

Stakeholder/Faculty Retreat

October 13, 2006

Austin Cary Conference Center

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION OF PARTICIPANTS

Karl Havens, Ph.D., Chair of the UF Department of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences welcomed everyone and thanked the Stakeholders for taking time from their busy schedules to attend this meeting focused on creating a new Center for Excellence within the Department.

Dr. Havens then asked everyone to introduce themselves and, if you are a stakeholder, add what one thing you would like to see result from this workshop and implementation of the plan.

The Stakeholder responses were:

1. A center built that actually integrates the sciences from outside of fisheries. Think about how IFAS started. Holistic approach.*
2. A demonstration of the integration of academic objectives with agency driven objectives. A demonstration partnership.*****
3. Outstanding scientists can partner to resolve fisheries problems that we have here in Florida.
4. Understanding how the Water Institute can contribute to this endeavor.
5. Integrating other disciplines (federal agencies, etc.)
6. Dynamic, integrated and multi discipline approach.
7. Integration in biology and integrated fisheries.
8. Need to bring academic knowledge to bear to bring practical solutions.
9. Other disciplines other than just fisheries so we have a multi disciplinary approach.
10. A source of new recruits for quantitative type of folks. Full range of possibilities.
11. Will bring about the ability to enhance students and potential employees.
12. Really interested and excited about the interdisciplinary nature of it.
13. Develop an "attack" today.

Note: * indicates how many referred to this item as their response

Dr. Havens turned the meeting over to the Facilitator, Janice Fleischer, to review the agenda for the day. (www.flashresolutions.com).

AGENDA REVIEW

Ms Fleischer reviewed the day's Agenda (**Exhibit A**) and explained that this day was devoted to gaining input from the Stakeholders regarding the Center for Excellence.

She then turned the meeting back to Dr. Havens for a short overview.

OVERVIEW OF CENTER FOR EXCELLENCE- POWERPOINT PRESENTATION

Dr. Havens presented an overview of the Department in general and the formation of a Center for Excellence and its relevance to the stakeholders. He reviewed what had already been accomplished and how their input would be used in the refining and finalization of the Plan for the Center. In closing, he asked for questions and comments from the stakeholders. (Exhibit B). The group then took a short break.

Upon returning from break, Dr. Havens asked the stakeholders to react to what had been done, but also offer anything they think is currently missing from the plan.

The Stakeholders offered the following comments:

1. Critical needs: impacts to fisheries and fishery resources; make sure to consider cultural changes/needs and socio economic aspects.
2. Add a target to develop a joint strategic plan for research and management needs that would identify who your first partners would be and bring them in right away. Make sure there is no duplication of effort and not have folks overlapping each other.
3. Define a horizon that is short term to define the initial actions and partners. Direct focus for this short term.
4. Center concept can incorporate other universities and other units that have existing programs and expertise. Need to integrate other universities as well.
5. Identify who all the players are. Never enough interaction between all players.
6. This center could serve as a node for integration where people could get together.
7. Just make sure the right people are assisting, regardless of where they come from
8. Natural synergies as they occur; maximize that and make sure to really integrate. How do we form the natural synergies.
9. Disciplines are only just pieces of a whole; we must prioritize to bring about the synthesis and bring all parts together holistically.
10. Need to invest in the right type of personnel and framework for doing the integration. Example of building a house: needs an arche. And general contractor- we need to embrace the arch and general contractor as relevant: in bringing those folks on we use them for their ability to bring this all together.
11. Need a plan for what you want to build (Vision for future) jointly developed research plan. Legislators and private donors will see the benefit of this integrated approach.
12. How do you bring in the economic, the social and the environmental; some ways of thinking that does this; we must all work together to help work on sustainable fisheries
13. Offices are isolated; very concrete idea is that you need to bring the folks together in location.
14. Dept is trying to be on campus since it is currently located nine miles off campus. Long term vision is to have a new building on campus with other academic units.
15. Re funding: private businesses, NGOs, and advocacy groups will influence legislators.
16. Need to bring in the fishing industry, both commercial and recreational.
17. Most stakeholders that are mentioned in the document are only state and federal agencies. We need to include the other stakeholder groups- need to identify all the stakeholders who you want, who may want to be included and who could cause a block if not included.
18. Outreach and extension component of the program. Many problems are human related and how do we change behavior. Govt's are looking for those kinds of solutions.
19. Putting together a very specific strategic plan; system of rewards for participating. But on Legislative side we must give them something that translates into something they can understand that is really doing good generally.

