

September 30 SECDEI Agenda

1.) Introduction and Resources

- SECDEI Leadership [Google Spreadsheet](#)
 - i.) Contact the current leaders if you are interested in a leadership position that the spreadsheet does not accommodate
 - ii.) We can also deputize people for specific tasks
- A SEC website exists: <https://usyoungparticlephysicists.github.io>
 - i.) Any volunteers?
 - ii.) Contact Fernanda Psihas for editing access
- CERNbox Link: <https://cernbox.cern.ch/index.php/s/6p3jYOYIjOjbMjm>
 - i.) Password: SECDEI
 - ii.) Please add resources to it as you see fit
- Change-Now Physics website ([link](#))
- (Sep 23) Journal Club Discussion Resource: <https://forms.gle/oJ5xcDHrPEW6RJcr7>

2.) Because of CPM we propose skipping the journal club on Oct 7 and return for the one on Oct 21, keeping the business meeting on Oct 14.

3.) CPM Meeting Presentation

- 20 minutes shared in between all SEC Initiatives
- Introduce and Explain SEC-DEI organization:
 - i.) CommF03 (for the duration of the Snowmass 2021 process) **and**
 - ii.) Long Term Initiative of SEC
- What we've done:
 - i.) LOI participation
 - ii.) Town Hall discussion
 - iii.) Evaluating the diversity of SEC leadership
 - iv.) SEC Community resources (anonymous dropbox, town halls, journal clubs)
- What will we do:
 - i.) Continue the projects
 - ii.) Continue working with the DPF Ethics Task Force (and the future committee)
 - iii.) Work with the SEC Long Term organization and all the other SEC pieces to make sure we have representation of different groups in all levels
- Advertise how people can join our discussions

4.) Discussion about the meeting with the Ethics Task Force ([blue are discussion points](#))

- The box has wording that CoC issues should be reported instead to the ethics committee and lists who will see submissions

- The plan is to have an anonymized report of what happened and what was done to stay within account that holds the box. Purpose is as training tool to see examples. Anything with sensitive info excluded. [Could be useful to share this with Ethics Committee.](#)
 - i.) Need to understand how we'd do that (e.g. report?). Would need to update the language on the box itself to match policy to make process clear (Needs further discussion)
- If someone misuses the box (ie. reports something and specifically says do not tell the Ethics Committee) or comes to SECDEI leaders directly with concerns, could use our judgement. That comes with a lot of responsibility. There was concern about possible egregious reports that people don't want reported to the Ethics Committee. [We could protect ourselves from that harm/responsibility by making SECDEI leaders and box readers mandatory reporters.](#)
 - i.) We're not currently mandatory reporters. Current readers for the box are comfortable with responsibility for it.
- The SECDEI leadership could possibly get the same training as the Ethics Committee for handling things. We should also always feel free to say "I am not qualified to help with this, but let's help you find someone who is". Can help alleviate fears of talking to the Ethics Committee by making process clear to those that may confide in us.
- There should be a period of public feedback/vetting for anyone gaining access from the box, and the Ethics Committee should be notified so that they can give feedback too (i.e. if they have any reports on a person they could voice a concern). [We could also consider this for SECDEI leadership positions too since people may come to them as well.](#)
 - i.) Since SECDEI leadership terms are shorter, could do a full list of leadership positions
 - ii.) Process more rigorous for box readers
- There should always be two people involved in hearing something even if it is brought up in private channels. (i.e. we should say it is policy for safety of those reporting to always have 2 people and ask if they can invite specific named people to the discussion). This helps prevent one person from discounting someone's experience.
- [It sounds like we are open to letting people other than leadership run the box, and this could have longer terms especially if they will get the same training. We should re-gauge interest since it has been a while and channel had fewer people earlier on.](#)
 - i.) At present original readers are staying on and hasn't been discussion on changing yet
 - ii.) Could discuss adding people/structure for changing over? Maybe period of ~6 months? Readers should be longer than leadership terms because of the amount of training, etc. A year might be better-->could sync up with

Ethics Committee Training schedule

- 5.) Early Career Experience Survey (related to the proposed CommF03 town hall series)
 - We need to come up with a draft (based on the Sep 16 meeting discussion)
 - Any volunteers?

- 6.) Other Business