

Center for Particulate and Surfactant Systems

An NSF Industry/University Cooperative Research Center (I/UCRC) since 2008



Industrial Advisory Board (IAB) Meeting February 15-17, 2011 University of Florida, Gainesville, FL

~ Closed-Door Meeting Minutes ~

~ Thursday, February 17, 2011 ~

Seminar Room 202, Particle Science & Technology Building, University of Florida

IAB Members Only

Introduction & Welcome

The closed-door meeting was moderated by Steven Bolkan from Church & Dwight Co. (acting as IAB Executive Committee (EC) Chair on behalf of Paul Siracusa who could not attend) and Greg Spontak (retired) from Procter & Gamble (Vice Chair, CPaSS EC).

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 A.M.

- Welcome by Steven Bolkan, Greg Spontak & Brij M. Moudgil
- Brij Moudgil thanked the staff members at UF who were involved in the meeting preparations. He especially thanked his assistant Jo-Anne Standridge and receptionist Sophie Leone who will be retiring in April.
- Steven announced a change to the order of the previously circulated agenda with the purpose of facilitating discussion of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) findings and suggestions with IAB members

Executive Committee Elections

- Steven Bolkan informed the members present that he has replaced Paul Siracusa (also from Church and Dwight Co.) as Chair of the IAB EC due to Paul's time conflict with the IAB meetings – no one opposed
- The Chair reminded those in attendance that according to the Bylaws the current EC members, who have been in place for 2 years, were up for election during this meeting. Normally, after each two-year cycle, the Vice-Chair would take over the Chair's role and one of the existing EC members would ascend to Vice Chair. In any case, all six positions in the EC are up for election and nominations can be made by any IAB member (self-nominations are also welcome).
- Due to the ongoing efforts on strategic planning for CPaSS initiated during the last IAB meeting in August, 2010, at Columbia University, a continuation resolution was proposed (motioned by Ray Farinato, seconded by Sam Adamy) during this meeting and all members present were asked for approval.
- At this point, Reg Davies (retired, DuPont) did explain that by approving the no-dissolution of the EC a precedent would be established. He also added that due to the special circumstances of the current restructuring efforts at CPaSS he supported the continuation of the current EC.
- With no opposition among the present the continuation of the existent EC was approved. Elections for the new Executive Committee will take place at the Spring 2012 IAB Meeting. Reg also noted that those who are nominated should take note as to the responsibilities of being an EC member, either through the current EC members or through the Center leadership.

The information shared during the IAB Meeting is confidential and solely for the use of CPaSS Researchers and Industry Members

Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) Briefing and Discussion

- IAB members present were briefed on the activities of the SPC since the committee was appointed during the Fall 2010 IAB meeting at Columbia University.
- A survey was distributed among all IAB members last November/December. A follow up phone call was made by the SPC to IAB delegates. A summary of the results was presented at this meeting:
 - Return of filled out surveys was poor. As expected, the follow up calls were essential to collecting information.
 - The survey covered three main aspects of CPaSS: Center Approach (research foci and synergy of the joint center), Soft Deliverables (what are members looking for?) and Center Visibility (both inside IAB member companies and externally to potential members)
- Once the results were presented, all members present were invited to participate in the discussion:
 - Pat Macy inquired about CPaSS advertisements materials. The SME Annual Meeting is in February 27 and he offered to distribute some of those materials if ready.
 - Bruce Keiser stated that he had not responded to the survey because, as a delegate from his organization, he does not have the knowledge to respond the questions on behalf of his whole company. He also suggested that members should be enabled by CPaSS on a routinely basis so that the investment in the Center is easily justified
 - Steve Bolkan asked the audience what is it that each member is looking for at CPaSS and the IAB meetings.
 - Bruce Keiser is looking for the updates on projects like P-PAT (PI: Kevin Powers) and the progress on projects about surfactant properties, dispersion of powders in air, and he stated that Nalco would also be interested in oil recovery. He also said that distribution of IAB materials within his company is challenging. He has forwarded information to his colleagues in the past but how much follow up occurs afterwards depend on him
 - Naga added that delegates have a challenge filtering the information received at the meetings to a useful format for their organizations.
 - The role of the delegate within the company also has an impact on the distribution of materials. Bruce Keiser said he is an influencer within Nalco, not a decision maker. He thinks that when emails and communications come from managers vs. ‘influencers’, the messages have larger impact. CPaSS needs to reach out to the decision makers on a regular basis.
 - Greg Spontak stated that, in his career at P&G, he has experienced ‘influencers’ driving the business when they can sell their ideas.
 - Steven Bolkan asked the members if the newsletter/communications from CPaSS should be circulated among more people in each company besides the designated delegates.
 - Greg Spontak said that in P&G they have monthly technical reports that go out to all business units and suggested that if delegates included CPaSS information/advertisement in those internal reports, the impact within the company may be larger than by forwarding emails.
 - Naga mentioned that other organizations his company works with send out the presentations and they have found it to be effective.
 - A follow up comment was made that presentation slides are missing most of the words given during the oral presentations and they are not that effective.
 - Steve Glassmeyer talked about the first ever virtual symposium that P&G held last December and inquired if CPaSS could organize a similar event to share technical results. They found it to be a successful event in his company especially among the technical employees; it was not as successful attracting the interest of managers and business people who preferred personal interactions.
 - Pat Macy asked if the presentations given at IAB could be recorded and posted on the CPaSS website.
 - Steven Bolkan suggested that at least the technology overview/summary given at the opening of the meeting should be recorded and posted.
 - Martin Vethamuthu said that the information overload we all are subjected to nowadays may be more of an issue to find an efficient way of communicating with members
 - A general comment was that delegates have concerns about ‘sharing’ their companies technical problems in an open forum like CPaSS
 - Vida Scarpello (NSF) suggested that a way around those concerns could be to collect the general comments of what each delegate is taking to their companies from the meeting anonymously.
 - Steven Bolkan turned over the rest of the meeting to Greg Spontak who presented the ‘roadmap’ proposed by the SPC. It was suggested to evaluate the research portfolio as a table in which members by industry sector would be represented in columns and all projects in rows. This way it would be possible to ‘mark’ how a project applies or doesn’t to each sector. (see accompanying SPC slides)

- Naga added that the research themes/projects should be linked to the full description and connected to a ranking mechanism so that members could rank them per their own interest.
- At this point, Reg Davies talked about a 'philosophy change' in CPaSS. The lack of a unified theme in the particle side of CPaSS has hurt the Florida Site. Columbia University has established their focus on 'greener' surfactants and UF needs a similar thrust. He explained how in the ERC times of Florida, the Particle Engineering Research Center was organized in thrust areas that helped to focus the research projects and CPaSS is currently missing that. Up to now, CPaSS has been offering/selecting projects based on technology needs but it may be more practical to select projects after grouping members in 'clusters'.
 - ▶ Vida Scarpello shared her experience with other I/UCRCs where the Center formulates proposals with a small group of members before sharing with the whole IAB. This way industrial relevance and traction from those companies involved is secured.
- Vida also reiterated that I/UCRCs are meant to serve as many members as possible so projects need to be precompetitive and of broad appeal.
- Prof. Som said that in his experience the 'generic' problems are often better defined after his group has had discussions regarding sponsored (exclusive) projects.
- Greg Spontak introduced the last slide of the SPC briefing regarding what CPaSS wants/needs from the IAB
 - ▶ A potential change in the format of the IAB meetings was discussed by the SPC. Would IAB members be willing to a longer meeting if a round table/mentoring/technical discussion was added to the agenda?
 - ✦ General agreement among IAB members for a longer meeting.
 - ✦ Ray Farinato suggested a 'reverse seminar' session in which industry members would be the speakers on a topic of interest to their sector or in the format of mentoring students (e.g., discussing economic impact/cost analysis, etc.)
 - ▶ As for the visibility/advertisement issue in CPaSS it was suggested that a single slide per project could be used to distribute information internally within IAB companies.
 - ✦ Brij Moudgil asked for a format - Bruce Keiser has responded and his submitted suggestion is attached to the meeting minutes
 - ✦ Members greatly valued the poster session and would like to have access to the posters electronically to share with colleagues – after the meeting posters were made available electronically to all members.

