

Canadian Institute of Nuclear Physics Board Meeting

20 March 2014

Present: Garth, Jens, Jean, Ritu, Paul, Dave

Meeting Chair: Jens

Recording Secretary: Dave

1 Approval of Agenda

Approved.

2 Approval of Minutes from 20 February 2014

Minutes were not available and so the plan is to revisit this item at the next meeting.

3 URS Awards Committee

Peter circulated the following report to the committee via email, and then Jean also reported on the process.

The committee consisted of Peter Blunden (Manitoba), Jean Barrette (McGill), and Chris Ruiz (TRIUMF), and there were 11 applications, but the committee felt that four of them were significantly weaker than the seven that follow. These four were therefore not included in the rankings. The rankings of the remaining seven URS candidates are:

1. Murtha \$3,400 + \$1,300 travel
2. Rahman \$3,400
3. Davis-Purcell \$3,400 + \$1,300 travel
4. Morris \$3,400 + \$1,300 travel
5. Hansen \$3,400
6. Hodgins
7. Klassen

Depending on the total level of funding, we could award the top four or top five, with the last two as alternates should any of the top five not accept the award. Funding all five would cost \$20,900, including the travel awards.

Jean's report started out by mentioning that the committee used their own criteria, and it would have been useful to have had more direction from the Board. The committee members read each of the applications, then there was some discussion, the individual members reassessed, and then individual rankings were shared with the other members, and finally the rankings were combined. Although there were applicants from some of the members' institutions, there were no conflicts of interest.

Jean and Peter gave information on the top five recipients. The gender breakdown was one female and four male. The titles of the top projects were read out and the committee felt there was a broad balance of topics represented, but

they did not look too closely at the breakdown of project versus laboratory. It was decided that more criteria would be developed.

Jens thought that it was a good start for the first year of the program; next year there would be more concrete criteria and the committee should be thanked.

At this point Ritu suggested that we might want to base our award system on the TRIUMF model where actual projects (jobs) would be posted and then any student could apply to them. Others, however, did not like this idea and it was decided that we would continue with the current model. Next year it was also suggested that there should only be one application per supervisor. It was also agreed that we should reevaluate at the end of the summer to see how people thought everything worked out. New criteria could then be developed and we could incorporate any lessons that we have learned.

The question was then asked whether or not we had enough money to fund five applications. Paul said that this was indeed the case, even though we have other requests. There is \$17k in the NSERC account for the current fiscal year with another \$22.5k for the next FY till 01 April 2015. We would need \$20.9k to support the top five applications, and since we are not supporting graduate students this year, it should work out. Jens asked about next year, and since there is always carry-over we should be OK. However, we probably will not be able to support five every year; three or four will most like be more sustainable. Garth pointed out that five this year will look great on our NSERC renewal this fall.

Jens made a motion to support the top five applications, Jean seconded it, and it passed unanimously. The question was asked what we should do if one of the five withdrew, and everyone was happy with awarding the stipend to numbers six and seven directly, without any further discussion necessary. Jens made a motion to this effect with the caveat that we would *not* fund anyone past #7 regardless of the number of withdrawals, although this scenario was highly unlikely. Ritu seconded it and it passed.

4 Executive Director's Report

- (a) Membership: The case of Rutledge was considered and it was not really clear whether he was an astronomer or a nuclear astrophysicist. However, it was pointed out that we already approved Andrew Cummings, and he is in the same boat, so we really cannot deny Rutledge. He is NSERC eligible, and full-time faculty member and he isn't about to take over the CINP, so we should be just fine. Moreover, Jens pointed out that we will benefit from this. It was suggested that maybe he could be nominated for the SWG chair, but since he does not apply to GSC 19, this would be awkward. Jean made a motion, Jens seconded it and it was unanimously approved.

Next up was the associate membership of Bernier. This was a slam dunk since this was a student of Reiner Krücken. Jean made a motion to approve the membership, Jens seconded it and it again passed unanimously.

Finally, discussion about removing associate member Sophie Chagnon-Lessard ensued. She was no longer a student and nor did she have anything to do with the CINP. Paul made a motion to remove her, Jean seconded it, and it carried without dissension.

