

SPA Executive Committee Meeting Notes - J. Mazur

Meeting took place on 12/10/06 at the Argent Hotel, San Francisco

My notes of action items are in **bold**.

1. Abstract book for the Fall meeting has the van Allen cover: thanks to Dave Sibeck and Nicky Fox for working to get this done
2. Rob Winglee reported on press conference items for the Fall meeting:
 - a. Started working on press releases in September 2006
 - b. Needs additional help from the Committee in the future
 - c. Looking to get more SPA papers into the press
 - d. Solicited about 75% of the meeting chairs for ideas
 - e. Got grad students to find 'interesting' papers
 - f. SPA has about 4 of 20-30 press release topics
 - g. Discussion about press releases as a way to get more SPA visibility; Fred Spilhaus wants to form a committee on press releases
3. Bob McPherron reported on SPA agency night
 - a. Limited number of speakers (Fisher for NASA & Benhke for NSF)
 - b. Solicited community questions via the SPA newsletter in September 2006
 - c. Received 56 questions, mostly directed at NASA
4. Merav Opher reported on student paper awards
 - a. Recognized help from Geoff Crowley
 - b. Was not clear about how many awards they should give, was working with the previous rule of thumb of ~ 10% of the total number of papers
 - c. Asked the committee for feedback: seems about right
 - d. Ed Bierly commented that the awards are a big deal for the students, and the absolute number isn't as relevant
 - e. Nancy Crooker suggested that a large number might result in the awards losing prestige
 - f. **Merav will verify the rule of thumb with Geoff, and check on the award rates in other AGU sections**
5. Craig Kletzing reported on SPA abstract statistics and the tutorial
 - a. Fall meeting grew by about 17% from 2005 (11100 papers) to 2006 (13112 papers)
 - b. SPA percentage of total papers decreased slightly from 10.9% in 2005 to 9.1% in 2006

c. SPA details:

Section	2004 abstracts	2005 abstracts	2006 abstracts	Growth (2005 to 2006)
SA	308	308	240	-22.1%
SH	374	370	377	1.9%
SM	492	527	574	8.9%
TOTAL	1174	1205	1191	-1.2%

- d. Some discussion about why the SA abstract count decreased in 2006, no clear reason
 - e. The tutorial lecture given by Dan Baker went well
 - f. Craig expressed grief over a Spring 2007 Joint Ass'y special session proposal on results from the NASA Polar mission, seemed focused on programmatics and advertising rather than science
 - g. Fred Spilhaus seconded the aim to develop sessions that focus on science
6. Art Richmond reported on the planning for the 2007 Joint Assembly; 4 day meeting, 22-25 March 2007
- a. Noted that this meeting was not only viewed as a US/Mexico effort, but also pushed as a meeting of North & South America
 - b. Some Joint Meeting statistics:

Year	Joint Assembly Location	# Special session proposals
2005	New Orleans	208
2006	Baltimore	166
2007	Acapulco	254 (SA=8, SH=9, SM=12)

The 2007 meeting has more interest than the 2006 meeting.

7. Lou Lanzerotti reported on the Space Weather Journal
- a. "nothing but positive feedback" on the journal, but recently (in past 3 months) came across a few papers in JGR and Radio Science that were appropriate for the SpWx Journal
 - i. one paper discussed charging of vehicle mirrors, was published in JGR
 - ii. another paper discussed the impact of TEC on the FAA WAAS system over the US
 - b. Wondered if there were other papers in the same situation
 - c. Questioned whether the authors realize the readership they miss when publishing similar applied topics in science journals
 - d. Lou routinely visits the SpWx publication staff in D.C.
 - e. Main issue: have been absent a publisher for a long time, thus limited staff to pay attention to journal's fiscal health
 - f. Also short of advertising

