

IUPAP restructuring. External evaluation.

General Assembly, October 10-14, 2024



Photo by Yuya Makino

Silvina Ponce Dawson

DF, FCEN-UBA & IFIBA, UBA-CONICET

President Designate, IUPAP





With its Centennial, IUPAP renovated and expanded its aims. Advancing with these new aims is quite challenging.



With its Centennial, IUPAP renovated and expanded its aims. Advancing with these new aims is quite challenging.

At the Centennial Symposium and then at the regular officers meetings we started to discuss whether IUPAP's current structure was the best to advance with these new aims, what to prioritize, how to organize the actions.



With its Centennial, IUPAP renovated and expanded its aims. Advancing with these new aims is quite challenging.

At the Centennial Symposium and then at the regular officers meetings we started to discuss whether IUPAP's current structure was the best to advance with these new aims, what to prioritize, how to organize the actions.

I was charged with defining a strategy. As a first step, a committee with officers and EC members was convened which collected information on various aspects. This information was the source of the self-evaluation report.



With its Centennial, IUPAP renovated and expanded its aims. Advancing with these new aims is quite challenging.

At the Centennial Symposium and then at the regular officers meetings we started to discuss whether IUPAP's current structure was the best to advance with these new aims, what to prioritize, how to organize the actions.

I was charged with defining a strategy. As a first step, a committee with officers and EC members was convened which collected information on various aspects. This information was the source of the self-evaluation report.

We then decided to have an external evaluation, for which we appointed a committee with 5 people:



With its Centennial, IUPAP renovated and expanded its aims. Advancing with these new aims is quite challenging.

At the Centennial Symposium and then at the regular officers meetings we started to discuss whether IUPAP's current structure was the best to advance with these new aims, what to prioritize, how to organize the actions.

I was charged with defining a strategy. As a first step, a committee with officers and EC members was convened which collected information on various aspects. This information was the source of the self-evaluation report.

We then decided to have an external evaluation, for which we appointed a committee with 5 people:

- George Amolo, Professor at the Technical University of Kenya
- Mark Cesa, USA, President of IUPAC (2014-2015).
- Sang-Joon Cho, Park Systems Corp., Rep of Korea.
- Cathy Foley, Australia. Australia's Chief Scientist.
- Atlas Varsted, Denmark, former member IAPS' board, chair of the Committee.



With its Centennial, IUPAP renovated and expanded its aims. Advancing with these new aims is quite challenging.

At the Centennial Symposium and then at the regular officers meetings we started to discuss whether IUPAP's current structure was the best to advance with these new aims, what to prioritize, how to organize the actions.

I was charged with defining a strategy. As a first step, a committee with officers and EC members was convened which collected information on various aspects. This information was the source of the self-evaluation report.

We then decided to have an external evaluation, for which we appointed a committee with 5 people:

- George Amolo, Professor at the Technical University of Kenya
- Mark Cesa, USA, President of IUPAC (2014-2015).
- Sang-Joon Cho, Park Systems Corp., Rep of Korea.
- Cathy Foley, Australia. Australia's Chief Scientist.
- Atlas Varsted, Denmark, former member IAPS' board, chair of the Committee.

The internal evaluation report was mostly descriptive, but tried to identify inconsistencies within the current structure and organization. This led to the analyses and suggestions on Commissions, ACs and WGs.



With its Centennial, IUPAP renovated and expanded its aims. Advancing with these new aims is quite challenging.

At the Centennial Symposium and then at the regular officers meetings we started to discuss whether IUPAP's current structure was the best to advance with these new aims, what to prioritize, how to organize the actions.

I was charged with defining a strategy. As a first step, a committee with officers and EC members was convened which collected information on various aspects. This information was the source of the self-evaluation report.

We then decided to have an external evaluation, for which we appointed a committee with 5 people:

- George Amolo, Professor at the Technical University of Kenya
- Mark Cesa, USA, President of IUPAC (2014-2015).
- Sang-Joon Cho, Park Systems Corp., Rep of Korea.
- Cathy Foley, Australia. Australia's Chief Scientist.
- Atlas Varsted, Denmark, former member IAPS' board, chair of the Committee.

