February 15, 2024 Translation Working Group Call

Attendees: Dana Simon, Anna Sjodin, Charlotte Malmborg, Jody Peters, Chris Brown, Alexis O'Callahan, Alison Gerken
Regrets: Shannon LaDeau, Kira Sullivan-Wiley, Ayanna St. Rose

Agenda

1. Announcements
    a. EFI 2024 Conference
        i. Abstract submission deadline was extended to February 15
           Early bird registration for EFI 2024 conference in due on March 15
        ii. Details about the conference and links to abstract submissions and registration are on the conference webpage: https://bit.ly/efi2024
    b. Resources shared by John Rosenfield:
        i. Translational Ecology blog by Bill Schlessinger
           https://blogs.nicholas.duke.edu/citizenscientist/
        ii. Cary Institute Communicating Science program (perhaps if Shannon is available she can give us more details about this)
            https://www.caryinstitute.org/communicating-science
            ● From Shannon: Communicating science is part of our broader mission statement. However, Cary has no formalized program or audience. We have a communications team (2 science writers + web person) and several different translation efforts have been tried in the years that I have been here, often targeted to reach specific audiences. There have been some efforts that have been perceived as more successful for meeting translation goals, such as this alignment between aquatic and soil science and public policy around use of road salt.

2. RFP for creating connections with social scientists
    a. Update: EFI Steering Committee (SC) met and voted to approve funding. The SC would like the group to develop a committee to review and consider adding information about conflicts of interest and how to handle that
        i. e.g., share the review panel in the announcement so applicants can note if there is a conflict of interest and have on the rubric a place where reviewers and note if there is a conflict, if there is a conflict of interest, reviewer to recuse themself and appoint a new reviewer
        ii. The SC asks the group to come back with who is on the review committee and to share final language of the RFP and adjacent materials before it goes live
        iii. Let's see how this experiment goes, but Mike Dietze also thought these small grants might be a method for promoting connections for translational research via connecting with end users

       iv. Concrete tasks to discuss
- Set up a review committee: are there people willing to participate on the review committee?
- Finalize the RFP/application form/review rubric text: anyone willing to look at that material one more time and test out the application form (Jody can create it in Qualtrics)
- Brainstorm ideas for advertising - do we want to do this on a working group call or have the review committee lead this?
- Decide on a timeline
- For Advertising mention that the funding does not come from NSF or other gov't agency so anyone can apply for it
  - Will fed employees have conflicts from getting funds sent to them directly?
- Charlotte and Alison are willing to participate on the review committee, but don't want to lead it

3. Who, what, when, where, why, and how for partner/user/interested parties engagement and examples from the EFI community Tutorial ideas
   a. Series of short YouTube videos (5-10 minutes)
   b. Project summary and overview
   c. Links to files with information for this project
      i. Google Slides brainstorming resources for each W/H section
      ii. Google folder with the slides and notes about the tutorial from previous calls
      iii. Google doc with Script & Interview ideas
   d. **Next steps for this call**
      i. Brainstorm people/teams to interview - add them to the Google doc here
      ii. Review scripts, think about slide material
         - Things to consider that came up when reviewing the scripts (this is Jody's compilation from the notes, feel free to add things I missed) (see the Discussion section below with notes about these points to consider)
           - Who is the audience and do we need to do the interviews first (see Charlotte's question at the end of the Intro) (see Discussion point below)
           - Is this the order we want: why, what, who, when, how - is this the order we want? Do we advertise it as a series or stand alone modules
           - Break the How video into several options/ archetypes? Like a consultation/ proof of concept How and a collaboration How and a group-led How? Maybe the 4 types from the Wheel of Participation: communication and consultation to deliberation and co-production?
      iii. Talk about timeline, who is willing to present

iv. **Discussion from the call**
- What is the viewpoint from the videos - who is the audience?
  - Jody has been thinking of it from an undergrad/grad perspective since she wishes she had something like this when she started grad school
  - Charlotte hasn't been reading about it from a student perspective but more from the perspective of someone in academia who has no experience with working with stakeholders
  - Worried that it is coming off as academics know best. Want to be respectful of other non-academic viewpoints
  - Want to highlight the expertise of non-academic participants.
  - Chris - thinking it targeted toward postdocs and professors who haven't thought about it, but who want to make connections
  - Anna will read it as someone with an academic background and wants to learn about how to use it in an agency and management perspective
  - There is long term relationship building so grad student may not be in the position to develop those relationships
  - Think video can be how can you engage with users and stakeholders in general - so could also apply to entrepreneurs
- Do we need IRB approval? Do we want to do the interviews first?
  - Then after we go through the interviews then bring it back to the Ws and H
  - Could do the Why with the material we have to set things up and then could do the Who and How after the interviews
  - Don't think we need IRB approval since we aren't planning for an academic publication
- See how the interviews go and the info we get out of it. If there is enough to say things about the whos and the hows, then we can write more specifically for the EFI community.
- The current draft text is the broad overview, which is very academic. Think that is what is available right now. There isn't information about the concrete work of actually doing translational work
- Following the academic paper process - the problem, the examples
- With the interviews everyone will have their own way of making connections

- With the full length interviews - could organize by the type of stakeholder people are working with
- Chris' example of his forecast - it was a proof of concept that was focused on the biology first. Then people liked it and were interested in using the information so at that point then had to work with the end users to get feedback

v. For the interviews - have a set of questions for the interviewers to think about before the interview and link those to the Ws and H

vi. Giving a preset list of questions will be helpful

vii. The plan for the interviews is to have them on Zoom and Ayanna has some experience with video editing so we can have an edited script

viii. **Next steps and plan for the next call:** over the next month read through the Google document on consent, interview questions that Alexis, Kira, and Ayanna drafted for potential interviewees and nail down interviewees to start with

ix. **Alison to do** - go through the Google doc with the scripts to clean it up and address some of the questions, but won't take tons of time diving into to address all the issues