

NOAA Education Council Meeting

Date/Time: November 14, 2012 (1:00–4:00 pm)
 Location: SSMC3, Room 12836
 Dial-in: 866.901.0711
 Passcode: 8134683
 Contact: Lisa Iwahara (202) 482-3139, Erin Sams (202) 482-9183

Adobe Connects Link to Meeting: <http://connectpro46305642.adobeconnect.com/edcouncil/>

****Important Note Regarding Audio:** Unless you have a PC headset with a microphone, please remember to mute or turn off your computer speakers when you call in to avoid sound interference. If you have a PC headset, you will be able to connect directly through your computer and participate in the meeting as normal, without needing to dial the number above through your phone. Detailed instructions on how to set up your audio in Adobe Connects are available here: http://www.oesd.noaa.gov/council/Audio_AdobeConnects.pdf

AGENDA

1:00 Welcome/Opening remarks - Louisa Koch (20 min)
 ● Jean May-Brett from Science Advisory Board

OBJECTIVE: Decide on select council activities to accomplish in FY13

1:20 Review October meeting outcomes - Lisa Iwahara (10 min)
 ● Status of current work groups
 ● Recommended focus areas

1:30 Straw poll results - John Baek (10 min)

1:40 FY13 focus areas: Discussion - Lisa Iwahara and Sarah Schoedinger (60 min)
 TASK: Place eight proposed items along "Do now", "Do later", and "Do not take up as a Council" continuum

2:40 Break (15 min)

2:55 FY13 focus areas: Decision - Sarah Schoedinger and Lisa Iwahara (50 min)
 TASK: Review and adjust distribution of proposed items in the three bins as needed, and conduct final vote on portfolio as a whole

3:45 Updates and announcements

4:00 Adjourn

Upcoming Council Meeting Dates:

December 19, 2012
 January 16, 2013
 February 20, 2013

Attendance

In person: Louisa Koch (LK), Christos Michalopoulos (CM), Erin Sams (ES), Lisa Iwahara (LI), John Baek (JB), Marlene Kaplan (MK), John McLaughlin (JMc), Jennifer Hammond (JH), Maria Murray (MMu), Bronwen Rice (BR), Dan Pisut (DP), Sarah Schoedinger (SSc), Sarah Yue (SY), Paulo Maurin (PM), Molly Harrison (MH), Bruce Moravchik (BM), Rochelle Plotchak (RP), Stacey Rudolph (SR), Chelsea Berg (CB), Ron Gird (RG), Tracy Hajduk (TH; representing Kate Thompson), Marlene Kaplan (MK), Carrie McDougall (CMc), Britta Culbertson (BC), Sarah Schoedinger (SSc)

On the phone/chat: Seaberry Nachbar (SN) (voting for Kate Thompson), Stephanie Bennett (SB), Paula Keener (PK), Osaretin Obaseki (OO), Shannon Sprague (SSp)

Presenters/guests: Jean May-Brett was unable to attend due to a schedule change

Welcome/Opening Remarks (LK)

- Science Advisory Board meeting right now in SS; I was hoping that we could have Jean May-Brett in person at the meeting but they were required to stay at the meeting
- Let's transition to first item; working to set the foundation for our next strategic plan
 - Thanks for everyone's involvement at the October meeting
 - Would like everyone involved in the working groups to be involved in the decisions made today
 - If you have time to participate in new groups, please consider being involved; however, if you do not have time to dedicate to this effort, then take your other duties into consideration
- Atziri has been pulled off from Ed Council for the coming months to work on consolidation effort within NERRs

Review October meeting outcomes – Lisa Iwahara (10 min)

See PowerPoint.

- No discussion

Straw poll results – John Baek (10 min)

See PowerPoint.

