

Minutes of the DPF Executive Committee Phone Meeting

January 3, 2005

Present on phone: Jon Bagger, Bill Carithers, Andrew Cohen, Sally Dawson, Sarah Eno, George Gollin (guest), Howie Haber, John Jaros, Joe Lykken, Hitoshi Murayama, Natalie Roe, Liz Simmons, John Womersley

Agenda:

- Welcome new members, thank retiring members (Dawson)
- Nomination input (Dawson)
- Financial Report (Tuts)
- DPF/APS Meetings (Dawson/Lykken)
- Neutrino Study (Dawson)
- EPP2010 (Dawson/Carithers/Jaros)
- Outreach Committee Report (Simmons/Murayama)
- Government Committee (Gollin)
- Maternity Policy report (Dawson)
- Plans for 2005 (Carithers)
- World year of physics (Carithers)
- Report on APS Council Meeting (Jaros)
- Other business

The DPF executive members were reminded to send their suggestions to Bill Carithers (chair). He will collect them and ultimately generate a slate of nominations. For more details on the various positions, see <http://www.aps.org/exec/nomform.cfm>, and for more information on past office holders see http://www.aps.org/memb/04contacts_data.pdf. The deadlines for some of the prize nominating committees has been moved earlier than last year to give the committees more time to make their recommendations, so there is more pressure on the DPF to get their nominations for the committees in earlier. The prize committee nominations are needed for: APS Fellowship Nomination (deadline April 1, 2005); Panofsky, Sakurai Prizes (deadline May 1, 2005); Tanaka Award (June 30, 2005); Wilson Prize (July 1, 2005). Again, suggestion for members of these prize committees should be sent to the chair. Finally, the chair will appoint the members of the DPF executive nominating committee which will put together a slate of candidates for the positions of Executive Committee member (2) and Vice-chair. The DPF nomination committee needs to complete its work by May 1, 2005 to meet the election schedule.

Mike Tuts (Secretary/Treasurer) presented a summary of the DPF finances. As of October 31, 2004, the DPF had a balance of \$136k. The income from January 1, 2004 through October 31, 2004 was about \$32k (consisting of \$17k in dues, \$8k as the DPF share of the April APS meeting – this may change in the future by 10% as the formula changes, and \$7k in investment income). The expenses over the same period were about

\$12k (with \$4k in newsletter/mailings, \$2k meeting costs, \$6k in sorter travel/registration waivers/etc). There are outstanding commitments that include \$5k for the neutrino booklet, \$2k for a student lunch at the APS meeting. The last topic of discussion was the continuation of a travel grant program for graduate students to attend the April APS meeting. Last year was the first time that was done, with 34 students receiving \$300 travel grants. It was very successful and funded by the NSF (\$7k) and the DPF (\$3.2k). This year discussion with the NSF indicates that they are concerned about the availability of funds. Discussions with the DOE indicate that they do not support these types of activities. The committee members expressed strong support for this program, so it will be continued at whatever funding level we are able to accommodate. Sarah Eno agreed to coordinate the program.

There was a discussion about the 2005 APS meeting to be held in Tampa Florida (<http://www.aps.org/meet/APR05/>). The format is expected to be the same as last year with 12 and 24 minute talks. The committee members raised the issues of the problem that the program last time was not current, and that that the web site was not the primary source of information and hence it was impossible to have accurate information about the sessions. The idea of a separate web page was discussed and rejected (too confusing to have two distinct pages), but the idea of DPF control over that portion of the web page was raised. It has not been possible in the past. One of the problems identified was that the deadlines are just too early for many groups presenting results at the meeting. The suggestions was made to involve the chairs of the sessions at an earlier point so that they could confirm speakers and talks before the sessions are frozen in February. As an example of past problems, it was pointed out that at the last meeting an official invitation to a speaker did not go out, leading to the speaker not showing up. The conclusion was that we would continue to work with the APS to improve the meeting (some improvements have been implemented, such as the availability of cheaper conference hotels). Joe Lykken indicated that there were many joint plenary sessions (and that in fact 3-way joint meetings were requested but turned down). The DPF will sponsor a lunch for women in physics. It was also felt that the DPF component of the April APS meeting may not be well known, so we will send out an email to the DPF membership reminding them of that. There was a call for help with sorting, where Sarah Eno and another member from Maryland will help, and John Womersley volunteered as well. Given the large number of anticipated sessions, Joe also made a plea for all DPF members to volunteer to serve as session chairs.

Sally Dawson reported on the neutrino study – Boris and Stuart are starting to disseminate the report ideas to the agencies and Jack Marburger. There was no information on the state of the booklet, but Sally was going to inquire as to the status. As part of the effort to widely disseminate the report information, a “neutrino fest” is planned for the APS meeting and is being organized by Boris Kayser. John Womersley reported that the report will not be consigned to another dusty shelf, but rather that the agencies are circulating draft responses to the report. The report was characterized as a successful grass roots effort cutting across disciplines at a scientific level which now needs follow through from the agencies. John Jaros reported that the report was discussed

at the APS Council meeting, and that Janet Conrad made a presentation in which she was going to produce a list of lessons learned from this multi-divisional study.

