

LTER Executive Committee Meeting - Coweeta - 10-19-94
Jerry Franklin, Bruce Hayden, Fred Swanson, John Hobbie, John Vande Castle

Discussion of Agenda Items for LTER/CC meeting

- Issues regarding a six-year cycle of the Network Office.
- Budget Issues - for instance Network Office funding coming from a division-level budget
- Need of reviews from results of augmentation proposals - the sites would like this from NSF - Discussion of future augmentations.
- Change from move of Tom - rotator position of Long Term Programs in the future?
- LTER 2000 Science Document - 50 copies to be distributed - needing about 1hr of CC discussion.
- Workshop and Science related activities. Committee structure, esp regarding international participation. - i.e. participation of data management representation
- A better definition of the level of participation, in LTER in general, as well as participation in the Network program - especially regarding the external commitment to the Network program
- Bruce suggested that there be a document that says "what is LTER" - an agreed upon list - this could include sociology of the groups, reward system etc.
- Affiliation of new sites - what are the criteria to be involved - again relating to the "What is LTER" definition - participation at different levels, for instance involvement of data management committee regarding standards etc. The break here is the distinction of site versus network involvement. This, relating to ILTER involvement where it is more of a network of networks than involvement of individual sites.
- Difficulty of staffing of LTER sites - "reward system" of staffing - doesn't always fit in well with professional career paths
- Committee structure: Involvement of PI level - i.e. site rep people in the group - should perhaps be added. More involvement of site and science with the data management groups. It is suggested that there be a CC liaison group to be included with the data management group.
- How to deal with committee meeting a number of models - regular, annual meeting vs an "as needed" (just in time?) basis. Each of the committees need to decide what is needed, as well as the need to include ad hoc workshops - So there are really 3 levels, regular committee, occasional committee, and ad hoc workshops. The latter to be a line item, with requests to be approved, most likely by the LTER/EXEC.
- LTER NETWORK PROGRAM DISCUSSION - New Items The NSF review of the Network Office focused on both short term and long term needs. The review has been submitted in draft form, and probably needs to be communicated to the Network Office as it prepares its new document in the next few weeks.
- Review of Network program, now expanded to include an annual report. If this were followed by a review by a small group (as if they were NSF reviewers) it would be a good way to get feedback, and involvement of the full CC in the process of the Network program.
- International efforts - how is this planned to be implemented? - Does the Network Office play a role as a mediator. There is currently not a good connection between international activities at the ILTER level and the individual site level, especially science related research. Although ILTER is a relatively new effort, now that it is becoming an established entity, there needs to be a more formal linkage.
- Educational involvement needs to be defined at the Network program and individual site level. Especially related to graduate student intersite program funding - Having a motivational mechanism seems like a good idea, but the "rules and bounds" be defined, although it might not be good to impose a strict structure. A limit of \$2,000 seems like a good limit, allowing 10 awards, so this would be distributed across the sites well.
- Increasing the level of science discussion at CC meetings was discussed and suggested to be discussed at the CC meetings.
- A discussion of the Bioscience ms - to agree on the science mission statement is to be an agenda item - There needs to be agreement on the goals of the Network.

