

## SPA Poll Results

471 out of 3140 (15%) SPA members responded.

1. After elections, should vote counts for section officers be available online?

- 244   Yes, the public has a right to know.  
  212   No, fewer people would agree to run for office.  
   13   No preference

2. To which journal (by any publisher) do you submit most of your papers?

	SA	SM	SH
JGR	55	103	34
GRL	15	21	6
Radio Science	12	1	3
Space Weather	2	1	1
<b>Any AGU journal</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>44</b>
Ap. J., Ap. J. Lett.	1		67
Annales Geophys	9	21	2
Solar Phys			12
other	17	14	27
<b>Non-AGU journal</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>AGU/non-AGU</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>0.41</b>

What is your primary SPA affiliation?

- 125   SA  
  151   SH  
  194   SM

3. What is your opinion of AGU-SPA meeting sessions that focus on programmatic elements like current and future missions or facilities?

- 348   Favorable  
   93   Unfavorable  
   26   No opinion

### *Selected Comments*

**1. After elections, should vote counts for section officers be available online?**

- ▶ Yes, but you might want to censor the results if some candidates get less than maybe 5% of the winning number.
- ▶ Yes. On balance, I think that transparency carries the argument.
- ▶ Yes. Why should SPA elections be any different than local/state/federal elections? For that matter, SPA should also publish the number of registered voters [a.k.a. number of SPA members], percentage of those members who participated by voting and percentage breakdown by candidate.

► Yes. Why would fewer people agree to run if the votes are posted??? If that is a consequence of hiding the vote count, we have problems that need fixing. They are the ones that need to be addressed.

► The total number of votes should be given (e.g. 1000 out of a possible 3000); however, this is a democratic process and there really is no reason to withhold this information. Perhaps making it available upon request would be a better idea.

► I really don't care. I do not think that posting the count would keep people from running for office. When I used to run elections, I usually did not post the count so as not to hurt feelings. But that could be viewed as manipulative.

► No. The results should not be made public, but I think it would be a good idea to inform the losing candidate (but not the winner) of the tally for purposes of future guidance.

► No. I think I might not run if the results were public. I trust people to count, and it would be embarrassing to either win or lose by a landslide.

► No. As a past Secretary, I would indeed have had some reluctance to run for office if vote counts were published. In fact, I ran twice, losing the first time but winning the second time. By AGU procedure, candidates do not know their opponents in advance, so there is the potential for embarrassment. The first time I ran, I was up against a very well known person who is significantly senior to myself. The vote was probably quite lopsided. The second time, I ended up running against a person in my peer group who is a pretty good friend. The vote was probably close. My opponent claims that he told everybody he knew to vote for me. But if vote counts were published, I probably never would have run again after the first time.

AGU has a pretty well-thought-out way of doing this; I wouldn't mess with it.

► If we want to have fully democratic elections, then people should be allowed to put themselves forward, and be on the ballot. We could do away with the nominating committee. That would be a significant change and would likely result in SPA dominance by one or two factions. Unless we make that change, knowing the vote count serves little purpose other than satisfying curiosity, and discouraging potential candidates who are not particularly interested in politicking.

## ***2. To which journal (by any publisher) do you submit most of your papers?***

► Annales Geophysicae. We publish significant numbers of papers in JGR (Space) and GRL, too, but the issue is one of costs for longer substantial works that are penalized by the "excess page charge" policy in JGR.

► Annales Geophysicae. They still have page numbers and do not charge for color. They are easier to deal with than AGU journals and faster, in general. They are of equal quality also, in my opinion.

► That AGU journals accept Solar Physics/Heliophysics paper is not well-known within the international solar community. To promote AGU journals, AGU must do a comparative analysis of the ease with which papers are accessible online with GRL, JGR, ApJ and Solar Physics. A comparative cost of publication (page charges) will be useful. Similarly, a comparative turn-

around of papers (From date of received to date of publication) will help [Note: Solar Physics does not have any page charges].

Also, I notice that instead of having a volume number and page number, AGU journals have an obscure Cite ID. Every other journal and every other conference paper has a volume and page number. Surely every article appears on a numbered page. Why not just give a page number to each article. It's about time that AGU adopts uniform standards as other journals and not hold out on its own in some archaic system. For example, here are references as they are listed in ADS Abstracts for other journals:

Advances in Space Research, Volume 39, Issue 9, p. 1467-1470.

Solar Physics, Volume 239, Issue 1-2, pp. 449-460

The Astrophysical Journal, Volume 650, Issue 2, pp. L143-L146.

The Astrophysical Journal, Volume 658, Issue 2, pp. 1372-1379.

What is the point (of the Cite ID)? When I see a reference to an article, at least I know which page I should jump to in the journal, how big (the number of pages) the article is, etc. That information is lost in the Cite ID system.

### ***3. What is your opinion of AGU-SPA meeting sessions that focus on programmatic elements like current and future missions or facilities?***

- ▶ Unfavorable. One is being continually reminded of Al Gore's comment ``We have warehouses full of data that has never triggered a single human neuron."
- ▶ Unfavorable. Proposed programmatic special sessions were the bane of my tenure as Secretary. I don't think they are usually very good science sessions. If a new mission has new results, then fine, a special session is in order. But "advocacy" sessions, and all the info-nonsense stuff, are not a good fit for AGU. There's not much you can do about it unless the Secretaries show some spine. Lately, people can pretty much get any special session they want. It's got to the point where these are the only oral sessions. (I realize that AGU has changed the name of special sessions to "preplanned" sessions, whatever that means.)
- ▶ Unfavorable. However, I do not feel terribly strongly about this. But generally I would prefer a current mission to place their abstracts in relevant science sessions; if these do not exist the mission scientists should be sure to volunteer to organize relevant sessions.
- ▶ Unfavorable. I go to AGU for science, not planning meetings, which should be separate. We could have more science talks and fewer posters that way.
- ▶ Unfavorable. I feel strongly that sessions should be organized around scientific topics, not programmatic concerns (e.g., research funded by NASA LWS TR&T is not a good organizing principle for a special session) or missions. In the former case, especially with talks limited to one contributed per author at Fall AGU, it forces the author to make his/her sole contribution to the meeting in a session in which there may be only a few other researchers interested in his/her topic. In the latter case, researchers working on related science but who are not direct participants in the flight mission will feel excluded (e.g., "I'm not funded by RBSP, so I can't contribute to that session...").
- ▶ Unfavorable. Please curtail the future sessions and ensure that current sessions are really discussing science.
- ▶ Neutral. I don't particularly like them, but nobody is forced to attend.

▶ It really depends on the session. As the author of some such sessions, including some with large attendance, I clearly think they do serve a purpose, although I, too, find them distracting at times from the main science topics. "First results from THEMIS" is a really good idea, for example. It does not make sense to force all such things to pick a science theme or themes. I'm less happy with the "let's design a mission" or "what could we do if we had X?" topics.

▶ My opinion on programmatic sessions depends very much on the agenda and the breakdown between presentation, discussion, and round-table discussion.

▶ Favorable, as a modest element of an overall program, sparingly used for high-profile programs of wide interest.

▶ Favorable but limited to one per meeting.

▶ Favorable, provided there is a science focus and papers on the same science area are accepted in the session.