

PACIFIC NORTHWEST COOPERATIVE ECOSYSTEM STUDIES UNIT (PNW CESU) STRATEGIC PLANNING RETREAT

Center for Urban Horticulture, University of Washington, Seattle

April 30, 2001

Marilyn Snider, Facilitator—Snider and Associates (510) 531-2904 or (916) 483-9802

Michelle Snider, Recorder—Snider Education and Communication (510) 967-9169

Goals/Objectives	Next steps/Follow-up process	Advantages of PNW-CESU	Challenges/Problems	Opportunities	Threats	Brainstormed Goals
----------------------------------	--	--	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	-------------------------	------------------------------------

MISSION STATEMENT

The Pacific Northwest Cooperative Ecosystem Studies Unit (CESU) is a partnership for research, technical assistance and education to enhance understanding and management of natural and cultural resources.

THREE-YEAR GOALS

(2001-2004 * Not in priority order)

- Establish effective ongoing communication among all partners
- Demonstrate success in research, technical assistance and education
- Increase minority involvement
- Match partners' needs and expertise
- Establish an effective and efficient organization

ONE-YEAR OBJECTIVES

(May 1, 2001-April 30, 2002)

THREE-YEAR GOAL: *Establish effective ongoing communication among all partners*

ONE-YEAR OBJECTIVES:

1. By September 1, 2001, the UW CESU Webmaster (Gordon Bradley-lead) will establish a PNW CESU listserv and inform all partners of how they can place themselves on the list.

2. By January 31, 2002, an ad hoc Data Committee (Rich Holdren-OSU-Lead, Danny Lassuy, Bob Szaro, Bob Alverts, Dave Peterson, Regina Rochefort, Steve Paulson, Steve Colt-UOA, Jim Agee-UW, John Barker-UBC, Keith Blatner-WSU, Janet Schempf-ADFG) will develop a draft data exchange policy that allows data accessibility to the extent possible (e.g., limitation=copyright) and a strategy for developing and maintaining a bibliography of results.

THREE-YEAR GOAL: *Demonstrate success in research, technical assistance and education*

ONE-YEAR OBJECTIVES:

1. By September 1, 2001, Gordon Bradley-lead, Rich Holdren, Kathy Jope and Regina Rochefort will develop draft guiding principles that will allow the CESU to define success in research, technical assistance and education and distribute them to the partners for their review.

THREE-YEAR GOAL: *Increase minority involvement*

ONE-YEAR OBJECTIVES:

1. By October 1, 2001, Darryll Johnson (lead), Mark Petruncio, Oscar Kuwagley and Brad Smith will identify a list of Pacific Northwest minority institutions and organizations relevant to our mission that might be interested in participating with the CESU.
2. By October 1, 2001, Darryll Johnson (lead), Walter Hill and Mark Petruncio will assess what the CESU minority partners need and can contribute in the areas of research, technical assistance and education.
3. By April 30, 2002, Darryll Johnson and Clare Ryan will establish mechanisms for linking minority institutions and organizations with PNW CESU research partners.

1

THREE-YEAR GOAL: *Match partners' needs and expertise*

ONE-YEAR OBJECTIVES:

1. By September 1, 2001 and ongoing thereafter, Gordon Bradley will update the existing website to make available expertise by all partner institutions.
2. By September 30, 2001, Gordon Bradley, working with a Broker from each partner organization, will post on the web the Broker's name as a key contact.

THREE-YEAR GOAL: *Establish an effective and efficient organization*

ONE-YEAR OBJECTIVES:

1. By July 1, 2001, each partner (Gordon Bradley-lead) will identify a Broker with their organization who will be responsible for identifying needs and resources.
2. By September 1, 2001, Steve Shapiro will compile a common set of detailed processes for the financial/administrative procedures.

3. By April 30, 2002, Eric Shulenberg, working with all the Brokers, will determine a long-term strategy for projects to be undertaken by the CESU.

NEXT STEPS/FOLLOW-UP PROCESS

WHEN	WHO	WHAT
May 2	Gordon	Distribute retreat record to partners not in attendance
By May 4	All	Read the retreat record
Monthly	Gordon, Darryll, Jim Dobrowolski, Regina R., Bob Alverts	Review progress on the goals and objectives and revise (add, amend, and/or delete) objectives as needed
Monthly	Darryll, Gordon	Provide a written update of the strategic plan
April 2002	All partners	Planning retreat to review progress on the strategic plan and set objectives for the next six months

WHAT ARE THE ADVANTAGES OF A PACIFIC NORTHWEST CESU?