- g. Lou thought that Amitava was doing well in redirecting appropriate papers from JGR to SpWx, wondered if the other editors were doing an equally good job
 - h. Amitava will write to the other JGR editors to determine if they are aware of the need to get applied papers into SPWx**
 - i. Nancy Crooker noted George Siscoe's impression that it takes too long to publish in SpWx
 - j. Lou responded that the pub time was no different than JGR or GRL
 - k. Lou noted that at times it's hard to see what's new on the SpWx web site, now apparently unchanged in 2-3 weeks, but nonetheless there are new papers there
 - l. Lou reiterated that the AGU staff is overworked (Fred Spilhaus: same problem with EOS)
 - m. Comments around the table:
 - i. Nancy Crooker to get SpWx journal reminders throughout SPA
 - ii. Joe Mazur, the only journal to which he subscribes
8. Amitava Bhattachavjee reported on JGR
- a. Changed criteria for "technical or data report" papers (see Editorial, J. Geophys. Res., 111, A07000, doi:10.1029/2006JA011892)
 - b. Fair number of resubmissions, these were rejected but encouraged to be resubmitted
 - c. Noted lower numbers of SA and SH papers in 2006:

Articles by subject category: JGR

Year	SA	SM	SH
2003	61	159	69
2004	193	296	146
2005	201	261	145
2006 ytd	178	293	127

- d. Nancy Crooker questioned whether we should be concerned about SPA paper trends given that all other AGU journal paper totals are increasing at higher rates
 - e. Fred Spilhaus questioned whether our membership is increasing
 - f. Others mentioned anecdotes of APJ system being easier, ISI citation index not finding papers in JGR
 - g. Joe Mazur noted the big deal was the dramatic increase from 2003 to 2004
 - h. Nancy Crooker was concerned about the perception that overall Union membership and pubs are up, but SPA is flat; thinks AGU staff is doing its job, but wondered what the SPA community thinks
9. Dave Sibeck submitted a summary of problems with Eos, read to the Committee by Bob McPherron and reproduced below in a-d:
- a. "Corresponding editors do not: know whether a paper has been submitted; select or nominate referees; have permission to inquire

- about the status of a paper; see referee reports; give opinions concerning whether a paper is acceptable for publication"
- b. "Editor Manuel Grande: does not respond to email; may be entirely oblivious to the reviewing process (exception Bryant's article, see below?)"
 - c. "Managing editors at AGU: appear to make all editorial decisions; do not consult corresponding editors on any topic whatsoever; should continue to be involved in determining length and readability; should not select referees or determine whether the science is publishable."
 - d. "Contributors to EOS should: expect timely resolution concerning the publication of their articles; receive referee reports from both specialists, generalists, and editorial staff concerning the science and readability of their contribution"
 - e. Dave recommended the possible improvements listed below:
 - i. Run EOS like any other journal
 - ii. Empower corresponding editors with the ability to select referees, read referee reports, and make pub decisions
 - iii. Empower editorial staff with the ability to determine whether the article is readable by a non-specialist and make suggestions concerning this topic
 - iv. Respond to questions from contributors in a timely manner
 - v. Generate plot of time from submission to decision for each article and update throughout the year, publish results on EOS WWW page
 - vi. Send EOS staff to Fall AGU to ensure they attend press conferences there
 - vii. Ensure EOS staff contact NASA HQ, NSF, and NOAA routinely to catch press releases and new stories
 - f. There followed discussion around the table:
 - i. Lou Lanzerotti: Dave was a good catch, how did this happen?
 - ii. Nancy Crooker: it would be a big push to change the status of EOS contributing editors
 - iii. Pete Riley: concerned about his SHINE 2006 paper, contacted Dave about it but Dave couldn't do anything, couldn't get into system to check status
 - iv. Nancy Crooker: Manuel Grande is the only line of communication, source of breakdown
 - v. Fred Spilhaus:
 1. Editorial source designed to get news, to be small enough to handle ~100 papers per year
 2. Don't need/can't use 12 editors, have 4
 3. Corresponding editors don't have the responsibility over papers, hasn't talked to Dave who hasn't called

