2023 Low Energy Community Meeting Workshop on Collaborations
Notes taken by A. Gade and J. Singh

2023-08-09 @ 1300 Auditorium/FRIB/MSU

1800-1841: Pizza dinner

1841-1852: Brad Sherrill – Welcome and introduction

- Main goal – exchange ideas on how to build and encourage respectful, welcoming, equitable, and inclusive collaborations
- Good intentions do not always result in good outcomes
- Reminded participants of the LECM code of conduct
- MSU-FRIB and ANL-ATLAS PAC proposal review process will require statements of inclusion

Scott Bogner – Lessons from the FRIB Theory Alliance

- Code of conduct, clear language regarding:
    - Definitions of problematic behavior
    - Instructions for reporting issues
    - Consequences for violating the CoC
- Procedures:
    - Chair of bridge faculty program should explain DEI during the search process as well as after the hire
    - Chair of theory fellow program should explain how all applicants will be treated equitably
    - DEI statements from applicants, what are the expectations from junior/international candidates?
        - View of the committee is forgiving
        - Plans do not need to be actionable, but a good faith effort must be apparent
        - For future searches, the search committee should be given some guidance about how to gauge a "good faith effort"
    - Topical programs – DEI statement – diversity coordinator, DEI survey, how invited speakers are chosen, how funds will be allocated for DEI issues, collect best practices from previous topical program organizers
- Statistics on membership
- Mentorship of Fellows/Bridge faculty
- Interactions with other FRIB-TA committees

Questions for Scott B

- DEI guidance for FRIB TA events, new idea of collecting best practices
- DEI statements fellow search – is this not too much to ask for postdoc?

- Training for committee on how to judge DEI statements?

Thomas Baumann – Lessons from the MONA Collaboration

- Key – offer undergraduates a meaningful way to participate in research
- Weekly video meetings
- Annual in person meeting
- Director chosen every year during the annual meeting
- Code of conduct with consequences being developed now
- Shared leadership models – involve and support early career researchers as much as possible
- Publication and co-authorship policy – very clearly articulated
- Proposals and external collaborators
    - internal competition and ranking
    - graduate student for thesis research – first priority on data
    - undergraduate students – calibration data, secondary physics from impurities in the beam
    - external collaborator can be spokesperson
- funding model
    - no common MONA funding
    - each MONA PI gets single PI funding, for example RUI grants

Question for Thomas B

- Experience with shared leadership, aka undergrads being involved in leadership roles?
- How is data shared and who is on proposals?

Can non-MoNA members be PIs on MoNA proposals? And how are people funded – common or individually?

Paul Gueye – Lessons from Diversity Programs

- need to understand the target audience – do your homework
- even a well thought out plan with good intentions will fail if we don't listen to the target audience and to listen to their needs
- pre college programs – college students mentor pre-college students
- faculty at MSIs are overworked have limited resources (compared to big R1 schools)
- timing is important – when the opportunity arises, take advantage of it
- find a bridge that benefits both parties
- export nuclear science to MSIs – typically dominated by material science
- what does the homework look like:

    - visit the schools that we partner with to find out what things look like on the ground at their local environment
    - have the schools visit your institution to see what resources are available
- provide opportunities to both pre-college students as well pre-college teachers/instructors
- provide resources to MSIs participants so that there is less work load on them – for example, senior undergrads can visit MSIs and be tutors and help run the programs
- Questions for PaulG
    - How does homework look like in preparation for DEI effort?
    - Do you bring also high-school teachers in?

Hendrik Schatz and Ana Becerrill – Lessons from JINA and CENAM

- large collaborations and centers can have a bigger amplified impact
- interdisciplinary is a key strength – learn from best practices from different fields especially astronomy
- talks on DEI topics at conferences
- "un"conferencing sessions center organically around DEI
- triple impact:
    - direct benefit of specific activity
    - demonstrates commitment of leadership
    - shows that DEI is part of what scientists do
- create an inclusive community of early career scientists
    - mentoring
    - networking
    - leadership responsibilities
    - emphasize professional development
- put DEI on the equal footing as science in the JINA Frontiers white paper published in JPG
- junior days during conferences – professional development and school/lectures providing technical background for main conference topics
- online seminar organized by early career researchers (postdocs)
- conversation between workshop applicants and workshop selection committee about support for underrepresented communities as well as invited speakers
- Question for CeNAM team
    - What do you with 30% who do not care of object to DEI talks/activities?
    - Do you have special events for undergrads?
    - How did you get the good women participation on early slide? How did you improve minority participation more broadly in events?

