

**AAPT Executive Board Meeting -Minutes
Summer Meeting 2007
Greensboro, NC**

Saturday, July 28, 2007

Members Present: Harvey Leff, President; Ken Heller, Past President; Lila Adair, President Elect; Alex Dickison, Vice President; Steve Iona, Secretary; Chuck Robertson, Treasurer; Al Gibson, Chair of Section Representatives; Mary Mogge, Vice Chair of Section Representatives; John Roeder, At-Large Member; Dwain Desbien, At-Large Member; Gordon Ramsey, At-Large Member; John Mallinckrodt, Acting Editor, *American Journal of Physics* (AJP); Karl Mamola, Editor, *The Physics Teacher* (TPT); Toufic Hakim, Executive Officer

Guests: Guests: Maria Elena Khoury, Valerie Evans, Len Jossem, Jack Hehn, Warren Hein, Bernie Khoury, Jan Tobochnik, Mary Beth Monroe, Rob Merz, Jamie Mathieu, Rob Headrick, Caroll Martin, Tiffany Hays

1. **Welcome and Call to Order.** Leff called the meeting to order and welcomed all members and guests.
2. **Changes to the Agenda.** No additions to the agenda were suggested. **Gibson moved the approval of the Agenda. Roeder seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**
3. **Approval of the Minutes.** Minor changes to the Minutes were suggested and noted. **Adair moved that the April 2007 Minutes be approved, allowing for minor editorial changes. Robertson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. [developing countries online only]**
4. **President's Remarks.** Leff highlighted several items including the following:
 - Congratulating the US Physics Olympics team for their performance at the competition in Iran. Leff also complimented Toufic Hakim, Marie Elena Khoury and her staff for the exceptional job they did in hosting the team in College Park and assuring safe travel for the team.
 - Leff noted that Joe Meyer and Deborah Rice are willing to act as tellers, if necessary, for paper ballots in the November 2007 election.
 - He indicated that several ongoing items would be postponed until the October Board meeting including considering the AAPT Fellows program.
 - Leff announced that the request of Khoury by the Board to nominate the PTR program for the APS Education Award was not done.
5. **Follow-up of Previous Board Actions or Requests.** Hakim referred to his report and highlighted the following:
 - The National Taskforce on Teacher Preparation is a joint AAPT, APS, AIP program. Hein, Hehn, and Hodapp are soliciting nominees for the Taskforce and the Executive Board will be able to endorse the members. Solicitations were made through the list-serves and the Teacher Preparation Committee. Recall that this taskforce was formed in October 2007:

The charge to the task force would be to

- Develop an expository report highlighting effective and exemplary work of physics departments in the physical science preparation of K-12 teachers and the resulting benefits to those departments.
- Develop a summary of best practices in physical science preparation taken by those departments.

The Committee outlined the steps for the task force.

- Secure support from sister societies in the formation of the task force.
- Choose one representative from each supporting society to serve as the leadership for the task force.
- Choose the task force membership from among the leaders in physics/physical science teacher preparation.
- Define the scope of the study by the task force.
- Determine the methodologies for the task force's study.
- Employ consultants or engage community members in the work as necessary.
- Carry out the study and write the report.

The Committee anticipated that this work would span 2-4 years.

Dickison asked if there would be representation from the TYC community. Hein indicated that there would be representation.

6. Executive Office/Executive Officer Update. Hakim referenced the following activities:

- The exceptional efforts by Marie Elena Khoury and the staff of the Meetings Department to produce the Summer Meeting. Mary Elena Khoury reported that the Programs and Meetings/Conferences Departments had been merged.
 - The Department helped coordinate a congressional visit by the US Physics Olympic Team, produced an elaborate closing ceremony that included prior Olympians and coaches, produced a daily blog from the Team while they were in Iran. She reported that the program is considering establishing an advisory council and a committee to solicit and prepare questions. Since this year's preliminary exam was taken by three times the number of students as in earlier years, she is in communication with groups that might help facilitate the electronic collection and reporting of results.
 - The Department coordinated a New Faculty Workshop Reunion. _____ attended. The group has formed an advisory committee and will plan additional reunions.
 - The New Faculty Workshop is planned for the fall is already over-subscribed.
 - The Department coordinated the logistics for the PTRA program prior to the meeting. Over 70 PTRAs attended. She reported the Jim Nelson would be meeting with the NSF representatives regarding the pending proposals.
 - The Department coordinated the logistics for the Topical Conference on Computational Physics held at Davidson College.
 - Planning for the Baltimore Winter 2008 meeting includes 32 Workshops and 60 sessions. The Johns Hopkins University has expressed enthusiasm at helping with the conference.
- Leff moved - **That the Executive Board commends Marie Elena Khoury and offers its sincere thanks for her for 22 years of dedicated and high quality service to the AAPT.**

Robertson enthusiastically seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously followed by applause.

Questions for Hakim regarding his report included the following:

- Mogge commented that the timing for a job fair in January might be too late for the 4YC community. Desbien indicated that the times are about right for the TYC community. Hakim expressed an interest to revitalize the job fair that currently seems stagnate.
- Hakim indicated that he was involved in preliminary work with the National Academy of Science to produce a decadal document on Physics Education.
- Dickison indicated concerns regarding the bundling of TPT with Physics Today as a marketing strategy for high school libraries. His concern was the potential drop in membership of high school members if there was access to the journal both print and electronic through the school. He indicated that in the past, the Board was not convinced that the business plan was financially advantageous. Hakim indicated that AIP, after their market research, was preparing to offer Physics Today to high schools that offer AP Physics. AAPT requested to join the effort by bundling TPT. Hein indicated that he had not seen a decline in 4YC/University members due to AJP availability in university libraries. Valerie Evans commented that members remain because the association has something to offer them beyond the journals. Heller indicated that in the future, membership and publications should not be linked due to more general availability of material. Leff indicated that he felt that Dickison's concerns indicated that the Executive Board should be more involved in these decisions. The discussion was deferred until Sunday see #31. Khoury indicated that in the past, that business aspects of publications was considered by the Executive Board and the Publications Committee considered content and editorial issues.

