Subdivision report based on the Pittcon meeting. Main points:
- 4.1. Subdivision discussed the dues increase from \$2 to \$4. When ANYL inadvertently increased the dues, Brian (and ANYL) thought there might be some concern about the increase, but it turned out not to be a problem.
 - 4.2. The Young Investigator Award winner was Chris Culbertson from Kansas State was chosen. One concern regarding the award was the loss of eligibility of viable candidates. Poor award visibility has affected the size of the candidate pool and only three viable candidates are currently in next year’s pool.
 - 4.3. Progress on Csaba Horvath’s plaque at Yale – nothing has been done yet.
 - 4.4. The Separation Subdivision seems to be nearly invisible on the Analytical Division website. It is available on the website but it’s not prominent on the website. Also, Chris said that the Subdivision officers are not in the yellow book and he believes they should be.
5. Committee Reports
- 5.1. Program Planning: John reported that the Long Range Planning Committee met that morning to discuss ideas for future meetings. Principal issue (which will be discussed in New Business) was the possibility of collaboratively programming the Spring meeting as a test case in Chicago with Pittcon (ACS and Pittcon are both in Chicago). This would be a good time to test the waters of collaborative programming.
 - 5.1.1. Financial Planning: John said there were three issues. One was enlistment of corporate support for the Division. Bonner has put together a plan to solicit support from corporate supporters. This was discussed last year, and we have a letter that we are going to send out to potential corporate donors for a \$2500 commitment for three years. This would support awards, undergraduate and graduate awards (fulfilling Division educational goals). We will send a list around for potential donors. Two, financial liability of awards has been taken on by the Division due to spotty corporate support. One example, the Giddings award was unfunded for longer than the Division realized because of Taylor & Francis refusal to pick up this philanthropic activity of the Marcel Dekker Foundation after purchasing the company. Dekker Foundation will not be picking up the support because it doesn’t fit in their mission. The Spectrochemical award is being sponsored by the Division and Cole-Parmer’s support of the Electrochemistry Award is on shaky ground. John suggested that it’s the recognition and not the money. After some discussion, ***John moved that beginning in the 2007 award cycle, the Division liability for all Division awards be reduced to \$2500 and that any additional monies raised by sponsors be used for travel or other expenses involved with associated award symposia, and that any funding decision made by the Division does not affect the Subdivision.*** Bonner seconded the motion. Motion passed.
 - 5.1.1.1. During the discussion of the previous item, Steve mentioned that the whole award sponsorship conversation started because the Spectrochemical Award had lost its sponsor and that according to the Bylaws, the Division could only fund an unsponsored award for one year. The Division was able to retain funding of the Spectrochemical Award because it agreed to sponsor the award, rather than simply fund it. With respect to this decision, ***John***

moved that the Division retroactively sponsor the Giddings award, and at the San Francisco meeting, the Division revisits the continuation of these two awards. Bonner seconded. Motion passed. During the subsequent discussion, Marcel Dekker suggested that John talk to the University of Utah about sponsoring this award. Chris suggested that given the success of the speakers obtaining support for award symposia, the Division should continue to try to obtaining specific support for the award symposia.

