

**Final Approved Minutes  
Executive Board  
American Association of Physics Teachers  
January 5, 6, and 10, 2007  
Seattle, Washington  
Session I, January 5, 2007**

**Members Present:** Ken Heller, President; Dick Peterson, Past President; Harvey Leff, President Elect; Lila Adair, Vice President; Mary Beth Monroe, Secretary; Chuck Robertson, Treasurer; Randy Peterson, Chair of Section Representatives; Al Gibson, Vice Chair of Section Representatives; John Roeder, At-Large Member; Dwain Desbien, At-Large Member; Jan Tobochnik, Editor, *American Journal of Physics* (AJP); Karl Mamola, Editor, *The Physics Teacher* (TPT); Toufic Hakim, Executive Officer

**Members Absent:** Ruth Chabay, At-Large Member

**Guests:** Warren Hein, Bernard Khoury, Jack Hehn, Leonard Jossem, Alex Dickison, Gordon Ramsey, Steve Iona, Rob Headrick, Rob Merz, Roxanne Muller, Mary Creason, Valerie Evans, Maria Elena Khoury, Charles Holbrow

**1. Welcome and Call to Order.** Heller called the meeting to order and welcomed all members and guests.

**2. Changes to the Agenda.** Heller noted two items to be added to the agenda for January 6. Three Area Chairs were invited to attend the Board Meeting to make reports regarding the activities of their committees. At the invitation of Monroe, Charles Holbrow, Chair of the Pubs Study Committee, would visit with the Board on January 6 to respond to questions regarding the committee's report.

**3. Approval of the Minutes.** Gibson moved that the October 2006 Minutes be approved, allowing for minor editorial changes. Desbien seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**4. Report from the Executive Officer.** Hakim's comprehensive status report on follow-up activities to the October Board meeting and a report of current efforts within the National Office were included in the January iBook (see page 36 and page 38). Highlights of his additional report to the Board follow.

- The premier issue of *Interactions* would make its appearance on Monday January 8. Hakim recognized Rob Merz as the new marketing manager and announced that a new web manager (Vivienne Butler) had joined the Office on January 2.
- The financial condition of AAPT is stable with reserves in fine shape. He will bring expenditure requests to the Board over the next few months and therefore he will need to think about the reserves strategically.
- In response to the Board's directive to establish professional fundraising activities, a new development officer will be hired in March.

In discussion of Hakim's report, Mamola advised that he had plenty of anecdotal information showing that international members have an interest in the TPT as well as the AJP. His comment was made in response to Hakim's written report that the National Office would be investigating the factors contributing to AAPT international membership, which has remained steady at 13% over the past several years. This membership had been credited to their interest in the AJP and in an affiliation with a U.S.-based association.

## **5. Reports from AAPT Officers.**

- **Treasurer.** Robertson reported that the AAPT had over \$7 million in its long term reserve. As of the last report in November, the 2006 Operating Net Income had a deficit of \$459,486, which was \$183,397 more than the budgeted deficit of \$276,088. Robertson suggested that the many projects initiated by the Board in 2006 could be the primary factor contributing to the additional loss.

R. Peterson asked if the loss in revenue could be attributed to membership renewals. Hein explained that many membership renewals come in late in the year and it was possible that the budget did not reflect these receipts. However, he had not yet examined the budget to determine the causes for this deficit.

Hein reported that there have been problems with the auditors, which will cause a delay of the audit report to May. The Board will need to call a special meeting to consider the auditors' report or delay the action until the summer meeting. Robertson explained that the auditors had expressed a wish to leave. Following negotiations, the auditors agreed to conduct the audit this year, but requested more time since they were getting a late start. AAPT will contract with different auditors for 2008. Hakim commented that the recommendation was to change auditors every five or six years and AAPT has had the same auditors for a few years. D. Peterson replied that there are different opinions on this.

- **Secretary.**

a) December 22, 2006 Monroe transmitted the following electronic motion, prepared by Hakim, to the Board:

**The AAPT Executive Board makes Toufic Hakim's appointment to the AIP Governing Board effective January 1, 2007. Hakim will replace Bernard Khoury, who is resigning his position on the AIP Governing Board, effective this same date. The motion passed unanimously.**

b) Monroe reported that Joe Meyer and Debbie Rice had confirmed the election of Alex Dickison as Vice President, Steve Iona as Secretary, and Gordon Ramsey as the At-Large Member representing four-year colleges and universities. The three will assume their term of office at the close of this January meeting.

In discussion of this item, R. Peterson explained that there had been some comments made among Section Representatives that the election results were made public before the vote tally had been confirmed. Monroe replied that this was not the case. As soon as she receives confirmation of the election results from the Tellers (normally within 1-2 days of the November

1 voting deadline) she calls each candidate by phone. She reports to each candidate who was elected for their position on the ballot and if the candidates express an interest she will share with them *the vote tally for their position only*. As soon as all candidates have been advised of the election results, which are normally within 3-4 days, she emails the Board the names of the elected candidates. The vote tally is regarded as confidential and is not shared with the Board (unless the information is needed to resolve an issue that may arise). The Secretary does report to the Board the total number of votes received by the Tellers. The ballots received by the Tellers do not in any way reveal their identity, institutional affiliation, or educational level. After the Board has been informed, the National Office initiates its process for formally announcing the names of the elected candidates.

B. Khoury described the report of election results as having two parts. One is the reporting of the election results to the candidates by the AAPT Secretary. The second addresses how to make this information public. For the last election in 2006, the National Office posted the results on the AAPT website the day after Monroe informed the Board. Khoury asked if the same should be done for the nominees for the Fall 2007 elections. In previous years, such announcements were made in the *Announcer*.

In response to a question from the Board, Monroe explained that the Nominating Committee selects candidates (normally two, except in the case of the incumbent Secretary/Treasurer seeking election) for the AAPT elections and the AAPT Constitution also provides for nominations from the general membership. A petition for additional nominations must be signed by at least 2% of the regular and emeritus members of the AAPT and the Secretary must receive the original by a date set by the Executive Board. In response to a recommendation from D. Peterson, Hakim said he would discuss a feasible deadline date with Monroe and report their recommendation to the Board.

c) Monroe distributed copies of the committee assignments for 2007 Board members. She also distributed copies of the 2007 Conflict of Interest forms, asking members to complete and sign the forms and return one copy to Iona, the incoming Secretary.

• **Vice President.** Adair reported that the program for the Seattle meeting looked great. She had no additional items for report at this time.

In the Board's discussion of the program, Heller asked Hakim to report on the Symposium for Physics Education, which he had initiated. Hakim reported that the theme for this first Symposium was "*Overcoming Gravity, The Critical Force of Physics Education in Boosting National Competitiveness*". A panel had been assembled to address the following questions:

- Why do we need a strong workforce in science and engineering?
- What should be the role of physics education in developing this workforce?
- Are recent increases in the numbers of students in physics a supportive trend?
- What sort of local action and new thinking are needed to sustain this trend?

