SEC Long-Term Organization w/ DPF & Ethics

February 12th, 2021

https://indico.fnal.gov/event/47524/

GENERAL AGENDA:

- ➢ Discuss collaboration with Ethics representative and glean information on the Ethics Advisory Committee's formation and existence under APS DPF
- ➢ Discuss how best to use the pause in the Snowmass Process to develop a more mature organization
- ➢ Determine any "big-picture" items we might want to discuss at the next full Core Initiative Leadership meetings

ATTENDEES: Kristi Engel, Julia Gonski, Sara Simon, Fernanda Psihas, Amber Roepe, Garvita Agarwal

GOALS FROM COMMUNITY FEEDBACK:

Long-Term Organization Goals from Community Feedback

Define the long-term structure of the Early Career organization after the Snowmass process

1. Structure and continuity of this group beyond the Snowmass process
2. Determine how we continue to get new leadership and rotate leadership (e.g., as we age, how do we pull in new Early Career members?)
3. Website/Slack for permanent communication post-Snowmass
4. Renaming of the organization post-Snowmass
5. Consider who else needs representation (e.g., Engineers/technicians; input from Survey and DEI)
6. Collaborate with Early Career organizations
7. Making meetings and opportunities accessible for those with visas/around the world
8. Work/life balance
9. Impact of COVID-19 on careers

MINUTES:

- ➔ Meeting with the Ethics Advisory Committee representative (currently Amber Roepe), as well as Julia & Sara
  - ◆ Working list of topics to discuss with Ethics prior to this meeting (largely based on discussions from the Dec. 4th Initiative Leadership meeting and the Feb. 5th Long-Term Organization meeting):
    1. Their formation process, if they can speak to that

            - Do they advise us to exist under DPF based on their experiences of working with them?
        2. The kinds of things under their purview, so we know what we don't need to waste our time re-inventing within our organization
            - Or, if we "go rogue" and decide not to exist under DPF for some reason, this might be a discussion of what resources we could lean on them for within DPF
        3. If we see the Ethics Advisory Committee contributing to our White Paper in any way
    - ◆ We could potentially also ask them how they settled upon their leadership structure (which we believe to have been self-nomination based), and whether or not they feel that was a fair and equitable solution that might work for our organization
    - ◆ Perhaps also, if they have any thoughts on the matter, they could weigh in on goal 5 concerning who they feel needs representation and how our organization might address that topic
- ➔ As for whether or not they would advise us to exist under DPF, Amber has had great experiences working under DPF so far
    - ◆ However, it's important to keep in mind that they are the Ethics *Advisory Committee* (EAC), so their only purview as an advisory committee is to make recommendations
        - In this way, they're not the most official organization
    - ◆ But everyone has been very willing to work with the goals and recommendations of the EAC to make sure the community is safe for everyone
- ➔ It's also important to keep in mind that, unlike how we are currently approaching this with regards to our long-term early-career organization, DPF initiated/organized the EAC
    - ◆ The "seed has been planted for us, 'inception style'" with regards to DPF thinking about an organization or an advisory committee with our goals though, so us approaching them about it shouldn't be out-of-the-blue
- ➔ Amber overall recommends organization under DPF because it provides structure, but also a "chair line" as well
    - ◆ Built-in liaisons to other early-career structures and the APS higher-ups
- ➔ With respect to their leadership structure, the DPF Executive Committee chose from a pool of nominations
    - ◆ Nominations were open to the community and people could self-nominate or be nominated by others (either with or without being asked to by a person who also self-nominated)

        - But DPF seems to have had the final say and we really want our leadership to be decided by the early-career community, so this is perhaps not the best avenue for us to take

- Want a general idea of what are the current Long-Term Organization leadership's feelings on existing under DPF
    - If there is no strong pushback, we should think about approaching DPF soon to get things moving
        - This seems more than a bit antithetical to the proposed "bulletproof proposal" approach suggested in [the Dec. 4th Core Initiative Leadership Meeting] in that if we went to them soon, when we are not yet decided on our desired by-laws, it would definitely not be "bulletproof"
    - There seem to be some lingering concerns about attaching ourselves to DPF in a formal capacity, but mostly we've been viewing our mission and goals and trying to put structure around the organization we currently have as our principal concern, with whether or not to exist under DPF as the secondary
        - Having an existing set of structures going forward as our current focus, including knowing what our non-negotiables are
        - ★ But this isn't how the EAC came about. They weren't that established beforehand so DPF did have more say and control in their formation
            - Us pushing for "mandatory inclusion of someone within SEC," especially in a leadership role for DPF may not be okay with them; they may want some or almost complete control over who is in leadership
- Something to keep in mind as we consider the official formation of this organization outside of the Snowmass Process is that even when this was first being founded with respect to Snowmass, Sara experienced some animosity because they outsourced some of the initial procedural details to the early-career community
    - This seemed to mainly stem from the Frontiers themselves though, because they were upset they didn't get to pick who the Frontier liaisons were
    - Hopefully, because this would not involve the Frontiers, it may not be so bad for an advisory committee that is self-organized

- Wait… Are we talking about proposing an advisory committee under DPF or an organization under DPF?

