

**AAPT Meeting  
Executive Board  
July 31-August 4, 2011  
Omaha, NE**

**Sunday, 31 July 2011**

**Members Present:** Marina Milner Bolotin, Chair of Section Representatives; David Cook, Past President; Beth Cunningham, Executive Officer; Steve Iona, Secretary; David Jackson, Editor Elect, *American Journal of Physics* (AJP); Karl Mamola, Editor, *The Physics Teacher* (TPT); Jill Marshall, President Elect; Marie Plumb, At-Large Member; Diane Riendeau, At-Large Member; Steven Shropshire, At-Large Member; David Sokoloff, President; Gay Stewart, Vice President; Jan Tobochnik, Editor, *American Journal of Physics* (AJP); Paul Zitzewitz, Treasurer

**Guests:** Shirley Hyde, Executive Assistant; Jack Hehn, AIP Education Officer; John Layman, AAPT Archivist; Warren Hein, AAPT Executive Officer Emeritus; Tom O’Kuma, Meetings Committee Chair; Mary Beth Monroe; Marilyn Gardner, Director Membership and Communications; Michael Brosnan, CFO (via telephone); Lila Adair, Chair of Len Jossem Fund; Tiffany Hayes, Director of Meetings and Programs; Richard Peterson, AAPT Historian; Ted Hodapp, APS Director Education

**1. Welcome and Call to Order /Sokoloff**

**2. Approval of Agenda/ Sokoloff**

**3. Approval of Minutes of January-May, 2011/ Iona**

The motion was made by Shropshire and seconded by Marshall to approve the minutes by correcting certain typographical errors. The motion passed unanimously.

**4. President's Report/ Sokoloff**

“My first six months as President of AAPT have alerted me to the seriousness of some of the problems we face if we wish to maintain the high level of services that we continue to provide to our members. But, the bottom line is that despite some rocky times financially, our meetings, journals and other programs remain of high quality. I believe that we must strive to maintain this quality, while engaging our members more actively in these programs.”

Sokoloff announced that several candidates applied for the Associate Executive Officer (AEO) position, and that some would be interviewed during the meeting.

The Board had sought recommendations regarding continuing to hold two national meetings each year and the format of those meetings (number of plenary slots, etc) from the Meetings Committee. The present Committee is unable to fit these discussions into their schedule. Sokoloff suggests that he appoint a committee made up of members outside of the Board. The intent is to have the committee look at the two-meeting model and if a change in format might help the quality and attendance at a meeting. Iona wondered if there was a need for another committee since all previous committee have revealed similar data, but could not proceed to a conclusion. The issue is not studying the problem; it is suggesting a viable solution. Cook

wondered if a different member within the Meetings Committee could chair this other study committee.

Sokoloff asked if the Board wishes to proceed with a Winter Meeting in 2014. He indicated that the Meetings Committee is postponing a decision until they receive guidance from the Executive Board. The Board voiced no objection to proceeding with the planning for a Winter Meeting in 2014.

Tobochnik pointed out that APS is discussing their April Meeting and that we should interact with them to see about joint meetings. He indicated the importance of examining the economic pros and cons.

Sokoloff wants a committee report by October 2011 and a recommendation by January 2012. He will write a charge for the committee and will circulate the document to the Board for approval and then seek members. Stewart and Cunningham will explore possible joint meeting arrangements with APS for 2015.

Sokoloff indicated the continued need to address the role and structure of Sections in AAPT. “We all have had thoughts and concerns about the roles of our many sections. Some of us wonder about the structure of an organization with sections that are almost completely independent both financially and ideologically, and yet have statutory decision-making roles within the National AAPT. I have recently had a realization that when it comes to meetings, the National AAPT to a certain extent actually competes with local section meetings for some of our members! Surely our national meetings are able to offer a lot more, but section meetings are generally more accessible, with much lower costs to attendees. I believe that we need a study of the structure of AAPT in relation to sections. We need to re-consider the sections as now constituted, and be open to drastic restructuring that would better serve our members and rejuvenate National AAPT. “ He hopes that an analysis of the recent member and non-member surveys and discussion with COGS will provide some new insights regarding options.

A Fundraising Advisory Committee has been appointed: Steve Iona, Marie Plumb, David Sokoloff, and Diane Riendeau.

## **5. Discussion of President Elect’s Report/ Marshall**

Cook was pleased that there was good communications between the President Elect and the Nominating Committee so that high quality and willing members would populate the Area Committees.

Marshall indicated that she will be discussing the possibility of reducing events quotas during Programs I.

## **6. Discussion of Vice President’s Report/ Stewart**

Sokoloff asked how the online forms were working. Stewart indicated that they “seem to be working well.” They will be tried during Programs II.

There were some unexpected liability insurance costs for Cal Poly during the Ontario Meeting. The theme for Summer 2012 will be to support ALPhA. The theme will be, “The experimental

core of physics.”

Steward emphasized that the national office candidates need to be better informed about the position responsibilities and the time commitment necessary. She referenced some changes in the Executive Board Handbook. Specifically, the Vice-President begins some responsibilities immediately during/after the Winter Meeting.

## **7. Discussion of Secretary's Report/ Iona**

Iona announced the acceptance by David Jackson, Dickinson College, to serve as AJP Editor beginning in September. Cunningham indicated that Harvey Gould will serve as Associate Editor through the end of December and that there are some negotiations in place to select a longer term Associate Editor.

The 2012 Nominating Committee has selected the following as candidates for National Office:

Vice President: Pat Callahan and Mary Beth Monroe

TYC Representative: David Weaver and Paul Williams

Treasurer: Paul Zitzewitz

## **8. Executive Officer's Report and discussion /Cunningham**

Cunningham reported that there were several candidates for the Associate Executive Officer position and that interviews were taking place.

### **Budget Update (with Brosnan)**

There is a loss in Operations through June of approximately \$24k.

The cash balance is approximately \$240k. Payables include \$171k, but other upcoming expenses include payroll \$75k, rent \$54k, American Express \$19k. Therefore, Brosnan is expecting a cash flow problem and the need to transfer money from the long-term reserve.

The Board was then reminded that while we are operating with an almost balanced budget for 2011 (anticipated \$50k deficit), for many years AAPT operated with a deficit (even though the total income – including investments - showed a profit). Therefore, more and more current payables began to be paid for using available income rather than income designated for that expenditure. For example, when a member paid dues, the income was immediately spent to cover current needs rather than being held to cover journal and other specific member benefits over the course of the year. As a result, over time, current meeting income is being used to pay past meeting bills etc. The result is that the current income is not sufficient to pay current bills because past revenue shortfalls were never replaced. The only way to solve the cash flow problem is to be profitable for multiple years.

Brosnan explained some other timing issues regarding the Operating funds. One example is when the Associate Editor of AJP is paid. Usually, it is done in February to pay for the previous year. Since we are changing Associate Editors, the bill is due in 2011 rather than 2012.

Sokoloff and other Board members expressed confusion about the apparent “surprises.” For example, if we did something different regarding the Associate Editor this year, the money should have been encumbered or this year, so the change is not a “surprise.” Likewise, the large

influxes of money (*e.g.*, Zitzewitz Award gift and Venture fund expense and income) are showing up as these wild fluctuations in the Operating budget and confuse the actual balances in different accounts. Since these are restricted funds that do not influence our bottom line, these fluctuations cloud the understanding of the actual operating finances.

Brosnan indicated that AAPT has approximately \$1.5 mil in unrestricted reserves.

