

Minutes of the Second 2014 Council Meeting
Mineralogical Society of America
Room 103, Sacramento Convention Center, Sacramento, CA, USA
Saturday, 7 June 2014

Attending:

David Vaughan, President
John Hughes, Past-President
Howard Day, Treasurer
Andrea Koziol, Secretary
Steve Shirey, Vice-President
Edward Grew, Councilor
Christine Clark, Councilor
Isabelle Daniel, Councilor
Kim Tait, Councilor

Not present:

Wendy Panero, Councilor
Kirsten Nicolaysen, Councilor

Visitors:

J. Alex Speer, MSA Executive Director
Keith Putirka, Editor, *American Mineralogist*

Note: Motions and Council action items are presented in *italics*; SoC = sense of Council

ITEMS

[1] Call to order and Roll Call

David Vaughan called the meeting to order at 8:15 AM. All present introduced themselves.

[2] Additions to and deletions from the Agenda, approval of the Agenda.

Alex Speer updated the Agenda to include the additional reports that came in late and change in timing of the breaks during the meeting

S. Shirey moved that the Agenda, as amended, be approved, E. Grew seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

[3] Approve the minutes of the Third 2013 Council Meeting, and the First 2014 Council Meeting.

E. Grew moved to accept the Secretary's minutes with no corrections, C. Clark seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

[4] Accept Reports to Council containing no questions or action items as a group. Reports will be acknowledged by Secretary.

Nominating Committee for Officers, *American Mineralogist* Editorial Office & Editors. MSA Society News Editor for *Elements*, Editor *Handbook of Mineralogy*, MSA Representative to the GeoScienceWorld Board of Directors, MSA Representative to the GeoScienceWorld Advisory Council, Publications Director, MSA Webmaster, Lecture Program Committee, Lecture Program Coordinator, Bloss Crystallographic Fund Committee, Roebling Medal Committee, MSA Award Committee, Distinguished Public Service Award Committee, Dana Medal Committee, Kraus Crystallography Grant Committee, Mineralogy/Petrology Grant Committee, Representatives to AGI, CMS, EMU, GIA, GSA, GSA-MGPV, SMMP, MSA Representative to the American GeoScience Institute's (AGI) *ad hoc* Academic Classification Committee, Special Interest Group on Pegmatites, Special Interest Group on Planetary Materials, *ad hoc* Committee on Earth Materials Data.

Not heard from: Representatives to ACA, AGU, GS, ICDD, and FM.

C. Clark moved to accept all reports as submitted, S. Shirey seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

[5] Review of Executive Committee (EC) actions (Section 1). Items for action or discussion from the President's Report were taken up under the appropriate sections later in the day.

- a) The EC approved the details of the next MSA Distinguished Lecture program (Section 21(a)).
- b) Approval was given for a funding application made to the Honda Foundation (in relation to support for 'Mineralogy 4 Kids')
- c) Final approval was given for a distribution licensing arrangement between MSA and De Gruyter, for the marketing of MSA publications on a more extended global scale (Section 3, Appendix H).
- d) A Memorandum of Understanding between MSA and the Geological Society of London was signed by the respective Presidents and Executive Directors. (Section 1, Appendix A).
- e) A Memorandum of Understanding between MSA and the Mineralogical Society of Great Britain and Ireland was signed by the respective Presidents and Executive Directors. (Section 1, Appendix B).

D. Vaughan summarized these actions. In regards to b), J. Hughes reported that the application was ultimately not funded. In regards to c), A. Speer reported that work by De Gruyter is in the early stages. He added that MSA's agent selling print copies of *American Mineralogist* in China (Charlesworth) is showing no results. We may have to terminate this contract if De Gruyter has more luck selling electronic access. Serious sales by De Gruyter should start with the 2015 fiscal year.

