

# SEC Long-Term Organization w/ DPF & Ethics, pt. 2

March 19th, 2021

<https://indico.fnal.gov/event/48395/>

## 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, Fernanda Psihas, 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
    - **NOTE:** What is now point 5 was added during the course of this meeting, so some of the numbers have shifted. Those numbers are marked in red accordingly.

Recap from Last Three 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
6. LB Term Limits (*decided*)
  - 2 years staggered, with option to volunteer 2 additional years
7. 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](#))

8. LB Member Election Procedure (*decided*)
  - Nominations open to the community + members appointed by LB according to membership guidelines
9. LB Roles (not who occupies them) (*decided*)
  - Chair, Deputy Chair, DPF ExCom Liaison, DPF ExCom Adviser, Administrator, Treasurer, Webmaster, Sub-Committee/Initiative Chairs
10. Initial Sub-Committees/Initiatives (*decided*)
  - Inreach, DEI, Survey
11. Role of the DPF ExCom Reps (*decided*)
  - DPF Liaison and DPF EC Adviser, respectively. Eligible for any LB role
12. 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~~

([March 19, 2021](#); minutes [here](#))

**12. Role Election** (*decided*)

- Elected within the LB: Chair/Deputy Chair and Sub-Committee/Initiative Chairs
  - Volunteer basis or named by the Chair: Webmaster, Treasurer, Administrator

**13. External Liaisons** (*decided*)

- External EC Groups/Organizations can appoint someone to be a Representative to our LB, but not necessarily a member of it; no voting privileges
  - Invite external organizations to appoint someone to our board if they want, but we make the final decisions

**14. Membership Appointment Guidelines** (*undecided*)

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)

Moving Forward:

**15. Procedure to Add Sub-Committees/Initiatives**

- a. By petition from at least 3 LB members and majority vote of the LB
  - ~~b. By petition from at least 3 LB members and  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote of the LB~~
  - ~~c. By petition from at least 1 LB member and  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote of the LB~~
- Starting out, we can probably rule out option (c) since, assuming we will have 15 non-DPF ExCom LB members, 3 is only 1/5th of that, so if the initiative is important, that should be easily attainable

- ◆ Plus, the minimum number of people you want committed to a thing is really two Chairs and maybe one more person
- A majority vote should be fine if the interested parties are already present
  - ◆ It isn't like we're voting to hoist extra work onto someone who isn't entirely convinced this is necessary, just want a majority to think that it is necessary
- ★ All present parties in agreement concerning option (a)

## 16. Leadership of New Sub-Committees/Initiatives

- ~~a. By election immediately following their creation~~
- ~~b. Petitioners will co-chair until the following calendar year~~
- c. At least one of the petitioners will Chair/Co-Chair until the following calendar year, designated at the time of proposing the Sub-Committee/Initiative**
- As a note against option (b), if the petitioners are automatically in charge of the new Sub-Committee/Initiative, it perhaps excludes people by not giving them the option to be in charge
  - ◆ However, the petitioners did the work to put it forward, and it would only be until the following election cycle (so not even necessarily for a full year)
- What about if the proposal is a great idea, but is put forward/petitioned by someone who doesn't have the time to be the Chair?
  - ◆ Since there have to be three proposers, at least one should have to Chair until the next election cycle to make sure the Sub-Committee/Initiative gets established
    - Need to make sure for #15 that in the case where not all proposers intend to take up co-Chair positions, it is clear who the Chair will be
- ★ All present parties in agreement concerning option (c)

## 17. Procedure to Remove Sub-Committees/Initiatives

- ~~a. By petition from at least 3 LB members and unanimous vote of the LB~~
- b. By procedural review; yearly vote applying to each subcommittee before chair elections.  $\frac{2}{3}$  majority is necessary for removal.**
- We want the ability to remove committees maybe in cases where no one wants to do what that Sub-Committee/Initiative was created to do anymore, especially if there has been no interest for some time
  - ◆ Does not mean it could not be revived later
  - ◆ Want it to be obvious that a Sub-Committee/Initiative is not needed in the case of removal
- Something like a yearly procedural review before elections of the things that we, as an organization, really want to work and focus on could be useful here in identifying things that are no longer necessary
  - ◆ Would also give a yearly chance to revive any "retired" initiatives as well if interest has resurfaced or if the need for it has returned
- This seems a bit big for a simple majority vote though; want a minimum of  $\frac{2}{3}$

★ All present parties in agreement concerning option (b)

## 18. Procedure to Amend these Bylaws

- a. Discussion of amendments by petition of at least 2 LB members at a meeting of the LB and previous notice **in writing before** ~~to~~ at a meeting of the LB. Amendments require **discussion time, followed by** a  $\frac{2}{3}$  vote of the LB. **Unsuccessful amendments can be re-proposed after a period of at least one week.**
- This shouldn't be some overly easy thing, as we don't want them changing all the time, but we also don't want them to be fixed in stone, either
  - In organizations that Fernanda has experienced, any two people could propose an amendment, which would trigger a discussion by emailing all board members
    - ◆ One week post-proposition, the board would meet for discussion of the proposed amendment, make any modifications to it as necessary, and then vote to ratify it or not
    - ◆ This would probably work for us as well, with at least two necessary so you have, at minimum, a sponsor and co-sponsor for the amendment
  - No matter what, want to make sure that the process is clear concerning how much discussion time there is for an amendment and the expectations of the LB members within the timeframe between proposition and voting
    - ◆ What about contentious amendments? Or if life happens and some members don't get a chance to fully consider the amendment before the discussion?
      - We could allow one additional week for consideration and discussion, if necessary, to account for such scenarios. At the end of that second week, the vote happens.
- ★ All present parties in agreement with this structure (option (a))

Backtracking to items we had not yet fully decided upon...

