

Minutes of the DPF Executive Committee Phone Meeting

April 30, 2004

Present:

Jon Bagger, Daniella Bortoletto, Marcela Carena, Sally Dawson, Judy Franz (part of time), Robert Garisto (part of time), Howie Haber, Gail Hanson (phone, part of time), John Jaros, Boris Kayser (part of time), Young-Kee Kim (phone, part of time), Joe Lykken, Tom McIlrath (part of time), Hitoshi Murayama, Mike Tuts, Erick Weinberg (part of time), John Womersley

Agenda:

Government Committee: finding a new chair, activities (Carithers/Dawson) 6-6:30
Neutrinos: update, discussion of report roll-out, glossy book (Kayser)
Dinner, 7-7:45
Tom McIlrath (APS Treasurer), 7:45-8:00
DPF04 (Gail Hanson on phone) 8:00-8:20
Robert Garristo (PRL) 8:20-8:30
Judy Franz: Meetings (Lykken/Carithers) 8:30-9:00
Long Range Planning: Quantum Universe Report, NRC Study, APS long range planning (Bagger) 9:00-9:30
University representative to HEPAP: discussion, university issues (Dawson/Bagger) 9:30-10:00
Education Committee: Aspen workshop/Colloquium project/World Year of Physics (Murayama) 10:00-10:20
Anything Else? Ethics in Publishing (Jaros); Maternity leave for post-docs (Dawson)?

The meeting convened in the Director's Row J room before the start of the May APS meeting in Denver starting at 6pm (MST). The meeting opened with a discussion of the Government Relations Committee led by Bill Carithers (chair of the committee). Bill outlined the goals for the committee last year, which was to establish a phone and e-mail "tree", allowing one to achieve better than normal response for legislative issues, and to target key districts (the typical response to an email legislative alert is only a few percent). The implementation was to take advantage of the users organizations at SLAC and Fermilab, who would provide the third level of the "tree". For a variety of reasons, this goal was not achieved. There ensued a discussion among, and suggestions from, the DPF Executive Committee members on how to re-invigorate the Committee. As was noted at the last meeting, it is critical to find a willing and enthusiastic Government Relations

Committee chair willing to make a significant time commitment to this effort. A number of additional good suggestions for potential committee chairs were made, and will be followed up. It was suggested that it would be helpful to consider partnering with other Units, thereby achieving a critical mass of people all interested in bringing the plight of science, all of science not just high energy physics, support to the attention of Congress. It was noted that the Government Relations Committee, and the chair in particular, should make sure their message is brought to the staffs of key Congressional districts.

John Jaros, DPF Divisional Councillor, reported to the DPF Executive Committee on the discussions held in the APS Council meeting. There were two main topics: visa issues; and scientific ethics issues. On the topic of visa problems for foreign physicists in the US and for visitors to the US, John reported that the traditional avenues to address these problems through the Science Adviser, the State Department, and others are not making sufficient headway. Even the Congressional committee looking into visa matters appear to be more focused on taking a tough stance on terrorism rather than trying to find a sensible and workable solution to the visa problem. The approach of the APS is now to try and make small steps towards improving the visa situation in concert with the Science and Security Coalition (they are presently working on getting industry to join this coalition) and the various University Associations. In this way they hope to affect small changes – as an example it was suggested that the frequency of visa clearances might be able to be decreased from yearly to once every three years. On the topic of ethics, he reported that an important area of concern (based on the responses on many younger physicists) was the treatment of subordinates, for which one area of concern was the mentoring of graduate students. He reported on the importance of more traditional areas of scientific ethics such as the proper referencing of papers. Jon Bagger then read a statement by the Council on ethics. The DPF Executive meeting will bring these ethical issues to the attention of the membership in a report in the next newsletter. Other topics that were discussed at the Council meeting were budgets, long range planning, and the world year in physics (some of these topics were addressed by others later in the meeting).