7. Electronic Balloting & Incorporation Issues. Hakim reminded the Board that for several months there has been discussion of changing the state of incorporating to allow electronic balloting. After conversations with other societies and discussion with an attorney. The consensus is, since the New York statues are "silent" of the issue of allowing electronic balloting, unless there is a legal challenge and a legal decision, the process of electronic balloting is allowed. To err on side of safety, electronic balloting with an option for paper balloting by members should be considered. Following a lengthy discussion of procedural items regarding the mechanics of providing both paper and electronic balloting options and the importance of assuring that everyone who wants to vote via paper has the opportunity and is adequately notified of the option, Caroll Martin indicated that the cost for electronic balloting, based on a bid already received, would be \$6-7000 for both paper and electronic options. This compares to \$5-7,000 for the current paper only ballot. Hakim and Heller will present a motion later in the meeting that tries to address the concerns raised. See #19.

8. Search for Warren Hein's Replacement. Leff reported on the results of the electronic motion (Moved by Leff and Seconded by Iona):
"The AAPT staff positions Chief Academic Officer and Acting Chief Academic Officer are classified as Professional Scientific Employees."

The purpose of this motion was so that "there will be no ambiguity regarding the classification of the position. As Scientific Employees, the Board has the responsibility to

determine the conditions of employment such as reporting structures, evaluation structures, duties, etc. [Since] past Board practices could be interpreted in differing ways, this motion clearly states the classification of the CAO and ACAO positions as Professional Scientific Employees.”

Leff indicated that the motion passed 8-3, so now the office can proceed with the search by posing the announcement.

- 9. Update on Other Searches.** Hakim indicated that he has reopened the search for a Fundraising Coordinator and that he will be seeking an Events Planning Logician.
- 10. Senior Fellow for Middle and High School Programming.** Adair wanted to clarify that the plurals used in the announcement were to accommodate part-time employment options and that the intent is for no more than a 1-FTE position. Dickison wanted confirmation that this was a one-year renewable position. These were assured. Dickison was concerned that the Fellow would become more of someone who would shepherd miscellaneous projects though the office rather than instituting new programs and infuse new ideas into the organization. Hakim pointed out that the various aspects of the position could be spread among several candidates but that the New Teacher Workshop, Standards, and CEU’s were current issues that needed to be addressed. The discussion then moved to an understanding that the position would be for a Scientific Employee and that the selection process and arrangements with the host academic institutions would be similar to those arranged for Bob Hilborn.

The proposed recruitment strategy includes the following: The AAPT central office plans to send the announcement seeking nominations to all our pre-college teacher members and to all our colleagues within PTEC; the announcement will be posted on the AAPT website and will appear (based on timing) in other AAPT publications. Furthermore, it will be shared for posting in NSTA publications and other media, and pre-college related publications, such as *Education Week*. The position(s) will remain open until filled.

The selection process includes the following: The Executive Officer and (Acting) Chief Academic Officer will be assisted in their review of applications by a senior PTR, a member of the High School Physics Committee, the high school at-large member of the Board, who will also interview the top candidates. Advice from the Secretary will also be solicited. The Board will be given ample opportunity to review the credentials and application of the choice candidate(s), and will be asked to approve the appointment formally before it is made.

Roeder moved - **To approve the proposed approach for recruiting and selecting the one-year appointment of Senior Fellow(s) for Pre-College Programming and support the Executive Officer’s decision to proceed with the search and selection process. If multiple Fellows are selected, the maximum funding allocation would be 1-FTE. Adair seconded the motion. Heller proposed a friendly amendment to avoid referencing the selection process. The offer was rejected. Leff called for the vote. The motion passed with Heller abstaining.**

11. Overview of Marketing Strategies. Hakim indicated that the Marketing Strategies are not just related to the promotion of AAPT products, they are initiatives to increase the membership base, to increase the promotion of AAPT programs, and to increase the visibility and reputation of AAPT. Rob Merz, since starting in January, has developed a project timeline, and budget. Adair appreciated his written report and got assurances that before any large-scale implementations there would be a budget presented as part of the Board packet in October. Hakim indicated that he plans to provide a Zero Based Budget (ZBB) where each request is tied to a specific program with justification as part of the budget discussion in October.

Merz responded to Roeder's question that the Marketing Department is within the Communication and Publications Department at AAPT. Merz indicated that he would work to identify relevant international organizations to work with for membership options. In response to a comment by Heller on the need to work on reciprocal advertising arrangements with sister societies, Merz indicated that he has been developing relationships with NSTA and local organizations around meeting sites. Leff stated that the Section Representative and/or Executive Board should contact non-renewing members. He indicated that the Membership and Benefits Committee should discuss this.

