

Meeting of the Executive Committee of the DPF

29 April 2000

Minutes by C. Newman-Holmes (DPF Secretary-Treasurer)

Present: V. Barger, G. Beier, B. Carithers, J. Conrad, S. Dawson, G. Farrar (phone), H. Gordon, N. Hadley, P. Meyers, D. Naples, C. Newman-Holmes, C. Quigg, S. Wojcicki

Visitors: Judy Franz (APS), Mike Lubell (APS), Robert Garisto (PRL/PRD), Jack Sandweiss (PRL/PRD), Judy Jackson (FNAL), J. Langer, M. Blume

Agenda:

Open Session

1. [Future meetings \(Judy Franz\)](#)
2. [Funding for particle physics \(Mike Lubell\)](#)
3. [Scientific notes \(Robert Garisto and Jack Sandweiss\)](#)
4. [Report from APS Divisional Councilor \(S. Dawson, P. Meyers\)](#)

Closed Session

1. [Discussion of April, 2000 meeting and plan for April, 2001 \(Chris Quigg\)](#)
2. [Report from HEPAP \(Howard Gordon\)](#)
3. [Congressional reception \(Howard Gordon\)](#)
4. [Funding for particle physics \(Gene Beier\)](#)
5. [APS Web site \(Chris Quigg\)](#)
6. [Commendation for Trần Thanh Vân \(Chris Quigg\)](#)
7. [Program to have undergraduate students attend DPF meetings? \(Gene Beier\)](#)
8. [Report from Secretary-Treasurer \(C. Newman-Holmes\)](#)
9. [Prize funding \(Gene Beier\)](#)
10. [Snowmass 2001 \(Chris Quigg\)](#)
11. [Secretary-Treasurer's Report \(CNH\)](#)

Future meetings (Judy Franz)

APS Executive Officer Judy Franz joined us for a discussion of DPF participation in APS meetings. She is pleased with DPF's recent decision to alternate stronger participation in April APS meetings with DPF divisional meetings. The Division of Physics of Beams (DPB) alternates participation in the April APS meeting with participation in the Particle Accelerator Conference and DPB requested that we adjust the phase of DPF meetings so that we would emphasize the April APS meetings in the same years that DPB is present. DPF meetings are already planned for 2000 and 2002; we will have to change phase after

that such that we either have two DPF meetings in a row (in 2002 and 2003) or a three year gap (2002 to 2005) because the DPB request means that we would plan a strong presence at the 2004 APS meeting. Judy requested more rather than fewer meetings with APS while we were getting synched with DPB. She also emphasized the importance of knowing about DPF's intentions for planning purposes, e.g. would DPF really be absent during the "off-years"? The 2002 meeting is an issue because the APS meeting is in April, 2002 and there is a DPF meeting scheduled for May, 2002. In general, DPF plans to maintain our level of participation (similar to what we have done for past April APS meetings) during odd-numbered years and increase it during even-numbered years beginning in 2004.

There was also some discussion of the merits of shorter (and more numerous) talks versus longer talks.

Funding for particle physics (Mike Lubell)

APS Director of Public Affairs Mike Lubell joined us to share his thoughts on the funding situation for particle physics. Mike is troubled by what he sees on the budgetary horizon. He showed graphs of funding versus time showing small increases or decreases in HEP funding. Mike said that federal budgets were better when there was competition with the USSR. Also, the construction and operation of new facilities for our field has become more expensive and that will not change in the near future. Mike believes a key issue is how we move from the Cold War era to a post- Cold War era where defense is not as central as it was previously. DOE funding is in the Energy and Water bill and will thus be in competition with water projects - important in an election year. NSF funding is in the VA/HUD bill. Life science funding has gone up in the last 30 years but everything else has dropped relative to the GDP. Yet people believe that the economy is driven by science and technology so how does HEP take advantage of this? Mike emphasized the importance of the Congressional reception (discussed below) and said APS was preparing packets for physicist attendees with pointers for discussing the impact of particle physics (e.g. the World Wide Web).

There was a discussion of the need for our field to articulate a coherent vision. G. Farrar suggested that there should be a repository of particle physics success stories (e.g. profitable spin-offs) on the Web. The AIP does have success stories on the Web at <http://www.aip.org/success/>.

Scientific notes (Robert Garisto, Jack Sandweiss, Marty Blume)

Prior to the meeting, Jack Sandweiss distributed material about a proposal to create a new class of publications (refereed technical notes) to allow people in large collaborations to get more credit for individual contributions. Here is a short summary of the history:

The European Committee on Future Accelerators (ECFA) and the European Physical Society (EPS) have proposed that the scientific publishers establish a new type of scientific publication - so called "Scientific Notes".

