DE&I Committee

Narbe Kalantarians
Simonetta Liuti
Elena Long
Christine Nattrass

Priorities

- Top priority: Think about an effective approach for the integration of DE&I into bylaws
- Develop guidelines for meetings - on the back burner
- Work on training & detailed guidelines for investigatory committees - May be able to work with BNL's office of Equity & Diversity, waiting to see how this develops
- Consider how to manage documentation of complaints - May be able to work with BNL's office of Equity & Diversity, waiting to see how this develops

Requests

- Need examples of bylaws - please forward them to us! Email cnattras@utk.edu & NKalantarians@VUU.EDU
- Need a short list of people who could serve on investigatory committees to speed up the process. Volunteers? Email christine.nattrass@utk.edu

Bylaws

- Starting at big picture and possible points of contention
- Structure: leaning towards more structured, like a high energy experiment
- Authorship:
  - Need clear authorship rules
  - Can people remove their name from papers?
    - Pros: People shouldn't be required to have their name on papers they disagree with. Examples: People took names off pentaquark papers in NA49, CLAS
    - Cons: frequently bullying-adjacent, sometimes used as a means to bully
    - Lean towards: allow people to take their names off, but when this happens, form a committee to investigate the circumstances leading to this. Norm should be that all members are on all papers.
  - Author order: alphabetical or tiers of authors?
    - Lean towards alphabetical.
    - Pros: post docs doing support tasks treated fairly, disagreements over authorship can lead to conflicts.
    - Cons: Unclear outside of the collaboration who did what
- Service work:
  - Models:
    - Highly structured with quotas. Examples: LHC experiments
    - Less structure but some requirement. Examples: RHIC experiments.
  - Lean towards: Less structured but something like minimum requirement of 6 months for PhD students