12. Doubling Initiative. Hakim indicated that this is a joint AAPT, APS, AIP program to double the number of undergraduate physics majors. AAPT endorsed a statement on this in January. (The Board unanimously "endorsed the doubling goal as an AAPT initiative and charged 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.") This program fits well with the AAPT's strategic initiatives. The overseeing board includes 5 members each from both AAPT and APS. The proposed initiatives include the following:

- PhysTEC II – APS, Lead
- Three-Year Physics Degree – APS, Lead (AAPT to be heavily involved)
- SPIN UP II – AAPT, Lead
- New Faculty Workshop for Physics and Astronomy – AAPT, Lead
- Physics Quest – APS, Lead
- Middle School Science Gathering – APS (AAPT to be heavily involved)
- Expanded APS Minority Scholarships – APS
- Diversified AAPT and APS Meetings – AAPT and APS, Lead (in respective areas)
- Active Recruiting – AAPT, Lead
- Physics Career Web Portal – SPS, Lead

The Board identified a number of areas that could still be addressed as part of the Initiative. Heller indicated that AAPT was particularly well placed to address recruitment options at the high school-college interface. Desbien indicated that a similar recruitment initiative could be undertaken at the TYC-College interface since 50% of the minorities take since at a TYC and the TYC community teaches calculus based physics to over 33,000 students each year.

Heller stated that he did not see enough places where AAPT was taking the lead within the Initiative. Iona, Desbien, Ramsey, Roeder, and Dickison echoed similar statements.

Discussion moved to identifying a limited number of things that AAPT could work on including the HS-College and/or TYC-College interface for recruitment or professional development. Specifically regarding the stated recruitment initiative, Heller thought that AAPT may not be able to complete that task because it is not set up to acquire that information.

When Iona stated that he felt that APS was taking over the teacher preparation efforts, Hakim motioned that while “APS will take the lead” in this area, he expects AAPT to have income from the project to support its teacher preparation efforts. Hein and Heller indicated that APS has committed over \$1 million to their teacher preparation efforts. Hakim specifically stated that AAPT watched as APS took over educational efforts and he commented, “good for physics.” Then he pleaded that we play with the “big boys financially, morally, and politically.” Heller commented that this is not a competition, and that we should applaud the APS efforts, but that AAPT needs to step up.

Hakim moved - To endorse the mission statement for the Doubling Initiative as it appears below, and to support the Central Office’s efforts in completing the plan of action for proposed strategies, which will be presented at the October meeting and will include 2008 budgetary elements.

Doubling Initiative Mission Statement

We advocate doubling the number of bachelor degrees in physics to address critical national needs including K-12 education, economic competitiveness, energy, security, and an informed electorate.

Mogge seconded the motion; the vote in favor was unanimous.

13. Audit Committee Report. Gibson, as Chair of the Audit Committee moved the following: **The Audit Committee recommends that the Board accept the Audit Report.** Iona seconded the motion; Gibson indicated that the minor deficiencies identified in the report have been corrected and that the audit is unqualified. The motion passed unanimously. The Board should expect a motion in October regarding clearly identifying the membership of the Audit Committee.

Gibson moved - that the Chair of the Audit Committee and one Audit Committee member selected by the chair be actively involved in reviewing proposals and interviewing prospective new Audit Firms. Iona seconded the motion. The Board was reminded that the auditor is the entity that judges the financial management of the association and that the Board would make the final approval of the auditors. **The motion passed unanimously.**

14. Budget Update and 2008 Budget Planning Process. Robertson indicated that as of May 2007, the net operating income was approximately -\$195k. A major outstanding invoice involves the final cost sharing arrangement with AAS for the Winter Meeting. That meeting cost more than any other Winter Meeting we have held. Robertson indicated that there were likely some lessons learned about carefully negotiating cost sharing arrangements. Since the Year-To-Date projection is - \$255k (excluding interest earned from the Long-term Investment Account). Robertson indicated that salaries are \$100k larger than 2006 due to hiring more part-term employees. Dickison indicated that he would prefer to see more

itemization regarding expenses. Carroll Martin indicated that he would be posting balance sheets on the web.

Heller asked about a \$66k dues variance behind projection. Ramsey wondered if we had gotten the membership levels we had projected. After viewing the membership income for the last few years, there was no clear answer to the question.

Update on Appointments to Nominations Committee. The 2009 Nominating Committee is: Tom O'Kuma, Chair, Chris Chiaverina, Andy Gavrin, Paula Heron, Marina Milner-Bolotin.

15. Appointment to ACP Board. AAPT appoints two people to the ACP Board of Directors, and designates one person to cast the official AAPT vote; The Board needs to replace Warren Hein on the ACP Board. Currently Bernie Khoury is the other AAPT member on the Board. Roeder moved - **To appoint Toufic Hakim, Executive Officer, to the ACP Board of Directors starting on August 15, 2007, and give him the authority to cast the official votes for AAPT. Adair seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

16. Executive Session EI, EII

Sunday, July 29, 2007

12:30-5:00 PM

Guests: Voss, Mary Beth Monroe, Len Jossem, Dick Peterson, Jan Tobochnik, Bob Hilborn, John Layman, Valerie Evans, Bradley Ambrose

17. Next Steps in the Name Change Initiative. Hakim recapped that there was an electronic straw poll that included 1800 responses with 75% endorsing the name: Association for the Advancement of Physics Teaching. The goal now is to determine the next steps. Leff indicated that the comments made by the voters swayed his perspective toward not wanting to change the name. General Board comments included the following:

- Ramsey - I would have preferred a Likert scale option to rate the level of agreement with the name option. This would give a second approximation to the data.
- Mallinckrodt - I saw only a slight difference in being "of phys teachers" vs. about "physics teaching". He liked the inclusive nature of the new option.
- Adair - I did not think it was appropriate that the straw poll was phrased with only a yes or no option. For example, the other options considered should have been presented as well as the option to not change the name. She could not recommend moving forward with these results.
- Mamola -I also found that I resonated with many of the comments. He found it odd that people would be defensive about being labeled a "teacher;"

- Desbien - While he did not read the responses as indicating a division regarding teacher and teaching, he indicated that he has had experiences with professors who did not value teaching as a profession.
- Gibson -I personally felt more interest in including the word American in the name when considering the Olympiad. He commented that international members have joined AAPT under the American name. He also indicated that he did like the inclusive nature of the name option.
- Heller - I was not so much in favor of changing the name American. I liked inclusiveness and being in favor of something such as Physics Teaching rather than appearing to be a self-service institution of Physics Teachers.
- Robertson - He mentioned that almost all of the AIP Member Societies have the name American in them.
- (Jack Hein commented that when AGU was considering its name change, a senior member said by taking American out of name you do not stand for anything, you are just a collection of letters.)
- Roeder - I wondered after reading the supplement from Leff about the experiences of APS during their name change endeavor, if our time would be better spent trying to become more visible, and to find a better time to consider a name change given the possible legal implications of change.

