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Session Motivation

How do research universities appropriately and effectively convey their value to those on whom their very existence depends: lawmakers, policymakers, parents, students, businesses, and the general public?
Session Structure

- Panel of experts in the Science of Communication to describe evidence and share effective practices
- Send a set of VPRs/VCRs out into their communities to ask questions and communicate to “the public” and report back their experiences during this session
- Invite members of various communities to this session and feature their reflections
- Create a role playing activity to practice and reflect about communication experiences
Session Goal

For research officers to gain a much better appreciation, *by active listening [and observing]*, regarding views held by the general public of universities and research, and also by conveying to members of the public ways in which universities, and research, are contributing to solving problems, or addressing issues in their daily lives.
Session Activity
Session Activity

- Conversations at tables
- Select a scribe and/or reporter
- The majority of the members at the table are communicators of the value of research and/or research universities
- **Table persona** – A single individual plays the role of the receiver of the communicators’ messages by reflecting characteristics appropriate to a particular persona
- **Table observer** – The observer will not participate in the crafting and delivering of messages but instead will record interesting behaviors at the table, including those of the persona featured at the table and the communicators
Mark – mid-career faculty in Engineering, wants to lead a team to do something big and bold; had always worked independently or coordinated, but never truly collaborated.

Sue – full professor, fully funded research program, some collaborators and asked by university administrators to lead an effort to pursue large center funding.

Larry – mid-career faculty with strong opinions about interdisciplinary research; wants to pursue large team-based interdisciplinary efforts but the approach and direction of the research is not up for negotiation.

Megan – full professor, successful research career, wants to do more; wants to work with others on something of significance; finds a funding opportunity and attempts to find new colleagues to join the effort and build the approach collectively (in the context of the solicitation).
Persona = lawmakers, policymakers, parents, students, businesses, and the general public
Now...what are we doing again?

- *Communicators* should ask questions to determine views held by the *persona* of universities and research, and test messages to the *persona* regarding ways in which universities, and research, are contributing to solving problems, or addressing issues in their daily lives.

- *The Persona* should embrace their roles

- *Communicators* should test their messages

- *Observers* should document assumptions, listening behaviors, successes and challenges in communicating messages, length of messages

- Then...
Report out

Report from each table:

- Messages that were tested
- Success and failures
- Interesting observations