

Meeting of the Executive Committee of the DPF

April 20, 1995

Present: Bagger, Cassel, Dawson, Einhorn, Frisch, Grannis, Kernan, Sciulli, Shaevitz, Zeller

Guests: Barnett, Bederson, L. Brown, S. Brown, Franz, Friedman, Lustig, Shapero

Agenda:

1. [Physical Review Page Charges](#)
2. [Physical Review Letters](#)
3. [NRC Study of High Energy Physics](#)
4. [Report of the Public Information Coordinator](#)
5. [April APS Meetings](#)
6. [Progress on the CLTP Report](#)
7. [Snowmass 96](#)
8. [DPF Nominations and Election](#)
9. [APS Centenary Celebration](#)

For more on these items, see the DPF home page, <http://www.aps.org/units/dpf/>.

Physical Review Page Charges

The issue of page charges in the Physical Review has resurfaced because of the end of a three-year pilot project, during which time PRD was allowed to drop all page charges, while PRC was permitted to drop charges for compuscripts. All other sections of the PR were required to request page charges.

Pages charges are an important source of income for the APS, accounting for \$2.4M out of the \$21M that the APS receives from publications. (PR generates about 2/3 of the \$2.4M.) The journals are budgeted to make about an 8% profit.

At an April 10 meeting of the Divisional Chairs, David Cassel was told that the APS leadership would like to see the same policy towards page charges be applied across all sections of the journal. The leadership was concerned about maintaining good relations between the divisions.

Cassel argued that different journals must work under different conditions, and that a one-size-fits-all policy will not work. He pointed out that PRD has stiff competition from Nucl. Phys. B, and that page charges will reverse much of the recent progress that has been made in improving PRD.

After much communication between Cassel, the Editors of PRD, the Publications Oversight Committee (POC) and the APS leadership, the POC put forth a one-year compromise: For the next year, PRC and PRD would not collect page charges for compuscripts, but would impose a mandatory composition charge of \$65/page for other manuscripts. The charges for the other sections would be \$50 and \$65, respectively. The POC compromise will be put to a vote before the APS Council on April 23.

This issue engendered a lively discussion. Some comments are excerpted here:

Ben Bederson: Each journal should carry its own weight, but do it in its own way. PRC and D cannot survive with page charges because of the competition from other journals.

Harry Lustig: The long term trend is that as the price goes up, the number of library subscriptions goes down. Presently, the Physical Review is losing about 3% of its library subscriptions per year. Page charges are just one of many problems. What is the long term solution?

Lowell Brown: During the past three years, PRD has made remarkable progress in recapturing lost authors. As proof, he cited the fact that in 1978, the ratio of papers published by major North American institutions in PRD to NPB was 4.5. This number decreased to 1.7 in 1982, where it held steady until 1991. After the pilot project was instituted in 1991, the number rose to 4.1 in 1993.

David Cassel: The APS is facing hard choices. The Divisions should work together to come to consensus about what the APS should do in the face of these challenges. The APS should be questioning whether it needs to do everything it currently does.

The following motion was presented and passed:

The Executive Committee of the DPF unanimously

1. *supports the recommendation of the POC on page charges for PRC and PRD;*
2. *is convinced that the reinstitution of page charges would substantially harm the quality of PRD;*
3. *recommends that the next year be used for a thorough examination of the finances, activities and services of the APS in the context of the changing roles of the journals and their revenues.*

The resolution will be communicated to Bederson and Lustig before the Council meeting.

Physical Review Letters

Stanley Brown described a proposal designed to streamline the editorial process. The proposal is for each article submitted to PRL to be screened by a member of a special panel who would determine whether the article is appropriate for PRL. He/she would not

attempt to assess the scientific validity of the article. The goal would be to raise the standards of PRL, to eliminate obvious rejections, and to increase overall efficiency.

Brown asked the DPF EC to endorse a blind test -- a dry run -- to see if this proposal will work. During the discussion, a suggestion was made that the panel be empowered to recommend publication if the paper is sufficiently important. The consensus of the EC was that the test is a good idea and should be carried out.