- 5.2. Awards and Canvassing: John spoke since Fred Hawkrige no longer serves as the chair of this committee. John mention some inconsistencies with respect to award canvassing. Some awards (e.g. Chemical Instrumentation) have lots of nominees; others don't. John believes we need to address canvassing – for example, there are very few women candidates. The Division needs to find organizations or groups of people that represent these types of candidates, since the ad hoc approach is not working consistently. John suggested that candidates be identified and sought after for nominations, possibly through a website. Al proposed that an action item be to approach John Richardson for a history of award sponsors. Brian suggested that request for nominations should be advertised in the newsletter. However, to avoid the “Bidlingmeyer Effect” (defined by Chris as the over-solicitation of nominations only to find that people don't want to repeat the work involved when re-nominating a candidate), John suggested that once a list of potential nominees have been suggested for an award, the Awards and Canvassing committee would decide upon an appropriate “short list” of candidates. Nominations would be solicited from this short list, thereby avoiding over-solicitation of nominations.
 - 5.3. Education: No Report.
 - 5.4. Newsletter: No report. John Callahan moved that the Newsletter Editor be invited to each Executive Committee meeting and support travel expenses at the Chair's discretion. Bonner seconded. Motion passed.
 - 5.5. Webpage: No report.
 - 5.6. Nominating: John Callahan indicated four potential nominees for Councilors (Roland Hirsch, Alanah Fitch, Charlie Wilkins, and Bonner Denton), two for Chair-Elect (Isiah Warner and Cindy Larive), and we need to find someone to run against Al Ribes for Treasurer.
 - 5.7. Pfizer Graduate Travel Awards: Paul Edmiston mentioned that Pfizer has been very generous with respect to corporate sponsorship. This year, Pfizer has provided \$12,000 in travel grant support. It is interesting to note that while the Graduate Fellowship Committee receives 50 – 60 applications per funding cycle, the Pfizer Travel Grant receives relatively few applicants. Paul is a bit bewildered by this discrepancy. Chris mentioned that publication and timing is critical with this award. Chris e-mailed all academic presenters that submitted abstracts for Atlanta and informed them that the Pfizer Travel Grant deadline had been extended. This was a successful endeavor (Paul received several applications after Chris' communication) but still there was no selection process (award was not over-subscribed). The one main restriction is that the award recipient must be a U.S. citizen, which did seem to have an impact on the number of submissions. The timing is also a problem because the application deadline for meeting abstracts is far in advance of the meeting compared to the Travel Award application deadline. This is a catch-22 situation with respect to abstract submission. Bonner mentioned that if the Division programs at Pittcon next year, the increased graduate student presence would make the Pfizer award even more popular. Chris suggested advertising the Graduate Fellowship Awards with the Pfizer Travel Award to mentors of Analytical graduate students. No abstract needs to be submitted with Pfizer award as long as the recipient is a co-author with a submitted abstract. The recipient of the Travel Grants could use it for travel to either ACS meeting.
 - 5.8. Regional Meetings: Steve Petrovic presented Tom Wenzel's report. Tom indicated that all \$5,000 for 2006 ACS Regional Meetings and that no requests for 2007 funds have been submitted yet. Tom Wenzel suggested in his email that this would be a good time for him to step down and for a replacement to be located.
 - 5.9. Undergraduate Awards: Steve Petrovic presented Howard Dewald's report. A final total of 357 awards was presented in 2005. The report is consistent with previous reports except that Howard mentioned that this is his eighth consecutive year as Chair of the award, and he suggests to the committee that it is perhaps time to locate a successor.
6. Reports from Affiliated Societies: No report.

7. Old Business

- 7.1. Committee Chair Vacancies: Membership, Awards Canvassing, Regional Meetings, and Undergraduate Awards Committee Chairs need to be located. John volunteered to locate a candidate for the Award Canvassing Chair. The function of the Membership Committee was questioned. Not all Divisions have a membership committee chair. With respect to Regional Meetings, Bonner suggested Craig Aspinwall as a potential candidate for Chair. Bonner volunteered to talk to Craig about the appointment. With respect to Undergraduate Awards, both Nadja Cech (Chris' suggestion) and Kevin Bennett (John's suggestion) were suggested. John will contact Kevin.

8. New Business

- 8.1. Division Award Deadline: ACS has moved the deadline for award nomination from February 1 to November 1. This coincides with the Division deadline for nominations. Roland thinks it is bad if the Division award deadline is the same as ACS. Roland would prefer to have the award deadline prior to the National award deadline. John moved that the Division have an October 1 award deadline effective 2007. Bonner seconded. Motion passed.
- 8.2. Division Dues Structure for 2007: Bonner moved that we leave dues the same. Laurie seconded. Motion passed.
- 8.3. Replacement for Barbara Kebbekus as ANYL EAS alternate delegate: Don Bly suggested that Barbara be replaced by Sut Ahuja. Brian wondered if this made sense given that Sut lives in the Carolinas and the EAS meets six times a year in New Jersey. John moved that the Alternate EAS delegate is on a two year term.
- 8.4. Financial Contribution Request from EAS: Bonner said that given our attempts to raise money through corporate sponsorship for programming, awards, etc., we shouldn't be giving money to outside organizations. Brian says that the Delaware Valley section gives \$1,000 and then they get \$1,000 back in profitable years. In return, Delaware Valley organizes symposia. Chris suggested that the Division write back to Anne Aubry (EAS) and that the Division shouldn't be considered as a corporate donor and collaborate in other ways. Roland moved that we give EAS \$1000. John seconded. Motion failed. Chris will write a letter. John moved that we give EAS \$1000 in-kind (i.e. the Division will forgo getting paid by EAS for being a sponsor). Laurie seconded. Motion passed.
- 8.5. Appointment of FACSS Representative: John moved that we nominate Charlie Wilkins and Bonner Denton to serve as our Division representatives for FACSS. Catherine seconded. Motion passed.
- 8.6. Al Ribes Attendance at IRS Workshop: Al presented a motion that the Division pay for his travel expenses and registration fee to attend a one-day IRS workshop. Laurie seconded. Motion passed.
- 8.7. Division Dinner: Guests and mentors of awardees often feel that they can't afford to attend the Division dinner and it would be a great expense for the Division to pay for mentor's dinners. Laurie motioned that we don't reduce dinner expenses for mentors but deal with exceptions at Chair's discretion. Motion seconded by Bonner. Motion passed.
- 8.8. Participation in Strategic Planning Training: Chris and Al went to an ACS strategic planning session and felt it was a terrific experience. The group running this planning session train you how to make an effective strategic plan for your intended audience and the potential of Divisions without changing how ACS does business. Chris believes that we could become leaders for the Analytical community without simply programming at ACS meetings. Two things to consider: One, ACS will support two more people from our Division to receive this strategic planning training. Who should go? Two, do we want to come up with a strategic plan? Al described the start of the strategic planning process (e.g. interviews with targeted constituents – academics, students, corporate donors, industry, government – granting agencies and labs) and motioned that this process should start at the San Francisco meeting. John seconded. Motion passed. The four people trained by the ACS (Chris, Al, Laurie, and Steve) are expected to spearhead the strategic planning process.
 - 8.8.1. With respect to constituencies, Roland suggested that the NIH be included as a constituency. Alanah raised a point that Local Sections should be a constituency. Paul mentioned that different types of academic institutions be considered as constituents as well.
 - 8.8.2. John suggested that the list of proposed constituents seems a bit inbred. Constituents that are not as involved with the ACS should also be included to provide a less "colored" viewpoint.
 - 8.8.3. Al also suggested an electronic survey in addition to phone interviews.

