

**CoE/AMM Steering Advisory Board Meeting #1**  
**Thursday, September 6, 2018 (UWM)**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Present:** Brian Thompson (UWMRF), Nidal Abu-Zahra (UWM), Brett Peters (UWM), Mike Andrew (UWM), Jessica Silvaggi (UWMRF), Danielle Jones (WEDC), Joe Hamann (Rexnord), Scott Wollenberg (Modine), Sheku Kamara (MSOE), Scott Jansen (Employ Milwaukee), Buckley Brinkman (MEP), Mike Miller (HellermanTytonUS), Steve Russek (Astronautics), Gordon Nameni (Brown and Associates), Marv Klowak (Briggs and Stratton), Fred Begale (Badger Meter), Brian Schmit (Marquette), Mohammad Al-Omari (Kohler)

**WebEx Call-in:** Bob Heideman (A.O.Smith), Brian Witt (Ariens), Dane Morgan (UW-Madison), Richard Busalacci (MATC), John Borg (Marquette), John Schiessl (Generac)

- Meeting started at 3:00 pm
- Opening remarks, Dean Peters
- Introductions, call in and in-person
- Dani Jones emphasized the importance of advanced materials to the economic development of industry in Wisconsin. Abu-Zahra provided background and emphasized the multidisciplinary and cross-campus nature of the CoE.

**Main Discussion Points**

1. Technology roadmaps are needed for each thrust area to set clear targets and combine industry needs with researchers' capabilities/interests, available resources, and performance metrics.
2. There is a need to identify the differentiating capabilities of the CoE/AMM.
3. The focus of CoE/AMM is on the needs of WI industries, using WI intellectual/financial resources, with a much broader impact.
4. CoE mission should capture that the work will produce outcomes that are applicable and profitable to industry in a reasonable time-period.
5. A gate/test stage for projects should be added to ensure that the right projects are continuing, and the wrong ones are abandoned.
6. The vision statement should reflect the problems the CoE is aspiring to solve, rather than what it aspires to become. Also, it should emphasize the "materials processing" and "processing challenges"
7. Student training should be more emphasized as an outcome for the research projects which provides different aspect of training than the existing internship programs.

8. IP Models need to be hashed out early in the process. Interest in IP models which cover precompetitive and contractual research projects. I/UCRC-WEP model is a good starting point.
9. Contractual research projects help build confidence in the CoE and consortium.
10. A low initial membership fee can attract more companies to join the CoE. As the projects start to produce results, company members can be expected to pay more to maintain membership benefits.
11. A single tier membership structure is more attractive than multi-tier structure to start with. Additional membership tiers can be added later on.
12. Need to develop some preliminary ideas for potential projects for funding, this will encourage companies to join at the higher cost tier membership. Early success stories will drive membership.
13. “Capability and speed delivered at a good cost” was agreed on to be the highest value proposition the CoE can offer.

Meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Meeting notes were compiled by Dr. Ben Church (UWM).