

Minutes of the Ohio Section of the American Physical Society - (approved)

Executive Committee

Columbus State Community College, 19 October 2001

The Executive Committee of the Ohio Section of the American Physical Society met on Friday, October 19, 2001 in seminar room A of Nestor Hall on the Columbus State Community College campus. The meeting was called to order by Chair Robert Brown at 10:00 a.m. In attendance were Gordon Aubrecht, Jean Claude Ba, Robert Brown, Kim Coplin, Bruce Craver, Mike Crescimanno, Klaus Fritsch, Bob Hengehold, Graciela Lacueva, Stephen Pinsky, Roger Rollins, Brad Trees, Fred Trexler, Ron Winters, Paul Wolf, Louis Wright, Perry Yaney, and Warren Young.

1. Bob welcomed everyone to the meeting. Bob also noted that Louis Wright, chair of the Ohio University physics department, is requesting that OU host the spring 2004 meeting to coincide with OU's bicentennial celebration.

2. Approval of the Minutes of the Spring 2001 Meeting

The minutes of the Spring 2001 Executive Committee meeting were unanimously approved.

3. Local Chairs' Report - Gordon Aubrecht, Jean-Claude Ba, Brad Trees, Ron Winters

Brad reported that there were 97 pre-registrations for the meeting with 74 banquet reservations. There will be four parallel sessions for contributed papers (a total of 33); 18 posters will be presented at the poster session.

4. Secretary's Report - Kim Coplin, Bruce Craver

Kim reported that past issues of the APS bulletin have been scanned. The next step is to make them accessible via our Web site.

5. Treasurer's Report - Brad Trees, Klaus Fritsch

The treasurer's report was distributed and discussed. Brad noted that Kent State will be returning the \$3000 meeting advance to the Ohio Section, but that the Columbus State meeting will cost the section at least \$3000 (since Columbus State was a last minute host). Brad has requested an additional \$3000 from the section since the printing of the treasurer's report. The main source of income for the section is from membership dues, and dues income will be reported in November. Brad reported that financially the section

is in good shape. The Expense History Data sheet that was distributed shows that the balance for the Ohio Section has remained fairly constant.

6. Spring 2001 Local Chairs' Final Report - Bob Brown for Satyendra Kumar

Bob distributed the report provided by Satyendra Kumar who was not able to be at this meeting. There was a brief discussion about meeting information that was not provided in the report. Bob will ask Prof. Kumar for this additional information. Brad noted that abstract fees collected for the Kent State meeting totaled \$1240 while APS charged the Ohio Section \$1190 for abstract publication.

7. Forthcoming Meetings Reports

Spring 2002 - Youngstown State University - Mike Crescimanno, Warren Young

The topic of this meeting will be photon induced processes. Mike and Warren distributed a report with details of the meeting. They plan to contact schools in western Pennsylvania to encourage attendance since this meeting will be in northeast Ohio. The Executive Committee meeting will start at 10 am on Friday.

Bob reported on a fall conversation he had with Christine M. of the Ohio Section of the AAPT regarding how the Ohio Section/APS and AAPT should interact. AAPT is concerned about fees for OS/APS meetings. AAPT members pay \$8 for two meetings a year. AAPT members also prefer Saturday only conferences since it is hard for teachers to attend a Friday meeting. AAPT members are especially interested in networking, lab tours, meeting faculty, and "How to Do It" workshops. The dates of AAPT meetings are fixed for the 2nd week of October and the 2nd week of March. After this report, Bob asked how the Executive Committee wants to proceed with regard to joint meetings. Steve Pinsky commented that OSU views joint meetings as essential; they provide an opportunity to publicize OSU to people at the high school level. He also pointed out that funding for some meetings is based on the fact that high school teachers will be there. He suggested that the Ohio Section supplement registration fees. Gordon spoke on behalf of the SOS/AAPT. He agreed that there is a concern about cost and that Saturday meetings are more appropriate. He also said that SOS/AAPT has taken the position that they value a relationship with the OS/APS. After discussion of these issues, a committee was formed to investigate the relationship between the Ohio Section and local AAPT sections. Graciela will chair the committee. Bob offered to serve and Gordon suggested Jim Sullivan as a member of this committee. Anyone else wishing to be involved should contact Bob. This committee will report back to the Executive Committee in the spring.

