

SEC Long-Term Organization w/ DPF & Ethics

February 26th, 2021

<https://indico.fnal.gov/event/48061/>

GENERAL AGENDA:

- Discuss DPF “bulletproof proposal” for the long-term organization and potential structures and leadership approaches ([planning doc](#))
- 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, Joshua Barrow

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:

→ Facets of the proposal for the long-term organization (planning document [here](#)) have been split up for discussion one-by-one

- ◆ The goal is to take 5–10 minutes to come to an obvious agreement as to which option we should choose, or move on and come back to it later
 - Gives us a good idea of what will and won't be contentious
- ◆ **Red options** indicate those added during the course of this meeting

1. Membership of SEC

- a. All early-career members of the HEP field
- ~~b. All early-career members of the HEP field with active DPF memberships~~
- There is some degeneracy of the term 'member'... Here we mean people we are representing
 - ◆ Option (a) would possibly require a way to confirm that the members are actually working in the HEP field
 - But it would allow us to cast a wider net as to whom we represent, which is desirable
 - ◆ Option (b) would possibly require some way to confirm membership in DPF
 - In some organizations, "confirming memberships" is done using mailing lists
 - ◆ Either way, confirmation of membership is typically mostly relevant to check when giving grants, etc., so may not be something we need to worry about right this moment
- There is some concern about restricting this to DPF members... What about people in DAP, etc., Kristi and Tiffany, who are not only definitely active in this field but also active in current SEC leadership roles?
 - It might not be an option for everyone to join multiple divisions
 - ◆ Julia's vote is for option (a); we don't want to hide membership in the organization itself behind any kind of pay wall
- ★ All present parties in agreement concerning option (a)

2. Early Career Definition

- a. From student to 10 years after your highest professional degree
- b. Postdocs and from student to 10 years after your highest professional degree
- ~~c. Students and Postdocs~~
- Are we defining "Early Career" here?
 - ◆ We could adopt the definition from [the July SEC memo to the DPF Executive Committee](#)... *"As a guideline, SEC roughly defines early career as up to ~10 years post-PhD. However, we recognize that many people have different paths that can include career gaps and changes. We thus encourage anyone that feels that early career applies to them to join the organization. We also encourage those involved in the technical, operations, or engineering aspects of HEP experiments who may or may not obtain a PhD as part of their career path to join."*
 - Some people had problems with the 10-year rule
 - Do we know what they were? Or was it just concerning non-standard career paths?
 - What about people who put their career on pause?
 - We did purposefully leave this really vague in the memo to cover such a scenario

- ◆ What about engineers & technicians?
 - This is also covered in the memo, but we could go with something like “10 years after highest obtained degree” to be more inclusive
- What about early faculty? Are we including them in this?
 - ◆ Pre-tenured faculty probably count here, and it might be a positive force to have these people around or at least listening within the organization
 - ◆ However, the challenges and priorities of people in these positions can be quite different from that of students & post-docs
 - ◆ There are also potential issues if we represent both students and their employers (since presumably some of those early faculty members will have students of their own who would be eligible to join), especially in cases of harassment, work/life balance, etc.
- Having groups with different goals doesn't mean we have to exclude them
 - ◆ Transitions from some of these positions to others (e.g., post-doc to early faculty) can be really fast
 - We expect more aging out of members rather than early faculty only joining once they're faculty and then trying to dominate the conversation
 - ◆ But we do want to be mindful of the power dynamics at play here
- What about how our membership impacts efforts to do with funding & advocacy?
 - ◆ Currently, funding & advocacy language is very carefully worded to Congress so as to not be contentious... Funding things like harassment defense might not be able to go through these same channels
 - ◆ We also want to be able to do independent advocacy, and the relationship of a faculty member to the funding agencies may be problematic
 - Can we not have parallel efforts?
 - Josh feels that strikes, etc., in the past year or so have put us in a “brave new world” in terms of what we can do within HEP as students and faculty
 - ◆ Hypothetical: If the long-term organization were to put forth a proposal to Congress, might it not be more impactful if we had young faculty members on our side as well as students, etc.?
 - This doesn't seem to be the experience so far
 - But they do, in general, seem to be more apt to listen to people they have already worked with, and funding ties to young faculty may be an useful “in”
- ★ This item to be tabled for further discussion
 - Amber to formulate more inclusive wording

3. Leadership Board (LB) Membership

- a. 2 DPF ExCom Reps (previous and current EC) + N board members
- The N here is the number of board members besides the DPF Executive Committee early-career representatives, addressed below in #4
 - ◆ Of those N, should we have one from each unit or experiment?

