SEC Long-Term Organization (White Paper Discussion)
October 9th, 2020

GENERAL AGENDA:
  ➢ Discuss contributions from the other initiatives to the Long-Term Organization White Paper, including the subfiles and timeline.

ATTENDEES: Kristi Engel, Joshua Barrow, Sara Simon, Erin Conley, Matt LeBlanc, Tiffany Lewis, Mateus Carneiro, Manolis Kargiantoulakis, [we apologize if we missed anyone!]

MINUTES:
  ★ Farah Fahim to come talk with us next week (normal time, normal place) about how to be more inclusive of engineers, technicians, and other non-academic-tenure-track professionals in our long-term planning

  → Keep in mind the goal of this White Paper--- Want to better equip Early Career members in whatever direction they want to go
    ◆ Both want to support existing Early Career groups...
      ● Do this through the creation of the network for the proliferation of opportunities & best practices
    ◆ And make opportunities more available
      ● Don't want to leave out those members who may not have an Early Career organization or perhaps even a collaboration/experiment
  → White Paper draft on Overleaf
    ◆ Goal of this meeting is to start assigning the sections
      ● Namely the subfiles for Section 2 concerning the other Key Initiatives
    ◆ Goal of the subfiles is to communicate what it is that your Key Initiative currently does that works (and perhaps also what doesn't)
      ● Include your plans for the next year
      ● But especially what you'd like to continue doing beyond the next year into the next decade
  → Do we want to flesh out a better overall structure for this document?
    ◆ Subfiles go to the Initiatives for completion by their leadership/members
      ● Length of these subfiles depends on how much you think is possible for you initiative
  ★ Do we have a timeline for this?

- See the [Gantt chart](#)
  - We think this is pretty conservative and hopefully very doable
- Plan for community feedback to take longer than expected
  - Want to prioritize this

➔ A significant concern going forward: we seem to be losing more people than we're gaining
  - ◆ For how many people we presented to yesterday, we've seen a very small trickle of new membership
    - Want to have explicit things we can have new people do in order to efficiently on-board them and keep them engaged
  - ◆ Need to have better communication that this endeavor includes engineers, technicians, etc.
  - ◆ Maybe follow up with people who have dropped out that *were* more active at the start
    - Things were pretty chaotic and it's possible not everyone had time for that. But we've worked a lot of that out now…

➔ So how do we write this? There was some confusion about why the people who were contacted for this were included.
  - ◆ Because this process will span not only the Snowmass process, but also the next decade, we contacted *all persons* listed on [the leadership spreadsheet](#), as well as Sara Simon and Vishvas Pandey (see [09/25 Minutes](#) for more detail)
    - We acknowledge the turnover in leadership during this White Paper process, so we wanted to make sure to involve as many current and eventual leaders as possible in an attempt not to create any snags in passing the baton for other groups
  - ◆ What we have envisioned is that the leaders would take an hour or two with their subgroups, all with the Overleaf subfile open but with one person editing, and just bounce ideas off of each other
    - This was the approach we took for the Long-Term Organization LOI and it worked quite well
  - ◆ Want to include as many people as possible at this stage
    - Writing should be collective, editing after more selective (to ensure consistent tone/voice)
➔ Every White Paper has an Executive Summary, so if, e.g., Inreach, is writing their own White Paper, maybe the content of that Executive Summary with the addition of what you can see your initiative doing long-term would be good content for these subfiles

◆ What worked, what didn't, and how you see that evolving over the next decade

➔ How does our White Paper exist within the Snowmass process?
    ◆ Do we just have it submitted for our own referencing, or are we pushing it to the Conveners for specific highlight in the final report?
        ● If we engage with CommF, we can maybe get more of a spotlight on our effort/endeavor
    ◆ To keep in mind: Plan to submit to CommF02 (as with the LOI)

★ What kinds of things can we accomplish beyond Snowmass?
    ○ By pooling our resources, we can go for more ambitious outcomes
    ○ Need to be mindful of doing anything that might alienate APS support before we show we can self-govern
➔ Towards figuring out what we want to do, want to post the Google Form to the Snowmass Young website
    ◆ Want to crowdsource the name and logo
        ● A good way to keep people involved
        ● Consider keeping some sort of tie to Snowmass since the organization we create will have been born of Snowmass and will feed into the next one
        ● Mateus' partner is a designer, so we can maybe leverage this if need be
➔ Right now the videos are embedded on the "News & Events" tab of the website, but we did also create an unlisted YouTube channel for any videos we'd like to share
        ● Can share the HEP login information if others want to post
    ◆ Such a channel could empower with exponential knowledge base growth
        ● Provides complete dissemination of information; could imagine posting videos from events hosted by Early Career groups within our network such that everyone can benefit from them
    ◆ Maybe also post things such as select recorded Coffee Collisions or guests who meet with us to provide guidance/advice
        ★ Kristi's adviser, Jordan Goodman, is good friends with Jim Gates, so we could perhaps leverage that to have him come talk with us/DEI about best practices for ensuring long-term social justice, equality, and equity within our organization. Such a discussion would definitely be something we might want to make available to others

- ➔ Need to keep in mind the consent laws for the recording and public listing of videos though
  - ◆ While we could have Josh run things as Tennessee is a one-party-consent state, it would be respectful just to get peoples' permission explicitly as would be required if hosted by Fermilab (Illinois) or Kristi (Maryland)
  - ◆ Especially would need to keep this in mind if we set things up to live stream certain Zoom calls to YouTube
    - ● Can institutional Zoom accounts even do this? Or would we need to host off a private account?

- ➔ Plan to have approximately monthly meetings with the Initiative leaders to discuss how the subfiles are developing (as well as discuss other sections)
  - ◆ Gantt chart currently lists one intermediate meeting, but a desire has been expressed for more, which is great
  - ◆ Also want to post a list of some (~5) questions to a more public Slack channel to help get the discussions started towards writing these subfiles within the Initiatives