

## **DPF Executive Committee Meeting**

**April 13, 2008**

### **Attending**

**DPF EC:** Dan Amidei, Chip Brock, Bob Cahn, Janet Conrad, Cecilia Gerber, Al Goshaw, JoAnne Hewett, Boris Kayser, Andreas Kronfeld, Ritchie Patterson, Jack Ritchie and Natalie Roe

**Guests:** Dennis Kovar, Jim Reidy, Judy Franz, Kevin Pitts, Paul Karchin, Gene Sprouse, Robert Garisto, Mike Lubell, and Salvadore Mele

### **Agenda and minutes**

#### **1. Introduction, new committees, report on HEPAP, etc. (Bob)**

Bob reviewed the membership of DPF prize, nomination and fellowship committees. These are posted on the DPF web site under:

Prizes and Awards:

<http://www.aps.org/units/dpf/awards/index.cfm>

Governance/Committees:

<http://www.aps.org/units/dpf/governance/committees/index.cfm>

He also summarized his impressions of the February 2008 HEPAP meeting. For details see the DPF Newsletter at:

<http://www.aps.org/units/dpf/newsletters/index.cfm>

This led to a discussion with Dennis Kovar about the membership of the DPF chair on HEPAP. The exact nature (full or ex-officio) and term needs clarification.

#### **ACTION ITEM:**

Bob works with Mel Shochet and Dennis Kovar to clarify the DPF membership on HEPAP.

#### **2. Report of the Secretary-Treasurer (Al)**

Al reviewed the DPF funds available (\$174K) and the pattern of expenditures over the past few years. The various revenue streams provide ~ \$40K/ year with recent expenditures of ~ \$20K/ year, except in 2007 when DPF contributed an additional \$50K to the Panofsky Prize endowment. This led to a discussion of the use of the DPF revenue for more outreach and student travel support.

Elections for DPF EC members will be under way at the end of July with candidates selected by the DPF nomination committee. This year the election will be for two at-large EC members and the Vice Chair.

The DPF Newsletter has been postponed until after the release of the P5 report, when we intend to cover this news and the reaction in strategic planning by the HEP community. In the meantime some articles for the Newsletter have been posted on the DPF web site at:

<http://www.aps.org/units/dpf/newsletters/index.cfm>

#### **ACTION ITEM:**

DPF EC members follow up on articles for the Newsletter after the next HEPAP meeting:

P5 report, FNAL, SLAC and other community reaction, report on May HEPAP meeting, report on April APS meeting, open access, ...

### **3. Discussion of April 2008 APS meeting (Boris, Cecilia and Natalie)**

There were ~ 40 sessions organized by DPF, including a Town Hall meeting. Total attendance was ~ 1400 people with ~300 from DPF. There were many excellent plenary talks and a very active poster session. The possibility of providing web links to the plenary talks was discussed.

Cecelia summarized the travel support provided to students by DPF and an NSF grant. This year 63 students were provided \$300 travel grants, an increase from 27 in 2007. It was generally agreed that this was a very good use of DPF funds and should be continued or expanded in the future.

#### **ACTION ITEMS:**

Decide on the funds DPF should allocate in 2009 to supplement the expected \$7K grant from NSF.

At this point the meeting was opened to discussions with various invited guests.

#### **1. Comments from Dennis Kovar (DOE) and Jim Reidy (NSF)**

Dennis made a presentation covering several topics:

- Reorganization of the DOE/HEP Office
- New research review process covering university and lab groups
- Rotating reviews of national labs
- Budget status in FY08, Presidents budget in FY09, uncertainties in FY10

Jim described the manner in which the NSF EPP budgeting differs from DOE. This year (FY08) this resulted in a net 5% reduction in the budget. He pointed out that there are other sources of funds within NSF for HEP related activities, and urged use of these.

#### **2. Comments from Judy Franz (APS)**

Judy discussed plans for future “April” APS meetings: APS 2009 (May in Colorado) and APS 2010 (February in Washington DC). The issue of posting plenary talks from APS meetings was discussed, and the feasibility will be explored.

#### **3. Comments from Mike Lubell (APS)**

Mike discussed the fact that HEP has an “image” problem in congress and that we need to work harder to justify the expenditures made in our field. The current big push is for additional funding that would be attached to the FY08 Iraq supplemental bill. Considerable interest in this has been generated recently in the House and Senate, but the fate depends on the support of a few critical congressmen.

#### **4. Comments from Kevin Pitts (FNAL UEC Chair)**

Kevin gave a summary of the recent UEC/SLUO/USLUO visits to Washington. This included some useful advice on how to present the case for HEP to congress. It was agreed

that it would be useful to capture some of this information in the upcoming DPF Newsletter.

**5. Comments from Paul Karchin (Chair of 2009 DPF meeting)**

Paul reviewed preparations for the DPF09 meeting to be held at Wayne State, July 26-31, 2009. These need to be coordinated with the 2009 APS/DPF meeting to be held in May in Colorado. The organization is well underway and a web site will soon be available. The issue of a Proceedings for the conference was discussed, and Paul requested the DPF to provide advice.

**6. Comments from Robert Garisto and Gene Sprouse (PRL)**

It was pointed out that this year is PRL's 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration. A recent innovation is the designation of some articles of special interest to the physics community as "Suggestions" for the PRL readers (about 1 in 20 articles). See a January 2, 2007 editorial at: <http://prl.aps.org/edannounce/PhysRevLett.98.010001>  
As a further experiment the editors will flag certain articles as "Select" and will add brief summaries for the general reader.

**7. Open access publication (Robert Garisto, Gene Sprouse and Salvatore Mele)**

There was an animated discussion of the pros and cons of open access publication. Salvatore described the advantages of this, and a proposal, the SCOPA3 model, for generating the necessary funding (see <http://scoap3.org/>).

Some questions were raised about this proposal:

- How would funds be collected from US libraries?
- How would funds be distributed to journals?
- What critical funding is needed to make this self-sustaining?
- If PRL/PR would participate in this program and open access does not succeed, how would subscribers be recovered?

The consensus was that an APS evaluation of the advantages and risks of open access publishing was needed before the DPF EC could take a position.

**END Minutes**

Al Goshaw