Hakim, again asked about next steps pointing out that some of our members are not teachers, that if desired, we could offer another survey with different name options or a Likert scale,

Leff pointed out that APS solved their issues with a logo change and not a name change. Will we be able to resolve some of these issues with our logo change as well without additional polling? There were additional comments and questions regarding copyrights and trademarks.

Redirecting the discussion, Khoury indicated that we do not know the legal implication of the name change; but APS had a tangible problem that they were trying to solve regarding the interpretation by the general public of the words "physical" vs. "physics." He did not see that we had the same level of problem that we were trying to solve. In fact, he did not think that we had identified the problem so there are ranges of solutions available. Desbien and Ramsey echoed this with comments about "if it ain't broken..." They then asked if waiting 3-6 months before proceeding with a comprehensive poll would be better than continuing the discussion at this Board Meeting.

Heller returned to his point about gathering data to determine if the university people are being put off by our name change and the use of the term "physics teaching", as well as whether the phrases "physics teachers" vs. "physics teaching" are preventing us from furthering our mission by attracting and influencing other

groups.

After continued discussion Heller moved – To determine if the AAPT name generates problems in our ability to attract membership from universities or impedes our ability to aggressively support increased salaries for physics teachers. This motion was tabled by Mallinckrodt to await cost estimates for a study. There was unanimous consent to tabling the motion.

18. Electronic Balloting Motion. Hakim after working with Heller offered the following motion - **The Executive Board approves transitioning the AAPT Board elections to an electronic voting platform starting in the Fall of 2007, ensuring that all members receive early and adequate notification of the process (including a print mailing to all members among other efforts in this transition year to announce the voting and to offer the option of paper ballot to members who choose it). The President will appoint all paper-ballot tellers. Roeder seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

19. Four-Year College and University Programming. Bob Hilborn reported on his activities as a Senior Fellow. They included the following:

- Helping organize the NFW and reunion. Desbien asked how many of the reunion attendees were AAPT members – 80-90%.
- Working with Warren Hein in writing new NSF proposals for the additional NFW and reunions. He sees the need to involve new leadership in the program.
- Regarding the submission of the proposal to offer SPIN-UP workshops regionally
- Expecting to post the report from the Computational Physics Conference on the web
- Attended a Conference at Swarthmore conference in May regarding the redesign of the traditional pre-med physics course, invited others to discuss issues. There is interest in developing a Conference similar to the one held regarding the Calculus-based Physics Course for 200-300 participants. Desbien encouraged the planners to include TYC representatives.
- Interested in developing a Topical Conference regarding biophysics researchers and educational implications.
- Asked to participate in the examination of the science preparation of future physicians. This group will likely specify additional details for physics preparation. The dilemma is balance for medical school is for training in scientific thinking (seeking evidence, use of sophisticated diagnostic and treatment options) or more clinical (dealing with patients).
- Considering an Advanced Lab Topical Conference –perhaps in Michigan 2009
- Hilborn also indicated that his responsibilities at the University of Nebraska would be increasing so his involvement at AAPT will be decreasing.

20. Update on Governance Planning – Retreat & Review – Next Steps. Iona reminded the Board of the Retreat on Restructuring held at ACP in May 2007. The Draft Synthesis Report was included in the Board Packet. He indicated that during the meeting one goal would be to determine the quality of the report by gathering information about how well the report represents a synthesis of the ideas presented during the Retreat. He asked whether the Board

wanted to continue to solicit restructuring documents from groups or if they wanted to develop a framework that groups could fit into. His concern was that various groups would develop specific recommendations that would be at odds with one another. He warned that without a plan, the Executive Board could receive widely varying requests from multiple groups that would not converge on a unified, governable structure. He wondered how the Board could use the Governance Review Committee (GRC) to help develop a structure.

Leff reminded the Board that the GRC has a charge to look at existing documents, not to suggest structures. Perhaps we need to provide the GRC with a collection of questions. Khoury worried that we may have opened a Pandora's box where many groups within AAPT such as PER, ALPHA, PIRA may bring recommendations for restructuring. Since governance question can be very open-ended, the GRC needs boundary conditions and constraints.

Heller asked a more fundamental question whether the Area Chairs and Section Representatives see something wrong with their structure or just want modified connections within the Association? Khoury reminded the Board that at the Board Retreat 2006, they identified problems such as not being able to easily develop policy advice and the lack of quality communication between the Sections and National. This report was in response to these problems.

Hakim added that the Synthesis Report referenced universal membership for AAPT and Sections. He commented that this would address the economic concerns (*i.e.*, cost of joining national AAPT) mentioned by many in previous surveys. Adair, as an observer at the Retreat, pointed out that this was a preliminary document and is not unanimously agreed to. She then questioned the appropriateness of the Planning Group to continue the "fleshing out" process since the Planning Group members were volunteers for planning the Retreat and not for developing structures.

