

Comments on IPP Theory Fellowship program Heather Logan (Carleton U.)

- Started 2006 as joint project (IPP/Perimeter); continued 2008 IPP alone
- Provided \$20k/year for 2 years for a postdoc; 2 postdocs per year → \$80k/year steady state cost
- $\mathcal{O}(10)$ nominations per year, almost all of good quality; typically 1 nomination per group (i.e., of their top candidate)
- committee made ordered reversion list; offers typically ran down below the “half-way point”

Issue: intense hiring cycle (see D. Morrissey’s talk) means reversion-list frenzy during January–early February; ability to land one’s top candidate a rare thing.

Distribution of IPP(+Perimeter in cycle 1)–funded postdocs:

McGill	7	
UBC	3	
Carleton	1	→ faculty job abroad after 6 mo.
McMaster/Perimeter	1	joint position
U. de Montréal	1	
Toronto	1	

Distribution does not reflect the selection committee's orderings. Main selection factor in practice was which groups managed to hire their first-choice candidate. **“The rich get richer . . .”**

And this was a zero-sum game since the money came from the SAP envelope!

My perception was that the IPP fellowship offer did not have a significant effect on postdoc candidates' acceptance decisions.

My main concern for future IPP theory-HQP support: should not inadvertently funnel yet more resources to the largest groups.

Should aim to best leverage Theory faculty's research capacity to maximize physics output.