- JH: How many people participated in the poll?
 - JB: 18
- FN: There will have to be a discussion on how to determine the actual rank of some of these programs caught in the middle, that have low importance and high capacity ranks, yet ultimately rank in the middle of the pack
- CB: Is “do now” and “do later” in reference to 2013?
 - LI: Initially thinking that do now would be do now in FY13 and later be for FY14 and beyond, but Co-Comm discussion revealed it may be helpful to not draw such a strong line as some WGs may have a very short timeframe, while others may need to be set up immediately, but the outputs may not be completed within the fiscal year.
 - CM: It's a combination; some “do now” may have finite duration and may allow for other tasks to be taken on
 - FN: So for “later,” are we talking about FY13 priorities or things that are not FY13 priorities?
 - LK: let's see how things break out
 - LI: Hopefully the discussion with the stickies will help us see how things break out and what makes the most sense
- SN: For the “do not do,” what other criteria should we be thinking about if we put topics in this area?
 - LI: The first place I would look would be the 4 criteria we took into consideration for coming up with this list last month (capacity, cross-council commitment, timeline with outputs tied to outcomes, potential for demonstrating progress)
 - JH: It might also be the case that the lead should be taken by someone other than the Ed Council
 - PM: We're only looking at the next fiscal year or two, so it may be something that will be a priority later
 - FN: Another way to look at it is that this may not be something that should be taken on by the Council; where can we report out our “success”?
 - LI: SEE process asks us to report out during mid and annual reviews
 - CM: I would want to see those priorities after the meeting. There's no guarantee that these priorities will all make it to the SEE process; but it's also an agreed upon decision that we will report out to the Ed Council
 - LK: It is important for the Council to be aware of this information. I'm always looking for bragging points, too, and the SEE reviews are a source of these.

FY13 focus areas: Discussion - Lisa Iwahara and Sarah Schoedinger (60 min)

See PowerPoint.

- M & E Working Group (John Baek)
 - CM: I second that we need to do it now (referring to M & E working group, presented by John Baek)
 - FN: agreed with “do now” status as well
 - Virtual sticky placed at far right end of gradient (100% “do now”)
- Regional Education Policy Coordination (Shannon Sprague)
 - PK: Although we don't have regional offices with OER, we do have the alliance partnership and to us those are our regional touch points. We are using the OLP and addressing the NGSS when we work with our regional offices.
 - SSp: Right, and different offices are doing work to promote different areas (policy, standards, etc.).
 - PK: I think this is a priority effort and will be really important but also tricky to leverage our efforts and be collaborative/supportive without being duplicative.
 - CM: There is currently momentum behind it, so I recommend we use this now. The issue is deciding which regional structure to use; I would like to see an assessment of the visibility in each region to gauge realistic expectations for each region. Let's not try to do everything, but focus on the low hanging fruit first, adding others in the next year or two.

