

*Recognition of individuals in large collaborations:
Feedback ECFA collab's*

Summary ECFA input – 18-11-2020

- General comments and observations from Collab's:
 - Individual recognition issue generally seen as important: efforts to improve appreciated
 - Actions in various place already being taken.
 - Collabs open for feedback
 - Outcome previous ECFA study helped to raise awareness, outcome generally not very surprising.
 - Main discussion related to Early Career. Do not forget career of more seniors as well.
 - Recognition particularly important for technical ("enabling") work: detector, software, calibrations, analysis objects,...
 - Overlap with diversion and inclusion issue. We did not pursue this to large extent as it opens a whole new dimension of (equally important) discussions.
 - The recognition difficulty generally scales with size of collab's.
 - Larger collabs make an effort to install formal practices for initial contributions. Smaller collab's do not seem to need the formal committees/practices as much.
 - → Thought: can working groups of larger collab's adopt (part of) practices of smaller collab's??

- Generally Accepted points(1)

- Awards:

- Thesis awards, Outstanding Achievement award, Young scientist prize, ...
- Awards and prizes typically in large collab's. Small collab's seem to not need them.

- Publications - Alphabetical paper authorlist generally supported

- Limited authorship technical papers possible
- "Corresponding author" often used to indicate leading proponent

- Conference presentations:

- Large conf's: talk contents are more or less decided by collab.
 - Talks must be approved by convenors or experts; only approved plots and results
 - Talk guidelines provided
- Open nominations and self nomination for talks; promote persons having done "service work"

- "Decision making"

- Transparency of appointments and conf talk allocations
 - Plenary sessions, "open mike" sessions(!) , "Idea box"(!) , discussions between young scientists committee and the board.
- Demographic considerations typically important

- Generally Accepted points (2)

- **Review and publication procedure:**

- Long procedures is generally considered an issue for large collabs.
- Encourage faster procedure for "smaller" papers (dedicated single topics).
- Technical papers tend to go faster.
- Papers can be converted to conf notes and can be showed during seminars
- Students are permitted to include own unpublished results in their thesis and show it at national conferences

- **Promoting juniors**

- Poster sessions
- Dedicated session in Collab week for short-talks by early-career scientists.
- Technical talks at conferences ("performance", "computing")
- Advise by career planning committee
- Beam tests can be excellent possibility
- Prizes/awards
- Liaisons and convenorships for outstanding students, responsibility of detectors to distinguish juniors
- Reference letters

- Generally Accepted points (3)

- Promoting technical work

- Technical notes with limited authorlist
- Awards
- Reconstruction software is in a public repository so people can use it in applications/letter of recommendation
- Talk allocation ranking includes technical work
- Authorship qualification includes technical contribution
- Realization that sometimes technical work is insufficiently recognized
 - examples: R&D on a not-chosen technology; detector work ; reconstruction & physics software;
 - Atlas and CMS recognized by "service work"

- Communication to outside

- Differentiate between ("internal" and "external")
- Career committee helps providing information and gives guidance to people writing recommendation letters
 - Need to explain better what a convenorship entails
- Recommendation letters written by very senior persons

- Partially Accepted points/under debate
 - **Recognition with Awards & Rewards**
 - Many large collab's have various rewards, smaller collab's don't seem to need them
 - "Awards" (ie based on competition) often in place, recognition through "rewards" (not based on competition) is not.
 - **Publication**
 - General publications have full collab alphabetical authorlist
 - Augmented record of individual achievements in collab data base (internal/public?). Also for recommendation letters and talk appointments.
 - Collect statistics on contributions of proponents to analyses (internal notes) in collab database as long as collab keeps control on what is available for who. Would require pilot study.
 - Collab management to authenticate contributions of individuals to papers for CV purposes
 - **Highlight contributions of authors on internal notes.**
 - **Conference Presentations**
 - Give more room/time for technical subjects
 - Ensure that analysis proponents make the first presentation of new results
 - **Positions /Decision making**
 - Junior member part of Spokesperson candidacy
 - Physics coordinators elected by all collab voting
 - Largest collabs having internal discussions on transparency

- Controversial points (1)

- **Collab size**

- Consider adopting (part) of small collab practices (informal) in working groups of large collab's.
- Paper reviewing seems more light-weight, processes faster
- Small collabs tend to give priority/take into account thesis contents when planning analyses

- **Publications**

- Does it make sense to continue with huge authorlists (being one out of 2000 authors) in the long run? Value of being on the paper seems more "social/collaborative" rather than "reflecting scientific work"
- (Strong) hesitations by most to making internal notes ("ana"-notes) public. More in favor of collecting information on contributors.
 - Risk of too much recognition for final "analysis" people, ignoring the underlying work
 - Collaboration spirit vs individual recognition
 - Confidentiality material, insufficient quality control: not peer-reviewed. Fear of scooping
 - Which criteria to use for selecting the authorlist?
- Some discussion about "all results and data should be public because of public funding". More in favor of collecting information on contributors
- Hesitation on limited authorlist papers using MC data (Atlas "LAMP" discussion):
 - May give too much recognition for analysis people

- Controversial points (2)

- Shortening review process

- Evaluate and try to shorten procedures
- Quality vs Efficiency: are we becoming too strict and formal?

- Conference talks

- Seems to be quite different between small and large collabs
- Large collab: speaker "represents" the collaboration: "on behalf of".
 - Tends to lead to more control over content and coherence of talks:
 - Usually only approved plots. Sometimes full contents fixed.
 - Reputation more important for large collabs?
- Smaller collaborations seem to give more responsibility to junior researchers (PhD conference talks).
 - Can a more free type of talks be considered: eg. "results based on XXX data"?
- Small collab's seem to have more "talks per speaker" at conf's than large collab's - fact(?)
- Give more high-level talks to young (PhD/postdoc) scientists