

CLAS Collaboration Meeting

March 5-8, 2019



Data Processing Readiness Review

- Review to assess the readiness of a Run Group to start data processing (pass1 reconstruction), evaluating:
 - Tools and procedures readiness
 - Calibration & Alignment quality
 - Reconstruction quality (efficiency and resolution)
 - Analysis readiness
- Ad-hoc committee:
 - 5 people selected among Collaborators
 - standing committee in charge for 1-2 years?
 - Calibration, reconstruction and software experts
 - 1 day review with presentations
 - Committee recommendations to be addressed before data processing can start

Feedback from student & postdoc group

- 28 people registered
- Most issues from previous meeting (software documentation, meetings, service work) were touched on except the software/analysis workshop
- They appreciated the meeting and venue to voice their opinion!!!
 - Send out an email in advance next time
 - Mailing list of postdocs/students

From this meeting:

- Meetings organization and focus:
 - Too much overlap between meetings
 - Meeting minutes or at least slides would be desirable
- RGA/RGK cooking file structure and software version unclear for users
- Analysis tools need to be advertised and shown (Java and C++)
 - Workshop is requested

PAC47

- PAC meeting on July 29 – August 2, 2019
- Considering new proposals and run-group additions
- Parallel-running proposals with no new equipment:
 - The PAC requests the internal review report be submitted with the proposal
 - A collaboration representative will report on parallel running proposals to the PAC
- Jeopardy (will affect CLAS in 2020)
- **The deadline for submission of proposals and updates is 8:00 a.m. EDT (Eastern Daylight Time) on Monday, June 10, 2019**

- CLAS review schedule (**STRICT!**):
 - Abstracts for all new proposals due to CLAS chair: April 14
 - Full proposal due to CLAS reviewers: April 30
 - Response by review committee: May 14
 - Final committee recommendation: May 31
 - Submit to Working Group chairs and copy CLAS chair
- Details at:
 - https://www.jlab.org/exp_prog/PACpage/

Chair election

- Election for new Chair at the June meeting (06/18-21)
- According to the Charter:
 - *Management – E: At least 60 days prior to the election of a new Chairperson of the Coordinating Committee, this Committee will appoint two or more other collaboration members with the charge of searching for suitable candidates. It will notify the members of the Collaboration of the list of nominees at least 30 days before the election*
- Nominating committee appointed by April 14
- List of nominees by May 18

Fall meeting dates

- Known conferences:
 - DNP: October 13-17
 - XIII LASNPA — XIII Latin American Symposium on Nuclear Physics and Applications: October 21-25
 - EINN2019: October 27 - November 2
 - Workshop at JLab (??): November 6-9
- Proposed date:
 - November 12-15

Authorship of CLAS12 papers

- First discussion on possible revision of rules on author list composition for CLAS12 papers at November meeting:
 - Leading author or pure alphabetical order
- Leading authors + collaboration list has been effective in highlighting the main analysis contributors ...

...but:

- List of leading authors has been progressively increasing
 - Having leading authors implies analysis contributions are more relevant than experiment and operation support
 - Many collaboration, including medium energy physics, use alphabetical order
- Discussion will continue on Friday. Based on CCC proposal:
 - Leading author list with limit on maximum number
 - Alphabetical order

CLAS12 authorship rules

- Alphabetical order
 - Give the same “weight” to all collaborators: any CLAS12 result is a Collaboration result
 - Same evaluation of analysis contributions and operation support
 - Analysis lead recognizable via the role of contact author, presentation at conferences, analysis documents
 - Adopted by most Collaborations including GlueX (use corresponding author field to give visibility to students/main analysis contributors)
 - ...
- Lead authors (<N, with N being small) listed first, with student/post-doc as first author and other lead authors in alphabetical order
 - Role of young scientist leading the analysis is explicit
 - Higher visibility to analysis leads and/or experiment spokespersons
 - Limited number of leading authors to still recognize the role of the Collaboration
 - N needs to be defined
 - Uncommon in medium/large Collaborations
 - ...

Feedback received

Anselm Vossen

Inbox - devita@ge.infn.it Yesterday at 16:48



Re: Revision of author list rules for CLAS12 publications

To: Raffaella De Vita,

Resent-From: Raffaella De Vita

Siri found new contact info in this email: Anselm Vossen anselm.vossen@duke.edu

[add to Contacts...](#)

Dear Raffaella,

A comment to the remark that the format lead authors, other collaborators is uncommon in large collaborations. This is the format that is used at Belle. I agree though, that most collaborations use alphabetical ordered.

I have no strong opinion either way but remark that the 'corresponding author' method to identify leading contributors is basically reducing the lead author list to one...

Cheers,

Anselm

Tony Forest

Inbox - devita@ge.infn.it Yesterday at 17:37



Re: Revision of author list rules for CLAS12 publications

To: Raffaella De Vita,

Resent-From: Raffaella De Vita

Raffaella:

In my opinion we should have lead authors and not be alphabetical. The spirit should be to list students and post docs as lead authors.

Tony

Weinstein, Lawrence B.

Re: Revision of author list rules for CLAS12 publications

To: devita@jlab.org, Kuhn, Sebastian E.,

Resent-From: Raffaella De Vita

Siri found new contact info in this email: Lawrence B. Weinstein lweinste@odu.edu

[add to Contacts...](#)

Dear Raffaella,

I am strongly in favor of leading authors with N between 6 and 10 in order to recognize significant contributions. Some people make large contributions but give poor talks, so talks cannot substitute for paper recognition.

Larry