

Meteoritical Society Council Meeting
September 16, 2025, 3 pm – 5 pm (UTC)
Remote only!

**Minutes for the 5th Meeting of the Meteoritical
Society Council in 2025**

Council Members Invitees

Guy Consolmagno (President)
Maria Schönbachler (Vice President)
Nancy Chabot (Past President)
Cari Corrigan (Treasurer)
Jutta Zipfel (Secretary)
Byeon-Gak Choi (excused)
Alvaro Crósta

Elena Dobrică
Juliane Gross (excused)
Marina Ivanova
Yangting Lin
Yves Marrocchi
Gordon Osinski (excused)

Guests

Anthony Jull (MAPS Editor)
Rhiannon Mayne (Publications Committee)
My Riebe (McKay and Wiley Awards)

The following documents were sent to councilors prior to the meeting:

MAPS report Sept 2 2025.doc
MAPS Budget 2026.xls
Publications committee report 2025.pdf
McKay_Letter_to_Council_2025.pdf

Agenda and Minutes

1. President's welcome; review of electronic votes since last meeting 3:00 pm UTC

The president welcomed all councilors and guest to the meeting.

The secretary reported that no electronic votes had been taken since the last council meeting.

When writing this report it became clear that in fact one electronic vote was held.

Vote 26e Approval of the recommendation for supporting 5 Community Grants and 5 Research Grants at levels indicated. (31 July 2025)

2. MAPS Editor (Tim Jull) 25 min

3:05 pm UTC

Tim Jull reported about the ongoing difficulties with the new submission system which, after a year, is still not running smoothly. Since January 2025 they have contact with one of the program modifiers which has led to some improvement – but his workload must be tremendous as the turnaround is very slow. *Wiley* started off with a simple program and is adding to it all the tools requested from the current users (about 30 journals). *MAPS* has become one of the first to work with this system and is facing all the problems associated with the process to build a well-functioning submission system.

He then further reported that

a) Submissions are back to about what they were before Covid. In 2024, 126 manuscripts were submitted. The acceptance rate was at 76%. Some papers had to be resubmitted by the authors because of problems with the new submission system.

b) Almost all member and institutional subscribers sign up for online subscriptions. There are only two institutional print subscribers. More than half of the members receive the journal online. Two-thirds of the accepted submissions are published open access. Some countries have problems with the high fees, e.g., South American countries who have limited funds but are not part of wide-ranging open access agreements. The electronic abstracts for the Perth meeting are not online yet. There was some delay from the publisher. Over 3000 pages were published in 2024.

Questions:

Late reviewers do receive emails that their review is not needed any more but not the AE.

This can cause delays as the AE is waiting for a review that will not be written. Informing both reviewer and AE as well as the editor with the same mail still needs to be fixed.

How high is the number of inappropriate submissions? That number is only about 5-10 per year and these submissions get desk rejection. They are easy to recognize either by content that is not appropriate for *MAPS*, strange ideas, or being AI generated. Those submissions are likely impact factor driven; that is why the submission rate of such papers is much higher for *GCA*, for example.

Is there an easy way to get corrections, e.g., of misspelled names for papers already published online? Writing a corrigendum is the only way to correct that. Online is the version of record and cannot be changed after publication.

Is there still a charge when going over the page limit? Charges for exceeding the page limit are part of the contract with Wiley. They do apply for normal submissions only but not for open access. In some cases the editor can waive those charges.

Last year the Publications Committee looked into compiling a list with potential AEs at different career stages and geographic origin. Only few younger AEs were filled in. They are hard to get. It was recommended that the Publication Committee should draw up a new list with potential AEs by asking via the monthly newsletter who would be interested. Further it was suggested to add an option on the membership renewal page to be selected if someone is willing to serve as AE on *MAPS*.

Budget:

The budget shows a small increase compared to 2024. This increase reflects a modest raise of the salary to Agnieszka Baier which was required by the university. The budget needs to be amended to include funding for T. Jull and A. Baier for travelling to the Frankfurt meeting in 2026. The total will raise by that amount. T. Jull will send a revised budget to the treasurer.

Vote 28. Jutta Zipfel moved to accept the *MAPS* budget as amended.

Cari Corrigan second.

All present were in favor.

3. Publications Committee (Rhiannon Mayne) 25 min

3:25 pm UTC

Rhiannon Mayne reported on the activities of the Publication Committee (PC). The focus was mainly on two items, both of which she reviewed in more detail.

