

Introducing report of the  
Joint ApPEC-ECFA-NuPECC working group  
*Recognition of individuals in large collaborations*

*MM for the working group – 26-1-2022*

## Reminder: What was the issue?

- How to recognize individual scientific contributions and achievements of researchers in large collaborations?
- How can these achievements be made transparent for the evaluators and communities outside the collaborations?
- A community wide survey (1355 participants) was launched by ECFA.
- Results indicate significant “unhappiness”, in particular amongst early career scientists in large collaborations, see the extensive report:
  - <https://ecfa.web.cern.ch/sites/ecfa.web.cern.ch/files/ECFA-Survey-Recognition-Results.pdf>
- Follow-up with our combined ApPEC-ECFA-NuPECC working group. Invite representatives from (large) collaborations to a discussion.
- Discuss and exchange best practices, reflect on alternative procedures

## Reminder: Who are we?

### **From ApPEC:**

- Karl-Heinz Kampert (kampert@uni-wuppertal.de), co-chair
- Emmanuel Gangler (emmanuel.gangler@clermont.in2p3.fr )

### **From ECFA:**

- Bogna Kubik (bkubik@ipnl.in2p3.fr )
- Djamel Boumediene (Djamel.Boumediene@cern.ch )
- Marcel Merk (marcel.merk@nikhef.nl ), co-chair

### **From NuPECC:**

- Eberhard Widmann (Eberhard.Widmann@oeaw.ac.at ), co-chair
- Gerda Neyens (Gerda.neyens@cern.ch )
- Nasser Kalantar (nasser@kvi.nl )

## Reminder: What was our mandate?

- Discuss the Recognition issue with large collaborations in our field
- Explain our advisory and exploratory mandate.
  - exchange and discuss best practices, collect collaboration feedback on alternative or additional procedures,
  - report discussion results of collaboration inputs in the report
    - **not our opinions**
  - no ombudscommittee for individual problems.
- The collaborations remain themselves responsible for the actions of the working group and to implement (or not) recommendations!

## Activities

- July 2019: Installation of the committee on 13-7-2019 in Ghent
- Oct 2019: First discussions during JENAS meeting in Orsay/Paris
- Feb 2020: Completed list of experiments and spokespersons to contact
  - Full list in appendix D of the document
  - Pragmatic decision to proceed discussions with ApPEC / ECFA / NuPECC in parallel
- Spring 2020: Decided to postpone discussions with collaborations due to Covid
  - We felt that leaders in the field had other priorities
- June 2020: Completed list of discussion topics and questions to ask the collaborations
  - Same questions to each of the JENAS fields
  - List of questions and answers is included in the appendix of the document

## Activities

- June-July 2020: First round meetings with collaborations
  - Provide background information and of the recognition issue and clarification of our advisory mandate.
  - Lay out the list of questions to the collaboration and exchange ideas
  - First discussions with collaboration representatives
- Oct – Nov 2020: Second round meetings with collaborations
  - Collecting the feedback as discussed in the collaborations internally
  - Exchange feedback/ideas between collaborations
- Feb-Sep 2021: Writing process
- Oct 2021: Draft sent to JENAS chairs
  
- **Comment: the process frankly took (too) long**
  - Covid-19 did not help, as senior group leader in the field were confronted with issues that preceded in urgency the recognition discussion

## General Observations

- The “Individual recognition” issue is generally seen as important and relevant; efforts to improve are appreciated by collaborations at large.
  - Actions/initiatives in various collaborations already being taken.
  - Various further problematic issues were brought up by large collaborations.
  - Collabs welcome feedback and suggestions; several eager to learn outcome.
- Outcome of previous ECFA questionnaire was generally not very surprising to collab’s, but helped to raise further awareness.
- Focus tends to be on early career scientists. However, we should not forget recognitions of seniors and their career path as well.
- Recognition issue particular important for technical ("enabling") work: detector, software, calibrations, analysis objects,...
- Problematic issue scales with the size of the collab’s.
  - Large collaborations already often have measures in place while small ones do not need them.

## Topics of Discussion

- Publications: Individual authors do not see their role reflected
- Talks and Conferences: “Representing” a large collaboration goes at the cost of individual creativity and leads to repetition
- Analysis Procedures: Time scales are too long
- Information about Individuals: Evaluation of individuals by referees is difficult, in particular outside the field of specialization
- Promoting Juniors: Explanations of contributions require understand how large collaborations work
- Recognition of Technical work (Detectors, Software, Calibration,...: Technical work is very challenging and extremely important; not sufficiently appreciated.
- Governance and decision making: examples of good practices available
- Prizes and Awards: Many prizes have been initiated, but little attention for non-competitive “rewards”



## Conclusions & next steps?

- Lack of recognition for individual contributions in large collaborations is a real and more and more urgent topic.
  - It provides a realistic danger to make our field less interesting to young ambitious scientists
- Large collaborations have an awareness and are taking measures
  - There are very nice best practices being implemented
  - We feel that more needs to be done
- Our committee does not have *the* solution; our main recommendations are two-fold:
  - Many good practices exist. Consider them seriously and try to implement as many suitable practices as possible in your collaboration; be inventive.
  - Openly re-consider whether some standard traditions can be reviewed to allow more room for individual freedom, in particular with respect to (conference) presentations and written documentation.
- Another survey, now including ApPEC and NuPECC?

Back-up material





