

Minutes of the Division of Comparative Biomechanics Business Meeting, January 4, 2012

Sharon Swartz, Division Chair, called the meeting to order.

Sharon remarked that 2011 was a great year for DCB; membership in the division is strong as always, both quantitatively and qualitatively. We are now the 4th largest division within SICB.

The Charleston meeting is the largest SICB meeting ever, with over 1800 registrants and 1400 contributed papers, 9 symposia, and over 600 posters. Next year's meeting in San Francisco is expected to be even larger.

Marianne Porter, Divisional Representative to the Student/Postdoctoral Affairs Committee spoke next, reminding the membership of the exciting things going on of interest to students and postdocs during the meeting: Manny Azizi giving the Bartholomew Lecture; the Public Affairs Workshop on how to communicate effectively (limited to 75 participants due to lunch being provided), the DCB/DVM/DEDB joint social, the NSF workshop on "Demystifying grant application process," the SICB business meeting; and competing workshops: "Maximizing your potential through job applications and interviews" versus "The interface of math and biology", and finally the Broadening Participation and Society-Wide socials. Marianne reminded faculty members to encourage students to attend these events.

Bill Zamer then talked about the current state of things at NSF. The Foundation does not have a budget at the operating level yet for 2012; he says that the POs are hopeful that the budget will filter down to the program level sometime in February. No awards have gone out yet from the Fall round of review because of this – PI's on the successful grants have been notified, but because there's no budget, no money can be officially awarded yet. He asked us all to Please Be Patient.

Bill also related some highlights of the session about the new NSF pre-proposal process held on Wednesday – the Spring panel review will result in Invite/Do Not Invite decisions for full proposals, which will have a deadline of August 2. The submission for preliminary proposals is January 12. Note that the new preliminary proposal scheme does not apply to CAREER proposals (July deadline) or RCN proposals; those still go in as full proposals to begin with. Bill also mentioned that NSF is still encouraging the submission of high quality RCN proposals – these must be structured so as to get scientists together that normally wouldn't work together (e.g., biologists and engineers); he mentioned a new RCN on the area of ocean acidification as a model.

In the area of symposium support, NSF funded 5 of the 10 symposia at the Charleston meeting. Bill remarked that the IOS-targeted symposium proposals were really good – they dealt with helping the progress of science in the community, and were NOT retrospective symposia (which NSF is NOT favoring), and recommended modeling your symposium support proposal after the Altshuler and Dickinson symposium. Symposium support proposals need to be received by NSF not later than March 1; there is an upper limit of \$15K on the budget, and it's okay to include foreign scientists on the budget, but NSF won't fund their travel to the meeting (but NSF can pay registration, housing, and per diem costs once they're here).

Jake Socha asked about CAREER proposals – are they going to panel that meets in October? Bill answered that Yes, they go through the same review panels as always; they come in on a July deadline, and will be put into the same pool as the invited full proposals that are due in August.

Sharon Swartz then, by her own description, “floundered” for meeting highlights to point out, but Marianne Porter had already covered most of them. She commented that the Altshuler and Dickinson symposium that day had been great, and that the Miller and Alben symposium on mathematical approaches to the study of animal locomotion should be equally great. It’s also not too early to think about symposium proposals for the 2014 meeting in Austin, TX. In Charleston, 9 out of 10 symposia were supported by NSF or NIH; high-quality symposia have a high probability of external support. Sharon encouraged senior graduate students and postdocs to organize symposia, saying that it is great experience.

Sharon wrapped up her remarks by thanking Jake Socha for organizing the judging of the Best Student Paper/Poster competitions, and thanking all the judges as well. Jake responded that his super-spiffy and organized system was a modification of Ty Hedrick’s and Matt McHenry’s system – that it was a clear example of evolution in action!

Finally, Sharon reminded us that the winners of last year’s Best Student Paper/Poster competitions were Nicole George (oral presentation) and Tom Libby and Karin Moll (tied for best poster).

