

Education, Outreach and Training Committee (EOTC)
Teleconference Minutes
April 13, 2006, 10:30-11:30 central time

Leigh Abts	Johns Hopkins	Y
Thalia Anagnos	SJSU	Y
Scott Ashford	UCSD/PEER	N
Mark Benthien	SCEC	N
Helen Boussalis	Cal State LA	N
Stephanie Couch	CENIC	N
Reggie DesRoches	Georgia Tech	N
Jim Dorward	Utah State/CBEC	N
Shirley Dyke (<i>Chair</i>)	Washington U	Y
Andre Filiatrault	U Buff/MCEER	N
Judy Liu	Purdue	Y
John Van de Lindt	Colorado State	Y
Jill Andrews (BOD liason), <i>ex officio</i>	Caltech	N
Parshaw Vaziri, <i>ex officio</i>	NEESinc	Y
Melanie Brown, <i>ex officio</i>	NEESinc	Y
Ayde Perez, <i>ex officio</i>	NEESinc	Y
Tess Lacuesta, <i>ex officio</i>	NEESinc	N

I. Execution Plan

A discussion was held about the items to include in the Execution Plan and included having a short appendix with a list of programs for obtaining funding. We should add due dates for funding opportunities. There could be a bulletin board on the NEES website for partners to use who have an interest in participating. Groups like AISES should know about it and we should get the word out in an email. Thalia may have a list of contacts from drafting the EOT Strategic Plan and there are contact lists from the diversity meeting.

The need for an Institutional Review Board (IRB) process was discussed. Leigh can offer information on what Johns Hopkins does and make some suggestions on how to proceed. This is not something that we can ignore for long, and someone at NEESinc should become familiar with the process and be the point person regarding IRB needs. The IRB is the process used to determine which projects related to the study of human subjects, when exemptions are possible, and review evaluation tools when they exist to determine if they are acceptable. This is going to apply to a lot of the EOT activities, such as REU students. Here we use demographic surveys or assessment which is considered use of human subjects. Melanie will follow up on this issue to see if NEESinc must enter into IRB agreements with host institutions for the REU, etc. We should include a paragraph in the Execution Plan setting an objective for developing a procedure to make sure that PIs complete training necessary for IRBs. It will have to be determined if this can be done centrally through NEESinc for related projects, or if each institution on any given project will need to deal with the issues at their institution.

Miscellaneous comments included adding paragraphs about what working groups have done so far. Based upon studies we have done, here is what led to our goals. The deliverables look appropriate. Sections so far that are missing include the undergraduate, faculty and guidelines and recommendations. Shirley will follow-up on the undergraduate and faculty sections. The guidelines section is to be done by NEESinc. A priority in this section is for NEESinc to consider what types of MOUs need to be established with partners in collecting data. Partnerships with NEESRs should definitely be established. Shirley would like this to be incorporated into the Execution Plan. Judy suggested there be a graphic at the end to bring things together. Shirley will draft and send to Judy, then when ready, to the group.

II. ICEE Paper

The next item for discussion was the status of the ICEE Paper. Shirley submitted an abstract on the NEES Execution Plan. The paper is due this Saturday April 15th (if a review is requested) but the deadline might be extended. May 15th is the deadline if no review is requested. If time permits she will write the paper and send to the committee for comment.

III. Teacher Tech

This is an UCSD program in which groups train teachers on technological issues. We ultimately plan to give a workshop for teachers focused on IT or other Earthquake Engineering issues. Options for this year include a full course this summer or do an after school session to show materials to teachers, then develop a program. The committee strongly felt that the second option is more appropriate this year. We could show the materials and develop the course next year. The shorter session could be used to also get feedback on the activities planned. The participants could be like a focus group for future activities. Parshaw said that there is tentative date for NEESit to do this possibly on 5/24 or 5/31/06. This fits the EOT strategy and we can use it for the RET proposal in the fall. We will do similar things for A/P focus groups.

We should look at the National Science Digital Library and <http://www.teachengineering.com/> supported by NSF through the collaboration of the Colorado School of Mines and University of Colorado at Boulder with others. This website is a resource to assist in the alignment of pre-college engineering activities and as a repository to post those that are aligned so that schools across the country can benefit. The NEES EOT could benefit by working with the NEES partner institutions to assemble material and the resources to align existing, or planned, earthquake engineering K - 12 activities and lesson plans to the Teach Engineering format. Dr. Jackie Sullivan is the Principal Investigator.

The proposed full course would probably be in summer 2007. NEESinc would probably take the lead, and it would be held at the SuperComputer Center at NEESit.

IV. Annual Meeting Plans

Shirley asked about the topic for the EOT form. Parshaw will deal with specifics after the 8NCEE next week. Topics that had been mentioned included a graduate student association, diversity, and how to become involved in NEES EOT. The late registration deadline is set to May 15, 2006.

V. Justification for Educational End-User Workshop Supplement – see attachment.

This is an effort suggested by Joy Pauschke since the previous efforts were not successful to fund a workshop. Joy would pay for 10 middle school teachers to convene in Washington, D.C. one day prior to the annual meeting. They would be invited to stay for the NEES Annual Meeting as well. PIs would be attending anyway. This discussion would focus on what end users would need in terms of tools and activities at the K-12 level to be effective and useful in the classroom. There has been no word back from Joy yet to confirm the funding. Suggestions include: picking leadership teachers (who have demonstrated a strong interest in adopting and contributing to similar efforts) from a variety of backgrounds, some possibly from GK12 programs or other activities that have been involved in prior similar efforts. Ultimately it would be nice to include them in a Strategic Advisory Panel for NEES for improving future efforts.

We could work with RET sites who have a pool of teachers already involved. Middle school and high school teachers should be selected. Leigh said 150 teachers have gone through Johns Hopkins' RET program and he might be able to tap some of them. The budget is \$15K which might allow for a small stipend of about \$400 each. If we can find Earthquake Engineering RET/GK12 programs former attendees they might be interested. Leigh has a number of teacher contacts. Shirley has 4-5 teacher contacts in earthquake engineering. Parshaw mentioned Mr. Storm from Davis High School which has already demonstrated an interest in including advanced activities. We should find the most actively engaged from former programs. The 10 could then help with the A/P engineering project.

VI. Other business

Assessment of the Execution Plan was discussed. We don't have anything funded yet but should begin the process of submitting a proposal and trying to get funding for the development of metrics and the identification of the necessary data for the global assessment of NEESinc's EOT activities. Each individually funded project will have more specific goals to measure, and funds to do so, but a plan for tracking of the appropriate data needs to be put in place. Jim Dorward's center, CBEC might be able to do something for us. Parshaw thought Jim said this would cost normally about 10% of a total budget for a general education project. Parshaw will follow up with Jim to see if he can do this initial NEES assessment planning at this level. Parshaw will ask Joy if there is a way to get money through NSF to develop metrics.

NEESit will have a liaison to the EOTC, Tess Lacuesta. This is so that the EOTC and NEESit share in EOT strategies. We will try to ensure she attends the next meeting.

Action Items:

EOT Staff :

Bulletin Board/Email to Partners

Shirley:

Execution Plan revisions: Add and adjust cost writeup as per Thalia; Add Appendices with tables of NSF programs and NSF deadlines and of websites of interest; Add paragraph on long term funding as per Jim; Add IRB paragraph as per Leigh; Add graphic; Add paragraph about working group; follow up with undergraduate and faculty section authors.

Melanie:

IRB Process

Parshaw:

Teacher Tech – follow up with Tess
Contact Jim Dorward re: Assessment
Contact Joy re: metrics funding

Next call approximately 3 weeks.