Boris Kayser was invited to the DPF Executive Committee meeting to report on the status of the Neutrino Study being sponsored by the DPF, DAP, DNP and the DPB. A midcourse meeting was held on April 1-2 at Berkeley in order to take stock and assess progress, and to redirect working groups if necessary. The first day consisted of working group reports. The second day assessed the activities of the working groups, made plans for the final meeting scheduled in June 28-30 in Snowmass, and discussed the character of the final report due at the end of August. Boris reiterated that while the individual working groups are producing a strong case for the physics, it will all need to be integrated for the final report, and that the working groups will need to address the difficult issue of providing a sensible sequence of experiments in order to achieve the goals. There are two principal goals of the report – one is to convey to the funding agencies and our colleagues the importance of neutrino physics, and the second is to lay out a coherent plan, including difficult choices, on how to achieve the physics goals. The final report is expected to be a “layered” document starting with an executive summary, then a modest size (~30 page) document identifying the open questions and putting forward a coherent strategy for answering them, followed by a detailed (many hundred

page) section for the expert reader. A writing group of six is being assembled to put this document together; this group includes a number of the members of the coordinating committee. There was some discussion on the form of the final report, with a consensus emerging that the principal mode of distribution to the high energy community will be electronic, but that hard copies will be published in limited quantities for selected distribution to the funding agencies and libraries. Although the dates (June 28-30) and location (Snowmass) of the final meeting have been set, the formal announcement cannot yet go out until all the permissions from Fermilab have been given. The DPF Executive Committee would like to advise the membership of these dates so that our colleagues can make appropriate travel plans. The timescale for producing a final report by August was noted to be aggressive, although necessary if it is to have an influence in the Washington budget process. The tentative conclusions of the study will be discussed with funding agencies, providing them with an opportunity to express any concerns they may have. In addition to the full report, there are plans to produce a “glossy booklet” for a more general audience and legislators. Estimates for the cost of such a booklet are in the range of \$60k. There are three potential requests from the study group leaders to the DPF: the presence of the DPF leadership at the final meeting to help forge a consensus if necessary; some amount of financial help from the DPF; and an awareness that the study will require significant help from support staff that are not now available. In the discussion that ensued the issue of the contributions of the other divisions sponsoring the study was raised. The DPF leadership can play a role in encouraging a more active participation by the other divisions. Finally there was a discussion on the roll-out of the final report. Boris indicated there are opportunities to receive feedback on the report from the funding agencies in late May, and to receive public comments sometime in July when essentially the final draft will be available. It was suggested that the study leaders should present the report internationally once it is completed.

Hitoshi Murayama presented a report on the Colloquium Project, which had been discussed in the Education and Outreach Committee. This project would provide a database of colloquium speakers. The cost of developing such a database would be approximately \$1-2k. The DPF would also have to commit to the long term maintenance of the database. There was a discussion of the mechanism for quality control, how submission restrictions might be implemented, the development of keywords for the database. Hitoshi together with the Outreach Committee will develop a proposal.

Tom McIlrath, APS Treasurer, presented a report on the financial health of the Society. The Society is financially strong, with the financial performance this year expected to be in the black. Subscriptions are holding steady, and new products are being developed that will provide new revenue streams. There are \$60M in reserves and \$42M in annual expenses. The cost of publications is decreasing after the contract for Physical Review D was rebid and awarded to a new publisher, Beacon, starting in July instead of the traditional publisher, AIP. Based on this success, the Society will go out for bids for the publication of Physical Review C. Savings in the cost of these publications will be passed on to the subscribers. The DPF Executive was pleased by these developments.

Gail Hanson reported by phone on the status of the DPF 2004 preparations. The parallel session conveners (~20) are selected with a few more to go. The conference posters have been printed and will be mailed to the DPF membership using APS services. The plans for the registration process are being finalized, and the web page is in place (<http://www.dpf2004.org>). The proceedings, produced by World Scientific, will be published on the web and a limited number of printed reports will be made available for libraries. The DPF Executive Committee suggested that the Quantum Universe report would be available by the time of DPF 2004, and that the meeting would be an excellent venue in which to present the results of the report. The town meeting could be an appropriate place for that presentation – the DPF Executive Committee will provide suggestions for the Town meeting agenda.

The editor of PRL, Robert Garristo, presented a report on the state of the journal. He reported that the journal is healthy with submissions up 8% overall for 2002-2003. The first quarter of 2004 shows an even greater increase. Submission for particle physics are flat. Three new editors have been hired to deal with Condensed Matter papers. The PRL review panel has met and its preliminary conclusion is that the editors should play a stronger role in vetting papers. As Paul Langacker nears the end of his second term, PRL is looking for someone to replace him – the DPF Executive Committee suggested some names. PRL is also seeking advice on how to handle authorship for large collaborations – presently all papers need at least one human author (as opposed to a group name), with there are no different degrees of authorship for multi-author papers.

