

## **DPF Executive Committee Meeting**

**May 4, 2009**

### **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  
**Guest:** Sekhar Chivukula, Robert Garisto, Dennis Kovar, Mike Lubell, and Jim Riedy

### **Agenda and minutes**

The DPF EC Chair Boris Kayser convened the meeting at the Denver APS meeting at 7:00pm on May 4, 2009. The minutes below include links to some of the talks given at the meeting. They can be found at:

<http://web.phy.duke.edu/~goshaw/DPF-EC-2009%20Talks>

#### **1. The DOE perspective on our field (Dennis Kovar). See the web link to his talk.**

Dennis summarized the overall goals of the US HEP program, and the difficulties encountered with the constraints imposed by the FY08 budget. The impact of this budget (-8.4%) imposed challenges, but the core research activities were protected and quality science delivered. There were however significant impacts: staff reductions at Fermilab and SLAC; reduction of the B-factory schedule; work stoppage on Nova; and ILC and SRF R&D at a minimal level.

The HEPAP P5 report has provided guidance for the US HEP strategic plan under four budget scenarios. Dennis reviewed the three frontiers described in the P5 report: energy frontier, intensity frontier and cosmic frontier. He emphasized that this plan will deliver not only important basic science, but also contribute to development of new technologies and strengthen the US scientific workforce.

He then discussed the FY09 budget. The base funding of \$795.7M for HEP is +10% compared to FY08 and above cost-of-living from FY-07. In addition HEP will receive > \$200M from Recovery Act funding. Pages 15 and 16 of his talk detail the changes in funding level for specific segments of the US HEP program.

Dennis ended his presentation with comments on advanced technology and accelerator R&D. In recent years US leadership in these areas has been challenged by other regions and countries. The OHEP has begun to address this technology gap. In particular the OHEP will sponsor an Accelerator R&D Workshop in 2009 to discuss broad aspects of accelerator applications and the associated needs for federal and private sector support.

#### **2. The NSF perspective on our field (Jim Riedy). See the web link to his talk.**

Jim reported on a recent NSF sub-panel review of EPP. This concluded that the process of reviewing proposals is excellent, and provides the basis for the resulting funding decisions. The report also says “We especially commend EPP for pro-active efforts to build cooperative relationships within NSF ...”.

Jim then reviewed the short, intermediate and long-term science priorities of EPP. These include completion of the research programs at the Tevatron, BaBar and CLEO; exploitation of the discoveries at the LHC; utilization of the potential of DUSEL; strengthening University experiment and theory programs; and participation with DOE in long-range plans for the energy and intensity frontiers. For more details see page 4 of

Jim's talk.

The FY09 EPP budget was not yet available but Jim gave an overview of the distribution of funding from past years for various science programs (page 8 of his talk). EPP and PNA plan to make standard grants using ARRA funds; budget planning through FY13 shows this can be done within a stable program. He then discussed in some details the priorities for HEP from EPP and related NSF programs. A major new direction will be to support the broad science program that will be possible with the DUSEL laboratory.

In conclusion Jim reviewed the fundamental tenants of the EPP program: a mandate to support University Groups; fostering partnerships within NSF; use the P5 and PASAG reports for guidance: continuing response to proposals via merit review.

**3. The Washington perspective on science and the outlook (Mike Lubell). See the web link to his talk.**

Mike gave an extensive overview of the recent ups and downs of science funding. An excellent summary of the stimulus and FY09 base funding, compared to past years, can be found on page 19 of this talk. His appraisal was that the outlook for basic science in FY10 is reasonably good, but that the science community will need to make a strong effort to communicate with congress if we are to maintain our recent gains in FY11 and beyond.

