**Report to AAPM on 2016 AIP Education Liaison Committee meeting**

The AIP Education Liaison Committee met in College Park, MD, on Friday, November 11, 2016. The following is my report:

After welcoming remarks and introductions, **Bo Hammer** (AIP) spoke about a new funding initiative, the Venture Partnership Fund. AIP invests up to $100K per year in member societies with individual grants in the range $10-$40K/year with an emphasis on developing is partnerships between the AIP and member societies that could not otherwise be funded. They are considering, in particular, education and outreach programs.

**Suggestion:** Is this something that AAPM Education Council should look into as a way o funding projects?

**Mike Henry** (AIP) spoke about the outlook for science under the new administration. The basic problem at this time is that there have been no clear policy details from Trump. He did not touch on science in his policy statements; moreover, there were many contradictions in his statements. It does not appear that science education will get much support. It may be desirable to follow the development of the Trump transition team; see the transition Trump website <https://www.greatagain.gov/>. Some of the transition issues and the individuals thought to be on the transition team are as follows:

EPA transition – Myron Ebell, global warming policy connected with free market

Energy transition – Mike McKenna, president of consulting firm, lobbied for Koch

NASA transition – Bob Walker and ? Abrecht, developed platform to move NASA, human exploration at end of century; public-private partnerships

NSF transition – political independence may be at risk, but the NSF director is appointed for a 6-year term, and a new director was recently appointed

It is not clear if a Director of the Office of Science and Technology will be appointed

One of Trump’s initiatives to reduce the size of the federal government is to allow offices to shrink because of attrition; hence a hiring freeze may be in effect.

Some hope for funding may be in the $1 trillion Trump wants to fund for infrastructure. Although the funding is likely to be focused on jobs, there might be space for science in that budget.

Things are looking more stable in Congress. The Chair of Science Committee will remain. Updates on science policy can be found at <https://www.aip.org/fyi>. Several Congressional champions of science are no longer in Congress, in particular, Barbara Mikulski.

It should be noted that in previous years, science funding has gone up with Republicans in control.

**Ramon Barthelemy** (AIP), a former Department of Education Fellow gave his perspectives. There was no umbrella science education office until Obama. He established the Office of STEM consisting of 2 political appointees and 2 Fellows. The intent was to centralize funding of science education, but there was a great deal of objection by individual agencies. The funding of programs in the Dept of Ed is a zero-sum game, but the primary pushes have been into computer science and coding rather than into physical sciences. The Office of STEM is not likely to be replaced in a Trump administration. It appears that his plan is extreme reduction, if not elimination, of the Dept of Ed including a redesign of the educational funding system replacing property taxes with vouchers; this replacement is likely to provide insufficient funding for education. There is also concern with the status of Office of Civil Rights within Dept of Ed. Finally it appears that Ben Carson is the leading candidate for Secy of Educ. He is not well-versed in the physical sciences or even the scientific process.

**Suggestion:** It may be advantageous for the AAPM to place a Fellow in either the Executive Branch or in Congress and provide medical physicist input into the workings of our government. After completing such an experience, the Fellow could provide us with a great deal of information on the workings of government and might even have additional influence on the staff of the individual he/she worked with. We may want to seek funding from the AAPM to support such a Fellow. In discussing this issue with Barthelemy, I was informed that the cost should be about $100K/yr providing the Fellow with a stipend and expenses. If we decide to go this route, we should work through the AAAS.

**Greg Mack** (APS) then spoke about the Physical Sciences Education Policy (PSEP) Coalition. The PSEP is a way to address priorities for science education by supporting funding of a science teacher corps. The issue with this is how to get Trump interested in science education; the need to teach why science is beneficial. A lengthy discussion then ensued on how to teach science as process rather than as collection of facts.

**Jeanne Narum** (PKAL) then led a discussion on how to evaluate education programs for impact/mission fit/cost. The take-away message from this discussion is that physicists are not really very good on assessment.

**Suggestion:** We’re not very good on assessment, either of student performance, the quality of our teaching/coursework, or of student candidates for program admission. I would like to propose we develop an educational module to provide medical physicist educators with instruction on assessment. This might also be a session for a Summer School program on education.

Several representatives from the constituent organizations spoke issues that they had encountered and how interaction with other committee members could assist them in resolving these issues.

Overall, I thought it to be a productive meeting. We received some very good information regarding the Washington scene. Much of the remainder of the meeting addressed K-12 education, with which we do not have a great deal of involvement, although this is an area that our Public Education Committee may have some impact. It appears that the AIP Education Liaison Committee meets once a year, so I am not clear how much follow-up we will see on action items discussed, but I will make a judgment after I see the minutes from the meeting.

George Starkschall