Panel members included Mary Jean Ryan, Chair of the Washington Board of Education; Jeanne Narum, Director of Project Kaleidoscope (Panel Moderator); Arthur Bienenstock, Professor of Materials Science and Acting Provost for Graduate Education at Stanford; Kenneth Krane,

Professor of Physics at Oregon State University; Michael Neuschatz, Research Associate at AIP Statistical Research Center; and an executive (to be named) from Microsoft.

Proceedings will be made available for this special afternoon session. It is Hakim's intent to have a symposium as a plenary session at every Winter meeting. Due to scheduling difficulties this year's event was held in parallel with other meeting sessions. Hakim acknowledged the help from AIP, APS, and AAS leaders in organizing this event.

• **President Elect.** Leff reported that the Meetings Committee would have seven voting members and one non-voting member. (See Board Minutes, October 2006, Item 8.) His appointments to date included Dick Peterson as Chair, Alex Dickison as incoming Vice President, the two members from Section Reps—Tom O'Kuma and Mario Belloni (the Representative from the host section), and Mary Beth Monroe as one of two rotating members. Maria Elena Khoury, Director of Programs and Meetings, will serve as a non-voting member. Leff will complete the appointments in the near future.

Leff pointed out that the Board needed to authorize a budget for the committee to cover travel support for the members. Heller expressed concern that too many committee meetings were scheduled during national meetings and thought it would be wiser to have the committee meet in College Park. Robertson expressed that it might be cheaper for the committee to meet at a national meeting. D. Peterson stated that the committee would probably meet twice with a lot of additional electronic communications. He added that some travel might involve an occasional site visit.

**Leff moved that the AAPT financially support committee-related travel for members of the Meetings Committee. Adair seconded the motion.**

It was agreed that the Board would evaluate the committee expenses in one year. Hakim explained that he would designate \$15,000 for the committee and budget accordingly. Robertson directed that the money be taken from Klopsteg. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Leff expressed that the committee membership should also include a current Board member, in addition to the Vice President, and someone from the Executive Office. He explained that while his appointments would include a Board member, the defining list of committee membership should include a Board member. Leff also recommended that the Associate Executive Officer be a member. D. Peterson suggested that if the Board wanted to have the Meetings Committee parallel that of other organizational committees such as the Publications Committee, the membership listing should be phrased as the Executive Officer or his designate. Heller asked if the Meetings Committee should be given a sunset date. The Board agreed that this could be an item to be addressed by the Governance Committee.

• **President.** Heller reported that he had appointed Tom Foster (South Illinois University) to the Governance Committee.

**6. Officers' Visit to the NSF.** Monroe reported that on December 18 the Executive Officer Review Committee (Heller, Leff, Monroe, and Adair as guest) and Hakim met with program

directors, division directors, and assistant directors from the Directorate of Education and Human Resources (EHR)/Divisions of Undergraduate Education and Elementary (DUE), Secondary, and Informal Education (ESIE), and the Directorate of Mathematical and Physical Sciences (MPS)/Divisions of Physics and Materials Research. Highlights from their visit follow.

- Linda Slakey asked how far down the educational ladder AAPT's influence reached. Heller replied that there were many AAPT activities that addressed the needs of high school teachers and Monroe added that some efforts targeted the lower levels through the efforts of some Area Committees, such as the pre-high school and science education for the public committees.
- Duncan McBride, DUE S-STEM, explained that it was too early to determine how the new budget would impact DUE. Currently the NSF was operating under continuing resolution status. Therefore the NSF salaries and expenditures budget were frozen and travel was limited. The Division would not be able to implement desired changes in the Distinguished Teaching Scholars program. The budget for the CCLI program in 2007 is now 60% of its original budget four years ago. Slakey asked AAPT's help in helping to advertise the value of these awards.
- Robert Gibbs, Instructional Materials Development, and Karen Zuga, Teacher Professional Continuum, announced that ESIE would be combined with REC (Research, Evaluation, and Communication) to form the Division of Research in Learning (DRL). The purpose of the new division would be concerned with research in STEM education. Therefore faculty will need to reconsider how they will obtain funding to support professional development and curriculum development, possibly turning to the other NSF divisions, such as the Physics Division, and state support through their Math Science Partnership awards from the U.S. Department of Education.
- A topic generating much discussion during the AAPT visit with the MPS Directorate was the RET (Research Experience for Teachers) program. One aspect of the discussion addressed how the MPS programs could involve the two-year college community. The MPS program directors and officers (Joseph Dehmer, John Lightbody, and Lance Haworth) expressed serious interest in also working with AAPT in its efforts to reach out to the Historically Black Colleges and Universities and tribal colleges and its efforts addressing the outreach initiatives at the Materials Research Science and Engineering Centers (MRSEC), Partnerships for Research and Education in Materials (PREM) and Physics Frontier Centers.
- Wanda Ward, EHR Acting Assistant Director, at the conclusion of the AAPT visit, said that the AAPT would be on the EHR's invitation list to attend the NSF budget rollout. During discussion of the report, Hehn clarified that the U.S. Department of Education should not be characterized as being the primary agent supporting implementation of new K-12 curriculum (see iBook, page 44).

**7. Communication and Open Access.** Rob Headrick, Director of Communications and Publications, referred to his report included in the Board iBook (see page 46) and welcomed any questions or comments. Robertson asked what the timeline for the new AAPT homepage was. Headrick explained that he could not give a date, but estimated about 6 months. He explained that the new website manager, Vivienne Butler, would design and maintain the new homepage. Headrick added that some issues of *Interactions* would be distributed during the Seattle meeting and asked Board members to provide feedback to Daryl Malloy, Managing Editor. Headrick complimented the effort by Malloy to produce the 40-page magazine in 4 months. Headrick informed the Board that a first discussion of Open Access to AAPT electronic journals would occur during the meeting of the Publications Committee on Sunday.

**8. Membership Overview.** Valerie Evans, Director of Membership and Stewardship, reported that the trial memberships initiative has gone very well, especially since it has been publicized online. The offer includes a six-month complimentary membership to Section members who are not already national members with an additional one-year membership for half-rate. To date AAPT has received 250 applications and she projected that by mid-February the number will have increased to 500. Evans explained that the major challenge with the trial free-memberships is to develop a benefits package that will be attractive and foster renewals. Her department periodically surveys these members to learn their needs and interests.

**9. Report from AIP Education Director.** Hehn thanked the Board again for its standing invitation to the AIP Education Director to attend all meetings of the AAPT Executive Board. The new CEO for AIP is Fred Dylla from Jefferson Labs. Dylla's time at AIP will overlap with Marc Brodsky in March and then Dylla will assume the CEO position April 1. B. Khoury was deeply involved in the search for the new CEO. Hehn concluded by saying that this has been a very challenging year with respect to Congressional activities and the activities of AIP member societies. B. Khoury complimented the work of the AIP Search Committee, noting that D. Peterson had served on this committee.

Hakim expressed his thanks to Hehn for his help in organizing the Symposium.

