

CINP Board Meeting Minutes

May 2, 2025

13:00 Atl/12:00 East/11:00 MB/10:00SK+AB/9:00 BC

Virtual meeting

Present: Gwen Grinyer, Rituparna Kanungo, Thomas Brunner (minutes), Russ Mammei, Chris Ruiz, Liliana Caballero Suarez

Non-voting: Garth Huber (Exec Director), Greg Hackman (Treasurer)

1. Approval of Agenda

Thomas motions to approve agenda, Chris seconds.

2. Approval of Apr 09/25 Minutes

Gwen moves to approve minutes, Liliana seconds.

3. Finance Report (Greg)

a) Motion to approve the FY24 financial statements to be presented at the Institutional Members meeting on May 14

Greg uploaded the draft financial statement to the CINP webpage. Gwen asks if there are any particularities to mention. Greg formatted the financial report in a way that auditors are used to review. First page is the cash balances, Page 2 is simplified equity of money we have and outstanding balances. Unchanged from previous meeting.

Greg has received some of the outstanding invoices.

The following pages are on budget details. The numbers are more of interest to auditors. Details are captured in the following pages of the document, including projections. Page 8 is auditing details. Chris points out that "Confcerence" is misspelled on that page. The following pages have more details on transactions. Greg reiterates that there have been no changes to what has been shown before. Material is ready to be sent budget report to auditor once board of directors and Institutional Members meeting approve.

Ritu moves to approve the FY24 financial statement, Russ seconds.

b) Appointment of Auditor

Greg suggests keeping our auditor which he has a good working relation with. It is:

Dudley & Company LLP
#100 - 225 13th Ave
Regina, SK S4P-0V6

Ritu moves the motion to stay with past year's auditor, Thomas seconds.

Greg leaves at 12:10 EDT.

4. Executive Director Report (Garth)

a) Membership

- New Applications
 - o 265 Mira Quinn (Regina, Associate)
 - o 266 Sydney Plante (Regina, Associate)
 - o 267 Michael Bradley (Saskatchewan)

Thomas motions to approve the three above listed membership applications, Liliana seconds.

b) Conference Support Applications

- 24th International Workshop on Next Generation Nucleon Decay & Neutrino Detectors (NNN25)

Thomas is in conflict with this request.

Liliana agrees with Nicole's statement that neutrinos in astroparticle physics is challenging because it is between CINP and IPP. Liliana is in favor of supporting the conference but at a reduced level from the request.

Garth mentions that it was weird that the wrong working groups were indicated on the application form. Our total budget for conference support this year is \$7,000, as approved at the last meeting. Russ is OK with support but he also thinks that it should be at a reduced level and in multiples of the registration fee of \$150. The board wonders if 24 HQP from CINP will even go given the size of the community. For reference, Garth mentions that CINP typically receives on the order of 10 travel award requests for WNPPC.

Ritu motions to approve \$1,500 in support of 10 HQP travel for NNN. Russ seconds.

c) Graduate Fellowships competition summary

The CINP Graduate Fellowships selection committee:

- Russell Mammei (Winnipeg), Chair
- Ruben Sandapen (Acadia), Education SWG Chair
- Andrea Capra (TRIUMF)

CINP received 17 applications, 2 awards made (1 award declined, that fellowship was awarded to alternate #1)

Russ reports that it was a tough competition with 17 applications. The top 5 were all pretty close. Russ thanks the board for approving 2 fellowships. Approving one would have been challenging. The team aligned on the top 3 candidates. Ultimately, two students were selected (1 award was declined, that fellowship was awarded to alternate #1). Garth appreciated that there was agreement on the top three students and that the awardee selection worked out well.

Russ states that it is a lot of work for students and letter writers to prepare an application. The selection committee suggests to restrict applications to students that have finished their candidacy/prelim exam. It is hard for the committee to equitably compare early career students to senior PhD students.

Ritu wonders whether a student's program year is a better threshold instead of tying it to the exam. This way the process is independent of when the exam is held during each student's class and exam schedule. Following this, Russ suggests to limit the award to students in their 3rd year and up.

Garth reminds the board of the current eligibility rules: MSc students in their last year who are preparing to transition to the PhD program are eligible. There is a very uneven evaluation between early and late degree stage students. It is also a lot of work on Garth's side to process 17 applications. It total about 500 pages had to be processed within 4 days. Tightening the eligibility criteria will reduce this workload. Garth mentions that one supervisor had 4 students submit applications. It could be worth while to consider a limit on the number of applications that each supervisor can support. Garth reminds the board that in the past there was a vote and the board decided not to implement a limit on applications/supervisor.

Streamlining the application as suggested by Russ will be discussed with the selection committee by Garth and then brought back to the board. Garth says that at the Individual Members AGM during CAP he will ask for member feedback and then bring it back to the Board meeting in the fall for approval.

Gwen mentions that the evaluation criteria "academic qualification" and "likelihood of accomplishment" create an imbalance due to degree stage.

Russ adds to the conversation that only two applicants added references to Canadian LRP in their research plans. He reiterates the need to introduce ways to reduce number of applications to remove weaker students. Also, a lot of letters were from undergrad supervisors. Reference letters from graduate supervisors were more strongly considered.

Action Item: Garth will discuss eligibility criteria with the selection committee and solicit input from the community at the AGM during CAP, then present a proposal to the Board during the fall meeting.

Ritu signs off at 12:28 EDT.

d) Draft policy on Supporting Conferences located offshore

The board requested GH to draft a policy for Board approval.

