

National Academies of
Science, Engineering and Medicine

Societal Experts Action Network

Fall 2025 Symposium

September 17, 2025

National Academies of
Sciences Engineering Medicine
2101 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C.

Proceedings by:

CASET Associates, Ltd.
caset@caset.net

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcome	1
Maria Carmen Lemos, University of Michigan, Co-Chair of the SEAN Executive Committee	
Michael Hout, New York University, Co-Chair of the SEAN Executive Committee	
Session 1: The Network Imperative: Why Evidence Needs Infrastructure	7
Moderator: Adam Seth Levine, SNF Agora Institute Associate Professor of Health Policy and Management, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health	
Networks in Action: Sustaining Evidence Ecosystems	7
Overview Presentation and Q&A	17
Anita Chandra, Vice President and Director, RAND Social and Economic Well-Being	
Case Examples	46
Florence Hudson, Executive Director and Co-Principal Investigator, Northeast Big Data Innovation Hub	
Dovev Levine, Assistant Dean for Graduate Student Affairs and Assistant Vice Provost for Outreach and Engagement, University of New Hampshire, New England Municipal Sustainability Network	
Maria Flynn, President and CEO, Jobs for the Future	
Erin O'Malley, Executive Director, Coalition for Trust in Health & Science	

Session 2: Designing for Durability: Field Notes and Futures of Networked Action **88**

**Moderator: Sonia Angell, Johns Hopkins University
Member of the SEAN Executive Committee**

Terri Ferinde, Partner, Collaborative Communications

**Anna Rickliin, Health in All Policies Manager,
Fairfax County Health Department, Society of
Practitioners of Health Impact Assessment**

**Sacoby Wilson, Founding Member, Mid-Atlantic
Justice Coalition**

**Jennifer Maze, Co-Director, National Center for
Traumatic Stress**

Facilitated Room Discussion **120**

Session 3: Identifying Opportunities for Action **131**

Facilitator: Bridget Kelly, Burke Kelly Consulting

Sharing Takeaways and Facilitated Discussion **139**

Final Reflections and Adjourn **147**

**Maria Carmen Lemos, University of Michigan,
Co-Chair of the SEAN Executive Committee**

P R O C E E D I N G S (10:00 a.m.)

Agenda Item: Welcome

DR. CARMEN LEMOS: My name is Maria Carmen Lemos and I am a former professor at the University of Michigan at the School of Sustainability and Environment. I am retired as of September 1st. I will spare you the little dance that I do every time that I say I am retired and go straight into our welcome remarks on behalf of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine and of the Societal Experts Action Network, fondly known as SEAN to those of us who have been with it for a while.

I would like to welcome all of you, the ones here in person, and also the ones joining us virtually. I want to thank you very much for coming. I will tell you of people who have been at these meetings before. Those are the most fun meetings that you can have because it is mostly focused on people, on the audience, not on people speaking. And this year, we are focusing on something very important for all of us, especially in these challenging times that we are living in, which are networks. Networks are known to promote values to galvanize action, to sustain good will, to sustain ways of learning new things but also of understanding what needs to be done. And in this occasion, we are going to hurry here from a lot of people who are network members, network leaders, and scholars of

network. We are bracing ourselves to our very exciting one day, learning about those things and also learning from each other.

The meeting today has two sessions in the morning and then tabletops in the afternoon. And we are hoping that there will be a lot of participation. One of the things that we are doing slightly different this time around is that people will move around to learn more and get to know different people throughout.

On the first half of the day, we will focus on highlighting networks aligned with topic areas. The sessions will be chaired by Adam Levine and Anita Chandra. They will come here and they will guide us through discussions. And then in the afternoon, it is going to be a little bit less formal. We are going to discuss, under Bridget's guidance, different kinds of activities that she has planned for us.

I will read the housekeeping items because they will punish me if I do not tell them perfectly. I have already gone over the first thing that they wrote to me. Now, I am going to read it verbatim. This is a hybrid event. There are people attending in person and virtually. During the upcoming panel discussion, in-person attendees should use the microphones at their tables to ask questions and the moderator will call you. Virtual attendees should

submit your questions, using the Q&A feature in Zoom and a SEAN staff/person in the room will raise the questions on your behalf.

We have a graphic notetaker today, capturing key, emerging themes from our panels and group discussions. We will have the opportunity to view the graphics both during and after the symposium. Recordings of the panel discussions will be available on the SEAN website a few days following this event. If any of you need something, the SEAN team around the room can support you, Malvern Chelsea, Sean, Annie, Ron, and Bridget.

Before I pass the mic to Mike Hout, the other co-chair of SEAN, to talk a little bit about what is going to happen, I would to from the bottom of my heart to thank the team. The SEAN team is the most valuable, soft, strong structure in this enterprise. Without them, we would do nothing basically, literally. And we are profoundly thankful for their role through the years and for how graciously they have managed us so efficiently to meetings that are not only very consequential and we can see the impact of what is here in real time, which is very rare at the Academy, I will tell you that. To a certain extent, without them, we would not do that. Thank you very much to all the members, especially Malvern and Chelsea, for all

the hard work that they have put through the years. Thank you.

DR. HOUT: Thanks, Maria Carmen. Hi. I am Mike Hout. I am the co-chair of SEAN, the Societal Experts Action Network. That is the last time I will say all four words. It is just SEAN around here. I am Mike. I am a professor of sociology at NYU and co-chair of the SEAN Executive Committee.

As Maria Carmen mentioned, today's symposium is being hosted by SEAN. First, I go off script and now I am on script. I lose myself. We are an activity of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine and we are sponsored by the National Science Foundation. We were founded in the spring of 2020 in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic with the goal of connecting academic expertise with practical action at the state and local levels. This was extremely important in that moment and we continue to maintain our focus on providing state and local guidance or guidance to people who are engaged at the state and local level.

As the pandemic evolved, we branched out into other subjects mostly because we got requests for guidance from our colleagues and collaborators at the state and local level. In order to respond, we recruited a broader array of experts and engaged ourselves in a broader array

of activities that now include resilience to climate change, digital equity, loneliness, and AI. All of these are topics that many of you deal with on a regular basis and we have recruited people from across academia to provide volunteer -- we do not charge for this advice -- volunteer input into your decision-making process.