[6] Determine the member and institutional *American Mineralogist* subscription rates as well as member dues for 2015. From the Treasurer (Section 4):

(a) for *American Mineralogist* subscription rates, he recommends:

- 1) continuing to differentiate between domestic and foreign members print subscription rates to reflect more closely actual costs of production and mailing of *American Mineralogist*.

- 2) that MSA continue to shift the costs of content creation and printing from institutional to individual subscribers.
 - 3) that MSA increase U.S. member subscription price (paper + electronic) to \$110 (currently \$105) and similarly increase the non-U.S. member subscription rate to \$120 (currently \$115). These changes represent a 4-5% increase.
 - 4) that MSA increase the U.S. Institutional (paper + electronic) subscription rate to \$1025 (currently \$1000) and the non-U.S. Institutional rate (paper + electronic) to \$1050 (currently \$1025).
 - 5) that MSA increase the Institutional (electronic) subscription rate to \$950 (currently \$900).
 - 6) that MSA increase the GSW Institutional rate to \$170 (currently \$160) for *American Mineralogist* and leave unchanged the GSW Institutional rate of \$125 for the Reviews.
- (b) for MSA 2014 dues, he recommends:
- 1) that 2015 dues for regular and student members be maintained at current levels, \$80 and \$20 respectively.

H. Day introduced discussion on point a) and reminded Council to study Appendix A of his report. A posted loss of approximately \$88 K is a concern, though this is before any transfers from the Funds to cover the expenses that the Funds are to support (life dues, research grants, Mineralogy 4 Kids site, etc.), and transfers that cover this operating loss. There is a decrease in income to *American Mineralogist*.

The Report of Section 17(b) concerns details from GeoScienceWorld (GSW) about reduced income for the journal in 2013. A Speer explained that GSW's agreements with subscription agents allow the agents to delay payments until the end of a next quarter. This happened at year's end in 2013, so the 2013 income was not forwarded to GSW, and thus the participating societies until 2014.

In the Treasurer's report (section 4, page 4) is a table of proposed rate changes. Note that a number of categories are subsidized (actual cost is more than what will be charged), though not all. For more detail on how rates are estimated, there is a Member Dues Worksheet in App. C of the Treasurer's report.

A. Speer stated that MSA has subsidized *American Mineralogist* for some time, though the amount has gone down over time. The Society maintains a policy of small dues and subscription increases over time, not episodic large increases. However, there were long stretches of times in the past when rates were not increased, thus making income fall short of expenses. MSA has been playing catch-up ever since.

J. Hughes moved to accept the treasurer's recommendations on American Mineralogist subscription rates, C. Clark seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

H. Day continued the discussion on part (b), MSA member dues. At this time he does not recommend raising dues, even though there is a small deficit. Policy is that items that are benefits to members should be covered by dues. This past year we have had increased costs, such as support for overseas officers, and the cost of the reception at the Fall AGU meeting. Dues were raised last year, and it seems inopportune to raise them again so soon. Council was reminded that electronic access to *American Mineralogist* is now included with dues.

S. Shirey moved to accept the treasurer's recommendation for member dues of \$80, and \$20 for students. K. Tait seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

[7] The Treasurer and MSA Executive Director provided brief updates on MSA membership numbers, subscriptions, and MSA finances.

A. Speer reported that we have 2481 members at the moment, with a few new members added each week. We are retaining 92 - 94% of our members with renewals.

MSA accounts as of 6 June 2014 are approximately \$3,880,000, but our advisors at Wells Fargo expect a market correction later this year.

MSA renewed its lease at its current location for 10 years, obtaining a reduction in rent per square foot and in annual inflation adjustment. The building complex was for sale this year. Hayden McGuire, a real estate investment trust, is the new owner.