Tobochnik indicated that that implies that we have only three years of reserves that we could use to supplement the AAPT Cash Flow problems (at a rate of \$550k/year). Said another way, we would need an operating profit in 2012 of \$500k, to not have to transfer money from the Long Term Reserve (LTR).

Brosnan hopes to delay the request for a transfer from the LTR until the end of August. In 2010, the transfer was \$550k. He expects the transfer request to be \$350-400k for 2011.

Iona commented on the request from the Publications Committee that honoraria and travel expenses be paid earlier than 60 - 120 days. Brosnan indicated that the *de facto* policy is to delay requests 30 - 90 days. Iona commented that we need a policy regarding which bills are paid when so that we do not dishonor the contributions of our community.

Puskar asked what could we do to address these financial problems. Responses included to increase journal prices, to reduce membership losses, to add members, to fund raise, and to monetize some products/services. We need approximately \$50 more per member and \$150/meeting attendee to be profitable.

#### **Parameters and considerations for planning of FY 2012 budget (Zitzewitz/Brosnan)**

- The Membership and Benefits Committee will bring a recommendation for changes in dues and membership costs for 2012. Since most people renew at the current year prices, there is a delay in the revenue seen from membership dues increases.
- AAPT was able to negotiate an upgrade for the iMIS membership system at a tremendous discount (95%). There is an annual service contract for \$5k.
- All contracts for meetings and other services are now entered in the financial software and reviewed by Brosnan and Cunningham so that anticipated expenses can be forecast.
- The current ACP IT costs are \$130k. It appears that if we went with outside vendors and purchased telephones and servers, the initial costs would be \$80k for year one and would be less for subsequent years. In ACP, we have 10% of the floor space, but we do not use 10% of the IT services. Cunningham and Campbell are continuing to follow-up on this potential savings.

#### **Update on Fundraising Plan and appointment of Fundraising Committee**

The Board was reminded about the \$10k bequest from Cliff Swartz. The intent is to build on this base amount. A draft of the brochure for the Jossem fund was distributed.

The Board was reminded that AAPT coordinates the work with the US Physics Team for all the AIP Member Societies.

Cunningham presented a summary of the status of current grant funding. Especially noteworthy are the following grants funded since January 1st:

- ALPhA Immersions (to fund a series of workshops this summer on advanced labs)
- 4th International Conference on Women in Physics
- Two Year College Faculty Experience

AAPT recently received correspondence from Duncan McBride (NSF) that the “Beyond the First Year” proposal to fund the advanced lab conference (just prior to the Philadelphia meeting) as well as ALPhA immersions for 2012 through 2014 received favorable reviews.

Cunningham will be submitting a project for the proposal being prepared by the Physics and Astronomy Division of the Council on Undergraduate Research to be submitted to the NSF Research Experiences for Undergraduates program. If funded, AAPT will have the opportunity to hire a summer undergraduate research student to assist in the many projects we have at the National Office. This student will also interact with the other summer interns in the building. She anticipates that this student will be funded almost entirely by the grant.

AAPT has been nominated by the New Teacher Center to become a partner of “100K in 10,” a cross- sector partnership recently created to assist in preparing 100,000 new STEM teachers in 10 years, as recommended by PCAST in September 2010 and President Obama in his 2011 State of the Union address. We will be applying in July to join this partnership. We will base our application on professional development of physics teachers (retention) and plan to include eMentoring and programs like PTRA. (APS is also preparing an application for PhysTEC.) If AAPT is accepted as a partner, we will be able to apply for funding to support our efforts to prepare “100K in 10.”

In the past, AAPT has provided mini-grants for Sections to support their efforts with new teachers and pre-service teachers. The grants have been up to \$4k. The cost has been approximately \$10k/year from the Dodge Fund. The current balance in the Dodge Fund will not support this amount. Cunningham is requesting that AAPT delay any further distributions until the funds balance increases. Stewart would like to work with Milner-Bolotin to see if we could institute a matching program with Sections to allow smaller grant awards.

### **Summary of AAPT Grant Activity July 2011**

ComPADRE Pathway

DUE- 0532798

Grant Dates: October 2005- September 2011

Principal Investigator: Bruce Mason

Co- Principal Investigators: Jack Hehn, Ted Hodapp, and Warren Hein

NSF Program Officer: Corby Hovis

Total Budget: \$2,850,001

Budget Balance (7/11/2011): \$15,148

Enhancing STEM Student Learning Through Faculty Development Workshops for New Physics and Astronomy Faculty

DUE- 0813481

Grant Dates: September 2008- August 2012

Principal Investigator: Robert Hilborn

Co- Principal Investigators: Beth Cunningham, Ted Hodapp, and Kevin Marvel  
NSF Program Officer: Duncan McBride  
Total Budget: \$892,112  
Budget Balance (7/11/2011): \$566,179

Building Undergraduate Programs for the 21st Century: SPIN- UP Regional Workshops  
DUE- 0741560  
Grant Dates: September 2008- August 2011  
Principal Investigator: Robert C. Hilborn  
Co- Principal Investigator: Warren Hein  
NSF Program Officer: Duncan McBride  
Total Budget: \$232,086  
Budget Balance (7/11/2011): \$81,204

The Physics Classroom: Stewardship of Physics Education  
DUE- 0840768  
Grant Dates: October 2008- September 2011  
Principal Investigator: Bruce Mason  
Co- Principal Investigators: Beth Cunningham  
NSF Program Officer: Victor P. Piotrowski  
Total Budget: \$115,000  
Budget Balance (7/11/2011): \$44,976

PhysTEC Noyce Scholars  
DUE- 080408  
Grant Dates: August 2008- July 2013  
Principal Investigator: Monica Plisch  
Co- Principal Investigators: Beth Cunningham, Laurie McNeil, Alvin Rosenthal, Robert Thorne  
NSF Program Officer: Bert Holmes  
Total Budget: \$749,773

Physics Education Research Users Guide  
DUE- 0840853  
Grant Dates: 11/01/2009 – 10/31/2012  
Principal Investigator: Sarah (Sam) McKagan  
Co- Principal Investigators: Beth Cunningham and Bruce Mason  
NSF Program Officer: Corby Hovis  
Total Budget: \$150,000  
Budget Balance (7/11/2011): \$68,672

Physics Teacher Education Coalition II (PhysTEC II)  
PHY- 0808790  
Grant Dates: 9/01/2009 – 8/31/2014  
Principal Investigator: Theodore Hodapp  
Co- Principal Investigators: Monica Plisch and Beth Cunningham

NSF Program Officer: Kathy McCloud  
Total Budget: \$6,500,000

ComPADRE Pathway II: Sustaining Physics and Astronomy Resources for Education  
DUE- 0937836  
Grant Dates: 9/15/2009 – 8/31/2012  
Principal Investigator: Bruce Mason  
Co- Principal Investigators: Jack Hehn, Ted Hodapp, and Beth Cunningham  
NSF Program Officer: Duncan McBride  
Total Budget: \$493,000  
Budget Balance (7/11/2011): \$475,069

Enhancing STEM Student Learning Through Faculty Development Workshops for Two- Year  
College Physics Faculty  
DUE- 0940857  
Grant Dates: 5/11/2011 – 4/30/2013  
Principal Investigator: Scott Schultz  
Co- Principal Investigators: Todd Leif and Warren Hein (in the process of being changed to  
Beth Cunningham rather than Warren Hein)  
NSF Program Officer: Duncan McBride  
Total Budget: \$199,987  
Budget Balance (7/11/2011): \$171,223