We are not a roster or a panel. We are a network as the N in SEAN says. And today, we are here to talk about networks and networking. We are social and behavioral science experts. And we are eager to apply what we know to the problems that you all face.

Over 500 scholars and other experts have participated in our various activities. In just the last 12 months, SEAN has published guidance on strategies for integrating AI into state and local decision making. We have held webinars on social isolation and loneliness, hosted stakeholder convenings on wastewater surveillance, and facilitated learning conversations. All of these activities cultivated relationships with state and local leaders, intermediary organizations, and the academics who volunteered their time for these activities. All manner of expertise is necessary for handling these complex and regionally specific problems.

Today's symposium brings together a roomful of folks who have participated and some who are just getting

to know SEAN and we are eager to hear what you have to contribute to the whole enterprise of making networks sustainable. As funding and federal support shift, we rely more and more on the -- what did you call it -- soft structures below the surface to keep ourselves informed and connected. Today, we are going to hear more about that both in the form of a morning of panels where people will share their experience with network building and then in the afternoon where we will be presented with problems and subject areas that we will discuss face-to-face and then shift from one table to another and talk about solving the problems that we have inherited from the previous occupants of a given table. There will be more about how this is going to work after lunch. But that is our enterprise for today. We are incredibly grateful for the opportunity to have you all here today and to be able to highlight the wealth of experience that you bring to this enterprise.

Also, as Maria Carmen mentioned, very grateful to the SEAN staff who are supported by the National Science Foundation Grant that we received. As Maria Carmen said, these activities would not occur if the staff did not plan them and the staff did not find the people to invite. All of us are here today because of the support that we got from the National Science Foundation and the energy and expertise that our staff have brought to this enterprise.

With that, I would like to now invite Adam and Anita to come up to the table here in the front and to kick off the first panel of the morning. Thank you.

Session 1: The Network Imperative: Why Evidence Needs Infrastructure

Agenda Item: Networks in Action: Sustaining Evidence Ecosystems

DR. A. LEVINE: Hi everybody. I am really thrilled to be here and thank you so much for the introduction. I am going to say a few words just to frame up what we are going to be doing over the next couple of hours. I will start by just introducing myself. My name is Adam Levine. Adam Seth Levine. I put the Seth in there so that maybe I can be distinguishable on Google. I am a political scientist by training. I am now at Johns Hopkins. I am part of the Public Health School. I am also part of the SNF Agora Institute, which is the democracy institute there.

I will say one small update relative to what is on the guide that is on the tables, which is never before has deleting a word been so amazing but you can delete the word associate from my title. That is kind of nice. That should be out of there.

My research is on the science of collaboration, when do people work together, and especially researchers and practitioners and policymakers but others as well. And

then the SNF Agora part is we are a democracy institute at Johns Hopkins. I want to start by talking a little bit about both of these, both about the collaboration stuff as well as about the democracy stuff.

Why are we here? At a broad level, why are we here today like in this room and on Zoom? I am happy to talk more existentially. At a very broad level, it is because in order to solve our problems and improve communities we care about, we have to work together. We need each other. No single person can advance things like public health, climate resilience, AI governance and responsibility, education, and things like that. No single person can do it on their own. We need to work with other people.

Part of what we want to do is we want to discuss a few proven models of what that looks like, of what that network building looks like with various kinds of collaborative goals, various kinds of governance structures, various kinds of funding models.

In order to get from here to there, I want to start by establishing a few base definitions, if you will, and then I will talk a little bit about my own work and my own experience with networks.

First of all, two terms you will hear a lot today, heck, they are in the title of the event, are

networks and collaboration. What do we mean by that? What is the distinction or what is the difference? At a very fundamental level, networks involve connectedness, people, organizations, beliefs, knowledge, what have you. That can be within organizations. That can be within communities. That can be within sectors. That can be within families and it can be across all of that as well.

Now, what are these people within these networks trying to do? I think there are lots of things they are trying to do. But one of the things that we are especially going to be focused on today is they are trying to collaborate. They have a goal of collaboration. What do we mean by that?

Collaboration is a word that gets used in lots of different ways by lots of different people. I think it is useful to think about it -- what I have found is it is useful to think about it as basically lying on a continuum. At one end, you have more informal modes of collaboration, which is knowledge sharing between people with diverse forms of expertise and experience but where they remain autonomous decision makers. Think about people you go to for advice or feedback, things like that. And then all the way at the other end, there is more formal collaboration, which is where people with diverse forms of expertise and experience agree to be held accountable to each other and

they share decision making authority. They share ownership over some kind of products and things like that. In my world, that could be a new research project between researchers and practitioners coming together. But they can also be things like we are going to plan this event together and so on.

You can think about various forms of collaboration that also might exist in the middle, things like that we might often the word coordination for where there may not really be shared decision making authority where we are agreeing to say let us try to at least be accountable to each other at some level. We saw a lot of that during the pandemic. People who were agreeing at public health departments. They were agreeing to share messaging and things like that.

Regardless of the goal -- regardless if we are talking about informal collaboration, formal collaboration, or anything in between. One thing about many of these connections and these collaborations you will hear about today is that at some level, at some very fundamental level, they are voluntary. People are choosing to engage with one another and that often does not happen on their own. In fact, what makes many of the examples we will hear today so remarkable is because this stuff is happening. It actually exists in the world in the very first place.

In fact, a lot of my work is motivated by thinking about and asking people about what their unmet desire to collaborate is. How can we both surface that and how can we both meet it?

The last thing I will just say about setting up today is a lot of what we will talk about really is about these networks, about these examples, about governing structures and funding and all that kind of stuff. I do want to just make sure we do not lose the forest for the trees. And what I mean by that is to say that to me, one of the core functions of democratic self-governance is that people choose to work together. They may not know each other to begin with. They choose to work together in order to understand problems, identify problems, think about how to move forward, agree to be held accountable to each other at some level and so on. I think it is really important to think about the way in which a lot of what we are doing today is we are also in my mind advancing small D democratic self-governance. I think that is really important, especially maybe in a moment like today.