George Trilling sent a note to the U.S. members of the ATLAS collaboration about guidelines for the collaboration concerning such proposals.

Marty Blume (Editor in Chief of APS publications) asked Jack Sandweiss to chair a small group to make recommendations to him about APS involvement in the proposal.

Jack has been consulting with various people about the proposal. Eventually he will write a summary and a report of his findings.

Jack reported that so far, responses to the idea of a new class of publications are split about 50-50. Some say it is just one more thing to do, it is not necessary and who needs it? Others say it offers an opportunity to publish original work and is a partial solution to the problem of individual contributions engulfed by enormous author lists. There was a lengthy discussion by the Executive Committee which included the following points:

There was some difference of opinion on whether the viewpoints on this issue were correlated with age. Some claimed older physicists were against it while younger ones were for it, but this was disputed.

N. Hadley said the many large collaborations (CDF, D0, CLEO, BaBar) were polled a year ago. None of these groups were strongly positive and a few were negative. D0 felt it would be divisive.

S. Wojcicki pointed out that the response from a collaboration may depend on the stage and evolution of the experiment. He also said that we already have a vehicle for publishing detector information with a small number of authors (NIM); what is missing is a place to publish simulation results. There is now no place to publish work on the early stages of an experiment.

D. Naples and J. Conrad felt that it wouldn't hurt to have another place to publish individual contributions.

P. Meyer didn't feel another class of publications was necessary.

There was not general agreement on the subject of whether such publications would be of any value to someone seeking promotion. Some said only physics publications were relevant for promotion while others disagreed. There was not general agreement on the issue of refereeing these notes. Some felt that the notes had to be refereed to be of value (e.g. in a promotion process) while others felt getting referees would be overly burdensome.

Some felt that this new class might be useful for LHC post-docs to get some recognition for their work.

Some felt we should let the proponents start this and see if the system they put in place is useful and possibly could be adequate for experiments other than LHC who were interested.

During the discussion, the issue of recognition of individual contributions became entwined with the issue of general (public) access to preliminary results from large collaborations. Many felt that the LANL preprint server was adequate for the access issue.

M. Blume pointed out that APS now has a full-scale mirror of the LANL preprint archive. He would like to get recommendations for people to serve as monitors to look over preprint submissions to LANL.

Report from APS Divisional Councilor (S. Dawson, P, Meyers)

The APS Council passed a statement on broad-based funding for physics. It may be found at <http://www.aps.org/units/dpf/statements/00.1.cfm>. The Council has been discussing how to reduce its size as the Council is now so large that it has become unwieldy. There is a proposal for reducing the Council size. If approved by APS membership, DPF would have only one rather than two Divisional Councilors. The DPF Councilors endorsed the proposed restructuring of the Council and the Executive Committee concurred. Subsequently, a note from the Executive Committee was e- mailed to DPF membership urging them to vote in support of the APS constitutional changes to reduce the Council size.

Discussion of April, 2000 meeting and plan for April, 2001 (Chris Quigg)

The April, 2000 APS meeting was only one day old at the time of this Executive Committee meeting but C. Quigg and S. Wojcicki are soliciting feedback on the meeting to help with planning the April, 2001 meeting. Early feedback is that three-hour sessions with no break are too long. Also, sessions that go from 11:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. are undesirable as there is no time for lunch.

Report from HEPAP (Howard Gordon)

H. Gordon showed plots of HEP funding \$ vs. time that were shown at the last HEPAP meeting (March, 2000). One plot shows that in constant year \$, funding for high-energy physics has remained roughly constant over the last 10 years. However a similar plot with construction and LHC funds removed shows a significant decline (~ 25%) over the same time period. This means that the amount of money available for operation of facilities is much smaller than in the past. Problems with funding were also discussed elsewhere in the agenda.

Howard also mentioned that the charge from P. Rosen for the "White Paper" from HEPAP will be modified and will recognize the importance of a summer study in 2001 on future directions.

Congressional Reception

Recent DPF Congressional receptions (held annually in May) have been well-attended by physicists but not well attended by members of Congress or their staff assistants. This year's reception (16 May 2000) which is co-sponsored by DPF, DNP and DPB, was organized differently to improve its effectiveness. The organizers made a list of members of key congressional committees (Appropriations and Authorization in the Senate and House) and asked people who registered for the reception to specify their congressional

districts. Physicists were then matched with members of Congress and asked to contact the member and make an appointment in advance of the reception. (Key members with no physicist from their district signed up were assigned physicists from outside their district). Physicists will meet with the member of Congress or staff assistant and then bring him/her to the reception. The organizers have also prepared a list of "talking points" to guide the discussion before the reception. J. Conrad emphasized the importance of talking to the staffers.