- (b) Conference Support: There was an application from Sangyong Jeon and Charles Gale for the 7th International Conference on Hard and Electromagnetic Probes of High-Energy Nuclear Physics. This support was for graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, and it was for both a workshop and conference. The feeling was generally favourable, but wording should be included so that support for Canadians was prioritized. Jean noted that this was a medium-sized conference and so that support should be at the \$3,000-4,000 level and not the requested \$5,000. Jens pointed out that it was a topical conference of the Type B variety similar to Nuclear Structure 2014, and suggested we should fund it at the same level, i.e. \$4,000. Dave suggested putting in the same wording regarding Canadian students as the NS2014 conference. A motion on the Hard Probes conference support, with the same provisos as the recently approved Nuclear Structure conference, was made by Jean and seconded by Paul, and it carried.

Support for a graduate booth at the CUPC in October 2014 at Queen's University was then discussed. Jean pointed out that this is money well spent and suggested we continue with our support of \$1,000. Jens agreed that this is a good idea and made a motion to that effect. Dave seconded it, it passed and Jean said he would attend and man the booth.

- (c) Approval of CINP Bylaws and Articles of Continuance: The bylaws were approved as presented. However, there was a discussion on voluntary dues for affiliate members. It was agreed that any amounts paid would be at the mutual agreement of the affiliate member and the CINP Board, as is stated in the draft presented.

Two motions were presented. One, Jens put forward that we accept the changes to the bylaws and the articles. Jean seconded and it carried. Second, Ritu made a motion to hold a special institutional members' meeting to approve the new bylaws, Jens seconded it and it carried. Garth said he would arrange this soon.

- (d) Joint NSERC Create LOI with IPP: Everyone agreed this would be great, but it would be very complicated to realize. First of all, finding a willing university and VP research would be very challenging due to the significant amount of work involved. Garth pointed out that Regina had an inexplicably large allotment at four. He also said that Samir said not to put too much effort into it, due to the perceived low change of success. Jens suggested that we should still keep this in mind and maybe apply next year. Jean asked about who would be the PI, and the general feeling was that it did not look too promising, regardless of how beneficial it might be.

Jens made a motion to send a note to the IPP to gauge their interest, and to form a task force to study the idea in more detail for next year. It was agreed that this was the best course of action to take. Jean seconded this motion and it carried.

- (e) Proposed CINF+IPP Meeting Schedule at CAP Congress: Jens suggested we have a joint dinner with the IPP and then our 20:00 board meeting before the CAP begins.

- (f) SWG Chair Renewal Update:

- (a) Nuclear Structure – At the time of the meeting, the election was still ongoing between Kanungo and Garnsworthy.
- (b) Hadrons/QCD – Charles Gale was acclaimed.
- (c) Nuclear Physics Education and Training – Ongoing election between Bacca and Mammei.
- (d) Nuclear Astrophysics – Nominations still open, but closing soon.

There was a brief discussion on SWG chair term, and it was agreed to maintain the current five-year practice, as it is a natural timescale based on LPR preparations, etc. At the next meeting, there should be a discussion on the terms of reference for the SWG chairs.

5 News from TRIUMF

Jens reported that there was a new TRIUMF director, J. Bagger, a particle theorist and supersymmetry expert. He is to start on 2 July 2014, and everyone is very happy.

6 Financial Report

Paul Garrett presented a short financial report of the CINF. At the time of the meeting, a few days before the end of the fiscal year the balance in the NSERC Account is \$17,400. This does not include, however, the commitment decided earlier in the meeting (i.e. summer student scholarships, contribution to Hard Probe Conference and to CUPC). A new yearly installment of the present NSERC Grant (\$22,500) should be arriving on April 1st. This will be the last year of the present CINF NSERC Grant.

The account of the Institution totals at the time of the meeting roughly \$55,900. This includes the payments received from some institutions for FY2013. Payment from five institutions totalling \$16k is still outstanding.

7 Other Business

The next Board Meeting was tentatively scheduled for the week of 19–23 May 2014, a few weeks before the CAP Congress. The exact time will be set following a Doodle poll to be sent by Garth.

8 Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 14:08 EDT.