The dispute between the Hachette Book Group and Amazon.com has made the recent national news. Amazon is pushing for a greater share of e-book revenue and lower e-book prices, which of course is entirely at the expense of Hachette and its authors' income. In the dispute, Amazon.com has made it difficult for customers to buy Hachette books on the Amazon site. MSA had a similar experience with Amazon. In 2007 MSA was approached by Amazon to participate in their Amazon's Vendor Central program. Amazon would sell MSA products at list price, keep much of the proceeds in monthly fees and transaction fees, subject MSA to onerous conditions, but MSA would be responsible for fulfilling and shipping the order. A. Speer said no to this, whereupon Amazon.com ceased offering MSA publications through its site

D. Vaughan added some other points on membership. The importance of colleagues contacting lapsed members cannot be overstated. He noted that student membership numbers increased because of the Dyar/Gunter/Tasa textbook. Having *Elements* as a membership benefit is also a factor.

[8] The Financial Advisory and Audit Committee (FAAC) has several action items (Section 6):

a) Reaching the \$3 million milestone for our investment portfolio is a significant milestone, one that is impressive, but does not justify resting on our laurels. FAAC recommends that MSA aim for a \$5 million milestone, this level to be reached by a combination of investment performance and fundraising. The \$5 million goal has been

adopted on an informal basis by our investment advisor Jeff LeClair, Executive Director Alex Speer, and FAAC chair Mark Van Baalen; FAAC recommends that Council endorse this goal.

With a conservative investing policy and MSA's usual member and benefactor contributions, we would need many more additional benefactors and testamentary gifts to reach this goal. In general our portfolio has increased at 6.5% per year. J. Hughes and S. Shirey wondered if a goal of \$5 million for the endowment was too high, and a failure to reach a publicized goal may reflect poorly on MSA. A. Speer pointed out that the goal number need not be publicized, it could be a Sense of Council as an informal goal. I. Daniel proposed a smaller goal, or if a higher number was chosen that a plan for the use of the increased endowment be set.

H. Day reiterated that we wish to motivate membership. The purpose would have to be decided upon, but the question remained, would membership support these purposes? C. Clark and E. Grew likened such a campaign to college/university fundraising, in which goals and programs supported are clearly stated.

J. Hughes wished to clarify that Council should be thinking of the fiscal health of the society, not new initiatives. A. Speer said that the Outreach Fund was started to cover items such as the lectureship program, website, and Mineralogy for Kids, as these programs were underfunded at the outset.

J. Hughes suggested we package the attractive programs that we are doing, and enhance them. Several suggestions were given. Discussion had to wrap up at this point.

SofC: We welcome the Report of the FAAC, and are supportive of the goal of increasing endowment, but in the context of targeted initiatives we already have, including mineralogical education.

b) The most realistic way to raise significant amounts of endowment money is through bequests and testamentary gifts. FAAC recommends that Council adopt appropriate strategies to advertise and enhance this form of giving.

c) 2013 was the first year that the F. Donald Bloss Optical Crystallography Fund was spun off from the Outreach Fund to become independent. This change was effective July 1, 2013. A committee handbook describing the Bloss Fund and its policies has been developed (Section 22, Appendix A). FAAC recommends that financial guidelines be added to these policies.

H. Day recommended that guidelines similar to guidelines for our other funds be written. A. Speer clarified that the Bloss Fund is written differently, but those guidelines were not included in the new Committee Handbook and will be added. MSA is allowed to use only the non-restricted portion. So amounts available will vary per year. As a reminder, donations to the Bloss Fund become the principal

of the fund. An additional amount is added to the principal to take into account inflation. Both the principal and the inflation adjustment comprise the permanently restricted amount of the Fund. If the fund increases in value over this, that portion (= the income) can be spent.

SofC: We will place existing financial guidelines into the Bloss Committee handbook.

d) Develop plans to improve the documentation of our business processes, a recommendation by our auditors several times in recent years.

A. Speer said this is harder than it seems, and it is better to have overlap between new office personnel and outgoing office personnel. In addition, much information on current practices is in individual Committee and Officer Handbooks, and the different handbooks are updated annually.

[9] The Benefactors Committee - Corporate Giving & Capital Campaign (Section 9(a)) asks Council members to relay any prospective donor corporations and contacts to John M. Hughes, Chair of the committee.

