TC306 meeting 1/2026

Date: Thursday 22nd January, 14:30 CET

Place: online (Meet)

Agenda

1. Communications
2. Ongoing initiatives
3. New initiatives
4. Other issues

Participants

Name	Country	Membership	Attendance
Asif Ahmed	USA	Nominated Member	Yes
David Airey	Australia	Nominated Member	
George Anoyatis	Belgium	Nominated Member	Yes
John Atkinson	United Kingdom	Nominated Member	
Katia Bicalho	Brazil	Nominated Member	
Giovanna Biscontin	United Kingdom	Corresponding Member	
Gretchen Bohnhoff	USA	Nominated Member	apologies
Brian Byrne	Ireland	Corresponding Member	
Michele Calvello	Italy	TC Chair	Yes
Francesca Ceccato	Italy	Nominated by TC Chair	apologies
Ilhan Chang	South Korea	Corresponding Member	
Liang Cui	Canada	Nominated Member	
Vasiliki Dimitriadi	Greece	Corresponding Member	
Kurt Douglas	Australia	Nominated Member	Yes
Silvina Echazú Lamas	Argentina	Nominated Member	Yes
Tugba Eskişar Tefçi	Turkey	Nominated Member	Yes
George Fanourakis	South Africa	Nominated Member	Yes
Wolfgang Fellin	Austria	Nominated Member	Yes
Ana Heitor	UK	Corresponding Member	Yes
Mark Jaksa	Australia	Corresponding Member	
Orianne Jenck	France	Nominated Member	Yes
Polyxeni Kallioglou	Greece	Corresponding Member	Yes
Mamoru Kikumoto	Japan	Nominated Member	
Emil Mejlhede Kinslev	Denmark	Nominated Member	Yes

Ansgar Kirsch	Germany	Nominated Member	apologies
Katharina Kluge	Germany	Nominated Member	apologies
Biljana Kovačević Zelić	Croatia	Nominated Member	Yes
Tae-Hyuk Kwon	South Korea	Nominated Member	
Robert Lanzafame	USA	Corresponding Member	Yes
Alberto Ledesma	Spain	Nominated Member	Yes
Andy Leung	Hong Kong	Nominated Member	
Xia Li	China	Nominated Member	Yes
Huabei Liu	China	Nominated Member	
Charles MacRobert	South Africa	Nominated Member	Yes
Francisco Javier Manzano Diosdado	Spain	Corresponding Member	
Farimah Masrouri	France	Nominated Member	Yes
Manuel Matos Fernandes	Portugal	Nominated Member	
Bryan McCabe	Ireland	Nominated Member	
Silvana Montoya-Noguera	Colombia	Nominated Member	
Toshifumi Mukunoki	Japan	Nominated Member	
Soon Min Ng	Malaysia	Nominated Member	Yes
Hideki Ohta	Japan	Corresponding Member	Yes
Rolando Orense	New Zealand	Nominated Member	apologies
Marina Pantazidou	Greece	TC Vice chair	Yes
Anitha G. Pillai	India	Nominated Member	
Margarida Fernandez Pinho Lopes	Portugal	TC Secretary	Yes
Muhsin Rahal	Lebanon	Nominated Member	Yes
Anna Ramón Tarragona	Spain	Corresponding Member	
M. Rama Rao	India	Nominated Member	
Saibaba Reddy	India	Corresponding Member	
Rodrigo Salgado	United States	Nominated by TC Chair	
Thomas Shire	United Kingdom	Nominated Member	
Klaas Siderius	Netherlands	Nominated Member	
Ezra Tjung	Indonesia	Nominated Member	
Francisco Javier Torrijo	Spain	Nominated Member	
Roberto Valentino	Italy	Nominated Member	
Roberto Vassallo	Italy	Nominated Member	Yes
Vasiliki Xenaki	Greece	Nominated Member	
Jun Yang	Hong Kong	Nominated Member	
Fayrouz Yasser	Egypt	Nominated Member	

Agenda point 1 "Communications"

[by Michele Calvello]

TC306 members for new ISSMGE Journal Editorial Board. The Chair of the ISSMGE Publications Oversight Committee informed me that ISSMGE is launching a new journal on Geotechnical Engineering Research and requested "each TC to propose two members of their committee who would be qualified and willing to serve on the inaugural editorial board for the journal." I proposed, the following two TC members: Marina Pantazidou; Alberto Ledesma.

