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* **Progress report**
	+ Draft of 5 sections completed and sent to group
	+ List of core areas and datasets for each hypothesis complete and sent to group
	+ Need to stress strengths and exciting science from our site, not the political history
		- Example: How conceptual framework has changed
	+ Any place we can add graphs and show data is good
		- Can pull graphs from annual reports
		- Issue of showing graphs without methodology may come up
			* Will tell reviewers that PIs will be available to answer questions about methods and fill in important details during the site review
	+ Focus on what we have done so far for each hypothesis instead of what we will do
		- Example: Instead of saying Omar will use DAYCENT, say that Omar has been to training for DAYCENT and developed some initial parameters for the model
	+ Good idea to make site review document self-contained so that reviewers don’t have to constantly refer to other documents for clarity
		- Expand on acronyms
	+ May be a good idea to add more background beyond 1.5 years
		- 1-2 page synthesis at the beginning
	+ Every time a result is stated, give one or two sentences to show the meaning or impact of the result
	+ Need to get input from people outside the MC to fill in details for projects that are not as familiar
		- Someone from stream group
	+ Editing of sections:
		- Grizelle – CTE, hypothesis 4 and 5
		- Nick – Site management
		- Jess – Section 2
		- Mike – Networking
		- Whendee – Site science
	+ Report will be submitting to Lou by the end of the week
	+ Meeting on Friday, March 3 @ 3 pm to continue editing report
* **Education and outreach**
	+ Unclear comment by reviewer that they would like to see an assessment of education and outreach
		- No formal assessment has been done due to lack of $
		- Can do basic assessment such as # of teachers, # of schools, diversity, etc
		- More teachers are joining the program,