- Placing board members by experiment would favor larger experiments and blow up the number of board members that we have
 - ◆ N is likely to be defined by specific roles; strive for a representative group to choose from for each one
 - ◆ Could we maybe pull from some of the large organizations that already exist, like the Fermi user groups?
 - Would they want to be involved?
 - Want to “leave a seat open” for these external organizations so they can plug in (added as a point for discussion at the end of this section)
- ★ All present parties in agreement with this structure (option (a))

4. Number of non-DPF ExCom LB Members

~~a. 12~~

b. 15

- This would be the N-value from point #3
 - ◆ It really depends on the breakdown... How many committees/subcommittees will we have?
 - And how many members per committee/subcommittee? Two?
 - ◆ Want to have at least one more seat, if not a couple more, than strictly planned for by the roles at the outset
 - There are currently 4 Key Initiatives with ~3 leaders each, so 12 may be limiting
- We probably want to discuss the roles themselves before we make this decision
 - ◆ Also have something in the bylaws to allow change over time of this number as needed

- ★ Tentatively, present parties are in agreement concerning option (b), but also agree this should be returned to following future related discussions

5. LB Term Limits

~~a. 2 years~~

~~b. 2 years staggered~~

c. 2 years staggered with option to volunteer 2 additional years

- *Note:* These are the terms for the “N” LB members who are not DPF ExCom reps. The terms of the ExCom reps are defined by DPF and we are not proposing to try and change their existing structures
- We’ve already seen the benefits of staggering, so we can really rule out option (a) from the start
 - ◆ This may mean the first iteration is only a year, but that’s probably fine
 - ◆ Or we can ask the current leaders if they would be willing to stay on an extra year to facilitate this overlap
 - Then they would rotate out
- What about max term limits?

- ◆ For the Ethics Advisory Committee (EAC), the initial term is 2 years, but they can ask to stay on an additional 2 years for a max limit of 4 years served
- ◆ Want the organization to stay dynamic and healthy with leadership turnover
 - But how easy will it be to recruit our replacements?
 - Need to get better at inreach/outreach/networking recruitment for this purpose
- ◆ An option to volunteer to stay an additional term could help alleviate recruiting woes
 - Term limit implied with this

★ All present parties in agreement concerning option (c)

6. LB Member Eligibility

~~a. Any member of SEG~~

~~b. Any member of SEG and active member of DPF~~

c. Any member of SEG and active member of APS

i. Advertise resources for helping in funding fees

- This one is different than point #1 because, in principle, you care about this person's involvement in the field and/or their ties to DPF
 - ◆ It's important that those persons in leadership/board positions are "paying their taxes" to the field/organization; want to make sure they're actively involved in the field and contributing to it
 - Maybe just requirement of general membership within APS (for the whole of the term served)
 - ◆ We don't want to shut someone out if they're technically in DAP, DGRAV, etc.
 - ◆ APS also supposedly has resources for people who cannot afford their membership fees
 - Maybe confirm the details of this with the APS Director of Membership or Young-Kee Kim/Tao Han
 - Definitely want to advertise this when recruiting for the leadership positions so people know that financial situations should not be a barrier to being on the board
 - DPF may have opinions about this... Are we still planning on an informal meeting with Tao Han & Young-Kee Kim to gauge how feasible some options are or are not within DPF?
 - ◆ Yes, after fleshing out this document
 - ◆ At least to discuss an "Advisory Committee"
 - This does raise some concerns per discussions from [the last of these meetings on 02/12](#) (max size of an advisory committee, lack of ability to push back on decisions, etc.)
- ★ All present parties in agreement concerning option (c)

12. External Liaisons (for discussion next meeting)

CLOSING REMARKS:

- Want to ratify this past the rest of the Key Initiative leadership
 - Definitely want to have a comment period once the bylaws are written with ratification by [$\frac{2}{3}$?] majority vote
 - Devote the Key Initiative meeting next month to this
- Next meeting? There's obviously significantly more discussion to be had
 - Maybe sometime next week (just not Friday)?
 - Or two weeks from now?
 - Definitely this, but will try to meet in between