**10. Area Chairs' Meeting.** Leff reviewed the events of the Area Chairs' Meeting. He said that Hakim gave an excellent presentation and it was well received.

Prior to the meeting, Leff and Adair sent letters to Area Chairs asking them to examine their committee's mission statement and to determine how well the activities of the committee agreed with their mission. Following the general orientation regarding the Chairs' responsibilities in 2007, Leff led a general discussion concerning the role of Area Committees and the need for stronger committee governance. Subsequently the Chairs broke into four groups to discuss restructuring possibilities. The general consensus from the four groups was that the Chairs did not see a need for significant change. They did not feel that there were too many committees and did not believe any committees should be eliminated or combined.

Leff and Adair had developed some restructuring plans for the committees, as had Hakim, to help generate discussion among the Chairs. However, Leff and Adair decided not to present these plans to the Chairs, preferring to get input from the Chairs first. Leff said it was not clear to

him what would be done with the plans. During the meeting of the Chairs, some volunteered to serve on a subcommittee that would meet in College Park to begin planning for the two-day retreat for all Chairs tentatively scheduled for early summer. Leff concluded that the letter to Area Chairs and the subsequent discussion were successful in stimulating serious thought about the missions of Area Committees and their role in the organization. The Chairs' views have been expanded. Leff asked for advice concerning how to proceed in this effort to more actively involve the committees.

B. Khoury stated that it was significant to him that the reports from the four Chairs' groups did not refer to policy issues. It would have been useful if the groups had discussed the general purpose of Area Committees. He only heard one group allude to activities not concerned with planning the programs of AAPT meetings. Ramsey commented that most Area Committees are trying to do more outreach programs, which is an expansion of what the Board is presently trying to accomplish. Gibson opined that the Board was not really giving the committees credit for all that they are doing. Adair reported that one Chair had asked her if it would be ok for him to attend a Section meeting.

Robertson expressed that the questionnaire sent to the Chairs before their meeting stimulated the Chairs to think on their committee activities and that such discussions during future Chairs' meetings could help wean committees from only discussing meeting program activities. Desbien proposed that the At-Large Members on the Board could serve a more active role in helping Area Committees to consider new ideas addressing committee missions. He also asked that the Board be given an opportunity to review the restructuring models before they were shared with the committees. C. Robertson suggested that the Chairs' retreat should include the recent past chairs.

Gibson recalled that in the late 1980s, the Area Chairs met for 1.5-day training period in advance of the national meeting. The practice was ended because of the expense. D. Peterson added that some Chairs did not like the training meetings because of the additional commitment of time required of them. Heller reported that he was surprised that the Chairs did not recognize the potential linkages between committees. He therefore predicted that it was going to be hard to make change happen. Gibson, on the other hand, noted that there is some amount of cooperation between Area Committees such as the current efforts by the high school and teacher prep committees.

The discussion then turned to Board visitation to the meetings of the Area Committees. The Board had discussed during its October meeting whether or not to continue its practice of visiting the meetings of the Area Committees during national meetings. No consensus had been reached. Leff explained that the Board does need some type of report of committee activities. Therefore, he and Adair prepared some forms to be completed by the Chairs by the conclusion of the national meeting. They also advised the Chairs that Board members would only officially visit their meetings upon request by the committee. Only one committee requested a visit by a Board member. Heller felt that Board members should continue to visit the committees and asked each Board member to identify one committee he/she would visit. Unlike recent national meetings, Board members would not submit general reports of their visits.

**11. Executive Session I (with Executive Officers).** Heller called the Board into Executive Session I to hear a meeting update by Adair and Hakim.

**12. Executive Session II (without Executive Officers).** At the close of Executive Session I, Heller convened the Board in Executive Session II (1) to approve the Minutes of the October 2006 Executive Sessions of the Board and (2) to consider the report from the Executive Officer Review Committee.

*(At the close of Executive Session II, Heller adjourned Session I of the Board.)*

**Session II, January 6, 2007**

**Members Present:** Ken Heller, President; Dick Peterson, Past President; Harvey Leff, President Elect; Lila Adair, Vice President; Mary Beth Monroe, Secretary; Chuck Robertson, Treasurer; Randy Peterson, Chair of Section Representatives; Al Gibson, Vice Chair of Section Representatives; John Roeder, At-Large Member; Dwain Desbien, At-Large Member; Jan Tobochnik, Editor, *American Journal of Physics* (AJP); Karl Mamola, Editor, *The Physics Teacher* (TPT); Toufic Hakim, Executive Officer

**Members Absent:** Ruth Chabay, At-Large Member

**Guests:** Charlie Holbrow, Bruce Mason, Rob Headrick, Rob Merz, John Layman, Warren Hein, Bernard Khoury, Roxanne Muller

*(Heller reconvened the meeting of the Board.)*

**13. Report from PAG (Planning Action Group).** Hakim reported that PAG had met three weekends during the Fall and during the first two days of the Seattle meeting. The group was realizing progress. The Board received in December a first report from PAG regarding AAPT vision, values, and constituency. By March PAG will have developed a strategic framework of impact goals. Hakim will then work with Karen Johnston and Warren Hein to fill in the gaps. Subsequently their report will be sent to external reviewers. The reviewers will interact with members of the Board during its April meeting and will react to the plan developed by PAG. Hakim explained that PAG still needed to develop a strategic goal addressing general membership over the next 5-10 years. This will occur between April and July. Members of the Planning Action Group are Dick Peterson, Dwain Desbien, Al Gibson, and Ruth Chabay.

D. Peterson added that the main subject of the group's meeting in December concerned organizational structure of AAPT. PAG is continuing to work with Hakim to help provide him with AAPT background information. During the last meeting of PAG in Seattle, the members worked on the development of goals and objectives targeting membership and benefits. As yet the group had not yet begun to prioritize the goals.

In response to a question from Heller, Hakim explained that the work of the external reviewers would be to review the work of PAG against background materials of the type used and begun at the June Retreat. These documents provide a good sense of what AAPT is. Two reviewers have been identified (Don Langenberg, Chancellor of Prof. of Physics, University of Maryland, and

Neal Abraham, Provost and Faculty Dean, DePauw University) and a third will be brought on board.

**14. Pubs Study Committee.** During the Summer 2006 meeting of the Publications Committee, the members asked Monroe as Chair to appoint a special study committee to

1. Determine important issues related to AAPT online publications,
2. To review, and possibly prepare a revision of, the current job description of the AAPT Online Editor, and
3. To make recommendations regarding membership to the 2007 search committee for an Online Editor.

Bruce Mason's term as Interim Editor will end in January 2008. The Pubs Study Committee was also asked to make recommendations regarding

- What should constitute online publications,
- The distinctions between AAPT electronic publications and AAPT materials published on ComPADRE, if any; and
- The relationship should be between the AAPT Online Publications Editor and ComPADRE.

Members of the Study Committee were Charles Holbrow, Chair, Robert Beichner, Robert Headrick, Roger Stuewer, and Toufic Hakim (ex officio).

