



Canadian Institute of Nuclear Physics Institut canadien de physique nucléaire

Board of Directors Meeting 10:30 CST, November 13, 2014

Present: Jean Barrette, Paul Garrett, Gerald Gwinner, Garth Huber, Jeffery Martin.

Absent: Jens Dilling, Rituparna Kanungo

Minutes (taken by GH)

1 Approval of Agenda as circulated by GH.

2 Approval of Minutes of the meeting of September 11, 2014

- These are the revised minutes circulated by Ritu after Jean's comment.
- Approved: Jean/Paul.

3 Feedback from CUPC Student Award Competition (JB)

3.1 Selection procedure used

- 12 candidates, 4 prizes awarded.
- Each person (Juliette, Jens, Jean) separately ranked the students, Juliette did not rank one student she was in conflict on (supervisor Russel Mammei)
- 3 or 4 students were consistently ranked high
- 3 or 4 students were consistently ranked low
- There was less clear consensus on the ordering of the students in the middle.
- The committee first merged the individual rankings by averaging them. This provide a preliminary ranking. The final ranking was reached following a discussion of about each candidate with equal or very close ranking. The resulting top 4 candidates and 2 alternates were selected.

3.2 Jean's comments on the selection criteria

- The student's submitted abstract was very important.
 - Some students had too short or too long of an abstract. It was very useful to see what they submitted to CUPC, to see how much thought they put into it.
 - Many abstracts were very general, did not clearly identify the contribution of the student.
 - For next time: a statement from the supervisor on the student's specific contribution to the work would be very helpful.
- The seniority of the student was also considered.
 - For next time: the expected date of graduation should be listed.
- Student grades were considered.
 - Most students had very high grades, so small differences could not be used to distinguish between the better students, mostly useful to eliminate the weaker ones.
 - For next time: university transcripts should be requested. It was difficult to know if the student was selective in reporting only their better grades.
- Need for funds was also a consideration.

- This means priority was given to students who need to travel a longer distance to get to the conference. The higher cost might mean that they could not otherwise attend.
- Attracting a good student to the field was also a consideration.
 - Looked at how many nuclear physics-related projects the student had worked on.
 - Want good marks but this is not the only criterion.
- Jean does not think that the evaluation criteria should have fixed weights, it is better to give the committee members some flexibility to determine what they think is most important.
- It is necessary to have at least 3 people on the committee. It makes it easier to reach consensus if unanimity is not required.
- We also discussed whether a supervisor should be allowed to submit more than one application. It was decided to maintain this practice, but to require the supervisor to provide a ranking of the students if more than one is submitted.

4 CINP Booth at CUPC Grad Fair (JB)



- There were 27 booths, often with more than one faculty members per table. Since the attendance at the panel preceding the Graduate Studies Fair was about 70 students, and not all students attended the grad fair, there were almost more faculty members present than students.
- The booth locations were pre-assigned. The CINP booth was very well situated, located near the exit of the conference room, next to CAP. The booths were spread over 3 rooms so traffic flow to some booths might have been a problem.
- Jean thought the CINP booth was a success. He had discussions with 20-30 students, and 11 students signed up to be emailed more information. (GH will distribute these addresses shortly.)
- For next time: The two CINP banners were very helpful, but GH should make a CINP brochure similar to the format of the poster for students to take with them.
- Do not yet know where next year's CUPC will be held.

5 Executive Director Report (GH)

5.1 WNPPC Student Travel Awards

- Approved: Motion for 4x \$500 student travel awards to the WNPPC. Jean/Jeff
- WNPPC Abstract Submission Deadline: Jan 12, likely the deadline for travel award applications will be one week later, Jan 19.

- GH and Gerald agreed to be on the selection committee. GH will ask Juliette if she is available.
- Jean on reserve in case of any conflicts of interest.

5.2 CINP+IPP Research Context for SAPES

- The report was presented to SAPES at their Nov 6 policy meeting. The report was well received, likely will become an annual tradition.
- The report is now posted on the CINP website, an announcement will follow in the upcoming newsletter.

5.3 CINP+IPP CREATE Grant Task Force

- GH circulated his notes from the Sept 25 task force teleconference.
- Lengthy Board discussion:
 - Looks very daunting, putting together a strong application would be a very large amount of work.
 - Not obvious what the lead university would get out of this, why they would give it their strong support, including the apparently large expected cash contribution.
 - TRIUMF might be a better type of lead institution for this type of initiative, but they are clearly very busy with the ISOSIM program.
 - Not a natural fit for our community, if the industrial connection looks contrived the probability of success is likely small.
 - Accelerator Physics would be a stronger case if the lead institution had an already-existing Accelerator Physics Institute and degree program.
 - Medical instrumentation might be an easier match for the subatomic physics community, and there is a strong demand, but it would only be a compelling case from our community if the lead investigators diverted their efforts from fundamental SAP research to applied areas. That was not really the purpose of going down this path.
 - This was a nice suggestion from Elizabeth Boston, but it seems a poor fit to our needs and the success/effort ratio is not favorable.
 - We should keep this in mind for the future, but only follow up if we believe there is a natural fit with our community with a better chance of success.
 - Permission is given for GH to share our views with Mike Roney. We anticipate IPP Council will come with a similar conclusion at their Nov 20 meeting.

5.4 Discussion on Board preferences for date and location of CINP Town Hall meeting

- Constraints are:
 - Symmetries Symposium in Victoria: June 8-12
 - ACOT meeting at TRIUMF: June 12 and morning of June 13.
 - CAP Congress in Edmonton: traditional CINP Board meeting evening of June 14, with joint CINP+IPP session the morning of June 15.
- General preference to hold Town Hall meeting in Edmonton, starting afternoon of June 13 and all of June 14.

6 Finance Report (PG)

- No major activities other than some travel, CUPC awards.
- Approx. \$9000 in NSERC account, still expecting a deficit of \$2-3k by year end.
- \$50,434 in private account. Only recent expenses are for teleconferences.
- Audit: still getting all paperwork in place. Planning to do this in December.

7 Other Business

- The Board meeting minutes are posted on the CINP website. Should they be publicly-available or password-protected?
 - Currently, GH posts a tar file of Board minutes once per year. They are not posted quickly after each meeting, nor in an immediately-readable format.
 - We note that the IPP makes all of their Board minutes available on their website, and they are posted fairly regularly and in an immediately-readable format.
 - The logic for posting the minutes is to show we are accountable and transparent.
 - Decide to maintain the existing minutes posting policy.

8 Next Meeting

- Tentatively plan for second half of January 2015

9 Adjourn at 12:08 CST.