**4. The University Program: a report and discussion (Sarah Eno). See the web link to her talk.**

The Chair of HEPAP, Mel Shochet, formed a sub committee to focus on HEP university programs and bring any problems in the program to the attention of HEPAP and the agencies. The current members of the subcommittee are: Martina Artuso (Syracuse), Alice Bean (Kansas), Sarah Eno (Chair, Maryland), Boris Kayser (FNAL), Dan Marlow (Princeton) and Hank Sobel (Irvine).

Sarah reviewed recent activities of this subcommittee. They have requested demographic statistics from DOE and NSF, and other information relevant to the health of university programs. This is currently being compiled. In addition they have prepared a short survey that will be sent to all university groups. The purpose is to better understand how increased funding would be used to enhance research efforts, and to ascertain the impact of the decline in university infrastructure. See the last page of Sarah's talk for the questions in the survey.

**5. Possible web-based job site for HEP (Sekhar Chivukula). See the web link to his talk.**

Sekhar discussed the burden put on post doc applicants and evaluators when people apply for a large number (sometimes 100's) of theory positions. He pointed out that the duplication of applications and reference letters could be greatly reduced by making use of a central "Physicsjobs" web site similar to the one already in operation for "Mathjobs". A web-based job site sponsored by the American Math Society has been in operation since 2000 and is used by over 200 Mathematics Departments in North America. The site academicjobsonline.org is now open to other users. Sekhar described the operation of the site for employers, applicants and referees. It is accessible through Duke University at the low cost of \$50/year/research group.

The plan is to draft an open letter to all HEP theory colleagues describing this opportunity. The goal would be to get ~ 20 HEPT groups to commit to the use of this service for job applications in 2009-2010.

Sekhar ended by requesting that DPF, after review, endorse the use of the academicjobsonline service. If it is supported, he requested help in making this more useful to the HEP community and promoting its use.

#### **6. APS journal related issues (Robert Garisto).**

Robert discussed some recent innovations in APS journals. These include the introduction of “PRL Suggestions” that highlights 4 papers/week of interest to a broad physics audience. In addition the new online journal “Physics” provides the opportunity for a view of important trends and viewpoints, in addition to synopses of important physics developments.

He also described the challenges facing APS journals to maintain their position of leadership in the worldwide publishing community. The “impact” metric of journals is sometimes used to measure of their quality. This measure is sometimes not so appropriate for fields such as HEP. Also, the advent LHC physics will produce publications in a diverse set of journals in addition to PRL and PRD.

One significant change to PRL in response to these circumstances will be to reduce the number of accepted publications by 1/3 to 1/2. This will be done by the increased scrutiny of papers, selecting those with highest science impact.

#### **7. Comments from the perspective of APS (Judy Franz).**

Judy pointed out that DPF Business meetings are specified in our Bylaws, and suggested we consider holding these at future APS meetings. The next “April” APS meeting will be held in February in Washington DC in association with the AAPT. She also mentioned that 2010 will be a Laser Fest for both the APS and the Optical society, and requested that DPF consider how our field might make contributions to this celebration.

At this point the EC heartily congratulated Judy on her 15 years of service as President of the APS.

#### **8. General discussion of DPF activities and action items (DPF EC).**

The EC members then continued a discussion of how the role of the DPF EC might be strengthened. Some suggestions were:

- Assignments by the Chair to various DPF activities to the EC members
- Clarifying the responsibilities of the EC by establishing a calendar of events
- More frequent EC phone meetings
- Better communication with the DPF community through Newsletters or other online media

Chip Brock then initiated a conversation about the University Sub-panel Report and associated university issues. This resulted in a useful exchange of views somewhat damped by the lateness of the hour. Everyone agreed that this is an important topic and that the discussion would be continued at the next DPF EC meeting.

Action items:

- Respond to request made to DPF for support of a “Physicsjobs” web site
- Review ways that the DPF EC can represent and respond to concerns of the HEP community
- Establish dates for next phone EC meeting, and the EC and DPF business meeting at DPF09 (Wayne State)
- Continue the discussion of University and Lab concerns about HEP support

END DPF EC Minutes

Al Goshaw