Open discussion moderated by Brad Sherrill

- try removing names from searches and the hiring process
    - Studies show grading in class was done with names removed and it did make impact.
    - Lots of publications from other fields that it has large effect on outcome in hiring and so on.
    - In our field, many of us know each other and "blinding" search is not possible.
    - Have diversity advocate on search who is not chair.
    - LANL LDRD pre-selection has names removed, outcome will be valuable for future.
- have more equitable meetings:
    - share information/agenda ahead of time; give people time to process the information
    - people process information differently, not all will feel included or welcome because of these differences.
    - Resources available on the Berkeley website (IDEA): Website https://diversity.lbl.gov/2020/01/24/tips-on-inclusive-and-effective-meetings/
    - read contemporary management books (look for ideas from way outside the community)
    - We are selected community, living in our own world – sometimes, looking towards industry and business is useful to see their changes in structures and meetings.
- Collaboration ideas
    - write the rules and processes and procedures when you don't need them (when things are going well and set the expectations)
    - problems arise when there is confusion about the work scope
    - problems arise when people are overwhelmed
    - problems when some groups within a collaboration are not equitable
    - perform an "autopsy" for lessons learned – what should we do when things go wrong
    - two things are often reason for going off the rail. People run into situations that were not anticipated at all or people are very overwhelmed. In the medical field, people do an autopsy and analyze mistakes – can we do that, too, and learn from past mistakes and collaborations going off the rail.
    - We are bad in calling out issues that go wring in collaborations and during conferences – we do not have these discussions when it happens and calling this out is critical
- can some large institution (FRIB/DOE/NSF) make diversity studies more available (often hidden behind paywalls)?
- Difficult to call out bad behavior when it happens – but it needs to happen

    - Should have a discussion about how to do this before it happens
    - Resources for conflict management
    - Need to have empathy for the person acting strangely, but how to do this
    - Who do the complaints go to? Conference organizers, ombudspeople for large comparisons, neutral people need to be identified ahead of time, DNP allies
    - There needs to be consequences (hard to figure out what this might be – but maybe this goes directly to the offender's employer) if people are going to feel empowered to call out bad behaviour
    - Community-wide upstander training
- These workshops need to be appealing to early career scientists so that we can get their input
- Often people behave strangely during a conference and what they need is help.
    - How do we react?
    - Conferences have an Ally program, for example, can we have something similar in conferences, like ombuds people?
    - This could be broader for the community
    - Would you find ombuds people useful for the community? Would you use them or advise people to use them?
    - What happens when you call people out? How do we deal with that and what means do you have? What happens? How to do this in collaborations?
    - Not the subject of inappropriate behavior should speak up, others should take responsibility as well – by-stander training.
    - Action depends on level, e.g. Title IX and institutions take over.
    - What happens for micro aggressions and bullying?
- What does hazing look like in collaborations or scientific group contexts?
    - Aspect of hazing and group dynamics does not rise to the level of discrimination. More of a topic in sports and at universities in general.
    - Is there something we can do to identify and stop such actions that do not rise to the level of discrimination but makes junior people or minority groups uncomfortable?
- What is equitability in collaborations? At some point a part of the collaboration may not feel equal anymore. Environment impacts collaboration and over times issues with equitability arise. Role for the agencies?
- Three types of collaborations that worked TRIUMF
    - Instruments that were completely open – general purpose
    - Instruments that were completely closed – very specific and expertise driven
    - Groups with complementary instruments come together to carry out one big experiment

- The facility insists on understanding how a collaboration operates – does not prescribe what the collaboration does, but does force the collaboration to describe their process in order to enforce accountability
- Are there in-person interactive DEI trainings with case studies available to the community as opposed to impersonal online trainings?
- Training for the community of DEI-related issues
    - Expand DNP allies training program to large institutions
    - Training on DEI – mostly online, can we have this in-person with case studies?
    - Do labs like FRIB, ANL, or TRIUMF plan in-person training? Can this be community-wide?
    - In-person aspect is important. DNP Ally training gives examples and case studies – is very useful. Can be translated to Labs.
- How many grads and postdocs are in the room? Not so many – how do we get the future leaders involved?

Guy Savard and Thomas Glasmacher – final comments from the User Facility perspective

- Collaborations are all different, ATLAS lets collaboration determine how they runs – works well.
- Address issues quickly
- Look for small things that establish a pattern
- Very difficult to implement and monitor the effectiveness of DEI programs
- Two goals of large facilities:
    - Do great science
    - Improve/grow the community
- Impact is more relevant than intent
- Inclusivity is more challenging than representation
- The future of the field is at stake
- If people will not be welcome, they will go elsewhere, Representation is easy, inclusion is hard. We must mitigate impact, not intent.
- If this was an easy problem to solve, these conversations would not be needed