The text to be added is:

The CINP will only consider support for conferences held outside of Canada if there is a very significant Canadian role in the organization of the conference, including one of the lead conference organizers and program or organizing committee membership. The Board will prioritize conferences held within Canada over those held offshore, subject to budget constraints.

Thomas motions to approve updated policy. Liliana seconds.

Approved policies are posted at: <https://cinp.ca/bylaws-and-policies>

The conference support policy will also be added to: <https://cinp.ca/conference-support>

e) Update regarding CINP events during CAP Congress week

- CINP Board Meeting Thur June 12 @ 7:30
 - o Continental breakfast will be provided to those attending in person
 - o Zoom will be provided to those who cannot attend in person

CINP will provide breakfast for people who will attend in person. Gwen, Liliana, Thomas, and Garth will attend in person. Russ and Chris cannot attend in person (possibly able to call in). Garth will invite the working group chairs and institutional member representatives to the board meeting.

- CINP Individual Members AGM Thur June 12 @ 12:00
 - o Food can be purchased as part of CAP registration
- CINP+IPP Joint Session Thur June 12 @ 13:30
 - o Carsten Krauss (IPP) to chair this year
- CINP Town Hall Meeting, Friday June 13 @ 9:00
 - o One can purchase food as part of your CAP registration
 - o The Brief Writing Committee will release an agenda prior to the meeting
 - o We may need to start before 9am because a lot of brief NOIs were received

f) Update regarding LRPC and CINP Brief

Garth reports that 42 NOI were received, the Brief writing committee has reviewed them and is following up on them. There was a good response from experiments. From theory there were fewer submissions. Alex Gezerlis (Nuclear Theory SWG Chair) is following up with 12 theorists.

Garth and Carsten are meeting regularly (weekly).

Garth reports that he and Carsten Kraus met with NSERC and CFI on April 2 to review LRPC membership. Subsequent emails with NSERC regarding Conflict of Interest rules and Role of ExOfficio Members documents. There is general satisfaction, but Garth needs to review one draft before it can be finalized.

LRPC membership is nearly finalized. There is one member that needs to still confirm, otherwise the committee is set.

Following NSERC's past practice, the LRPC invitation states: "we strongly recommend that you do not participate as a member of any committee that will prepare briefs to the LRPC. Of course, you could fully participate as a member of the community to consultations undertaken by CINP, IPP, or any other organization."

As such, Paul Garrett (Nuclear Structure SWG Chair) will step aside from the brief writing committee but retain his other SWG Chair duties. Corina Andreoiu has agreed to take Paul's place on the committee (covering nuclear structure).

g) CINP May Newsletter

Garth is preparing the newsletter. Information shared in the newsletter will cover:

- CAP Congress info
- URS and GF results
- WNPPC award recipients
- research articles from outgoing Grad Fellowship awardees as asked by fellowship. Work on newsletter is ongoing.

h) Other reports from the Executive Director

The institutional representative meeting is coming up. Gwen is unavailable, Russ will be able to chair the meeting as alternate to Gwen.

Ritu's and Thomas's terms are ending. Garth already sent the email to the institutional representatives to alert them to this.

Garth reminds the Board that if an institutional representative is unavailable, the institutional rep can assign a duty to represent them. It is more important for the institution to be represented at the meeting than having a particular member there.

5. News from TRIUMF (Chris/Ritu)

Chris reports that TRIUMF just had ACOT and it went well. A lot of focus during the meeting was on the upcoming long shutdown. A question that came up during ACOT is the shutdown's impact on student progress. For this year's beam schedule there was an exercise to identify affected students and make sure that they had backup plans in place. This input and priorities from experiments were combined to develop the beam schedule. All local TRIUMF graduate students and experiments with associated students will get data in this schedule.

There has been a mayor restructuring in the science division for nuclear physics. The nuclear specialists support group has been disconnected and is now the ARIEL support group. Moving forward this is intended as a support team for users and beam scheduling. Martin Alcorta is head of this division. The nuclear physics department is now only made up of BAE scientists who in the future will focus on research. KPI and reporting has been moved to other departments.

Garth mentions that it sounds like the one-year scheduling process went well. Any idea whether this may be the new template going forward? Chris states that when starting back up in 2027 with radioactive ion beams, things will be very different. The goal for TRIUMF/ARIEL is to be more like a factory. Instead of requesting experiment shifts, the time will be allocated in "blocks" and requests will be rounded up to the nearest "block" (a block = likely half a week). Ritu is working on changing how projects are proposed for beam time.

Chris also mentions that for student projects involving radioactive beams you need backups and backups for your backups. Moving forward after the shutdown, the goal is to have a high probability for experiments to run within 2 years. At the moment this probability is likely less than 50%.

Garth complains about technical issues during the ACOT meeting: he could listen in to the plenary session and could see the people through the video feed but slides were not shared. Chris will relay the complaint.

Gwen asks for updates on the status of organization for TRIUMF science week. Chris has no information nor did he receive any announcements. Gwen mentions that July 23 appears to be the date, however, there appears to be no official announcement yet. Chris knows that Vannassas Vasaltas is invited to give an astroparticle physics talk, and there is a talk on ACTAR.

6. Other Business

None

7. Next Board Meeting:

Gwen reminds the board of the next meeting on Thur June 12 Board meeting at CAP Congress (USask) 7:30-8:45 Sask Time, Room TBA

8. Adjourn

Thomas motions to adjourn, Chris seconds.