

CINP Board Meeting Minutes

Date of the meeting : July 21, 2014

Members in attendance :

Jean Barrette, Jens Dilling, Paul Garrett, Gerald Gwinner, Garth Huber and Rituparna Kanungo

1. Approval of the Agenda

Jens opened the floor asking if everyone agreed with the agenda. There were no additional comments, so agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes from June 15 Board meeting and June 16 AGM

June 15 Board meeting minutes :

Jean raised a couple of points that should be modified. There was a motion to approve the minutes with an understanding that the changes will be made.

Moved by Jean and seconded by Ritu.

June 16 AGM minutes :

There were no comments. Jean moved to approve the minutes and Gerald seconded it.

3. Appointment of Officers

In the June 15 Board meeting since Paul was not present, the discussion on appointment of the Treasurer for fiscal year 2014 was postponed to this meeting. Garth proposed that we reappoint Paul to stand for another year. Jens formally asked Paul for this, and Paul agreed. Jean made the motion to appoint Paul as the CINP Treasurer for 2014 and Ritu seconded it.

Paul said this will be his last year in this role. He will step down once the auditing is over.

Garth asked if the new Treasurer should be appointed before Paul ends his term. There was a discussion on transfer of the NSERC MRS funds to the institution of the new Treasurer. Paul suggested that at first the funds from NSERC in 2015 be sent to Regina. This would allow Garth to at least continue immediately in a smooth manner with the regular CINP expenditures. Once the new Treasurer has been appointed the funds will be transferred to that place.

Garth said that the Treasurer need not necessarily have to be a Board Member.

Jens, Garth and everyone thanked Paul for his service in the role of Treasurer for long time.

4. Finance Report

Paul presented the financial report. He very humbly apologized for the unavoidable delay in circulating the report because the relevant person in financial services was unavailable due to health issues.

The detailed NSERC budget report was circulated prior to the meeting.

- He clarified that in the section FY14, the \$500 against WNPPC 2014 student support was for an invoice that came in late.
- In the “Commitments” section, he said that the funds marked against “Hard Probes” and “SSSP2015” will not be invoiced in this fiscal year.
- The current projected expenses lead to an overspending of \$1,170, which Paul remarked was a very comfortable situation.
- Jens mentioned that there will be an additional expenditure added with him attending the NUPECC meeting in 2014 fall in Edinburgh. It was decided to keep ~ \$750 against this in the budget line item as placeholder for projected expenses.

Report on the CINP private account

- Paul reported receiving the outstanding dues for the last two years from TRIUMF.
- \$20K was sent to Regina in support of the Executive Director
- The private fund balance is currently \$49,908.

Garth asked for a motion by the Board to approve the financial statements. Ritu moved to approved it and Jean seconded it.

Jens asked Paul to send the notice of annual dues to TRIUMF within this calendar year, which makes it easier for TRIUMF to make timely payments.

It was decided that Garth, on behalf of Jens, will email the financial statement to the institutional members asking for their approval.

5. Executive Director’s Report

a. Discussion on NSERC MRS application

- Garth checked if the invitation to participate in the NSERC MRS application, sent out by Paul, was received by everyone.
- Garth summarized the draft budget plans (with four different scenarios) in preparation for the NSERC MRS application Notice of Intent.
- Jean commented that we should increase the conference sponsorship line item from \$7,000 to \$10,000.
- There was extensive discussion on two budget items (a) Graduate student scholarship and (b) Post doctoral fellow supplement.

Jean first proposed that in order to make a more convincing case for new funding to NSERC, we offer support for graduate students to attend a summer school that very often is not so easy for a supervisor to support. He also mentioned that scholarships and stipends for graduate students and post docs. might be difficult to argue for because these are somewhat supported through research grants. It was also mentioned that if there is

one post doc. support available it is difficult to decide who should this support. He mentioned that to ask for a grant increase of 3-4 times larger than previous times we need to create a good model with proper rationale.

Garth mentioned that IPP ask for post doc. support was for theory and was based on the fact that in general theory grant sizes are smaller than experiment grant sizes. He also mentioned that people not in big project grants should avail this.

Gerald said anything can be tried out as long as it doesn't annoy the committee. He mentioned that the IPP post doc. position is gradually fading away. One of reasons for IPP post doc he said was to do more phenomenological work that would support the experimentalists as otherwise the theory grant would not have taken on such theory projects. This kind of thing is not so convincing case to make for nuclear physics. The explanation needs to be convincing. There might be a difficult situation as to who gets this support, since it will likely be only one support for the entire community.