Now, I am going to talk a little bit about my own experiences with networks and collaboration. I said I studied the science of collaboration. I am personally really excited to be here. In fact, to be honest, between you and me and everyone online, I wish I had been here

about eight years ago. That is because I started a new network and it totally failed. I probably could have used the insights that we are going to hear about today.

The network was called Research4Impact. Now, there is a newer version of it. Now, it has been far more successful. But initially, what it was -- it was designed to connect researchers and practitioners from a wide variety of sectors. Researchers, mostly social scientists. I am a trained political scientist by training. Basically, it is this online platform for them to connect.

We started in 2017. I have two amazing co-founders, Jake Bowers and Don Green, who are political scientists. We built basically this LinkedIn-style online platform. And within the first ten months, 388 researchers and practitioners had built profiles on this platform. We were like, wow, this is so cool. This is amazing. Oh my goodness. The only problem is that even though 388 people had built these profiles, only 7 people had actually reached out to anyone else. At one level, I had a built a network. We had built a network. Cool. On the other hand, no, we did not. Network in name only. I do not even know what you call it at that point.

What I learned in scratching the surface a bit and talking to some of the people who had built these profiles -- it basically had overcome all of these kinds of

barriers. Actually, to be honest, overcome many of the kinds of barriers we are going to hear about today. Things like having capacity. Things like being interested. Things like being presented with opportunities. Those kinds of things. Even though that had happened, they still did not -- and this is what they revealed to me when I started asking around -- they still did not necessarily feel comfortable actually talking to one another and they still were hesitant to reach out to somebody across sectors.

What we ended up doing was -- that was interesting at one level to say oh my goodness. What we are observing here is the way in which people can have this kind of unmet desire to collaborate. They obviously want to; otherwise, they would not have joined the network. But yet then they are not going to the next step. Part of what we were observing was the importance of those kinds of relational factors and how people can be uncertain about that kind of relationality.

The other thing though is that we were observing basically like the absolute critical importance of governance because what we ended up doing and this was the more successful sort of 2.0 version is basically doing hands-on matchmaking where we would offer to make matches for people and all of a sudden having somebody who would do that like that was the flood gate is open.

And what I have learned since then in a variety of other work trying to surface a need, decision makers on that desire to collaborate. They are often really can be a lot of this. It is one of those things where it is people do not necessarily think about it all the time or maybe have not thought much about it until you come and ask.

I have done these surveys with nationwide surveys with local policymakers in which 57 percent will say I have an unmet desire to collaborate with a local researcher around a policy challenge that we are facing or 40 to 50 percent of local and state policymakers who say I have an unmet desire to engage with a bioethicist around some of the ethical challenges that I am facing. That was with the medical doctor at the University of Michigan.

And then 81 percent of local sustainability officers around the country basically saying I want to interact with a sustainability researcher to tackle things related to land use or climate resiliency or things like that.

I think all of this underscores the way in which this stuff just does not happen. Also, thinking about how do we develop and test new ways for researchers who want to be honest brokers like to build these kinds of new collaborative relationships. That is a little bit about my work. Again, my work talks about certain kinds of networks

with certain kinds of people and certain kinds of goals. And what we will hear about today is some of what I just mentioned. For example, connecting researchers and policymakers but then also -- and researchers and practitioners as well as others.

Last before I get yanked off the podium here, just a slight pep rally mode, which is not only am I happy to be here today but actually also I am proud to be here today. I am proud of everyone else who is here in the room and on Zoom. And the reason why I say that is because I do think in a moment like this, it is really easy to focus on division and many people are focusing on division. To me, choosing to connect and collaborate, to think about how to do it and to choose to do it, that is, as I mentioned earlier, a core active democratic self-governance. And it really focuses on possibility.

One of the reasons why I like the science of collaboration -- I like studying it. I like trying to think about designing interventions to do it. It gets you to think about not just what is happening now but what could be happening. And think about how can we get there in a very concrete way. It is really cool -- I am a little bit of a nerd about this -- to create new collaborative relationships, to be part of them, to observe it for others. That is what research for impact now is. We are

matchmakers who like to do it for others. It is really cool and it is really gratifying. I am sure that is going absolutely to come through in the kinds of examples that we are going to hear today.

What is next? What is coming up? We have a great line up. First, we are going to hear about some general considerations related to networks. And then afterwards we are going to hear about a number of great examples and many of the strategies that have been used.

I want to emphasize that today both the morning and the afternoon is very much a participatory event for the people in the room as well as for the people on Zoom. Throughout, we want you to be thinking about what have you heard and what other strategies do you think are important, have been important in your work. What do you think is missing? What do you think ties some of this stuff together?

And what we are going to do in the morning especially is focus on -- we are going to invite you to focus on questions as applied to all of the examples that we hear about. And then you will have time during lunch to really ask more specific examples.

With that, I am going to hand it over to my colleague here, Anita Chandra. She is going to introduce herself and again thank you so much all for being here.

Agenda Item: Overview Presentation and Q&A

DR. CHANDRA: Thanks Adam and thanks to everyone for being part of this really wonderful conversation. I am really thrilled and honored to have been invited to speak to you and share a few themes and thoughts that I have from the work that I have done on building networks being part of networks, engaging in networks and so forth.

My name is Anita Chandra and I work at RAND, which is based here in DC but also in various other locations. Many people know it as the place on the beach in Santa Monica. We are not so lucky. But I am based here in DC.

I wear a couple of hats in the organization. I am vice president of a division called Social and Economic Wellbeing and covers a lot of the topics that Adam and others have already been alluding to, public health, climate resilience, technology, and the like.

And then as a researcher, my background is in public health and child development. I think the Hopkins' connection here is super strong. I am a graduate of Hopkins. I do not know if that was planned. I am really thrilled to be here for a lot of different reasons.

My work also sits at the intersection of research and practice. I am an applied researcher. I spend a lot of

time in communities working directly in terms of intervention of policy work.

The other thing to note about RAND is that the way that we measure the value of RAND is based on networks and impact. For us, publishing is not an end. It really is about whether we have had influence and whether we are meeting the public good through our work. How we infiltrate, engage, partner, collaborate in networks is everything to the work of our organizations. I sit with a lot of these points. I am really looking forward to your insights today.

