

SEC Long-Term Organization w/ DPF & Ethics

April 7th, 2021

GENERAL AGENDA:

- Discuss meeting with DPF Chairs (Tao Han & Young-Kee Kim; [minutes here](#)), including how we see their vision for this organization meshing with our own idealistic one
- Determine our 30 day plan of what we intend/need to accomplish to move forward with our proposal

ATTENDEES: Kristi Engel, Julia Gonski, Sara Simon, Amber Roepe, Joshua Barrow, Garvita Agarwal

MINUTES:

Housekeeping items:

- The mission statement in the [Bylaws Summary document](#) needs to be a cohesive paragraph rather than just a collection of bullet points
 - ◆ Have added the paragraph form of this from the [Long-Term Organization LOI](#):
 - “SEC aims to provide long-term Early Career (EC) 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.”
 - ◆ We could also just condense the whole of that LOI down to a page or less for them at the beginning of a proposal
- The next DPF Executive Committee meeting is this afternoon
 - ◆ Is there any feedback we have that Julia can take to this meeting?
 - She feels [Friday's meeting](#) went pretty well
 - ◆ Next one after this is in four weeks; may be something we want to aim to attend

Topics we need to address during this meeting:

- Solicit general feedback on [Friday's meeting](#)
 - ◆ What do we think of the advisory aspect?

- How do we want to initiate community feedback on our proposal/bylaws summary?
 - ◆ When do we want to start this? Is there some sort of milestone we should reach before sending it out?
- Do we, in terms of bringing our proposal before DPF, want to aim for the Executive Committee meeting in four weeks?
 - ◆ Still want to have an airtight proposal before really initiating anything, including maybe changing how our leadership interfaces with DPF

Feedback:

- What we want the DPF Executive Committee to understand is that this is not us going for a second-level power grab as a satellite organization
 - ◆ Rather, we are going for a ground-up organization with a few leaders elected from our constituency, with those leaders as the Advisory Committee
 - Would DPF choose from our Board who would be on the Advisory Committee? (our LB being larger than a typical Advisory Committee)
 - ★ But do we even need/want an Advisory Committee itself? What would they be doing? What are their goals?
 - ◆ Want to be clear that our goals go far beyond just us having a seat at the table
- They (Tao & Young-Kee) seem to see a distinction between having a formal connection to/being an official committee of DPF and being/having an Advisory Committee
 - ◆ It's important to keep in mind here that the Ethics Advisory Committee isn't an "official" thing; you won't find them on the DPF website or anything like that
 - The EAC has no power to make any real changes
 - ◆ They talked a big support game, but will they actually listen to us?
 - Want some kind of formalized acknowledgement... Maybe a change to the DPF bylaws?
- We don't just intend to perform advisory duties, though— that would just be one facet of the organization.
 - ◆ We have the Survey Initiative, which could perform insightful longitudinal studies; the DEI Initiative, which could study how diversity is changing within the early-career community; and the Inreach Initiative, which has access to many excellent speakers to easily disseminate knowledge & learning within the organization

- ◆ Also want some kind of representation on this Executive Committee who could speak up for or against things concerning our mission
 - May want some tangible power for this kind of setting
 - And we won't have a vote in the Executive Committee in an advisory role (besides the Early Career Rep vote we already have)
- Having an Advisory Committee would be really good for creating a paper trail of changes we have tried to make and the advocacy we have done for ourselves
 - ◆ It would act as a face for us inside the Executive Committee in this scenario
- What it seems like we're looking at is a trade-off of having voting privileges vs. having the final say in our leadership
 - ◆ The latter scenario would have us less formally tied to DPF, but we would still have access to DPF and would still have a vote through our EC Rep
- In favor of making sure we have genuine influence/power to make change, many tenured leaders seem to brush off the issues that the early-career community brings to them, especially concerning the lack of academia positions, even with obvious data supporting our concern
 - ◆ How do we make sure that the established members of the field don't just use us and dangle positions in front of us that don't really exist to manipulate us to stay?
 - We know that many are leaving the academia field that did not want to do so, there just weren't any available jobs
- How would we, within our organization, tackle issues like this? How would this change depending on the form/relationship with DPF we took?
 - ◆ This would really be an advisory thing; our link to the DPF Executive Committee could take the results of surveys, etc., that we perform to show them that this is important to many people and they should really care
 - ◆ In such a case, it would be very important that we could choose who would be the one to bring these issues to the Executive Committee— if we advocate well, it probably doesn't matter if we don't have our own separate vote
- From the label of "Advisory Committee," not only can we bring issues to the table, we can also make recommendations as well
 - ◆ This gives the Executive Committee something tangible they can do, and it's less work for them to just do what we recommend to resolve problems
 - ◆ In this way, we can fit the solutions to what works for us
- ★ Tao Han suggested they would select from our Board who was invited to the Advisory Committee, so we would have most of the say/control over who this is

