

## Minutes of the 2022 DCPB Divisional Member Meeting (held via Zoom)

The member meeting of the Division of Comparative Physiology and Biochemistry (DCPB) was held on January 4<sup>th</sup>, 2022, via a Zoom meeting through the Pathable virtual meeting platform.

Division Chair Ken Welch started the meeting at 5:52pm MST, and began with a request to approve last year's minutes. Kim Hammond made a motion to approve; Jon Harrison seconded the motion. Members unanimously voted to approve the minutes from last year's divisional meeting.

Ken began the meeting with a discussion of updates to the divisional bylaws. The SICB executive committee identified inconsistencies among divisions in their respective bylaws, and the goal is to "clean things up" for clarity and consistency. For example, number of days for review of changes will change to 30 days instead of 60 days, and we will specify the use of electronic ballots for elections, as we no longer conduct elections via regular mail. In addition, we are changing the wording to use more inclusive pronouns. We need to post these changes by January 15<sup>th</sup>, to include in the spring election cycle.

### Bartholomew Award discussion

This is an opportunity for us to modernize aspects of the Bartholomew award description. There are some concerns about one person winning more than one major SICB award. We want to encourage a greater diversity of winners to honor. One question was whether the pedagogical (i.e., Moore) award is different from the research awards (i.e., Bartholomew and Gans). Kim Hammond agreed that the research awards should be exclusive, such that we give one preeminent award per person. One suggestion was to change the wording to: "past or concurrent winners of awards celebrating early career research will be ranked lower." This allows folks to apply for both awards, but people who haven't been honored with another award would be ranked higher. It was noted that often senior leadership ask about the Bart award and try to weigh in, even if they have nominated someone; this should be discouraged (or ignored) by the Bart committee. We agreed that we are interested to hear what the Gans committee thinks about this. The question arose about what would happen if the same person was selected for both awards – would the person need to decline one? It was suggested to refine the wording to: "Preference will be given to applicants that haven't received an early career award for a disciplinary area from the Society in the past." Several folks seemed to agree that if offered both awards, the candidate should decline one, but it would be left up to the candidate to decide which award to decline and which to accept in that instance.

Kim Hammond brought up the issue that Bart award nominees often submit more than 3 letters of recommendation or 3 papers for review, and that gives them an unfair advantage. She suggested that we specify in the wording for the award that submissions should be limited to the suggested numbers, e.g., "only the first 3 references will be considered." In addition, Ken pointed out that nominees' descriptions of research have been getting long, and suggested that

we add page limitations. Ken has set up a Google doc to invite an iterative editing process to get this ready for January 15<sup>th</sup>. It was also noted that we should make it explicit in the criteria for the Bart award that DEI (diversity, equity, and inclusion) considerations are important for the selection process.

It was noted that COVID has been quite a disruption to early career researchers, and folks suggested that we extend the consideration period (currently 7 years post-PhD) by one additional year. There is already such a consideration for parental time, though it may not be explicit. We would ask nominees to request an extension with a COVID impact statement. There was a general feeling that we would not grant such an extension indefinitely, but we could revisit this again next year.

### APS Intersociety Meeting

Dan Warren, chair of the organizing committee for the next APS Intersociety Meeting in Comparative Physiology gave us an update. The meeting will be held in San Diego, October 27-30, 2022. It will be held at a downtown hotel, not at the Town & Country, which he hopes is a welcome change. The submission deadline for symposia, which may include up to 2 chairs, is January 12, 2022. The theme of the meeting is “From Organism to Omics in an Uncertain World.” There is a form for submitting symposia on the website, and it only requires suggested speakers rather than confirmed commitments at this stage. You can contact Dan at [daniel.warren@slu.edu](mailto:daniel.warren@slu.edu) with questions. The society has allocated \$1500 per symposium (for up to 10 symposia), and all speakers receive complimentary registration. The recommendation is for 4 speakers, each of whom would give a 30-minute talk. The regular abstract deadline will be some time in April or May.

