

Minutes of the DPF Executive Committee Phone Meeting

2-4pm, January 26, 2006

Present: Dan Amidei, Daniella Bortoletto, Bob Cahn, Marcela Carena, Bill Carithers, Andrew Cohen, Sarah Eno, John Jaros, Joe Lykken, Jack Ritchie, Natalie Roe, Mike Tuts, John Womersley

AGENDA

- Welcome new members and thank outgoing ones
- Status of April meeting
- Report on the new HEPAP and on EPP2010
- Status of 2006 DPF Hawaii meeting
- Discussion of future of DPF participation in April meeting
- Report on committee membership (prizes + nominating)
- Report on DPF finances, DPF financial commitments, and prize endowments
- Report on Bahcall prize proposal + FIP travel grant proposal
- Report on Outreach Committee
- DPF/NSF travel fellowships to April meeting
- Discussion of new DPF initiatives + things we need to do better

The phone meeting was opened by Joe Lykken, the 2006 DPF Chair. Joe welcomed the new members Jack Ritchie, Dan Amidei and Bob Cahn, and noted that the DPF is no more than the sum of its members. He thanked the outgoing members John Womersley, Marcela Carena, and Sally Dawson for their excellent service. Finally he thanked Bill Carithers for his service as Chair in 2005.

Natalie Roe reported that to date the plans for the APS April meeting were going well. She thanked Bill Carithers and Sarah Eno who contributed their time to sort abstracts. About 200 abstracts submitted. A looming problem that she will face is finding session chairs, which she will be addressing soon. The DPF Executive Committee members are encouraged to volunteer to serve as chairs. As is traditional, the DPF Executive Committee will hold a face to face meeting at the start of the April meeting. Mike Tuts will poll the Executive Committee to see whether Friday evening or Saturday evening is the best time for the committee.

Joe Lykken reported that having gone through a six month period with no HEPAP, the agencies are in the final stages of appointing some 20 people to HEPAP. The first meeting is expected to be on March 3-4, 2006 in Washington. There is much work that has accumulated for HEPAP to discuss and approve, including reports from P5, the ILC/LHC subpanel report, the Dark Energy task force, etc. A chair has been selected.

Joe led a discussion on the EPP2010 Committee. The last meeting was held last Monday, after which they will write their report. Given the NAS approval process it was

speculated that the final report may not be released for three to twelve months. The discussion centered on what the role of the DPF should be, and whether the DPF Executive Committee should try and interact with EPP2010 and volunteer its services before that time. The consensus was to wait until the report is released and shortly thereafter convene an Executive Committee meeting to plan the DPF response. If there is any substantive information available by the time of the APS April meeting, then it would be appropriate to arrange a presentation by the EPP2010 leadership at that meeting.

Joe briefed the Executive Committee on the current status of the plans for the 2006 DPF meeting to be held from Oct29-Nov3 2006 Hawaii. It will be a joint meeting of Pacific Region Particle Physics Communities (<http://www.dpf2006.org/>). Plans for the meeting seem to be going fine. Some concerns about the expense of the conference hotel have been addressed by providing alternate (and cheaper) accommodations. Mike asked if there will be any program to support student travel to the meeting – Joe did not know but would find out. Daniella Bortoletto and Sarah Eno are on the program committee and reported that there have already been some planning meetings – they noted that given the international nature of this meeting the planning is more complex than for the typical DPF meeting. John Jaros asked if there would be any special plans for outreach, such as one or two outreach talks; he noted that the Hawaiian venue might help attract speakers. There were no known such plans, and it was noted that the schedule is already crowded and that preparations are already well advanced.

Andy Cohen led a broad ranging discussion on the issue of future April APS meetings. At the last April meeting Judy Franz proposed forming a committee to look into future of April meeting. That committee has been formed with Chris Quigg chair and Andy Cohen is a member of that committee. Andy read the charge of the committee. The charge is broad, allowing the committee to consider all options up to terminating the meeting. Andy then solicited the input of the DPF Executive Committee. He briefly reviewed the history of the meeting and the genesis of this joint APS meeting which started because of falling attendance (a viable APS meeting was characterized as needing an attendance that is greater than 1,200). The current April meetings have an attendance of about 1,400, with the DPF component being about 1/3 of that. The DPF is currently committed to this joint meeting through 2007. A frank and extensive discussion followed. Among the many points that were raised were: whether this meeting served was useful as a research meeting; a general consensus that the choice to move the meeting from Washington (for reasons of cost) was a mistake because of the loss of opportunity to involve and influence legislators; an acknowledgement that it is beneficial for HEP students, although it was noted that many parallel sessions are poorly attended; a variety of views on whether the format of the meeting encouraged attendees to hear talks outside their own discipline; a general frustration with the poor use of technology (web postings, etc); whether a “student specific” meeting might be more beneficial or not; whether it would be possible to limit the number of talks and thereby allowing more time to attend other sessions with increased audiences – here it was noted that this would have to be implemented by the big collaborations as the APS rules give all members the right to a 10 min talk; the positive aspects of having an increasing number of joint sessions with the other divisions making the breadth of the meeting a draw and allowing the DPF to reach out to the wider

physics community; the value of the aspects dealing with outreach to women; should the meeting be combined with the March meeting (this was not supported), AAAS, or AAPT. This last point led to a side discussion that it would be useful to participate in organizing HEP talks at the AAAS meeting as a means to reach out to the wider science community – Andy graciously volunteered to help with this in the future. The Executive Committee expressed a clear view that the meeting venue should be moved back to Washington and that the benefits of that outweigh any potential cost increase (it was noted that the current April meetings are not cheap either). Andy encouraged the members to send him e-mail with their thoughts on this topic.