2011 ALPhA Immersions Program  
DUE- 1106928  
Grant Dates: 3/15/11 – 2/28/13  
Principal Investigator: Lowell McCann  
Co- Principal Investigators: Beth Cunningham and Gabe Spalding  
NSF Program Officer: Duncan McBride  
Total Budget: \$49,687  
Budget Balance (7/11/2011):

Fourth International Conference on Women in Physics  
PHY- 1112637  
Grant Dates: 5/15/11 – 4/30/13  
Principal Investigator: Beth Cunningham  
Co- Principal Investigators: Beverly Hartline, Apriel Hodari, Luz Martinez- Miranda, and Meg  
Urry  
NSF Program Officer: Kathy McCloud  
Total Budget: \$120,000  
Budget Balance (7/11/2011):

**Cost control measures in the AAPT office**  
Advertising has been included on the eNNOUNCER.

While there has been planning for a Video Contest, and even though Vernier is willing to serve

as a founding sponsor, the project will not start until there is a firm financial commitment to initiate and continue the program. Cunningham wants to include an evaluation component to demonstrate the effectiveness of the program. Gardner indicated that the products from the contest could be marketed.

Mamola asked about the US Physics Team. Cunningham indicated that AIP Member Societies contribute \$40k, and AAPT pays \$80k (partially offset by exam fees and gifts). Students also pay \$750 fee to attend the training camp.

### **AAPT office morale**

Cunningham indicated that the staff is working as hard as possible. The staff is very lean given the number of projects and products we offer. Because the staff has gone without raises for several years and with the recent TIAA-CREF reduction, the morale has suffered. Coupling this with some staff reductions, there is a feeling of uncertainty. These must be considered when designing the budget for 2012.

### **Parameters for setting Meeting Registration Fees and timeline for Early Bird registration (with Hayes)**

Hayes indicated that she was unaware of guidelines directing deadlines for Early Bird registration. She presented a chart indicating that the deadlines have varied over the last few years.

The Board would like to see a recommendation based on a certain number of weeks before the national meetings to mark Early Bird, Advanced, and one-site registration rates.

Plumb complimented the staff for providing an email blast regarding the early bird deadline.

### **9. Progress on Jossem Fund (with Adair)**

The Jossem Committee, chaired by Lila Adair, has developed a brochure to describe the fundraising effort. During the time August 2011 – January 2012 the committee hopes to approach major donors, and then take the efforts public. A smaller committee will develop applications for the distribution of the funds. The distribution mechanism will need to seek Board approval.

### **10. Member needs survey and prospective member survey (Gardner/Lapps)**

AAPT, with the help from the AIP Statistical Research Center, developed a survey of prospective members and new members.

The survey was designed using Survey Monkey with review and consultation from the AIP Statistical Research Center. The survey link was e-mailed on April 15 to 8,732 current AAPT Regular members as of March 31, 2011. A follow up was included in the May issue of the *eNNOUNCER*. A total of 1096 (13%) members started the survey with 1049 (12%) completing it. The number of responses needed to consider the survey valid is 350 responses, confidence interval / margin of error +/- about 3.5% at a 95% level of significance.

What We Learned



- The most preferred communications channel among respondents is email (45.8%).
- Journal access was listed as the primary reason for maintaining their membership. (73.1%)
- By far, the most important service to respondents is the journals with 87.6% rating the print copy Important or Extremely Important. 90.4% rated online journals as either Important or Extremely Important.
- The benefit listed as least important is the Group Insurance with 45% of respondents listing it as not important.
- Respondents requested additional professional development opportunities as the primary service (27%) that AAPT could provide to make their professional lives better.
- Meetings that are closer to home and have more information about current topics in physics and how to teach them was the second most important service to our members.
- Additional networking opportunities came in as the third most important service requested.

This most recently collected data indicates:

- The majority of prospective members choose not to be a member of AAPT because of cost.
- Respondents are confused about the international role that AAPT plays in physics education.
- Prospective members primarily use aapt.org for AAPT journal information and links to physics resources
- Only a minority of prospective members responding is participating in national meetings and other AAPT programs.
- A large portion of the respondents request regional meetings to cut down on travel expenses.
- There is still some confusion about the national AAPT membership and section memberships.
- Respondents are likely to spend time accessing journals and reading print newsletters more than any of the other benefits or services AAPT provides.

#### Open Ended Questions

Of the benefits and services that were rated Extremely Important the top 5 were:

- On-line 31%, n = 241
- Meetings 23%, 181
- Physics Teacher 24%, 196
- Print Journals 14%, 116
- AJP 9%, 73

Of the benefits and services that were rated Not Important the top 5 were:

- Group Insurance 45%, n = 322
- Meetings 7%, 53
- Membership Directory 3%, 25
- Print Journals 3%, 23
- Career Center 3%, 22

On what AAPT could do to make life as a professional educator better, responses were categorized into 11 areas. The responses mainly related to professional development, the journals, and meetings. The response categories and number of responses are:

<b><u>Response Category</u></b>	<b><u>% # of Responses</u></b>
Professional Development	27% (n = 135)
Meetings	17% (84)
Uncategorized	16% (80)
Networking	15% (74)
TPT	14% (70)
PER	11% (54)
Advocacy Tools	6% (31)
AJP	5% (28)
Funding	4% (23)
Web site	2% (14)
AAPT Training Tools	1% (5)
Sections	0% (4)

Tobochnik indicated that he joined AAPT to help support physics education. He was surprised that that was not a choice selected by respondents.

#### **11. Discussion of Treasurer's and Finance Committee's Report/ Zitzewitz**

Zitzewitz highlighted the following:

- The investment accounts show a positive growth of \$164k,
- Winter Meeting 2011 shows a loss of \$33k.
- Dues income shows a shortfall of \$50k.
- Journal Access fees showed a profit.
- For the three months ending June 30, 2011, AAPT reported operating revenues of \$2,281,696 and operating expenses of \$ 2,364,297 resulting in a loss from operations of (\$82,601) before investment related activity.

#### **Motion on Investment Policy Statement from the Investment Advisory Committee**

Since AAPT changed TIAA-CREF advisors, there was a request to update our Investment Policy Statement (IPS).

**Zitzewitz offered and Cook seconded a motion to approve the Investment Policy Statement and Guidelines for American Association of Physics Teachers. The motion passed.**

#### **Investment Policy Statement and Guidelines for American Association of Physics Teachers**

Adopted: July 31, 2011

Last Modified:

#### **I. Overview**

The American Association of Physics Teachers (A.A.P.T.) has created this document to establish investment policies, strategies, and guidelines for use in conjunction with its investments in financial securities. The document provides the framework for a long-term investment strategy focused on the needs of the organization. It is designed to provide clear guidance to the professional external advisors (Managers) in its investment process in order to assure that the organization's objectives are achieved.

## **II. Overall Investment Objectives**

The basic philosophy governing the investment of the A.A.P.T., as defined in section III, will be the long-term balanced growth and income with the understanding that the endowment value will fluctuate with the capital markets over shorter term market cycles. Within this philosophical framework, this investment policy seeks to provide a competitive total return, consistent with historical capital market conditions, and subject to the risk tolerances, liquidity requirements, and investment guidelines established throughout the remainder of this policy.