J. Hughes introduced this topic. Work is continuing and there is another proposal in the works. J. Hughes and A. Speer reported on a visit to Excalibur Minerals, a benefactor.

[10] From the Committee on Committees (Section 7), discuss and confirm the proposed list of committee members and chairs. Authorize the MSA Secretary to contact individuals in the order(s) listed (except when restricted by guidelines for the position).

S. Shirey, as chair of this Committee, introduced this topic. The committee tried to consider diversity and involving new people. Alternate names are provided in case the first person suggested declined. A. Koziol added that people almost always declined because of overwhelming work or family issues, not because they did not want to serve MSA. Discussion followed on the lists of names for each committee. The Secretary will stay in contact with S. Shirey about any changes in the persons nominated. The idea of reviving the Membership Committee was put forward. Perhaps the charge of this committee should be re-thought? C. Clark volunteered to be the new chairperson.

C. Clark moved to authorize the MSA Secretary to contact individuals in the order(s) listed. K. Tait seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

[11] People items from other reports:

a) From Jodi Rosso, the Series Editor of the *Reviews in Mineralogy and Geochemistry & Monographs Series* (Section 13): Pierrette Tremblay will be retiring from the Executive Editor position of *Elements* magazine at the end of 2014. As you may already know, Jodi recently accepted the position to fill the vacancy. Jodi will begin immediately and overlap with Pierrette for the remaining 2014 issues. Jodi will assume the role of sole Executive Editor in January 2015. Therefore, it is with considerable sadness that Jodi announces her resignation as Series

Editor of RiMG. Alex Speer and the Series Editor are presently discussing the mechanics of the transition until MSA Council identifies a replacement. Jodi is committed to be involved with RiMG until the replacement is named so that the series doesn't falter.

Jodi Rosso does both editing and layout. These two functions could be separated in the future. It is unknown at this time if this position would be generally and publically advertised. There are several names in the air for the position. It may be impolitic for Jodi to continue beyond January 2015 as she will then be full time editor of *Elements*. Council will talk about this at the third 2014 Meeting.

b) The MSA Representative to the International Mineralogical Association (IMA) asks if there are any Council members also plan to attend 2014 Meeting of IMA which will be held at the Sandton Conference Center, Gauton, South Africa on September 1-5, 2014 (Section 13). 2014 is an IMA year. This means that there will be a need for "delegates" and the MSA Representatives to the various IMA Commissions (Section 7, page 10) will be contacted by IMA about the work of their group.

George Harlow is the MSA liaison to IMA, if Council has any questions. K. Tait reported she was attending.

c) The Chair of the Nominating Committee for Fellows (Section 27) reports that she has not had any response from committee member Wilson Crichton. If nothing is heard by time of the Council meeting, she will let us know. His term ends this year.

d) The MSA Meetings Coordinator (Section 18) reports on a developing consensus wherein the MSA Representative for AGU meetings (Abby Kavner) would be responsible for encouraging MSA members to submit session proposals. The MSA Representative would also correspond with the two pairs of representatives (from MRP, VGP) to identify sessions that should be co-sponsored by MSA, and to have those section representatives represent MSA interests as the meeting is organized.

J. Hughes felt we have come up with a plan for better communication between AGU and MSA. A. Speer noted we need to have someone at early stages of planning for these meetings. A memorandum of understanding (MOU) is rather broad; we need to have a person there for more detailed work. A discussion of meeting planning followed, but it did not end with a SofC.

e) The Chair of the MSA Lecture Program Committee recommends that the two committee members whose term expires this year be replaced by at least one European scientist to overcome a possible lack of familiarity with potential European lecturers by the dominantly North American committee (Section 21(a)).

This item was discussed quickly. The Secretary will be in touch with S. Shirey, Chair of the Committee on Committees as part of their job of filling committee positions by the Fall meeting.