Follow up activities from GEE2025

- The next ISSMGE bulletin, due to be published soon, will have an informational article on GEE 2025, written by Marina Pantazidou, highlighting all plenary lectures.
- All the articles published in the conference proceedings are already indexed in Scopus

EduHackathon at FOMLIG2025. The EduHackathon was held during the 3rd Workshop on the Future of Machine Learning in Geotechnics (FOMLIG2025), held in Florence on October 15-17, to explore the potential usefulness of Large Language Models and other generative AI tools within geotechnical education. The session in Florence has two parts: 1) the presentation of eight "experiments" conducted by members of a group of geotechnical engineering educators before the conference; 2) a floor discussion on the topics presented in the first part and on the results of a survey carried out among conference participants in the days preceding the workshop. An article on this experience will be written and submitted to a special issue of the journal Geodata and AI (https://www.sciencedirect.com/special-issue/327703/ethics-and-intelligences-for-a-geotechnical-renaissance).

GEE2029. In the previous meeting it was decided that a call for expressions of interest would start at the beginning of 2026, with the goal of having a decision by the summer of 2026. TC306 also needs to initiate with the ISSMGE board the procedure for the new round of Burland lectures (the board each time gives approval for 12 years, or 3 lectures). It is important to first have the place of the conference and then initiate the procedure for selecting the 4th Burland Lecturer.

Agenda point 2 "Ongoing initiatives"

2.1. Peer-reviewed Educational Materials ISSMGE section

[Marina Pantazidou] highlighted the key features of this initiative (https://www.issmge.org/education/peer-reviewed-educational-materials). More specifically [MP] pointed out the need for a systematic peer review process that we need to define and prepare, and that requires time, as we know very well what peer review is for research, but we don't know what peer review is in education.

[Michele Calvello] said that this issue will also be addressed later during another agenda item.

2.2. GEE posts

[Michele Calvello] highlighted the key features of this initiative (i.e., a short contribution written by a TC306 member, after an initial draft is discussed within the TC so that the final post reflects the result of this

interaction) and showed the two existing examples published online on our web page (https://www.issmge.org/committees/technical-committees/impact-on-society/geo-education).

[Marina Pantazidou] informed everyone that there is material for a GEE post relative to a video sent previously by [MP] to members. Some relevant contributions have been received, and a new GEE post will be produced during 2026.

[Robert Lanzafame] asked how one of these posts can be initiated. [Michele Calvello] explains that there is no formal procedure in place and suggests that, if members have an idea, they should send the initial draft to the TC Officers, who will circulate it in the committee asking for comments and/or contributions.

[Michele Calvello] invited all members to be proactive and propose ideas and initial drafts for GEE post, in order to relaunch and sustain this initiative.

2.3. Award for TC306 Young Educators

[Marina Pantazidou] presented an idea to promote young people active in geoengineering education. This has been discussed previously in 2024 (Lisbon) and 2025 (Nancy). The main features are to: i) encourage younger members to create small-scale educational materials despite lacking pieces of subject-matter knowledge; ii) create an opportunity for respected senior colleagues to hand down (transmit) their expert knowledge to the younger; iii) generate an end-product should be educational to instructors. [MP] suggests running one or two pilot editions. For that, the suggested procedure for a pilot is for a younger member of TC306 to submit a brief proposal with intended contribution and 1-2 senior colleagues to be consulted.

[Michele Calvello] suggested discussion the age limit for a member to be considered Young. [George Farounakis] commented it could be 40 years, and not 35 years as most typically done. [George Anoyatis] suggested the alternative to consider the career stage, rather than age, and to define the award accordingly (early-career members award). [Emil Mejlhede Kinslev] said that the 35-year-old age limit was introduced in the world of sports, and considering that we're talking science it's fine to push it as long as we're not awarding a young geotechnical engineers award to someone obviously old.

from the chat

[Marina Pantazidou] COMPOSITION OF THE YMPG: The YMPG is transitioning from a previous structure of having representation from each of the ISSMGE regions to a smaller Core Team. The Core Team consists of ISSMGE members, 35 years of age or younger at the time of appointment.

