

LHCb - October 5th, 2020

**JENAS: Joint ECFA-ApPEC-NuPECC Working Group
Recognition of Individuals: LHCb responses on
request for feedback**

General questions:

•Do you recognize the issue in your collaboration?

Answer:

Yes, we recognise the importance of this challenge. In particular, there are two audiences for the information on personal contributions.

- 1) Information transfer on individuals contributions for evaluation inside high energy physics, e.g. postdoc appointments.*
- 2) Information transfer to institutes and universities for evaluation relative to other members of personnel, e.g. faculty appointments and promotions.*

•Does your collaboration consider it an important/urgent topic?

Answer:

Yes, we think it is considered as important. Moreover, the issue is particularly important for early career and those not working on the final data analysis but on detectors, software, calibrations etc.

•Do you already have a forum to discuss this?

Answer: *No*

•Can you provide feedback on "best practices" that you already have implemented?

Answer:

- *Thesis prize*
- *Early Career Scientist prize*
- *Liaisons and convenerships often reserved for brilliant and motivated young students*
- *Ensure that the analysis proponents make first presentations of their results at public seminars and/or conferences*
- *Reference letters written by senior scientists*
- *Requests to management to authenticate the contribution of individuals to particular papers*

FEEDBACK PART I

•Which system do you use for author lists (alphabetical, opt-in, opt-out, other)? Is it generally appreciated?

Answer:

- *Alphabetical for all physics papers*

- *Some technical papers include only authors that worked on the particular subject.*

•Which system do you use for assigning conference talks?

Answer:

- *People apply for talks on a conference portal (team leaders are informed), and the Speaker Bureau (SB) makes final decisions, physics conveners and detector PLs can be consulted. In the absence of anyone applying the SB asks a speaker, based on information from physics conveners. A database is used to keep track of previous talks and a score computed for each individual to ensure a fair distribution of presentations. In general, the probability to get the desired talk, or an equivalent one, is rather high.*

•How are talks prepared within the collaboration?

Answer: *After the talk is assigned the speaker should follow the guidelines listed in an easy to access webpage. A rehearsal is mandatory, where a Speaker Bureau member plus the conveners of the Working Groups of reported analyses are always present. In case any modification is needed, the speaker should post the updated slides before the conference.*

•Do people feel there is enough freedom to determine the contents of their talk?

Answer: In general yes, the major constraint is usually the time given by conferences to report many analyses.

•What do you think of making analysis notes (limited author list of analysis proponents) public? What are reasons pro and con to do that?

Answer:

The collaboration has chosen not to make analysis notes public. These notes may contain internal information and are not required to be prepared at the presentational level of a publication.

In addition, there is already significant recognition mechanisms (see above) in the experiment for the proponents of analyses. The more serious issue we identify is recognition for people working on the enabling aspects, detectors, software, calibrations etc.... Which this would not address.

Indeed, on one side making analysis notes public could be seen as an effective solution to enhance the visibility of the analysis proponents, on the other side it may create differences with respect to other people working on different aspects of the experiment, like e.g. detector and/or performance studies, which are equally important to obtain the final result. More in general, the life of large

collaborations is based upon the principle that very different specializations are needed for reaching the final target, and this should not be questioned by highlighting a particular publication. Other means can be used for the purpose: first presentation of the result at seminar/conferences by the proponents, role of corresponding author, contact point for the experiment for average groups etc...

•Would you object to a system where statistics can be collected for the proponents of such ana-notes?

Answer: Yes, for the reasons given above; these contributions can be conveniently weighted in the CV Moreover, the information is already made available by the spokesperson when requested and in references.

•What is your opinion of prizes and awards?

Answer: We do have awards especially for Early Career. We give every year about 4-5 prizes for the best thesis and 4-5 "Early Career Scientist prize" which are special prizes introduced to recognise technical work.

•Do you differentiate between awards (a prize for “the best”) and “rewards” (a prize for “an achievement” –no selection).

Answer: Not really. In principle we have a set of awards, although the number that we give every year is not strictly

fixed such that there could always be room for more prices if needed.

FEEDBACK PART II

•One way to recognize achievement is appointing people to responsible positions (board member, conveners, reviewer etc.). How does that work in practice in your collaboration?

Answer:

- *For physics analysis and performance working groups: this is under the supervision of Physics and Operation Coordinators, who collect the nominations within the groups and make the final choice in consultation with the management; a final endorsement by the Collaboration Board is foreseen. The Physics Coordinator is elected by all of the authors of the collaboration.*
- *Reviewers: choice of the Physics Coordinator in consultation with conveners*
- *Project Leaders: proposed by the institute teams belonging to the project, endorsed by management and by the Collaboration Board. Project leaders decide the internal structure of the project and appoint those responsible for specific activities.*

•Does it have a political aspect e.g. equal share between countries?

Answer: Yes, the management keeps track of regional distribution of positions for the larger bodies. As well as (as much as possible) of gender distribution. However, significant fluctuations are allowed.

•Analysis reviews are sometimes lengthy procedures that take longer than the job contract of individuals doing the analysis, such that papers are not ready to be published or that results unblinded before graduation or end of contract. Is this an issue? If so, is there a mechanism to deal with that?

Answer: It can be indeed an issue in some cases. On the other side, the quality of the final result is something on which we cannot compromise; the most effective mitigation is to strengthen the analysis groups in such a way to have prompt reactions during the process.

•Do you have specific policies or practices to promote the work of juniors?

Answer:

- Thesis prize*
- Early Career Scientist prize*

- *Liaisons and convenerships often reserved for brilliant and motivated young students*
- *Ensure that the analysis proponents make first presentations of their results at public seminars and/or conferences*
- *Reference letters written by senior scientists*
- *Requests to management to authenticate the contribution of individuals to particular papers*

•Do you have something in place for recognition for technical issues?

Answer: The Early Career Scientist prize