## **III. Fund Description**

The sum total market value of the fund shall be defined as the Portfolio. The Portfolio is an endowment fund funded from membership dues, journal subscriptions, and gifts. Gifts are often designated for specific purposes, and these designated funds will be identified as such. The A.A.P.T. may, from time to time, create other designated funds. The intent of the endowment is to keep the corpus intact with the income and/or capital gains expended in keeping with the purpose of the organization. Spending objectives for this fund are set by the Organization.

## **IV. Investment Authority and Discretion**

The Guidelines will be implemented through the use of professional external advisors (Managers). It is the intention of the A.A.P.T. to allow the Managers full discretion within the scope of this mutually agreed upon Investment Policy Statement and Guidelines (Guidelines). It is contemplated that the Guidelines shall be implemented by the Managers using mutual funds.

## **V. Risk Tolerances and Control**

Risk shall be defined as the expected standard deviation of return based on historical capital market data. Risk shall be evaluated in terms of the total Portfolio, not each individual investment. To minimize risk, the Portfolio should be well diversified across asset classes, economic sectors, industry groups and individual securities. Within the risk framework established above this policy contemplates that the Manager will construct a Portfolio that:

- is divided into a long-term portfolio and a short-term portfolio.
- The long-term portfolio
  - Will be widely diversified by security type
  - Includes both investment grade and high yield fixed income funds to lower portfolio risk
  - Includes international securities for added diversification and lower portfolio risk
  - Includes real estate funds for added diversification, income and lower portfolio risk
  - Includes other such securities as deemed necessary for added diversification and enhanced return potential.

- The short-term portfolio will invest in cash and short-term income funds.

## **VI. Withdrawal policy**

No more than 4% of the undesignated funds in the portfolio may be withdrawn annually to fund the A.A.P.T.'s programs and support its operational needs. For purposes of this withdrawal policy, the amount that can be withdrawn will be determined using a rolling average of the 16 most recent quarter-end market values of the total portfolio. The purpose of the 4% limitation is to enable the corpus of the portfolio to grow during times of market strength, thereby providing a buffer in times of market weakness.

The Target Asset Allocation and Asset Allocation Rebalancing policies established in sections VII and VIII of this policy have been established to assure funding for foreseeable needs for withdrawals.

Withdrawals may come from capital and income assets of undesignated funds upon approval of the Executive Board of the A.A.P.T.

## **VII. Target Asset Allocation**

The long-term strategic asset allocation of the Portfolio will be determined by the A.A.P.T.'s Investment Advisory Committee in consultation with the Manager. The portion of the long-term portfolio invested in equities should be between 30% and 70%. Exposure to each asset class will be measured by market value and is subject to the rebalancing guidelines described in section VIII.

## **VIII. Asset Allocation Rebalancing**

The key objective of the portfolio rebalancing process is to minimize the loss of risk-adjusted returns resulting when the portfolio's actual asset allocation deviates from the target asset allocation. Rebalancing can also be used to enhance the risk-adjusted return of a portfolio by purchasing/selling asset classes at relative low/high valuations. Asset allocations may also be modified due to changes in economic conditions.

The portfolio will be rebalanced at the time there are material cash inflows or outflows. Additionally, the Managers will consider rebalancing whenever a single asset class' allocation exceeds  $\pm$  ten percent (10%) of its Target Asset Allocation. Rebalancing is ultimately at the discretion of the Manager.

## **IX. Performance Evaluation and Reporting**

Investment return is to be measured in a manner consistent with the organization's guidelines issued by the Global Investment Performance Standards (GIPS), or, if differently, as specifically directed by

American Association of Physics Teachers in writing. Investment returns will be reported quarterly.

This review will examine the Portfolio's total return, as well as that of the separate asset classes or funds that comprise the Portfolio. Performance is to be compared to all relevant benchmarks. Rolling five (5) year periods will be used to determine whether the Portfolio's objectives are being met. To aid in the evaluation of Portfolio trends, quarter, year-to-date, one year and three

year period ended returns will also be reported.

All asset classes will be compared to their relevant benchmarks and the benchmarks should remain consistent from reporting period to reporting period.

#### **X. Specific Prohibitions on Investments**

The Portfolio may not at any time:

1. Acquire any security subject to any restriction on the sale thereof, or subject to any investment representation.
2. Acquire or sell any commodity or commodity contract.
3. Acquire any security on margin, or otherwise utilize borrowed funds for the acquisition of any security including but not limited to the use of reverse repurchase agreements.
4. Sell any security not a part of the Portfolio.
5. Make any investment for the purpose of exercising control of any corporation.

#### **XI. Policy Modification and Exceptions**

Any changes to this Investment Policy Statement deemed necessary by the Managers will be fully discussed and agreed upon by both the Managers and the Treasurer and Executive Officer of the A.A.P.T. in consultation with the Investment Advisory Committee before taking effect, and such changes will be incorporated in writing into the Guidelines.

Exceptions to this policy may be recommended by the Treasurer of the A.A.P.T. in writing. Written notice of a policy exception should contain the date the exception is effective, the specific exception to be allowed and the date the exception's effectiveness will terminate. Any changes deemed necessary by the Officers of the organization will be incorporated in writing into the Guidelines.

---

Treasurer  
American Association of Physics Teachers

Date

---

Executive Officer  
American Association of Physics Teachers

Date

#### **12. Discussion of Report of Historian/ Peterson**

Peterson indicated that he met with Iona and Layman at ACP to better clarify the location of historical references and to discuss relevant documents that should be archived.

He indicated that periodically, the historical perspective is very important for the working of AAPT. He will be working to revise the present history written over the last 60 years and add information about important programs such as PTRS and the New Faculty Workshop to try to bring the history more up to date.

Ideally he indicated that he would be working to collect some oral histories of older members and past officers.

### **13. Discussion of Report of Archivist/ Layman**

Layman indicated that many AAPT archived items are in the ACP Bohr Library, but most are housed within the Executive Office

He indicated the need to have a record of:

- Executive Board meetings documents
- Various Executive Officers' chronological files
- Various chronological Executive Office files
- AAPT Section Records
- AAPT Area Committee Records
- International Conference Materials
- Historic Materials
- Strategic Planning Documents
- Winter and Summer Meeting Programs
- Externally funded AAPT projects
- Awards Files
- Handbooks

### **14. AIP Representative's Report/ Hehn**

Hehn reported on the following:

- One result of the AIP Executive Committee Retreat was an agreement to shift the AIP business strategy to concentrate on journals and Member Societies. That is, to stop all non-member publishing services contracts.
- The Physics Policy Resource Center (in which AIP Education is located) receives \$10 mil from publishing and \$10 mil from fundraising. The implication is that the program will need to continue and expand its fundraising efforts.
- The Careers Grant is progressing with three site visits to develop information about careers for undergraduate who may not be following a route to academia. The next step would be to offer suggestions for curriculum changes.
- The recent SPIN-UP conference at Hampton University generated a great deal of interest within the HBCU community.
- There are about 120 students registered for the AAPT Summer Meeting.
- The NRC-BOSE recently released its frameworks document. Achieve, Inc has the contract to write the national science standards.
- The likelihood of Congress passing the ESEA during 2011 is small.
- The NSF has developed guidelines for its Broader Impacts Criteria (Criteria 2). They are inviting comments on the document.

Jack Hehn is retiring as the AIP Education Officer. The Board expressed their thanks to him for the support, wisdom, and insight that is has shared with AAPT over the years and that we wish him well in his future endeavors.

