

# DE&I Committee

Narbe Kalantarians  
Simonetta Liuti  
Elena Long  
Christine Natrass



# Requests

- Need examples of bylaws - please forward them to us! Email [cnattras@utk.edu](mailto:cnattras@utk.edu) & [NKalantarians@VUU.EDU](mailto: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](mailto:christine.nattrass@utk.edu)

# Differences in bylaws - upcoming culture clash

**JLab - Papers, talks are opt-in** → **less structured, formal policies.** Seem to be way fewer fights over content, approval of papers & talks. Less structured approval process. Less formal rules. Culture of people just doing the right thing.

**RHIC/high energy - Papers, talks are opt-out** (if opt-out is an option) → **more structured, formal policies.** Most talks, papers go through fine, but a significant minority get blocked - not always controversial or difficult subjects, frequently bullying-adjacent.

Suggest training incoming post docs since they may be surprised

# What do bylaws cover? → What committee covers this?\*

- Membership in collaboration, duties of collaborators in good standing, authorship policy → Institutional board
- How decisions about scientific direction are made → Executive Council or Management Board
- Talks policy → Talks/Conference Committee
- Publication policy → Publication Committee

\*In high energy because JLab is more informal

# Some rough draft principles for bylaws

- Should be some process to review decisions, actions and possibly appeal for most procedures.
  - Generally individuals should not be allowed to make unilateral decisions or block talks/papers without review.
  - This should not be an add-on DE&I thing but part of the culture.
- A reasonable attempt to distribute responsibilities/leadership positions should be made, as well as tracking statistics on these things.
- Junior representatives should be included on various bodies as well.
  - But shielded from career-damaging situations!
- By default, information & meetings should be open.
  - Exceptions: some discussions of individuals under consideration for leadership positions, some aspects of DE&I investigations (but be aware records can be FOIA'd)
- Bureaucracy should be as light as necessary to get the job done with adequate protections

# Some examples

On internal review committees for papers, unanimity was historically tacitly required. Several cases where papers were held up or blocked by a single outlier on the committee, without a process to overrule them. This can be a form of bullying.

In some collaborations, the spokesperson can single-handedly block a paper, without review. When the collaboration is a large fraction of the field, particularly because it is hard to switch collaborations, this can stop entire subjects from being discussed in the field.

Detente in many cases where the paper describes what is done but omits controversial interpretations.

Safety rules generally require immediate, frequently unilateral action - but that does not mean these decisions should not be reviewed later.

Need to balance adequate review with a fair process and the ability to actually have a scientific discussion.

# Data on disparities in talk distribution

## [Study on high profile talks in heavy ion physics](#)

### Conclusions

- Female theorists significantly underrepresented, with extreme overrepresentation by a small fraction of women. Female experimentalists underrepresented by a few percent, statistically significant but small, more evenly distributed among women.
  - Experimental talks committees are net positive, even if it's not perfect
- Female experimentalists more likely to give experimental overview talks (political, requires staying on message), significantly less likely to give visionary talks.
  - No woman has ever given the summary talk for Quark Matter
- Some speakers, regardless of gender, are massively overrepresented
- Perhaps warrants rethinking relationship between collaborations and experiments?

# Steps forward

Need to make big decisions on structure

# Bylaws - **LAST TIME** - included as a reminder

- 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