During the Seattle meeting of the Publications Committee, the members had considered the report from the Study Committee and had voted to recommend that the Board accept the report and its seventeen recommendations. In anticipation of the Board's discussion of this item in Session III, Monroe asked Holbrow to visit with the Board to address questions they may have. Holbrow summarized the Study Committee's report and gave the rationale for their seventeen explicit recommendations. These addressed seven general recommendations abbreviated below:

1. AAPT appoint an Online Publications Editor in Chief (OPEIC) to identify, solicit, generate, and publish online materials worthy of preservation and dissemination to AAPT members, the larger physics community, and other purposes supporting the goals of AAPT;
2. The OPEIC will identify, recruit, and appoint Area Editors;
3. AAPT will pay the Editor in Chief and the Area Editors;
4. AAPT will identify several possible sources of online publications material;
5. AAPT will own the copyrights to its online publications, maintain these publications on its own servers, be responsible for the long-term preservation of the publications, and seek to use them to produce an income stream;
6. AAPT will develop a plan of feedback and evaluation as an integral part of every website; and
7. AAPT should allocate about \$100 per web page.

D. Peterson asked if conference sites on the web should be password protected, thus making access a membership benefit. The Study Committee recommended that AAPT require a fee to access the conference papers, which would produce a revenue stream for the Association.

Monroe asked if *Interactions* should be the responsibility of the Online Publications Editor. Holbrow explained that the real thrust for AAPT is to identify new sources for online publications, not to move current publications out of the national office. The Study Committee had not considered this publication or the general AAPT web presence. He suggested that the Board might want to consider the establishment of an Online Publications Area Editor, who would oversee national office publications.

Holbrow explained that he had talked with Bruce Mason regarding AAPT materials published in ComPADRE. Mason and Holbrow agreed that the Editor in Chief (EIC) should decide what materials to publish in ComPADRE. Mason expressed his concern that it was not clear what would happen to the AAPT materials in ComPADRE when the NSF funding for the digital library comes to an end. He stressed that the Board needs to consider the short-term and long-term relationship between the Association and ComPADRE.

In response to a question from Tobochnik, Holbrow explained that the Study Committee envisioned the time commitment for the EIC to eventually be comparable to that of the AJP and TPT editors, although maybe not in the beginning. (See also these Minutes, Item 25.)

**15. Doubling Initiative 1.** Hakim and Hein proposed that AAPT adopt an initiative to double the number of physics major graduates as an impact goal (See Board iBook, page 54.) This discussion by the Board was the first of two; the second discussion was scheduled for Session III of the Board during the report from Ted Hodapp, APS Director of Education. (See these Minutes, Item 23.)

The doubling initiative proposal is a response to the American Competitiveness Initiative (ACI) legislation before the U.S. Congress. The Initiative had adopted the recommendations of the National Academies' report, *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*. The legislation calls for stronger STEM education at all levels. Two of the recommended strategies proposed an expansion of America's science and engineering talent pool (a) by improving K-12 science and math education through teacher recruitment and professional development and (b) by attracting the best and brightest in science and engineering higher education (providing 250,000 four-year undergraduate scholarships to increase the number of U.S. citizens with a bachelor's degree in science or engineering.) Hakim and Hein expressed that this effort provided AAPT with a significant opportunity to have a proactive role in supporting both the national science agenda and AAPT's interests in advancing teacher preparation, professional development, and undergraduate physics education.

Hakim described earlier efforts by components of the physics community to increase the number of graduating physics majors. The current initiative proposes to increase the number of physics graduates from 5 K to 10 K. The Executive Office would like for AAPT to have its own statements regarding doubling initiative, which would establish an AAPT ownership in this effort. However, the doubling initiative would be a physics community-wide initiative with APS and AAPT in the lead. Hakim reported that PAG would be listing this initiative as a primary goal within its forthcoming strategic framework. The timeline for the proposed goal would be 5-10 years.

Doubling the number of physics graduates is a serious and ambitious goal and will bring important secondary issues to the table for discussion, such as the value of a degree in physics. Involvement in this effort will provide AAPT with the opportunity to build on the findings of the SPIN-UP project, especially those addressing HBCUs (Historically Black Colleges and Universities). Hakim explained that he wanted this action by the Board in Session II so the Board could report to Hodapp during Session III that AAPT had made a serious commitment to this initiative. (See these Minutes, Item 23.)

Hein pointed out that the number of physics graduates today is the same as it was ten years ago, but the number of all college graduates is 2-3 times larger. He stressed that the focus is on the number of bachelor degrees, not PhD's. A bachelor's degree in physics can prepare students for many different career paths. In addition the military are stressing a real need to graduate more domestic students. Roeder asked if there was literature advertising a physics degree as a preparation for different careers. Some Board members explained that this information is readily available from the Society of Physics Students.

Ramsey added that some universities have different career tracks for their physics majors and advised AAPT to solicit additional information from them. Tobochnik expressed that AAPT is well positioned to significantly contribute to the doubling initiative since the Association is an organization of teachers and can build on its connections between different education institutions and across educational levels to reach out to students. Hakim added that the AAPT could also impact the curriculum aspects of this effort. Several Board members made comments illustrating the need to better advertise to students, counselors, and college faculty what physics majors do in the real world and the job market for physics majors. Board members also stressed the importance of involving two-year colleges and minority-serving institutions (MSIs) in this doubling initiative.

Heller reported that the AIP was organizing a liaison committee to reach out to MSIs and wanted an AAPT representative on the committee. The purpose of the committee will be to enhance the opportunities in physics for members of underrepresented groups.

**Hakim moved that the AAPT Board endorse the doubling goal as an AAPT initiative and to charge the national office with developing a plan of action for implementation, complete with strategies and timelines, and with a detailed description of how the partnership with APS and other societies will operate. Leff seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**16. Bauder and Venture Funds.** Robertson reported that the Bauder Fund had received three applications for a total of \$2500. The Venture Fund had not received any requests for funding. Robertson will urge Section Representatives to solicit proposals for these funds. (Also see these Minutes, Item 29.)

**17. Visits from Area Chairs.** Leff explained that in an effort to strengthen connections between the Area Committees and the Executive Board, as well as other groups within the AAPT, Hakim had invited three Area Chairs to attend our Board meeting and to describe their committee activities, challenges facing their committees, and ideas that would help enhance communication

across all AAPT groups. The Board will continue to invite Area Chairs to its meetings. Visiting this meeting were Wayne Fisher, High School Committee, Janelle Bailey, Space Science and Astronomy Committee, and Peggy Hill and Marie Plumb (outgoing and incoming Chairs), Women's Committee.

Fisher described his committee as fairly active in both the development of activities for meeting programs and publications for high school teachers, such as the "Physics First" booklet. He noted that it is easier to generate the activities than to provide the follow through necessary to complete the tasks. The time commitment for such tasks is typically longer than the term of the Chair (two years). He explained that most of the work was accomplished by subcommittees. In recent years there have been subcommittees addressing No Child Left Behind legislation, high school laboratory guidelines, qualifications of high school teachers, and the photo contest. He noted that a sub committee on state standards was being organized.