Now, it has always been critical, as Adam and others have already shared, to penetrate organizations, sectors, systems, and networks and even now more than ever in terms of information and evidence that is actually practical, timely, and usable. We will talk about that a little bit more today.

One of the questions that was posed to me at the outset of today's conversation was what is the role of social and behavioral and economic sciences in designing not just services and policies but how much the social and behavioral and economic sciences actually bring to the science of collaboration in networks.

The kinds of traditions that I pull from in the work that I have been privileged to do are really based in

system's theory even before we get to network theory. How do we think about the systems of systems whether those are health systems or education systems or child-serving systems in communities are built with the idea of network capacity and network building. And for us at RAND, systems analysis is the root of all policy analysis. It becomes kith and kin to how we think about designing and making policy recommendations whether at the federal or the state or the local level.

All of our work in terms of collaboration science that Adam spoke to really is evolving in today's conversation when we think about technology and the role of AI and emerging technology and how do we factor that into it. As those sciences evolve around technology, how does it make a difference in terms of relationship building? How does it thwart and how does it facilitate those relationships is something that we have to consider.

And then there are two other pieces of the sciences that I certainly bring into the work that I have been privileged to do, which is around narrative change and social mobilization theory. Quite frankly, that is not always what you get trained in. Certainly, I was not trained in the school of public of health at the time that I was there. But those are some of the tools and the

aspects and the contours that I use the most in the work that I do with communities and networks.

Now, the challenge of penetrating networks is multi-fold and probably even more challenging today. One is how do we create sustainable use of evidence for meaningful change. It is one thing to provide some idea about what is the best science on some particular health or climate or other matter but how does that stick in networks is a big challenge.

How to align those evidence-based solutions with systems' incentives can propel networks into doing things that are promoting wellbeing and things that are impeding that wellbeing.

How to evolve networks to be ready for those new ideas, new thinking, and new approaches. Creating agile networks is also a piece of the puzzle. Networks are not static and I am sure we will talk about that today.

And then how do we often sync up parallel initiatives? I spend a lot of time at the community level and I will step through this in a minute, trying to make sure that we are not working at cross purposes on initiatives and communities. We have environmental sustainability networks. We have health networks. We have child-serving networks. We have senior living networks. We have aging in place networks. We have all sorts of

networks. And yet if we actually look at that, we are working around some common core outcomes, objectives, and North Star and we can leverage the power of the horizontal in those networks if we were able to sync up those parallel networks. That becomes a challenge but also an opportunity to find ways to leverage additive and multiplicative benefits.

The other challenge that I wanted to lay as table stakes that is really affecting our ability to influence and gauge partner with networks is what is counting as evidence right now in our discourse in our conversation. How do things take off in networks both in terms of quality information as well as mis- and disinformation? How do we get people to pay attention to us in an increasingly diverse attention-based economy? Engaging in ways with networks in ways that I never certainly trained in in terms of new forms of storytelling, new forms of social media, new forms of engaging, different kinds of influencers. All of that matters. And then of course Adam's great point, how do we prioritize collaboration in times of stress? I just wanted to lay those questions out because I think it is creating new opportunities but also new challenges that we have to consider.

The other two points I wanted to raise are twofold. One of the things that we talk a lot about when we

think about networks is we often talk about people in relationship to the organization they represent, the sector they represent, and having worked a lot of the community level, we want the health sector there. We want the environmental work sector there. We want public safety there.

But another way to flip this is really to think about what are people doing in those networks that bring a set of skills and assets. I think in terms of these kinds of categories. I think in terms of people who are shaping narrative whether that is actively shaping narrative through arts and culture or people who are just good and who are shaping conversations. People who are cultural brokers in networks. You know those people who actually can move conversations, move change, move engagement, get other people to be brought along into the conversation.

It used to be for even organizations like RAND that if we brief the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of HHS, we were done, that we got to the highest level of decision making. I think now more than ever we have so many intermediaries who are policy influencers and figuring out how to engage them in networks matters.

And then I do not know if folks are familiar with the work of ReThink Health and the work of Bobby Milstein but also the issue of system stewards, people who can work

horizontally within and across sectors in networks. That matters.

And then finally, thinking about network maintenance and capabilities in terms of iterative loops matters. You do not just establish it and then to Seth's great example and then it is done. Engaging in terms of what is it going to look like a year from now or three years from now in planning that out. Those are some of the core principles that I have engaged in and I have observed as critical as setting the table for this conversation.

I want to make just four points with just brief illustrations. One point that I think is critically important and particularly given what SEAN is trying to tackle is like topics like social connection or climate resilience of public health. Improvements in big outcomes require not only systems-based approaches. This requires a deep understanding of who is in the network, how they are currently moving in the network, and how they must move together differently. What do I mean by that?

I will take you back to take you forward. Twenty years ago when I started working in the area of disaster resilience pretty much at the dawn of the day that Katrina hit on August 29, one of the things that we were trying to advance was a new way of networking because quite frankly, our ability to respond to disasters had not been working

and of course we understood that that was magnified in the context of that particular disaster.

One of the things that we had to get people to do was to start to see who actually is bringing a set of assets and capacities in a particular network. How should we bridge civil society, NGO, layers of government together?

We started to talk a little bit about this concept of response reliability, not in the context of emergency preparedness for those of you who are familiar, but who actually can bring what assets at what time at what stage of response, recovery, and long-term recovery?

And what it allowed us to do was to start to think about how people move in networks in terms of where they marshal resources, how they bring institutional knowledge, cultural knowledge, other knowledge and capacity, and at what times during the cycle of how we are responding to an event or a disaster.

And while that matters in terms of acute disaster, what it does is it lays a groundwork for building a different kind of network that can be activated at any given time.

Now, at that time, we started talking about the reality of multiple and overlapping disasters and the fact that infrastructure recovery was going to be shorter than

human recovery. At that time for those of you who are part of those conversations, that was a novel way to approach it.

But our ability to actually start to play out different network designs that allowed people to understand what can you provide in the short- and long-term, how will you move in the network differently depending on the phase of a disaster or cycle or a problem response matters in terms of the nuance of the network that you are creating.