[12] The Executive Director has three operational items (Section 3):

a) Council needs to confirm that the Third 2014 and First 2015 MSA Council Meetings will be held in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada on Saturday 18 October 2014. The MSA Management Committee meeting will be held Friday afternoon or evening of 17 October 2014.

SoC: We confirm this meeting place and time.

b) Council needs to give an indication about location and timing of the Spring 2015 Council meeting so arrangements can be started. The 2015 Goldschmidt Conference will be in Prague, Czech Republic, 16-21 August 2015. This is too late in the year for the Spring Meeting. The fall-back position is the MSA Offices in Chantilly, VA.

E. Grew pointed out that the Joint AGU Assembly and GAC/MAC meeting will be held in Montreal, QC Canada on May 3 – 7 2015. The potential date for a Council Meeting is May 2, 2015. This was met with approval.

SoC: It is proposed to have the Spring 2015 Council Meeting at the GAC/MAC – Joint AGU Assembly in Montreal.

c) As proposed by Frank C. Hawthorne and seven previous Roebling Medalists, should the Roebling Medal be accompanied by a certificate? If approved, should this be only going forward, or back certificates issued?

The general consensus, after a short discussion, was that this would engender much good will for not much money. A certificate would be issued, but not framed.

SoC: Issue Roebling certificates to past medalists and to future awardees. Back certificates will be signed by the current president and secretary.

[13] The Short Course Committee (Section 19) asks Council to review a proposal for a short course by Carl Steefel, Simon Emmanuel, and Larry Anovitz on Pore Scale Geochemical Processes. The course would be at the 2015 Goldschmidt Conference, Prague, Czech Republic. The committee recommends acceptance of this proposal, pending resolution of a few budget details.

Alex Speer introduced this topic. The budget in its current form is imprecise and unrealistic. After some discussion a Sense of Council was reached.

SoC: In principle Council likes the idea of this Short Course. Council requests that a course organization document with logistical details and a fully developed budget be submitted to the MSA Office. If DOE money is going to be requested, organizers must write the proposal. A deadline of July 30 2014 is suggested for course budget and description.

[14] MSA procedures for Policy Statements: <<http://www.minsocam.org/msa/policy.html>> require that the MSA Council reevaluate a position statement every 4 years, to assess whether it

retains suitable value and purpose as it expressed when adopted. Both the Executive Director (Section 3) and MSA Representative to the Society of Mineral Museum Professionals (Section 29(m)) write that the *Preservation of Natural History Collections: Minerals and Rocks* Policy Statement (Section 3, Appendix K) requires review in the Fall of 2014. The Executive Director (Section 3) indicates that the Policy Statement on *Asbestos* (Section 3, Appendix L) also requires review.

[Executive Director's note: Perhaps the first discussion or question to answer is if the MSA experiment into Policy Statements has been worthwhile, the process, the format, and the statement contents effective? Should they be more "tutorial" or "explanatory" such as those of the Policy and Position Statements of the Geological Society of London? An example would be the one on "Shale Gas" directed at a more general audience?

If MSA decides to continue, there was no process outlined for such reviews. Council could:

- *simply reaffirm the existing policy*
- *decide to not reaffirm the policy and delete it from the website*
- *ask an individual to review and possibly revise it.*
- *ask the original proposing committee to review and possibly revise it.*
- *ask a new committee to review and possibly revise it.*

The original proposing committees comprised:

- *Asbestos: John Brady, John Hughes, Pamela Burnley, and Dave Bish*
- *Preservation of Natural History Collections George E. Harlow, Peter Heaney, John Hughes, Jeffrey Post*

In his previous role as instigator of the Collections statement, George Harlow is prepared to organize a review of that statement upon instruction from Council (Section 29(m)).]

