

SEC Long-Term Organization w/ DPF Chairs

April 2nd, 2021

<https://indico.fnal.gov/event/48588/>

GENERAL AGENDA:

- Gain insight from Tao Han & Young-Kee Kim as to where DPF sees our organization fitting within current structures
- Obtain feedback from Tao Han & Young-Kee Kim on the ideal bylaws and structure for our organization we have established thus far
- Solicit opinions from Tao Han & Young-Kee Kim concerning our two undecided items (EC Definition and Egregious/Special Cases)

ATTENDEES: Kristi Engel, Julia Gonski, Sara Simon, Fernanda Psihas, Amber Roepe, Joshua Barrow, Sam Homiller, Ivan Lepetic, Mateus Carneiro, Tao Han [TH], Young-Kee Kim [YKK]

MINUTES:

Quick Context

- This organization that we have been discussing is the non-Snowmass part of Snowmass Early Career (SEC)
 - ◆ There's currently a lot of interest in the HEP community at-large as to its Early Career members— How best to serve them, representation within their community, etc.
- We wanted to capitalize on the existing structure we have created for the Snowmass 2021 process to create something more long term
 - ◆ Such an organization would not only carry through to the next Snowmass process, making the creation of a future SEC more seamless, but would also function beyond that purpose to serve the Early Career community in a variety of ways
 - ◆ A desire for this level of representation and organization was expressed by the Early Career community in feedback solicited prior to the start of Snowmass 2021
- What we would really like to get out of this meeting today would be feedback on the structures we have established so far ([planning doc](#), [bylaws summary](#)), opinions on our undecided items (bylaws points #2 & #15), and an idea of where DPF sees this organization fitting within how things currently work
 - ◆ For reference, these bylaws were discussed in meetings on [02/26](#), [03/12](#), [03/19 pt.1](#), [03/19 pt. 2](#), and [03/26](#)

Top-Level Goals

We want to create an organization that represents the interests of early-career particle physics across the board. To that end, we have put forth the following mission statement:

→ As originally established in the second tab of [the SEC leadership spreadsheet](#):

- ◆ Long-term early career representation
- ◆ Fostering a multidisciplinary community within HEP
- ◆ Pursuing initiatives for the benefit of the early-career particle physics community
- ◆ Creating an inclusive space that promotes equity and representation across high-energy physics

→ As more formally presented on page two of [the Long-Term Organization LOI](#):

- ◆ “SEC aims to provide long-term EC [Early Career] representation to all members of the (astro)particle physics community. Towards this goal, we strive to foster a welcoming, inclusive, collaborative, and multidisciplinary community within HEP. Initiatives that benefit EC members of the particle physics community benefit the community at-large. Creating an inclusive space that promotes equity, respect, and representation across the discipline is of the utmost importance.”

★ Need to make sure we clearly put forward this mission statement within our proposal!

Discussion

→ [YKK] What we really want to do is make sure there are smooth connections between whatever form this organization takes and the existing Executive Committee Early Career leadership within DPF

- ◆ [TH] We have to, with this organization, enhance what early-career activities we already have; there are many committees under the Executive Committee
- ◆ [TH] I am fully supportive of such an organization and see no reason that the DPF Executive Committee would not be as well

→ [TH] The question here is, how strongly or weakly coupled to the Executive Committee would this organization be?

- ◆ [TH] The weakly coupled case: We self-organize and exist independently, but the DPF Executive Committee would endorse our actions
- ◆ [TH] The strongly coupled case: We would form a committee under the DPF Executive Committee
 - [TH] Our long-term organization could coordinate the Executive Committee activities of all existing early-career functionalities