At that time, my colleague, Danielle Varda, who is now running for state rep in Colorado, but was a researcher, developed something called Partner, which allowed communities to start to assess the quality and the nature of their relationships in the network. She and I talked about this concept of relationship budgeting. You cannot be all things to all people at all times. But you do need to employ the theory of loose ties to make sure that you have enough connective tissue in your network to marshal resources effectively.

In fact, when we started case studies about disaster response and resilience, both after Katrina and globally, the thing that mattered the most was the way that the network was designed. Even when you compared communities that had difficult challenges in terms of disaster profile and social economic conditions so this is

not to downplay those very critical root issues. The communities that had networks that linked government and government, government and NGO, had those loose ties and had thought about this concept of response reliability and how people move through phases were the ones that were able to recover more quickly. And that has been borne out by work by my colleague, Daniel Aldrich, and many other social scientists for 20 plus years. This is an important principal of understanding who is in the network, how they are moving, who is reliable, and reliable at what stages.

The second point is that narrative matters deeply. And when I say narrative, I do not mean communication and messaging strategies. What I mean is fundamentally understanding the values, the stories, and the histories in which the network is situated. How do people come to understand their circumstance? How do people come to understand the issue that you are collectively trying to work on? What are the choices and decisions they have made about that before they enter the network? How do they situate the network in a community and how do they understand what that community is all about?

One of the things that we have done in our work is really get people to tell that story about what is the root set of values that is guiding their orientation to a particular issue. Even if that is a flawed set of values

that we might think or they do not have all the information or they are missing something, just like in therapy, it does not really matter what is the truth. It matters what you believe about yourself fundamentally. And in a network, how people engage and how people stick in a network, that narrative arc, first what they come in with and then what they share in terms of their narrative story matters. I will share some resources afterwards about the narrative tree and what this means.

We have been working a lot in this idea of the wellbeing economy. How do we step beyond just GDP and doing in the US and internationally? And that is a really hard conversation for Americans, in particular, to come to. We have to find a different narrative around purpose and dignity that was different than a narrative that might work in Europe or in New Zealand or in other places.

Starting there and creating just spaces and places for people to share even before you get to the task of what your network is trying to achieve is deeply important. And it is not a one and done. You come back to it.

For example, in work that we did in Santa Monica, California, ten plus years ago with Bloomberg Philanthropies building the first civic wellbeing index that informed local policy around wellbeing, we used

artists and cultural brokers to start to work through that narrative. For example, to the point of social connection, at that time, one of the concerns in that community was the lack of connection within and across neighborhoods. They thought that they were connected until they looked at the data. We created a photo booth at various points in the community and essentially created this idea of we are family where strangers took photos together. And people like their photos, particularly in the US. This was a bonding thing that created a shared sense of identity and purpose long before we did the roll up the sleeves work around wellbeing economies and wellbeing policies. That is a critical point.

A third point. Governance choices are a big deal in maintaining networks. I am sure all of you have thought about different forms of governance and shared decision making. In work that I have had the honor of doing both in Santa Monica on the Civic Wellbeing Index and creating wellbeing policy but also in places near here like Prince Georges County on health in all decisions policy.

We had to create some idea around shared accountability but not in the usual way where we are trying to create a bunch of performance metrics but actually coming to some conversation about common or shared outcomes, what is the low hanging fruit. We do not have to

do all things together. But are there a couple of things that we can move in a way that we can agree we will adapt our processes and protocols to create that space for shared ideation and shared decision making.

In the Santa Monica Wellbeing Project, this was an idea of getting governments to actually realize that they had investment in the wellbeing of their people. Their role was not just filling potholes. They actually had a critical role in how citizens thrived and flourished and that mattered.

This was a new posture for government to sit in a network with other kinds of entities, civil society, business, nonprofits, and the like. We ended up actually working through a model of concentric circles of networks so networks upon networks upon networks so that it allowed us to have some aspect of common shared understanding within sectors that had to achieve some aspect of their job or their duty. But then they could come into this larger network to work on these loftier goals around thriving and flourishing and wellbeing.

And what that allows is that it is much more realistic in terms of how communities work. If you are entering into a network around some lofty idea around sustainability or public health or wellbeing, it can be very daunting. It does not feel real or tactical or

practical at times even if everybody agrees that the motivation and the outcome and the goal are critical.

Finding ways to get people to work, we do this forest trees exercise where we are working on trees tactical aspects that the network can accomplish. And in the larger concentric circle of network, we are working on forest issues. We are working on blue sky topics. We are going back and forth between blue sky topics and tactical topics so that people are understanding that there are meaningful impacts that they are making in choices, in governance, and in decision making while we are also trying to attend to this larger goal of making the community thrive or building a resilient population.

Now lastly, I just wanted to conclude. One of the things that is also critically important is how do you plan for not only network cultivation but plan for the backslides and plan for internal disruptions and external disruptions.

We have spent a lot of time working in communities around the country. They are called Sentinel Communities. I am happy to share more on that. Really focused on the issues around health equity and advancing collective wellbeing.

Before we started to engage these communities in a meaningful network, we actually just tried to understand

where they were starting in terms of their orientation to equity and collect wellbeing. This is the narrative arc point. And we started to realize that communities were getting stuck basically in the same three buckets. They were getting stuck in terms of cohesive narrative work. They were getting stuck in terms of measures coordination. And they were getting stuck in terms of investment alignment. And that became basically the three legs of a stool of a set of workshops that we have now done with communities and that we are still doing with communities to get them on the same page to work through those sticking points.

We worked through a lot of exercises with communities to basically help them build those networks and find ways that they are actively working on tasks and activities together. That is part one.

But the other thing that we do is we work through processes and protocols about how they are seeding possible changes that will not take root for many years into the future. And that allows us to really plan for mid- and long-term network cultivation because inevitably, there will be internal and external challenges to that network.

Networks have started. They have pulled apart because of funding or people do not have time for collaboration or all of a sudden, we cannot talk about

health equity or all the things that you can imagine that are going on for communities right now in the US. But because we have been able to seed those kinds of practical ideas, just little bits of things and protocols or standards or different things within agencies and sectors. Those network actors do not feel as frustrated as they might have been when bad things or challenging things happen.