D. Vaughan introduced this topic. Council discussed the points described in the Executive director's comments: What is the goal, and who is the audience? Are these statements to be a scientific brief or a strong position statement? An example briefing note from the Geological Society of London on shale gas (copy provided for Councilors, see <http://www.geolsoc.org.uk/shalegas> and link therein) was discussed as another kind of model. A. Speer commented that based on experience, policy-makers look for statements that support their side of an issue – it quickly becomes partisan.

D. Vaughan suggested, and council discussed, the idea of a fact sheet or brief accompanied by a policy statement.

D. Vaughan volunteered, as did C. Clark and S. Shirey, to review options. A. Speer reminded Council that the Policy Statements just could be simply reaffirmed.

SoC: If current policy statements are reaffirmed, this will happen at the Fall 2014 Council meeting. Any suggestions by Council for the current statements should be made soon.

[15] The MSA Representative to *Elements* Magazine indicates that Council (or more likely, the MSA Executive Committee) approve the 2015 *Elements* cost allocation for participating societies to remain at \$15. (Section 16).

A. Speer introduced this topic. MSA is publisher of record for *Elements*. It was clarified that the cost allocation is the \$15 per member subscription fee paid by the participating societies.

C. Clark moved to approve the 2015 Elements cost allocation. S. Shirey seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

[16] The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU's) between MSA and The Geological Society of London (the UK equivalent of GSA) and the Mineralogical Society of Great Britain and Ireland (MinSoc) are given in Section 1 of the Council Meeting Book. Initial discussions are underway as to what initiatives might flow from these agreements. Council also needs to give thought to how the arrangements embodied in MOU's can be sustained in the longer term. The President includes a one page list of possible activities (Section 1, Appendix C).

D. Vaughan initiated this discussion. He reported that discussions between himself, A. Speer, and corresponding officers of The Geological Society of London (GSL) and the Mineralogical Society of Great Britain and Ireland (MinSoc) had generated some ideas, such as:

1. publicize significant publications
2. Explore the use of the TV studio available at the GSL
3. share information on publishing
4. consider position statements, such as the aforementioned brief on shale gas from the GSL.

A. Speer noted that some communication is office to office. As to point #2, he noted that MSA Distinguished Lecturer Matt Kohn's talk on the Himalayas was delivered at the Burlington House headquarters of the GSL, was taped and is available on the GSL website. D. Vaughan wondered if a committee should be formed. There was not much support for this suggestion. Other societies have a liaison person, but it varies by society. J. Hughes said that AGU is not used to working with other societies like ours, whereas the Geological Society of America has a well-established system of associated societies. Discussion ended without a Sense of Council, but with the understanding that D. Vaughan will be the current liaison with the GSL and MinSoc.

At this point in the conversation someone asked about the MSA-sponsored student Lunch that was held at the last GSA meeting. J. Hughes reported that it went very well, and was actually over-subscribed. There are enough funds to support another lunch, probably in 2015, after a one year break. A. Speer described how each panelist made a short presentation, with the last 1/3 of the time was taken up by one-on-one discussions between students and panelists.

[17] MSA Representative to the Society of Mineral Museum Professionals (SMMP) asks MSA to consider endorsement of funding for collection preservation by NSF (Section 29(m)). He requests a conversation in Council and among members about the worthiness of and strategy for MSA expressing an opinion to influence NSF funding policy on rock and mineral collections. SMMP stands ready to participate in such deliberations.

Related to the SMMP request is the Earth Materials Data Infrastructure (EMDI) Committee report on iSampleS (Section 10(a)) and the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) Director John Holdren's recent memorandum requiring that federal scientific agencies create a draft scientific-collections management and public access policies (Section 3, page 20 and Section 3 – Appendix L).]

K. Tait reported that she was part of the e-mail conversation taking place in regards to approaching NSF. A. Speer gave the example of the oil companies looking for organizations to store core samples instead of throwing them out after initial work is done. Who will store and curate the material? Museums cannot do it all. E. Grew gave the example of the Polar Rock Repository in the Byrd Polar Research Center (Ohio State University) supported by the NSF Office of Polar Programs. Perhaps this could be a model. A. Speer reminded Council that the original policy statement (see Section 14 above) has to be reviewed anyway, and it may be the opportunity to ask George Harlow and the original Committee to look at MSA's Policy statement again in light of recent events. Should MSA support a national policy statement, stating it is a priority to preserve scientific collections?