[Ana Heitor] I think we also need to think that now many post docs take up 5 to 10 years to get a tenure position, and colleagues with diverse pathways, Early career educator would be better (say within few years of their lecturer appointment)

[Robert Lanzafame] +1 for "early career" based definition. For example, phd with a teaching role and within X years of starting as a faculty member

[Kurt Douglas] Definition of 'early career/young' should align with what you want to achieve i.e. who do you want the award to assist?

[Marina Pantazidou] A pilot will be promoted, considering all these contributions and then the award will hopefully evolve into a more consolidated version after the pilot.

Agenda point 3 "New initiatives"

3.1. TC306 web ecosystem and dissemination of relevant information

[Michele Calvello] reminded that information on the activities of TC306 is reported and stored in different online venues, all of them accessible from the landing page of the TC306 web portal hosted by ISSMGE (https://www.issmge.org/committees/technical-committees/impact-on-society/geo-education).

The following two new initiatives of this ecosystem were highlighted:

- **TC306 ZENODO community**: TC306 educational material with DOI. The first item published on this repository is the GEE2020 proceedings (https://zenodo.org/records/18313485)
- **Email distribution list**: distribution list of Geotechnical Engineering Education news (on Google groups). It is a distribution list that TC306 members and other interested educators can join to disseminate and receive news related to Geotechnical Engineering Education (https://groups.google.com/g/geotechnical-engineering-education).

The specificities of the different venues were discussed in relation to how to properly disseminate news on educational material available online.

[Michele Calvello] mentioned the case of a recent collection of "Soil testing videos" (9 videos 10-14 minutes long each) produced by the Geotechnical division of the Hong Kong Institution of Engineers (https://hkieged.org/public/soil-testing-video-series), with a request for advertisement coming from two Hong Kong colleagues, Andy YF Leung (TC306 member) and Anthony Leung.

[Michele Calvello] opened the discussion on whether the TC should use this request to launch a review process, by asking the contributors for more information and start a pilot on peer-review of video material. [Marina Pantazidou] suggested a procedure similar to that used for reviewing a book proposal, in which authors send a sample chapter to be analysed by the editor. [MP] also pointed out the need to have transcripts of videos, to allow the peer review process. [Alberto Ledesma] pointed out that in the case of TC306 the review process is done on a voluntary basis and not paid for (as is the case of book proposals) and promoted the idea of having a repository of links to know what's available. [Michele Calvello] said that a repository created and managed by the TC without any review process would anyway be considered a collection of material implicitly endorsed by the TC, even if one states that the quality of the material has not been checked, and that could lead to some people using it for self-promotion of their own material. An existing geotechnical engineering repository exists in the United States (https://usucger.org/teaching-aids/) managed by the United States Universities Council on Geotechnical Education and Research USUCGER. [Robert Lanzafame] suggested using a GEE post to review to analyse one or two videos, and expressed availability to engage in such a review, then interacting with the video authors, ending with posting a GEE post. Both [Michele Calvello] and [Marina Pantazidou] welcomed the suggestion.

from the chat

[Ana Heitor] In Leeds we have an initiative on decolonising the curriculum, so all these materials could be useful to broaden students' knowledge (e.g. different types of soils). I am happy to help with review of 1 or 2 videos from Hong Kong, but ideally would like to align that when I am teaching the relevant module, e.g. from October 2026.

[Michele Calvello] broadened the discussion mentioning a recent email received from a professor at Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University (China) aimed at discussing "*a potential [..] series of short educational videos (3-7 minutes) [..] to introduce students to innovations and practical applications of geotechnical engineering in an engaging way.*" A demonstration was provided for what these videos may look like (https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLA9LjqdrlOj2wYRj0rqKcotkva10UmhF6). [MC] noted that all the videos were created with NotebookLM (an AI tool), each one starting from a single research paper. It is clear that everything was done automatically without any human review. This can be done in a matter of minutes by the students themselves, and possibly the web is soon going to be flushed with videos like these. The following questions can be posed. What do we need to produce good quality (peer-reviewed) short educational videos for the purpose required? Do we need to spend time producing good quality engaging and easy-to-understand videos like the ones produced almost instantly by AI tools?