- [TH] This coupling would formalize regular interactions between our organization and the Executive Committee
 - ★ [TH] We may need APS input and permission for something this formalized; would be very important to keep the conversation going in this case
- [YKK] It doesn't necessarily have to be a formal committee— we could be an Advisory Committee, that is, fulfilling an “advisory role to the [DPF Executive Committee]”
 - ◆ How to interface with DPF and APS in general is one of our main questions, but what would be the differences between this and the aforementioned strong-coupling case?
 - ◆ Related to this question, it is of note that there is currently no formal Early Career Division under APS
 - This has made it difficult at times to interface with the physics Divisions
 - We want to set a precedent within DPF as the first APS Division to have an Early Career Committee, and genuinely hope this motivates other Divisions to establish their own as well
- [YKK] This could start as an Advisory Committee and become something more formal later if a need is seen by APS for more structure
 - ◆ [YKK] Think of it as a “pilot Advisory Committee”
 - ◆ [YKK] This would allow [the Executive Committee] to see the functions and values of this group before formalizing
 - ◆ [YKK] But we definitely don't want to lose relationship connections to existing organizations/structures [within DPF], for example, would need to consider what kind of communications would foster this
 - Towards this end, and already within our proposal, we want to codify the connection between the DPF Early Career Executive Committee Representatives and this organization to make that concrete link from the beginning
- The concept of existing formally within/under the DPF Executive Committee does raise a question that is of the utmost importance to those of us who have been planning... Could we still determine our own leadership if we were a DPF Advisory Committee?
 - ◆ [TH] If you look at the Ethics Advisory Committee, its members were selected from nominations that were open to the community and, once formed, they selected their own chair

- It is important to note that for the Ethics Advisory Committee, though the nominations were open to the community, the DPF Executive Committee had the final say here
 - ◆ [TH] “No question, you should decide your own leadership”
 - [TH] However, if coupled to the DPF Executive Committee, the Executive Committee will have to go through this as “someone has to be responsible for this; the Executive Committee will have to be responsible”
- [YKK] Many procedures here will need to be clarified. Once that is done, you all who have planned this can be invited to an Executive Committee meeting and then we can go through everything
- ◆ [TH] This advisory role is between the strong & weak coupling options envisaged prior to this meeting and will likely be the most feasible
 - But our leadership would, ultimately, be determined like the Ethics Advisory Committee in this case
 - ◆ [TH] I also imagine that your Chair could become a DPF Executive Committee member
 - [YKK] We do want to get Executive Committee approval on all facets of the proposal beforehand, including for something like this
- Concerning our link with the DPF Executive Committee... Currently we have the DPF Early Career Executive Committee Representatives (i.e., Julia & Sara’s positions) as two automatic, guaranteed members of our leadership board/committee
- But this does imply that it would be added to the responsibilities charged to their positions within DPF that they should be part of our committee. Would codifying this relationship be doable?
 - ◆ [YKK] Your Chair would really have to understand the long-term organization’s connection to DPF
 - [YKK] The current ties between SEC and the DPF Early Career Executive Committee Representatives was born out of the assignment of Fernanda & Sara to lead SEC because DPF knew it would be a significant effort
 - ◆ We might add some step in the middle of our leadership selection that deals with/includes the selection of the Early Career Executive Committee Representatives in the case where DPF is going to have the final say in all facets anyway
- Before we move on to soliciting feedback on the points that we are as-yet undecided upon, we feel it is important to note that one of the key reasons that

leaders outside of the SEC Long-Term Organization Initiative, such as Ivan, Sam, and Mateus, are in attendance is that one of the things we really want to do is get the community involved in the initiatives that SEC has already started

- ◆ It is critical to continue community engagement initiatives such as outreach, and there could be great benefit to performing surveys to better identify and support the needs of the early-career community specifically
 - And, of course, diversity, equity, and inclusion considerations should be at the forefront of all decisions to foster the welcoming, collaborative, and respectful organization proposed in our mission statement
- ◆ We want to be more than just an Advisory Committee; we want to be a long-standing community with our own goals and power

Feedback on Remaining Bylaws Points

2. Early Career Definition.

- a. From student to 10 years (in field) after your highest professional degree
- b. From student to 10 years in the field after your highest professional degree, excluding faculty who oversee early career students or postdocs

→ The questions here are ‘Do we include faculty members?’ and ‘What are the implications for our choice either way?’