## 4. Number of non-DPF ExCom LB Members

- ~~a. 12~~
  - b. 15
- We want a fixed number of board members, regardless of circumstances where an LB member may hold more than one established role
    - ◆ E.g., if the Chair of DEI is also the Treasurer, that would not mean we would only have 14 non-DPF LB members
    - ◆ Think of it like a soccer team, rather than a small business
  - These 15 members (plus the two DPF ExCom reps, should they wish to wear multiple hats (*not required*)) will populate the established roles and disperse themselves among the Sub-Committees/Initiatives (see #12 for which of these are elected and which are open to volunteers)
    - ◆ Eligible only for members in their second year (or later, if volunteered an additional two years as necessary) on the board: Chair of the LB, Chair of each Sub-Committee/Initiative

- ◆ Eligible for all members: Deputy Chair of the LB, Webmaster, Treasurer, Administrator, other leading members of the Sub-Committees/Initiatives
- ★ All present parties in agreement concerning option (b)

## 5. Voting Members

### a. Each LB member is a voting member

- A fixed number of voting members means a fixed number of votes
  - ◆ Being fixed at an odd number (17 votes) means a simple majority can always be reached
  - ◆ As terms are 2 years, this does imply that roughly every other year, one more LB member would be placed than others, but if there are some positions unavailable to first-year members (Chair and Sub-Committee/Initiative Chairs), this should not be too impactful
- ★ All present parties in agreement with this structure (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~~
- d. From student to 10 years (in field) after your highest professional degree
- e. From student to 10 years in the field after your highest professional degree, excluding faculty who oversee early career students or postdocs**

- Looking back on the last discussion of this point ([02/26 meeting](#)), the actual discussion being had was whether or not to include faculty members who fall within that “10 years (in field) after your highest professional degree” stipulation
  - Amber added the “(in field)” detail during the [meeting on 03/12](#) and that’s definitely the way to go
  - And we definitely don’t want to just say “Students and Postdocs” because that ignores Community Feedback Goal #5 and potentially doesn’t include engineers and technicians
  - ◆ Previous discussion in favor of including them: They could bring valuable insight to the organization, lots of experience and therefore perhaps connections that could be used for advocacy work, and could provide guidance about navigating a continued career in academia
  - ◆ Previous discussion against including them: It is possible that, as EC *professors*, they could have students or postdocs working for them who are also members of this organization. This could create a skewed power dynamic wherein those students/postdocs no longer felt safe expressing concerns within this organization (e.g., about work/life balance issues)
- If the main problem is the potential for a weird power dynamic, it would maybe be fine to have EC faculty who do not advise students and postdocs

- ◆ This would allow, e.g., academic staff scientists, who are typically still considered faculty but who do not have students/postdocs, to still be involved in the organization if they so desired
  - ◆ However, if there is some very compelling argument not to have them, could perhaps be convinced not to have any faculty members
- ★ Want to present options (d) and (e) to the Key Initiative Leadership for their input

#### 14. 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 one** candidate to the Chair. **At The vetoed nominee can, at the discretion of the Chair, be considered as a nominee for the following year** ~~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. **The LB will decide whether to veto the nominee in question.**
    - 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)
- While some concern was expressed (in [pt. 1 this morning](#)) that the idea of an explicitly given veto power, in writing in the bylaws, may really put some people off, it is critical that we ensure that it is there to protect those who need it without requiring them to expose themselves or divulge personal details
- ◆ This is an extreme case, but if a rape victim is on the LB and their rapist is nominated, they should absolutely be able to go to the Chair and veto them from being a candidate for a board position that year without having to go into detail
    - This happens more than we know, and if we want to be inclusive, we need to ensure everyone feels safe and empowered
  - ◆ Having a limit on the veto, i.e., someone can only veto one person a year, would likely ensure that people did not, and could not, abuse this power.

- It should be reserved for egregious cases, but should not require the person using their veto to share private information if they do not wish to do so
- There is also the option that the decision to veto or not would be a vote by the LB
  - ◆ The Chair would voice the concern to the board so as to keep the concerned member anonymous
- And we also still need to account for special circumstances that are not egregious in nature but still warrant deferment of a nominee to the next election, e.g., pregnancy
- Overall, this is a really really delicate matter that would likely be most responsibly handled through a meeting with *both* DPF Ethics Advisory Committee representatives (Amber & Jeremy) to discuss the approach to part (c)
  - ◆ At bare minimum, would appreciate their input on the wording for this so that if we take it to the Key Initiative leadership at-large with multiple options still, we can focus on the choice, not the diction
  - ◆ Fernanda to email Jeremy & Amber to try and find a time at least a couple of us can meet with the two of them soon
- ★ This item tabled for further discussion