- 8.8.4. *Al moved that the Division approve a \$10,000 budget for strategic planning. Roland seconded. Motion passed.*
- 8.8.5. Paul mentioned that this is a long process. You need to have input from stakeholders and buy-in among all the stakeholders for effective strategic planning.
- 8.9. Assuming Operation of the Analytical Sciences Digital Library (ASDL): Ted Kuwana emailed Chris and told him that the ASDL is coming to the end of its funding cycle with NSF. ASDL needs a home. Chris feels that this is an excellent opportunity for the Division to interact with the ASDL. Chris met with Cindy Larive and Ted and Pittcon and wrote a white paper about the possibility of ANYL adopting ASDL. ASDL already has a managing structure that works well, but ASDL does need a method of transition and an income stream that will offset the costs of running the ASDL. Cindy Larive mentioned that the ASDL is mainly run by volunteers and its costs are web hosting and web maintenance, which should not be a great expense. Cindy did mention that if the Division wanted to enhance ASDL's functionality, it might cost some money. However, once the database and functionality is static, the library should have minimal costs to run. John would like to have a better idea of current fixed costs, even if the costs are minimal. Chris also mentioned that the NSF might fund a transition proposal, which would provide the Division with a window to establish what the costs and income of running ASDL might be and the Division would not have to take such a heavy financial hit. **Roland moved that a subcommittee of two people from the Division and two officers from ASDL should be formed in order to discuss the adoption of the ASDL and to allocate up to \$2000 for expenses so that the subcommittee can make a proposal to the Executive Committee in San Francisco as to how this transition might occur. John seconded. Motion passed. Chris and Alanah will be the ANYL participants on the subcommittee.**
- 8.10. Spring Meeting and Pittcon: Laurie was asked by Chris to talk to representatives at the Pittsburgh Conference regarding the possibility of ANYL programming in Spring 2007. Both Pittcon and the ACS meeting will be in Chicago within a month of each other. It was expected that Pittcon would be resistant to the idea of incorporating ANYL programming, but Laurie was surprised by an overwhelming positive response. Some of the motivating factors are:
- Pittcon's numbers are down (from roughly 30,000 to 20,000 attendees)
 - ANYL brings three major aspects to the table:
 - Symposia that would be jointly sponsored and advertised by Pittcon and ACS. Allows speakers to be funded at the level that Pittcon normally funds. It would elevate symposia to a higher level.
 - ACS would bring in sessions that involve undergraduates – a market in which the ACS is stronger than Pittcon
 - Pittcon feels that the ACS can bolster Pittcon's educational offerings
- If ANYL agrees to do this, the number of sessions would drop from roughly 30 to about 10 high visibility symposia, so that we don't set ourselves up for failure. This is intended to be a one-year trial. Bonner also added that we have discussed moving all of the divisional recognition of National ACS awards to the Fall meeting. The intent is to make the ACS Fall meeting the Division's big meeting. As far as servicing the community, Bonner felt that this would be a big plus to the Analytical community. Laurie discussed pros and cons. Pittcon wants a proposal from us by the end of March. **Pros:** No more split loyalties, expand our exposure to new programs (ACS wants new routes to grow), recruiting opportunities for ACS, allow for specialty analytical chemical educational programming (CHED isn't meeting our members needs). For Pittcon, a pro is that the ratio of exhibitors to conferees is a bit high now and we could improve that ratio. **Cons:** ACS will probably not be happy. We may not be serving all of our constituency. Reduces the possibility of interacting with other chemists (at least for the Spring meeting – may be overcome with a strong Fall meeting). Finally, we will not have a revenue stream for the Spring meeting although the Division may save a great deal of money by not having to pay all of the registration fees (we get approximately \$8,000 from the ACS in Spring revenue but we expend \$30,000 in registration fees plus additional travel expenses and non-ACS members). We have roughly 600 authors at the Spring meeting (1/3 invited, 1/3 contributed, 1/3 posters).
- Executive Committee member opinions:** Roland feels that the biggest disadvantage is that we wouldn't be serving our discipline. Roland feels that we would be moving a bunch of sessions to a meeting that already has a lot of analytical chemistry and withdrawing them from a meeting where we are the foundational discipline of chemistry. Even though Pittcon and ACS are only two weeks apart, we still have numerous presentations and posters at the Spring ACS meeting. Some cooperation with Pittcon is fine, but to withdraw from ACS National meeting would be a bad thing for the discipline. If

