

Minutes of the DCPB Business Meeting, January 4, 2013, San Francisco, CA

The meeting was called to order by Division Chair Don Mykles at 5:15PM, Jan 4, 2013.

Bill Zamer, Steve Ellis, and Sophie George (from NSF) provided an update on the agency.

Within Bio, programs are working with a budget that is 80% of what they had last year. Programs are making funding decisions based on that reduced budget, and proposals falling between the 80-100% funding level must wait until the budget is finalized. SICB symposia proposals were encouraged to 'look forward' vs. retrospective, to bring together researchers who don't normally talk to each other, and to inform the community about leading edges in the field. NSF anticipates it will be more competitive to get a symposium funded in this fiscal environment. Bill gave a reminder about Research Coordination Networks- for networking activities, and coordination among researchers. RCN's can be focused on an organism, group of organisms, or specific sets of questions. Collaborative visits can be funded, but not bench work. Full proposals to the RCN proposal mechanism are due at the normal deadline for full proposal within Bio.

NSF would like REU supplements, which traditionally have been submitted after award comes in, to instead be included in the original research proposal if foreseeable. The REU supplement information should be within supplementary documents of new proposals. This mechanism started last year.

An NSF preproposal process update was announced for the SICB business-meeting, Sunday Jan 6 2013. NSF announced a website change for Jan 14 and warned of formatting changes in anticipation of the Jan 18 pre-proposal deadline.

The minutes of the previous year's DCPB business meeting were approved by assent.

Don Mykles gave the Chair's report:

The 2013 budget includes the same allocation from the Society to the division (\$3000), \$2000 to support symposia, \$800 to support socials, and the rest to support the best student presentation competition. The Division also has a balance of ~\$13,000 in discretionary funds, which comes from the \$5 'assessment' (=divisional dues) on membership collected last summer. Contact Chair Mykles with your ideas on spending these funds(a suggestion from the membership was support for international comparative physiology meetings).

The SICB Executive Officers joined the meeting at 5:36.

The Executive Officers reminded our division of the upcoming SICB meetings in Austin TX and West Palm Beach FL, to be followed by a west coast site (San Diego, Portland, or Phoenix). The San Francisco meeting was the largest ever, with 1622 abstracts submitted. Membership is up, and the society is fiscally sound.

Divisional members questioned the executive committee about public affairs workshops, student writers and photographers, and the possibility of an international meeting.

The DCPB Program Officer Kristin O'Brien gave her report. There were > 200 abstracts from our division, and 90 students competing for best student competition (many thanks to Harry Itagaki and to all judges). Four symposia in Austin have been sponsored by the division.

Jonathon Stillman (incoming program officer) encouraged symposia proposals for the West Palm Beach meeting.

Don Mykles delivered the Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology journal report. Rejection rates and manuscript flow have remained steady over the last year. The rejection rate remains high, and most of this comes as desk rejects. Papers that don't fit or are preliminary or fatally flawed do not even get past the editorial board.

Impact Factors remain high at:

Part A 2.235

Part B 1.923

Part C 2.616

Part D 1.718

Please view the appendix to these minutes for additional details of the journal.

The ranks of the Editorial Board and Associate Editors continue to have good representation from DCPB. Overall, the journal is in great health and the editors are open to any suggestions or questions from the DCPB membership on any matters.

Report from the editors of Physiological and Biochemical Zoology (PBZ) for 2012

Trish Schulte delivered the PBZ report.

This year (2012) was another busy one for PBZ. We received a total of 196 submissions (up from 187 in 2011) from countries around the world: 43% from North America, 21% from Europe, and approximately 10% from each of Asia, Australia/New Zealand, and South America.

The quality of our published papers remains high, and our rejection rate remained stable at 50% (with approximately half of these being rejected without review).

We have worked hard to reduce our time in review, which has declined steadily since we assumed the editorship of PBZ. The average time to provide a first decision is now 37 days (down from 55 days in 2008). Average time with reviewers is now 18 days (down from 29 days in 2011). The average time to final decision is 60 days, and is dependent largely on how long it takes authors to revise their manuscripts.

We continue to struggle to get the University of Chicago Press to reduce the time between acceptance and online publication, which currently averages 50 days (the same as last year). However, this is down substantially from 172 days in 2008, the year before we assumed the editorship.

Our impact factor has remained relatively stable (currently 2.201), and our ranking against competitor journals is also similar to last year. Readership remains high, with monthly online downloads of over 17,000 per month in the busiest times of year.

Our focused issue for 2012 (Intraspecific Variation in Physiology and Behavior), which came out in November/December is already very successful, and a number of papers from this issue have been among our top downloads for the year, with more than 300 downloads for the most accessed paper in this issue (as of December 17th).

Our focused issue for 2013 (Conservation Physiology) has already received many submissions, and we are seeking suggestions for a topic for a focused issue for 2014.

PBZ would not be possible without the hard work of a large number of people, and we would like to extend our particular thanks to the PBZ managing editor, Andrea Canfield, the PBZ Associate editors (Ted Garland, Jon Harrison, Irene Tieleman and Stephen Secor), the entire editorial board, and the more than 300 dedicated individuals who provided reviews for PBZ this year.

Respectfully submitted

Dr. Kathleen Gilmour
Dr. Patricia Schulte
Co-editors in chief, PBZ

Don Mykles then continued with other Division business. He encouraged all to attend the Bartholomew Award lecture, given by Alison Sweeney .

Members expressed frustration with internet access at the meeting, and an idea of tacking on a fee of \$20-30 for internet access for the duration of the meeting was proposed. There was a general sentiment that it was not needed, and it could be an option for a fee (like a wine tour).

Chair Mykles brought of the issue of SICB membership in IUPS. They want a membership fee of \$1000/year, and SICB is not willing to pay for a membership for a strictly physiological society. Since the IUPS meeting is every 4 years, membership would cost us \$4000. If we don't pay this we can't forward suggestions for symposia for the meeting. A discussion followed with the resolution that the DCPB Executive committee will make a decision.

Chris Slay reported as the grad/postdoc representative. He is working on a workshop on crafting 'elevator' talks, and this year there was a booth among the exhibitors from the postdoctoral committee.

Jon Harrison addressed the meeting and asked how to make the meeting more interactive. Should we have clickers in the rooms? How do we facilitate more questions?

The meeting adjourned at 620.

Respectfully submitted-
Richard Londrville, DCPB Secretary.

CBP (to Dec. 27, 2012)

	2012 %		2011 percentages		2010	
submitted	1275	100.0	1337	100.0	1247	100.0
currently pending	79	6.2	69	5.2	104	8.3
accepted	349	27.4	356	26.6	395	31.7
rejected	97	7.6	96	7.2	138	11.1
desk rejected	662	51.9	725	54.2	497	39.9
withdrawn	3	0.2	4	0.3	4	0.3
currently returned for revision	85	6.7	87	6.5	109	8.7
	1275		1337			
all rejections	759		821		639	
rejection rate	59.5 %		61.4 %		###	
pending mss. 6 weeks over rev. time li (27 of 115) will not make it	44		assuming that 25% of pending mss (40 of 160) will not make it			
all (anticipated) rejections	27		861			
final rejection rate	830		64.4 %		###	
current acceptance rate	65.1 %		26.6 %		###	
accepted without requiring revision	27.4 %		0	0	0	
reviewers who supplied reports see attached pdf	0		1291		1482	
increase in submissions over 2010	1144					
	2.3 %		7.10%			