

## DPF Executive Committee Meeting

March 31, 2012

**At April APS meeting in Atlanta:** Pierre Ramond, Patty McBride, Jonathan Rosner, Ian Shipsey, Alice Bean, Marj Corcoran, Kate Scholberg, Kara Hoffman, Yuri Gershtein, Nikos Varelas, Jonathan Feng (on speaker phone)  
Guests: Kate Kirby (APS), Glen Crawford (DOE), Jim Siegrist (DOE), Mike Lubell (APS), Robert Byer (APS)

### Agenda and minutes

1. Welcome (Pierre Ramond)
2. APS Strategic plan (Kate Kirby and Bob Byers)

Strategic planning process started over a year ago. Three parts: members, physics community, the rest of the world. The initial draft of the plan has been passed around.

- It is important for APS and organization to look like the demographics of the country. A priority area is to increase underrepresented groups. This includes industrial physicists.
- There was a lot of talk about how to connect and serve early career physicists
- International engagement was also discussed as 21% of APS members live outside of the US.
- How can we communicate more effectively to several different constituencies. Can we use web technology and social media better
- Can we partner with other like-minded organizations better such as American Chemical Society.
- International partnerships also encouraged.
- Can APS act more as one APS, ensure financial security, etc.
- There will be task forces organized to implement the ideas.
- A few years ago DPF tried to get a speaker's bureau set up. Yes, this is something that should be brought to the task force and DPF could start to nucleate this. An effort is ongoing to get media savvy people to communicate about science. Another idea is to record a science talk of the day.
- The APS is quite compartmentalized. An example is prizewinners where the prizewinners are noted, but not necessarily contacted.
- Could meetings be better conceived. There was the discussion of what meetings are the important meetings.
- Physics Quest program is an example of a good outreach program.
- APS should contact FNAL's outreach office to exchange ideas.
- There is a career planning person who gives presentations and gave one for students at the meeting yesterday.

3. View from the Hill (Mike Lubell)

The fraction of R&D spending has always tracked the discretionary spending and is approximately 15%. However, the discretionary spending fraction has been

changing. The 2011 budget control act cuts discretionary spending. The budget process was discussed.

4. View from the Hill (Nikos Varelas)

36 people from Users Organizations met with 180 offices. They brought a folder of stuff including Symmetry and the trifold brochure and met mostly with staffers. The meetings were very supportive for science and STEM education. Two key words were innovation, national character of high energy. There were also executive meetings with OSTP, OMB, Secretary Chu, DOE and NSF. OMB is very powerful. There was a feeling that the intensity frontier experiments were single measurement experiments. There was also discussion about how expensive LBNE was. Brinkman was happy about the cosmic frontier. They were encouraged to hear about Snowmass. There are questions about how we would define the success of Snowmass.

5. DOE Overview (Jim Siegrist)

How do we present the science case for these experiments? While the physics demands a portfolio of experiments, this is not always understood by those outside of physics. So the HEP community needs to speak with a common voice. The congressional staff needs to see something about the science output versus year. This means a storyline about the discoveries. For the LHC running, it is still early to see what will happen as the design energy running is still a couple of years away. Measurements at intensity frontier are hard and our sociology needs to accept this difficulty. At the Cosmic Frontier – LSST doesn't turn on until 2021, but DES will be there soon and the Dark Matter community is getting together. For Snowmass, you may want to focus especially on the intensity frontier issues.

6. DOE Comparative Reviews (Glen Crawford)

There is a presentation from HEPAP that was examined. The success rate for previously funded PIs was 78%. Success rate for new PIs in this new scheme was 46%. One of the main issues discussed at HEPAP was the support for senior research scientists where they cost more than a postdoc. There was a strong emphasis on recent research results in the reviews. The DOE is going to start the process sooner next year and streamline the process. From HEPAP letters, there were two main things:

1. Technical infrastructure at the universities has eroded.
2. Could there be discussions about the issues raised.

There will be discussions about the senior research associates with the experimental staff. Research and Operations are separate cases and will review differently. There are now new rules such as to limit the amount of faculty salary that they will pay on a grant. There are now going to be Lab comparative reviews. There will have to be investments into the technical infrastructure.

7. ALPCG (David McFarlane, Jim Brau)

Evolution of US strategy on lepton colliders was discussed in his presentation. They would like to reconstitute the organization to assume the same functions for a broader set of energy frontier options called Lepton Collider Physics Framework (LCPF). The goal is to coordinate a research program to prepare the US HEP community for a forefront program. A Monte Carlo toolkit for development of LCSim has been

decided on. He suggested that this group would hope to contribute to the Snowmass meeting with a specific role.

Questions included whether the muon collider R&D at FNAL were on board with this approach? He thinks it fits in well with the future strategy. There would be some work to engage this part of the community to be ready for Snowmass.

What is the uniqueness of Snowmass with this effort that is not covered by the other meetings that are already planned with the lepton collider community? It needs to fit in with the rest of the community's plans.

6. LHC papers, SCOAP3 and PRX (Gene Sprouse)

Physical review has grown over the years and now there is an open access journal PRX. This is supposed to be a high profile journal similar to PRL. He gave statistics showing the geographic distributions for the number of articles submitted published, and the cost associated with them. He talked about SCOAP3 which is the CERN initiative to convert High Energy Physics Journals to Open Access. APS was asked to respond to a SCOAP3 questionnaire where they put terms including payment into their response.

7. PRL update (Robert Garisto)

PRL moved from counting lines to counting words only in the body of the paper. The number of submissions have gone up 9% over the past year. Every two minutes someone cites a PRL.

8. Community Planning Meeting and Snowmass Meeting Update (Jon Rosner)

Conveners have been found for the groups:

Energy Frontier – Michael Peskin, Chip Brock

Intensity Frontier – Joanne Hewitt, Harry Weerts

Cosmic Frontier – Jonathan Feng, Steve Ritz

Instrumentation Frontier - Howard Nicholson, Marcel Demarteau

Facilities Frontier - Bill Barletta (non accelerator), Gil Gilchriese (accelerator)

Need to formulate a charge for each of Community Planning Meeting and Snowmass 2013. Need to articulate the case for HEP in a more publicly understandable way. We also need to focus on the international area and what we want to do with them. Young people have to be involved and need to meet with representatives of other divisions of the APS. There needs to be a meeting with the conveners and chair line early in May. There is a draft of the charge that is being worked on.

There was contact from people interested in Dark Matter issues wanting to schedule a workshop similar to the intensity frontier workshop and the synergy between the CPM and these meetings were discussed. Need to get communications together to poll the community on sub conveners, etc.