we withdraw from the ACS Spring Meeting, some of the National awardees will not be presenting their talk in the Analytical Division. John spoke to Roland's concerns: John reiterated that discussion has taken place regarding that all of the National awards presented in the ANYL programming would be done in the Fall ACS Meeting instead of the Spring ACS meeting. John wonders if ANYL is central to the Spring ACS meeting based on our revenue stream. Chris indicated that most people he talked to, if they had to make a choice, would choose to go to Pittcon rather than the Spring ACS meeting. Paul suggested that not only should this be treated as a pilot (since both meetings are in Chicago) but also that we need to assess our activities, possibly through some sort of survey. Catherine feels that there might be some political backlash if we tried programming at Pittcon. John and Chris feel as though the ACS isn't trying hard enough to help this Division with programming or even honor a request to lower registration fees for invited speakers that are not ACS members. Roland feels that it is up to the Division to decide where it programs, and we should not worry about what the ACS thinks and that a plan should be developed for more than one year. Roland pointed out that the rationale is present: Pittcon and ACS are both in the same city in 2007 and 2008 (Chicago, then New Orleans).

John Callahan moved:

- 1. That the Executive Committee (EC) proceed with speaking with John Katz and exploring how this program change is viewed by the ACS (and try to make the point that this is an opportunity perhaps for the ACS to reach out to other folks).**
- 2. That the EC proceed with the discussions with Pittcon (and understand how we could execute this, what the financial issues would be, what we would have to bring to the table, and what they could give us, and make a preliminary, non-binding proposal to Pittcon).**
- 3. That the EC poll our membership in some way.**
- 4. That the EC in 2 to 3 weeks communicate by email about this issue, which would require a motion being put on the table electronically.**

Alanah seconded the motion. Motion passed.

John Callahan moved that the vote we conduct on the previous motion be done electronically after the submission of a motion to all members of the Executive Committee by email no later than one month after the conclusion of this meeting. Laurie seconded. Motion passed.

9. The meeting was recessed at 5:52 pm.

10. On April 21, 2006, the Executive Committee reconvened via conference call at 10:30 am EDT. Present were Chris Enke, John Callahan, Alanah Fitch, Steve Petrovic, Laurie Locascio, Sally Stafford, Roland Hirsch, Al Ribes, Bill Heineman, and Royce Murray.

10.1. The first discussion revolved around support for a proposal stipulating that the Division program at the Pittsburgh Conference instead of the ACS Spring National Meeting. Chris had submitted to the Executive Committee via e-mail on April 19th, 2006, the proposal to co-program at Pittcon for Spring 2007.

10.1.1. Laurie mentioned that while at Pittcon, ACS ANYL members were supportive of the proposal.

Royce suggested that if the Division programmed at Pittcon as a one year experiment, it wouldn't be long enough to evaluate the impact. Royce was most concerned about the long-term impact of not programming at the Spring ACS meeting.

10.1.2. Royce also added that with respect to videotaping presentations for webcasting, many ACS journal editors equate videos with publishing. Laurie addressed Royce's concerns by saying that webcasting would only apply to talks that are overviews with no new data. In addition, webcasting would only have limited availability, which differs from publishing. Laurie emphasized that the desire to videotape certain speakers would be to increase availability to members. Chris added that there are patent issues as well and that authors must be able to opt out of webcasting in these situations.

10.1.3. After Chris mentioned that only 400 attendees actually saw award winning presentations at the 2006 Spring ACS meeting, Alanah asked if there was any data regarding the attendance of non-divisional members. Chris and John said there's no way to assess that point. John mentioned that attendance isn't what he had hoped, and he didn't think the impact is great outside of ANYL.