    - We would present the idea to DPF of an early-career advisory committee that would have additional goals (the goals of our long-term organization)
        - *Note:* An advisory committee is less than 10 members!
    - Or, this advisory committee could bring forth issues from both leadership and members in DPF, with the organization itself (which would work towards aforementioned goals) linked to DPF through the advisory committee
- ➔ The main challenge is that we want our own leadership; we don't want DPF picking leaders for us
    - We feel strongly that we do NOT want to do what the EAC did to choose our leaders, as the DPF Executive Committee had a direct hand in who ended up being involved
- ➔ It is written into APS/DPF that there must be early-career members in the EAC and the Executive Committee, so if we did want to set up an organization outside of DPF, we could establish a sort of liaison structure using the guaranteed early-career members
    - The EAC could bring up any issues for us, but they are just advisory in nature, so they don't have much real power and there is no way to force DPF to listen to them
- ➔ Leaders of our organization could be pitched to DPF as non-negotiably picked/nominated/elected on our own, with our formal liaison to them being the early-career member of the Executive Committee
    - We aren't saying we would pick the Executive Committee representative or ask for additional say in who that might be, but whomever DPF picks would be tasked to work with us as part of that position if this was the approved DPF plan
    - The Executive Committee representative could also be used as a "temperature gauge" as to how much DPF is listening/engaging with concerns from the early-career community
        - Their involvement might vary by member (we may not always be as lucky as we have been with Fernanda, Sara, and Julia), which is why we would want to push DPF to make this liaising a formal part of their job/task them with it
- ➔ It might also be the path of least resistance to include the early-career leader on the EAC as a formal part of our membership
    - Want to have places for them, and the Executive Committee representative, to "plug in" to our organization
        - There is likely to be less pushback if it doesn't look like we're trying to control DPF, just interface

- ➔ In terms of formal structure, we have outlined several plans here, following the Feb. 5th Long-Term Organization meeting
    - ◆ This is meant to be our initial proposal for how we will structure the organization
    - ◆ The first part of the document is how the organization is structured now and how we might modify this to be more effective long term/better meet needs expressed by the community
    - ◆ Deliverables can be found at the bottom based on the community feedback on long-term goals for the long-term organization
        - Added by-laws to the deliverables tasked to us as they will be necessary to move forward with any semblance of legitimacy
- ➔ We do want to keep some of the structure we have now
    - ◆ Want the DPF representative to liaise and we want them on this board in some capacity, but we're not sure how much power we really want to give them
        - We definitely want them on this board, but just maybe not leading it as they are chosen by DPF, not the community
    - ◆ Could consider having both members in chair positions on our board with the intent to simplify continuity of the organization
        - This might eliminate some internal politics
        - And may also legitimize our board in the eyes of DPF
- ➔ One proposed option has a community-elected President *and* the DPF representatives as Chair and Deputy Chair… What's the difference between the Chair leading and a President leading?
    - ◆ This is really a question about how much say do we want to give DPF here?
        - They don't always make the best decisions for the early-career community (probably not maliciously, just not necessarily focused on early-career needs like we would be)
    - ◆ We could maybe have the DPF representatives as Adviser/Deputy Adviser rather than as Chairs
        - Sara advises we use "Liaison" rather than "Adviser" for this DPF position
        - The idea of assigning them as Chairs would also be to avoid frustrations that leadership, e.g., Fernanda and Amber, have experienced in other settings wherein you are asked to pick leaders out of a room of people with whom you are unfamiliar
- ★ This also puts more work on the DPF representatives and takes away our power to choose our own leadership (and we know that the DPF nominations are not representative)

    - Elected leadership is really important to us; non-negotiable even
        - Once a system is set up, we could elect a Chair from the constituency and have the previous Chair move into the Deputy Chair position for continuity purposes like ATLAS does
    - And it *is* a lot to ask people who go for an Executive Committee representative position to lead this whole other organization for two years
        - This could be a breaking point that causes genuinely good candidates not to go for it, thus damaging our/the early-career community's link to DPF
- ➔ Terming the DPF representative's position as an "advisory role" as this does not force additional work upon them
    - We could maybe have the advisory position be for the previous DPF representative without asking people to do additional work as they have, by design, worked with the new representative and current leadership, and thus would make effective liaisons
    - Sara strongly feels it needs to be someone *currently* on the Executive Committee in this role
        - Having Adviser and Deputy Adviser as their positions would rectify this
        - Gives DPF a clear method of communication; provides good transparency between us and DPF itself

- ★ But Julia does not have much faith that APS will recognize any external organization
    - Even having a direct liaison they chose will not necessarily make them listen
    - Legitimacy comes from being formally wedded to DPF
        - Want to formalize everything up front, and when that formalization occurs, push as hard as we can about maintaining autonomy over things like electing our own leadership (non-negotiable)
    - This planning document is a great place to start and iterate upon, but even things like getting DPF to charge their Executive Committee representative with an advising role… We don't know if that's feasible
- ➔ Want to have an informal meeting with Tao Han and Young-Kee Kim
        - Our best chance at getting this accomplished and getting the things we want is apparently while YKK is still involved and in power
    - We could gauge a lot from how passive aggressive they are about everything

        - Would allow us to “take the temperature” of DPF to an organization such as the one we are proposing and its potential relationship to DPF
        - Also strategize how to most effectively formally present our organization to the DPF Executive Committee in terms of legitimacy
    - Want to make plans for the best-case outcome (full acceptance), as well as the worst-case outcome (shut out)
        - What would the DPF representative role look like in each case?
        - What would the overall leadership look like in each case?

IN CLOSING:

- Want to meet next week to further this discussion
    - Continue to flesh out the planning document with our “bulletproof” proposal
    - Maybe also have an informal set of notes to go to a meeting with Tao and Young-Kee
- Also want to identify where any lingering questions or reservations lie so that they may be effectively addressed