

DPF Executive Committee Meeting

**December 1, 2009
Fermilab**

Attending

DPF EC: Chip Brock, Bob Cahn, Janet Conrad, Cecilia Gerber, Al Goshaw, JoAnne Hewett, Boris Kayser, Andreas Kronfeld, Patty McBride, Ritchie Patterson, Kevin Pitts, David Saltzberg
Regrets: Janet Conrad

Agenda and minutes

The DPF EC Chair Boris Kayser convened the meeting at 9:00am on December 1, 2009.

1. Planning for future DPF meetings.

The question of the proper timing of DPF meetings was discussed. In the past the meetings have been held at about 18 month intervals. Is this the best spacing? There is also the issue of conflicts with other major conferences (ICHEP, LP, EPS, etc.). How can we improve the usefulness and impact of the DPF meetings?

Boris suggested scheduling DPF meetings every two years, perhaps in odd-numbered years to allow some coordination with EPS meetings. Cecilia emphasized the importance of maintaining opportunities for students to present talks. A discussion ensued on the general format of meetings. The value of a meeting devoted entirely to HEP in addition to the April APS/DPF meeting was noted. A consensus emerged for scheduling DPF meetings every two years, perhaps in mid to late September.

ACTION: Form a Sub-committee to follow up on how the timing and format of DPF meeting could be changed to better serve the DPF community.

2. Consideration of additional DPF Prizes

Currently the DPF sponsors the following annual awards:

- The Sakuari Prize (particle theory)
- The Panofsky Prize (experimental particle physics)
- The Wilson Prize (joint with DPB) (accelerator physics)
- The Tanaka Award (outstanding doctoral thesis)

Several issues were discussed. In selecting winners for the Panofsky Prize it is difficult to identify individuals in very large collaborations. The monetary value of the prizes varies, and it would be desirable to increase their endowments to a level of about \$200K. It was also noted that there are no prizes/awards for post-PhD young scientists.

ACTION: Form a DPF Sub-committee to review the current DPF prizes/awards and study options for additional recognitions. This requires consultation with the APS Prize Committee.

3. Communication issues, including the DPF Newsletter

David reported on his efforts to collect articles for the DPF Newsletter. His goal was to have all the following articles in hand by December 6.

- HEPAP Report (Mel Shochet)
- Report from Washington (Bill Foster)
- Summary of DPF meetings (Patty McBride)
- DPF election results (Al Goshaw)
- LHC report
- Fermilab report
- Letter from DPF Chair (Boris Kayser)

David expressed the frustration of getting people to promptly respond, and pointed out that news gets quickly out of date. Should DPF consider options other than a paper Newsletter? Perhaps web postings or blogs?

4. Role of DPF in US HEP planning

There was a general discussion of the role the DPF Executive Committee might have in constructively contributing to planning of the US HEP research program. As elected representatives of the DPF community, EC members have a responsibility to represent the broad consensus of the membership. Some possible issues to explore:

- continuing support of experiments after completion of construction
- university infrastructure
- adaptation to participating in experiments based off-shore
- priorities for US based experiments

Various approaches were discussed to how the DPF might organize these discussions. One suggestion was a DPF-appointed panel to broadly look at the US HEP science program. It was noted that any DPF activities must be closely coordinated with the DOE and NSF agencies, HEPAP and P5.

5. Promoting globalization of HEP

Boris raised the issue of how DPF might contribute to the health of HEP throughout the world. The recent science-funding crisis in Japan was mentioned as an example of a global concern. Better coordination of DPF conferences with EPS and JPS might be useful. Would a DPF Committee on globalization be useful? Boris agreed to contact Amy Flatten at APS to discuss how DPF can help Japanese science in its current difficulty. Bob Cahn suggested contacting John Ellis at CERN for issues related to LHC participation.

6. An offshore HEP users group?

Chip initiated a discussion of the challenges faced by US scientists when HEP experimental programs are based offshore. The US LHC Users organization is an example of an organization formed to deal with these issues. How can DPF contribute to the support of LHC and other offshore experimental programs? One way is participation in trips to Washington where concerns specific to doing research abroad could be raised. It was agreed that continuing DPF support of joint UEC, SLUO and USLUO DC visits is very important.

7. The Study Abroad Initiative

The DPF EC agreed to support a proposal by Homer Neal to develop a Study Abroad Program at CERN. A commitment of \$10K was made by the DPF EC for the development of this proposal. The EC should receive a report on the use of these funds and the progress of the proposal.

8. Formation of DPF Sub-committees

In order to better distribute the responsibilities of the DPF EC, it was agreed that sub-committees should be formed. The following were proposed:

- Newsletter and Communications (David Salzberg)
- Washington DC trips, outreach, lobbying (Chip will follow up)
- Appointment of Prize committees (proposed that the Chair-elect appoint these)
- Nominating committee for EC members (Chip will follow up)
- Fellowship Committee (Boris will follow up)
- DPF student travel support (Ritchie Patterson)
- Future DPF Conferences (Chip and Kevin)
- Additional DPF prize awards (Boris, JoAnne)

END DPF EC Minutes
Al Goshaw