10.1.4. Chris asked whether the Division should co-program in the spring at both Pittcon and ACS. He stated that if we didn't program at ACS in the spring, that the Division would beef up the Fall ACS meeting programming. The National ACS awardees might be marooned in the fall, but felt that they

- were marooned anyway. The proposal would be to move symposia to the fall and combine the awards with Division awardees.
- 10.1.5. Roland had concerns similar to Royce. Roland doesn't feel that adding a few symposia will have much of an impact at Pittcon, but removing ourselves from the spring ACS meeting would be a disservice. Roland felt that ANYL is still fundamental to the ACS meeting. Overall, Pittcon has a smaller number of conferees than the ACS meeting (10,000 versus 11,000). Chris felt that the relevant number is the 400 attendees for division programming. How are we having a presence at ACS with that number? Roland was confident that more than ANYL members come to ANYL sessions and that we could coprogram with other divisions. Roland was not opposed to having a presence at Pittcon, but not at the expense of ACS. Alanah felt some polling was in order. Without data, we can't have a useful discussion – only opinion.
 - 10.1.6. Royce questioned why Pittcon wouldn't welcome this. It removes competition. Laurie answered that historically, Pittcon has had reservations working with ACS. Laurie did agree with Royce on this point. However, Chris said that Vicki McGuffin's session at Pittcon had more attendees than the entire set of awardee sessions at ACS. However, Roland did reiterate that the ACS attendance was larger than other scientific meetings, and that for INOR/CHED/ORGN, the spring meeting is well attended.
 - 10.1.7. Laurie felt that would be a tough draw coming to ACS two weeks after Pittcon, especially with both meetings in Chicago next year. John discussed the ACS versus ANYL attendance question. What is the Division doing to serve the ANYL community? The fact that other divisions make the ACS meeting big did not mean much to John. John said that ANYL is faced with the fact that we can't have a substantial impact on the spring meeting attendance. The Pittcon proposal is one way ANYL can make a bigger impact. The Division can either stick with the status quo or make a point to the ACS that two meetings per year is too much. An ANYL presence at Pittcon makes this important. Chris agreed with John. The principal function of ANYL is to provide programming. Only 400 people come, so the membership is not taking advantage of programming efforts and lots of energy is expended in the process.
 - 10.1.8. Bill also shared John and Chris' deep disappointment as a former Division Chair. Lots of energy is expended on programming with poor attendance as a result. Bill said that students want to go to Pittcon, not to ACS. Students tend to go to the Fall ACS meeting. When Charlie Wilkins was Chair, he wanted to focus on the fall meeting. Issues were the same then as now. Bill said that even Pittcon has problems. Bard & Zoski programmed at Pittcon and had poor attendance. However, Bill thought they would have done well at ACS. Bill felt we could bolster the fall meeting with cross-programming, etc. However, it's a reality that people do want to go to Pittcon. Chris added that the Division is trying to maintain a presence and bolster Division membership – find out the needs of analytical chemists.
 - 10.1.9. As far as only programming at one meeting goes, Laurie mentioned that BIOT only programs in the fall. Also, John Katz had mentioned to Laurie that 1 or 2 divisions are also considering pulling out of the spring meeting. Roland mentioned that a number of divisions only program at one meeting, which makes things slightly easier. However, Roland wonders if we will have real impact at only one meeting per year. Al mentioned that we can see how many people come to our symposia after the move to Pittcon. Al said that the biggest point is attendance at the ACS meeting, with the Subdivision drawing more attendees at Pittcon than the Division is at ACS.
 - 10.1.10. To support points made previously, Al said that BIOT has been successful doing webcasts, so they must have solved issues of intellectual property and publications. Al also said that John Katz is receptive to the Pittcon proposal so maybe there will be no long-term damage by pulling out of the Spring meeting. Al also said that the Division leadership must communicate well with the Division members and do a good job with metrics so that we can understand the impact of our actions on the Division.
- 10.2. Chris asked if we wanted to take remaining resources and co-program at Pittcon and ACS, or do our best job in the fall? Is there any reason not to co-sponsor with Pittcon? Royce suggested the reversibility of this step. If ANYL advertises programming with Pittcon, Royce felt that would damage further increases in attendance. This is likely to be an irreversible step.
 - 10.3. The following motions were offered to the Executive Committee
 - 10.3.1. Motion #1 (Sponsored by Laurie Locascio, seconded by John Callahan): Motion to co-program as described in the proposal at the Pittsburgh Conference in Chicago in Spring 2007?

- 10.3.2. Motion #2 (Sponsored by John Callahan, seconded by Alanah Fitch): Motion that the Analytical Division not conduct programming for the Spring 2007 ACS National Meeting, with the exception of co-programming with other divisions, in order to enhance programming at the Fall ACS National Meeting.
11. The Executive Committee also discussed the proposed relationship between ANYL and the Analytical Sciences Digital Library (ASDL). Chris had submitted to the Executive Committee via e-mail on April 19th, 2006, not only a draft proposal for ASDL to come under the umbrella of the Analytical Division of the American Chemical Society, but also a memo outlining the financial status and timeframe for the current funding of ASDL.
- 11.1. After a short discussion regarding potential sources of funding and the possibility of a business plan, a motion was presented to the Executive Committee.
- 11.1.1. Motion #3 (Sponsored by John Callahan, seconded by Laurie Locascio): To approve the proposal as outlined in the April 19 memorandum with the proviso that the Division sponsorship would be assured for two years following cessation of NSF supplementary funding and subject to renewal thereafter.
12. The Executive Committee agreed that the meeting would remain open until the conclusion of the vote on all three motions, and that a motion to adjourn the meeting would be communicated electronically.
- 12.1. The vote on Motions 1 – 3 were concluded on April 26, 2006 and the results were as follows
- 12.1.1. Motion #1 passed (Aye, 8 votes; Nay, 3 votes)
- 12.1.2. Motion #2 passed (Aye, 7 votes; Nay, 4 votes)
- 12.1.3. Motion #3 passed (Aye, 9 votes; Nay, 1 vote; 1 abstention)
- 12.2. On May 3, 2006, a motion to adjourn the Spring 2006 Executive Committee meeting, which was sponsored by Steven Petrovic (seconded by John Callahan), was sent electronically.
- 12.2.1. Motion: The Spring 2006 Executive Committee meeting is to be adjourned once the Chair has been notified by the Secretary that a majority of email responses supporting this motion has been received.
13. The meeting was adjourned on May 3, 2006 at 5:00pm PDT once the Secretary notified the Chair that a majority of the conference call participants had electronically voted in the affirmative to adjourn the meeting.

