

October 14 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/6p3jYOYljOjbMjm>
 - i.) Password: SECDEI
 - ii.) Please add resources to it as you see fit
- Change-Now Physics website ([link](#))

2.) Journal club on Oct 21

- **The mixed effects of online diversity training** Edward H. Chang, Katherine L. Milkman, Dena M. Gromet, Robert W. Rebele, Cade Massey, Angela L. Duckworth, Adam M. Grant, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences Apr 2019, 116 (16) 7778-7783;
 - i.) <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1816076116>
 - (1) <https://hbr.org/2019/07/does-diversity-training-work-the-way-its-supposed-to>
 - (2) <https://hbr.org/2016/07/why-diversity-programs-fail>
- **“Science faculty’s subtle gender biases favor male students”** Corinne A. Moss-Racusin, John F. Dovidio, Victoria L. Brescoll, Mark J. Graham, and Jo Handelsman, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, October 9, 2012 109 (41) 16474-16479;
 - i.) <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211286109>
 - (1) <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/25/science/bias-persists-against-women-of-science-a-study-says.html>
 - (2) <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/10/06/magazine/why-are-there-still-so-few-women-in-science.html>

3.) CPM Meeting Presentation feedback?

4.) Long Term White Paper

5.) Early Career Experience Survey (related to the proposed CommF03 town hall series)

6.) Other Business

Meeting Minutes:

1. Focus on issues of race/ethnicity for upcoming journal readings
 - a. Coincides well with Black In Physics week coming up
 - b. Start with “mixed effects of online diversity training”
2. Last week was Snowmass Community Planning Meeting
 - a. Discussion about inclusivity for those not looking to stay in the academic track
 - i. Long-term organization meeting this Friday will discuss this
 1. Plan to write a white paper on long-term future of SEC initiatives, which includes the DEI initiative
 - a. Asked to write ~1 page outline on SECDEI future (~November timescale)
 - b. Need to put everything together in order to get feedback from full SEC group
 - c. Wait to see how DPF ethics committee evolves? May not have enough time due to holidays. Should know who is on committee by ~end of October
 - d. Will try and put together a Google Doc for collaboration on outline
 - b. Discussion from Energy Frontier parallel session about choosing inclusive memes
 - c. Community engagement plenary on Wednesday
3. Early Career Experience Survey
 - a. SEC DEI has agreed to obtain information on early career experiences; have begun putting together another survey
 - i. Feedback: previous survey was too long
 - ii. New survey has many sections, but most respondents will not respond to all/most of the sections
 1. Ordering of questions largely determined by branching (i.e. senior faculty members don’t have to answer about research advisor)
 - iii. Should we use Qualtrics/something that is not a Google form?
 1. Erin will try and move the survey to Qualtrics, and may also help with the response analysis
 - iv. How do we define “traditional” career path? Example: trained/studied as an engineer, then took an engineering job, without gaps. Nontraditional may be someone who trained as an

- engineer, then took a physics job. May not need a separate “nontraditional career follow up” section (can instead just show options, plus a “my career path was traditional” option, to everyone)
- v. Choosing not to allow multiple choices in current career stage due to question branching
 - vi. Choosing to ask about having an advisor for >2 months, since working under an advisor less than this may make it hard to know them well
 - 1. Adding an option to state that one has a co-advisor, without answering the questions again regarding the co-advisor
 - 2. Will change some of the “Yes/No” questions in advising section to sliding scale options
 - 3. Including an alternative “supervisor” follow-up section for those in technical positions (largely the same questions)
 - vii. Will follow up on sense of belonging questions based on journal paper (from Erin)
 - viii. How to ask about minor microaggressions? Is “annoying” dismissive?
 - b. Rest of survey overview: sections for interactions with juniors and peers, personal perceptions of professional status, demographic information, work-life balance (not all are finished yet)
 - i. Should we be collecting demographic data?
 - ii. Extra help on this survey is appreciated

Chat Log

From Sara Michelle Simon to Everyone: (2:07 PM)

<https://www.blackinphysics.org/events/>

From Erin Hansen to Everyone: (2:13 PM)

Sorry, I missed all of that, I'm having internet issues this week. I'm comfortable presenting the articles I posted at next week's meeting or at a later date.

From Me to Everyone: (2:14 PM)

We'll start with the first paper in the agenda and then progress into your articles in subsequent journal clubs.

From Erin Hansen to Everyone: (2:14 PM)

perf

From Erin Hansen to Everyone: (2:18 PM)

I can help but not be point -- DNP is at the end of the month

From Sara Michelle Simon to Everyone: (2:18 PM)

DO we want to brainstorm together?

From Erin Hansen to Everyone: (2:29 PM)

I'm definitely down to help with this! I've worked extensively with qualtrics. Its definitely easier to draft in Google Forms but analysis is WAY easier in Qualtrics. (more mongoDB style sorting) can we define "traditional" more clearly?

From Erin Hansen to Everyone: (2:50 PM)

for a later question -- it might be interesting to ask what their primary mechanism was for network building (self driven, advisor, peer groups, prof organizations)

From Amber Roepe (she/her) to Everyone: (2:56 PM)

Sorry I need to connect to another meeting