

Science Division 2004 Biennial Forum
Program theme: "Connections"
10 -11th June, 2004-10-01
Muresk Institute of Agriculture- Conference Centre

Wash Up Report

The purpose of this report is

- To review the feedback and participant evaluations from the event.
- To reflect on the impact and effectiveness of the seminar as a major Divisional communications strategy.
- To make recommendations based on the insights of the planning team that will add value to further divisional events and communications.

Overview

All Science Division staff were expected to attend the 2004 Biennial Forum, held for the first time outside of the metro area at Muresk Conference Centre, Northam. A total of 127 attended.

The planning team comprised Neil Burrows, Glenda Lindsey, Ian Abbott, Margaret Byrne and Tammie Reid, with assistance closer to the event from Marilyn Mawkes, Paul Gioia and David Gough.

The overall structure and design of the 2004 forum was based on staff feedback from previous events and in response to a more recent email request from Neil.

People wanted to hear more from peers and colleagues within the Division, they expressed a wish that all staff remain for the evening socialising and that it was important to hear from the CEO and the Science Director with particular focus on restructure and the role of Science in CALM. Other planned segments included the announcing of the Director Awards and a Woodvale safety presentation. The Director expressly wanted the event to foster and model new ways of working and thinking together, that cut across the "containers" within the division

The purpose of the forum became, in order of priority

- To share information.
- To enable networking.
- To enhance group functioning.
- To support behaviour change.
- Motivate improved performance.
- To enable education, learning and skill development.

In general, the most important outcome of this event was to build a sense of camaraderie, a sense of belonging, a unified feeling within Science Division and to communicate corporate acknowledgement of the value and role of good science underpinning CALM's conservation outcomes

A number of new forum formats were successfully introduced, such as the thumbnail peer presentations, a whole of division workshop, communications training and an expansion to the Director's recognition scheme to include a group category.

Written staff feedback was recorded for both days, using a variety of tools including, questionnaires, open ended questions, sliding scales and voting. Verbal feedback, emails and subsequent conversations with the planning team members and participants have also informed this report.

Overall, the participant forum experience was inclusive for all staff, fostering high levels of interaction and exchange and engendering a sense of divisional pride in achievement and progress. The feedback mechanisms indicated an overwhelming positive response to the event.

High Points:

- The awards dinner was abuzz with conversation, most people mingled right from the start.
- Rachael Green's session on communication was seen as most valuable and enjoyable by the majority of the division and certainly set the scene for continued staff interaction and exchange throughout the forum.
- The forum was a strategic time to introduce the new Science structure and program leaders, the humour in which this was done was appreciated by many.
- The auditorium worked well as a place to gather a large number of people. The acoustics and technology greatly enhanced the seamless presentations orchestrated so well by Paul Gioia.
- The support and backup of Muresk's conference organiser Rhonda Main was outstanding.

Low Points:

- The room set up for the awards dinner was a difficult configuration to address. The sound system was inadequate and it was difficult to keep people's attention as it was hard to see and hear.
- Many people were concerned that we had offended Bruce Hobbs and that the Chief Scientist's presentation was cut short and interrupted by technical difficulty. Bruce had in fact arranged beforehand with Neil and Ian to be cut short as he wanted to leave time for questions and was using a PowerPoint from a previous presentation. Follow-up by Neil after the event proved Bruce was not at all put out and enjoyed the opportunity to be present.
- The poster presentations were under utilised, even though the effort to relocate them to both venues meant they were on show the whole time.

Surprises:

- The shortened presentation formats worked well, with peer presentations of a high standard and rated as interesting by their colleagues. People certainly enjoyed hearing about the work of the division in small packets of information. Some people attempted to present a full paper in the 5 minutes and the majority of the feedback indicated that we do away with most of the 20 minute slots and add more to the thumbnails to allow 10 minutes for peer research presentations.
- There was an overwhelming positive response to the Communication workshop and this theme and flavour of making connections, persisted throughout the gathering

Concerns

- The catering/food service proved difficult to move 120 people through meals and drinks breaks. There were numerous comments on the lack of quality and quantity of food being served.
- Follow up and reporting back on the next steps of the workshop "Strategies to Improve Science Division Connections" remains to be done,

- Finding other non metro venues within 1 1/2 hours of Kensington that can cater for the staff numbers and presentation requirements.