### NSF Updates

Kathryn Dickson delivered the NSF updates. She sent the full text of updates to all SICB secretaries, which can be distributed upon request. Kathy expressed her thanks to all reviewers and panelists who have helped NSF process proposals. She highlighted new solicitations for climate change research – one for biodiversity and one for organisms. There is also a new solicitation for research on infection biology. A new NSF program provides support for post-baccalaureates who are not going directly to another degree program, and it provides support for cohorts of these post-bac students at a given institution. Another program provides support for teachers at the middle school, high school, and community college levels. Additionally, there is new support for faculty in their first 3 years at a non-R1 institution; these are relatively small grants and also shorter proposals (6 pages). Kathy encourages everyone to sign up for the NSF blog and news alerts, to stay on top of new and continuing programs. The integrative biology programs are continuing. There is also funding for other kinds of supplements and symposia; contact the relevant program officer for more information about those. March 1<sup>st</sup> is a good target date to request NSF-funded support for a SICB symposium for the 2023 meeting. Kathy noted that there are openings for permanent positions at NSF, which will be posted soon. She and others encouraged folks to consider becoming a rotating program officer for NSF.

## Physiological & Biochemical Zoology (PBZ) Journal Update

Jon Harrison gave the annual report on PBZ. This is the 95<sup>th</sup> year of PBZ. PBZ has started publishing methods papers. There are several paper types supported by the journal, including comments on published papers, brief communications, in memoriam papers, and perspectives. Submission rates were down a bit (120 in 2021, compared to 143 in 2020). There were 69 revisions, which is similar to previous years. The acceptance rate was 30% in 2021, which is higher than 2020 but similar to 2018. Average time to first decision was 43 days, and average time to final decision was 60 days. Stephen Secor has retired from the editorial team. PBZ's impact factor for 2021 was 2.25, which is the same as 2020 and 2019. The journal is ranked 58<sup>th</sup> out of 81 for physiology journals, and 42<sup>nd</sup> out of 175 for zoology journals.

## SICB Executive Officer Updates

Melina Hale, current SICB president, reported that we had over 1000 in-person attendees at this year's meeting, with vaccination rates over 99%. The SICB Executive Committee is holding drop-in times at a table in the exhibit hall, 3-4pm Wednesday and Thursday, and also via Zoom. Melina noted that Miriam Ashley Ross, SICB treasurer, is stuck in a snowstorm on the east coast and hopes to report on the SICB budget at Thursday's society-wide member meeting.

Patricia Hernandez noted that SICB is always looking for volunteers for committees. Please send her an e-mail if you are interested!

Molly Jacobs, the SICB communications editor, wants to hear ideas for what divisions need. She also put in a plug for SICB+.

Beth Brainerd, SICB past president, introduced herself.

Adam Summers, editor of Integrative Organismal Biology, SICB's open access journal, encouraged everyone to submit their manuscripts to IOB. The journal has a supportive peer review process, and will be assigned an impact factor around 5 for 2021!

Other executive members introduced themselves: Michele Johnson, SICB secretary; Brett Burk, executive director; Thom Sanger, program director elect, who welcomes ideas for next year's meeting; and Jake Socha, current program officer.

DCPB members brought up our Bart award discussion with the executive committee, who agreed that we should consult with the Gans award committee as well.

Maria Stager brought up that we are still in need of in-person judges for the best student presentations. In particular, there is one talk on Thursday at 11am that needs judges. We hope to offer a single BSP session, like the other divisions do, at next year's meeting.

The members expressed their thanks to Ken for his service as DCPB chair.

Kim Hammond motioned to adjourn the meeting, and Caroline Williams seconded. The members unanimously approved, and the meeting adjourned at 6:48 MST.

Respectfully submitted by  
Heather Liwanag, DCPB Secretary