Heller trying to refocus on the GRC bemoaned that the Report did not provide ways to evaluate the suggestions. Hakim reminded the Board that this was a framework not a plan.

There were then many comments indicating that the document was too preliminary to act upon even as a framework, and that some Board members would like to see different scenarios. It was suggested that a subgroup should study these and develop models and recommendations for the Board to act upon by identifying the implications.

Leff made a preliminary motion regarding a charge to the GRC. This motion was revisited later See #28.

Iona was in favor of using the GRC to bring recommendations to the Board regarding changes. Mogge agreed stating that there are many different suggestions to flesh out, and that she would like to take all the suggestions from PAG, 2020, AC-SR and send them to the GRC for synthesis and evaluation before anyone does anymore work. Hakim wondered that since the reports started with different premises if they should be grouped together.

Leff stopped the discussion and sought a motion later in the meeting that would provide direction on how to proceed.

21. Gordon Research Conference Proposal. In 2005, AAPT allocated \$4000 to the Gordon Conference held in 2006. The 2008 conference is on Physics Research and Education: Computation and Computer-Based Instruction. Heller pointed out that we are getting asked to support conferences that are not AAPT developed events, we should decide if that is something that we want to do.

Ramsey moved – **That AAPT provide support for four graduate students and two international participants to a maximum of \$7600. Roeder seconded the motion. The motion passed, Heller and Iona abstained.**

This award would be allocated from the Special Projects Fund.

Leff agreed to appoint a task force to develop a policy to handle funding requests to the Board.

22. Executive Session EIII

Wednesday August 1, 2007

Absent: Karl Mamola

Guests: Richard Peterson, Mary Beth Monroe, Tiffany Hays, Marie Elena Khoury, Valerie Evans, Karim Diff, Dave Maiullo, Rob Headrick, Rob Merz, Jan Tobochnik, Roger Fuller

23. Greensboro Debriefing.

- Adair commented on the high quality plenary speakers. She received many compliments on the PIRA Room, the poster area, the USB memory stick gift, the photo contest location, and the demo show She also had high praise for the hotel and dorm staff, the staff from UNCG, and the AAPT. Ramsey noted that the photo contest location provided a lot of interest in physics from the other hotel guests. Heller commented that RIPE was unhappy about the poster sessions not thinking that they were given adequate play and respect (only one day, one hour, posters not listed in program booklet). They felt that the posters were considered second-class to papers. He suggested that we request a report from RIPE that specifies their concerns. There was a suggestion to send the Events List with the Committee schedule to Area Chairs so that they might be able to identify possible conflicts.
- M. Khoury reported from the Exhibitor Lunch that they felt good about the meeting and appreciated that the exhibits were in a high traffic area. She added that the additional AV requests doubled the usual bill. She reported that the meeting included 1012 paid registrants, by including exhibitors, hosts, guest, the number is 1272 (not including staff). She could not report on the number of high school teachers that participated in the free day, but would have a report in October. The North Carolina section paid 23 scholarships. The conference page registered 1200 hits during meeting. Adair commented that this meeting was the best example of local hosts and local section involvement that she can remember.

- Roger Fuller, Member Services, commented on the enthusiastic crowd, and that he talked to a large number of students. The meeting brought in an unusual number of new and renewing memberships. Usually meetings do not bring in new memberships and renewals. This meeting though brought in 14 new and 17 renewal members. He indicated that he had received many questions about the purpose of the profile (he received 400+) and reported that students seemed pleased that their membership costs would remain the same for 3 years after graduation.
- Daryl Malloy commented on his amazement regarding how the Meetings Department was able to scramble to meet competing requests of members!
- Rob Merz highlighted the increased media coverage of the meeting including: News Record newspaper article on PTRA and PIRA, WFDD–NPR radio on Pollack paintings are fractals and on Janet Guthrie, FOX-8 on Forensics and the demo show, and CBS-2-on Janet Guthrie.
- Rob Headrick reported that we spent approximately \$20k to videotape the plenaries. He reported that web streaming and CD/DVDs will be available,
- Roeder reported some problems with hours when breakfast was served and the transportation schedule to the meeting from UNCG. Others commented that the bus frequency was an issue. There was also a suggestion to include passing times to/from plenaries.
- Hakim noted that during the Cracker-barrel Sessions with the Executive officer, there were some questions and comments about the name change.

24. Meetings Committee Report. Dick Peterson reported the following:

- The Monterrey, Mexico request has been declined.
- The possible meeting with the Engineering Education group may be too soon after the late APS joint meeting.
- The committee is soliciting sites in the western portion of the US for the Summer 2010 meeting.
- The committee is anticipating a strong meeting in Edmonton due to the active secondary education program in Canada and the general acceptance to travel longer distances to attend meetings. Also many international members find it easier to travel to Canada rather than to the US.
- Peterson commented on the committee's concern about the cost of the meeting for the membership.
- Since AAAS symposia and teacher days are determined well in advance of the meeting, AAPT needs to act aggressively to be included.
- Peterson commented on the sobering changes in the meetings department and the added burden of Tiffany Hays.
- Heller encouraged the group to present information such as distance from meeting to dorms in the site presentations. Likewise, he encouraged data to determine break-even point for meetings.
- Heller reminded the committee that there are guidelines for hosting a meeting that need to be easily available on the website.

