HEPAP Human Resources Study

Status Report

Presentation at the HEPAP Meeting February 14, 2005

Jim Whitmore Glen Crawford Chip Brock

The issue:

- We have a rich physics program involving two categories of experiments during the 2004-2009 timeframe: those either currently running or those coming on line. It is essential that we plan to fulfill these obligations through to publication of physics results. The first step to developing such a plan is a careful understanding of our physicist resources.
- Accordingly, at the April 2004 HEPAP meeting, a basic question was asked: "Does the field have the people to adequately carry out the experiments to which it is committed until the end of the decade?"

The Action:

Fred appointed a Working Group comprised of:

Young-Kee Kim John Womersley

Howard Gordon Joel Butler

Sekhar Chivukula Usha Mallik

Bill Molzon

- With Chip Brock and Glen Crawford and
- Jim Whitmore as co-Chair persons

The issue: (letter to each PI)

- To answer this question, each university and laboratory group was requested to give its plan for the distribution of faculty/staff/postdocs/students among the various projects with which they are involved for each year through 2009.
 The funding assumption is constant level of effort, starting with 2004 as the base year.
- These data will be compared with those supplied by the relevant collaborations, who will each be asked for their minimum year-by-year manpower needs. In addition, for on-shore experiments, their year-by-year expected U.S. and non-U.S. contributions will be requested.
- Respond to this request by <u>September 30, 2004</u>.

Form sent to all NSF and DOE PIs

Part 1

- Institution:
- Contact Person:
- Funding agency(ies)
- Projects working on between now (FY2004) and FY2009 (A, B,):
- A eg D0
- B eg ATLAS

Part 2

- Current personnel in each category / Funded in FY04 from base / Funded in FY04 from off-base
- Type of person
- Faculty
- Research scientists
- Postdocs
- Graduate Students
- Others (identify type of person)

Part 3

- Estimated number of FTE personnel working on each project in <u>each category</u> in each year (only from base funding):
- A) Faculty FY2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
- Project A
- Project B
- Sum (should equal number in Part 2 and be constant)
- B) Research Scientists FY2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009
- Project A
- etc

Response from these NSF PIs:

Michigan State (4)

Ohio State U (2)

U. of Rochester (2)

Occidental Coll

California Tech

U. of Minnesota-Duluth

University of Montana

Case Western Reserve U

Virginia Tech

U. of Cincinnati

Stony Brook (2)

New York University

Stanford University (3)

George Mason University

Bucknell University

U. California-Irvine (3)

Rutgers University

U. of California, Santa Cruz

Columbia University (3)

Penn State (2)

Stanford University

University of Nebraska

U. California, Riverside

Alfred University

University of Maryland (2)

Brown University

Cornell U. / LEPP

University of Chicago

Johns Hopkins University

U. of Illinois at Chicago

Vanderbilt University

University of Kansas

Syracuse University

Northeastern University

University of Notre Dame

Hampton U. (2)

Wayne State U (2)

University of Chicago

University of Utah (2)

Northern Illinois U

U. of Houston

U.of So California

U. of Washington

Yale U.

University of Illinois

Barnard College

Rice

UCLA (3)

U.C. Berkeley

Illinois Inst of Tech

RP Institute

Cal State at DH

6 PIs did not respond yet

Response from these DOE PIs:

Argonne National Lab

Brookhaven N Lab. (3)

Carnegie Mellon U

Colorado State University

Cornell University

Fermilab (2)

Harvard University (2)

Inst for Advanced Study

Lawrence Berkeley NLab. LSU

Michigan Tech U

NIST, Boulder, CO

Notre Dame (2)

Purdue University (2)

Southern Methodist U

SUNY at Binghamton

The University of Iowa

Boston University

Bucknell University

Case Western RU.

Colorado University

DOF

Florida Inst of Tech

Illinois Inst of Technology

Iowa State University (3)

MIT (2)

Navel Research Lab

Ohio State University (2)

Rockefeller University

Stanford University

Temple University

Tufts University

Brandeis University (2)

Cal Tech. (2)

Coll of William and Mary

Columbia University

Duke University (3)

Florida State University

Indiana University(2)

Langston University

Michigan State University

Mount Holyoke College

Northwestern University

Princeton University (3)

SFSU

STI Optronics, Inc.