- SSp: [On the virtual sticky gradient] Importance just shy of M & E
- NGSS (Molly Harrison)
 - SSc: Question for the group—what extent in the field or programs are people already planning to do this kind of analysis? (ex. I know Climate will already be doing this)
 - PK: At NMEA, the COSEE group along with NOAA has already had a large initiative along these lines, but how are we coordinating with that?
 - SSc: We are coordinating already; for the purpose of analyzing the draft standards, I'm not too worried. But once we have the framework, how do we disseminate to a broader audience?
 - PK: with the second iteration that's coming out and work currently being done by COSEE & NOAA staff on the ground, this task by the Education Council may result in duplication of efforts....
 - SSc: Are you concerned that we're disconnected?
 - PK: I just want to make sure that we don't have another working group spending time on it when there's all of this work at the ground level making the links.
 - SSc: That's seems like a concern of the first review group, where they made sure that there was no duplication among NOAA staff and the NGSS
 - FN: If you listen to what they're asking for, they mention support from agencies that are responsible for some of the information.
 - JMc: When the GLOBE Program had their US partner advisory committee this year, the committee asked for GLOBE to prepare for the new NGSS with updated materials.
 - SB: The development & distribution of a guide for NOAA staff would be helpful to make links in discussions with states
 - SSp: Most discussions we've had recently raised concerns about how schools/states are going to be able to implement NGSS
 - CM: I would encourage both SSc and FN participate in NGSS workshop
- Strategic Partnerships (Tracy Hajduk)
 - CM: I'm torn here...I see the value, but it could potentially be a touchy topic. As long as we have clearly stated objectives for the Council, then we should be safe. The ones that you pursue and have worked on are the ones that you promote the best. I urge the group to be deliberate with what our objectives are and what we hope to accomplish. There's a lot to learn from each other, but we need to be clear about what we will accomplish and how.
 - CB: I agree. I'm a little hesitant about this because Sea Grant in particular has a couple thousand partners that are constantly changing and are at many different levels. As soon as we take the survey, it may be out of date and our partnerships may have changed.
 - SSp: It's important for local educators to understand how a partnership with NOAA works.
 - MK: I'm waiting to see what's actually in the survey because what it contains will explain what we can do with the partnerships that are accepted.
 - JB: I can speak to the survey. This was done about a year ago, and is still pretty rough. The idea was that the partnership WG would be best served to provide input on how "partnership" should be defined. We need that shared definition to complete and then run the survey. A writing session is needed to get to a consensus that is relevant Council-wide.
 - SN: Another thought... The Sanctuaries office is trying to do something similar and thinking about issues with duplication.
 - CMc: What Shannon said made me think "to what end?"; We get a snapshot of partners at the time, but what is the purpose? I don't feel like this topic has a goal.
 - FN: We've been talking about this for a very long time, while partnerships have come and gone. In the CPO, we work extensively to develop partnerships. They obtain money to do work of the agency. Whatever tool we choose has to be more nimble than a survey that can become out-of-date quickly. I think it's critical, but I don't think [a survey] is the way to go.
 - LK: The third bullet ("Coordinate with M & E for evaluation definitions and develop measures to value partnerships") could be a way to focus this.
 - JB: In terms of M & E, it's having the right input. Even within a small group we still haven't reached consensus, though. Maybe there are two purposes for this WG? 1) for efficiency, or 2) continual reconnaissance — knowing what may be aligned with strategic goals, knowing who's already doing the same work. We'd need more resources to support the work, but the M & E group has a process to narrow these definitions.
 - BM: I think it's critical to see this to an end point, get a baseline measure, so that we can use the definition to draw information and use it for other programs.
- NODE (Dan Pisut)
 - PM: This is a value-adding product that adds to the data infrastructure and extends the scope & reach that other parts of NOAA have (NESDIS, data visualization).
 - DP: We have in-kind resources and support has been voiced to have this content online. Having the NOAA seal of approval would allow us to do this.
 - LK: If NESDIS is interested in investing in this, would they be more interested if this was an adopted priority?
 - DP: Yes, that would help. And Atziri's absence the next few months should not be an issue.

- LK: Have you thought what benefit the addition of NESDIS to NODE would be (how NESDIS would benefit from supporting NODE)?
 - DP: We have a capacity to develop new activities; should decide as a Council to determine how to carry it forward
 - CMc: NODE was developed with NESDIS; built by external contractors that had expertise that NOAA lacked. Do we still need external support for additional NODE bases?
 - DP: I think we still need external support to develop NODE and eventually map to NGSS.
 - PM: We are in the process of getting 5th Coral Reef module using NODE data at CRCP. We're tentatively trying to see if this can be done within NOAA, perhaps within CSC.
 - DP: External development also allowed us to create a very simple website to access education materials
 - FN: are there people that are going to do this this year and have a budget for it?
 - DP: This is a phased approach, but decision is whether we have people involved in later steps to complete development
 - PM: The website has already been approved. Money has already been allocated for the Corals module.
 - CM: I do think NODE is the best example we have for a real tangible NOAA effort for teachers and students to benefit from. It's also the most resource and time extensive of our 8 group topics to choose from. We don't have a lot of additional money to fund this.
 - DP: Would like to see it done within the fiscal year; some if it has happened and has to happen, while some cannot be decided upon until we see the budget and know that time can be dedicated to the project.
 - CM: Lack of resources (money) is the ultimate issue; clearly many offices have already expressed interest in the past. I do not agree that we have the resources to take it to the next level.
 - FN: Place between "do now" and "do later"; what you're asking us to do is grow & widen this effort, which may take us into FY14 and beyond.
- Education Strategic Plan Revision (Christos Michalopoulos)
 - FN: When is this due?
 - CM: Sometime in FY14
 - PK: This would be difficult to write by committee, so a WG would make the most sense.
 - CM: Place in the middle, "do later"
 - Coordinating Postsecondary Education Opportunities in NOAA-related Fields (Marlene Kaplan)
 - MK: We have money, plan to "do later" (for the sake of not bunching up the tasks and because it will be happening down the road anyway)
 - PK: I would love to work with you on that.
 - LK: There are 3 interagency groups on the CoSTEM, one of which is focusing on evaluation. This may benefit from the interagency effort
 - MMu: Other programs might benefit from figuring out how you'll also work with the Pathways Program
 - MK: Discussing how to work with Pathways right now
 - JH: Having had internships in our program, I value the students but I don't see this as an Ed Council issue. Maybe bring this back to the Council in a year or so to see if it is pertinent.
 - FN: To counter Jennifer, I am leery of us not putting the only priority we have for Goal #2 forward. It's a key priority that should be considered.
 - MK: Place just in front of Strategic Planning
 - Distance Learning (Bruce Moravchick)
 - MH: I've done coursework on this and we could definitely use a review of Best Practices because we're not necessarily doing these at NOAA.
 - FN: There are too many educators to do everything in person, and the demand for our sciences is going to increase as the NGSS go into effect, making distance learning critical to moving our efforts forward.
 - CMc: We could consider moving forward with this and partnership strategies, because they are mechanistic in nature, as efforts not in designated working groups.
 - LK: 'Accomplishments' as described are broad and I worry that if we are not clear in our search for knowledge, we will do surveys that will not provide us will relevant or useful information.
 - BM: The point is that almost all programs are using some type of distance learning. Can we all benefit from some kind of coordination among the community? Many programs are using this capacity, and it's cheap, so a better-coordinated community can be a great benefit.
 - BM: Place between "do now" and "do later"