Hill reported that this has been an exciting year for Women in Physics. The committee would like to organize a website. The website would report information related to faculty searches and activities reported in the CSWP newsletter. Hill would like to consult with other area committees that had created their own websites.

Bailey reported that the Space Science and Astronomy Committee had been busy during the past year as it prepared for our joint meeting with AAS. She described their committee as being very visible within the community but with little activity. She would like to change that. She would like to see the completion of a survey, a previous committee effort that had died due to lack of people power. Bailey explained that she had been frustrated because of the lack of response from her committee members. Little activity was occurring outside of the committee meetings. However, she and Tim Slater were talking about how their committee could replicate some of the AAS activities. She also suggested that there could be a strong linkage and cooperation between the AAPT Women in Physics Committee and the AAS committee for women in astronomy.

Hakim asked the Area Chairs if they thought their term of one year was long enough. Hill replied that while she had strong support, she had received very little mentoring. Therefore she was trying to work more closely with Plumb to facilitate the transition. Bailey commented that she really liked the idea of Vice Chairs, which was suggested during the Chairs meeting. Hein asked the Chairs how the committees involved Friends of the committees. Hill and Bailey said the Friends responded to emails on the committees' listservs and gave some feedback during committee meetings, but that was pretty much the extent of their involvement.

Hakim asked the Chairs if the Nominating Committees look at specific criteria when they select new members for the committees. Bailey responded that most nominations to her committee have been volunteers. During the last appointment, she had prioritized the applications for the Nominating Committee. She explained that her committee has had members appointed to the committee that were not known by the Chair. Her committee had also had problems with some members serving on a second committee, which met at the same scheduled time. Overall, Bailey described as all nominees for her committee as reasonable candidates. Hill reported that when the Nominating Committee has consulted her about committee appointments, she stressed the need for diversity across educational levels and from different geographic locations. She had

found the nominations to be primarily a good process. Hill complimented the work by the last Nominating Committee. Hill added that she had no idea how much work was involved in being Chair, especially since some members don't even attend the meetings. Hein asked her if it would be helpful for the Executive Officer to write a letter to her supervisor expressing AAPT's appreciation for her contributions. Hill said it would.

Some discussion followed concerning the attendance requirement for committee members. Although there was some agreement that some members can be active and contributing members without attending the face-to-face meetings, Hill stressed the importance of members attending these meetings and urged the continuance of this requirement.

**18. Section Governance.** Hakim reported that discussions continue within PAG regarding how to improve the involvement of Sections and their members in the activities of the Association. A small group of Section Representatives will be invited to the ACP to organize a retreat for all Representatives in late Spring 2007. In addition, we need to determine what the Sections want from the national organization. Currently less than 10% of AAPT members attend national meetings and, for the most part, these are not active in local Sections. One idea has been suggested to change the name of Section Representative to AAPT National Councilor. The rationale was that the title of "councilor" better conveys a connection to governance of the organization.

During the subsequent discussion Board members expressed that for the most part Representatives are not cognizant of the activities affecting physics teaching within their own Sections. Gibson explained that the Representatives would probably know of the activities at their own education level but not for all physics teachers within their region. Iona added that this issue becomes more complicated for those Representatives from multi-state Sections.

During the Area Chairs meeting, there was a request that the Chairs meet with the Representatives. In response to this, R. Peterson and Gibson will attend the meeting of Programs II.

Iona asked what other ideas had been explored by PAG with regard to Section Representatives. Hakim replied that there had been some initial discussion about changing the distribution of the Sections. R. Peterson proposed that an orientation for Representatives on a parallel with the Area Chairs' Orientation could make a significant difference. D. Peterson added that PAG had asked that the seating arrangements in the meetings of the Representatives and Council be structured as round-table discussions. The feedback to this change had been positive.

**19. Grants Overview.** Hein reported that a full proposal authorized by the Board in October 2006 had been submitted to the NSF (MSP/PHY). The request was for \$1.5 M for 4 years to support the physics talent search. The Executive Office has had no word to date concerning this submission.

Two preliminary proposals were submitted to NSF (EHR/EISE-TPC) in the interim between the October and January Board meetings. Each was a PTR program proposal requesting support of

\$1.5 M for 3 years for professional development, one for cross-over teachers and the other for alternative teacher certifications.

A proposal requesting \$17,500 support for the Symposium on Physics Education has been submitted to Boeing. On the behalf of the PTRA program, several proposals have been submitted or are being prepared for submission to state MSPs: the Maryland and Texas proposals have been granted; a proposal was submitted to Utah; and grants to Idaho, Georgia, and Colorado were under development.

Hein explained that according to current AAPT policy, submission of a full proposal required Board authorization. Preliminary proposals do not require prior Board authorization. Hein and Hakim asked that the Board consider changing this policy, which would not require a change in the Constitution or the Bylaws. B. Khoury expressed that in his opinion, full proposals seeking less than \$100 K should not require authorization by the Board. Hakim explained that seeking Board approval for every proposal ties the hands of the Executive Office.

**Tobochnik moved that proposals requesting support for less than \$100 K may be submitted to external funding agencies without Board approval. The Board will be notified of such submissions at the time of the submissions. Roeder seconded the motion. The motion passed.**

Dickison advised that the AAPT should be careful not to become competitive with its members. Desbien expressed concern that multiple grants submitted at one time could incur costs to the office. Robertson replied that such occurrences, if they were to happen, would be reflected in the budget at the end of the year. Tobochnik stressed the need not to micromanage the Executive Office.

**20. Structure of National Meetings.** Included in the Board iBook was an item for consideration by the Board concerning the structure of our national meetings. The numbers of papers and parallel sessions have increased to the point that concerns had been expressed about the effectiveness of the meeting in providing opportunities for networking and informal discussions by participants. The Board was asked to discuss the following meeting-related observations:

- The number of contributed/invited presentations and breakout sessions continues to expand, making it more difficult to find good meeting venues.
- Owing to the large number of invited sessions, many are scheduled in common time slots, which may negatively impact attendance at some sessions.
- Not all awards should be linked to lectures and not all award lectures have been of high quality.
- The business meetings and paper sessions are co-mingled creating little time to interact with speakers and share experiences relevant to the presentations.
- The schedule does not allow committees to meet multiple times and longer than 90 minutes in some instances.

Leff reported that an additional item discussed by the Area Chairs concerned the time limit for papers. Some members had voiced opposition to the ten-minute limit recently placed on papers.

Leff explained that AAPT meetings are becoming more difficult to organize due to the large number of contributed papers. Some Chairs had concerns regarding a large number of parallel sessions while other Chairs did not see the number of sessions as a problem. Leff added that the Board also needs to consider at some point the number of invited papers, which has become large in recent years.