Texas A&M University

UC Santa Barbara

Response from these DOE PIs:

UCLA (3) UC - San Diego UC - Riverside University of Colorado (3) University of Hawaii University of Kansas University of Michigan (3) Univ of New Mexico (3) University of Pittsburgh Univ of Southern Cal University of Virginia Vanderbilt University Wayne State University

University of Arizona UC - Santa Cruz (2) University of Chicago (3) University of Connecticut U of Illinois at UC (2) University of Louisville Univ of Minnesota (2) Univ of NC at Chapel Hill Univ of Rochester (2) Univ of Tennessee (2) Univ of Washington (2) Virginia Tech Yale University

UC – Berkeley UC - Irvine University of Cinncinnati University of Florida U of Illinois at Chicago U Mass, Amherst University of Mississippi University of Oregon (2) Univ of South Carolina Univ of Texas at Austin University of Wisconsin (4) Washington U in St. Louis

29 PIs did not respond yet

The issue: (letter to each Expt)

- This message is the complementary survey of experiments for an evaluation of their needs for the same time period: What are the required levels of effort needed to keep your experiment running and producing physics results/publications through FY2009.
- Please assess your needs to maintain and operate your experiment at a realistic minimum level of effort. There are two emphases in this assessment: a reasonably precise accounting of the current effort within your experiment (the FY2004 numbers) and an accurate estimate of your experiment's needs for out-years. In order to be concise, we're trying to assess these needs within two broad areas:

(Letter to each expt, cont.)

- a) Maintenance and Operations, largely focused on data-taking operations with respect to detectors and beams; and
- b) Data Analysis
- Respond to this request by <u>September 30, 2004</u>.

All current responses are listed on FAQ webpage:

http://www.pa.msu.edu/~brock/file_sharing/FAQ_survey.htm

Form sent to all Experiments

EXP Responder Date

ACTUAL	Personnel	FY 04	NEEDED	FY 05	FY 06 FY 07	FY 08 FY 09
			Personnel			
operations	FTE Fac -US institution	#	TOTAL FTE F a	ac #	# etc	
	FTE host lab staff	#				
	FTE Fac/staff foreign inst	#				
operations	FTE PD -US institution	#	TOTAL FTE P) #	# etc	
	FTE PD -host lab	#				
	FTE PD -foreign institutes	#				
operations	FTE GS -US institution	#	TOTAL FTE G S	S #	# etc	
	FTE GS -foreign institutes	#				
	TOTAL OPERATIONS	#	TOTAL OPS	#	# etc	
			(expected precision ±10%)			
analysis	FTE Fac-US institutions	#	TOTAL FTE F a	ac #	# etc	
	FTE host lab physics staff	#				
	FTE Fac/staff foreign institutes	#				
analysis	similarly as for operations (above)) for FTE PD	and GS			
FTE checksum total faculty/staff		#	total faculty	/staff	# etc	
FTE checksum total PD		#	total PD	#	# etc	
FTE checks	sum total GS	#	total GS	#	# etc	

major tasks: 2005: upgrade installation, which involves an increase in FTE post docs by 2

major tasks: 2006: upgrade complete;

major tasks: 2007 – 2009 : Any general comments:

Response from these Expts:

At FNAL

Dzero Jerry Blazey BTeV Joel Butler

HyperCP (E871) Craig Dukes Minerva (E938) K. McFarland

At SLAC At BNL

BaBar David MacFarlane MECO Bill Molzon

At Cornell

CLEO-c Jim Alexander/Ian Shipsey

Other

VERITAS T. Weekes STACEE Rene Ong

SNAP/JDEM Loken, Stewart LIGO Peter Saulson

K2K / SuperK H. Sobel ATLAS Bill Willis/Howard Gordon

CMS Dan Green/Bob Cousins

21 Experiments did not respond

Summary

- For the experiments
- Sent out 35 requests, rec'd 14 responses
- · 40%
- For the NSF PIs:
- Sent out 78 requests, rec'd 72 responses
- · 92.3%
- For the DOE non-theory, non-tech PIs:
- Sent out 89 requests, rec'd 60 responses
- · 67.4%

Current Issues

- Some institutions have sent in two (or more) responses and some PIs responded to both NSF and DOE – need to check
- Need to follow up on non-responders (PI and expts)
- Need to check each response for internal consistency – some DOE theory groups responded
- We are working on a program to collate all responses (in Excel)

Next steps

- Questions (for each year 2004-2009):
- From PI response: for each listed expt (current and planned), sum the total personnel (in each category; faculty, gs, etc)
- From Expt response: for current expts, compare the above (PI response) numbers with their needs (in 2004, at least there is a check)
- From Expt response: for planned expts, examine carefully their needs and compare with PI response
- We would welcome specific questions from you:
- Please send to hepexp@pa.msu.edu

Summary

- We are a "bit" behind in collecting the data, but nearly there. The experiments, in particular, have not been very responsive.
- We realize the need for these data and will process them asap (we have had volunteers to help on this from the working group as soon as the data are complete).