

Title: Communication with Early Career Scientists (ECS)

Hosts: Andrea Cardini & Nils Gillwald

Several topics were touched on during the barcamp session:

- Communication between mentor and mentee
- Information for newcomers
- Mentorship program and appraisal interviews at DESY
- Decision making in collaborative work, group organization and project planning

In general, **the importance of a good, efficient, and respectful communication was stressed for all the above points.**

The main point of agreement among participants concerns what are the characteristics of a good mentor and a good mentee. Clear communication of the expectation from both sides is relevant, especially in DESY where mentor and mentee might come from widely different cultures, and therefore approach the supervision from **different perspectives**: some might expect daily communication in informal setting, while others might expect regular structured reports. The idea of an **expectation questionnaire** for supervisor and student at the beginning of the supervised project was proposed during the final wrap-up as a possible solution.

Still on this topic, one important message is that communication should be well structured on both sides. Feedback from the mentees might be strongly filtered and indirect if there is no trust of active measures in their favor been taken by the mentor. Furthermore, mentees should feel safe in **showing their mistakes** and their ideas on how to fix them, in order to receive the correct type of support. Conversely, supervisors might experience a lack of trust in their students' ability to understand the situations, or more simply lack of time and extrapolate the students' feedback to what they expect through their experience, instead of **asking for clarifications**. Good **training in communication and mentorship** could be useful **both for the mentor and the mentees** to establish a good cycle of **constructive feedback**.

Transparency on communication structures within a working group is very important, the mentees should understand who they should talk to and when. This also connects to the **information for newcomers being sparse**, with the Welcome Days being often not sufficiently advertised and the need to **rework the welcome service for newcomers**.

Support for future career paths was also cited as one of the most important characteristics of a mentor. This applies also to the **inclusion in the decision-making process** at all levels. For postdocs and doctoral researchers interested in continuing in Academia, it is important to learn how decisions are made. One idea that was mentioned was to include ECS in the decision-making widening the scope and importance of the collective decisions progressively. Meeting structure and project planning were quoted as good entry points for doctoral researchers and postdocs respectively, however this topic was not further discussed due to lack of time. In general, no consensus was reached on **how to include ECS in the decision-making**, however **a consensus was reached on the need for ECS to be included more**. This point in particular would help senior scientists delegate part of their work to more capable personnel who have been offered the chance to **learn how to contribute to decision-making**.

The subjects of **appraisal interviews** and the **mentor program** led to **both consensus and disagreement**. The goal of the mentor program was also subject to disagreement, as some interpreted it as more focused on the thesis progress tracking while others had their focus centered around the support outside of the active project for the doctoral researchers. The practical implementation of both appraisal interviews and mentor program appeared to be quite diverse across groups, leading to wild differences in the opinion of the participants. A consensus was found on needing **clarification of the goal and scope** of these activities.