



**MEETING NOTES
UNIVERSITY- INDUSTRY RELATIONS ROUNDTABLE
6 MAY 2012
ATLANTA, GEORGIA**

Attendees:

Kelly Dallas (Chair) – ArcelorMittal Burns Harbor
Staci Beiswanger – Steel Dynamics Inc.
John Gerrard – ArcelorMittal USA
Stephanie Glashagel – TMK-IPSCO
Deborah Hamilton – Virginia Tech
Fred Harnack – United States Steel Corporation
Thadhani Naresh – Georgia Tech
Ron O'Malley – Nucor Steel Decatur
Kent Peaslee – Missouri University of Science & Technology
Tom Russo – Trusscon Inc.
Veena Sahajwalla – University of New South Wales
Ronaldo Sampaio - RS Consultants Ltda
Brian Thomas – University of Illinois
Jim Turnquist – Michigan Technology University
Ron Ashburn – AIST
Lori Wharrey - AIST
Chris McKelvey – AIST

1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Kelly Dallas welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited all participants to introduce themselves.

2.0 ANTI-TRUST GUIDELINE REVIEW

Ms. Dallas stated the meeting would be held in compliance with the association's anti-trust guidelines provided with the agenda.

3.0 COMMITTEE PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVE

Ms. Dallas reiterated the purpose of the AIST Foundation University–Industry Relations Roundtable is to foster communication between our university network (professors and career services representatives) and the steel industry (human resources personnel and operations representatives). The committee objective is to increase the number of professors teaching a steel-related curriculum, and to increase the number of students interested in a career in the steel industry.

4.0 “THE REAL STEEL” MARKETING VIDEO CONTEST

Chris McKelvey provided the group with an overview of “The Real Steel” Marketing Video Contest. The idea for this contest came forth from the University-Industry Relations Roundtable in the fall of 2010. The contest implementation followed the following timeline:

Development of Program	Oct 2010 thru May 2011
Call for Entries.....	1 Jun 2011 – 1 Oct 2011
Deadline to Enter the Contest	1 Oct 2011
Deadline to Submit DVD.....	31 Dec 2011

The contest was promoted extensively to Material Advantage chapters (faculty advisors and chapter chairs), to over 50 university marketing departments, and The Art Institutes. Fifteen video abstracts were received (all were “accepted”), which resulted in three videos received by the deadline. The deadline was extended for two weeks which yielded two additional videos.

The videos were first voted on by the public during the month of February 2012. Combined, the five videos had been viewed 3,461 times, and received 1,510 votes. Three steel companies hosted the online voting links on their websites.

The contest committee then evaluated the videos on overall quality, and how they addressed the following areas:

- Overall Quality
- Environmental Consciousness
- Energy Conservation
- Technological Advancements
- Safety Awareness
- Attracting Young People to the Steel Industry

Mr. McKelvey showed the three winning videos to the committee: the winners of the 2012 contest were:

First Place (US\$5,000) – “*Steel: Shaping Our World*”
Student Captain – Blake Whitley, The University of Alabama

Second Place (US\$2,500) – “*Picturing Steel*”
Student Captain – Miller Wright, The University of Alabama

Third Place (US\$1,000) – “*Essentials*”
Student Captain – Andonery Ramirez, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico City

The committee discussed future contests and agreed that the event would be repeated for 2013. Kent Peaslee offered that moving the deadline ahead until 1 Feb would likely be more conducive to garnering participation. A few attendees asked if the videos were on the AIST website. Chris McKelvey responded that the links to the AIST Foundation’s YouTube channel is on the AIST website Homepage. It was recommended that the videos be placed on the AIST website in the existing video library. The roundtable participants recommended that the video contest be repeated for 2013, with a theme implemented to bring about direction and uniformity.

