

TO: ANS DIVISION AND LOCAL SECTION CHAIRS

FROM: TED QUINN, ANS PAST PRESIDENT

SUBJECT: ANS INFRASTRUCTURE III MINI TASK FORCE REPORT REVISION FOR BOARD APPROVAL

DATE: July 27, 1999

Attached is the Mini Task Force Report, revised by the individual task group chairs based on all the comments received at the June 1999 ANS Meeting. A lot of work was accomplished since the June meeting by the combined group of ANS staff and volunteers to best incorporate all of the comments received and match the needs of all constituent units in ANS for their and the Society's best interests.

Changes were made to each of the three mini tasks, based on the comments. I am summarizing them below just to cover the elements that were addressed at the Boston meeting -- there is much to do to implement this plan. Andy Kadak has a plan to take this to the Board of Directors in the second half of August 1999 for approval so that we can incorporate as much as possible for the November ANS Meeting in Long Beach and the June Meeting in San Diego.

Andy asked that we send this to you for your review and to gain your endorsement and help in transferring ownership of this plan to each of the groups responsible for implementing it. **EVERYONE IN THE SOCIETY HAS A ROLE IN MAKING THIS PLAN WORK** - there is not a single constituent unit that is not affected. We ask your help in making this work for your own group and for the Society to move forward.

The major elements of the comments incorporated were:

TASK 1 - MEETING APPROVAL PROCESS

The appeal process on meeting approval that goes to the ANS President, from the National Program Committee Screening Committee (NPCSC), was retained. It was felt by the group that this best represented both the streamlining process we targeted on gaining and the strengthening of the NPCSC approval process needed to make the Society's meetings work in a more productive manner and with the best technical and marketing approach to benefit our members.

TASK 2 - ANS MEETING PRESENTATION

The many key elements for upgrade are now intended to be done in a graded implementation process. Both costs and associated benefits are to be implemented slowly with the higher priority items, such as the key electronic display processes and coffee breaks done sooner than later. The ANS staff will have the responsibility to implement the graded approach in the best manner possible to benefit the attendees.

TASK 3 - ANS MEETING FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS

An updated Division participation level to access the Division allocation was added for National Meetings, based on classifying small Divisions (with less than 800 members) at a lower paper and session requirement. These Divisions will need only 15 qualifying papers per meeting and 30 qualifying papers per year (see mini task report for description) while the larger Divisions will require the 40 per year and 20 per meeting that was included in the plan presented at Boston.

In addition, the emeritus member rate for meetings was reduced to \$50 with no associated tickets provided -- this is the same rate and benefit package provided to student member attendees.

In summary, we ask for your support and help in implementing this plan. If you have any questions, or

require additional clarifications, please respond back to me at equinn@mdmcorp.com or to Joe Braun at jbrown@ra.anl.gov, by **AUGUST 15, 1999**. After this date, Andy Kadak will forward the plan to the Board for their approval.

Thank you on behalf of Andy, Harry and our whole Infrastructure III Team for your help and support to ANS in making us a better Society and better able to meet our members challenges in the coming millennium.

With warm regards,

Ted Quinn

**American Nuclear Society
President's Task Force III
Meetings Task Force Report - Task 1
Planning and Scheduling**

FINAL-July 28, 1999

**MUST BE CONSIDERED IN CONJUNCTION WITH MEETINGS IMPROVEMENTS &
MEETING FINANCIAL FORMULA TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

ANS has a number of topical meetings, executive conferences, professional development workshops, and other meetings that have a significant bearing on both the exchange of information within the society and the financial health of the Society. Under the current system of meeting planning and approval, the financial aspects of these meetings are not getting full consideration in establishing the meeting logistics. The principal reason for this is that the Divisions, which are primarily technical organizations, are also expected to handle the financial planning of the meetings. In doing this, they act independently of the other meetings being planned at the same time.

In order to remedy this situation, implementation of a meeting integration function is proposed based on the following Basic Principles:

Basic Principles – Meeting Integration:

- Division and local section will focus almost exclusively on the technical and social aspects of the meeting (See Meetings financial formula task force recommendations)
- The ANS Meetings Department will handle all meeting logistics for National Meetings including co-located topicals. They will work directly with ANS Division or Local Section, as appropriate for periodic and non-periodic meetings.
- The Screening Committee of the NPC will oversee the Process
- Meetings assigned by the Screening Committee to share locations and dates will still be advertised and operated as independent topical meetings. Each meeting is expected to have its own registration, budget, program committee, and organizing committee (although overlap is expected in the latter for such things as spouse programs, technical tours, banquets, and other areas as appropriate and as agreed to by the individual General Chairs.
- The majority of meetings assigned by the Screening Committee to share locations and dates with the National Meetings will not be required to be Embedded Topicals. They will have the option to be run as a separate Class I topical, in the manner described above.