Minutes respectfully submitted,

Steven C. Petrovic,
Secretary, ACS Division of Analytical Chemistry

Attachments:

1. Pittcon memo/draft proposal from Laurie Locascio, ANYL Chair-Elect, dated April 19, 2006.
2. ASDL memo from Chris Enke, ANYL Chair, dated April 19, 2006. This memo includes Chris' statement that a letter of support from the Division regarding support of ASDL would be drafted if Motion #3 passed.
3. Draft proposal for ANYL support of ASDL, dated April 21, 2006.

To: Executive Committee
Division of Analytical Chemistry, ACS
From: Laurie Locascio
Re: ACS Analytical Division Co-programming with the Pittsburgh Conference (Pittcon)
Date: April 19, 2006

A proposal has been put forth for the Analytical Division to participate in co-programming with Pittcon at the spring 2007 meeting. If this proposal is accepted by the Analytical Division Executive Board and the ACS Board P&MR Committee, the Analytical Division will not program at the ACS National Meeting in the spring of 2007. The Division will use any additional resources that result from withdrawal from the ACS spring meeting to strengthen our presence at the ACS National Meeting in the fall of 2007. Attendance at the ACS National Meetings by members of the Analytical Division is low when compared to other ACS divisions. In the spring, this effect is exacerbated by the fact that our competing conference, Pittcon that attracts over 30,000 attendees, is often held within a few weeks of the ACS National Meeting. Next year, this effect is made worse by the fact that both conferences will be held in Chicago. By co-programming with Pittcon, we believe that we will be able to increase our visibility; more effectively serve our members; and provide greater motivation for member participation in the fall ACS National Meeting. We propose to co-program with Pittcon on a one-year trial basis. Following the conference, the Executive Board will meet to determine whether to continue co-programming in future years.

In summary, we propose:

1. Four (4) jointly sponsored symposia held during peak attendance days with topics proposed by the Analytical Division Chair;
2. Four half-day contributed sessions aligned with the topics of the jointly sponsored symposia, with speakers selected by the Analytical Division Chair;
3. One session on teaching and education for analytical chemistry;
4. One poster session for undergraduate students; and
5. Analytical Division Chair-Elect participates in the Pittcon program meeting on 4/22/06;
6. Analytical Division provides \$2000 per symposium; Pittcon provides all other funding for invited speakers;
7. Pittcon provides fees for conference rooms and audio/visual equipment;
8. Pittcon supports the videotaping by the Analytical Division of selected symposia for broadcast available to ACS members, and Pittcon attendees, on the Division website; and
9. Pittcon supports paper submission through the Pittcon website, and polls attendees about their membership in the ACS Analytical Division.

I strongly support co-programming with Pittcon. Similar ideas have been suggested by past Analytical Division chairs since year after year we struggle with the issue of how to attract our members to the spring ACS meeting. Informal polling was conducted by division officers and the vast majority of members strongly support this move.

The attached proposal was reviewed by the Analytical Division Chair, Chair-Elect, Past Chair, Secretary and Pittcon Board welcomes this initiative and has agreed to these terms.

We will have a discussion of this matter at our upcoming conference call meeting followed by an electronic ballot.

Proposal to The Pittsburg Conference by the ACS Analytical Division Executive Board to Co-Program at Pittcon 2007

March 28, 2006

Preamble

- ❖ Whereas Pittcon 2007 and the 233rd ACS National Meeting will be conducted both in Chicago, IL less than 1 month apart.
- ❖ It is understood that it would be less of a hardship for the analytical community at large if Pittcon and the ACS Analytical Division would co-program to reduce the travel burden of our members and avoid splitting the analytical community between meetings.