### **15. Report of APS Education Director/ Hodapp**

Hodapp announced or commented on the following:

- PhysTEC has approved four new sites: Boston University, Virginia Tech, Cal State-San Marcos, SUNY- Genesso
- There is a video project involving FIU and Seattle Pacific to develop tools to be used in training Learning Assistants
- PhysTEC is working the ACS to help them develop a similar program to support chemistry department and to develop chemistry teachers.
- APS is involved in two new grant proposals involving “110k in 10” (want to produce 100k new teachers in the next 10 years) and an Investment in Innovation Proposal (this proposal will be reviewed by the AAPT Review Committee regarding AAPT involvement)
- The Minority Bridge Program is attempting to increase the number of PhD’s earned by minorities in the US. The goal is to produce the same percentage as for Bachelor degrees awarded to minorities.
- APS has developed a series of Webinars
- APS is willing to collaborate on the efforts regarding careers. Career information is the second highest page selected on the APS website.
- New curriculum is being developed about direct CO<sub>2</sub> capture from atmosphere
- The APS poster on Quantum Information will be ready for inclusion in the November TPT
- Monica Pilsch has been selected to be on a committee to review products from Achieve, Inc.
- There is a writing group to develop funding for a graduate education conference (joint with APS, AAPT). The hope is to hold a conference in Spring 2012
- APS will begin a strategic planning process
- APS is exploring different structures to help bring NSBP and NSHP into the APS family.

Marshall asked if a TYC could become a PhysTEC site. The response was that the institution needs to be able to certify physics teachers.

Peterson indicated that NSF would like to see the broadest possible joint involvement by AAPT, APS and AIP in activities, programs and grants

#### **16. Discussion of Report of the Committee on Workshop Quotas/ Stewart**

Stewart is seeking additional information from the Executive Office. This data is necessary before the committee can make any recommendations

#### **17. Discussion of Report on Committee on Alternative Access to Meetings/ Gardner**

Gardner indicated that WebEx will be used to broadcast two sessions from the Omaha Meeting: Session BB an Educational Technology session and Session CD on High School Assessment. There are at least three remote viewers who will provide feedback on the effectiveness of the process.

#### **18. Discussion of Report from the US Liaison Committee to the International Union on Pure and Applied Physics/Ramsey**

There is a World Conference on Physics Education being planned for July 2012 in Turkey. The conference is scheduled to include workshops and talks. AAPT has three members on the

IUPAP including Dean Zollman, Gordon Ramsey, and David Sokoloff. USLC members include Beth Cunningham, and Gordon Ramsey.

Ramsey provided an update on the status of requested items:

- There is still a desire to have an international portion on the AAPT website to feature ICPE, GIRIP, and other conference proceedings.
- It would be nice to see AAPT representation at international meetings with reports provided back to AAPT

## **19. Discussion of Marketing Report/Lapps**

Lapps described the following:

- The initiative to produce 3-minute video descriptions of “What AAPT Means to Members.”
- The “Why Physics” campaign continues with APS and there is a session at the Summer Meeting on the topic.
- Social media is getting more comments and followers
- The display booths at NSTA Regional Meetings will continue with help from Sections.
- The US Science Festival is scheduled for Spring 2012. It will expand to include physics careers.

## **20. Publications Committee Report and Discussion/ Iona**

Several appointments for Editorial Boards were offered:

- The Publications Committee recommends that William I. Newman (UCLA) and Ryan E. Doezenia (University of Oklahoma) be appointed to the Resource Letters Editorial Board for three-year terms beginning after the AAPT winter Meeting in Ontario, CA. These two people would replace Amy Joanne Kolan and Harvey S. Leff.
- The Publications Committee recommends that Al Greer (Gonzaga University), Peter Siegel (Cal Poly, Pomona), and Bill Wootters (Williams College) be appointed to the AJP Editorial Board for three-year terms beginning January 1, 2012. These three people would replace L. Mahadevan, Carl Mungan, and Harold Zapolsky.

**All appointments were approved the Board.**

As mentioned earlier, Roger Stuewer requested that the Publications Committee forward a request that AAPT reexamine its policy regarding the payment of honoraria and reimbursement for travel expenses. This is specifically related to payment to authors for Resource Letters.

The Committee also discussed ways that ComPADRE could repackaging some of its material for sale or for better use. The Committee wondered what sources of funds might be available to support page charges for ST-PER (see PER-LOC Report later during the meeting). Finally, the Committee discussed the value of the Five-Year Reports given the time lag in getting and reporting the data and the overlap of information sources to the Review Committee versus the Editors.

## **21. Discussion of Programs and Conferences Report/ Hayes**

Hayes reported that:

- The total registration for the Summer Meeting is approaching 900



- The shuttle bus service is partially sponsored by Creighton University
- There was an attempt to space the posters further apart
- The Creighton Physics Department provided tremendous support for the AAPT Meeting.

### **Wednesday, August 3, 2011**

**Guests:** Shirley Hyde, Administrative Assistant AAPT; Tom O’Kuma, Meetings Committee Chair; Trina Cannon; Marilyn Gardner, Director of Communications and Membership; John Thompson, PER-LOC

Sokoloff called the group to order.

### **22. Discussion of Past President’s Report/ Cook**

Cook described the proposed changes in the procedures for the review of proposals that involve AAPT or wish to be endorsed by AAPT.

**Cook made the motion to approve the revisions, Shropshire offered a second. The motion passed unanimously.**

### **Revised Charge to the Review Board**

#### **A.1 Sections 3 and 4 of Proposed New Charge**

3. Review proposals which will be submitted to other agencies such as the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education and for which AAPT will be the fiduciary agent or, if not the fiduciary agent, from which AAPT will at least receive some monetary benefit.

As soon as possible as the proposal is being conceived, the PI(s) will contact the AAPT Executive Officer (EO), who will make these guidelines available. Then, if invited by the EO, the PI(s) will submit to the EO (1) the identity of the intended funding agency, the deadline for submission to that agency, and a web link to the guidelines of the specific funding program, (2) a project summary of no more than two pages that places the activity in context, explains its specific objectives and procedures, and addresses all of the criteria imposed by the funding agency, (3) a preliminary budget, (4) a curriculum vitae for each PI, and (5) a statement describing the way AAPT will be involved in the proposed activity and share in the funds. These documents must be provided to the EO at least two months prior to the deadline for submission of the final proposal. In some cases (see next paragraph), the EO will transmit those documents immediately to the AAPT Review Board, which after its review will in some cases (again see next paragraph) seek the endorsement of the full AAPT Executive Board. On the basis of the provided information, the EO and, when required, the Review Board and the Executive Board will decide whether to authorize AAPT's involvement in the activity.

The Executive Board has authorized the EO alone to make the final decision regarding any proposal not exceeding \$250K. For proposals exceeding \$250K but not exceeding \$500K, the Executive Board has authorized the EO and the Review Board together to make the final decision. Proposals exceeding \$500K must first be reviewed by the EO and the Review Board. The EO and Review Board may either jointly make a positive recommendation to the

AAPT Executive Board, which in turn will make the final decision, or reject the proposal and notify the AAPT Executive Board of that decision from the Review Board a motion to revise proposal review procedures regarding letter of involvement or endorsement

Since some back and forth communication between AAPT and the PI(s) may need to occur before AAPT can come to a decision, the PI(s) must understand that, if the initial decline to be involved.