Funding for particle physics (Gene Beier)

G. Beier distributed a draft of a letter he had written about particle physics funding to be sent to member of Congress on key committees. The letter was subsequently revised with the assistance of other DPF Chairs and was sent to Senators Frist and Domenici and Representatives Sensenbrenner, Smith and Packard. The text of the letter may be found at <http://www.aps.org/units/dpf/statements/conglet.html>

APS Web site (Chris Quigg)

Judy Franz distributed flyers about a new web site APS is launching to convey the excitement of physics to the public. APS is soliciting input from each division about what should be included. They are also looking for advice about whom in the division can be contacted for assistance. C. Quigg agreed to talk to the APS contacts about what already exists related to particle physics. He will also find out what they have in mind and what their time scale is.

There was some complaining about the DPF Web site, but when C. Newman-Holmes asked for volunteers from the Executive Committee to improve it, the complaining died down rapidly.

Commendation for Trần Thanh Vân (Chris Quigg)

Trần Thanh Vân is retiring after many years as a leader in particle physics. He is best known for organizing the Moriond, Blois and Vietnam conferences. C. Quigg has drafted a statement to be signed by the DPF officers commending him for his contributions to particle physics. The text of the statement may be found at <http://www.aps.org/units/dpf/statements/van.html>.

Program to have undergraduate students attend DPF meetings (Gene Beier)

The Division of Nuclear Physics (DNP) has a program called Conference Experience for Undergraduates. This program encourages undergraduates to attend DNP meetings and present their work. A DNP physicist applies for grants for this from NSF and other sources. DPF is considering trying to start a similar program.

Report from Secretary-Treasurer (C. Newman-Holmes)

The [treasurer's report](#) was presented. A [list of members of DPF committees](#) was also shown. Both are appended to these minutes.

Prize funding (Gene Beier)

G. Beier has begun inquiries on this matter and will report on progress at the next meeting.

Snowmass 2001 (Chris Quigg)

Chris Quigg led a discussion of plans for a summer study in 2001. The Executive Committee agreed with Chris that it would be useful to plan a meeting focused on scientific goals rather than a "shoot-out" among various machine options. There was some discussion of possible locations and the desirability of a reasonable price tag. The location was subsequently finalized as Snowmass, Colorado. There was also some discussion of the output of this summer study. More information about plans for Snowmass, 2001 may be found at <http://lutece.fnal.gov/Drafts/Snowmass2001talk.pdf>.

Next meeting

The next meeting will be in Columbus in August, 2000.

Secretary-Treasurer's Report (CNH)

Here is the DPF financial status as presented at the meeting:

Balance at last meeting (as of 11/30/99)	\$111,982.0 7
Income	\$3,031.50
Expenses	\$2,243.42

Balance as of 11/30/99	\$112,770.1 5

Income

Dues	\$425.00
Interest	\$2,606.50
April Meeting	\$0.00

Total Income \$3,031.50

Expenses

Newsletter printing \$548.00

Postage and mailing \$902.56

Fee waivers \$0.00

Travel \$792.86

Total Expenses \$2,243.42

Prize Funds	11/30/99	3/31/00	Change
Panofsky Prize	\$61,138.88	\$57,559.20	(\$3,579.68)
Sakurai Prize	\$210,837.33	\$219,960.32	\$9,122.99
Wilson Prize	\$132,751.31	\$131,052.93	(\$1,698.38)
Tanaka Award	\$25,721.80	\$26,325.49	\$603.69

Membership of DPF Committees - 2000

Nominating Committee

J. Brau (Chair)

H. Schellman (Vice-Chair)

B. Grinstein

J. Siegrist

K. McDonald

J. Lykken

Panofsky Prize Committee

H. Weerts (Chair)

M. Shapiro (Vice-Chair)

L. Littenberg

J. Richman

E. Thorndike

Sakurai Prize Committee

G. Kane (Chair)

E. Simmons (Vice-Chair)

M. Dine
A. Nelson
M. Shifman

Wilson Prize Committee

G. Dugan (Chair)
W. Panofsky (Vice-Chair)
R. Ruth
H. Blosser
R. Palmer

Tanaka Award Committee

H. Gordon (Chair)
T. Ferbel (Vice-Chair)
J. Conrad
D. Cassel
Y-K. Kim