- ❖ It is understood that co-programming would prevent subject and speaker overlap between the two meetings
- ❖ It is understood that many Pittcon attendees are active members of the ACS Analytical Division
- ❖ Therefore, the ACS Analytical Division proposes to co-program with Pittcon for the year of 2007 to serve all of our members and participants

Proposed Approach

The Executive Board of the ACS Analytical Division proposes as a pilot to co-program with Pittcon for 2007. If this proposal is adopted, the ACS Analytical Division will not program at the 233rd ACS National Meeting in Chicago, thereby minimizing the competition between meetings for the analytical community.

The ACS and the ACS Analytical Division do not propose to interfere in any way with the implementation of Pittcon 2007 by its governing board. The ACS Analytical Division does request representation (the Analytical Division Chair- Elect) at the Pittcon program planning meeting in order to make programming decisions that are consistent with the vision for Pittcon 2007. We anticipate that this would be a highly cooperative, open and friendly discussion. The ACS Analytical Division will make full use of its email mailing list, its newsletter and other media available to us to advertise this joint effort and to encourage people from the analytical community to attend.

With regard to the content of the technical programming that the ACS Analytical Division would bring to Pittcon 2007, the ACS Analytical Division Executive Board proposes the following:

1. Four (4) jointly sponsored, high visibility half-day symposia to be offered during peak attendance days that would be heavily advertised by the ACS Analytical Division to its members. The ACS Analytical Division will propose topics to be discussed at the Pittcon planning meeting. At the discretion of the Pittcon Program Chair and the ACS Analytical Division Chair-Elect, we propose that the ACS Analytical Division could choose instead to co-sponsor symposia directly submitted to Pittcon. The ACS Analytical Division proposes to provide \$2000 per symposium (approximately half of the resources required to support a half-day session).
2. Four half-day contributed sessions aligned with the topics of the jointly sponsored symposia, with speakers selected by the ACS Chair. Planning of these sessions will comply with the format of all other Pittcon programming.
3. One session on teaching and education for analytical chemistry.
4. One poster session for undergraduate students, preferably not intermixed with other poster sessions, or at minimum, set aside in the same location.
5. We will work to coordinate our symposium suggestions with the Chromatography Subdivision that already does programming at Pittcon. However, it is understood that this proposal is separate from and in addition to their arrangement with Pittcon.

We request that Pittcon provide normal Pittcon support for travel for invited speakers participating in the jointly sponsored symposia above and beyond the \$2000 that the Analytical Division provides. We request that Pittcon provide fees for conference rooms and audio/visual equipment for all proposed sessions.

In support of providing a service to the chemistry community to compensate for any negative impact of this programming move, we would like to request that Pittcon supports and facilitates the videotaping of selected jointly sponsored symposia for asynchronous broadcast available to ACS members, and to Pittcon attendees, on the ACS website. This service would have an associated fee to cover the split expenses of Pittcon and of the Analytical Division. Pittcon's role and support would be acknowledged at the website. This element is seen as an important component of the whole package. By moving our programming to Pittcon the Analytical Division is impacting negatively attendance to the national ACS meeting and impacting negatively those chemists from other branches of chemistry that practice

analytical chemistry and who will be attending the national ACS meeting but which would not be drawn to Pittcon (the Division also stands to lose income from these attendees).

We propose that all participants register through Pittcon at the normal Pittcon rates. The ACS Analytical Division does not request any portion of the Pittcon registration fees.

We propose that the ACS Analytical Division offer travel grants on the amount of \$4,000 to undergraduate and graduate students for attending Pittcon and participating in this new programming. The Analytical Division would administer this travel grant program and Pittcon's funding would be acknowledged.

Finally, we propose that contributed papers for the ACS Analytical Division be submitted through the Pittcon website since we have no means to organize papers outside of the OASYS (On-line ACS's submission) system that is hard-wired to the ACS National Meetings. We also request that Pittcon asks attendees to indicate whether they are members of the ACS Analytical Division upon registration so that the Division can obtain data to support the assumption that we are serving our membership.

Suggested Symposia Topics

Suggested symposia topics for the four jointly sponsored ACS Analytical Division/Pittcon symposia will be submitted through the Pittcon website and will be labeled as "Proposed Co-Sponsored ACS Analytical Division/Pittcon Symposium". The proposed topics are the following:

1. Tropical Disease Detection and Analytical Chemistry in the Developing World
2. Controversies in the Science of Global Warming
3. Nanobiotechnology: From the Single Cell to the Single Molecule
4. Nanostructured Materials and Self-Assembled Systems

Benefits to Pittcon

- ACS programming will attract additional analytical chemists to Pittcon that will in turn bring more value to its exhibitors.
- ACS Analytical Division should draw greater participation from undergraduate institutions which is one of our strengths.
- ACS Analytical Division can provide a focus on education and teaching which is one of our strengths.
- ACS Analytical Division will work to provide increased publicity of this co-programming event through advertising and direct email contact with our 11,000 members.