- ◆ [YKK] Firstly, maybe add “actively worked” because there may be cases where people may take a year or so off, perhaps because they had a baby, etc.
 - Done. Options for bylaws point #2 are now as follows:
 - a. From student to 10 years (**actively worked** in field) after your highest professional degree
 - b. From student to 10 years **actively worked** in the field after your highest professional degree, excluding faculty who oversee early career students or postdocs
- ◆ [TH] DOE & NSF usually define this (“Early Career”) using tenure; once you reach tenure at a national lab or university, you are no longer considered early career and are switched over from early-career funding to normal funding
 - But as far as DOE/NSF are concerned, this definition of “Early Career” is only for faculty/staff, not for students & postdocs, who we also need to consider herein

→ [YKK] Your concerns here (the potential skewed power dynamic for some within the organization if young faculty and the students/postdocs they advise are both members) are valid, but there are a lot of implications to your second option

- ◆ [YKK] It isn't perfectly black & white as to who is an adviser; there may be some gray area in this such as lab scientists and postdocs who may informally advise students
- ◆ [YKK] Implementation of such a restriction would be very complex, even if the ideas behind it are good
- [YKK] Maybe you could make it a voluntary, kind of 'conflict of interest,' reporting
 - ◆ [YKK] As a consideration, if someone did voluntarily remove themselves but then lost their student (as this is sometimes a one-year trial kind of relationship), could they come back if they were still within that 10 years?
 - ◆ [YKK] Overall, be inclusive, but making it a bit more loosely defined might be easier to implement in reality
 - In such a case, we might also consider empowering students/postdocs by making the position of Chair one to always be held by a student or postdoc (to be discussed later)

15. Member Appointment Extenuating/Special Circumstances.

- a. Any LB member can anonymously veto one candidate to the Chair. The vetoed nominee can, at the discretion of the Chair, be considered as a nominee for the following year
 - b. 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 in closed session whether to veto the nominee in question.
 - c. 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)
 - d. Considerations at any level (egregious or not) can be brought anonymously to the Board for discussion/decision in closed session so as to keep the reasoning for removing/deferring a candidate more ambiguous
 - e. External ethics review to deal with all issues of this nature
- This point specifically addresses egregious or special circumstances concerning nominees being considered for leadership positions. The current board would, from the pool of community nominations, choose who would be placed to the board the coming year, but we want to be prepared for concerns in general about a nominee, conflicts between a nominee and a sitting board member, and special cases where a nominee may not be able to take a leadership role that year, but wishes to in the near future
- ◆ This is meant to address things even as critical as assault, and has been a problem that leadership boards some of us have served on in the past have had to scramble to handle in a fair way

- ◆ We are considering vetoing or delaying problematic nominees, raising the questions ‘How do we handle such a case?’ and ‘How do we keep such things anonymous?’
 - We want the solution to both be broad, but also to be something that “has teeth” and can solve problems put before it
- [YKK] For the Ethics Advisory Committee, we solicited community feedback on all nominees
 - ◆ [YKK] Writing down issues about a nominee was obviously something we could not do, but you might consider a solution such as this to identify if there are any special considerations at any level

CLOSING REMARKS:

- [TH] “Advisory Committee or not, your long-term organization is your own organization.” Advisory is just your relationship with the DPF Executive Committee; DPF will support you either way
 - [YKK] You may want to be an Advisory Committee so that the Executive Committee can act on your feedback. In this way, the Executive Committee has to be involved and there needs to be discussion with the Executive Committee as a whole
- [TH] The DPF Executive Committee considers early-career activities to be very important and they are a priority
 - [TH] Specifically to address these, there are regular, 20 minute discussions in the Executive Committee lead by Julia; you are all invited to attend these 20 minute Town Hall meetings as a way to get feedback