The Division Program Officer, Steve Deban, spoke next. The major new event was the trial run of the 5 minute lightning talks – Steve asked everyone who participated and/or attended those to please give feedback using the survey at the end of the meeting with thoughts about how they worked. Steve also reminded the members that DCB is sponsoring two symposia at the San Francisco meeting: “When Predators Attack,” organized by Matt McHenry, and “Vertebrate Land Invasions: Past, Present, and Future,” organized by Tonia Hsieh, Rick Blob, Alice Gibb, and Miriam Ashley-Ross.

Sharon thanked the departing officers (Program Officer Deban and Secretary Ashley-Ross). She thanked the nominating committee for getting great candidates for last Spring’s election, and introduced the new officers. Laura Miller is the new Program Officer, and Tim Higham is the new Secretary. Tim’s first project is the DCB divisional webpage – he is looking to make major improvements! Please send your ideas about content that you’d like to see to him.

Sharon introduced a new member of the DCB team, who will be serving on the editorial board for Integrative and Comparative Biology. Adam Summers is rotating off of that position, and Anna Ahn will be the new DCB representative on the ICB editorial board.

Next, there was an announcement from Adam Summers about the next International Congress of Vertebrate Morphology (ICVM). ICVM-10 will be held July 8-13, 2013, in Barcelona, Spain. Adam encouraged everyone to go to the ICVM-10 website (<http://icvm2013.com/>) and please preregister if you will be attending. Adam asked how many people had received his email with ICVM information; a minority of DCB members raised their hands. Adam explained that that was because “ICVM’s Record Keeping Staff had proven itself unable to keep up with attendees’ locations.” People

who had moved to a different institution had been "lost," and therefore hadn't gotten the email messages. Adam therefore asked everyone to please indicate their interest in the meeting on the ICVM-10 website so they would get back on the mailing list. Adam concluded his remarks by saying that since he has been one of the editors of the journal *Zoology*, that the journal has gotten great papers from the DCB members (and they have been well cited!), and to please keep it up. Adam also thanked all of the people who have reviewed papers for the journal.

The SICB officers then came in and introduced themselves. They discussed several topics.

- 1) The first thing was to relay a message from Bob Podolsky, the Chair of Educational Council. Bob would like everyone to visit the SICB website and update their information. New details regarding teaching are requested, which should help people coordinate thoughts and ideas.
- 2) The next topic was the SICB meeting in 2015. It will be held in West Palm Beach in Florida, and SICB received a great deal on hotel costs. In addition, they pointed out that the costs for housing next year in San Francisco are very reasonable. Next year's meeting could be larger than this one! The officers expressed their excitement about holding the meeting in San Francisco next year, and noted that the economic downturn probably lowered the costs and enabled us to go there.
- 3) They encouraged people to work with the program officer on proposals for symposia (for the 2014 meeting in Austin). There were many great applications for the meeting in San Francisco.
- 4) The officers addressed concerns regarding the lack of internet in the poster area. They outlined that it would have been prohibitively expensive. However, the folks in West Palm Beach have already agreed to provide free internet in the Convention Center.
- 5) For future meetings, the officers raised the possibilities of increasing the number of 5-minute talks, switching to 15 minute talks, and including 2 posters per board.
- 6) The officers noted that child care was new this year, as was video recording of the plenary lectures and other selected talks. They will appear on the Video Channel (YouTube) and perhaps iTunes.

Beth Brainerd (Brown University) then talked about the Research Coordination Network for X-ray Motion Analysis (RCN-XMA) that is funded by NSF. Beth and David Lee (UNLV) are the PIs. They offer a Short Course each summer and this year it will be at Brown University from June 11-15. Please see <http://www.xromm.org/rcn-xma> for more information. Beth noted that everyone is welcome to apply, including undergraduates, graduate students, postdocs, and faculty. Expenses are covered for domestic participants. The number of participants from Europe was high last year. Beth also noted that they are happy to help anyone with X-ray motion analysis, including setting up their own system or collecting data. She noted that a short period of data collection can last years of analysis and writing! These systems have become increasingly accessible over the past few years.