Meeting Integration Process

1. Establish a Base Calendar
 - a. Screening Committee will initially establish a base calendar of periodic topicals and national meetings using a five year planning base. Base calendar would include topic, preliminary time frame (by yearly quarters), and responsible division(s). Preliminary dates based on prior meeting timing will be used to establish the initial calendar.
 - b. ANS HQ would be responsible for reviewing national meeting locations and hotel contracts prior to commitment. ANS HQ would provide recommendations for periodic topical locations and contracts as appropriate.
 - c. Class III embedded topicals, Class I Topicals Co-Located with national meetings & Periodic Class I topicals with strong technical and financial performance will be identified on the base calendar. Successful, periodic Class I topicals that have been held three or more times at a regularly occurring frequency will be considered for placement on the base calendar as "Periodic Meetings".
 - d. Quarterly schedules will be established for presentation and evaluation of meeting concepts and integration.
5. Confirmation of Base Schedule (Periodic Meetings)
 - a. Based on the quarterly evaluation schedule, the meeting concept for periodic meetings is

**American Nuclear Society
President's Task Force III
Meetings Task Force Report - Task 2
Meeting Improvements**

FINAL-July 28, 1999

The focus of Task Group 2 was to develop a list of recommendations that would improve the technical content and the overall value to attendees of ANS national meetings. Based on valuable input and analysis of what attendees expect from their attendance at meetings, the consensus of the group was that the following recommendations should be implemented.

1. Meeting Planning Recommendations:

The following list of suggestions should be implemented for the 1999 Winter Meeting in Long Beach, CA. Registration fees should be adjusted to cover the cost of adding these meeting enhancements:

1. Refreshment Breaks - morning and afternoon.
2. Provide a ticket to all attendees for an Honors and Awards function.
3. Upgrade Audio/Visual equipment provided to presenters, include LCD projectors and VCR capabilities.
4. Build in dedicated time to visit the Nuclear Technology Exhibit - refreshment breaks,
walk around luncheon, poster presentations.

2. Paper Submittal and Publication Recommendations:

Electronic Paper Submittal and Review

ANS Headquarters staff should have an automated electronic management system in place (electronic summary submission, review, author and session organizer notification, meeting program and publication capabilities) for the 2001 Annual Meeting in Milwaukee. All divisions must work within the new automated system to make it work smoothly.

Full Paper Peer Reviewed Sessions

Divisions should designate sessions that encourage full, peer reviewed papers.

Camera Ready or CDR Publication Format

The electronic summary management system should provide various publication options to meeting organizers.

3. Programmatic Recommendations:

Technical Program Redesign

ANS should consider technical "track" organization and development for National Meetings. The divisions should establish the tracks. Full papers and poster sessions should be encouraged and factored into division programs. The concept of co-located and embedded topicals in national meetings was strongly endorsed by all. A time slot should be incorporated into the technical program planning to allow time for "hot topics" or "late breaking news." The group encourages more frequent communication between Division Representatives and individual session organizers.

Professional Development Workshops

Involvement from Divisions is needed to determine topics (and expert presenters) that will enhance the professional development of their membership. P.D Workshops on technical issues which have appeared relatively recently, or areas of significant interest in various stages of resolution should be considered as topics. Short course classroom type topics should also be evaluated. Market research should be done to determine the needs and expectations of our membership in the area of professional development.

Division Participation

To ensure the health and well being of the Society, all Divisions need to support the national meetings, in addition to supporting topical meetings. A minimum level of support for each division needs to be established. It was also suggested that the Professional Divisions Committee (PDC) should take the lead in evaluating and supporting the "vitality" of each Division.

Cooperation with other Societies

Co-sponsorship of activities (including meetings, sessions, workshops, and panels) by other Societies is suggested if a win/win situation can be negotiated for all parties. This type of cooperation can bring additional viewpoints from speakers from other groups, as well as enhance meeting attendance.

4. General Recommendations:

Governance at Meeting:

Continue the policy to not allow governance and committee meetings (including the Board of Directors) to meet during technical sessions. All committees should be encouraged to do more of their work electronically, in an effort to reduce governance meetings on-site.

ANS Board of Directors and Divisions to promote Value of ANS

There is a perception that industry management does not see the benefits of what ANS

has to offer companies and their employees. This perception and a relatively dormant state of the industry increases the difficulty of employees getting approval to attend meetings and to get involved in Society activities. In order to better advertise the benefits of ANS involvement, an aggressive coordinated marketing effort should be undertaken by the Board, divisions, and others interested in projecting the Society in a positive light. A standard informational presentation packet should be developed, and an organized campaign to address government and industry management should be implemented.