Benefits to ACS Analytical Division

- We are most interested in serving our members in new and innovative ways. Co-programming will reduce the burden of our members by limiting the amount of competing meetings and cutting down travel costs to our members.
- We will greatly reduce the splitting of the chromatography program between that presented by the Chromatography Subdivision at Pittcon and Spring ACS National meetings.
- We will have a chance to try this potentially advantageous arrangement to see if the anticipated mutual benefits are realized and if development of a longer-term cooperative relationship is desirable.
- New opportunities will be made available to undergraduate and graduate students.

To: Executive Committee
Division of Analytical Chemistry, ACS
From: Chris Enke
Re: Proposal to NSF for supplement to Analytical Science Digital Library at UCR
Date: April 19, 2006

Cindy Larive has talked to the NSF program officer for the ASDL grant that is funded through UC Riverside. Cindy is the PI on this grant. He suggested that Cindy submit a proposal to supplement the current grant in order to fund a transition from NSF support to DAC sponsorship. The May 1 deadline for this supplement would require us to make a decision in the next few days regarding the inclusion of a letter from DAC indicating our participation in this transition period and our willingness to assume responsibility for it for some period after the termination of the grant.

Here are some relevant facts. The current ASDL project is funded through September, 2007. The proposed NSF supplement would be for \$75,000 (total direct and indirect) to extend the current grant through a transition period that would end somewhere between October 2008 and October 2009. By that time, it is assumed that the DAC website and the ASDL website would have merged into a single server and be maintained by the same programmer. Current cost for the programmer is \$15,000 per year and for the Web site, we should count on up to \$2,000 per year. Travel costs for one meeting per year for two principals involved in the ASDL function should also be considered. Altogether, I foresee that \$20,000 per year should more than cover.

We would know whether NSF has funded the supplement by the time we meet in San Francisco. Assuming it is funded, we will have until at least late 2008 to come up with the mechanism for continuing its support. I believe the DAC part of the website could be maintained within this same budget.

I am very much in favor of writing a letter from DAC indicating our support of the transition proposal and committing to assume sponsorship of ASDL upon the exhaustion of the NSF funds for a period of at least 2 years and to working toward a funding mechanism that will work for the long term. I believe that creating a strong web service of useful information is a major service that we can provide the analytical community. A portion of the web services can be reserved for DAC members giving further motivation for formal association with DAC.

We will have a discussion of this matter at our upcoming conference call meeting followed by an electronic ballot.

Draft Proposal for the Analytical Sciences Digital Library to come under the umbrella of the Analytical Division of the American Chemical Society

By Chris Enke, March 21, 2006

Preamble

- ❖ It is understood that the NSF support for the ASDL project will soon be terminated.
- ❖ It is understood that the ASDL represents a tremendous effort in its establishment and uniquely serves a variety of important needs in the analytical community.
- ❖ It is understood that the Analytical Division seeks to serve its membership and the analytical community at large in other ways than ACS meeting programming.
- ❖ Therefore, the Analytical Division desires to explore the possibility of providing a stable home for the operation and enhancement of the ASDL project.

Possible Administrative Structure:

The ASDL already has an administrative structure which includes an Editor-in-Chief and Managing Director, a Recording Secretary/Treasurer, and Advisory Board, a Web Programmer, and a team of Associate Editors. It could be considered comparable to the operation of a journal except for its ongoing and dynamic nature, the range of its content, and the method of access and dissemination. Since the operation is currently successful, it would seem wise to leave the current administrative structure as intact as possible.

Coordination of ASDL operation with DAC goals, function, and budget could be achieved through the appointment of an ASDL officer to a voting or ex officio position on the DAC Executive Committee.

It is possible that ASDL and/or DAC would be separately incorporated. The relationship between ASDL and DAC could then be structured as a cooperation or joint working agreement.

Possible integration with other web-based functions of the DAC:

DAC already has a web site with information of interest to DAC members. There exists the possibility that the DAC web site will expand its functions (to include employment or news functions, for example). At the minimum, the DAC and ASDL web sites would be cross-linked (as they already are). However, DAC may well find that their web interests would be best served by sharing the server and programmer with ASDL.

Possible funding mechanisms:

There are some expenses involved in the operation of ASDL. There is the server and the programmer, at the minimum. There will also be travel expenses for the ASDL Board Meetings and for the ASDL officer to attend the DAC Executive Committee Meetings. It has been suggested that DAC and ASDL jointly apply to NSF for transition funding to handle the ASDL expenses for a year or two until these costs could be absorbed within the DAC budget. Income to offset the increased expense could be generated through the payment of dues for some of the web services provided to the analytical community.

How to get started:

If the DAC Executive Committee is interested in pursuing this proposal, I suggest that we form a subcommittee of two people to explore this possibility with ASDL. Further, that we authorize funds of up to \$1500 for two ASDL officers to attend the San Francisco meeting for a few days while they and our subcommittee work out more details of timing and mechanism. This more detailed plan would then be presented to the ASDL and DAC boards for their consideration.