

# SEC Long-Term Organization w/ DPF & Ethics, pt. 1

March 19th, 2021

<https://indico.fnal.gov/event/48388/>

## 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, Fernanda Psihas, Amber Roepe, Pranava Teja Surukuchi

## 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

Recap from Last Two Meetings:

([February 26, 2021](#); minutes [here](#))

1. Membership of SEC (*decided*)
  - All early-career members of the HEP field
2. Early Career Definition (*undecided*)
  - 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~~
  - d. From student to 10 years (in field) after your highest professional degree
3. Leadership Board (LB) Membership (*decided*)
  - Two DPF ExCom Reps + N Board Members
4. Number of non-DPF ExCom LB Members (*~decided*)
  - [Tentatively] 15
    - We need to discuss the roles themselves before making a final decision on this
5. LB Term Limits (*decided*)
  - 2 years staggered, with option to volunteer 2 additional years
6. LB Member Eligibility (*decided*)
  - Any member of SEC and active member of APS (advertise resources for helping with funding fees)

([March 12, 2021](#); minutes [here](#))

7. LB Member Election Procedure (*decided*)
  - Nominations open to the community + members appointed by LB according to membership guidelines
8. LB Roles (not who occupies them) (*decided*)
  - Chair, Deputy Chair, DPF ExCom Liaison, DPF ExCom Adviser, Administrator, Treasurer, Webmaster, Sub-Committee/Initiative Chairs
9. Initial Sub-Committees/Initiatives (*decided*)
  - Inreach, DEI, Survey
10. Role of the DPF ExCom Reps (*decided*)
  - DPF Liaison and DPF EC Adviser, respectively. Eligible for any LB role
11. Role Election (*~decided*)
  - a. Elected within the LB: Chair/Deputy Chair and Sub-Committee/Initiative Chairs
    - Volunteer basis or named by the Chair: Webmaster, Treasurer, Administrator
      - Seemed agreed on this, but no final decision due to time
  - ~~b. All elected~~

## Moving Forward:

### 11. Role Election

- a. Elected within the LB: Chair/Deputy Chair and Sub-Committee/Initiative Chairs
    - Volunteer basis or named by the Chair: Webmaster, Treasurer, Administrator
  - ~~b. All elected~~
- Due to time constraints, while we seemed mostly in agreement concerning this point last meeting, we did not come to a concrete decision.
- ◆ No objections to option (a)
- ★ All present parties in agreement concerning option (a)

### 12. External Liaisons

From discussion on 02/26 ([see notes for #3](#)), floated the idea about wanting to “leave a seat open” for external organizations, such as the Fermi user groups, so they can plug into our organization.

- ~~a. External EC Group/Organization leaders can “plug in” to the LB, but do not have voting privileges (unless they are separately holding a traditional LB position)~~
  - ~~b. External EC Group/Organization leaders can “plug in” to the LB and hold at-large voting privileges (assuming they do not separately hold a traditional LB position)~~
  - ~~c. External EC Group/Organization leaders can “plug in” to the organization, but not to the LB~~
  - d. External EC Groups/Organizations can appoint someone to be a Representative to our LB, but not necessarily a member of it; no voting privileges
    - i. Invite external organizations to appoint someone to our board if they want, but we make the final decisions
- Having this kind of liaison thing should be pretty easy to implement
- ◆ Would be especially good for fostering discussion and hearing ideas between groups
  - ◆ Maybe we could establish liaisons in both directions, but there’s probably no need for them to be a voting member (assuming they do not independently already hold a position on our LB)
- We do definitely want to codify this in our bylaws
- ◆ Want to make a list of organizations we think are relevant to reach out to
  - ◆ Thinking more user organizations, like the [FSPA](#), rather than representatives from experiments

- If the latter, would likely get very overwhelming very fast and could over-represent large experiments as well as experimentalists in general (leaving out theorists)
- Maybe don't want to call them a "liaison," though
  - Want something more formal like ~~Adviser~~/Representative
  - ◆ Would invite these external organizations to appoint someone to be their Representative to us and join in with our organization
- We do want them to have direct access to the board, just not necessarily voting privileges
  - ◆ "Plug in" sounds too informal or invites their interaction with us to be infrequent.
    - Want the Representatives to be fixtures of the Board, just not voting ones (again, assuming they do not already separately hold an LB position)
  - ◆ Want to invite them to the conversation, but we make the final decisions
- ★ All present parties in agreement concerning option (d)

### 13. Membership Appointment Guidelines

Incoming members of the LB will be appointed by the current LB out of the list of nominees according to the following guidelines:

- a. Appointment of each member will be decided upon:
    - ~~i. At a meeting of the LB and by majority vote from the LB~~
    - ii. At a meeting of the LB and by majority  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote from the LB
    - ~~iii. At a meeting of the LB and by unanimous decision of the LB~~
  - b. The LB will appoint incoming members considering:
    - i. Nominee statements, number of nominations, diversity of fields, general LB diversity
  - c. Extenuating/special circumstances clause:
    - i. Any LB member can anonymously veto a candidate to the Chair. At the discretion of the Chair if the veto defers the candidate for a year (by one election cycle)
    - ii. Egregious concerns about a candidate can be brought to the Chair, who can voice this concern to the LB while keeping the concerned member anonymous
    - iii. Candidates who have been nominated can be deferred to the following election cycle by the Chair (either by the candidate themselves or someone else approaching the Chair)
- This one isn't so much picking between options (a), (b), (c), etc., but rather, which option of each guideline do we feel is the best choice, as well as adding any additional, needed guidelines to this list
- In terms of voting (option (a)), getting a unanimous decision may be a bit too difficult

- ◆  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority is probably doable; for an LB of, e.g., 15 voting members, this would be 10 votes for confirmation
- There needs to be some discussion about what group of people will be appointed...  
Not entirely sure how to codify that
  - ◆ To meet diversity/equity concerns and make sure our LB is representative, would we not be voting on a group of people, rather than making decisions one-by-one?
    - As the placement of one LB role could restrict the options for the next, resulting in the last role to be assigned being potentially very restricted indeed to meet our desired level of inclusivity and representation
- And what happens if there is an extenuating circumstance and someone has a *very* good reason as to why a certain candidate should not be placed into a leadership role (harassment, etc.)?
  - ◆ Could we establish some sort of ability for a current LB member to anonymously veto a candidate to the Chair? Then the Chair could report this veto to the whole of the LB without having to say who called for the veto or why
    - If we've placed them in an LB role, theoretically we trust them to take this sort of power seriously
      - We also don't want to force anyone to have to disclose details of a situation they are not comfortable disclosing in order to feel safe within this organization and our Board
    - Maybe something to discourage any abuse of this power such as restricting the ability to one veto per year?
  - ◆ It would then be up to the Chair as to whether the candidate in question is deferred by a year (one full election cycle) or permanently removed from the ballot
    - This raises the (somewhat separate) question of what our policy will be for deferring candidates who are not elected by the LB or if we want a clean slate each cycle, but we can come back to that
  - ◆ Moving forward with this idea of the Chair having the final decision as to whether to defer a candidate or permanently block them... We couldn't keep a list of "blocked" candidates as this would be a liability, so any sort of removal from the ballot would be semi-permanent at most
    - Hypothetically, if the issue was a large enough one that it would be widely considered the kind of thing for which a permanent block might be placed, one would think that more than just one person would be aware of it
- This shouldn't just be for negative extenuating circumstances— want to establish this clause for any special circumstance with the ability for a candidate to be deferred to the next election cycle for any reason
  - ◆ E.g., maybe someone is nominated by the community, and they'd really like to take up the leadership mantle, but they're pregnant, so they feel they cannot do so this year

- Having explicit “veto text” in the bylaws may freak some people out
  - ◆ We might make it so that one of the initial conditions of the LB is that if someone has a convincing argument as to why a particular candidate should not be eligible for a leadership position, they could make that to the Board
    - We, as the LB, are not judge, jury, and executioner, and we do not want to force anyone to be that/put them in a difficult position
  - ◆ But we also really don’t want to force people to disclose things of a delicate nature/things they are not comfortable disclosing; a rape victim on the LB should not have to disclose to the whole of the LB that they were raped to prevent their rapist from being considered for an LB role
    - The bar for reporting these kinds of very sensitive things is already really high, so we need to be careful not to make it any higher
- This really may be the kind of thing we don’t make a single choice on and, rather, bring it to the larger Key Initiative Leadership group
- ★ This item tabled for further discussion

### **CLOSING REMARKS/LOGISTICS PLANNING:**

- Do we want to circulate this document 7–10 days before a meeting with the whole of the Key Initiative Leadership? Meeting would be ~1 hr. (maybe the week of March 29th?) with a vote to ratify the bylaws at the end of that meeting
  - Would allow us to solicit feedback on the document asynchronously during that period prior to the meeting
  - This is really important, but would maybe not be the most effective because likely some decent portion of people would not get a chance to read the document prior to the meeting, and then feel uncomfortable ratifying it after only an hour with it
- We would also want to meet with Tao Han & Young Kee Kim in the week before the meeting with Key Initiative leadership (maybe the week of March 22nd?)
  - Last time we talked with the other leaders, we did say this was the plan to meet with DPF leadership before coming to them for ratification
  - We would really need to find a time to meet between now and then; would want to have us “be good” with this document so we can send it to them to set up said meeting
  - It’s also a tight squeeze and a prayer that we can find a time that works on such short notice
- What if we talk through the nominal plans/bylaws at a meeting with the Key Initiative Leadership, answer any questions they may have, open the Google Doc for comments, and then have another meeting for ratification a week–a few weeks later?
  - Would still meet our desired goal of having these bylaws written and ratified before the Snowmass process officially restarts