PI/Faculty Retreat, 7/22/2015
Notes: Jennifer Viale

Attendance:
Keith Bowman (until 12pm), Scott Kern, Ellen Hines, Sarah Cohen, Wim Kimmerer, Jonathon Stillman, Mike Vasey, Roger Bland, Ed Carpenter, Andy Chang, Kathy Boyer, Nate Miller, Tomoko Komada, Bill Cochlan, Meg Burke, Karina Nielsen

Review/highlights of background readings (Karina)

Intro (Meg)
Review 3 main goals, 1 research, 2 education, 3 public engagement using “Ladder of Feedback”.

Ladder of feedback explanation – goal objectives strategies
1 clarifying question
2 like
3 dislike
4 suggestions for improvement

Research section
1 clarifying
broaden, diversify what is the scope, define diversity
field research what is the scope of that

2 like
nice comprehensive vision of research, to advance RTC as a whole
post-doc scholar program and hopefully funded by outside sources
incorporates education within research objectives
collaborative strong point and interdisciplinary
strengthen marine operations program

3 dislike
define diversity (need to diversify in terms of discipline, and by ethnic background and should be overall goal too)
modern, flexible research facilities- like we want to encourage interdisciplinary projects
define meaning of flexible within labs, will people be booted?
Add long-term partnerships for monitoring
Broad approach to each of the areas, to serve the whole Bay Area community
Missing repository idea
Need longer time horizon, just has 1, 5 and 10-year time frames
Research bullet to make us relevant for the whole bay area.

4 suggestion
diversity, relevance for the local bay and the community
high standards for ourselves and our tenants etc. flesh out what is meant by last objective
under identify gaps of expertise, not list things we’re stuck with in the future, certain disciplines, what do we really need?
Ensure that RTC is a resource for ourselves and for others, tie this strategic plan with the university’s strategic plan, defining different levels of community, this will help

*Meg comments*
*Do you want to prioritize objectives?*
*Alignment with university strategic plan and with national reports*
*How does RTC make sure that scientific data is relative useful to science policy makers*
*Education goals, is this the way you want it?*

**Education section**
Will it stay on formal education or do you want to bring in informal education aspect?
(vote: 8 stay formal, 7 include informal)
eventually that this will need to be decided, but will stick with how it is now for the below
discussion
clarify what we have in mind by informal and formal
dearly will need to have further discussion, and it’s great it’s on the table now.

1 **clarifying**
what is meant by transdisciplinary?
undergraduates included in education goals?
raise funds process, who/what for?
clarify last bullet point
define excellence in university level
define growth, what do we mean by explore
what do we mean by professional (in professional development)
how to state an objective vs. strategy

2 **like**
emphasis on MS program becoming transdisciplinary and to be more academic program
PhD joint program
broad, lot a room for interpretation, which gives freedom
transdisciplinary
formalizing an academic program
emphasis on diversity and changing face of marine science
hands on research, capitalizing on our research
recognize that we can do better the things we’re already doing well
variety of ways to improve student support, access to transportation

3 **dislike**
transdisciplinary (word)
objectives written as strategies not objectives
grad support, what does it mean
exploring benefits/costs of PhD are not really central to program
challenges of how to make program transdisciplinary
who is teaching courses
no undergrad/postdoc education
professional development area, informal education
need to measure performance and assessment, tracking, how well are we doing
finding ways of integrating students with external partners, internships etc.

4 suggestions
how to state an objective vs. strategy
don’t see undergraduate listed, need something more specific (i.e. REU etc.)
one of the best assets of RTC is location on bay, and draft doesn’t reflect yet undergraduates need a bullet point area
SEPAL and active learning, has shown to enhance retention of information, try to incorporate in teaching
Clarifying question of active learning?
Raise funds to the strategies, provide grad students with resources to complete program without extra expense/stress (i.e. housing) - flesh out what we mean by support to grad students
Move PhD program down to strategies – revisit if it’s a priority objective or an operational strategy
Cost/benefit analysis of what it means to become an academic program
Vague terminology – i.e. explore, transdisciplinary, one sentence = one meaning,

Meg: make sure terms are clear, this is not scientific manuscript but a foundational document that must make sense to a wide variety of audiences

While we develop the marine science program here, we need to be sure we don’t alienate depts. on campus and we become exclusive and lose people. RTC is part of SFSU community. Unique but not exclusionary.
Teaching expectations are different, so in offering these programs need to review how this will affect.
Strive for clarity, but still needs to be aspirational, and communicated to a broader audience

Meg This document should be the mothership that you return to make sure you stay on track.

Increase diversity of students in marine sciences and have them go on to careers into marine sciences, want to be equally competitive, masters students go on to competitive programs or jobs
diversity at graduate level, is tied to diversity at undergraduate level.
Train for other career tracks

Doc need linkages between areas, not silos
metrics
linkages - 1) w/in document 2) w/ main campus 3) w/ national reports
keep reminding reader of guiding principles
every bullet should be clear, get rid of jargon/phrases
who is the reader of this document?
  Internal as a reference document
  For larger university community, depts. administration
  External facing audience, those whom we ask for support, networking, internships

Strategies are not clearly linked to one objective, seem to serve many objectives

Goal first. Strategies are operational. Strategic plans never final, always an evolving
document. Strategies also change the most and are dependent on context. Operational
things are reality checks.

**Public engagement section**

1 clarifying
what are walking tours – integrate history, science etc. on site
what is stewardship program
what is meant by useful social media program – useful intentional content
what is outstanding professional development program
order of priority implied? – no
clarify public engagement goal, subtle difference between outreach and education
Is it assumed we are only talking about science education?