20. Expand the scope of what we define as stakeholders; bring in industry. Those groups define how you get support in legislature and Governors office.
21. Tourism is another group of stakeholders.
22. Where should our focus point; a research framework or to get money; do these two approaches get put together.
23. You may have clients who support your work; be careful in trying to do objective science; don't let the \$ get in the way of changing that goal.
24. The selling of this Center can be comparatively easy; it can bring money and influence to the State.
25. IFAS is strong because they have the industry backing.
26. Greater willingness to talk about the value of the research; answer the "so what" question about science research. Research scientists don't often know why this is important.
27. Researchers often cannot afford to be in advocacy positions. Cutting edge research and outreach need to be combined.
28. Where Center stops and where others pick up that work. We must be strong in doing the research and bringing it out (delivering it) to the industry- this is what makes IFAS strong.
29. Fisherpeople want stronger stocks; how do we address this. The agencies are really critical; we need to consider fisheries as a whole.
30. Once we have educational material, how do we get it out to the public? Outreach component is a myth.
31. Take the ag model and apply it to natural resources in regard to public education. Example: dolphins dying due to fishing gear. Non traditional outreach needs to be incorporated.
32. The term "integrative" might be a tool; one is scientific disciplines as a component; the other is integrating across the primary areas of the university as well as outside the university. "Axis of integration."
33. Identify trends and needs; do we do this well enough? Look at hot issues that local people need and can that translate into research and give the data to the legislators.
34. Establish coop, internships, adjunct professors, all this helps in outreach.
35. Research, teaching and outreach were mentioned in the presentation: do we want to do outreach or extension. Extension is a two way conduit rather than just outreach. The plan should be "beefed up" in the extension element which allows for two way dialogue.
36. There are specific examples that can be mentioned that will show it does not take away from the objective science.

INPUT ON DRAFT ACTION PLAN – RATINGS AND PLENARY DISCUSSION

Participants were directed to their packets for a copy of the currently drafted Plan. Goals and objectives were shown with ratings tables. The Facilitator explained the next exercise. All sections with ratings tables would be rated by the stakeholders only on a scale of 1-5. Once all sections were rated, the Facilitator would go back and get comments on all rated sections from the participants.

The following scale was used to rate the sections:

- 5: wholehearted support
- 4: support
- 3: neutral
- 2: you still have questions or concerns
- 1: you are opposed

Exhibit C is a copy of the Plan with all ratings, mean scores and comments taken during the meeting.

CLOSING COMMENTS AND NEXT STEPS

Upon concluding the above exercise, Dr. Havens once again thanked the stakeholders for their attendance and valuable input. He indicated he will take all comments received and refine the Plan with this input. Some focus groups will begin to meet to implement some of the items in the Plan in the near future.

Before adjourning the meeting for a BBQ given by the Department for the Stakeholders, Dr. Havens asked the participants for their thoughts on how the Department could get benefits out of this initiative soon. Responses were:

1. Create an inventory of current activities: agencies, faculty, etc.
 - a. Helps to look for gaps
2. Look at where folks have common interests and look for areas for joint initiatives
3. Action Item 1.1.5: identification of critical issues would be interesting and important early on
4. Distance learning opportunities should be increased; would agencies be interested in this?
 - a. Those who attend distance learning often bring what is learned to others
5. Chart of faculty and staff on webpage; someone asked for an Org chart
 - a. Students abstracts are on the web too
6. Pilot possibilities: critical issues of hydrology, fisheries and human issues
7. Pilot possibility: initiate a more formalized seminar series from agencies; would help to identify important issues throughout the state
8. Make seminars available online, etc.
9. Minimum flows and levels (MFLs) needs a hub, formalized discussion about how each WMD does this; to have experts tell WMDs what is needed as they gather their research
10. ½ to 1 day with stakeholders at which we rate and rank the priority issues; the stakeholders heard from us now we should hear what the critical needs are from the agencies
11. Long term goal to develop an undergraduate program to develop some of these skills; hard to do only in a Master's Program; post-Master opportunities
 - a. question is whether there really is a need for another undergraduate fish program
12. Focus on what the job market is; what skills are needed; we should look at this as the program is developed
13. From marine fisheries prospective, there is a lot of opportunity for jobs
14. Difficult now to find U.S. people with skills that this Center is talking about; you can find people outside U.S.; there a strong demand for quantitative modeling people now; university setting is best environment for the approach needed for fisheries management approach taking into account the ecosystem
15. Have an academic model that acknowledges the input from the stakeholders as a driver and that stakeholders know they must invest in that program, that would be the demonstration model (invest does not just mean money)
16. The students coming out of the Department now are already very good; we are just suggesting it can be made better
17. Program for Environmental Statistics concept needs to be included in the plan
18. This is a big bold idea and congratulate Karl for doing it

Ms. Fleischer asked everyone to fill in their Evaluation forms and the meeting was adjourned.