Brainstormed List:

- multiple perspectives
- greater, improved research results for the dollars spent
- active tribal engagement
- reduced overhead
- opportunities to increase workforce diversity through participation of minority institutions
- new opportunities to link research with university and agency education
- simplified contracting
- conducting policy-relevant research
- broader understanding of agency mission
- possibility of avoiding redundant funding for similar projects
- broader information sources for the general public and students
- opportunity for providing technical assistance for remote areas
- client relevant research, technical assistance and education
- ecosystem-based instead of political boundaries
- diverse institutions
- opportunities for integrated research
- more ready access to many institutions
- new research areas and new funding possibilities
- new opportunities for collaboration
- better outreach coordination
- new opportunities to bring current science to agency workforce
- attracting graduate students who may become agency employees
- getting science into policy
- new education opportunities for agency employees
- new body for Congress to earmark money to

WHAT ARE THE POTENTIAL CHALLENGES/ PROBLEMS OF DEVELOPING A PACIFIC NORTHWEST CESU?

Brainstormed List:

- loss of overhead
- difficulty of communication among partners because of geography, discipline, agency/university cultures
- difficulty creating workable administrative procedures
- no specific resources to start networking
- it's another administrative layer
- problems with international cooperation
- problems linking the source of funds (agency) with source of doing the job (fairly)—linking dollars with expertise and vice versa
- problem of long-term research using graduate students
- difficult to get universities to cooperate
- used to talking with certain people and doing things their own ways
- mechanisms for sharing data are not in place
- don't have linkages between science and application
- problems getting relevant research from universities
- lack of will to participate
- scale limitations
- concern about equitable involvement of all partners
- unsure how to keep partner institutions engaged
- time commitments
- difficulty sharing research dollars
- identity confusion—just one more entity out there
- faculty schedules that constrain responsiveness
- exclusion of potential partners
- agencies with different client groups may not be served
- ineffective mechanisms to develop consensus
- potential location for earmarks
- difficulty getting field units engaged and interested
- time constraints on coordination
- natural resource research may exclude humanities
- no NGO involved
- lack of continuity of funding
- fear from other universities of losing money for research
- internal turf wars
- we have to work together when we don't know each other
- lack of criteria for evaluation
- challenge of interdisciplinary cooperation (biological vs. socio-cultural perspectives)
- concern over value added
- unsure how to prioritize research among partners
- problem of timeliness with deliverables
- everybody's got a full plate already
- no explicit mechanism for student participation
- waning commitment among partners
- potential for bureaucratic blockades
- politics, politics, politics

- different tribal and minority cultures not validated through studies
- overcoming diverse contracting
- getting scientifically credible research
- boundaries—geographical, research, etc.
- difficulty meeting expectations
- budget fragmentation

WHAT ARE THE EXTERNAL FACTORS THAT WILL/MIGHT HAVE A POSITIVE IMPACT (OPPORTUNITIES) ON PNW CESU IN THE NEXT THREE YEARS?

Brainstormed List:

- increased environmental awareness
- strong interest in ecosystem management
- perception of cooperation
- environmental disasters
- public pressure to incorporate science and management
- political rationality
- interest in integrating natural and cultural resource concerns
- the importance of ecotourism
- increasing recognition of global climate change impacts
- energy crisis
- reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act and the push for a more scientific basis
- increased funding for interdisciplinary science
- better networking tools
- Internet technology
- legislatively mandated research projects
- habitat management by judges
- development of mutual trust
- increasing capabilities of tribal and native groups
- increasing political pressure to show return on investment through collaboration
- reduction in the amount of micromanagement by legal decree
- push to settle water rights

WHAT ARE THE EXTERNAL FACTORS THAT WILL/MIGHT HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT (THREATS) ON PNW CESU IN THE NEXT THREE YEARS?

Brainstormed List:

- increased population
- potential dismantling of BRD
- economic downturn
- shifting public focus
- reorganization
- habitat management by judges
- unforeseen environmental events (e.g., volcanic eruptions, earthquakes)
- declining federal budget
- shifting federal focus
- push to privatize federal responsibilities
- increasing monetary needs at universities
- potential decline in students interested in natural resources

- politicized decision making
- vandalism

BRAINSTORMED GOALS

- Establish effective ongoing communication among all partners
- Develop a 3-year plan for research
- Obtain credibility
- Establish a staff exchange program among agencies and universities
- Build trust among partners
- Develop proposal evaluation criteria for projects funded via CESU
- Develop PR with other agencies and other federal agencies
- Have active programs in research, education and technical assistance
- Develop technical assistance network
- Increase multi-institutional projects
- Achieve public recognition of CESU
- Flesh out the CESU website and links with agencies
- Achieve early successes
- Reduce barriers to collaborative research
- Establish agency input into university education
- Develop systems for cross-agency communication
- Get more Congressional appropriation
- Develop an open mechanism for matching needs with resources
- Develop a handbook of administrative procedures
- Develop clear mechanisms for moving funding
- Establish procedures to increase minority involvement
- Develop a long-term funding program
- Extend information and transfer science to managers
- Establish student internship program
- Involve every partner
- Involve effectively social science into ecosystem research
- Provide a product each agency can use
- Develop continuing education for agency employees such as graduate degrees
- Define research and educational needs
- Develop a template for a common archival system
- Set an open mechanism for identifying agency needs
- Begin new projects or modify existing projects
- Develop short courses for agency and university students
- Emphasize/integrate cultural part of the equation