1) Marketing report from Wiley

The marketing report is mainly based on personal emails, and tries to increase the number of submissions and makes recommendations on how to raise the visibility of the journal.

Questions identified by the PC when evaluating this report were:

a) Who can see the new dashboard with real-time marketing impact data? The editor has not seen this dashboard and has no control over it. The outreach committee should be brought in contact and evaluate these data.

b) Does Wiley allow MetSoc any control over these marketing campaigns?

The editor has not seen this dashboard and has no control over it

c) Does MetSoc have any particular goals they want to meet with these marketing campaigns?

The PC recommended, if there was some input possible, to refrain from sending emails to compile the marketing report. There were too many emails sent and some had redundant content.

Comments from council:

Any recommendations/materials for how booths at conferences could be advertising the journal should be forwarded to the Outreach Committee and T. Burbine who is organizing the MetSoc booth at AGU.

2) Submission system

The PC received a detailed list from the editorial board of *MAPS*, A. Baier and T. Jull, about problems with the new submission system. That, together with input from two committee members in their roles as AE and author allowed them to condense a list of critical technical issues that are leading to a much higher administrative burden. The impact on the editorial process is already severe and may make it hard to retain AEs on board due to increasing workload.

The Publication Committee recommended a formal communication from the society to Wiley management to highlight these critical issues. Further it recommended collaboration with journals experiencing similar issues by the system change.

For future considerations, for example when renewing the contract with Wiley in 2029, it would be important to document these issues in order to keep a record whether they have been changed or resolved completely within a reasonable time frame. This record should be in hands of the PC.

The following discussion addressed the letter to be written.

In conclusion, it was agreed on to write a one-page letter to Gillian Greenough that she could pass-up to her superiors. This letter should emphasize that the Society shares the vision that *MAPS* should be a success but that there is a strong concern that the journal will fail because people will stop submitting to it or AEs will quit. The focus should be on failure or success rather than the technical problems. In addition, it should emphasize that Wiley is relying on the good will of the AEs and the authors, and using the journal as "one of the early adopters" to work out their new system. This letter will be drafted by the president and R. Mayne.

4. McKay and Wiley Awards (My Riebe) 25 min

3:55 pm UTC

My Riebe summarized her written report and explained how the evaluations and recommendations were reached. The recommendations are for one McKay winner and an alternate and for four Wiley Award winners (plus the alternate, if the recommended McKay winner is selected).

She further outlined that the procedures and rubrics applied were the same as last year. My Riebe stressed that judges should take into account English as a second language. Various scores were calculated to identify the top 50% of the talks. Of these top talks written comments by the judges were evaluated with a LML model, and afterwards manually checked by two committee members.

Regarding the representation of the community, 50% of the recommended winners are non-native speakers which was exactly the same percentage as among all presenters.

Further, My Riebe recommended a) informing students of what a good talk is prior to a conference. b) Changing the specifics for a top score of the rubric "Soundness of Science". Currently it requires best techniques to be used. This may be difficult to achieve in institutions with limited funding and laboratories that are poorly equipped.

Vote 29: Cari Corrigan moved to accept the recommendation for the McKay winner.
Yves Marrocchi second.
All present were in favor.

Vote 30. Yves Marrocchi moved to add the alternate from the McKay award to those four candidates recommended for the Wiley Award, and to accept the recommendation for the Wiley winners as amended.
Yangting Lin second.
All present were in favor.

Council discussed the recommendations made. Council agreed that having some transparency of what the criteria are against that the talks are evaluated would be important. Also sharing some resources of what a good talk is, was supported. This information could be posted on the website and linked to the McKay and Wiley Awards pages. Teaming up of the Awards Committee with the Membership Committee for providing resources should be followed up. Further, talks that did not reach top scores should be evaluated for the reasons why, so that the committee preparing the "what is a good talk" web page can understand what the most common issues are that need correcting.

My Riebe will forward these recommendations to the Awards committee. Unfortunately she will not be able to lead this process herself as her contract is coming to an end and she will likely need to leave the society. The president thanked her for leading this committee for the last two years and doing such a wonderful job.

5. Open discussion

4:05 pm UTC

The president announced the following:

- The Nomination Committee still needs a bit more time to come up with a recommendation.
- Two members of the Impact Committee whose first terms are ending will be renominated.
- There is progress in appointing a new member to replace Devin Schrader on the Nomenclature Committee.

ADJOURN

4:10 pm AWST

The president adjourned the meeting.