Post Forum Reflection on Impact and Effectiveness: What New Vantage Point Does the Division Have After the Forum?

- A united sense of the Division.
- Enhanced peer communication and work based connections.
- A thoughtful and insightful list of recommendations on actions that will improve the "Connections " and communication internally/externally for the Division, many of these recommendations are already in progress and some have been completed. **(NEIL..... Can this summary table be sent to everyone in the division with an endorsement and progress update from the SMC? In which case this point converts to a recommendation?)**
- External viewpoints on the Division, in this case from the CALM NRM Branch and the State's Chief Scientist, gave a broader context to the work of the Division and encouraged new thinking about opportunities for CALM science partnerships and funding.
- It is useful to work with a facilitator to help pull the whole event together.

Recommendations

1. Maintain the momentum from this event and incorporate the feedback into the next biennial forum. Useful to have facilitator assistance.

Action: The 2006 planning team.

2. Keep the 2 years in between the whole of Division gatherings and introduce an annual science symposium, based on a science theme/regional focus, publish these proceedings and integrate with other Divisions of CALM and tertiary student/ institutions.

Action: Neil and the Science Exec Team, and to approach the SDCA Division for assistance.

3. The Science Director to have the Connections workshop strategies pinned up on his wall and to have this as a standing item on the agenda on the agenda of the Science Executive.

Action: Glenda and Neil

4. Continue to organise the Science Forum in a non metro location to ensure the whole of division involvement and interaction. Targeting out of semester colleges, Ag Schools, TAFE centres etc. Travelling distance to be no more than 1 1/2 hours from SHQ.

Action: Glenda to begin the hunt for suitable venues and pre-book.

FEEDBACK FROM THE PARTICIPANTS

OF THE Science Division Biennial Meeting

“Connections” MURESK – JUNE 2004

Content

48	said the Content was Just About Right.
1	said there was Too Little
2	said there was Too Much, the remaining
<u>38</u>	were just either side of JAR.
<u>89</u>	TOTAL

Pace

53	said the Pace was Just About Right.
2	said the Pace was Too Fast, the remaining
<u>34</u>	were either side of JAR.
<u>89</u>	TOTAL

Format

56	said the Format was Just About Right
7	said the Format was Too Structured
2	said the Format was Too Loose, and the remaining
<u>24</u>	were either side of JAR.
<u>89</u>	TOTAL

PERCENTAGE FEEDBACK

Content:

Just About Right	Too Little	Too Much
54% JAR	1%	2%
42% close to JAR		
96% Happy with Content		

Pace:

Just About Right	Too Slow	Too Fast
59% JAR		2%
38% close to JAR		
97% Happy with Pace		

Format:

Just About Right	Too Structured	Too Loose
63% JAR	7%	2%
27% close to JAR		
90% Happy with Format		

“YOUR FEEDBACK” – 26 COMMENTS

- A great improvement on previous efforts!
- None. (From person who ticked, Too Much, Too Fast & Too Loose.
- Cutting Bruce Hobbs short was not warranted.
- Just about right.
- Just about right.
- More Workshops.
- Less content, more topics.
- Very useful Forum.
- Perhaps more talks at 10 minutes each?
- Very well done!!
- Enjoyable experience.
- More Workshops, 2) Another day longer, 3) B.B.Q. Tea.
- Had a great time meeting the people.
- Well done.
- Great.
- Good/better than last year.
- Thumbnails too short – 10 minutes.
- Was good.
- Good.
- Bit more time allocated for Thumbnails would be good. Great couple of days.
- Far superior to Point Walter. Excellent Venue. Very good format. The “Loosening-up” Session with Rachel was a great idea. Bringing in Russell Hobbs was a smart move – he was interesting, and I’m sure it was a very good idea to show him CALM Science staff, all assembled!
- Much better this time.
- Bruce Hobbs should have been allowed to finish. Thought the mixture of 20 minutes presentations plus 5 minutes thumbnails was excellent. I liked the venue but their food was substandard and took too long to get and in Dempster there was no light in the downstairs bathroom at night. It was great to have drinks and music later on after dinner.
- Very happy to attend (for once!).
- Thumbnails → 10 minutes.
- With thanks for organizing.
- Good time keeping. Almonds, nuts and lollies good idea. Next one not in June!! Some introductions better than others. Maybe should start with a brief get-to-know one another. Talks. Another session like Rachel’s. More talks.

