

Center for Embedded Systems

An NSF Industry/University Cooperative Research Center

Year 3: Industry Advisory Board (IAB) Annual Meeting
IAB Annual Meeting - Minutes
June 13, 2012, 8 a.m.
Southern Illinois University, St. Louis

CONFIDENTIAL
revised: June 26, 2012

The meeting was conducted by IAB chair Byron Gillespie, Intel – AZ.

IAB Members (ASU)

Byron Gillespie	byron.r.gillespie@intel.com	Intel, Chandler (AZ)
Kim Schuttenberg	kshutte@marvell.com	Marvell
Mohan Mohanraj	mmohanraj@marvell.com	Marvell
Rudy Beraha	rberaha@qualcomm.com	Qualcomm
Andrew Vandivort	amvandivort@raytheon.com	Raytheon
Ken Butts	ken.butts@tema.toyota.com	Toyota

IAB Members (SIUC)

Stephen Phelps	Phelps Stephen K@cat.com	Caterpillar
Paul Bierdeman	Bierdeman Paul W@cat.com	Caterpillar
David Andersen	david.andersen@gd-ots.com	General Dynamics
Michael (Mike) Krenz	michael.krenz@hs.utc.com	Hamilton Sundstrand
Steve Tollefson	steve.tollefson@hs.utc.com	Hamilton Sundstrand
Vance Havens	Vance.havens@hs.utc.com	Hamilton Sundstrand
Rathish Jayabharathi	rathish.jayabharathi@intel.com	Intel, Folsom (CA)
Howard Wilson	Howard.wilson@intel.com	Intel, (OR)
Matt Wilding	mmwildin@rockwellcollins.com	Rockwell Collins
Scott Zogg	szogg@rockwellcollins.com	Rockwell Collins
Robert (Bob) Wright	robert.wright@tsi.com	TSI / Dickey-John

NSF Members

Alex Schwarzkopf	aschwarz@nsf.gov	NSF
Craig Scott	scottsc@u.washington.edu	NSF

Center Administration

Sarma Vrudhula	sarma.vrudhula@gmail.com	ASU
Spyros Tragoudas	spyros@engr.siu.edu	SIUC
Lisa Christian	lisa.christian@asu.edu	ASU
Nancy Beasley	embedded@siu.edu	SIUC

Agenda:



IAB_closed_agenda
_June2012_v 5.pdf

Old Business:

1. Approve minutes from January 2012 meeting. Motion to approve, seconded, approved by all.
2. Year 4 financial projections.
 - For year 4 projects, ASU will collect \$300 K in membership fees (members: Intel AZ, Marvell, Qualcomm, Raytheon, Toyota -2).
 - SIUC will collect \$350-375 K in membership fees (members: Caterpillar, DICKY-john, General Dynamics, Hamilton Sundstrand, Intel CA, Intel OR, Rockwell Collins).
 - Byron presented a breakdown of the “value” of CES membership to industry beyond the membership fee investment, which totals approximately \$1.5 million in value. This slide, “IUCRC for Embedded Systems Value” will be available for members to use as they wish.
3. Vote on chair / vice chair selection, process, and timing. Reviewed proposal and added additional requirements:
 - IAB elects a chair and a vice-chair for a 2-year term
 - Nomination/voting at June meeting
 - Chair runs IAB business meetings at January and June meetings; liaison with CES directors and project managers
 - Vice chair serves if chair is unable to
 - Chair and vice chair eligible to serve for 2 consecutive terms
 - Added: Chair and vice chair not from the same company, due to economic implications of one-year membership commitment
 - Added: When the chair steps down, the vice chair takes the role of the chair person and new vice chair elected
 - Added: Keep chair/vice chair as is until June 2013
 - Added: Elect new vice chair in June 2013 and the positions are passed at the end of the June meeting
 - Added: Alternate school representation (ASU/SIU)
 - Motion to approve, seconded, approved by all

New Business:

4. Vote on year 4 proposals
 - Byron reviewed voting logistics and the baseline understanding of voting. These comments are outlined in slide 12 of the attached agenda, titled “Voting Logistics.”
 - A set of “sticky notes” to be used as ballots was created for and distributed to each company. Ballots contained the company name and vote number (for example, Intel AZ 1/10).
 - Single sheets for each proposal were posted on poster boards around the room. Sheets listed: project title, dollar amount requested, PI Name, school.
 - Members placed their individual votes on the proposal sheets as they desired. Each member had the option to move their votes at any time during voting, as they saw where other companies showed interest. Process took approximately 30 minutes.
 - When completed, the final vote defined the Industry Priorities of the research proposals (by university). Site directors were given the Industry Priorities to guide them in selecting and funding projects.
 - Results of the vote:



Year4_vote_results_
final.xls

5. Year 3 project final report deliverables

- Center publishes the “results report” each year in the fall (summarizes the results of each completed research project).
- PIs are responsible to create two items:
 - 1) content for “results report” for publication: an update of the 5-slide format including updated outcomes, list of publications, list of students supported by the project
 - 2) updated presentation (use January update slides) showing which milestones were completed (note: this is the same content required for the results report, but in presentation format)
- PIs will be available for conference calls upon member request (webX type event, expectation that the PI creates a technical presentation).
- CES to create an IP Repository for the deliverables for the project as defined by the original proposal. If the industry member wants access to software, they must request it from the PI.
- No vote for now. The group consensus was to try this approach, see how it works, and then evaluate and recommend a formal proposal in the January meeting.