Closing

Task Group 2 recognizes that implementation of meeting planning recommendations described above necessitates increases in meeting registration fees - likely an unpopular proposition even though meeting participants desire the improvements. In order to mitigate the financial impact on meeting attendees, it is suggested that meeting planning improvements be phased-in or implemented incrementally over a period of a few years to evaluate the impact. For example, in order of priority, the improvements should be implemented in the following order: refreshment breaks, then audio-visual equipment, honors and awards luncheon tickets (arrangements or ticket choice), and then the Nuclear Technology Exhibit walk around. Such a staged implementation would keep registration increases incremental. Furthermore, such a staged approach would offer ANS HQ staff an opportunity to explore options for partial underwriting costs of such improvements via corporate support, local section connections, and so forth.

With respect to the Honors and Awards activities, it is suggested that possible changes in the format (in lieu of a luncheon) for such be examined in the context of meeting improvements. The major goal with such a change is to improve the attendance and stature of awards presentations. A format that works at the Division level is an afternoon awards session (say 4:00 - 6:00 p.m.) with a reception following. ANS HQ staff should evaluate the feasibility and scheduling of this option and consider offering each attendee a choice between a ticket for the President's reception or the Honors & Awards luncheon.

Over the past several months, a number of Task Force and Infrastructure III meetings have been held to evaluate ANS meetings. The bottom line for all this discussion is to create better meetings with improved sessions and greater attendance. To hold a meeting, three distinct and important partners are involved. They are ANS Headquarters, the Divisions and Technical Groups, and the Local Sections. All three must work together to have success. In order to reach the goal of improved meetings, it was felt that an incentive should be offered to each partner based on the "value" each "added" to the meeting. The incentive would be paid out of the net revenue the meeting generated.

Several different methods were evaluated for the incentive system by the mini Task Force of the Presidents Task Force III on Divisions. The concept is to provide an incentive to each partner for performance above a minimum level. There are also different incentive plans for different types of association meetings. These incentive plans are explained below. It is important to understand that taking part in this incentive system is optional. For divisions and sections that participate above a certain level at the National meetings and/or regional programming, there is a sharing of revenues. There is no penalty for divisions and sections that do not participate in the incentive plan but then there is no shared revenues.

SUPPORTING THE NATIONAL MEETINGS, EMBEDDING A TOPICAL MEETING OR CO-LOCATING A TOPICAL MEETING

A primary outcome of Infrastructure III is to improve National Meetings and encourage greater divisional support for the national meetings by increasing the number of papers and attendance. It is hoped that by sharing in national meeting revenue, increased participation and support from the divisions and technical groups would be generated. To participate in the incentive plan, a minimum level of participation by divisions is necessary at both national meetings.

A minimum of participation for divisions with a membership less than 800 would be three sessions for each national meeting. This would be a minimum of 15 full papers, summary papers and panel sessions per meeting and 30 per year. Divisions with a membership of 800 or more, the minimum level of participation would be four sessions for each national meeting. This would be a minimum of 20 full papers, summary papers and panel sessions per meeting or 40 per year.

Payments are made to the divisions based on the type of paper presented at the meeting. Full papers are paid at a rate of \$60.00, summary papers are paid at a rate of \$30.00 and full panel presentations (5 presentations per panel) are paid at a rate of \$50.00 per panel. Only two full panel presentations per meeting will be counted when calculating the incentive payment. Also, payments are applied to presentations above the minimum level of support. To illustrate how this portion of the incentive plan works, a small example is below.

Assume a division presented 15 full papers, 15 summary papers and 5 full panel presentations at both the June and November meeting. Their minimum level of support of 20 per meeting is met because $15+15=30$ plus $(2 \times 5) = 10$ for the panel presentations. $30 + 10 = 40$ per meeting.

A. The minimum level of support is calculated as follows:

1. First, 2 full panels with 5 presentations would be counted as 10. This is the maximum count allowed for panel presentations. The rest of the panels are not counted toward the incentive.
2. Next, lowest paying papers are counted.
Only 10 more papers are required to reach maximum participation in this case so 5 of the summary papers are deducted.
3. Lastly, if more papers would have been needed to meet the minimum requirement, the balance would have been deducted from the full papers. In this case, the minimum requirement was met with the 2 full panel presentations and 10 summary papers.
In this case, we would not deduct any full papers.