The final thing is that we do use a lot of future tabletop exercising. You do not have to get so in the weeds on that. But it allows people to start to plan for the inevitable shifts that are going to happen in the dynamism. Even before things that have happened over the last year or two, we were starting to ask people. You are not going to continue in a linear forward direction in this network. We are just going to say you are not because that is just the reality. How are we making sure that if you backslide, you do not completely have to re-start? What does that fundamentally look like?

That posture, that orientation, particularly when you are doing things that are challenging because they are bringing in social complexities like resilience, like wellbeing, like equity, like health and climate change, it allows you to create stickiness that would not have been there before and then allows you to kind of maintain your

trust and credibility with community partners along the way.

With that, I will turn it back over. Thanks.

DR. A. LEVINE: Thank you so much. That was wonderful. We have 15 minutes built in for Q&A. That is, for people again who are on Zoom, definitely you can put stuff in the chat and SEAN staff will basically raise their hands and let us know that you have questions. For people in the room, we have mics. Feel free to raise your hand and then just use the button there.

And also, I have questions for Anita if I can tick things off unless there is somebody else -- I will kick things off. Actually, I am going to ask you two questions at once. The first is I would love to hear you talk more about the thing you said at the beginning about the value of RAND is the value of networks. I think those of us who create networks sometimes it can sort of -- I am sure the people -- the question is what is the impact of that. Of course, you can talk about the number of people or whatever. As we learn about the research for impact thing, a number of people with profiles, that was not really what mattered. I would love to hear you talk more about that concretely.

The second question. You can do whatever you want. Can you give an example of a network that you built

that did not work? What did that look like and what did you learn from that?

DR. CHANDRA: The reason why I say that RAND is about networks for a few reasons. One is that in order to move policy change or make sure that people are using evidence to drive decision making, you have to understand the decision-making structures. You have to understand the systems. You have to understand the networks, who is influencing at what point.

When I used to have a different role at RAND and I hired for the organization, one of my main questions that I used to ask new researchers coming into the organization is what room do you want to be in. And what I meant by that is where are you trying to affect change and have you thought beyond just your research study fundamentally. For us, understanding how those networks are designed or moved is important.

The other thing is that we -- I think this is not just us but we have two things that go on at RAND. One is we have an impact framework, which is called the three-tier test. We want to be working at the top of the agenda of tier one. But really, tier two and tier three are the way that we evaluate ourselves. Tier two is how we got our work in the hands of people who can do something with it in ways that they can do something with it. And tier three really,

which is the gold standard, has that informed decision making in a meaningful way.

It does not just mean that we have moved policy because that takes a long time. But we also are trying to move process and methods. Have we set the table in a new way that allows people to say I had not really thought about that policy question but now you have put some data together and it changed my orientation to what the solutions pathway is? And certainly, how are we changing network pathways and service delivery pathways?

I think in terms of networks where we have had -- I will say that in every one of the networks that I am talking about, we have had back slides. For example, in the Santa Monica civil wellbeing work, which started more than ten years ago, it was very much hyped up in city government. There was a lot of action and excitement in Santa Monica. We had mayor and city manager support. Obviously, we had external support as well. We went through several rounds of that even though we had planned for the network cultivation.

Then a new regime came in in terms of politics and was worried about focusing so much on this lofty idea of wellbeing. We just have to focus on the day-to-day for people. And one of the things was that we had not probably done the job that we needed to do to connect those two

things. These things do not exist in a vacuum. Food security is not separate from basic wellbeing and dignity and vice versa.

It ended up moving more to the civil society sector and government said we are not going to do this for a little while. Interestingly, because we had seeded stuff, it has now come back around because they realized, as a lot of American cities do with disease of despair and where we are as a country, that not thinking about wellbeing, thriving, and flourishing has been to their detriment.

I think the points of failure have been where we actually did not understand some of the interrelationships and who were the cultural brokers. Our narrative was not strong and tight.

The other one that I mentioned is that I have worked with the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation for many years on their culture of health effort. That has now turned into health equity and collective wellbeing. What I would say is that they have done amazing things. They would be the first to be able to share some of those perspectives. But there are narratives right now in our health conversation. There are networks that are built in our health conversation that may be more powerful right now. Is that a temporary failure of people who are working in health or public health? I might suggest it potentially

is. That network has to be rebuilt in a new way and I would argue having worked a lot on those things, what did we miss, how did we miss it, and how was the network getting co-opted in new ways I think is a big challenge.

DR. A. LEVINE: Great. Thank you. I am out of questions. It has to be all of you. By the way, feel free to ask questions of either of us as well or both of us and really anything about some of the broad topics that we have heard so far.

MS. HUDSON: Thank you. That was very insightful and it helped me think of a couple of comments I will make when I come up there. I had not heard of your three tier test before, Anita. I was just looking it up. I have been spending a lot of time looking up things that you guys are saying. It appears that it is specifically for policy impact the way I saw it. I am wondering. Is it just policy impact or ecosystem impact? Do you look at it in different ways because being government funded, we really cannot -- should not be trying to influence policy, a number of us like me. But when we look at what we do like in this Northeast Big Data Hub I run or the COVID Information Commons, agenda setting is valuable, listening, and then helping set an agenda that serves the people and the institutions. Influence is very valuable and improvement is what we are all trying to do. Let us make this planet and

this culture and civilization even better. Do you apply it to other than policy impact?

DR. CHANDRA: First of all, one thing that is also important to say is when I say influence, I do not mean advocacy. RAND is fiercely nonpartisan. What I mean is that people are using evidence-informed choices for decision making. That is our mission. We want to make sure that that is being at least considered as people are designing or thinking about policy, number one.

The expansion of our three tier test actually in that tier three has been over the last decade plus kind of in these three buckets, policy, process, methods. I actually was part of the team to expand that. And the reason why was because we knew that not only are we not just about policy but also that takes time. But we often have these interim steps around process changes. We do a lot of work in health care where we are trying to inform better service delivery or quality of care. That is really going to be in your process measures or get a network of physicians to act or do something differently, for example.