Regardless of its amount, every proposal for which AAPT will be the fiduciary agent (example: 2009 Advanced Lab Topical Conference) or from which AAPT will receive monetary benefits (example: the 2001 PhysTEC proposal submitted by APS) will be as- signed a co-PI from the AAPT Executive Office. The AAPT co-PI must have at least one month (six weeks if the submission deadline is during or right after the Christmas holiday or within two weeks of an AAPT National Meeting) to review a draft of the entire proposal and to work with the PI(s) to finalize the text and the budget, to work out the programmatic and financial details of AAPT's involvement, and to assure that the plans for dissemination include one or more presentations or workshops at an AAPT National Meeting. A final budget must be submitted to the AAPT co-PI no later than one week prior to the proposal deadline. Further, even if the initial decision has authorized AAPT involvement in the proposal, failure to complete a final proposal that satisfies the AAPT co-PI will be grounds for withdrawing AAPT's involvement.

In all cases, the PI(s) will submit to the EO a copy of the final proposal (including the final budget and a project summary), and the EO will inform the Board that the proposal has been submitted and provide the Board with the project summary and the final budget.

4. Review proposals for which the individual or organization submitting the proposal requests a letter of support or endorsement from AAPT for a project in which the AAPT Executive Office is not represented as a co-PI. (Example: AAPT endorsement of participation by PTRC in MSP projects)

As soon as possible as the proposal is being conceived, the PI(s) will consult in- formally with the AAPT Executive Officer (EO), who will make these guidelines available. Then, if invited by the EO, the PI(s) will submit to the EO (1) the identity of the intended funding agency, the deadline for submission to that agency, and a web link to the guidelines of the specific funding program, (2) a project summary of no more than two pages that places the activity in context, explains its specific objectives and procedures, and addresses all of the criteria imposed by the funding agency, (3) an estimate of the total amount to be requested from the funding agency, and (4) a curriculum vitae for each PI. These documents must be provided to the EO at least one month (six weeks if the submission deadline is during or right after the Christmas holiday or within two weeks of an AAPT National Meeting) prior to the deadline for submission of the final proposal.

While the EO can certainly seek input from the Review Board whenever he or she wishes, the AAPT Executive Board has given the EO alone the authority to make the final decision regarding a letter of support if the proposal is for less than \$500K or, regardless of the budget, if

- a. One or more individuals with a long-time relationship with AAPT seek a letter saying that AAPT judges previous similar work by the same individual(s) to be valuable and expects that the proposed project will allow that work to continue and to grow or

- b. The letter is to say that AAPT is pleased someone is going to be using specific AAPT products and the PI has communicated to the EO that these products will be used in a way that the EO has reason to believe will be effective.

Otherwise, the EO will immediately transmit all documents to the Review Board, which will, in consultation with the EO, decide whether or not a letter of support should be submitted by the EO.

Since some back and forth communication between AAPT and the PI(s) may need to occur before AAPT can come to a decision, the PI(s) must understand that, if the initial information comes to AAPT too close to the deadline for final submission, AAPT may decline to provide a letter of support.

No less than one week prior to the deadline for submission of the proposal, the PI(s) will send the latest draft of the proposal to the EO for review, primarily so that the EO can confirm that the authors have not overstated the intent/extent of AAPT's endorsement and to verify that plans for dissemination include one or more presentations at an AAPT National Meeting

In all cases, the PI(s) will submit to the EO a copy of the final proposal (including the final budget and a project summary), and the EO will inform the Board that the proposal has been submitted and provide the Board with the project summary and the final budget.

The Executive Officer will inform the Board when such proposals are submitted and provide the Board with a summary of the proposal and copy of the budget

#### A.2 Section 3 from October 2009 Charge

3. Review proposals that will involve the name of AAPT and be submitted to other agencies such as the National Science Foundation and the Department of Education.

In all cases except A, the Review Board should receive a two-page summary and preliminary budget at least three months before the proposal must be submitted to the intended funding agency.

A. Proposals of less than or equal to \$100,000 for which AAPT is the fiduciary agent must have a PI or co-PI from the Executive Office but do not have to be reviewed by the Review Board.

The Executive Board has authorized the Executive Officer to approve all such proposals (example: 2009 Advanced Lab Topical Conference).

The Executive Officer will inform the Board when such proposals are submitted and provide the Board with a summary of the proposal and copy of the budget.

B. Proposals greater than \$100,000 for which AAPT is the fiduciary agent must have a PI or Co-PI from the AAPT Executive Office and must be reviewed by the Review Board. The Review Board will review the two-page summary and preliminary budget and make a recommendation to the Executive Board as to whether or not the proposal should be submitted with AAPT as the fiduciary agent.

C. Proposals made from other organizations or individuals, for which AAPT is not the fiduciary

agent but from which AAPT might receive monetary benefits, will be required to submit the two-page summary and preliminary budget to the Review Board.

These proposals could involve other organizations but will still have a co-PI from the AAPT Executive Office, (example: the 2001 PhysTEC proposal submitted by APS). The Review Board will review the proposal and make a recommendation to the Executive Board as to whether or not the proposal should be submitted with AAPT participating as described in the project summary and budget.

D. Individuals or organizations that request a letter of support from AAPT for a project where the AAPT Executive Office is not represented as a PI or co-PI on the proposal will be required to submit a two-page project summary and preliminary budget to the Review Board (example: participation by PTRa in MSP projects). The Review Board will review the proposal and make a recommendation to the Executive Officer as to whether or not a letter of support should be submitted by the Executive Officer for inclusion with the proposal.

**The Board unanimously approved these changes.**

**From the Awards Committee**, Cook highlighted the need for nominations for the awards. He commented that the electronic submission procedure is available. The nominations will be stored and accessible to the Committee.

**From the Committee on Governance Structure (COGS)**, Cook reported that they have been looking into some revisions to the Area Committee structure. As such they have circulated a questionnaire among the Chairs to gather information that might help clarify some issues and lead to some recommendations. The hope is to be able to report to the Board in October and then to the Area Committees in January.

#### **Special Item from the Awards and Membership & Benefits Committees /Cook**

AAPT received an unsolicited offer to help fund AAPT memberships. Cunningham and Cook collected information from the Awards Committee, the Committee on Membership and Benefits, and the Area Committee on International Physics Education, and their comments have been incorporated in the description below. Once the Board has approved the document, the donor and his representatives will approve the agreement.

## **Hashim A. Yamani AAPT Memberships**

### **General Description**

Each year, AAPT awards several two-year Hashim A. Yamani AAPT Memberships, which are regular electronic memberships and include electronic only access to copies of the *American Journal of Physics*, *The Physics Teacher*, and *Physics Today*. These awards are supported by the Hashim A. Yamani Fund, which was endowed in 2011 by generous contributions from several colleagues and mentees of Dr. Hashim A. Yamani, a prominent and well-respected physics educator, researcher, and public servant in Saudi Arabia. Individuals eligible for a Yamani

Membership must be either an undergraduate senior who is planning a career teaching physics or a graduate student who is in his or her last two years before receiving his or her final post-baccalaureate degree and who is planning a career teaching physics. Citizens of any country in the world are eligible for support but citizens of developing countries in such areas as the Middle East, Africa, and Southeast Asia will have priority over citizens of developed countries in such areas as North America and Western Europe.

### **The Hashim A. Yamani Fund**

The purpose of the Hashim A. Yamani Fund is to increase international AAPT membership.