Tobochnik asked if Program Chairs had evaluated the papers as to frequency of topics and if people were giving the same paper multiple times. However, it was pointed out that by current submission policy, any member could submit a paper and so there are no controls on these. Leff then asked the Board if we wanted to continue with our present policy. Board members were divided in their opinion: some wanted an upper limit on the number of parallel sessions and others did not view the number as a problem. There were 12 parallel sessions in Sacramento and again in Salt Lake City. The largest number of parallel sessions in Seattle was 6. Leff was inclined not to have a large number of parallel sessions. There was some thought that a large number of papers seemed to decrease the pedagogical value of the papers.

Adair explained that the single most frequent criticism she received was the down time. Therefore in Greensboro there will be only two plenary sessions. She noted that the ratio of posters to papers was getting better.

Leff then brought the discussion to a close saying that the more important question to be addressed by the Board is how to change the meeting format so as to make the meetings more attractive. A few members expressed the need to improve the marketing of these.

**21. Executive Session I** (with Executive Officers and guest John Layman). Heller convened the Board into Executive Session I to hear the report from FRAC.  
*(At the close of the Executive Session, Heller adjourned Session II.)*

### **Session III, January 10, 2007**

**Members Present:** Ken Heller, President; Dick Peterson, Past President; Harvey Leff, President Elect; Lila Adair, Vice President; Mary Beth Monroe, Secretary; Chuck Robertson, Treasurer; Randy Peterson, Chair of Section Representatives; John Roeder, At-Large Member; Dwain Desbien, At-Large Member; Jan Tobochnik, Editor, *American Journal of Physics* (AJP); Karl Mamola, Editor, *The Physics Teacher* (TPT); Toufic Hakim, Executive Officer

**Members Absent:** Ruth Chabay, At-Large Member and Al Gibson, Vice Chair of Section Representatives

**Guests:** Jack Hehn, Ted Hodapp, Warren Hein, Maria Elena Khoury, Roxanne Muller, Natasha Randall, Robert Hilborn, Leonard Jossem, Bernard Khoury, Tom O’Kuma, Valerie Evans, Robert Headrick, Gale Quilter  
*(Heller reconvened the meeting of the Board.)*

**22. Recap of Meeting.** Heller asked Board members for their reactions to the meeting. Adair said overall the meeting was a good one. The problems that arose were small ones.

The hallway reports of the meeting were positive. She did receive comments from members asking for separate programs from the AAS program. The Chairs in Programs II said they wanted more integrated sessions. Ramsey commented that he liked the blend of sessions resulting from the joint meeting but would prefer to maintain the identity of AAPT.

Natasha Randall reported that there were 700 fully paid attendees and 1100 head count. The AAS had about 2500. Roeder commented that this was a good meeting site with good facilities. Hakim reported that the coffee break expenses were more than \$30,000. This cost will be shared with AAS. He also commented that the poster times had not been published in the program.

Robertson reported that the exhibitors had expressed a desire to see new people at their booths, but the joint meeting with AAS had not attracted new people. However, they liked the scheduling for exhibits. Leff asked if the exhibitors were still talking about not attending future winter meetings. Robertson said the Verniers and Stokstad (PASCO) are having problems justifying their time to attend. He added that these vendors had commented that the commercial workshops had been marketed as events separate from the meeting program.

Valerie Evans reported 35 on-site member registrations and referred them to the AAPT website for trial membership. Students attending the meeting will receive free membership and will be notified of this by letter. Staff reported that the truck roll over with the registration and staff materials had caused some problems during the first days of the meetings. The problem with a loss of power to some rooms was due to the large use of the internet by the participants.

M.E. Khoury felt the meeting was a good one. Participants liked the media ready room, the available eating facilities in the convention center and the large meeting rooms. She reminded the Board that these came at a cost to the organization. The convention center cost was \$75 K. However, she believed it was worth the costs. In addition, the participants liked the use of registration kiosks. The University of Washington physics faculty provided tremendous help with the workshops. The workshop attendance was very good, especially Friday and Saturday mornings.

The Board applauded the staff for their good work.

**23. Doubling Initiative 2.** Ted Hodapp, Education and Diversity Officer at APS, reported that the redesigned APS webpage had gone live two months ago. In addition APS has extensively expanded its outreach activities. Their next focus will be on education initiatives. The Society has taken the stance that any future APS educational effort will be done in cooperation with the AAPT. APS has raised its journal rates by 2% and so the question arose concerning how the additional revenue should be used. Discussions have occurred with committees under Hodapp's supervision and with AAPT, the AIP Education Division, PKAL, the APS Forum on Education and others regarding how the physics community can increase the number of undergraduate physics majors in the U.S. The question is really how we can improve the low number of physics majors, which according to Neuschatz is 0.4%. Hodapp explained that while there are a lot of good reasons to increase the numbers of physics graduates, some negative comments have been made regarding the undertaking of a doubling initiative. These need to be addressed. One

comment says the current job market for physics majors is low. The response to this has been that physics graduates get jobs outside the physics community. Another comment asked where these students are going to attend college and how do we advise them. Hodapp said that according to the SPIN-UP report, this aspect is vital if we are going to increase the number of women and minorities who graduate in physics.

Several possible activities have emanated from conversations with the different groups. The APS will begin in February to develop a strategic plan. Hodapp would like to see a plan of parallel efforts all going in the same direction with a clear indication of what the other societies will be doing. APS has decided to describe their initiative as an effort to significantly increase the number of undergraduate physics majors rather than as an effort to double the number of physics graduates. Hodapp asked that as the AAPT progresses that we bring recommendations to him and he will forward these to the APS planning group.

D. Peterson commented that as APS reaches out to women and minorities in this effort he assumes that two-year colleges will play a major role. Hodapp's reply was "absolutely." Tobochnik suggested that in light of the strong interest in biophysics in our country it would seem useful to use resources to attract more biology majors into physics courses above the introductory level.

Desbien asked Hodapp what role he envisioned for AAPT in this initiative. Hodapp replied that AAPT would need to make this decision. He suggested that AAPT activities could target undergraduate students, high school teachers, and implementation of the SPIN-UP recommendations. Hilborn injected that according to the Symposium panelists a lot of this had already been occurring spontaneously. Hilborn and Heller are talking with select department heads to determine why their departments have been successful in this effort. Hilborn advised that the physics community has to be very careful in how it phrases what the initiative is trying to accomplish. We have real altruistic reasons for launching an initiative to increase the number of physics graduates; it is not just to grab resources for our own purposes. Hodapp suggested that an article in the *APS News* might stimulate reactions from APS members. B. Khoury disagreed with Hilborn's advice, saying that the doubling initiative is a self-serving effort and this should not embarrass us.

R. Peterson reported that the Committee on Undergraduate Physics was strongly opposed to the doubling initiative. Although he presented positive benefits from such activities, the committee members remained very negative in their reactions to the proposal.

- The Committee expressed that a significant increase in numbers could occur if we could address the loss of two-year college transfers. Many transfers drop out of college before completing their bachelor degree studies. The assumed reason for this loss is that the transfer students do not become a part of the student community at the four-year college/university level.
- The Committee also cited a lack of jobs for physics graduates. R, Peterson advised them that careers in medical physics and other related areas comprise a market for our graduates. According to Marc Brodsky there is currently an increase in the number of

physics graduates and also a slight increase in the number of jobs available. Board members asked for copies of this data.