The methods piece is a little bit more challenging sometimes to characterize or quantify. But that is really critical for us because we want to be shaping the analytic conversation if we think about different methodological approaches to a problem. Sometimes that

shaping is like how we even talk about a problem and the contours of that problem. Sometimes it is about unearthing something through the scientific approach whether that is decision making under deep uncertainty, which we do a lot of at RAND or any kind of methodological piece.

Sometimes these all go hand in hand in terms of a particular research topic area. We are not just working on policy or just working on process. Multiple things are happening at once. But it is critically important that we think about the ecosystem in that way.

Again, we want to be elevating and be useful in the conversation. The other piece of this is different forms and modes and methods of how we are packaging our information and our conversations. It is not enough to have a report or an article although those are critically important. How are we getting into spaces and places in ways that people can actually ponder what we are saying and do something with it? That means being smarter about social media in particular ways. That means being smarter about tools in particular ways.

For our researchers, which I think others will speak to today, it also means some training/retraining. Everybody is coming into RAND at least on the research side of RAND. Maybe studying at Hopkins or other places and they have fabulous social or economic or physical science

skills. But very little of this -- although I know curriculum has changed -- has really taught fundamentally.

One of the things that -- it is a see one, do one, teach one culture. They are learning by going into these conversations at HHS or at the health department or at the education department and that is when you are really starting to realize oh goodness. All this evidence that I have been producing does not make a hill of beans difference because I have not packaged it the right way either. I did not understand the system. I did not understand the network actors. I did not do any power mapping. I do not know who is who. All of that is on-the-job training for a lot of what happens at our organization.

DR. A. LEVINE: I know Chelsea has a question from the online folks.

MS. FOWLER: I wanted to share a question from our virtual audience. This, I think, applies for both of you. How have the various technologies that have emerged over the past 10 or 20 years impacted the network that you all have been part of, whether that is social media, Zoom, AI? The landscape looks very different now than it used to be.

DR. CHANDRA: Please, I think a couple of things. There is no substitute for basic relationship work. I adore all the people on Zoom and all that. But there is still a need to engage in certain kinds of in-person activities.

And the way that we do that in hybrid ways is important. The way that we try and create connection and really the covenant that is important in a network and how we do it even online is critically important and whether that means how we welcome and introductions and how we connect to people. It is more personal and not just professional that matters.

I will say the AI story is a double-edged. On one hand, it is affording us to have interesting convergent kind of research and analytic conversations because people can come to the table with particular interconnections on how they view the world through different sectors because Claude or ChatGPT is helping with that.

On the other side, it shorthand some things that are critical in network cultivation that you do not want to have happen because it does not allow us to have that common or shared understanding. And that, I think, is a challenge whether it is building that narrative work, coming up with common governance guidelines, that kind of thing. AI is not particularly helpful in that regard.

DR. A. LEVINE: I will just add a couple of things to that. One thing is sometimes I get asked to speak about their Research4Impact 101, the online platform experience, the thing that did not work, in technology rooms. That is because effectively what that was was basically a LinkedIn

style online platform, a technological solution to a problem of researchers and practitioners, people who work in nonprofits in that case, who were not connected but maybe would like to be.

What is interesting about that example is that you have people joining the network. You say yes. Technological solution. That really worked in that case. But then, as I mentioned before, they did not feel comfortable reaching out to each other for a variety of reasons that they then revealed later on.

I do not think the answer from that or the takeaway message from that is that online networks never work because after all LinkedIn seems to work or at least LinkedIn tells me that it works.

But to say that if there are these kinds of relational barriers and by that, I mean very much like the nuts and bolts of interacting with people we do not know on a daily basis. Some of that of course is things like trust and whether or not the person has practical information to share but it is also things like will they criticize me. Do I know what is appropriate or inappropriate to say? Will they value my expertise and knowledge on the issue? That kind of stuff as well that we know matters every single day with the people we interact with. The technology was not helping with that.

Now, we are sort of more -- it is more hands on and we have moved rather to a more hands-on matchmaking that is less technological and more person-based in a lot of ways. That is at least one example of that.

And then the other example I will mention just in terms of the AI as well is in some of my other work, not the Research4Impact stuff. We are interested in seeing whether researchers -- surfacing policymakers on that desire for research and science and then thinking about how to meet that, again, as honest brokers, not advocating for particular policy solutions in any way. In that work, AI has been useful -- because often the questions are essentially what other examples are there of something or what the broad research literature says. And sometimes it can be useful as a starting point to say what do we know about this. As a researcher, you look at that and say does this seem complete or not. Does it seem like it is missing things or not? Is it (indiscernible) or not? At least it is a reasonable starting point.

But it also underscores the way in which it is not the endpoint. Having researchers who know the literature and what not and can evaluate what the output of that is and of course add to it is really important.

Does anybody have a question that is 15 seconds?

DR. LEMOS: I will try my best. My question was actually for you -- talk a little bit about this. I find that when I tried to do the matchmaking and I have been trying for many years and failed for many years is that the lack of training is much more acute from the side of science of scientists than actually practitioners. Practitioners know what they are doing and they know exactly what they do every day and they know what they need. We do not have to tell them what they need.

But there is this sense of supply-driven demand. I have the science. It is a great. There is a movie in your mind that says here is how practitioners will respond to that. That never happens.

My question for you is that on the organization 2.0 that is better, what kind of training or even understanding scientists have that it is not just being there or trying to connect but how to build that relationship beyond the great product that you have to offer.

DR. A. LEVINE: Thank you for that question and just to answer it super briefly and happy to talk more afterwards. I definitely have observed many of the kinds of hesitations/concerns in a lot of ways you are describing. One hundred percent. And also, just that people have said that to me from both sides.

I guess I would say a couple of things. One is it does definitely depend upon what people are trying to do. It comes back to this question about what the collaboration goals are. For the informal collaboration, the knowledge exchange. Let us say there is a -- just to give the kind of request that we might get. A practitioner says I have this theory of change. I want to measure -- it calls for this kind of impact in the world but we are not really measuring that right now because it is hard or whatever. We just have not done it. What are some ways we might do that systematically?