Jens said it could be a model where we do not associate a post doc. to a specific project but we make an open competitive call for the named CINF post doctoral fellowship. The post doc. would choose where to go. The project needs to be approved by the Board. He mentioned that this would be a mission of CINF to attract good personnel from Canada and abroad with an eventual goal of increasing faculty positions in nuclear physics.

It was not decided yet whether it would be full support for one post doc. or partial support to be supplemented by the supervisor.

Ritu mentioned that Jean's proposal for supporting graduate students for summer school was a very good idea. In addition, she suggested we can offer partial scholarships to foreign graduate students who are not eligible to apply for the NSERC PGS-D fellowships. She said it would be difficult to coordinate funding one post doc. with limited benefit to a greater number of people in the community. Later, in the meeting while Ritu agreed that Jens's idea of trying to grow new faculty positions was a good one, it wasn't clear how this would work with the CINF sponsored post doc. Jens commented that at first it would be to raise the awareness on nuclear physics.

Paul echoed the suggestion that supporting graduate students would be a more democratic way of spreading around the support in the community.

Jens's suggestion on attracting highly skilled post docs. was adopted for the NOI budget planning.

It was discussed that the CINF MRS Notice of Intent amount would be increased to about \$150K.

Referees :

Jens suggested five names of high-profile reviewers for the MRS.

Angela Bracco, Brian Fulton, Tony Thomas, Rolf Keizer and Alinka Lepine-Szily

There was a question raised if the MRS grant requires external reviewers. Gerald checked his documents and found there were no external reports. He later confirmed from NSERC SAP MRS rules that generally there will not be any external reviewers but if needed expert(s) will be consulted.

5b. White Paper for Compute Canada

Garth mentioned that Reiner suggested a common white paper from CINP and IPP, which turned out to be a very good idea. He said that the response from nuclear theory was very strong. The theory support section of the white paper is almost entirely dominated by nuclear theory. He said that the draft of the white paper will be circulated by July 25. The plan is that the IPP Council and the CINP Board would separately approve it. Adam Garnswarthy is working together with Garth for coordinating this.

5c. CREATE Task force

Garth mentioned that the members of the task force are Mike Roney, Peter Krieger and Adam Ritz from the IPP. Garth Huber, Adam Sarty and Michael Gericke from CINP. It was discussed that there is no one in the task force with expertise on the TRIUMF-UBC successful CREATE grant. Jens said he will consider on that.

5d. CUPC student travel awards

The board approved four students awards at \$500 each in for supporting the travel expenses of students to attend the Canadian Undergraduate Physics Conference, 2014. A selection committee was formed with Jens and Jean as members from the Board and another members will be appointed. Garth was tasked to find a suitable person before the next CINP Board meeting.

5e. Conference support

The request for \$4000 to support the DREB 2016 conference was approved by the Board, conditional upon the successful renewal of the NSERC grant in 2015. Jens moved to support the conference and Gerald seconded it. The motion took place in the absence of Ritu since there was a conflict of interest on this subject.

5f. Terms of reference for the scientific working groups

Ritu moved to approved the terms of reference for the five different scientific working groups. In this process the change of name Beyond the Standard Model to Fundamental Symmetries was also approved. Jens seconded the motion.

6. TRIUMF news

- Jens reported that Jonathan Bagger has started his term from July 2. He has already attended the IUPAP WG9 meeting in Darmstadt which is a meeting of Heads of nuclear physics laboratories.

- NRC has asked TRIUMF to provide a rationale/plan for what to do with the 222 M funding announced by the Federal Government. This is for framing the Contribution Agreement.

- TRIUMF is preparing a budget request directly to Industry Canada in the pre-budget discussions. This will not be done by NRC because it is not in their mandate. TRIUMF has had discussions with Industry Canada who said they will directly entertain receiving the TRIUMF request. NRC will therefore not be commenting on this request. It is not clear how this additional funding will be provided, whether the 222 M number will be updated as a whole or will this be some separate contribution.

- In this context Jens mentioned that the CAP pre-budget submission went off well for subatomic physics. TRIUMF and SNOLAB were well featured and there was a mention that subatomic physics is very well coordinated in Canada.

7. Any other business

There was no other topic of discussion raised.

8. Approximate date for next meeting

The week of September 8 was discussed as a probable time for next meeting, specifically because this would be two weeks prior to the October 1 deadline for the NSERC MRS grant application submission.