FY13 focus areas: Decision - Sarah Schoedinger and Lisa Iwahara (60 min)

See PowerPoint.

- Let me start by saying that we clearly have some clumping. We're going to try to create some separation between these activities. We and our colleagues do very good work, so we want to think of our Council priorities.
 - Need to be cognizant of resources, Council priorities, timelines, etc.
 - We should be thinking of activities that have been proposed; some can be done with minimal workload impact on the community.

- Question to the group: Is the way you see decisions reflected currently how you all would like it? If so, why?
 - PM: To tie this back to what Louisa said early on, our activity commitments should match personal goals. Looking at the stickies, the overall load to the Council does not seem immense. Most of these already seem to be built into the workplan of the leads.
 - CM: It would be good if we take a quick look at who is signed up for what, so people do not get pulled into different directions.
- PK: I'd like to add that we've got so much going on that I wasn't able to sign up for all that I'd like to do. Some of this is already taking place within some of our programs and we can already bring efforts to the table.
- MK: Do any of these sunset or go away after a while? The NGSS will be busy for the next 6 months or so.
 - MH: The NGSS will definitely have an end point.
 - MMu: Some really do need to be done now because they're time relevant, so need to be done later, some are more of a "why wait?" approach and we need to take these into consideration.
 - LK: We do have a natural date where all of these will be revisited as we move forward with the strategic plan development
 - CM: During the December meeting, suggest the leads present again with more detailed information on each priority.
 - SSc: That's good to point out, so people can still have an out upon further analysis.
- SSp: What's the long-term big picture strategy? If a priority really only effects a handful of people in the Council, is that worth it? Maybe we can look at one thing as an entire community, push it through, then move on to the next.
 - SSc: Some things will be recurring, some will get pushed out and be done
 - FN: There's a lot going on with some of these priorities with some our partners, like Distance Learning. We haven't had conversations about some of these timeline issues yet. Clarifying and coming back will be important for some priorities we're looking at.
- SSc: Are any priorities in need for a more detailed plan?
 - LK: I think they all are, some more than others.
 - PM: Would it be good for the next meeting to have each lead explain what they can do in the next fiscal year, what efforts will be needed by the Council
 - LI: We won't be able to include this in the Implementation Plan if we delay a decision. The fiscal year has already started, and I hesitate to push the decision further into the future. This was a balance of getting enough info to make a decision but not to try to force the in-depth work the work group needed to do on the specific activities. The slides that the work group leads submitted tries to reflect that balance.
- JMc: This discussion leads me to see 3 groupings of tasks on our chart (Distance Learning/Partnerships/NODE, Strategic Planning/Post-secondary, and M&E/Regional Programs /NGSS)
 - PK: I agree with this view.
 - SSc: You're right in that some work by some WGs can help other WGs, and that can be shared more broadly
 - PK: It seems like the focus of the Council is changing, not working on the NOP...are we drilling down too deep?
 - MK: There is activity on the NOP with the IWG-OE; interagency metrics are a crucial way to do this and NOAA is trying to lead the way for making this happen.
 - CM: A lot of the interagency efforts were put on hold until the election.
 - CM (again): Further separate NODE from Partners/Distance Learning, move toward "do later"
 - Focus on what we are trying to accomplish; it's a lot of work but it can happen quickly
 - Need to allow the leads to think more about the details of the groups
 - MK: I like the idea of fewer priorities, and I can do my work under the banner heading of the M & E Framework
 - FN: How do we infuse the work of the Council into the SEE process?
 - CM: Since the Ed Strat Plan and the NGSP were initiated at different times responding to different drivers, the two documents were related but not one and the same. A lot of work needs to be put in if we were to try to make it the same.
 - CM: not everything the Council does falls under the SEE process; you are the exception because everything Climate does is covered by the Implementation Plan.
- SSc: The stickies have been moved to reflect Christos' proposal. Any changes?
 - (Regional Programs, NGSS, M&E together at "do now")
 - CM: My suggestion for NODE is to get the budget, then get Council approval, then move forward; for Distance & Partnerships, come back with a better plan, present it to the Council and then decide from there
 - SSc: Some people provided their interest in participating in working groups, and this should be a homework piece before the next Ed Council meeting.
- SSc: Do people feel like they have enough info to make a decision?
 - BM: Distance Learning is something that came from the Council meeting last month, something that we thought would be a good idea; if there's not much interest, I'm willing to drop it. Do any other people think this is important to pursue?
 - CM: Many people said that they saw benefit in this, especially with a tough economy
 - SSc: There is definitely interest.
 - SB: I support Distance Learning, and think it should be moved up.
 - SSc: The question is that plan should be hashed out more before including as a WG
 - TH: That group has been doing a lot of work and has really benefitted.
 - SSc: Seaberry hinted that Sanctuaries will continue to work on this development
 - CM: The complexity increases at an order of magnitude at the Ed Council level compared to the Sanctuaries alone.