Joe has started to brainstorm on members for the Prize Committees (Panofsky, Sakurai, Tanaka, and this year Wilson) as well as the Nominating Committee. This latter committee is needed very soon. He asked for help in suggesting potential members. Please send him your input.

Mike Tuts reported on the financial state of the DPF. The financial state of the division is healthy. As of 11/30/05 the balance in the DPF account is \$157k (which is significantly larger than the previous year balance of \$134k). The income for the year was about \$42k (made up of \$16k in dues, \$9k from the April APS meeting share, \$10k in investment income, and a \$7k NSF grant to support graduate student travel to the APS meeting). The expenses for the year totaled about \$20k (with \$2k in meeting expenses, \$2k for sorter travel support, \$5k for a neutrino pamphlet, and \$11k for April APS travel grants for about 35 students). Therefore the net income (after expenses) was \$22k. Mike then talked about the state of the prize endowments. As of 11/30/05 the endowments were: Panofsky \$115k; Sakurai \$351k; Tanaka \$29k; Wilson (shared with DPB) \$158k. The yearly prize awards are currently \$5k (except the Tanaka thesis award of \$1,500) and include travel allowances. There is a general consensus that the prize awards should be raised from the current \$5k to \$10k. In order to provide \$10k awards, the endowment needs \$200k at a minimum, therefore the Panofsky and Wilson prizes are currently underfunded. There followed a discussion of how this might be achieved. Although the rules prohibit the use of DPF funds to pay for the prize stipends, there are small measures in accord with the rules that could be taken, such as providing the travel allowance from DPF funds rather than prize endowment funds – this would allow modest growth in the endowment. Other more creative mechanisms to redistribute the current endowment funds and solicit new funds were discussed. These ideas should be discussed with the APS development group. Natalie has been investigating the options. As a result of this discussion it was decided to use the DPF funds to support the travel allowance as a means to build up the endowment.

Bill Carithers reported to the Executive Committee on the status of his efforts to establish a prize, award or lectureship honoring John Bahcall. He has contacted the Chairs of Astrophysics and Nuclear Divisions as well as Alan Chodos. There are concerns expressed on how to distinguish this possible prize from the existing Bethe prize, which has very broad guidelines for recipients. There are many details to be settled before one could implement a prize. Bill will continue to explore the options with other divisions. The second topic covered by Bill was the state of the program to sponsor visitors to come work with US experiments. The DNP has supported this program with \$5k. Four awards

have been made to physicists from Brazil, Argentina and Russia. If the DPF sponsored the program with a \$5k contribution, then the DPF could be assured of three \$2k awards and representation on the review panel. The DPF Executive Committee agreed to sponsor this program at the \$5k yearly level for a period of two years and then evaluate the program for continued sponsorship.

Since Hitoshi Murayama was unable to attend, there was no report from the Education and Outreach Committee.

Dan Amidei reported on the status of the April APS meeting travel grants for 2006. The NSF has provided a grant of \$7k to help support these grants. The balance of about \$4k will be provided by the DPF. Currently Dan has 10 applications, but the closing date is in March – we expect about 30-40 applications. Dan suggested some possible changes for the future: explicitly limiting the awards to those giving talks in DPF sponsored sessions; considering the support of undergraduate students giving talks at DPF sessions (he will start by contacting the SPS to understand how many such students there might be at the meeting).

The last agenda item introduced by Joe was a free ranging discussion on what activities the DPF could participate in to better serve the DPF constituency. Bill Carithers noted that for the last few years there have been no DPF business meetings called for in the by-laws. He noted that other divisions do hold such meetings. He suggested that it would be possible to replace those meetings with an article in the Newsletter that lays out the state of the Division; he offered to write that article. He also noted that HEP is at a critical juncture and that the DPF could help to engage the community in discussing the issues that face the field. What followed was a discussion on the usefulness of holding a Town Meeting at the DPF2006 meeting. While it was unclear what the detailed format of the meeting should be – a number of ideas were discussed: the attendance of the funding agencies? The attendance of HEPAP? Discussion of the EPP2010 report and what DPF's response should be? It was decided that Joe would contact the DPF2006 organizers to explore the possibility of holding such a Town Meeting – the details of the meeting would be decided on later. John Jaros emphasized the need for outreach to other communities – he suggested an increase in the number of outreach talks at APS meetings, such as at the March meeting. Part of this outreach would involve reciprocating with the other Divisions – what message would they like to send to the DPF community. This would be a way to convey to other scientific communities our future plans and the excitement of the field. Joe noted that the Government affairs committee has not succeeded in establishing a grass root political action committee, and that perhaps it was not fruitful for the DPF to do this, but rather to work through existing methods. Bill noted that the previous plans were likely too ambitious. Bob Cahn noted that for DPF is perhaps too “narrow” for these activities. We should be partnering with a broader community than just high energy physics. One existing APS organization is POPA – it was not known if the DPF community was represented on POPA. Bob, who has served on POPA, agreed to discuss POPA's role at the next DPF Executive Committee meeting. Mike agreed to contact POPA member Marty Einhorn to request a newsletter article on POPA. Marcela, who is now on CISA, suggested that there should be closer contact between DPF and

CISA on international issues. In general the Executive Committee agreed that we should be more proactive in nominating DPF members to APS Committees. Joe will send out a message on the APS Committees to which we should be nominating members.