

LTER Executive Board Meeting Notes

April 13, 2018

Approved at LTER Executive Board meeting on 5/15/2018

Attending:

Name	Present	Absent
Peter Groffman (chair)	x	
David Foster (HFR)	x	
Michael Gooseff (MCM)	x	
Sally Holbrook (MCR)	x	
Steve Pennings-GCE	x	
Dan Reed (SBC)	x	
Michelle Mack (BNZ)	x	
Eric Seabloom/Sarah Hobbie (CDR)	x	
Katie Suding (NWT)	x	
Jess Zimmerman (LUQ)	x	
Kari O'Connell (EOC-rep)	x	
Wade Sheldon (IMC-rep)	x	
Frank Davis (NCO)	x	
Marty Downs (NCO)	x	
Corinna Gries (EDI)	x	

Agenda and Notes

Event updates:

- Symposium: April 19 full house (115 attendees), including many agency people
- Webinars have been receiving good attendance (~60-80 people) and recordings are posted online.
- ASM-workshop submission form is live and was circulated in the last newsletter. Due date May 30.

Nomination committee for Science Council Chair:

They have identified one candidate and are pursuing a second. Frank Davis will circulate the CVs by Monday.

Proposed All Scientists' Meeting (ASM) Code of Conduct --

<https://lternet.edu/lter-meeting-code-of-conduct/>

A code of conduct is standard for meetings as it presents the intention of the organizers and offers a blueprint for action. The proposed code is based largely on the ESA code of conduct. Action is taken by the Network Communications Office in consultation with the Executive Board.

Action: approved

All Scientists' Meeting (ASM) Social Media Policy

Decided: Add a statement to ASM workshop sign-up stating that presenters need to let participants know if they want to opt out of social media.

Web Guidelines RFC --

https://drive.google.com/open?id=1uxNvIETEZR4aAj4sJkRjLzC__Cok-O8PfsASbRIMcL4

- Generally, this is a positive document, written in a way that is accessible to both PIs and IMs.
- The Information managers are still reviewing it and making comments. For some sites, shifting headings may only happen over time as they redesign their sites.
- The question of what is an LTER paper probably doesn't need to be part of the web guidelines. It can be resolved separately, but should be discussed at the Science Council meeting. It may not be possible to get everyone to adhere to the same practice.

Discussion:

- Requiring that you can only list papers that acknowledge the LTER is way too restrictive. It defeats the purpose of having a site bibliography on our websites -- which is to inform people about our site.
- We make lists of papers for different reasons. When we are reporting to NSF -- we should only include their \$. When we post to the website we want a broader view.
- Even when reporting to NSF, it may be important to include papers that are using our data. In many cases, authors are using the data, but they are 4 steps removed, so extremely unlikely to cite the data directly or acknowledge the grant.
- Discussion at the science council meeting would be worthwhile to alert and discuss with NSF to the subtleties and to gauge the possible compliance of the sites.

Should LTER make a formal comment on NSF's proposed rule for reporting incidents of harassment?

- Comments are due by May 4. Link to the proposed Federal Register language: <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2018/03/05/2018-04374/reporting-requirements-regarding-findings-of-sexual-harassment-other-forms-of-harassment-or-sexual>
- This is a new reporting requirement for NSF -- if anyone associated with your NSF project that has received a finding, the Institution holding the grant has to report it.

- If NSF threatens punitive action, it might inhibit universities from reaching a finding.
- Seems like we need to be careful not to end up in a double dilemma where we have conflicting responsibilities to different organizations.
- The role of LTERs would be that they are ensuring a harassment-free work environment. Terms of the grant would presumably be transmitted along with any subcontracts.
- **Decided:** No network response to federal register language is required.
- **Additionally:** The sexual harassment subcommittee will have some recommendations for communicating regarding sexual harassment and will want a slot of the agenda for the EB and the science council meetings.

Science Council Agendas (overall, EB meeting, PI meeting)

Overall:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1GYwRgN6cgVVMd0r1gNz-eI2iJsvexRGAgPyMx0y8B1Y/edit?usp=sharing>

Detailed:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1XmCorJyBbNAAmiALGScfD7Jc-We4IVXTHeqnG_CbqF4/edit?usp=sharing

Format for discussion of NCO-EDI-LTER relationship

It's important to have some structure for this discussion and some opportunity for sites to offer feedback ahead of time. We can spend some time at the EB meeting talking about how to structure the science council discussion.

It would also be useful to get some general feedback before that meeting.

Marty Downs will put together a brief survey addressing 3 NCO goals and 3 EDI goals with space for comments. Responses will go directly to Peter Groffman.

Format for discussion of 40th anniversary review

NSF will have some information, but not as much as they had hoped. It may be a short discussion.

PI Meeting topic and format -- NSF present for first half, not for second half