- Contributions go into a restricted/designated endowment under the control of the AAPT Treasurer as specified in the AAPT Constitution.
- Citizens of any country in the world are eligible for support but citizens of developing countries in such areas as the Middle East, Africa, and Southeast Asia will have priority over citizens of developed countries in such areas as North America and Western Europe.
- Income from the endowment will initially be used to provide two-year regular electronic memberships—hereafter Yamani memberships—for individuals who are either (a) undergraduate seniors who are planning careers teaching physics or (b) graduate students who are planning careers teaching physics and who are in their last two years before receiving a final post-baccalaureate degree.
- In time, income from the endowment may also be used to provide (a) Yamani memberships for early-career physics teachers and/or (b) partial travel support not only for Yamani members but also for early-career physics teachers who are AAPT members to attend an AAPT national meeting or a new faculty or similar workshop.
- All Yamani memberships include electronic access to (but not print copies of) the *American Journal of Physics*, *The Physics Teacher*, and *Physics Today*. (If requested by the recipient and if fulfillment by mail to the country involved is possible, reliable, and fairly prompt, print copies will be provided if the recipient pays the difference between the cost of an “electronic” membership and an international regular membership with print copies.)
- The size of each travel grant will be determined by the size of the endowment, the number of memberships awarded, and the distance the recipient must travel to attend the event. The amount remaining after early-bird registration fees (if any) associated with the event have been deducted from the total award will be available to help the recipient with airfares, meals, and housing. The *maximum total* award will likely be about \$1500, and that amount will be announced each year at least six months prior to the summer meeting.
- No individual shall be awarded more than one Yamani membership, and no individual shall be supported more than once for travel to an AAPT national meeting or workshop.
- The endowment must reach a minimum of \$25,000 before Yamani memberships will be

awarded to students and \$60,000 before travel for Yamani members and for early-career physics teachers will be supported. Further, the income from at least \$25,000 will be reserved for Yamani memberships for students.

- The Membership and Benefits Committee may propose to the Executive Board additions or modifications of the policies and procedures relating to this fund.
- The number of Yamani memberships and, in time, the number of travel grants and the maximum amount of each travel grant to be awarded each year will be determined by the AAPT Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Officer and based on the size of and income anticipated from the Hashim A. Yamani Fund.

### **Procedures for Soliciting and Selecting Recipients of Support from the Hashim A. Yamani Fund**

The availability of support from the Hashim A. Yamani Fund will, in the first instance, be advertised by easily found information on the AAPT website. Periodically, in addition, a notice will be placed in the eNNOUNCER, and notices will be sent to the members of the AAPT Area Committee on International Physics Education, to international members of AAPT, to international participants in conferences and meetings, and to other appropriate individuals identified by AAPT members, the Executive Officer, or the staff in the Executive Office. Such notices will explain the nature of awards supported by the Yamani Fund and, in particular, invite those contacted to call these awards to the attention of potential recipients.

Applications will be submitted by eligible individuals, either at their own initiative or at the suggestion and encouragement of a mentor. A complete application will consist of:

- The applicant's *curriculum vitae*, including full identity, country of citizenship, and contact information (mailing address, phone numbers, email address) for the applicant, description of educational background, employment history, and listings of accomplishments, publications, honors received, presentations at colloquia, and workshops and conferences attended.
- A one to two page narrative statement of the applicant's background and career plans, including a statement about the applicant's interest in AAPT and his or her perception of how AAPT might contribute to preparation for a teaching career.
- The name of and contact information for two individuals who will submit letters of recommendation on the applicant's behalf.
- Two letters of recommendation from individuals who know the applicant well, and who can speak both of the applicant's accomplishments and of the applicant's promise for a successful career teaching physics.

The applicant will submit items 1, 2, and 3 to a secure data base residing on an AAPT server by accessing a form provided on the AAPT website. In addition, this form will provide a tool the

applicant can use to send his or her recommenders an email explaining how to submit a letter of recommendation.

Applications will be reviewed and recipients will be selected by the Yamani Selection Committee consisting of

- The Chair of the Membership and Benefits Committee, who will chair the Selection Committee,
- The Chair of the Area Committee on International Physics Education,
- The AAPT representative to the United States Liaison Committee to the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics (IUPAP),
- The Director of the AAPT Department of Membership *ex officio without vote*, and
- The AAPT Executive Officer, *ex officio without vote*.

Applications may be submitted at any time. All applications received by 1 July will be considered for a two-year membership that will start on 1 September of that year.

There was some discussion about the level of control in selecting recipients. Cunningham reiterated that AAPT members and leaders will be selecting the awardees, and that AAPT does not limit participation or involvement regardless of policies or practices in other countries.

**Cook moved and Shropshire seconded the following motion:**

**The AAPT Executive Board adopts the Yamani Fund description and procedures and accepts the fund. Further, the Executive Office is charged to establish procedures and publicity for the fund.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

### **23. Meetings Committee Report and Discussion /O'Kuma**

(a) Report on future meeting sites

The committee considered several sites for SM2014 (i.e., Minneapolis, Cincinnati, Madison and Denver). After the visits, the committee is only considering Minneapolis and Cincinnati. One major cost difference was that the meeting in Minneapolis would be on the UM campus, the Cincinnati meeting would be at a hotel.

The Meeting Committee has found that meetings hosted on a university campus are approximately \$13k more expensive. Moreover, it is becoming more difficult to find universities willing to host and/or have the ability to host the growing size of our meetings. While surveyed members often prefer a university setting, the Meeting and Conference staff finds it easier to work with a hotel/conference site.

O’Kuma shared a chart listing various costs for many recent meetings. Comments from the Board included questions about how many AAPT members are within a certain radius of the meeting locations, and there were questions about the wild variations of indirect costs or different meetings.

O’Kuma indicated that the Council would be asked to vote on this meeting in the fall or at the Winter Meeting.

Sokoloff pointed out that the Board has not changed any plans regarding offering future national meetings.

Regarding WM2014, the Meetings Committee is considering Charleston, SC and Orlando, FL. The Committee will continue to offer post-meeting electronic survey.

#### Structure of Meetings

The Committee has been asked to examine the structure of the national meetings. The Committee has looked at previous studies and meeting costs. They find that for the last several years, total meeting expenses exceed income by about \$200k/year. To turn this around, we need about 200 more attendees/meeting. In the past the national office has set the registration fees. Their recommendation has been not to increase the fees much and rather to try to increase attendance.

Zitzewitz wondered what the additional costs in terms of meeting spaces for papers and posters would be if 200 more people attended the meeting.

#### **24. Discussion of Report on Membership and Communications /Gardner**

Gardner indicated that:

- The largest membership losses has been in the 4YC /U group. Their membership has declined by 9%.
- Dues revenue has been increasing over \$52k/month (approx \$730k/year). The current income is above the 2007 level.
- The number of non-dues paying members has decreased from 12% to about 2%

Questions from the Board included if these changes could be used for projections and if the 4YC/U drop is accompanied by an increase in retired/emeritus membership. Gardner indicated that her perception is that departmental funds for faculty PD/travel are decreasing so that meeting attendance and association memberships are declining.

Gardner reported that AIP is proposing to give all high school members free access to Scitation for AIP journals. Their approach is to sell content, not subscriptions. They are trying to increase content access. Hehn pointed out the APS has made their entire collection available to public libraries.