Break: 10 minutes break observed

L.I.F.E. Forms Discussion

- A summary of the results from the Level of Interests Forms was presented. A pie chart depicted the level of interest for each project.
- Only the comments made for those who have marked 'interested with change' were showed. It was agreed that in the future all comments should be showed as many members will write comments of interest with not strictly connected to their level of interest.
- General comments of interest during the meeting were:
 - Projects could benefit from synergistic interaction. Modeling and measuring should be combined
 - Other I/UCRCs dedicated to computation could also be of help (CORBI projects- NSF)
 - ▶ Prof. Som requested permission from the IAB members to apply for a CORBI project at the Columbia site that if granted would require dedicating some of the CPaSS funding at the Columbia site to that project.
 - ▶ No objections were raised
 - Food companies are not yet present among IAB members and should be tapped into as they should be very interested in some of the projects presented.
- Evaluation per project – once non-attending IAB members have had the opportunity to submit LIFE forms online, the entire comments (without company affiliation) will be distributed to the IAB Members.

Administrative Issues

- Next IAB meetings have been set for the following dates:
 - Fall 2011: August 17-18 at Columbia University
 - Spring 2012: February 13-15 at the University of Florida

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 A.M.

As recorded by Maria Palazuelos, Florida Site Director

Strategic Planning Committee (SPC)

S. Bolkan, R. Davies, D. Nagaraj and G. Spontak

- Appointed per IAB Members' recommendation at the Fall 2010 Meeting
- SPC to assist in creating a long term vision/mission and sharpening the overall research focus and developing a roadmap for the Center
- The committee will also support Center leadership with increasing member recruitment and industrial visibility

Oct 2010 – Teleconference & Planning Meeting

Nov 2010 – IAB members from both sites were sent surveys email/mail

Jan 2011 – Follow-ups to the surveys by phone completed by SPC members

Feb 2011 – Survey Debriefing & Planning Meeting at Spring 2011 IAB Meeting

Today's Objective

- Discuss and understand survey results
- IAB alignment to top priority focus areas for moving forward

Survey Outcomes

What you want/we heard - Potential CPaSS Actions

- **Vision/Mission** – Highlight the Industrial Relevance
 - TBD – Suggested - 1stop shop, Value added particulate products, etc.
- **Visibility / Expansion** – Needed!
 - Internal: Within IAB Companies - Expand communications to more delegates, newsletter/nuggets to share
 - External: New Members/ Public - Marketing, shared trade shows
- **Non-Research Deliverables** – Highly Desired and Valued
 - Promote Training/Seminars/Webinars/Grants/SBIR/STTR opportunities
- **Leveraging of joint Center** – Split Opinions
 - Highlight Synergy: More joint projects
 - Diversity of IAB Members: Round tables, Brainstorming, Mentoring
- **Research Focus** – Need for Problem Solving of Common Issues across IAB members/sectors

e.g. Problem Matrix – Technology Roadmap

Research Themes	IAB by Sector	Consumer Products	Mining/ Oil	Pharma	Specialty Chemicals	Instrument/ Analytical Equipment
Value Added Particle Products						
Metering of Fine & Cohesive Powders						
Analysis and Removal of Impurities and Value Materials						
Applications of Bacterial Byproducts in Oil Dispersion						
Interfacial Interactions / Dispersion						
Shape Analysis						

What CPaSS Needs From You:

Consensus on where the top focus should be – Philosophy Change (?)

- **Center Approach** – Assistance to Sharpen multiple research foci approach
- **Cluster Identification** – Grouping IAB members by interest topic to increase project traction
- **Mentoring** – Project coaching of students/researchers, internships, round tables, brainstorming - (IAB meeting format change?)
- **Visibility** – Promote CPaSS internally within companies and externally to partners – disseminate IAB meetings reports and share your networks with CPaSS

Project Title: *Greener Surfactants: Structure, Properties and Performance relationships.*

PI: *Jun Wu*

Team: *Researchers on project*

Goal: *This project goal is to provide....*

Previous Findings:

- *Would be the list from the previous meeting.*

Current Findings:

- *Major Highlights but be brief and concise.*

Future Direction:

- *List of three planned accomplishments for next report.*

Sponsor: *List here the one or two IAB members that sponsor this project.*

Contact for more information: *Jun Wu at Columbia. Insert email or phone number of principal contact.*