25. Exchange with Invited Area Committee Chairs. Dave Maiullo (Apparatus), Karim Diff (TYC) commented about the following:

- Members wanted more information from the AAPT website, they found it very difficult to navigate and get submission of talks and abstracts, several members commented on missing The Announcer,
- There was appreciation at the publicity regarding the Demo Show,
- There was a sense that AAPT is in transition, and that it is not clear where the “weight is falling”; therefore, more communication regarding what the Board is trying to do would be appreciated.
- The Apparatus Committee is uncertain if ALPHA might be a terrible thing or an opportunity. There is a fear of commercialization, a fear of change in mission and goals regarding leaving PIRA and Apparatus behind. The Committee is not clear on how the Board feels about ALPHA, (*N.B.* The Executive Board has not discussed ALPHA) nor did they “see the formation of the group coming.” (Leff commented that the people who teach advanced labs include members of many organizations including APS and OSA, so the concept of ALPHA is to provide a home for all these people; regarding the fear with commercialization - while TeachSpin is involved at this time, it would be desirable to have the organization stand alone. Apparently, the group needs to better explain itself to different constituencies: Within AAPT, it is separate organization, similar to PIRA. It might be possible that ALPHA could sponsor sessions at APS and AAPT meetings, there should be no sense of competition, Hakim noted that this might be an opportunity for AAPT to take the lead by collaborating and discussing how to best include ALPHA. “We want to avoid something that will take away from AAPT.”)
- The TYC community shares many of the same concerns regarding a sense of transition. They do seem to be taking a sharp position. The Committee is trying to become more active regarding building on TYC-21. They want to sponsor a conference to increase the production of papers for TPT, and to promote professional development of the TYC faculty similar to a TYC program for new faculty. They are investigating a new approach to committee structure that will establish roles for new committee members and provide direction for the new chair. There was very good participation in the TYC breakfast including 41 attendees and a poster session in the Resource Room.
- Heller reported that the Graduate Education Committee seemed positive regarding the potential changes and hoped for more influence. Heller reported that the RIPE not seem to care and seemed not to have comments.
- Don Franklin provided a written report for the International Committee. The International Breakfast attracted 35 people. The Committee also sponsored emails welcoming international registrants. Their future- goal is to increase international membership 500/year and 200/meeting. To increase participation in the meeting, the Committee is considering Q&A sessions held online or to have posters with Instant Messaging. The Committee is encouraging countries to apply to become AAPT sections.

There were additional comments from the Area Chairs and the Board regarding the lack of focus regarding the perceived changes. This increased level of uncertainty feeds apprehension, and rumors. Generally a feeling of uneasiness is produced by a lack of knowledge especially when it is unclear what is the motivation for making (or not making) some of the changes.

Khoury noted that in the past five days the Board has heard that we need to hear more from the membership, but the membership is saying that they need to hear more from the Board. To this Dickison commented that the membership may be hearing and reacting to rumors that than the perspective from the Executive Board.

26. **Thanks.** Sincere thanks were offered to Lila Adair, Marie Elena Khoury, and Tiffany Hays and the staff for their efforts in producing a very successful meeting. Heller thanks Dick Peterson for his work in selecting the award winners.
27. **Charge to the Governance Review Committee (GRC).** Leff and Iona made the following motion-

The Governance Review Committee (GRC) will advise the AAPT Executive Board on governance issues identified by the Executive Board. It is anticipated that the GRC will normally be asked to work on one issue at a time, prioritized and with timelines specified by the AAPT Executive Board. The GRC will operate between August 1, 2007 and July 31, 2008, with possible reappointment by the 2008 AAPT President.

The following two issues for GRC consideration have been identified, and others might arise.

1. Review of AAPT Governance Documents

(a) Review and identify inconsistencies and obsolete sections in existing AAPT governance documents, including Policies and Guidelines, the Officers' Handbook, and Primers #1 and #2. (If the Board deems it necessary, the AAPT Constitution and By-Laws will be added to this list.)

(b) Recommend changes needed to achieve an up-to-date Officers' Handbook (to supersede the Policies and Guidelines, Primer #1, and Primer #2).

2. Develop a chart that briefly describes the purpose of and indicates the connections among the different committees, programs, groups, and outreach efforts sponsored or supported by AAPT. These include, but are not limited to, Topical Groups; Area Committees; programs such as PTRA and the NFW; publications including journals, books, web-based communications; the Executive Board; and Sections. The goal is to produce a visual that indicates connections among AAPT related activities that indicate reporting and management responsibilities.

Second by Roeder. The motion passed unanimously.

28. **Follow-up on Area Chairs-Section Representatives Retreat Activities.** Based on a lunch meeting of the AC-SR Planning Group, Iona brought the following motion - **Request \$25,000 (plus one meal and room facilities charges) be allocated to a one-day meeting as part of the Baltimore-Winter Meeting 2008 for Section Representatives and members of Area Committees. The meeting would be to:**
- **Examine and develop structural models for Area Committees to increase their effectiveness for raising and responding to issues effecting physics education.**

- **Examine and develop structural models for Section Representatives to increase their effectiveness in involvement of local physics educators and in communication with the Executive Office.**
- **Examine and respond to membership models.**

While this request is specifically for Winter 2008, the Executive Board is encouraged to make this a continuing part of the AAPT budgeting process.

Roeder seconded the motion.

Heller and Desbien indicated that they thought this to be a very bad idea. Their belief is that this is not an efficient way to formulate policy. Desbien also commented that the Area Chairs and Section Reps are not charged to develop governance structures. He stated that since the Board has not discussed this, it seems inappropriate to have them continue to develop plans. Ramsey added that he felt that the Board should call the group together to create a specific recommendation, not the other way around. Returning to his point, Heller emphasized that the very large groups in which he has participated never collaborate in a face-to-face fashion.

Mogge pointed out that the intent is to have the Planning Group produce options that the larger group could react to. These would be developed by November, so the larger group could consider the options prior to the January meeting. Heller and Robertson indicated that they did not see this as practical and that it was a “recipe for divergence.” Leff too wondered whether the work would not best be done electronically or via conference calls.

