11:17:09 From John Orrell : https://blogs.cardiff.ac.uk/imgame/imitation-game/
11:35:04 From Sam Meehan : And students!
11:38:11 From Cindy Joe : I was just in an accelerator research centers talk and they talked about the huge gulf between the number of people who are trained in the field and the number of people we need to contribute. I'm sure they're not the only field like this. There is a recognized need (in many technical and engineering fields at least) for more—we should be able to pull in people to meet that need, and recognize (and promote) the people who do.
11:40:14 From Jim F. : My experience has been that the HEP community expects 100% commitment and that if one has other interests we are somehow not serious about HEP. A lot of this is entrenched cultural issues inside HEP.
11:41:57 From Elena Gramellini : One of the problems with attract people from AI is the salary aspect: top postdoc jobs in HEP pay ~70K which is the low end of an entry job in AI
11:42:36 From Sam Meehan : +1 Jim F - Totally agree!
11:49:55 From Cindy Joe : @Elena: it's like money osmosis—the job availability and money are higher in tech, so we lose good people to that, but for the same reasons they won't necessarily come to us from there, it seems like mostly a one-way thing.
11:53:11 From Jim F. : It is important to recognize the mission of the DOE labs is very different from research universities and from other organizations. The DOE labs are there to take on efforts that others cannot, i.e. to enable the science rather than to do the science. Most of the funding goes to operations, not research, to enable that primary mission. Some research is of course part of the job. This is not that different than universities where in principle the primary mission is teaching/education. And then we can do science as well. I don't know that this is different in other fields. I believe it is worse in industry where the accountability is cast in terms of return on investment. So I am still here in the national labs enjoying the variety of work I get to do.
11:55:14 From Cindy Joe : Can/should we have a way to discuss this all further on Slack?
11:55:23 From Sam Meehan : I would like that
11:55:58 From Cindy Joe : Someone could start an appropriately-named channel if there is not already one?
11:56:09 From Kathryn Jepsen : There should be one…
11:56:26 From Brendan Kiburg : I will keep the room open as a space to chat for anyone that wants to continue after the session
11:56:33 From Breese Quinn : several breakout sessions have created channels, e.g. you could make cpm_topic_118
11:57:09 From Kathryn Jepsen : https://join.slack.com/share/zt-htd3oncn-d7GKKvJfy8lfuNTUh39leQ
11:57:15 From Kathryn Jepsen : 118, right?
11:57:28 From Jeter Hall : #cpm_topic_118
11:57:34 From John Orrell : John.orrell@pnnl.gov
11:57:44 From Cindy Joe : Can the title of the slack channel be the

topic name? I'm going to forget the number
11:57:59 From Cindy Joe : or rather, the name of the channel can be the number, that's fine
11:58:08 From Cindy Joe : but the description should include the topic
11:58:16 From Sam Meehan : I agree, can we change it to cpm_topic_118_career_mobility
11:58:27 From Jeter Hall : Sorry Cindy! I was just trying to keep consistency with the other session specific channels
11:58:32 From Cindy Joe : No, that's totally fine!!
11:58:39 From Sam Meehan : I think you can change the name
11:58:46 From Cindy Joe : I think consistency is useful
11:58:51 From Kathryn Jepsen : https://join.slack.com/share/zt−htd3oncn−d7GKKvJfy8lfuNTUh39leQ
11:59:10 From Cindy Joe : Very good talk!
11:59:36 From Cindy Joe : Vitaly, I enjoyed your slide and discussion in particular.
11:59:42 From Cindy Joe : I felt very "heard," thank you.
12:00:09 From Vitaly Pronskikh : Thank you , Cindy, we have similar views, I see