

**Education, Outreach and Training Committee (EOTC)
 Doubletree Crystal City Hotel, Van Buren Room
 June 20, 2006, 8:30 a.m. Eastern Time**

Leigh Abts	Johns Hopkins	N
Thalia Anagnos	SJSU	Y
Scott Ashford	UCSD/PEER	Y
Mark Benthien	SCEC	Y
Helen Boussalis	Cal State LA	Y
Stephanie Couch	CENIC	Y
Reggie DesRoches	Georgia Tech	N
Jim Dorward	Utah State/CBEC	Y
Shirley Dyke (<i>Chair</i>)	Washington U	Y
Andre Filiatrault	U Buff/MCEER	Y
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	N
Ayde Perez, <i>ex officio</i>	NEESinc	N
Tess Lacuesta, <i>ex officio</i>	NEESinc	Y

The meeting started around 8:45 AM.

Shirley reviewed the agenda and stated that the primary goal for today is the execution plan (guidelines section). It should be finalized and voted on.

Introductions were made.

1. Execution Plan finalize guidelines section and vote to recommend to BOD

Shirley suggested that the group go through the guidelines section paragraph by paragraph. This will be an appendix to actual plan. The rest of plan has been agreed upon, with some small adjustments. Shirley stated that we want to make sure that the guidelines section draws people in and is effective in facilitating partnerships.

Some discussion:

John van de Lindt commented that we should encourage MOU at time of proposal. It would be easier at that time to ensure that an MOU is in place. Scott Ashford commented about too many MOUs then. Others commented that this would be too much work. John then suggested maybe a form-MOU or draft. Shirley agreed that NSF should have standard, a statement about a plan to enter MOU. Andre agreed that yes, there should be a generic MOU at the proposal stage, or some statement that the PIs 'have read generic MOU and agree with it.'

Stephanie Couch commented on the need for something more enticing and information about support. Be more explicit about what we can do for them.

Andre Filiatrault commented on the issue with confidentiality; he suggested that we leave submittal of details for after the proposal awarded. For the proposal stage, he would rather indicate how the EOT activity fits with NEES EOT execution plan; that should be good enough. The group agreed.

Stephanie Couch commented that we should provide guidance about how to fit into big picture, the vision of NEES EOT – maybe not this year, but in the future.

Stephanie Couch and Parshaw Vaziri led some discussion about how to coordinate publicity for different EOT activities; is there some way for the PIs to report to NEESinc about such PR opportunities? Andre commented on experience with media people at his institution, who often develop a plan locally. How will NEESinc coordinate with these local efforts? NEESinc should develop media plans with the individual institutions. Shirley drafted a statement about assistance with dissemination of activities through news media organizations, etc. There was some discussion also about proper credit being given to NEES, etc. It was suggested that NEESinc create a media package with all the appropriate information.

Parshaw Vaziri provided some background information about guidelines drafted related to NEES Equipment Sites. Shirley suggested that the first step, maybe rather than an MOU, should be gathering of information and names of EOT contacts at each Site. There was some discussion about need for an additional EOT summary from each Site, that there is already an agreement/partnership. Andre Filiatrault commented on differences between research projects and NEES Sites. He also commented on, for the Sites, the need for clear guidelines about how many training workshops a year, etc. For the annual reports, the EOT committee should review the EOT portion to assist the SOC committee. What is done on the research side should be paralleled with EOT. This recommendation should be made to the Board. Further discussion on this will happen with the chairs of the different committees. This section of the guidelines is reworded to comment on the reporting of EOT activities as already a part of the cooperative agreement between NEESinc and each Site.

Stephanie Couch commented that we should be using NEESinc, NEESit, and NEES EOT to coordinate some sort of overall activity once or twice each year. All Sites would participate in this activity and demonstrate the capabilities of NEES. There can be evaluation of this activity. There was some discussion about mandating such an activity and funding. Funding may not be an issue if Open Houses at different Sites are coordinated, for example. However, there may be issues with coordination with research schedules, etc. Should the partnership be with the researchers, not the Sites? On the other hand, perhaps the Open House activities can be independent of research projects.

Revised guidelines section:

Shirley incorporated a number of revisions to the guidelines section as suggested by the committee. The revised version was printed for review before a vote by the committee.

Shirley called for a vote to put this forward to the Board. Parshaw will incorporate some additional revisions per discussion. Some minor revisions for consistency were suggested.

Thalia made a motion to take a vote on the revised guidelines. Scott seconded. The vote was unanimously for approval of the revised guidelines by the 10 members of the committee that were present.

2. Discuss Issue Forum Plans for Annual Meeting

Parshaw distributed a copy of four Issue Forum questions. The committee reviewed them and discussed. Related to the second question, some Sites/centers already do the student associations; there was some discussion about how ill-defined the group might be NEES-wide. Andre commented on the need for funding. Shirley suggested activities such as an annual student design competition, for which some funding might be found. Shirley also suggested acquiring feedback from students on this issue. Scott commented on the valuable input that a student association could provide to NEES. The group agreed to keep the question on the table.

Related to the question about short course coordination and bringing latest research outcomes to practitioners, Andre suggested inviting practicing engineers to the NEES annual meeting (mentioned previously and also listed under next agenda item). There was some discussion about student-practitioner interaction at a poster session, etc. There was also a discussion about a virtual option.