Gibson commented that that the Board wanted to involve the groups in the discussion to answer some Retreat questions. The Area Chairs only seem to be able to plan for meetings, and therefore need more time to think and plan. He also commented that there is diversity in the level of buy-in to the Synthesis Report by the Section Representatives. He indicated that he thought that the Board did not feel that the Synthesis Report contained enough rationale and recommendations. This is an opportunity to have this happen.

Heller tried to identify common ground by seeking the level of agreement on the Board for the following:

- Seeking more communication and more input from the Section Reps and Area Chairs. (Reminding the Board that they said that they would like a more specific set of recommendations and acknowledged that the Planning Group would be willing to do this.)
- Agreeing that the Planning Group should bring recommendations to the Board.

Ramsey and Desbien again encouraged electronic communication instead of bringing the entire group together. It was also mentioned that the Board needs to be much clearer about what we are trying to fix. They pointed out that the Board has not identified the issues we are trying to “clean up”. Until we do so, the Board must expect differing versions to be proposed. Specifically there was a concern that if the group met prior to the Baltimore meeting that the Board might be able to respond before the presented plans would become available to the membership.

Hakim and Mogge reminded the Board that they stated the Synthesis Report did not have “enough meat”; this proposal is to provide more meat. Dickison wondered why the Area Chair-Section Rep group is the one to complete this task rather than the PAG or the GRC? Leff call for the end of discussion. **The motion failed: 4-6.**

Desbien stated that we cannot have continued indecision, we need to identify what we consider the problems to be addressed, and we need to provide the leadership. Ramsey wanted to see models clearly assessed identifying how they are improvements, why they are better, and what are the cost estimates.

Heller reflected that since PAG had been disbanded, and that we had a Retreat Planning Group it was a responsible action by them to offer to clarify the Synthesis Report results. “Either the Board supports that or it needs to put that group out of business.”

Heller offered the following motion - **The EB appreciates the work of the Section Representatives and Area Chairs during their May 2007 Retreat, and has received their draft Synthesis Report. The Executive Board supports the Planning Groups’ recommendations regarding further steps. Specifically, we encourage the Planning Group to involve the Area Chairs and Section Reps to:**

- **Examine and develop structural models for Area Committees to increase their effectiveness for raising and responding to issues effecting physics education.**
- **Examine and develop structural models for Section Representatives to increase their effectiveness in involvement of local physics educators and in communication with the Executive Office.**
- **Examine and respond to membership models.**

And to include the original questions regarding the initial charge to the group. These include:

- There are a very large number of committees for an organization of AAPT’s size, resulting at best in split interests and a collective inability to work cohesively on organizational priorities. Should the number of standing committees, appointed by the Board, be formally capped?
- Should a prescribed “lifespan” be established at the outset when committees are formed with regular reviews and options for extension?
- Committees vary widely in charge and scope. Should area committees be organized into two different classes: Issues/Policies (Area) Committees and Operational Committees (e.g., Publications or Membership & Benefits)? The latter could parallel the National Office’s operational model, in terms of structure Publications/Membership/Finance/Meetings, and later, Development and Public Policy), and advise the National Office and Board through the National Office on the general operational issues; the former may focus on programs and policies. Should that classification be considered? Changing names of committees may help align expectations with responsibility (action groups or task forces for short-term work, standing committees for long-term oversight, and perhaps interest groups for advice on issues and policies).
- Area (issues) committees do not seem to serve the Association (which would be ideal) as advocates and/or experts on certain aspects of physics education (be they

- curricular or relating to human resources). What should be done to develop leadership committees charged with scanning their corner of the physics educational landscape and making recommendations to the National Office and/or Board on issues of concern, opportunities for action, etc.?
- A few committees seem to have shared or common interest. Should the consolidation of such committees be considered and have larger committees and multiple subcommittees as the need arises?
 - The way the Board has interfaced formally with the Area Committees is by having its members attend some of the committee meetings, by having the Board's Review Board evaluate the reports, and when reports are made directly to the Board on occasions. How can communication between the committees and the Board be enhanced?

Roeder seconded the motion.

Hakim wishing to avoid future problems with reports to the Board asked for clarification about what the group should expect the Board to do with their Report.

Adair warned that the Synthesis Report presented some specific information and it would be inappropriate for the Planning Group to create new models that contradicted the information in the Synthesis Report.

Desbien encouraged the group to clearly identify what the model is trying to fix.

The motion passed. Dickson voted no, Adair abstained.

Heller moved-**That the involvement and the Area Chairs and Section Reps be done electronically (e.g., email, web posting, conference call). The Executive Board looks forward to receiving a progress report in October 2007, January 2008, and a final report by April 2008. Ramsey seconded the motion. The motion passed, Adair abstained.**

Hakim again asked what the Board anticipated doing with the report when it came to the Board.

Desbien strongly encouraged each Board member to think about what governance aspects need to change.

- 29. Publications Committee Report.** Iona presented two motions from the Committee:
The Publications Committee recommends the approval of the following to the AJP Editorial Board: Christian Brosseau (University of Brest), Gerardo Munoz (California State-Fresno), Beate Schmittmann (Virginia Tech). These will replace David Griffiths, Elaine Oran, and Sidney Redner. The motion passed unanimously.

