

Feedback from CALICE to Questions by ECFA-NuPECC-ApPEC Recognition Working Group

Roman Pöschl*

On behalf of the CALICE Collaboration

1 General questions

- **Do you recognize the issue in your collaboration?**

We are rather in the phase of building up awareness for the topic. The fact that we have been contacted by the JENA group clearly has triggered this process. See also the answers to the next questions.

- **Does your collaboration consider it an important/urgent topic?**

There is the general awareness that we have to make sure that working in CALICE is beneficial for the career of a researcher. After the invitation we have put the emphasis first on early career researchers.

- **Do you already have a forum to discuss this?**

Not yet, but we have organised a meeting with early career researchers and the interest to create such a panel has been expressed.

- **Can you provide feedback on “best practices” that you already have implemented?**

No direct answer here but some of our practices are outlined in the answers to the specific questions.

2 Specific questions

- **What does your collaboration think about the conclusions of the ECFA report?**

We haven't forwarded the question explicitly to the collaboration. Feedback from early career researchers was however positive on this type of actions. They would like to be kept informed about future similar actions.

- **Were some important issues perhaps not addressed?**

No opinion at the moment.

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

CALICE has an opt-in authorlist. For a paper the alphabetical order according to the cities of the institutes is used. Within an institute the authors are listed in alphabetical order.

*roman.poeschl@ijclab.in2p3.fr

- **What do you think of making analysis notes (limited authorlist of analysis proponents) public? What are reasons pro and con to do that? Would you object to a system where statistics can be collected for the proponents of such ana-notes? Would it be useful to introduce a JENAS wide system?** The CALICE Analysis Notes are public and the main actors of the analyses are explicitly given as corresponding authors. See also <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CALICE/CALICEResults#SiWECALResults>. CALICE won't object to a system in which statistics can be collected.

- **What is your opinion of prizes and awards? Do you differentiate between awards (a prize for “the best”) and “rewards” (a prize for “an achievement” - no selection).**

In CALICE we don't grant prizes and awards. CALICE is different from e.g. the LHC Collaborations, which have a well-defined membership both through CERN registration procedures and through financial implications of collaboration membership. In that sense CALICE membership is on a purely voluntarily basis. It might even not be the most natural choice for e. g. a young researcher. Therefore, we think that a kind of competition is not appropriate for CALICE. However, if CALICE members get an external prize or award, this is made known to the collaboration.

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

The governing body in CALICE is the Institution Board that assembles the leaders of the groups that are CALICE member. The focus of CALICE is prototypes of granular calorimeters. We make sure that the different prototypes are adequately represented in the management bodies of CALICE. Note for completeness that further boards are the Technical Board, the Speakers Bureau and the Advisory Board. Since there are contributions from three regions of the world (Europe, Asia and North-America) the boards have also a regional balance. Members of editorial boards for analysis notes and papers range from experienced researchers to early career researchers.

There are no dedicated working group in CALICE. We assign however conveners to the sessions of collaboration meetings. It is fair to say that among these conveners there is always a regional balance.

- **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?**

Also CALICE faces the problem that the publication procedures extend beyond contract durations. The public CALICE Analysis Notes are one way to alleviate this, Beyond we rely on the group leaders of the corresponding groups to be able to finish the paper. Colleagues who left the collaboration remain on the author list for papers until the corresponding group leader decides to take them off. Papers on technical details of a prototype are organised within the given prototype and don't have to go through a full approval process. This speeds up the process and keeps the authorlist shorter than for a fully reviewed CALICE paper (with typically 100-150 authors).

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

The public CALICE Analysis notes mentioned before are often the first publication of

an early career researcher. We think therefore that these are suited for the promotion of juniors.

Promoting early career researchers is often a factor in our decisions about talks and presentations. Early career researchers report regularly at international workshops and conferences on their results. In general, the proceedings are published with the author of the manuscript as the only author.

Combined beam tests are always excellent occasions for juniors to become visible in the collaboration for example by responsibilities for the experimental setup, the run coordination and the data quality checks. Note here that CALICE prototypes have up to 40 layers and 500,000 readout cells. Thus, beam tests with full scale prototypes go beyond the size of a typical beam test and can be considered as small experiments.

- **Do you have something in place for recognition for technical issues?**

Since CALICE is an R&D collaboration there are naturally many technical contributions that are highly valued.

- **What do you put in place to help the recognition of individuals by members external of the collaboration (for instance for their career advancement). Is there a way for external referee to assess what a convenership entails ?**

There is a risk that external referees think that the individuals are “just” working on prototypes and that technical challenges and also the analyses are at relatively low level. On the other hand throughout the years CALICE became a “brand” and CALICE members are appointed to and leading high level international bodies. These seniors do write recommendation letters. We think therefore that external referees can judge on the scope of positions and the work carried out in CALICE.

- **Are specific measures in place to include individual’s opinion in decision making processes?**

At the moment we don’t have specific measures in place. All groups are represented in the Institution Board. Hence, group leaders are essential in representing members of their team to the collaboration. All collaboration meetings are organised as plenary meetings. Therefore individuals are informed and can express their opinion to general and specific topics through several channels. For the election of leading positions we constitute a wise person committee with changing membership.

The preparation and conduction of beam tests are carried out by the teams working on the corresponding prototypes. The opinion of individuals is taken into account in e.g. the run plan.