The internal evaluation report was mostly descriptive, but tried to identify inconsistencies within the current structure and organization. This led to the analyses and suggestions on Commissions, ACs and WGs.

The questions presented to the external evaluation committee were more "strategic", although some points about structure were addressed.



Questions asked to guide the work of the external evaluation committee



Questions asked to guide the work of the external evaluation committee

Q1) How can IUPAP increase its visibility among physicists, physics students and/or companies with interest in physics? What target audience should IUPAP prioritize for its communications? What means of communication and type of contents would be best to this end? What type of actions should be strengthened and or added to increase IUPAP's visibility?



Questions asked to guide the work of the external evaluation committee

Q1) How can IUPAP increase its visibility among physicists, physics students and/or companies with interest in physics? What target audience should IUPAP prioritize for its communications? What means of communication and type of contents would be best to this end? What type of actions should be strengthened and or added to increase IUPAP's visibility?

Q2) IUPAP has traditionally been organized in Commissions that cover subfields of physics and relate to the corresponding physics communities through conferences and prizes. IUPAP then started to address transversal issues (physics for development, inclusion and diversity in physics, physics in industry, etc) "using" its traditional structures even though they are not the most adequate. What type of organization/structure would be best to address these transversal issues and increase the impact of IUPAP's actions? What funding sources can we apply to to further support these activities? Please notice that almost all IUPAP's income comes from the dues paid by IUPAP's members.

Q1) How can IUPAP increase its visibility among physicists, physics students and/or companies with interest in physics? What target audience should IUPAP prioritize for its communications? What means of communication and type of contents would be best to this end? What type of actions should be strengthened and or added to increase IUPAP's visibility?

Q2) IUPAP has traditionally been organized in Commissions that cover subfields of physics and relate to the corresponding physics communities through conferences and prizes. IUPAP then started to address transversal issues (physics for development, inclusion and diversity in physics, physics in industry, etc) "using" its traditional structures even though they are not the most adequate. What type of organization/structure would be best to address these transversal issues and increase the impact of IUPAP's actions? What funding sources can we apply to to further support these activities? Please notice that almost all IUPAP's income comes from the dues paid by IUPAP's members.

Q3) By addressing these transversal issues, we would like to have an impact beyond the physics community, particularly, on policy and policy makers. What type of actions would be best to increase the impact of IUPAP on policy and policy makers both at the national and international levels? Should IUPAP channel these efforts at the international level through the International Science Council or have actions of its own? Which ones? How to better impact on national policies?

Q4) In 2021 we introduced a new membership type, Corporate Associate Member, to incorporate commercial companies or international research organizations that have a special relationship with the field of physics. These members pay dues but do not vote at the General Assembly. What type of actions would be best to attract the support of companies with interest in physics and/or physicists? How to better reach out to physicists outside academic and research institutions?

Q4) In 2021 we introduced a new membership type, Corporate Associate Member, to incorporate commercial companies or international research organizations that have a special relationship with the field of physics. These members pay dues but do not vote at the General Assembly. What type of actions would be best to attract the support of companies with interest in physics and/or physicists? How to better reach out to physicists outside academic and research institutions?

Q5) IUPAP has a very small support staff, most of the work is done by physicists who contribute with IUPAP on top of their regular duties at their home institutions. Is it possible to increase IUPAP's visibility and/or impact with this type of functioning? Enlarging the support staff would require additional funds. What sources of additional funding could IUPAP apply to?

Q4) In 2021 we introduced a new membership type, Corporate Associate Member, to incorporate commercial companies or international research organizations that have a special relationship with the field of physics. These members pay dues but do not vote at the General Assembly. What type of actions would be best to attract the support of companies with interest in physics and/or physicists? How to better reach out to physicists outside academic and research institutions?

