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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,