

## **Communication Committee Ad-hoc Meeting LTER All Scientists' Meeting August 31, 2015 – 12:00pm**

**Attendees:** Julie Doll (KBS), Marcia Nation (CAP), Lina DiGregorio (AND), Peter Groffman (HBR), David Foster (HFR), Jonathan Walsh (BES), Carol Blanchette (LCO), Phil Robertson (KBS), Clarisse Hart (HFR – notes)

### **Overview**

The group convened with leadership from the new LTER Communications Office (LCO) to discuss interfacing with NSF, committee leadership, and initial ideas for Network-level strategy.

### **Action Steps**

- An important first step for the LCO will be to build a vibrant brand for the Network that identifies the value of long-term research.
- LNCO will consider the 2010 LTER [Strategic Communications Plan](#) as they craft their strategy.
- Frank Davis and Peter Groffman should meet with Saran to discuss the communication roles of the LTER chair and LNCO executive director.
- Clarisse will consult the committee by-laws and revisit the question of a chair with the group.

### **Minutes**

CBlanchette presented an overview of the proposed trajectories of the new LTER Communications Office, including a new full-time hire for communications (search in progress) and the creation/revision of a strategic communications plan (the group suggested [this document](#) be used as a starting point). She described the NCEAS model for synthesis working groups, which embed communications thinking and staffing from the outset (as well as assessment/evaluation, informatics). She noted the [SNAP](#) (Science for Nature and People) program as a model for the kinds of products NCEAS has helped create.

CHart explained for Carol the role of this committee (strategic, Network project-based) versus the group of communications site reps (on-the-ground, daily communications work).

The group made suggestions for Network-level communications needs:

- Build a vibrant brand/identity for the Network (and sites)
  - Identify the value of long-term research – showcase what makes LTER unique and necessary
    - A series of slides that show why LTER and NEON are important, complementary, and distinct (LTER is hypothesis/question-driven, each site with a deep understanding of place)
    - Transformational bullets developed by sites in past years are products that could be revamped
    - Products and messages will help Saran advocate for LTER within NSF
- Amplify messages from sites
- Better leverage opportunities from the mini-symposium
- Focus on proactive versus reactive communication

The group discussed the relationship of sites, the LNCO, and LTER science leadership to NSF.

- CBlanchette said the LNCO would be a point of contact but not an exclusive pipeline to the NSF communications office.
- Science leadership within LTER will be creating messages and scientific consensus for the LNCO to amplify.
- Frank Davis, Peter Groffman, and Saran should meet to discuss the role of the LTER chair and executive director, regarding internal communication.

Question: Are there by-laws for this group? If so, they should be revised to include an LCO representative within committee membership. Leadership should also be nailed down: there was some discussion during the spring 2015 conference call of Clarisse Hart and Susan Daily becoming co-chairs. All present voted that Clarisse should be chair moving forward; she will consult by-laws and revisit this with the group.