

Water Institute FAC meeting Notes

Friday, July 22, 2011 (11am to 1pm in Weil 365C). Lunch was provided.

Attended by: Jon Martin, Rafael Munoz-Carpena, Martha Monroe, Christine Overdeest, Ramesh Reddy, Matt Cohen, Kathryn Frank (WI Staff: Wendy Graham, Kathleen McKee, Lisette Staal)

Notes:

1. Wendy Graham welcomed new members: Matt Cohen, Kathryn Frank who attended the meeting, and also mentioned other new FAC members who were unable to attend - Mike Binford and Andy Kane.

Discussion/Action: Jon Martin is the current Chair; Tom Frazer is on the FAC as the past chair. Need to identify the Chair Elect soon.

2. Update and input on Distinguished Scholar Seminar nominations
 - o *Reference Doc: 2011-2012 Seminar Speaker Nomination*

Discussion/Action: List of Nominees was shared. Martha Monroe will follow-up with contact on Claudia Pahl-Wostl for input. Matt Cohen mentioned Emily Burnhardt, and Fracking. Martha Monroe suggested NEMO program at UConn as possibility. <http://nemo.uconn.edu/> *NEMO (Nonpoint Education for Municipal Officials) is a University of Connecticut Program for local land use officials addressing the relationship of land use to natural resource protection. The National NEMO Network is one of six National Facilitation Projects of the USDA/CSREES Water Quality Program.*

3. Update on 2012 Symposium
 - o *Reference Doc: Call for Abstracts*

Discussion/Action: Martha Monroe suggested that we make a connection through Extension to get the WI Symposium on the list of approved “in-service” training for extension staff. Suggestions for speakers mentioned – Martin Doyle, Larry Bard, Kucharek (U. Minn), Ken Reckhow (Duke), Kathryn suggested adding design (regenerative design) into the potential plenary speaker suggestions (she will explore potential people for this).

4. Develop FAC oversight plan for the Water Institute Graduate Fellows Program
 - o *Reference Doc: WIGF oversight plan draft for discussion*

Discussion/Action: Shared an initial draft of an oversight plan. Several comments/suggestions were provided and Lisette will work to revise the initial draft to reflect the comments. Martha Monroe and Lisette will meet to work on revising the plan and engage Mark Brown to take advantage of, and build on, IGERT feedback/evaluation

experiences and results. (Note that there was an evaluation done by an outside resource for the IGERT program and we can refer to that summary provided by Mark Brown.)

General comments during discussion included:

- The ‘evaluation’ should focus on what is different about the students in the group, the **added value** brought by cohort training in terms of interdisciplinarity and preparation for water science. Is the cohort approach a better method for building interdisciplinarity?
 - Any plan should clearly outline success “as measured by what” and “compared to what” and should include measures at a couple of scales—student level (did we attract the best, did they get what they expected), and the institutional level—are there new courses, partnerships, research, as a result? Is there a way to find measures to compare this Cohort to a “typical” Cohort – is there a typical, or at least a baseline to go from? For example,
 - “What classes do they take? Are they taking the same as others in their department or significantly different?” (Martha also suggested the possibility of a comparative study by each of the faculty that is teaching the class. (how these fellows are performing)
 - How much are the students in the cohort able to leverage the WI activities
 - How different is information that is needed to measure success for the deans?
 - How do these experiences compare to the IGERT programs?
 - Would the recent “Doctoral “ report being submitted to Machen be of help (Rafa suggestions)
 - Program might consider using learner centered type of activities – for example, journaling as a qualitative measure of the process of the development of Research Ideas throughout the program.
 - Suggested that Cohort Faculty note any of the publications that come out of this program should identified as related to program funded by WI.
 - It will be important to find an efficient and effective way to get the information that we need (without overburdening anyone). Agreed that there is a need for an oversight/evaluation plan and FAC should be engaged.
 - We should consider different models for evaluation in relation to program goals including short term, immediate and long term. Consider education/social science student linked to an evaluation program?
 - Are there two levels – cohort and institutional learning? Documentation of the program is and keeping track of how things develop.
5. Share results of 5 year Water Institute review
- *Reference Docs emailed:*
 - *5 year report (attached to emailed agenda July 20, 2011)*
 - *Review committee comments (attached to emailed agenda July 20, 2011)*

Discussion/Action: Wendy Graham shared the 5-year review with the FAC and Win Phillips’ comment that over the next phase of the Water Institute indicated by the University’s RCM management will need to move toward increasing the outside funding to internal subsidy ratio. Several FAC mentioned the usefulness of the recommendations

made by the review team. Due to lack of time and many FAC members not present, the WI staff will solicit by email input from the FAC on what they felt are the key learning points from the review that should be considered as priorities in the next strategic plan for the WI.

6. Discuss process for updating the WI strategic plan for the next 3 years
 - o *Reference Doc: Draft Process/timeline for updating WI Strategic Plan (2011-2016)*

Discussion/Action: The context of the next phase of strategic planning is represented by the major challenge to establish a Plan for Sustainability and efforts toward increasing the outside funding to internal subsidy ratio. Wendy shared a timeline for completing strategic planning for the next phase of the WI. FAC members noted the need for national, international image and the need for external panel members. Also noted was the need to address Social Science integration, participation. FAC agreed to respond to a brief email with focused questions about the review and strategic planning priorities before the end of August. WI Director and staff will meet the Week of Sept 6th and will meet with FAC the week of September 26, 2011. Timeline is focused on completing the plan by the end of the year, including having an external panel review the plan and provide input for forward thinking.