SofC: Ask George Harlow and the original committee to review the policy statement on Preservation of Natural History Collections.

[18] The President (Section 1), Benefactors Committee – Corporate Relations and Capital Campaign Chair (Section 9), and the *American Mineralogist* Editorial Office & Editor (Section 12) write that it would be helpful for Council to discuss possibilities for any form of celebration associated with the upcoming the centennial anniversary of the *American Mineralogist* and the centennial anniversary of the formation of the Mineralogical Society of America (2019). The President (Section 1) points out that most suggestions may require funding and a considerable amount of effort will be devoted to this area of activity by our key fund-raisers John Hughes and Barb Dutrow.

K. Putirka started the conversation by reporting on what the *American Mineralogist* editors are planning. For example, he has invited articles that celebrate the Centennial. They could be Outlook Papers or new research. A. Speer reported on the suggestion by a member to have a commentary on the value of the top article that appeared in *American Mineralogist* during each decade for a symposium at the Tucson Gem and Mineral Show. K. Putirka is looking for contributions from the community.

D. Vaughan asked Council to consider in general how to approach the centennial. Should a committee be formed? A. Speer noted that for past celebrations they were usually committees of one. Options such as a big party at a national GSA meeting, or smaller events at several venues were suggested, as was a 'powwow' on the future of Mineralogy. In addition to Barb Dutrow, Peter Heaney and Jay Bass were mentioned as showing interest in planning for the Centennial.

The 2019 GSA Meeting will be in Denver Colorado. H. Day suggested that we keep the business meeting as is, but use the reception time for a sit-down dinner. There was a mixed response to this idea. D. Vaughan reported that the MinSoc has suggested field trips to classic localities in Scotland in honor of the MSA Centennial. This seemed to be of interest to those present.

[19] The Executive Director attended EarthCube's "*End User Communities and Professional Societies Assembly Workshop*" 18-20 March 2014 (Section 1, page 27) to gain a better idea of what EarthCube is about, and to put both Bob Hazen's 2012 "*The Mineralogists' Data Manifesto: A Shared Responsibility*" (Section 3, Appendix P) and the previous Earth Materials Data Infrastructure (EMDI) Committee reports in a better context. The long-term goal of all this is to develop a cyberinfrastructure for the GeoSciences. GeoSciences here is defined as NSF does - research spanning the atmospheric, earth, ocean and polar sciences. Cyberinfrastructure encompasses data acquisition, data storage, data management, data integration, data mining, data visualization, etc.

The MSA Executive Director described Bob Hazen's proposals in light of EarthCube, with an eye to what role MSA could be in a future GeoSciences cyberinfrastructure. The (EMDI) Committee report (Section 10(a)) provides additional considerations from the data policies of the *Editors Roundtable in the Earth Science* (Section 10(a), Appendix A) and the MSA Publications Director reports that Rachel Russell has been pro-actively exploring journal format and communication type (Section 11) and that he is to appoint a MSA Data Journal Committee (to be composed of three MSA Council or former council members, Rachel Russell, Steve Shirey, and Alex Speer and, they with input from Earth Materials Data (EMDI) chair Kersten Lehnert will craft the format of the MSA Data Journal.

A. Speer led this discussion, which was mostly for Council's information. He has attended the EarthCube meetings to find out what is going on, and how MSA and its members would participate in such activities. There are two reasons for EarthCube: 1. To make data public and 2. To enable data mining in ways the original authors never envisaged.