The fourth question, about NEES' last EOT legacy, was noted as more of a broader impacts question (post year 10). The first question, related to ways in which NEES cyberinfrastructure can be more effectively utilized for EOT, was modified to include 'collaboration' more explicitly. Jim Dorward commented on a web portal and listed some examples with other organizations.

3. Finalize four questions for wireless polling at Annual Meeting

Thalia Anagnos mentioned EOT with regards to practitioner involvement. Perhaps a polling question could be related to practitioners and what they need, etc. It was mentioned that there are requirements for NEESR projects, but only for Grand Challenge. Andre mentioned that perhaps practitioners should be invited through NEESR projects to the NEES annual meeting, so that there is an automatic mechanism, as with REU students. He also mentioned an online use group; practitioners look for test results but also weigh in on test development, etc. Thalia noted that this could be a 'Best Practice' example.

Not related to polling but related to the newsletter, a suggestion was made for a 'NEES nuggets' site – brief sentences/updates about a project could be uploaded by a PI. NEESWood has a newsletter and website. Perhaps information about such

practices/templates could be collected and also shared with other PIs, so that others do not ‘reinvent the wheel’.

Parshaw will work on questions for the polling. Those committee members at the Issue Forum can meet and revise.

4. Discussion and input for the evaluation plan planned for development

Jim Dorward presented on the evaluation plan, or Research and Evaluation Logic Model. Jim discussed links/logic between Program Objectives and Program Activities. Furthermore, is it a one-way link or a two-way link (i.e., is there a feedback loop)? Program Outcomes must also align with the Activities. An evaluation plan cannot be developed until the project logic is understood. Also, there is no such thing as a static logic model; the model will need to change to adapt to revised expectations.

Thalia commented that some of the assessment needs to happen within the NEESR project itself. So, in some cases, the NEESinc portion is simply the mechanism for reporting. Thalia asked if it would make sense to have a workshop on assessment. There was discussion on how individual NEESR projects might not be evaluated, but NEESinc will be evaluated in terms of EOT impact, for which data from NEESR projects will be required.

Shirley asked if this committee could contribute to the evaluation plan, and what questions need to be asked. Jim suggested thoughts on overall goals, lasting legacy, and what activities. Thalia also commented on need for more thought on overall goals. There was some discussion on measurable outcomes (e.g., how many REU students go on to graduate school.)

5. Public policy working group – purpose, formation and goals

Leigh has led this discussion the past, but is not present. The discussion is about: if we were to form a public policy group, what would be the actual task that this group would take on? This topic was tabled for a later conference call.

6. New proposals under discussion: RET, GK12? Toolkit development, etc

Shirley thought that the committee could help by providing some input on how to structure the RET proposal. Parshaw noted that he expects to submit the proposal this October. He suggested creation of a working group.

Thalia thinks that the RET should follow the same model as the REU (i.e., should have groups of teachers working together at institutions). Scott commented on his experience with an RET, which was not positive. Thalia commented on a possible partnership with an education department. Helen Boussalis commented that RET during the academic year (once a week) worked better than during the summer. Scott agreed. It is a large time investment for the PI. Shirley noted that Leigh has also had a successful RET.

There was some discussion about providing experience for teachers without RET. Perhaps utilize the cyberinfrastructure, and every Friday have something that uses telepresence.

Scott Ashford suggested that NEESinc find an interested faculty member and have that person help write the RET proposal.

Stephanie Couch shared a model for an after-school program that is going to be funded. Thalia mentioned possible partnering with existing programs (e.g., math science partnerships), possibly even Stephanie's program for the math portion, providing an online portion. Helen provided some background on a proposal with just this type of activity.

It was noted that RET could also be for community college teachers, which would be very interesting and at a good level for the topic. Thalia mentioned that the number of students transferring into engineering from community colleges is dropping, so there is a definite reason for pursuing this.

John van de Lindt provided an update on an EOT payload proposal building on 3 different NEESR proposals (with Pedro Silva, Judy Liu) as a demonstration project. Originally the idea was proposed as a payload. After the St. Louis EOT meeting, the idea of the toolkit came in (for building of teaching modules), and there were some efforts to submit to NSF education program, but John was told there could not be any assessment for the particular RFP that was pursued.

There was some discussion of the toolkit and the possibility of incorporating games with different levels (Andre). Portions of the game could actually be 'live'. Stephanie mentioned the name of a game developer, who might be a good contact. Thalia mentioned the possibility of various cyber-participants at one time.

7. Teacher Tech and similar programs, lessons learned and how to improve

This topic was tabled for a future discussion because Tess was not available at this time.

8. How(who) to find new PIs to tackle the tasks in the Execution Plan

Shirley commented that committee members should keep an eye/ear out for interested parties.

9. New business

No real new business. Stephanie Couch showed slides for her presentation for later in the week, for which she was asked to wear both her EOT 'hat' and her CENIC 'hat'. Stephanie asked for feedback from the group.

Thalia suggested that NEESit work on visualization to help describe difficult-to-understand concepts. Parshaw mentioned some work in progress on a visualization platform.

There was some talk about a website/video clips providing a ‘layman’s approach’ about all of the different equipment and what each piece is/does.

10. Review action items

- Shirley will review bylaws – related to review of EOT portion of Annual Reports (Equipment Sites) by EOT committee and recommendations to SOC committee.
- Shirley will send latest version of Execution Plan.
- Next telecom will discuss public policy working group and Teacher Tech