[Michele Calvello] also asked how to act when people reach the TC to advertise their educational material. [Marina Pantazidou] replied that we have an established dissemination venue on GeoWorld with over 2000 members (https://www.mygeoworld.com/groups/geo-engineering-education-tc306) that can be used by everyone. [Marina Pantazidou] added that reviewing a video is very challenging, as often they appear very nice and palatable but then, thinking seriously about it, you find problems and you have to spend a lot of time to articulate these problems. And there's always the catch that videos prepared for an audience of students may have the science and technical content fudged out.

3.2. Proposals by members

[Michele Calvello] opened the discussion to identify possible ideas for developing some group initiatives, specifically encouraging the co-design and co-production of small-size educational material within small-size task forces, working on clearly defined and relatively short time frames.

from the chat

[Roberto Vassallo] I'd like to communicate something to you. Just today, some structural engineering colleaugues asked me to join a group aiming at opening a small educational lab at our university focused on dynamics. They're going to buy a small shaking table to be used for demonstrations and tutorials for our students. They asked if I whish to add a geotechnical part, I said yes, I'm interested to do something like that, with structures and geotechnics working together. If everything goes fine and the lab is started, this would be a nice initiative to share with our TC. Does any of you have experience on educational initiatives like that focused on soil dynamics? Would any of you want to collaborate by similar activities at their university? If so, we might talk about it another time, or you can contact me at roberto.vassallo@unibas.it

[Robert Lanzafame] I have 2 ideas/proposals that already align with some things we have discussed today: 1. I am willing to help review things and give feedback. Particularly if anyone is interested in things that involve programming/computation, but not exclusively (as discussed in meeting, reviewing a video and giving feedback is a great way I can start!). 2. I might teach foundation engineering later this spring and will prepare materials with the intent of sharing as small online materials after. If anyone would like to share existing materials or collaborate from now for the next 2 months, please let me know Easiest way to get in is touch: lanzafame.robert@gmail.com

[Michele Calvello] asked immediate feedback from the participants in relation to the following potential online initiatives he could decide to initiate in the future (for now the ideas essentially coincide with the titles of the initiatives):

- Geotechnical Engineering Education colloquia. Interviews with authors of published articles (for instance in GEE conference proceedings) to further disseminate the Geotechnical Engineering Education issues that are tackled in those articles, or with authors of geotechnical books to discuss the stories beyond the development and the structure of those books.
- GEE whiteboard co-teaching. More than one educator tackling single geotechnical topics, concepts, formulas or parameters.
- Panel discussions on debated themes.
- Powerful analogies. Collection of analogies or metaphors used to explain geotechnical concepts.

Some discussion followed.

[Marina Pantazidou] liked the idea of the debate. ICRM has a debate format and already run a few of them (https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLJDDx6DYJKNCENzmPzTbozT24fLrM_9y6). [MP] has watched one but didn't particularly like it, perhaps that could be a starting point for TC306 to improve. [Alberto Ledesma] said it is an idea worth thinking about, yet it is important to consider that the outcome of such initiatives may be unpredictable.

[Ana Heitor] commented that the colloquia/interviews could work as podcasts in a digestible format (e.g., 15 of light-hearted conversations), for instance tailored to people that are starting out as lecturers.

from the chat

[Ana Heitor] on the analogies, I think having examples of demos we can use in classroom to illustrate concepts would be excellent too, there was a book on this a few years ago and I sometimes still some their demos

[Charles MacRobert] analogies would be good

[George Farounakis] I also favour the use of analogies.

[Wolfgang Fellin] Maybe something like this: https://diglib.uibk.ac.at/urn/urn:nbn:at:at-ubi:3-22981; Portable hands-on experiments in geotechnical education

Agenda point 5 "Other issues"

[Michele Calvello] remembered everyone NOT TO FORGET to subscribe to our new distribution list: https://groups.google.com/g/geotechnical-engineering-education

Closure

The meeting ends at 16:10 CET