Brown suggested that we watch for the July 1 debut of the electronic version of PRL.

NRC study of high energy physics

Don Shapero and Jerry Friedman described a proposed study of high energy physics by the NRC. The study would contain two parts: Phase I, an initial report, and if warranted, Phase II, an in-depth study. The NRC report would be complementary to the DPF self-study through the CLTP. The results of the NRC study would be endorsed by the Board on Physics and Astronomy of the NRC.

Friedman said that these are hard times for science, and that the usual reviews are seen as self-serving on the Hill. He said that the NRC study would carry more credibility. Shapero pointed out that the NRC study would appear in one or two years, and that it would help maintain the momentum created by the Drell Panel and the CLTP report.

Concerns were about priority setting, and in particular, about checks on the NRC panel. Friedman assured the EC that the study would be conducted with sensitivity to the HEP community.

The following motion was passed unanimously:

The DPF EC endorses the NRC Phase I study and will cooperate to ensure its success.

The resolution was communicated to Friedman and Shapero, who requested a list of six candidates for the study, together with a possible Chair. David Cassel agreed to send them names.

Report of the Public Information Coordinator

Michael Barnett reported on his work as the DPF PIC. He

described the DOE Census/Workforce study which is being carried out with the help of the Particle Data Group;
reported on an APS training session for PIC's, which was designed to develop a better understanding of what is news and why it is news;
proposed a contest to stimulate the development of material for the general public.
He asked for suggestions for fund raising possibilities.

Barnett also proposed a Congressional Reception to tell Members and their staffs that high energy physics physics is alive and well. The idea was endorsed by the EC, and a subcommittee of Jon Bagger, Barnett, Marty Einhorn and Michael Zeller was appointed to carry it out.

April APS Meetings

Judy Franz reported that the DPF participation in the April meeting is falling. In fact, only 800 DPF members participated this year. Since the DPF is the cornerstone of the meeting, it is important to make the meeting more appealing to the DPF.

Franz reported that next year the April meeting will be in Indianapolis, over a weekend. Her hope is that Indianapolis will be less expensive and more convenient to Fermilab and midwestern universities. She expects the weekend date to be more convenient for university faculty.

Suggestions: Get invited speakers confirmed earlier, so that the program can be publicized. Make the contributed deadline later. Make sure that invited sessions do not conflict with contributed papers. Create an Organizing Committee, composed of postdocs or young faculty, possibly from the local area.

Henry Frisch agreed to work with Paul Grannis on speakers and format. The EC should send suggestions to Grannis. The EC should send suggestions for the Organizing Committee to Jon Bagger.

Progress on the CLTP Report

The CLTP Report is nearing completion. Most of the Working Groups have completed their reports. The Editors are writing an Executive Summary. The report will be finished in June.

Snowmass 96

A Snowmass workshop will be held during the summer of 1996, probably from June 25 through July 11. The Workshop will be jointly sponsored by the DPF and the DPB, with the DPF as the lead organization. The theme will be something like Physics with Particle Accelerators at the High Energy Frontier.

Although the meeting will be organized by Americans, it will have strong international representation on the International Advisory Committee. The DPF EC should send suggestions for an Organizing Committee and an International Advisory Committee to David Cassel. He will get back to the EC with a title and an abstract for the Workshop.

DPF Nominations and Election

The EC needs to appoint two new members of the DPF Nominating Committee. One must be the Chair. The present members are Marjorie Corcoran, Gordy Kane and Rolly Morrison. The EC also needs to suggest names to Judy Franz for the APS representative to the committee.

A set of names was discussed. Two will be passed to Judy Franz; the rest used by David Cassel to constitute a committee. The committee should be publicized in the DPF newsletter to help solicit nominations.

APS Centenary Celebration

The DPF needs to appoint an representative for the APS centenary celebration. This topic was not discussed because of the late hour. It will be discussed by email.