- Another point made by the Committee was that some physics graduates are hired as math teachers and with time become unhappy with their positions. R. Peterson stressed that it is very important to have the appropriate jobs for graduates. Hodapp did not think this was a concern and cited the 8% percent of physics teachers who leave their jobs each year.
- The Committee argued that physics departments and faculty could not accommodate a doubling in the number of physics students. One committee member explained that the college administration would not hire additional faculty to meet the demands of the increased enrollment.

R. Peterson concluded that while the Committee has serious reservations about this undertaking, he believes that if good arguments are prepared, the Committee could be persuaded to support the effort.

Hehn explained that the proposed change and measurement of its impact is a 4-5 year cycle. The current increase in physics students cannot be linked to the report from SPINUP alone. Something had to be going on before this study. It will take a long time to realize an increase in the number of physics graduates.

Hodapp briefly reported on other activities occurring within APS. A conference will be held in June 2008 on graduate education, which is an outgrowth of the report from the Graduate Education Task Force published last year. A proposal has been submitted to the NSF requesting funding support for this. The conference will present sessions on ethics education, teaching assistant training, and best practice ideas. Hodapp explained that the conference probably would not address graduate curriculum. APS would like to produce a product addressing best practices. APS is preparing a brochure, with internal funds, to attract more minorities by better informing the students and their parents about career opportunities for physics majors. The brochures will be distributed to middle schools along with additional marketing by video and website venues.

APS has been conducting a professional skills workshop for women. The workshops provide training in communication and negotiation skills and target post tenure women. The APS has received an NSF supplement supporting this effort. Hodapp asked for help from the AAPT in determining how these activities could be incorporated into our national meetings. Heller explained that the AAPT Women in Physics had expressed an interest in this training and believed that this was an appropriate activity for the AAPT. He suggested that AAPT could write a companion proposal for this APS program.

#### **24. Membership and Benefits Committee.**

- During the October meeting of the Board, Hakim and Evans submitted a report proposing one model for departmental memberships with anticipated benefits for consideration by the Board. Following discussion, the Board endorsed the concept of departmental memberships and requested a model for approval at the January meeting and rollout in 2007. (See October 2007 Minutes, Item 12.)

R. Peterson reported that the Membership and Benefits Committee, in follow up to the October discussion and action by the Board, conducted a small survey among R1 universities to determine if their faculty members are AAPT members. About 20% of the faculty members at small universities are AAPT members and 10% of the faculty members at many large universities are members. They found almost no student memberships at these institutions. The Committee discussed similar strategies targeting high schools and school districts. Past attempts to attract membership have included special rates offers but these were not as successful as they would have liked. R. Peterson explained that 1/3 of the dropped memberships were high school teachers. R. Peterson concluded that AAPT might offer the departmental memberships to R1 universities first and review the success of this strategy. D. Peterson said that departmental memberships might be more successful with liberal arts colleges.

Monroe advised the Board that the AAPT Constitution and Bylaws define four categories of membership in the Association, none of which clearly provide for departmental memberships. Following discussion regarding the process and timeframe to amend the Bylaws, D. Peterson proposed that the matter be handled by simply providing the departments with a package of benefits, which include regular memberships for its faculty. Such an offer would not require an amendment to AAPT Constitution or Bylaws. His suggestion was accepted.

Discussion followed regarding additional benefits to be offered in a departmental package. Some suggestions included registration fees to national meetings and other AAPT events. Evans stated that the model presented in October included students memberships. R. Peterson explained that the Committee would like to implement a test run of the departmental package. Hakim asked what the Board wanted to achieve from a test run of the departmental package. Heller said that the package would be a test model for R1 universities. Hakim stated that the Board had accepted the model presented in October and he was ready to implement the offer to universities. He would like to expand the offer of departmental packages to liberal arts colleges. R. Peterson said that the Committee wanted to modify the model presented in October. He will prepare, in consultation with the other Committee members, a detailed document showing the modifications to the October model so that it will be clear what the package contains. The revised model will be presented to the Board in April.

- **R. Peterson moved, as Chair of the Membership and Benefits Committee, that the AAPT Director of Membership and Stewardship be an ex officio, non-voting member of the Membership and Benefits Committee.**

The Director normally attends the committee meetings and works closely with its members. This action parallels the October action by the Board that appointed the Director of Communication and Publications to the Publications Committee as an ex officio, non-voting member. **The motion passed unanimously.**

**25. Publications Committee.** Monroe had three items to present from the Publications Committee.

- Following the report from, and subsequent discussion of, the Pubs Study Committee, the Publications Committee unanimously voted to recommend that the Executive Board accept the report and adopt its seventeen recommendations.

At the urging of Bruce Mason, Interim Online Editor and PI for ComPADRE, the Publications Committee agreed that its motion to the Board would request that the Board consider what the relationship between AAPT and ComPADRE would be, with special consideration given to the time when the NSF funding for the digital library ends. Therefore, **Monroe, as Chair of the Publications Committee, moved that the Board accept the Pubs Study Committee report and recommendations. In addition the Board will consider the future relationship between ComPADRE and the AAPT, short-term and long-term.**

Some Board members were hesitant to implement all recommendations. Since the recommendations were extensive, they believed it would be hard for the Board to oversee their implementation.

**Khoury said that the Board should accept the report and recommendations, move ahead with the appointment of the Online Publications Editor in Chief, and thank the committee for its work. The motion from Pubs, with Khoury's statement attached as a friendly amendment, passed unanimously.**

- **Monroe moved that the Board make the following three-year appointments to the TPT Editorial Board: Dave Keeports (second term), Greg DiLisi, Art Hobson, and Rachel Scherr. The motion passed unanimously.** Their terms will begin at the close of the Seattle meeting.
- The *Resource Book for New Teachers* by Jan Mader and Mary Winn had been reviewed by physicists, under the supervision of Al Gibson, and Rob Headrick had determined that all necessary copyrights had been obtained and appropriate credits given. Therefore the Publications Committee recommended its publication. Monroe expressed her thanks to the authors, Al Gibson, the members of Pubs and the external reviewers for their work over the last six years in bringing this product to fruition. At the request of Mader and Winn, the book will be published in print copy. However, the resource may later be published in CDROM format or in part on the web (ComPADRE). **Monroe moved that the Board authorize the publication of the *Resource Book for New Teachers* by Jan Mader and Mary Winn. The motion passed unanimously.**

**26. Update from Section Representatives.** R. Peterson reported that the Representatives liked the round-table format for their meetings as it facilitated discussions. The Representatives emphasized that they had formally voted in recent years that AAPT would continue to publish the meeting abstracts in print copy. They were very displeased that the print copy of the Seattle abstracts was not available and wanted assurance that future abstracts would be published in print copy.