John Jaros, Bill Carithers and Sally Dawson reported on the status of the EPP2010 National Academy study (<http://www7.nationalacademies.org/bpa/EPP2010.html>). The DPF is organizing the town meeting components and it was reported that there were a half dozen requests to make presentations at the meeting. It was noted that the panel members were particularly pleased to hear from the younger and most enthusiastic physicists at the Town meeting held in Washington at the end of November. Sally Dawson reported that the lack of discussion and interaction by the committee was disappointing and suggested ways that interaction could be enhanced at the next town meeting to be held at SLAC on January 31 – February 1, 2005. Sally described the formal talks that would be given (see the web link for details).

Liz Simmons discussed the activities of the Outreach subcommittee. The listserv needs more help to get it going – initial enthusiasm and help from APS seems to have slowed down. An initiative to have the archive server establish an outreach component was also initially greeted with enthusiasm, but it too has slowed down in the implementation phase. The Aspen Center report (<http://www-ed.fnal.gov/aspen/aspen-report.pdf>) will be added to the DPF web page. Hitoshi Murayama reported that he is still intending to establish a web site for physics colloquia.

George Gollin was invited to participate as chair of the Government Committee. He reported that there had not been much activity but that perhaps the focus of the committee out to be changed based on his recent experiences with trying to get Illinois to support the establishment Rare Isotope Accelerator (RIA) at ANL. By stressing the economic benefits of such programs, he found resonance in the State agencies and thereby is garnering support for the project. This led to a suggestion that it may be most effective to focus on a highly targeted and specific goal rather than the broad charge given to the committee to facilitate support for all the physical sciences. This particular example was characterized as a target of opportunity and hence difficult to plan for. There was a large amount of discussion where a number of points were raised: we should work closely with the APS governmental affairs office and that we should reach out to Steve Pearson at APS; we should take advantage of these opportunities as they arise; we need to better understand how different divisions can work together in this area – it was suggested that this was a good issue to raise at the unit convocation in February; it was noted that perhaps other divisions were more effective in lobbying for their fields.

Sally Dawson provided an update on the issue of maternity policies for postdocs. She recapped the history, explaining that some postdocs at institutions have felt pressured to continue research work immediately after having a baby. Because of this, the DPF had written a letter asking the NSF what if any was its policy on these matters. No response has been received. Sally will ask Daniela to follow up on this with the NSF.

Bill Carithers spoke about his vision of the plans for 2005. He suggested that the coming year might be a year of consolidation rather than a year of big new initiatives. He

highlighted two areas where this would be appropriate: in the area of public outreach (particularly given that this is the world year in physics); and in the area of government affairs. In the area of public outreach he suggested that the DPF should look at the APS webpage for the World Year in Physics (<http://www.physics2005.org/>) and see if there were areas where the DPF could partner with other divisions or topical groups in sponsoring appropriate outreach activities. He suggested that the government affairs committee needs a central focus (the past focus of a phone and email tree to make sure that every congressional member was covered did not work, or really get off the ground). He would like the committee to have a new central focus. In the same spirit of smaller initiatives, he suggested that we should try and form closer ties with the world physics community. A possible starting point would be to contact the heads of the EPS and JPS and arrange a face-to-face meeting at one of the big international conferences (the Lepto-Photon meeting in Upsala was suggested). He will pursue this idea.

That led into a discussion of the World Year in Physics where a number of activities were described. The April APS meeting will have a number of activities such as a Einstein festival evening as well as some joint invited sessions. That raised the question of whether there could be similar activities at the big summer HEP conferences, although it was noted that this was already rather late. Andy Cohen mentioned that the Aspen Center was holding a series of lectures and that the DPF could sponsor one. We concluded that we should send out an emailing to our members asking that they post their activities at the WYP website (<http://www.physics2005.org/cgi-bin/wyp.cgi?ID=2000>).

John Jaros reported on the November 20 APS council meeting held in Seattle. He reported first on the activities regarding the visa problem. There has been considerable progress – a letter concerning this issue was sent to the Department of State signed by some 25 institutions. The huge backlog in visa processing has been eliminated; what was taking many months now clears in 30 days (at least 90% of the applications). Those that do not clear in 30 days are flagged for further follow-up. Part of the improvement came from removing the FBI from the approval process (they now just see the applications). The second item was a discussion about raising the standards for Fellowship – this was not aimed particularly at the DPF. POPA reported that they were seeking nominations (see above notes on nominations), and that they were worried about possible new export controls on research. Finally Lubell presented a gloomy Washington report making the case that (a) scientists are not making their case to the public, and (b) there needs to be a better connection made in the case for science as an engine for economic growth.

Finally there was a discussion of the DPF writing statements of appreciation to recognize a few individuals who have made long-standing contributions to educating young physicists in our field. This was met with enthusiasm and draft notes will be written for circulation among the DPF Executive Committee members.

The meeting ended at 3pm (EST) with a final thanks to all the outgoing Executive Committee members for their service to the field.

Submitted by Mike Tuts (Secretary/Treasurer)