#### **The Membership and Benefits Committee offers the following motion:**

**The AAPT Executive Board approves that all high school members be allowed free access to all AIP journals at no cost to AAPT.**



**The motion passed unanimously.**

## **25. Report of Membership and Benefits Committee/Milner-Bolotin**

### **(a) Motion on 2012 Membership Dues rates**

The Committee suggested increasing the rate for print journals by \$10/year. They also did not recommend working to close the membership cost gap for high school and college members. Milner-Bolotin initiated her concern about the loss of membership revenue with this recommendation. She pointed out that in 2008, the rate for high school members was reduced but the number of members did not increase. Also, the Board has worked to close the gap in the past few years.

Tobochnik pointed out that the online-only options just began this year, so we do not know how many members may switch to this option. Moreover, at some point, it will be too expensive to offer paper journals.

Several Board members (*i.e.*, Iona, Shropshire, Riendeau) encouraged the Board to work to close the gap between high school and other membership rates so that the membership is more unified and treated more equally. Particularly since the online only option is a cost saving option available to the members.

**Shropshire moved and Marshall seconded the following:**

**The AAPT Board sets the Pre-College Membership Dues at \$74 for 2012.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Sokoloff moved and Iona seconded the motion:**

**The AAPT Executive Board approves the amended membership and subscription rates for 2012.**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

## **26. Discussion of 4YC/U Representative's Report/ Shropshire**

Shropshire indicated that the Undergraduate Committee:

- Is developing a newsletter targeted at Department Chairs and SPS Advisors on the theme: What has AAPT done for you lately?
- Wants to contact all graduate schools within a radius of the national meetings to encourage faculty and student attendance.

Stewart added that there seems to be little interest in standardizing introductory physics course curriculum.

## **27. Discussion of TYC Representative's Report /Plumb**

Plumb indicated that the TYC dinner was very successful and that the Committee and the community is looking forward to the AIP-SRC TYC survey. She also reported that the planning for the tandem meeting is proceeding.

Finally, she reported that the Committee is also very supportive of the TYC-NFW.

### **28. Discussion of Section Chair's Report/ Milner-Bolotin**

Bolotin-Bolotin indicated that they are working on the goal of improving Section-National relationships.

### **29. Discussion of Audit Committee Report/ Milner-Bolotin**

Cunningham indicated that the Audit is still not available. She indicated that there is some fault with both the AAPT and the auditors.

Plumb asked, "Is this a problem?" If so, then we need to express our displeasure. It was clear that the Board was annoyed at these delays. The Board felt that the audit must be approved by September 30.

### **30. Alternative Access/Shropshire**

Shropshire indicated that two sessions at the Omaha meeting were transmitted via WebEx. There were many lessons learned (*e.g.*, need a WebEx moderator, designated microphone and webcam) and the plan is to expand the offerings to six sessions at the Winter Meeting 2012. Three people served as outside evaluators and provided valuable feedback.

Sokoloff encouraged the Committee to offer more specifics at the October Meeting regarding plans for Ontario. Marshall added that it will be important to alert speakers and those contributing to the session that the session will be a WebEx offering. This might encourage/discourage some participants.

### **31. Discussion of Report from PERLOC on the PERTG/ John Thompson**

PERLOC plans programs and distributes funds (for conference scholarships, mini-grants, scholar in residence grants, awards to PERG papers, and to support page charges for ST-PER). They provide speakers to groups external to PER, and they have served as an advisory board for the PER Users Guide. The group has helped support the Docktor and Mestre Report as well as the NAS Decadal Report on PER. Currently, they are in communication with APS to establish a Topical Group within APS to have an official presence as a research community within APS.

The PER-Topical Group has about 700 members.

### **32. Discussion of HS Representative's Report /Riendeau**

The High School Teacher Day had 23 teachers pre-registered. Dan Crowe was the primary leader for the day, and he would like to offer this event at every summer meeting. It will be interesting to track if the offering leads to increased membership. Sokoloff pointed out that if it were to continue, that it should need to seek funding.

The PTR program is focusing more on middle school and elementary content and professional support.

Cunningham added that the NRC-BOSE K12 Science Framework document was recently released. A working group agreed to respond to the report to suggest changes to Achieve (the group that will be developing the science standards.) It would be very helpful if AAPT could

establish a working group to be in contact with Achieve during the development process. There is another group looking at teacher professional development and teacher quality.

The Board should consider two items: developing a white paper about the Framework Report and to endorse the College Ready Standards for Physics.

### **33. Discussion of TPT Editor's Report /Mamola**

#### **Discussion of AJP Editor's Report /Tobochnik**

The Editors would prefer to make their oral reports to the Publications Committee rather than the entire Board.

The Board offered its sincere appreciation to Jan Tobochnik for his leadership and guidance as editor of the American Journal of Physics.

### **34. Discussion of online vs. face-to-face meetings /Sokoloff**

#### **(a) Discussion of format for Fall, 2011 Executive Board Meeting (WebEx or Face-to-Face)**

Sokoloff prefers the electronic meeting format because it will save the association \$16k. Cook offered a contrary opinion stating that the important budget issues and interaction with office staff may make the expenditure worthwhile. He added that the \$16k might be the maximum value particularly if the meeting is held in conjunction with the EORC. Sokoloff indicated that the dates for the EORC are not negotiable.

Riendeau pointed out that since the approved budget did not include support for a face-to-face meeting, the Board would need to approve funds for such a meeting. Cook pointed out that the Board has revisited decisions before.

Plumb thought that our online meeting approach is improving, but it is not yet good. "In the spirit of trying things out," she would support the effort again. But she agreed that we lose something in the experience.

Sokoloff indicated that we should try the experiment again and could reconsider the expenses/cost savings in 2012.

Cook reiterated that the Board will be discussing the most important issues during the October meeting. He believes that it is valuable to have face-to-face interaction with the CFO.

#### **(b) Dates for Fall, 2011 Executive Board Meeting and EORC**

Sokoloff stated that he would develop a proposed schedule for EORC and the Board. The October meeting would be scheduled electronically, but the EORC would meet together for the meeting at ACP.

The dates for the EORC are: October 26-28

The dates for the Executive Board Meeting are: October 28-29

### **35. Discussion of Technology & Information Report /Cunningham, Campbell**

The database management system iMIS will be upgraded to iMIS 15. We received a 95% discount on the upgrade including an e-commerce module. The change will allow us to have

meeting registrants make changes online. It will also provide enhanced security for credit cards. The interface will be web-based not hard-line based so that access will be easier. The planned launch date is after WM2012. Campbell anticipated that savings within the IT department would offset the costs.

### **Electronic Motions**

**Motion: The AAPT Executive Board approves the selection of Robert Hilborn as AAPT Associate Executive Officer and authorizes Steve Iona and Beth Cunningham to negotiate salary arrangements within the parameters in the attached announcement.**  
**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Motion: The AAPT Executive Board acknowledges receipt of the 2010 Financial Audit Report with changes noted and directs the Executive Office to make it available to the membership**

**The motion passed: 8-For, 1-Abstain, 2-No vote**

**Motion: The AAPT Executive Board approves the appointment of the following as the 2013 AAPT National Nominating Committee:**

**Scott Schultz, Delta College, Chair**

**Dan Crowe, Loudoun County Public Schools Academy of Science**

**Gabe Spalding, Illinois Wesleyan University**

**Lynn Aldrich, Misericordia University (elected by the Section Representatives)**

**Dyan McBride, Mercyhurst College University (elected by the Section Representatives)**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

### ***Suggested motion:***

***The Minutes from the July-August Executive Board Meeting are approved with minor corrections.***