The Carl Gans Award was presented by Emily Carrington. Emily first discussed Carl and his contributions to comparative biomechanics. Emily noted that Carl was a driving force, loved natural history, and promoted integration. He completed very elegant work, both theoretically and technically. She also noted some of the details regarding the Award. A young investigator (PhD within the past 7 years) is eligible to apply. In addition, any single contribution from that year can also be put forth. Emily mentioned that there were several nominations this year, and the winner was

Dr. Kelly Dorgan, who is currently a postdoctoral researcher at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography working with Greg Rouse. Emily described Kelly's contributions and a quote from her advisor was also read.

Sharon Swartz then raised some issues pertaining to the Carl Gans Award. She brought up the issue of conflict between the Carl Gans Award and the George A. Bartholomew Award, which is a society-wide award for early PhD integrative biologists. Sharon mentioned that people were nominated for both awards this year. However, the winner of the Carl Gans Award was determined after the Bartholomew Award, so there wasn't an issue. However, there are a few things to consider in the future, including whether the Awards Committee should establish a 1st and 2nd place for the Gans Award and then wait to hear about the Bartholomew Award. Alternatively the Committee could simply deliberate after the winner of the Bartholomew Award has been determined. The DCB Committee could coordinate with the Bartholomew Award committee. Another option is to make it a rule that a candidate can be nominated for ONLY one of the two awards in a given year. Finally, another option is to change the award and not have it be an award for young investigators. Adam Summers then questioned why a single person couldn't win both awards. He suggested that creating restrictions might make the Carl Gans Award seem like #2 on the list. He said that it would be great if a person working on comparative biomechanics won both awards in a single year. This would be a great sign that comparative biomechanics people are having a great impact.

Emily Carrington and Bob Full then discussed the details of the Award. Emily wondered who actually gave the money for the Award, and whether we could obtain clarification from the donors. Bob mentioned that this is a complex situation. They had already discussed this in previous years and there really wasn't a consensus. The wording is in the bylaws, but the wording is a bit strange. A vote on a few different options would be good.

Tom Daniel then voiced his opposition to Adam! He suggested that many people would qualify for both awards, but suggested that we wait for the Bartholomew Award to be determined and then make a decision. He would like to keep the "young investigator" aspect. Beth Brainerd then stated that she likes the idea of making it a paper award. She was not sure if the "young investigator" aspect should be kept. Tom Daniel then suggested that the Carl Gans Award could be given to the "biggest impact". He mentioned that another society does this. Finally, Sharon Swartz mentioned that no nominations for best contribution were received this year. Bob Full mentioned that the nominations last year were split between young investigators and best contribution.

Rhea von Busse, a postdoctoral researcher from Brown University, then discussed a new idea for incorporating video content into SICB meetings. She pointed out that people have lots of video that they might want to show at the meeting, but the video might not be in their poster or talk. Rhea proposed 4 new ways of sharing video: SICB could offer a table or iPad strap in order to include video in the poster session. There could also be a monitor or projector (as occurs at other meetings, such as the meeting of the American Physical Society), which could show videos continuously and would not require supervision. In this case, the videos would need to be in a common format. The third option is to have a separate table during the poster session. People could sit with their laptops and show video. Finally, there could be a dedicated session where people show video. This could be interactive and very effective for sharing video. Tim Higham supported these ideas given that videos

often appear briefly in presentations and it would be good to have more time to look over them. Sharon Swartz mentioned that SICB would provide a booth next year to try out this idea of incorporating video. There will be a dedicated computer or projector. Next year will be a trial. Finally, Ty Hedrick asked whether the videos would have to be clips that are NOT in talks and posters. The answer is no, they could be in a poster or talk AND the special video section.

The meeting was then adjourned.