Mike asked about getting meeting information to APS for distribution. Although APS should contact Mike, the Executive Committee encouraged Mike to contact APS first. APS will also provide mailing labels. Perry suggested we need an advisory committee for meeting hosts. Bob H. and Perry volunteered to be meeting host advisors. This information will be added to the Ohio Section Web site.

Fall 2002 - The Ohio State University - Steve Pinsky

The meeting dates are October 18-19. The topic of the meeting will be "String Theory" to celebrate the addition of a string theory group at OSU. Meeting organizers hope to attract well known speakers from the Midwest and also plan to advertise the new building at OSU. Steve noted that all Saturday events will be held in the Physics Department, and that they are sensitive to the needs of AAPT participants. Funding is being provided by both the Physics Department and the Dean's office at OSU. In addition, OSU has a professional meeting organizer. One concern is the cost; rooms at the Holiday Inn on Lane Avenue are \$94/night. Steve stressed they really want to encourage a connection with AAPT. There was a brief discussion regarding the four talks and whether they should all be theoretical in nature. Steve is open to suggestions and said it would be no problem to get a speaker to talk about experimental work (e.g LIGO).

Spring 2003 -

Bob has talked with folks at NASA Glenn and they are interested, with a possible topic being imaging. Bob H. said that one possible troublesome issue with a meeting at NASA might be prior notification to NASA of meeting attendees.

Bob then commented that any discussions of where the next meetings are to be is very dependent on where section wants to go. He suggested that we keep a couple future meeting locations TBA until the future direction of the section is decided.

Louis then spoke about the future OU meeting noting the 2003-2004 is the bicentennial year at OU. They are being encouraged to host regional and national meetings during this time. They would prefer to host the Ohio Section meeting during the Spring of 2004. Before a definite decision is made on this issue, Beverly Berger at Oakland University needs to be contacted.

8. Nominations Committee Report - Ron Winters

Ron made a request that nominations for officers be sent to him. Ron will contact potential nominees and the slate of nominees for officers will be presented at the spring meeting. Ron also commented that as we move to electronic elections, it will be helpful to see more than one nominee for each position.

9. Honors and Awards Committee Report - Bob Hengehold

The Maxwell Award will be presented to Mike Mickelson at the banquet for this meeting. Bob mentioned Maxwell awards may be given at the Youngstown and OSU meetings. Bob hopes to get information out to departments at major universities to ask for nominations for the Fowler Award since he does not get as many nominations for this award. It was noted that the official awards committee is the Executive Committee.

13. APS Council Report - Perry Yaney

Perry reported that one area of concern for APS is the budget. He noted the History of Physics Forum has a new award and that the by-laws of the California section were approved. Perry is working to clarify details the Ohio Section will need to take care of if we expand. He also noted that the two current section council representatives are from the New England Section and Southeastern Section. The issue of whether sections should send their representatives to the APS Council meetings even though this is not funded is still being discussed. Perry mentioned that the Ohio Section might consider making the Council Representative a member of the Executive Committee. Gordon commented that it would then be an elected position. Perry also reported that the Ohio Section is OK in terms of membership percentage because new sections are trying to get up and running.

10. Membership Committee - Graciela Lacueva, Fred Trexler

The membership committee report was distributed and discussed. Currently the Ohio Section membership stands at 2.68% of the national membership. Bob commented that these % numbers are not as significant as we might think. Graciela pointed out states outside Ohio with a large number of members are Indiana, Michigan, West Virginia and Kentucky.

11. Section Expansion and Name Committee - Bahram Roughani, Robert Brown

The members of this committee are Gordon Aubrecht, Bob Brown, Bahram Roughani (chair), Paul Wolf, and Perry Yaney. Bob distributed an outline to guide the discussion regarding possible section expansion and/or a name change.

Mission statement - Bob said at some time we need to craft a mission statement and that the ingredients should include 1) student participation 2) an opportunity for the membership to attend a meeting and learn and 3) a research area at the pioneering level should be highlighted.