Q5) IUPAP has a very small support staff, most of the work is done by physicists who contribute with IUPAP on top of their regular duties at their home institutions. Is it possible to increase IUPAP's visibility and/or impact with this type of functioning? Enlarging the support staff would require additional funds. What sources of additional funding could IUPAP apply to?

Q6) How could we measure the level of knowledge of IUPAP and/or the impact of its actions?

Q4) In 2021 we introduced a new membership type, Corporate Associate Member, to incorporate commercial companies or international research organizations that have a special relationship with the field of physics. These members pay dues but do not vote at the General Assembly. What type of actions would be best to attract the support of companies with interest in physics and/or physicists? How to better reach out to physicists outside academic and research institutions?

Q5) IUPAP has a very small support staff, most of the work is done by physicists who contribute with IUPAP on top of their regular duties at their home institutions. Is it possible to increase IUPAP's visibility and/or impact with this type of functioning? Enlarging the support staff would require additional funds. What sources of additional funding could IUPAP apply to?

Q6) How could we measure the level of knowledge of IUPAP and/or the impact of its actions?

Q7) What other suggestions do you have?

Q4) In 2021 we introduced a new membership type, Corporate Associate Member, to incorporate commercial companies or international research organizations that have a special relationship with the field of physics. These members pay dues but do not vote at the General Assembly. What type of actions would be best to attract the support of companies with interest in physics and/or physicists? How to better reach out to physicists outside academic and research institutions?

Q5) IUPAP has a very small support staff, most of the work is done by physicists who contribute with IUPAP on top of their regular duties at their home institutions. Is it possible to increase IUPAP's visibility and/or impact with this type of functioning? Enlarging the support staff would require additional funds. What sources of additional funding could IUPAP apply to?

Q6) How could we measure the level of knowledge of IUPAP and/or the impact of its actions?

Q7) What other suggestions do you have?

These questions together with the internal evaluation report were sent to the Committee on February 7, 2024.

Q4) In 2021 we introduced a new membership type, Corporate Associate Member, to incorporate commercial companies or international research organizations that have a special relationship with the field of physics. These members pay dues but do not vote at the General Assembly. What type of actions would be best to attract the support of companies with interest in physics and/or physicists? How to better reach out to physicists outside academic and research institutions?

Q5) IUPAP has a very small support staff, most of the work is done by physicists who contribute with IUPAP on top of their regular duties at their home institutions. Is it possible to increase IUPAP's visibility and/or impact with this type of functioning? Enlarging the support staff would require additional funds. What sources of additional funding could IUPAP apply to?

Q6) How could we measure the level of knowledge of IUPAP and/or the impact of its actions?

Q7) What other suggestions do you have?

These questions together with the internal evaluation report were sent to the Committee on February 7, 2024.

On March 9 2024 we had an initial virtual meeting with the committee, after which they started to organize their work on their own. They selected Atlas as their chair to communicate with us. We held other virtual meetings and provided all the information they required.

Q4) In 2021 we introduced a new membership type, Corporate Associate Member, to incorporate commercial companies or international research organizations that have a special relationship with the field of physics. These members pay dues but do not vote at the General Assembly. What type of actions would be best to attract the support of companies with interest in physics and/or physicists? How to better reach out to physicists outside academic and research institutions?

Q5) IUPAP has a very small support staff, most of the work is done by physicists who contribute with IUPAP on top of their regular duties at their home institutions. Is it possible to increase IUPAP's visibility and/or impact with this type of functioning? Enlarging the support staff would require additional funds. What sources of additional funding could IUPAP apply to?

Q6) How could we measure the level of knowledge of IUPAP and/or the impact of its actions?

Q7) What other suggestions do you have?

These questions together with the internal evaluation report were sent to the Committee on February 7, 2024.

On March 9 2024 we had an initial virtual meeting with the committee, after which they started to organize their work on their own. They selected Atlas as their chair to communicate with us. We held other virtual meetings and provided all the information they required.

On September 7 we received the very interesting report that Atlas will present.