6. Discussion on technology roadmap

- The Center’s technology roadmap is published in the new “general marketing brochure” in the centerfold section titled, “Research Areas of Expertise.” Brochures were distributed at the meeting.
- Members were encouraged to use this brochure to help recruit new industry members.
- AR—Lisa send 5 copies to every company.

ADDED AGENDA ITEMS:

7. Discussion on Center growth - universities and companies

- Craig Scott, NSF, raised this issue, saying that as the Center moves closer to its application for Phase II, the NSF likes to see growth in the number of participating universities, as well as in new members. BACKGROUND: CES is now entering its 4th year in a 5 year award from the NSF. In the next year or so, the Center may apply for “Phase II” which would extend the Center as an I/UCRC for an additional 5 years.
- Alex Schwarzkopf, NSF, specified that growth will come naturally and doesn’t necessarily be a “goal.” The NSF requires a new university site to bring in a minimum of 3 companies.
- Alex elaborated that the role of the IAB in Center growth is: if there is a school that would have value to the center, bring this to the attention of the directors and let them initiate contact. If there is a company that an IAB member thinks would be interested in joining, give entrée to the site directors and work with them to help bring in the company.
- When evaluating additional university sites, issues to consider are: complimentary technology strengths, geographically strategic location, and active facility who will be able to recruit members.
- Suggested complimentary technology areas: communications; time trigger protocols, RF systems, power controls, sensors, issues related to certification.
- Brainstormed list of potential schools: Vanderbilt, University of Connecticut, Rochester School of Technology (undergrad program); University of Texas, Austin; University of Illinois--Urbana-

Champaign; Georgia Tech, Virginia Tech, Washington University, Stoneybrook, University of Wisconsin , University of Penn, Kansas State, UC Davis.

8. Discussion on increased member communication re: overlapping research interests

- It was voiced that more time for the IAB to meet and discuss research priorities and interests would be helpful prior to the time when faculty develop proposals. For example, Vance Havens described the successful collaboration between Rockwell Collins and Hamilton Sundstrand early this winter and how that helped shape proposals from SIUC.
- Recommendation: schedule an informal time at the January meeting for the IAB only to discuss research priorities and brainstorm potential project ideas.
- AR – Lisa to put this in the agenda for January and find a venue to facilitate good discussion.

9. De-brief of current meeting (Byron)

- Comments from IAB that presenters must improve in the following areas:
 - keeping to defined time limits for presentations
 - keeping to the 5 pre-determined slides: presentations are NOT technical lectures, but must be a highlights summary to peak interest and drive conversations in the poster sessions
 - Shorter presentations (1 minute), in which presenters tell the audience what the project is ABOUT and “sell” it to attract members to the poster session; then more time to be spent in poster sessions. Also: additional technical information can be posted on the website (doesn’t need to be limited to the poster)
 - better delineation if a project is new or continuing
- To help the directors emphasize these priorities to faculty, Byron is taking charge of monitoring the time of presentations, and the directors should summarize these comments for the faculty and attribute them to the IAB
- Other comments on facility / set-up:
 - Need better controlled, more reasonable AC temperature
 - Provide amplification for speakers if needed
 - Improved space needed for poster sessions – either an empty room for better facilitation or should move U-shaped table configuration to the center of the room for more room around perimeter for posters
- Include a brief introduction of the process and agenda for the meeting for new members at the beginning of day 1 of meetings
- Fewer questions right after presentation; put them in the LIFE forms to be answered during that recap session
- Use the newly updated LIFE form that will be ready from NSF for January meeting: suggestions, comments, questions

10. Set January meeting date (Byron)

- Approved date: January 22-23, 2013, Tempe, AZ
- Byron to explore hosting meeting at Intel in Chandler, AZ (2nd option: a Phoenix-area hotel) – enthusiastic response from IAB
- Byron proposed a 30-minute session at January meeting for Intel to give an overview of Embedded Atom Curriculum program – positive response from IAB
- Byron proposed including a session on leading-edge technology from different universities as part of the IAB meetings, starting with ASU’s flexible displays for January meeting – positive response from IAB

11. Action Items:

- Directors to review Industry Priorities, evaluate projects / requests / funding, and provide the IAB with a list of funded projects for year 4 (Sarma Vrudhula, Spyros Tragoudas)
- Update websites with all materials from June meeting (Nancy Beasley, Lisa Christian)
- Center to publish the “results report” for year 3 in the fall (Lisa Christian)
- Organize conference calls with PIs on final project results per member request –IAB to initiate after September 1st (IAB members, Lisa Christian, Nancy Beasley)
- CES to create an IP Repository for the deliverables for the project as defined by the original proposal (Sarma Vrudhula, Spyros Tragoudas)
- Distribute 5 copies of general marketing brochure to every company (Lisa Christian)
- Support recruiting efforts for both university sites and new members as discussed (IAB)
- Share IAB expectations re: presentations with faculty and students (Sarma Vrudhula, Spyros Tragoudas)
- Integrate IAB recommendations on improving meetings for January set-up (Lisa Christian)
- Mark calendars for next IAB meeting: January 22-23, 2013 (All)
- Include the following items in the January 2013 meeting planning:
 - Schedule time / venue for industry collaboration / brainstorming session (Lisa Christian / Byron Gillespie)
 - Request Gabriela Gonzalez to give an overview of Embedded Atom Curriculum program (Byron Gillespie)
 - Request ASU flexible display demo (Byron Gillespie)
 - Request Intel Conference Room in C7 for venue (Byron Gillespie)
 - Write proposal for final report deliverables (Lisa Christian, (Byron Gillespie)
 - Implement “countdown timer” to enforce times for presentations - request for extra monitor/pc and countdown slides (Byron Gillespie)