The Publications Committee recommends the approval of the following to the Resource Letters Editorial Board: Kimball A. Milton (University of Oklahoma), Rosemary Wyse

(The Johns Hopkins University). These will replace Suzanne Amador Kane and Michael Nauenberg. The motion passed unanimously

30. Bundling TPT with Physics Today. Hakim indicated that the bundling initiative was planned to roll out in the fall. The plan is to offer TPT and Physics Today to 7500 high schools that offer AP Physics classes. The subscription price will be \$99/year with a 60%-40% revenue sharing with AIP. Since AIP did the market research and thought that this would be a profitable market. Gibson indicated support for the initiative from the Membership and Benefits Committee. While the Committee agreed with the concept, it mentioned that it did not have enough information regarding considering this as a revenue stream. Hakim and Hein indicated that this was consistent with the Doubling Initiative and might have other PR effects as the posters etc from TPT arrive in libraries. Dickson repeated his concern of providing the journals for \$50. He also was unconvinced that it would not have an effect on high school membership.

Hakim moved – **The Executive Board endorses the effort to bundle TPT and PT (including electronic access) for 7500 high school libraries, Heller seconded the motion. It passed unanimously.**

31. Fall Executive Board Meeting. The Executive Board will meet at ACP beginning Friday, October 19, 2007 through Sunday noon October 22, 2007.

32. Discussion about *Interactions*. Daryl Malloy was available to answer questions from the Board.

- Leff asked how authors were selected? Primarily from suggestions from Executive Office personnel or the membership (e.g., Area Committees).
- Why Interactions? The publication helps answer the question of “why physics” to the broader community. For example, when the school board considers dropping physics from the curriculum, Interactions would be available targeted at the non-technical community to make the case for supporting physics education.
- Adair pointed out that less than two staff people produced The Announcer, but the information in the Board Packet implied a much larger staff is needed to produce Interactions. She reminded the Board that they had turned down requests for astronomy journals and PER journals, yet have begun this new publication. She wanted to see a business plan before further funds are approved. Robertson suggested that it would be helpful to see the business plan in October that could then be used to approach sponsors.
- Roeder felt that if Interactions is to be “physics education’s face to the world” that AAPT’s name should be listed. In addition it should have AAPT’s meeting and products.
- Iona indicated that the Board needs to decide if Interactions is a marketing product or a journal. If it is a journal then the Publications Committee needs to include the editor on the Publications Committee and to formally evaluate the publication. If it is a marketing method, then it falls into a different category.

Malloy indicated that production of The Announcer became more difficult because much of the institutional knowledge associated with the magazine had left AAPT. Also, the infrastructure to create the magazine required a significant investment to upgrade its desktop publishing needs

33. Proposed Local and International Program Funds. Hein pointed out that AAPT does not have a corresponding program to the NFW for the pre-college audience. To bring all new pre-college faculty to one location would be impractical; however, Sections could help with the dissemination of information. The intent of this motion is to use \$25k of Dodge funds to support the PTRAs program as it offers workshops for professional development of new pre-college faculty (\$1k/workshop, and to provide a stipend for the PTRAs.) Gibson agreed that a workshop for new teachers was a good idea and moved – **Take no more than 4% of the current Dodge Fund to support new teacher workshop for pre-college teachers presented by PTRAs. Roeder seconded the motion.**

Dickison wondered why restrict the instruction to the PTRAs when there are other professional development programs available. Heller stated that if AAPT wants to do this, we should do so using matching funds. This approach would increase buy-in from the state or community hosting the workshop. Clearly in one day only a brief presentation of different resources or techniques is possible. The PTRAs could and should then be used for follow-up workshops. One of the successes of the NFW is the development of a community. “How will this workshop help develop these communities?”

While some Board members encouraged spending more money to support the workshops, Gibson did not feel that it was wise to allocate more money from the fund. Desbien asked for clarification whether this is a one time or continuing request. It was described as a one-time event.

The motion passed, Heller voted no.

34. Returning to the Name Change Discussion. There was a discussion regarding assessing the impact of the phrases “physics teacher” vs. “physics teaching” on differing communities. The Executive Office is planning a \$20k market analysis regarding why people are not joining and/or leaving AAPT. Hakim indicated that for \$7k additional, we could have the firm provide information about how high school and 4YC instructors respond to the different names. This amount will be budgeted in 2008.

Gibson wondered if AAPT has made good use of the previous surveys of members and non-members. Hakim indicated yes, but recommendations from the previous surveys have still not been implemented. Other questions and comments included whether AAPT has age data on the membership and how data is reported to the Board.

Roeder moved - **To approve the authorization of \$27k for the planned survey-of members and non-members as well a survey regarding the impression of the differing name options. Leff seconded the motion. The motion passed, Desbien, Gibson, and Robertson abstained.**

35. Financial Issues. Robertson expressed a significant concern regarding the rate at which AAPT is spending money. While he recognizes the potential long-term benefits, he

reminded the Board of the \$250k excess of disbursements compared to income in May 2007. The Board needs to carefully identify costs and benefits of the expenditures. To this, Leff asked whether we know why we are in the red?

Hakim reiterated that he would produce a balanced budget for 2008. Likewise he will minimize the loss for 2007. It will require belt tightening, but he felt that there were expenses necessary to make improvements. He will provide more detailed forecasts for October-December at the next Board meeting.

Dickison encouraged the Board to allow Hakim flexibility for this year to allow him to initiate new programs. However, he was looking forward to some returns after this first year. Leff added that he would feel more comfortable if we were planning on some of these expenses.

Hakim tried to place the budget formation in perspective by indicating that the budget presented was generally based on 2005 with small adjustments. By October 2007 the office will go through a ZBB process so that everyone will know better where dollars are coming from and going to. After this the office can become more accountable. Currently he cannot use the system to make projections or identify balances on an ongoing basis. The office has purchased a computer module to add this flexibility.

Roeder asked for a fundraising report in October. Hakim indicated that he would provide a report and a plan in October.

36. Executive Session EIV, EV