- In response to this, what we want to write up and bring for community feedback before the next DPF Executive Committee meeting is as follows:
 - ◆ We (the long-term organization) would be independent with autonomy over who is on our Board
 - ◆ Want formal acknowledgement from DPF that our Chair is *ex officio* welcome at DPF Executive Committee Meetings
 - This, along with having DPF's chosen EC Reps as default members of our LB, creates strong ties to DPF and clear paths for communication
 - ★ In terms of incremental progress, having this codified is great for the legitimacy of our organization
 - Use this structure, along with the Advisory Committee, as a proving ground to gain trust & responsibility as we are in uncharted waters

Undecided Items/Community Feedback:

- 2. Early Career Definition** (*undecided*)
 - 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
- Don't want to push on this too much without Fernanda
 - ◆ But having some transition time for newly placed Faculty to stay in our organization would probably be good so they don't suddenly lose support in a brand new role
 - And maybe, in the first few years of advising students, if they've been in our organization, they would still be closely tied to us and the things we care about that it wouldn't be an issue
 - ◆ Also need to keep in mind the very relevant point Young-Kee brought up that formally excluding those who were advising would likely be a bit tricky to do in practice
- We did settle on, in [the second meeting on 03/19](#), letting the community decide between these two choices
- In terms of getting said community feedback, maybe we could make this list of Bylaw choices a [Google Form](#) wherein each item has an optional feedback box and/or voting
 - ◆ So for items like #2 and #15, each choice could have options related to agreement like "yes/no/somewhat/ambivalent"
 - ◆ Amber volunteers to make this before this weekend

- This would allow us to review it early next week, then we could have it open to the community for two weeks and send out many reminders to go through it
- No further discussion among us concerning these choices; plan to regroup before we go back to DPF with our proposal

What about the APS April DPF Town Hall?:

- ★ During the April meeting, there will be a DPF Town Hall meeting and a DPF business meeting, *both open to the general public*
 - The DPF Town Hall will be Monday, April 19th at 1730h CDT
- Tao Han called for suggestions of things to discuss/“issues relevant to our DPF mission,” but no feedback has yet been received concerning this... Might be a good idea to stack this in our favor of issues we want to address
 - ◆ Julia is running this discussion (20 minutes dedicated to Early Career); it would be good PR/visibility to float the idea of our long-term organization
 - I.e., someone asks what Snowmass Young will become after the Snowmass 2021 process and then we can “conveniently” answer
 - ◆ May also want to float the Survey Initiative because that should be coming out within the next month
- Julia to have us as speakers so we can answer questions
 - ◆ Want to draft some of these questions ahead of time so that we can fill the 20 minutes (of 60 total) dedicated to EC aspects in a smart, efficient way
 - ◆ Could comb [the kickoff meeting presentation](#) for questions we might ask to provide good information
 - We could also maybe pull some questions from our [Bylaws feedback form](#)? Or turn feedback into a question, Jeopardy-style

CLOSING REMARKS:

- Julia to send out a Doodle poll soon to plan for the end-of-April “heartbeat meeting” of SEC Snowmass Coordination Leadership to begin recruitment planning

Plan for the next 30 days:

- Turn Bylaws choices into a Google Form
 - Review this early next week
- Open this Form for community feedback for two weeks
- Commandeer the early-career portion of the DPF Town Hall for our benefit
 - Plan questions beforehand
- Review feedback and prepare proposal for May DPF Executive Committee Meeting