WHAT COULD BE IMPROVED (WCBI)

- A stretch between the longer talks.
- Lunch queue.
- Too far. Too cold.
- Keiran should have attended presentations.
- Workshop – misplaced. Needs to focus on communications upwards.
- Have it back in Perth.
- Not such an early start – leaving Perth at 6.45am – hard to stay awake in afternoon.
- More salads for lunch! Enough coffee at tea time. Getting lunch took too long.
- Can’t hear some questions from floor. Possibly use a mike.
- More Scientists/Groups giving 10 minute thumbnails.

- Incorporation of a State Insect Collection in the new Herbarium/Science Accommodation.
- Increase thumbnails to 10 minutes plus 2 minutes? Question Time.
- Ice-breaker workshop wasn't able to 'get' to real communication issues in Division, which aren't officer to officer.
- Better poster presentation facilities.
- Science presentations – too many and too long.
- Copies of Presentations in paper would be useful for reference.
- Catering.
- Afternoon tea – ran out of coffee!!!
- Hold in Perth.
- Queues for lunch, tea.
- Longer drinks.
- Less time spent on AM facilitator.
- Long queues of meals. Servery could be improved dramatically.
- Shorter presentations – 20 minutes too long.
- More variety of vegetarian food.
- Keeping to time.
- Power points with thumbnails.
- More externals, some Branch Manager input. Engagement of R.M. what do they want from us?
- More fresh-air time!
- Keiran McNamara should set aside the time to attend the entire forum.
- Start earlier. More time for more talks on research.
- Closer to home.
- Venue.
- Short talks on SCIENCE ✓✓✓ rather than administrative matters.
- Afternoon session too long and break too short considering queue for coffee!

WHAT WORKED WELL (WWW)

- All.
- Accommodation.
- Broke the ice.
- Communicating – broke the ice. Presentations – Great!!
- Hearing about the research being conducted in the group. Keeping to time.
- People exchanging ideas/thumbnails.
- 'Off-site' venue a plus.
- Communication Workshop - interesting activity and I think it worked very well.
- Thoroughly enjoyed the presentations, gave an informed insight into activities in the Division.
- Enjoyed communication workshop this morning – a good "ice breaker".
- Creating conversations was an excellent way of getting everyone (most people) to communicate and participate in activity. Good choice of Venue.
- Presentation of Science (Session 2). Overview from Ken Wallace re NRM. Overview from Keiran.
- Conversations to make connections. Schedule is very good.
- Workshop.
- Getting interaction among participants early on. The mints and H₂O on the table.
- Auditorium – good lecture room. Food.

- Thumbnail presentation short informative.
- Creative cons workshop. Sundowner.
- Talks by Scientists. Short and long talks interspersed. Drinks and snacks provided during talks.
- Meeting people at Connections sessions!
- Ice breaker at start with Rachel Green. Thumbnails helped break-up more in-depth presentations.
- Changes of pace, participation, close venue, not going all day.
- The venue being in the country. The presentations have been very good and interesting. Having an auditorium.
- Breaking the ice, good to get to know others. Longer presentation times.
- Session to encourage interaction put at start – very good ice-breaker. Alternating 20 minutes and 5 minutes presentations – good variety and different approaches – comes across better than all longer talks.
- Accommodation is nice. Teamwork and communication workshop was excellent.
- Rachel's session thumbnails – just long enough.
- Length of presentations.
- Creating conversations workshop. Presentations.
- General format (compared with Point Walter).
- Research talks. Mix of topics/content. Format. Venue. Ice-breaker Workshop.
- Talks – information sessions were better than previous years when we just mainly got loads trying to brief the entire division of program. Facilitator she did an excellent job with a difficult task. We definitely need to talk between groups.
- Talks. Thumbnails.
- Interaction.
- Rachel Green's workshop.
- Great interaction happening.
- 5 minutes and 20 minutes presentations of work excellent.
- Venue – great improvement. Theme – very appropriate. Conduct of the Conference.
- 'Conversations' was good ice-breaker and social 'training'. Good range of talks.
- Mix of activity and listening.
- Communications Workshop – good, basic but necessary information.
- The breaks are about right.
- The general layout of the place and the quality of the presentation.
- Mixed format of presentations.
- Time management. Muffins.
- Food! (so far...)
- People. Interaction after Workshop (conversations).
- Format; thumbnail presentation. Having it away from Perth. Workshop was enjoyable.
- Very interesting and informative presentations.
- Rachel was good. Most of the presentations were interesting.
- Presentations and format.
- Timing of the sessions. Good talks.
- Talks structure (20 minutes plus 5 minutes talks).
- Conversations.
- Conversations. Communication.
- Introduction. Discussion/presentations. Great muffins. Good coffee.
- Science project talks and interacting important, good mix of lengths, good time-keeping.