Procedure to change the by-laws. 1. A vote by the executive committee. 2. Approval by the APS Council. 3. Approval by majority vote of the OS/APS membership.

California Example - Bob pointed out that we can incorporate another state into the Ohio Section without having the other state vote. For example, the California section recently added Nevada to its membership.

Multiple Membership - You can belong to any number of sections, but it is not clear whether two sections can claim the same state.

No 3% Problem - Bob stressed that we should not take action because we perceive a problem with our membership percentage. The Ohio Section has a lot of history, and we should not focus on our membership percentage. He has spoken with Tricia (APS membership), Judy Franz, and Ken Cole and all have responded that there is no 3% issue. This is not in the APS by-laws regarding section membership (it pertains to division membership).

APS Position/Activity - Judy Franz indicated that every section has its own special strengths. Sections are treated as individuals. There is currently no activity regarding the formation of a new section.

Goals - We need to consider our goals before expanding or changing the name. What do we want to achieve by adding another state? We need to consider issues such as meeting hosts; how many meetings a year can we support? Providing a meeting that is easy to get to is a current goal.

Michigan Survey Results - Bob sent out 851 emails to Michigan folks and had an 8% return rate. He asked if the respondents would be interested in supporting expansion of the Ohio Section into Michigan. Of the 55 who responded, 53 said yes and 2 said no. Half of those who responded are not current Ohio Section members.

Name - The name suggested by a majority of the email respondents was "Great Lakes Section". However, this name would not have the support of the APS since to truly represent the Great Lakes, other states would have to be included. Other names would be Michigan-Ohio Section or Ohio-Michigan Section. Bob feels that Ohio should have the prominent position in the section name.

Number of Meetings/Year - This is a function of how the expansion issue turns out. If Michigan and Ohio join, then it would be reasonable to have 1 meeting/year in Michigan and 1 meeting/year in Ohio. Fred commented that from his experience in the New York section that people looked forward to having meetings move around the state. It was also noted that there weren't a lot of people who would travel great distances to attend a meeting.

After the introduction of these items by Bob, the Executive Committee had a general discussion regarding expansion and a possible name change. Gordon responded that he would include "interactions with other physicists" as a component of the mission statement. Ron said that there has been a 3% issue in the past, that having a Council representative depended on the membership percentage. He also noted that including Michigan would seem to imply a change in the section name.

At this point, there was a discussion of the meeting proposal from Ron and Kim. This proposal suggests one meeting per year at a central location. The format of the meeting would include 2 invited speakers (national level) to give tutorials in their research area, 2 invited speakers (local) to discuss teaching, two parallel contributed paper sessions (teaching and research), and a series of parallel town meetings/round table discussions focusing on aspects of teaching. It is important that the Ohio Section meetings are events that people will want to attend and that meetings provide an opportunity to talk about teaching and learn new physics.

Bob asked for comments on what other Executive Committee members want from Ohio Section. Responses included interactions with others, both high school teachers and college/university professors. Paul commented that researchers have national meetings;

he feels section meetings have a social responsibility too. Meetings should help to develop contacts and build community. This may be more difficult to do with a larger geographical area. The American Chemical Society might be an example since they do a great job with the local level. Roger responded that traveling to other universities has always been a benefit and that he would prefer two meetings a year since one meeting per year might not keep the organization going. He also commented that the section getting too big is not a good idea. Both Roger and Lewis said that we should look at the value of the contributed sessions. Are contributed sessions on research valuable? Warren responded that the Ohio Section meetings have provided a great opportunity for students to give papers, and that in his opinion, a distance within 4-5 hours drive time is OK. Mike concurred that it is important to have a venue for students to present papers. Bruce asked if the idea of expansion has been narrowed down to Ohio and Michigan. Gordon stated he is excited about the possibility of involving southern Michigan. He values the contributed talks and feels three components of the mission statement should be students, learning, and meeting colleagues.

Bob summarized the discussion with a statement of 3 action items. 1) Talk to AAPT to encourage connection with YSU meeting 2) Investigate having Michigan or Michigan State host a meeting in the near future 3) Have a town meeting as part of the Spring 2002 YSU meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 pm

Respectfully Submitted,
Kimberly A. Coplin