5.0 2011-2012 RECRUITING RESULTS AND PROJECTIONS

Various company representatives offered general recruiting results including actuals and projections:

- ArcelorMittal has hired 165 out of 178 interns.
- Nucor has 20 interns for this summer. They need to “backfill” positions opening up due to retirements.
- TMK-IPSCO’s Project Engineering Group is adding 10 positions, including 2 FeMET scholars. They plan to add 25-30 positions in all.
- All schools seem to be getting more and more International students coming in.
- Jim Turnquist from Michigan Technology University added that they are getting many requests from industries for electrical engineers. He also offered that they are actually starting back up a mining program at his school.
- Kent Peaslee offered that Missouri S&T has 500-600 Mechanical and Electrical engineers of which a high percentage go to steel industry. Of the metallurgical engineers (~ 25 grads) 75% took jobs in the steel industry.
- It was noted by the group that math & science enrollments are “flat”.
- International enrollment has risen at one school from 2% up to 25% among undergraduates.
- Staci Beiswanger offered that they do not currently recruit at high schools.
- John Gerrard briefly talked about a program that ArcelorMittal has developed called “Steelworkers of the Future” designed to develop “crafts” position workers.
- Veena Sahajwalla from the University of New South Wales offered that they spend a great deal of time promoting scholarships to high school students. New South Wales is implementing strategies to get kids in on a more consistent basis.
- Kent Peaslee said his school (Missouri S & T) does the same: anyone who tours the materials science program gets a \$500 scholarship. They are also seeing state pressure to develop a three year program to get students through quicker.
- Ronaldo Sampaio added that in Brazil there is heavy emphasis on team projects, and that the aerospace industry is drawing students away from steel.
- Jim Turnquist at Michigan Technology University indicated he wants to develop a week-long campus program at his school to raise awareness of “the new steel industry” and asked for industry input on what companies could offer to have on campus.

6.0 ISSUES OF ENGINEERING EDUCATION – JAPANESE PERSPECTIVES

Ms. Dallas reviewed the article from the April issue of Iron & Steel Technology. The article was written by Akira Kojima from the Iron and Steel Institute of Japan (ISIJ). Members present commented on various statistics that they found to be of interest.

7.0 FUTURE INDUSTRY SURVEY

Lori Wharrey raised the question of whether the UIRR would be interested in conducting a similar survey. The article from Japan is the culmination of 4-5 years of research and very detailed, but something similar might be useful. Kent Peaslee indicated he would be in favor of this, and suggested looking at young professionals who are 5 years out from graduation. Others present

were also in favor and Lori then asked for any volunteers to work on a sub-committee to construct a draft of the survey. Those present who volunteered to serve on the sub-committee included:

- Stephanie Glashagel – TMK-IPSCO
- Jim Turnquist – Michigan Technology University
- Staci Beiswanger – Steel Dynamics Inc.

Jim Turnquist suggested a company called “Universum” for conducting the survey. Lori indicated she will be in touch with the sub-committee members.

8.0 AIST FOUNDATION BOARD CHALLENGE

Tom Russo thanked the round-table participants for their comments and past suggestions. He challenged the committee to recommend specific program ideas for the AIST Foundation to consider, touting that the Foundation has worked hard to raise sufficient funds for new programs.

Thadhani Naresh from Georgia Tech suggested faculty grants to build stronger steel related curriculums. He feels strongly that providing tenured faculty unrestricted funding is the best course, because they have a big “say” on what is implemented. Veena and Kent offered that they feel it would be more beneficial to give funding support to young faculty to begin research and projects. Ron Ashburn asked the group how much money they felt was needed to be effective. Thadhani responded he felt \$100K - \$150K is needed, while Kent Peaslee countered with his opinion that \$25K - \$50K would be effective.

Additionally, it was suggested faculty grants fund a multi-year project with the award increasing each year, according to meeting performance goals (\$25K first year increasing to \$50K third year). This would give faculty more incentive, while giving the AIST Foundation some control to ensure the funds were being used effectively. All faculty in attendance agreed that unrestricted funding is best. It also supported that young faculty should be targeted.

9.0 NEXT MEETING

The meeting ran overtime, and Kelly Dallas thanked everyone for their valued participation and input. She announced the next UIRR will take place on Monday, 8 October 2012, 10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. (EST) at MS&T’12, Pittsburgh, Pa.