4. (Presumably) all other corresponding editors like the structure?
 5. Mohi Kumar now on EOS staff
 6. Takes time to dumb-down papers, many too technical
 7. Just hired last year, was short-staffed
 8. EOS needs to tighten paper tracking
10. Nancy Crooker on other publication issues
 - a. Report of one paper rejected from Green JGR, submitted to Blue JGR and published
 - b. Amitava: no communication with Green JGR, asked for the paper reference (Nancy Crooker to provide)**
 11. Nancy Crooker reported on GRL status (for Mark Moldwin)
 - a. Mark's term expires in 12/2006
 - b. Currently takes 12 weeks to get to press
 - c. 57% acceptance rate, one of the highest of all GRL editors
 12. Pete Riley on Reviews of Geophysics:
 - a. Outgoing editor (Peter Cargill) was frustrated by the slow speed
 - b. Hard to get authors to commit to review papers
 - c. Soliciting improvements, noted that journal doesn't get the representation from SPA that it deserves
 - d. Wants to build up readership
 - e. Submissions have come up
 13. Guan Le reported on the website & newsletter
 - a. Nothing new to report
 - b. Nancy Crooker noted that many don't know the SPA website exists, asked Guan to advertise it in the newsletter**
 - c. Noted the site has a useful & comprehensive meeting calendar
 14. Peter Chi on the newsletter
 - a. Newsletter published twice per week
 - b. Currently has 2,439 subscribers
 - c. Soliciting suggestions for the newsletter
 15. Nancy Crooker on the SPA budget
 - a. Input of \$8K, output of \$1K over past 3 yrs; balance is over \$12K
 - b. Discussion of option to donate \$10K to Max Hammond fund (student travel to meetings), needs \$25K to start, we have \$8K
 - c. Fred Spilhaus suggested SPA could cover the balance of \$25K once donations reached \$15K, adopted by committee vote**
 16. Deb Scherrer reported on outreach at the Acapulco meeting
 - a. Planning family events, solar telescopes, NASA stuff
 - b. 2007 is the IHY, American advisor to IHY
 - c. Cherilynn Morrow is energizing the group, lots going on
 17. Dick Wolf reported on Union Fellows and awards
 - a. Difficult planning this year because AGU shifted deadlines
 - b. Had more nominees (28). Number closer to 20 last few years.
 - c. 4-5 Fellows is SPA's fair share
 - d. Put forward 8 names

- e. Fred Spilhaus asked why there were so many nominees, hoped it had to do with AGU's increased effort to encourage members to nominate
 - f. 3/15/07 is the deadline for medal nominations
 - g. Nancy Crooker: encourage meeting attendees to nominate for medals, ensure nobody on SPA Fellows committee writes any letters for Fellow nominations
18. Yan Song reported on the Fred Scarf award
- a. Winner is SM23B-04, John Dombeck
 - b. Deadline for 2007 award is 4/1/07
- 19. In closing, Deb Scherrer noted that the committee did not get far on the EOS contributing editors problems. Committee moved to officially ask the AGU to discuss the issues of lost papers and communications with authors.**

Meeting attendance list:

Fax sent by :

01-16-07 00:23 Pg: 1/1



SPA Exec Con Mtg Argent 12/10/06		
<u>name</u>	<u>phone</u>	<u>email</u>
E. Biechy	202-777-7506	e.biechy@zsu.org
Mohi Kumar	202-777-7531	mkumar@agu.org
ROBERT MCPHERSON	310-825-1882	rmcpherson@igpp.ucla.edu
Merrin Opler	703 725 1009	mopler@physics.gmu.edu
Amitava Bhattacharjee	403 862 2517	amitava.bhattacharjee@unh.edu
Guan Le	301-286-1087	Guan.Le@nasa.gov
YAN SONG	612-624-4053	Yan@fields.space.vmn.edu
Peter Chi	310-825-2040	pchi@igpp.ucla.edu
Jane Seebold	202 777-7430	jseebold@agu.org
Deborah Scherren	650-723-1495	dscherren@solar.stanford.edu
Richard Wolf	713-347-3308	rawolf@rice.edu
Robert Wingler	206-685-8160	wingler@ess.washington.edu
PETE RILEY	858-826-9550	Pete.Riley@saic.com
Craig Kletzing	319-335-1904	craig.kletzing@uiowa.edu
Joe Mazz	703-324-8415	joseph.mazz@cesr.org
Ant Richmond	303 497 1570	richmond@ucar.edu
Fred Spillhaus	202-777-7510	fspillhaus@agu.org
Nancy Crooker	978-443-8559	crooker@bu.edu

Lou Lanzerotti (on phone)

02/16/2007 10:08AM (GMT-08:00)