- Interesting talks by Research Scientists giving overviews of their projects. Need more.
- Meeting new people.
- Rachel Green's Workshop.
- Organization.
- Rachel's session.
- Mix of 20 minutes and thumbnail talks. Conversation workshop - ? a little later in the day.

WRITTEN FEEDBACK...OPTIONAL – MURESK – JUNE 2004

What aspects of the forum did you find most valuable?

- The Workshop.
- Forum review and participant evaluation.
- Information delivery and exchange.
- The connections that were made and the information shared.
- What other areas DO.
- All of it. Good balance of networking and information.
- Bruce Hobbs and hearing from the other Scientists about their work.
- Ken Wallace's talk on the NRM system. The short and long talks by Scientists on their projects.
- The Big Picture was made visible, i.e. Bruce Hobbs.
- Keynote speakers by the power broken. Hobbs, McNamara, Burrows.
- Talks and thumbnails.
- Social sessions – Big Picture made clearer.
- Meeting other CALM Science staff – networking.
- Science Division structure discussion and Rachel.
- Networking with people informally. Hearing what the 'Big Wigs' have to say directly.
- Workshop by Rachel Green.
- All relevant.
- Workshop – communications. Workshop – connections (last session).
- Workshop. First session with Rachel.
- Meeting other staff and finding out what they do.
- Rachel was good and though spooked by it, was a good tool.
- Finding out what everybody does and what each divisions work programs consist of.
- Making connections with a whole lot of people that I have never met before.
- Learning about what other people do.
- Presentation by Neil Burrows and Ken Wallace were enlightening. The best feature of the forum was that there wasn't too much of this kind of talk.
- Presentations on the work of others.
- Meeting others.
- Information transfer.
- Talks by visitors. Talks by staff. Structure presentation. Discussing possible projects with collaborators and Ken Wallace.
- Rachel.
- Bruce Hobbs talk and insights.
- Everything – it was my first forum attendance and had no idea what to expect.

- All aspects were valuable. It is important to meet other staff from other areas. Presentations were excellent.
- Information sessions by all presenters well prepared.
- Getting in touch with colleagues.
- The re-union aspect and the emphasis on making connections.
- Workshop and thumbnails.
- Creating conversations very helpful. Perhaps a bit too long, and perhaps have a few talks first so that people have time to settle in first.
- Mixing and talking with colleagues previously not met.
- Discussion of Division and its role.
- Connections, met lots of new people.
- Communication workshop – good ice breaker.
- Presentation by various scientists talking about the work they do.

What were you hoping to accomplish by attending the forum? In what ways did the forum meet or fail your expectations?

- Improve our business! Partly – the review was good, having seminars that were a 1-way flow of information could be done as part of another forum.
- Networking – provides opportunity.
- Learning more about individual's research.
- Met them all.
- The above and it did fulfill my expectations. I was a bit disappointed however, that Bruce Hobb's talk was not allowed to finish.
- Find out what's happening in the Division, and I did.
- Meet more members of the Division. I was expecting it to be boring at times, however I found the interesting mix of talks (both research and strategic) was quite stimulating.
- Some vague sense of unity. Achieved more than I expected.
- Find out about plans and directions for Division. It met my expectations.
- Meeting new members of the Division.
- Integration of staff.
- Meeting other CALM Science staff – networking. Exceeded expectations.
- Informal contact with people I rarely meet with, but enjoy conversing with.
- Get to know what staffs were doing. Get to know many staffs on professional and personal level.
- To connect with as many people as possible in the Division. To hear some of the interesting work in the Division. To hear the "Big Picture" in Science.
- Meet staff members, learn about work going on.
- New contacts. Catch up with people met at previous meetings.
- Introduce myself – being new and discuss possible collaborations. No expectations really.
- Increase knowledge of 'what's going on'.
- Getting to meet other Science staff and get to know each other over a social atmosphere. The forum met my expectations.
- Finding out what other people do in this division and what they have accomplished to date.
- Meeting and mixing with other people and swapping knowledge.
- Meeting other S.D. staff – met! Learning about where S.D. is heading – not totally met! Feeling of belonging to a tribe – met!
- No preconceptions.
- Gather background info, meet others. Generally met expectations.