2 like
diversity of the objectives, cover wide spectrum
juxtaposition of science and art
creative, interesting out of the box
a lot of objectives grounded in things already happening
Rosenberg Institute public forums and Discovery Day, and RTC being a repository of data
Thinking about a diverse array of getting public involved and reach out to community
Inclusiveness in landscape stewardship
Adaptability of walking tours
Citizen science in general

3 dislike
trying to meet suggestions and being ok with University could be a problem, having high
school students on site, University rules are challenging
section is overblown and so many programs, how do we staff this? Original idea with
outreach that it would be self-sustaining
scope is big compared to mechanism, tie closer to education and research goals, so that
activities stem from research
diverse and entertaining ideas for a goal and need a link that is tied to formal education and
not enough linkage between this and other two goal sections, need context, strategy then
prioritize – key operational questions
outreach they (students) do should serve the research, need to be explicit
objectives are listed as action items
missing overarching objectives
goal needs to be refocused, not strong enough, not sure what we’re making people aware of, leading the charge, being the go-to place
nothing explicit in here about how we as scientists will access tools to reach public
missing piece about informing policy and management
who’s doing what, how much by scientist etc. clarifying roles
specific named events too specific
policy issues need fleshing out

4 suggestions
objective that we want to get to the point where we are the go-to place for resource agency directors come to us – “Ghost Buster Objective”
Engage the public in scientific activities through public programs (i.e. public forum, Discovery Day)
Demonstrate to public how they are affected
Improve linkage
Scratch current way high school students come into lab
Look at summer time as an opportunity to programming that’s hard to do during academic year.
Rethink ways to engage high school students if it’s a priority
Use existing partnerships and programs (NERR, on campus etc.) to deliver courses for teachers
Make sure we’re leveraging already existing programs/partnerships
Raise funds for graduate docents for outreach activities
Friends of RTC project to raise funds
High school internship program (maybe just summer, different form) make it a program and competitive
Not brainstorming how we achieve things
Make goal statement stronger
Find a different mechanism to make high school program work
Leveraging partnerships, making sure that current partners, and does this provide a return on investment
Liaison with people in government
A mechanism where faculty are given credit for educational outreach (in light of research)
Hire young faculty don’t want outreach to take them away from their research/publishing requirements
These goals and objectives need to make sure it informs hiring decisions, this document needs to be shared with administration to be endorsed
Develop partnerships with art/communications department to make specific programs about science communication, develop novel ways of engaging public
Public engagement important to keeping us relevant to society
Support a flexible workforce that supports models of each lab, welcome the different kinds of partnerships that work for our research programs
Provide an easy framework to insert outreach into a research program
Leveraging the board appropriately fits in this goal, to help achieve goal (could be strategy)
Weekly column from RTC written by different faculty members on marine science/hot subjects
Flipchart
Metrics – thumbs up
Linkages – w/in the document – thumbs up
Linkages – w/ main campus – thumbs up
Linkages – w/ national reports – thumbs up
Priorities – 8 thumbs up, 2 down, 4 neutral

To difficult, and lead us down a path we don’t want to go down. Priorities will change but chiseled in stone in document. Maybe an informal prioritization? If you don’t want it inferred as listed about priorities, then state this directly. Set priorities based on time of document, maybe we’ll achieve the first few years
Concern if ranked or prioritized some on low list won’t get done, and if set in stone can’t change; limit scope of strategic plan
Is putting into timelines 1, 3 and 5 years a way of prioritizing?
Objectives shouldn’t be prioritized. It’s the strategies and tactical should be prioritized.

Some confusion between objectives and strategies. Discussion about priorities is important for strategies but not objectives
Definite but flexible document

Guiding principles – thumbs up
Policy aspects – leverage science and education efforts to inform policy decisions/actions –
If doc doesn’t consider policy makers as stakeholder, it’s much less likely to happen.
Object could be to make sure that the info we have is accessible format for policy makers.
Tie it in with research and increase collaborations etc.
Do research in areas that policymakers need.
Personal contact is important. Policymakers will contact people they know.
Briefing packets useful, effective way of communicating.
Tie in with university goals

Timelines – should these be incorporated in all sections? –neutral

Successful plans are revisited regularly, once a year too frequent. Something beyond a 3-year horizon, the further out you get you don’t have the context or changes with fundraising etc. vague. A sentence someplace that it says plan as of date, based on a 3 year time frame

Strategic planning document needs to be linked with vision document. Should the objectives be more outcomes focused? Discuss at end of day.

WHAT’S MISSING
Transportation issues for students, community, should this be part of the document?
Maybe as a specific strategy, not an objective as its own
What are the facilities needs that need to happen, for example, if we had a rebuilt wharf that could solve transportation, north dock could be rehabilitated into shoreline for teaching etc. for example.

if facilities needs are in strategic plan makes it easier for fundraising and not random; allows you to say “we need this” and these are the priorities

Accessibility: whether we want to explore reaching out (virtual courses to increase impact) to other students on campus, to increase FTES; solar panels up now, come up with innovative ways of moving bodies around, field station being a place of convergence; identify strengths in bay area: social media, biotech etc. reach out to those communities to help; citizen science is important; exploring strategic partnerships in technology for example

NEXT STEPS
Come up with a working draft we are willing to share
Bring to stakeholders for review/feedback
Larger community review for final input on draft (from stakeholder feedback)

Email Karina by end of the week (7/24) if you can volunteer to be in small working group to help further.

Do final discussion and have someone on main campus to weigh in first. Dean? Provost? Maybe bring to science council? Or have departments represented at RTC review it at their department meetings?

Discussion around shared governance

##