The Section Representatives conducted their annual elections. Mary Mogge was elected Vice Chair, Tom O'Kuma and Marina Milner-Bolotin were elected to serve on the national 2009 Nominating Committee, and Joseph Spaccavento, Bill Waggoner, and Oren Quist were elected to serve on the Section Representative nominating committee. The Representatives selected for nomination to Council Jeff Williams and David MacDonald to serve on Membership and Benefits Committee. In formal action, the Council authorized the appointment of these two.

**27. Report from Executive Officer Emeritus.** B. Khoury briefly summarized his duties as Executive Officer Emeritus since September 5, 2006 and anticipated duties in 2007. As EO Emeritus he has an office at the ACP. Khoury explained that most of the AIP responsibilities had been shifted to Hakim, but that he continues to meet with the ACP Board and is a member of FRAC. He will serve as Chair of the Governance Committee in 2007. He will also help with the preparations for the retreats of the Area Chairs and Section Representatives to be held in early Summer. Khoury anticipated that he would be doing some writing for a revision of the Officers' Handbook. Khoury concluded his report, saying that he was enjoying his association with the new Executive Officer and would continue to provide input and advice on those occasions when Hakim should request his help.

According to the Transition Policy adopted by the Board, Khoury as EO Emeritus reports to the Board. Therefore he asked if the Board had any objections to his proposed activities for the next year. The Board had none.

During discussion of his report, Khoury explained that it was his hope that the retreats for the Area Chairs and Section Representatives would be held by July. This timeframe would allow the Board to consider any governance issues that may arise from these two events during its Fall meeting scheduled for October 20-21, 2007. The plan is to implement all changes in January 2008.

**28. Area Committee Vice Chairs.** Ramsey asked what the process was for establishing the position of Vice Chair for Area Committees. D. Peterson said the decision to have Vice Chairs had been made by the Chairs during the Programs Committee meeting.

Khoury explained that the question to be resolved is who will have the authority to appoint the Vice Chair. D. Peterson said this matter relates to the responsibility of the President Elect. The President Elect appoints the Area Chair. Therefore at the end of the Summer 2007 when committee appointments are made, the President Elect should appoint both a Chair and a Vice Chair for each committee. Thereafter the President Elect would only appoint the Vice Chair, who would serve a one-year term and then succeed the Chair.

**29. Bauder Fund.** C. Robertson reported that the Bauder Fund Committee had met and had awarded three proposals for a total award of \$2000, this in addition to the \$200 continuance for the lecture demonstration workshop.

**30. Lotze Scholarship.** C. Robertson reported that AAPT had three high quality candidates for the scholarship. The scholarship committee normally awards two scholarships. The committee contacted Barbara Lotze and she was delighted with the opportunity to award three scholarships this year. In addition, the committee selected three recipients for Honorable Mentions.

**31. Reimbursements.** Adair explained that she was not receiving reimbursements in a timely manner. She asked how to shorten the turnaround time. Robertson replied that requests for reimbursement should no longer be sent to him but to Carroll Martin, the AAPT Financial Officer. Robertson will continue to review reimbursement requests by the Executive Officer. D. Peterson emphasized that periodically, approximately every three months, the Financial Officer

should send copies of these requests to the Treasurer. Heller asked if it were possible to have reimbursements directly deposited to personal bank accounts. Hakim will look into this.

**32. Awards.** D. Peterson reported that the Committee had a lot of business to conduct and therefore some discussion and action was handled by email prior to the Seattle meeting. The Committee selected Neil Tyson as the recipient for the Klopsteg Award to be given at the 2007 Summer Meeting. Tyson has accepted the award. During the meeting in Seattle the Committee selected recipients for the two teaching excellence awards and the Millikan Award. D. Peterson will contact these three to confirm their acceptance.

FRAC submitted some revisions for the descriptions of the awards. The 2006 Awards Committee members will do some additional word smithing. Last October, the Board approved the creation of eight non-monetary awards in concept. The Awards Committee had initial discussions regarding these during the Seattle meeting. Four of these awards target model programs, rather than individual contributions. The Awards Committee will seek input from Area Committees regarding criteria for three awards. Heller, as the next Chair of Awards, will likely present a report of developed criteria for some awards to the Board during its April meeting. The Awards Committee did not want to give Area Committees responsibility for selection of the recipients because confidentiality of the nominations is a very important aspect of the awards. D. Peterson explained that the Awards Committee could probably deal with three of the eight awards a year and the awards do not have to be given every year. Desbien expressed his concern that the awards are favoring four-year colleges and universities more than high schools. The high school community comprises a very large percentage of the AAPT membership and few of the current and proposed AAPT awards target this community. He would like to see equity across the membership. Hehn said that this would be a good opportunity to involve the Sections in discussion since many Sections give high school awards.

Adair reported that she would like to change the format for award presentations and lectures in the 2007 Summer Meeting. She proposed having two separate sessions that would combine the presentation by the award recipient and the reception. The sessions would be less formal than previous award sessions, would not be plenary sessions, and would resemble cracker barrels in format. Adair explained that it is important for the award recipients to make some type of presentation, but that she wanted to schedule the meeting time more efficiently. These special sessions will likely incur some additional expenses. The Board gave its support for her proposal.

**33. Senior Physics Fellow Report.** Bob Hilborn said that the activities he listed for the Board in October are underway (See October 2006 Minutes, Item 28). The SPIN-UP study and proposal addressing HBCUs are under development. In April he will report on the progress of the other initiatives. Hilborn invited any ideas that Board members may have regarding these initiatives. He explained that he had completed the move from Amherst to Nebraska and would now commit 25% of his time as Senior Fellow. On the average he plans to be at the ACP one day every month. His appointment as AAPT Senior Fellow will end in August 2007. D. Peterson explained that he would like to meet with Hilborn and other physicists as he prepares for a lab focus conference.

**34. Review Board.** D. Peterson reported that he had received an annual report from every Area Committee, although most of them were late. The 2006 Review Board members will review these reports and prepare responses for each.

**35. Executive Session I (with only the Executive Officer).** Heller convened the Board in Executive Session I to hear a report concerning issues relating to AAPT's incorporation.

**36. Executive Session II (without the Executive Officer).** Heller convened the Board in Executive Session II to consider the report from the Secretary regarding her meeting with the Executive Officer.

**37. Executive Session I (with the Executive Officer).** Heller again convened the Board in Executive Session I at Hakim's request.  
*(Heller reconvened the Board in Open Session.)*

**38. Closing Remarks.** Heller described his presidential year as interesting and said he had enjoyed working with the Board. He then made some comments about the contributions of those members who were leaving the Board: Chabay, R. Peterson, D. Peterson, and Monroe. At the conclusion of his remarks he passed the presidential gavel to Leff.

Leff thanked Heller for his contributions as President, summarizing some of the challenges that had faced the AAPT and the AAPT President during this past year. He then presented Heller with a small gift in appreciation of his service to AAPT. The Board, with a round of applause, added its thanks and expression of appreciation to Heller.

**39. Adjournment.** Heller thanked the Board and guests for their work during this meeting. President Leff then adjourned the meeting.

Mary Beth Monroe, AAPT Secretary