The group is now in a governance and organizational structure mode, trying to make a useful organization. They have an "aspirational" document but no final structure at this time. A. Speer did participate in the discussions and suggested that they organize as a non-profit organization. EarthCube is meeting again in DC at the end of the month. MSA could be a working partner. Following Hazen's article ("*The Mineralogists' Data Manifesto: A Shared Responsibility*") MSA could contribute by organizing a working group for various topics. Another working group is the publishing group with K. Lehnert.

A. Speer continued by outlining why MSA would want to get involved. One reason is to remain relevant as this kind of group and data analysis may be the future. Most of the people he met at the EarthCube meeting engage in virtual communities. If we don't want a "bricks and mortar" society like MSA to become a tiny society just giving out awards,

we need to remain relevant to individuals in those communities. A. Speer suggests that we start with what Hazen has written and keep getting involved.

There is also the EarthChem program (<http://www.earthchem.org/>), which links to existing resources. Rick Carlson of the Geochemical Society and others note that they know what they want to do, but they have no money.

In other news, the editors' round table with K. Lehnert will be meeting soon. Bob Hazen will organize something at AGU, but Alex is uncertain of the details. For all of this agenda item: nothing needs to be decided now, but Council should be aware of these developments.

H. Day asked: Who is the contact person, if MSA wanted to get involved? Alex replied that it depends on what one is interested in, but checking out the web page (<http://www.earthcube.org>) would be a start. Many earth scientists do not seem to be aware of this organization.

Steve Shirey then spoke to several points. K. Lehnert has a template for data storage. Could MSA work on a template for mineral data? The Sloan Foundation has been suggesting that scientists do science in different ways. As an example, his group is buying diamonds to form a study collection, so that one does not need to depend on connections at De Beers, etc.

Councilors had a number of suggestions. I. Daniel wondered if there could be a data repository within MSA, such as the Crystal Structure Database. A. Speer cautioned that such a repository should not compete with, but complement Mindat.org, with its rich information on localities. I. Daniel replied that a database of peer-reviewed articles and more information, not just localities has its merits. E. Grew noted that Mindat.org has its issues with inaccurate data. S. Shirey added that someone must check the validity of data and references, for any database. K. Tait noted that RRUFF (<http://rruff.info>) also exists as a data source. A. Speer explained the background to RRUFF to Councilors who were unaware of it. He noted there is a draft MOU between Bob Downs/RRUFF and MSA, but never returned approved by RRUFF. RRUFF is private now but if it did become a commercial enterprise, it would be selling MSA published data, which we do not want, and the MOU allowed its reconsideration if that were to happen.

Conversation on this topic wrapped up with A. Speer promising to keep Council informed of progress with EarthCube. A. Speer feels the nature of publishing is changing, and EarthCube may represent a new direction.

[20] The "Final Report of the American Geosciences Institute *ad hoc* Committee on Academic Geoscience Program Classification" was released by AGI (Section 29(b), Appendix A). It presents the three options that were explored:

- Accreditation (e.g. ABET for the engineers)
- Classification

- Competency Based Badging (students demonstrate competency or mastery of a subject, regardless of the path taken to gain that mastery.)

Council may want to consider the ramification of these three approaches as it may impact the instruction and professional training of mineralogists, petrologists and geochemists. There is not any immediate action needed, but it is unclear how vigorously any next steps of the report will be pursued. It is possible that AGI will make some request of its member societies so Council should be aware of the outcomes of this AGI project.

A. Speer explained some of the background leading to this Final Report. It comes down to Geology students competing for jobs with students who have certifications, such as civil engineers and now engineering geologists. Perhaps the Geological Society of America, as a broad organization, is better placed to comment on this.

Councilors wondered if accreditation would help geology departments. Could MSA have a say that mineralogy is an important part of the curriculum? MSA, we hope would have a role to play if this goes forward.

A. Speer said at this time MSA Council needs to be aware of this topic, but there is very little motion on this issue however.

There was no other business to discuss.

H. Day moved to adjourn, S. Shirey seconded, motion passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 2:55 PM.