- Be informed about the Division's position and future. Learn about work going on. Find out about funding. Meet people, new and old.
- To see what people do – done. Some strategic planning – not really done. Meet other people – done.
- I had no expectations. As I said my first forum.
- Way to better connect – to talk with others about what they do.
- It was much better than I had anticipated.
- Getting in touch with colleagues.
- Update on activities and directions.
- Meeting new staff in Division.
- Learning more about the division as a whole. Talks were good, with the mix of length making it easier to concentrate. Session 3, Neil's talk in session 4 and Bruce Hobbs were all very helpful and informative.
- As above – good result.
- As above.
- Meet more science division. Found that some people thought I was talking to them to make up my numbers.
- Meet CALM employees. Find out about what other CALM Science people do.
- Meet people in the Division and learn about their work.

Where to next? Your ideas for future gathering and events.

- Regular seminar series. Continue biennial “retreat”.
- More thumbnails presentations.
- Should be yearly.
- Similar format, but maybe a few of examples of “how I connected” with another group. We needed the bar to be planned to be opened ∴ somewhere to socialize.
- This should be an annual event and should be held somewhere like Muresk.
- Out of the CBD is good.
- Similar Venue outside Metro area. Continue with a similar Agenda.
- Away from Metro area.
- Here (Muresk) is very good. Or Rotto?!
- I hoped for stimulation. I also look forward to the social interaction. I got both.
- Anywhere, it doesn't seem to make any difference.
- Out in the countryside, maybe in Albany or Exmouth?
- MORE thumbnails and longer for them (10 minutes).
- More use of workshop style (last session) to explore issues and capture knowledge/ideas/experience of staff.
- Away from Perth – possibly in a reserve that has facilities.
- Bi-annual gatherings, some presentations – it seems a pity there time was cut short when they had more to present – time barriers maybe needed to be assessed.
- Another meeting away from Perth and in the country as this one was. The campus here is very good because there was movement between places.
- Every 2 years (the way it is, is fine).
- Similar remote location and format.
- More frequent but less elaborate events would be useful for addressing a range of issues and give all the opportunity for input into divisional direction.
- Some new issues will arise in future, but communication issues will probably be ongoing.
- Isolated site – good. As many or more talks from staff across the Division's range.

- Good venue, being away, ensures staff stay for fellowship and connecting.
- More often, shorter. Formal followed by social.
- Good format – stick to it.
- Min and Max 10 minutes each presenter (excluding E.D., Bruce Hobbs etc) and more of them. Very interesting.
- Bi-annually is fine – location is fine. Better than the previous location.
- A similar venue where presentations were not obscured.
- Getting in touch with colleagues.
- Essential to do. Remote location best.
- Mandurah, Busselton, Margaret River.
- In two years a similar event would be good, depending on events that need to be worked over, in the meantime, e.g. centralization.
- Continue as is – meeting at a remote location is good.
- More 10 minute thumbnails.
- Increase thumbnails to 10mins.
- Liked thumbnail idea. Good to start with fun activity.
- Similar to this one.

In what ways did your participation at this Forum help you pursue your professional goals?

- Renewed interest in collaboration, Identification of focus of funding.
- I made “connections”.
- Information only.
- I found out that CALM Science had a biometrics section! Good opportunity to network.
- I’ve met people with whom I can form professional connections.
- Practical networking skills were improved.
- Good discussions and new personal contacts.
- Networking with Divisional members, particularly outside the Metro area.
- Gave a more realistic understanding of the context in which I work – i.e. can’t exist in isolation.
- I agree that 10 minute presentations would be good.
- Renewed contacts.
- To sell your professionalism.
- Encouraging to see the Division recognize the importance of connections to be made within other areas of CALM.
- Improved networking skills.
- Have new ideas about my direction for next IDAPES review.
- Extending what my skills are to others.
- Opportunity to meet new people and gain new knowledge.
- Helped by improving self esteem through the connections theme, being more confident in work and communicating with people.
- Letting other people know what work we do.
- Meeting expectations relevant fields i.e. fungi.
- Obtained more background info.
- Creating conversations. Will help in future communication with colleagues. Meeting people within Calm science
- Give me a better idea of where people are coming from.
- Not application.
- Getting in touch with colleagues.
- Not sure.