- MK: Maybe we should get some things running now instead of coming back to the Council next month to see how they work.
 - SSc: we have more to flesh out with these before going ahead with them.
 - CM: we don't have enough of a plan to go ahead with most of these.
 - PK: how much time do you see needing to be dedicated to each of these? I would have to know that in order to know whether I can participate in any of these groups.
 - SSc: M&E is probably the one we best understand, but I'm not sure we're going to be able to provide you that information in this time frame. You're not signing your name in blood today, but providing us with a guideline of who is interested in being involved in each group
 - FN: staff cover to Council member is going down; not only Council members will be involved in these working groups
 - SSc: we need to go deeper into our bench in the Education community, not only use Ed Council reps and their alternates; one of the biggest reasons for doing this is to use the resources of more of our Education community
 - PK: but we might not come to the Council with as much reporting if we do that.
 - SSc: That's true, but that speaks to being careful with who you pick to staff these WGs. Some people will be able to do that and some will not. We can't continue in the status quo though because we all have too much to do and in the meantime are failing to draw on the talent pool that we have.
- MH: What's the end game here? What do we need to do now?
 - LK: We should put it to a vote. Maybe we ask M&E, Regional, & NGSS to come back in December with a more detailed direction, or maybe give thumbs up/down with the top 6?
 - CM: move yes/no to the 8; have top 3 come back to the Council in the coming months
 - MH: we need to revisit to ensure that people are attending the group
 - CM: once we have a yes/no vote, the groups voted "yes" will come back to the Council with updates.
- LI: we're not making a distinction b/w M&E/NGSS/Regional and NODE/Partnerships/Distance?
 - LK: we'll focus on these first, then move on to the others
 - Thumbs up/over/down
- **VOTE:**
- **Whole slate (1st wave: M&E, Regional & NGSS; 2nd wave: NODE, Partners, Distance; 3rd: Post-secondary, Strategic Plan): thumbs up for consensus**
- LK: thanks for an interesting dialogue; let's break here and take discussions offline until the next meeting

ACTION:

Co-Comm Plus will discuss and propose a timeline and give specific charges to the three groupings of WGs. We will use the December Ed Council meeting to finalize the reporting process for these WGs.

Updates and Announcements

- ...