B. The number of papers the incentive payment will apply to is calculated as follows:

1. Number of summary papers at \$30 each:
 15 presented less 10 required for minimum support = 5
2. Number of full panel presentations:
 5 presented less 3 that are not counted = 2
(Note: For full panel presentations, the limit is 2 per meeting and the remaining are counted)
3. Number of full papers
 15 presented less 0 for minimum support = 15

C. The payment is calculated as follows:

1. Payment on summary papers:
 $15 - 10 = 5$
 $5 \times \$30 = 150$
2. Payment on full panel presentations:
 $5 - 3 = 2$ the maximum amount counted for full panel presentations
 $2 \times \$50 = \100
3. Payment on full papers:
 $15 - 0 = 15$
 $15 \times \$60 = \900
4. Add all Payments together:
 $\$150 + \$100 + \$900 = \$1,150$

Since this division had the same number of presentations at both the June and November meeting, they would \$2,300 for this example year. If they did not meet the minimum support level at both meetings, no payment would be due.

HOLDING A STAND ALONE TOPICAL OR CO-LOCATING A TOPICAL MEETING

Another purpose of Infrastructure III was to create an incentive to the Divisions that would increase their participation at topical meetings. The same three partners mentioned above must work together to create a successful outcome here. A Co-Located Topical Meeting is treated as several Topical Meetings conducted at the same place and location. Registration fees for any Co-Located Topical meetings would be set at the same price. Each registrant would identify which of the co-located meetings they want to attend. The budgets and finances for each co-located topical would be independent of the others and each co-located meeting would have to stand on its own.

The incentive system would reward each partner on a “value added” approach. This incentive system is based on several parts. First, all valid debts of the topical meeting are paid. Next, the attendee fee of \$60.00 is paid to ANS for underwriting the risk of a meeting. Third, the remaining revenue is split between the divisions, local sections and ANS. The divisions and local sections will receive 75% of the remaining revenue and ANS will receive 25% of the remaining revenue. For ANS’ 25% of net revenue, the Society will continue to support topical meetings as follows:

- | Item | Support |
|------|---|
| 1. | Lend ANS name |
| 2. | Review hotel contracts |
| 3. | Review and approve meeting budgets |
| 4. | NPC Calendar (updated four times per year) |
| 5. | Meetings Calendar on ANS home page and links to the meeting sites |
| 6. | Publish and distribute “Meetings at a glance” brochure |
| 7. | Preparation and publishing of meeting adds in “Nuclear News Buyers Guide” and National meeting programs |
| 8. | Record keeping of meeting data |
| 9. | Answering phone inquiries and distribution of meeting programs and materials |
| 10. | Final reports and statistics including financial reporting |

The Local Sections and Divisions and Technical Groups can negotiate between themselves, how to split the remainder of the 75% net profit in accordance with existing meeting financial guidelines and policies. Below is an example of how this incentive plan will work.

Assume a conference had net proceeds of \$40,000.00 with 250 attendees.

1. ANS is paid the \$60 attendee fee as follows:
 $250 \times \$60 = \$15,000$.
2. The Divisions and Local Sections are paid 75% of the remaining net revenue:
 $\$40,000 - \$15,000 = \$25,000$
 $\$25,000 \times 75\% = \mathbf{\$18,750}$
3. ANS is paid 25% of the remaining net revenue:
 $\$40,000 - \$15,000 = \$25,000$

$$\$25,000 \times 25\% = \$6,250$$

SUPPORTING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

This is a third way the divisions can participate in the incentive options if they desire. Currently, Professional Development Workshops are conducted by ANS with some participation from divisions. The divisions that do assist are paid a fee of \$500. Under this new incentive option, the participating division will receive \$50 for each attendee in excess of 15 which is generally the break even point for workshops. This is to create an incentive to the divisions to provide greater participation and assistance with professional development workshops. An example of this is below:

Assume a professional Development Workshop has 60 attendees.

The Division would be paid as follows:

$$60 - 15 = 45$$

$$45 \times \$50 = \$2,250$$

Additional Financial Items:

The following three items are a result of information provided from group one and two of the mini task force. Since they are financial in nature, they are listed below.

1. A differential between the member and non-member price for stand alone topical meetings must be set at \$150.00. This is to encourage individuals to become ANS members since one years membership fee is currently set at \$88.00.
2. Currently, Emeritus members do not pay to attend a national meeting. It is proposed to charge a fee of \$50.00 to Emeritus members to attend national meetings. This fee will include a copy or the meeting Transactions and is the same rate that student members pay.
3. Also, complimentary invited participants would be limited to **one** per session or panel, unless the sponsoring division or local section is willing to pay for additional complimentary participants. Complimentary speakers cannot be combined to allow for more than one at any given session or panel.
4. Lastly, the additional services included in Group 2 could result in an increase of approximately \$120 to the registration fee. Efforts will be made to receive support to underwrite these costs.