- N/A.
- Hopefully better communications.
- Met quite a few herbarium people.
- Improved ability to network. Consider the big picture in terms of the direction of science in CALM and WA.
- Not much.

Are you interested in being a part of the next planning team?

- No.
- No.
- No.
- No.
- No – (On contract and soon to be unemployed).
- No.
- No thanks.
- Stick with this format!
- I refuse to answer on the grounds of being incriminated. Plead 5th amendment.
- No thanks.
- No.
- Yes (Amanda Mellican).
- Yes (G Liddelow).
- Yes (Margaret Byrne).
- Possibly (Lesley Gibson).
- No.
- No.
- No.
- Not particularly.
- No, like everyone else I'm too busy and something else will suffer.
- No.
- No.
- No.
- Unsure.
- No.

OTHER COMMENTS

- Venue: Dempster – No lights in Bathroom and toilets early in the morning. Came on after daylight!!

Science Forum Connections Workshop.....The Top Three (or more) Insights from Each Group
Muresk, June 04

1. Why do we need to improve our connections	2. What are the risks of not building connections?	3. What are some of the barriers to forging better connections?	4. What can we do to improve our connections within the Division?	5. What can we do to improve our connections with other areas of CALM?	6. What can we do to improve our connections externally of CALM?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To exploit synergies between ourselves within the Dept and at the community level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Science can become insular and irrelevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public perception of CALM, engaging with the community, landowners, NGO's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work place Regular staff meetings/monthly Informal/formal agenda Social events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seminars: getting the right people to attend. Demonstrations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address CALM's image: Govt, public and agricultural
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To secure support from departmental, external and community arenas: both funding and political 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restricted knowledge base leading to missed opportunities and duplication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication barriers between Science Division and the Regions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Divisional Intranet site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Personal profiles - Current research projects - News sheet of current affairs, at regular intervals - Alerting process Maintain currency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better marketing A person to facilitate this – perhaps a rotating role with a rotating focus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define target audience: be clear on who we want to connect with. e.g. institutions, universities, AGWA, community NRM groups
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage our profile within the dept, community and politically 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited implementation of research findings and poor management outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligning research priorities with Regions/Districts at project planning phase. Sort out the \$'s 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Divisional Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - current format good - 10 minute thumbnails - teambuilding - remote location more frequent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use existing avenues A column in Conservation News More information on the intranet (put seminar presentations there) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement outreach programs (how shall we connect with them and why) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e.g. workshops (like Muresk) Training projects, on the job support, collaborative

					projects
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sharing knowledge-extending skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perpetuating and creating further silos 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of interaction: graphic divergent priorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve electronic communications: e.g. website up to date 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications • What do regional staff do? What do science staff do? What can we do for each other? • Ask questions of each other • Form collaborations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional Community Connections
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breaking down communication barriers – sending out the message 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appearance of lack of integration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of listening: preconception: competitive culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue biennial forums 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building personal relationships • Take the time to visit people. Don't rely exclusively on email 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • SciTech • Internet
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced costs – collaborating instead of competing • increase chances of funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of valuable collaborations e.g. financial, intellectual, data sharing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of time, personnel, a lower priority • No Steve Irwin 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seminars/talks at each centre (rotation) after an incentive e.g. morning/afternoon tea, sausage sizzle etc 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination of Information • Workshops • Posters distributed to other sections • Short Landscape articles with vibrant photos • Publish data and distribute to other sections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Partnership improve external cor • build capacity
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of SMT in identifying potential links when addressing CP's 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentations to Districts/ Regions • Develop joint projects: workshop research priorities together, don't just ask for a wish list 	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post new CP/SPP's on website for divisional comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage program involvement that makes connections e.g. fire, 	

				LODP, Landscape	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Produce an internal directory of expertise: website and hardcopy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Actively involve District/ Regional staff in projects 	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-location will greatly assist connections: shared facilities e.g. labs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognize the connections <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a valid activity - time allocation - needs resources 	
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More forums 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formalize connections e.g. project plans, project reviews, IDAPES- make connections a target/goal 	