Judy Franz, Executive Officer of the APS, spoke on numerous topics. She started by reminding the DPF Executive Committee that 2005 is the “World Year in Physics” and encouraging all to participate and to “brand” all activities with the official logo. Anyone planning events should inform the APS staff. The kickoff for the World Year in Physics will be in Paris, with the US start at the February AAAS meeting. Mike Barnett is chair of coordinating World Year in Physics activities for the DPF. Judy mentioned that the APS has reached the half way mark on a capital campaign to raise \$4M for education and outreach activities. Jon Bagger appointed a committee (Joe Lykken, Nick Hadley, and Marty Breidenbach) to provide input to the APS on the format of meetings. The format at the next APS meetings will be quite different: shorter sessions with three rather than five invited talks (providing more time for lunch); the meeting will run for four days rather than three and a half; there will be 12 periods of three talks each (talk times will remain the same); DPF will have 13 talks. The main participants at the meeting will be DNP, DPF, and DAP. The Committee voiced their concerns over the high cost of the meetings. Judy responded that the APS is looking to reduce costs by holding meetings in less expensive cities, but that trying to find a middle ground to satisfy all participants was difficult. Holding meetings in a hotel rather than a convention center is also a means to hold down costs (as is being done at the Denver meeting this year). When the Committee asked why the hotel conference price was higher than discounted prices available online, the explanation was that the APS must negotiate prices and guarantee a minimum number of bookings years in advance. The DPF Executive Committee offered to gather talks so that the APS could post them – the APS does not have the resources to gather talks, but does have the resources to post them on the web. That raised the issue of difficulties

encountered by the conference organizers because the web based program details were not kept up to date, leading to some confusion in scheduling talks. Judy explained that the APS that the old software used for this will be changing soon. The DPF Committee asked if someone from the DPF could be on the site selection committee – Judy agreed that would certainly be possible. The next decision to be made is for the 2007 meeting. There was a suggestion made that perhaps alternate years could accommodate the needs of one Division over the others, however the problem for the APS is that they do not know which Division will be attending which meeting, making such planning difficult. The 2006 meeting will be in Dallas (driven by the DAP).

Jon Bagger, past DPF Chair, made a presentation on the Strategic Planning exercise undertaken by the APS Executive Board and the Council. He outlined a number of areas being studied by this group, including: physics, meetings, journals, governance, units, international, education, Washington, public affairs, profession, societies. Each of these areas has a Board members coordinating that aspect of the exercise. He urged that the DPF should provide answers and opinions before June. John then discussed the Quantum Universe report. This report reframes the questions raised in the HEPAP long range plan. The 2004 DPF meeting at Riverside will present the opportunity to roll-out this report to a wider audience. Finally John talked about the Board on Physics and Astronomy (BPA) study to be produced under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences. The idea is to provide a 15 year plan for the future of HEP with the opportunities and objectives identified, as well as setting priorities. The study would likely be chaired by someone from outside the field, having credibility with the legislators in Washington, with a vice or co- chair in the field. He raised the issue of whether the DPF could sponsor a series of town meetings. The final report would be presented to the heads of the funding agencies.

Erick Weinberg, PRD editor, addressed the committee seeking advice on the division of topics between PRC and PRD. The issue was whether some topics should be moved from PRD to PRC. The DPF Executive Committee agreed with Erick that the present range of areas handled by PRD was appropriate and did not need revision.

Hitoshi Murayama returned to the topic of the Colloquium project. He proposed to include more general topics and levels in the talk database. He mentioned that it would be important to have a regular expiration date on the talks and regular updating of talks as needed. The issue of how to advertise this database was raised. The consensus was that the information about this database should be sent to Department chairs (who will forward it to their Colloquium Committees) and to Science Museums.

Sally Dawson returned to a number of topics. She said that the DPF needs a proposal from the neutrino study leaders on what they want specifically from the DPF and the other divisions sponsoring the study. Sally said that Joe Kroll had agreed to replace Chip Brock as the university representative on HEPAP. Sally mentioned that there was a discussion of the University program at HEPAP presented by Chip Brock, who suggested that a glossy brochure highlighting the university aspects of the program would be helpful. Sally reported that there are no new developments on the issue of maternity leave for postdocs.

John Jaros, Divisional Councillor, talked about ethics in publishing. In addition to the more traditional ethical issues involving falsification of data, the ethical treatment of subordinates, one important item raised was the issue of “self-plagiarized” material. Much of this problem could be addressed by making sure that authors properly reference previous work, but it is important that the awareness of this issue be raised. In the coming months there will be an article in Physics Today on ethics (it would be appropriate to address the specific issue of self-plagiarism in a sidebar article). This same issue will be the topic of an article in the upcoming DPF newsletter.

The meeting ended at about 10:30pm

Submitted by Mike Tuts (Secretary/Treasurer)