What is helpful about that when doing the matchmaking is actually defining roles. There is this technique called role assignment within the conversation to basically identify what the areas of expertise are, task relevant expertise that each brings and actually explicitly stating that. And effectively what I do -- I will basically sort of almost feed questions to people. I think you should ask about this because this person knows this. I do that during the facilitation and it is a way to try to set the agenda. That seems to make a difference.

For the other side and I am really going to get yanked off of the panel here. What happens if people are looking for more formal collaboration, which the projects with shared ownership, decision-making authority, account

ability -- that then I think there are a whole bunch of different steps associated with the relationship building and especially putting things in writing upfront. That is a longer conversation but I am happy to talk more about that. But at least it is worth stating it is a longer conversation. Thank you.

We are going to shift now to talk about case examples. What I am going to do is I am going to invite -- we have four amazing panelists who are going to come up and they are going to take the seats here. Anita and I are going to hang out back there. They are all going to introduce themselves. We have Florence Hudson. We have Dovev Levine, Maria Flynn, and Erin O'Malley. Florence is going to go first.

Agenda Item: Case Examples

MS. HUDSON: Wonderful. Thank you so much for inviting all of us and I am excited. I am already networking with you all. A lot of fun. My name is Florence Hudson and I am executive director of the Northeast Big Data Innovation Hub in the Data Science Institute at Columbia University. My background is I am actually a mechanical and aerospace engineer. I started at NASA. I worked on future missions around Jupiter. But then I was at IBM for a long career. I was a VP and a CTO there of strategy and marketing. And I have my own consulting firm,

FDHint, which is a global advanced technology consulting firm. I do a lot of different things.

But in my role at the Big Data Innovation Hub, I am very fortunate to lead this network. Our network, the Northeast Big Data Innovation Hub, is one of four regional big data innovation hubs, funded by the National Science Foundation in 2015. We are in the northeast. We look this big on the map but it is a census thing. There are a lot of people in it. There is a Midwest, south, and a west hub.

Then we were funded again in 2019 and that is when I became executive director in 2020. I was on their advisory board from the beginning. They say when you are on a board, they could ask you to run the place so be careful what boards you go on. I am really delighted to do it.

When I joined this hub, our mission is to be a collaboration hub and a catalyst for data science education innovation. How fun is that? In 2015 when the hubs were created, data science was not really well known. There were very few academic programs in it. Now, you probably feel flooded whether you are in statistics or math or data science or wherever you are. But there really was not a lot of it. Our job was really to develop this national big data ecosystem working together.

The gaps that we were working on or increasing data science awareness like what is it and then there are

so many people who had no clue. I am like they are going to miss the jobs. We have to help them learn this. Education and collaborative innovation. We have over 100 different institutional collaborators from IBM to Nvidia to Rutgers to all sorts of things and to help people grow in the data science world and help grow the data science world itself.

Our network structure and approach to collaboration is we have a number of governing boards. They do not really govern. They guide and we listen to them. That is the key piece of the hub is that we always say we listen first. We listen to what are you trying to accomplish. What gaps do you have? What are your goals and wishes in this area?

We have the co-PIs as we say in the funded world, the co-principal investigators. Our PI was Kathy McKeown at Columbia for the 2015 award. Then it is Jeannette Wing, who is now our EVP of Research at Columbia. She is the PI and we are the co-PIs. I am a co-PI as executive director. We have a co-PI at RPI, Jim Hendler, who is very well known in data science and semantic technologies. And then Vasant Honavar at Penn State and then Andrew in Massachusetts.

We have a steering committee that represents our community. We have an advisory board, a whole bunch more people that are in the domain areas that we care about. We have experts talking to us.

And then when I joined in March of 2020 and I did not see my office for a year and a half. You could probably remember why. We could not go on campus. Jeannette and I decided that we wanted to increase data science awareness and education more broadly across the United States, starting with the Northeast. And we created this Northeast Student Data Corps idea. And we asked the community. Does anybody want to be a founding committee? And 24 people volunteered. Maybe this is a good idea.

We started this Northwest Student Data Corps. We announced our first virtual webinar because nobody could come to campus. We had over 700 people register. How did they find us? When they find a network that is open and available and collaborative, they come running. Do I fit here? Everybody fits here. Close your eyes. Everybody fits.

The NSDC Founding Committee got us started. Since then, the students have asked us, could we have a chapter? We are like a chapter. Sure. How are we going to do that? Now, we have over 50 chapters. They self-govern. We had a call with one of them one day and they looked at us and said we love you. I was like is that an HR problem. What do you mean you love us? They said data science is not easy to learn. We get that. That is why we created this community as the National Student Data Corps. They can watch the same video 15 times and nobody will know. It just makes it so

much easier for them to learn. And then they self-congregate locally to have a club like different types of clubs. Very interesting. We create the governance and then they start self-governing because they see how it works, which is so cool and then we connect them together.

They are incentivized to shared resources because when you share, you get stuff back and so the different NSDC chapters share. We always make sure we celebrate the successes of the community. We had a seed fund program and a collaborative agreement with NSF that we had to spend a million dollars of our funding for seed grants for institutions that do not usually get NSF funding. They have never done this before. They do not know how to do it. We are like okay. We had a competition. We gave out 25 of them and then we have a seed fund success story booklet online. They can say, look, I am published.

We also celebrate them regarding in our COVID Information Commons that is funded by the government. It started when there were 32 COVID-related NSF grants when they called us in March of 2020. Now, we have 14,000 of them because we download through the APIs, NSF, and NIH awards and over 10,000 humans. We do these research lightning talk webinars. And the researchers say please. I want to present. We have a student paper challenge and the students who win get to present. We allow them to have

broader impact to share their research and learn from others.

We actually went as far as -- I do a lot of publishing with Springer. We have a book on the COVID Information Commons, research insights from the coronavirus. We have the ISBN already. And it should be published later this year. We have 95 authors. Do not even ask. It was amazing. That will be published. And the goal for each chapter was who funded you. Thank you. We are very fortunate to be funded by these institutions and agencies. What were your goals? What were your results of your research? What are your recommendations to mitigate future pandemics? How is this going to help society going forward? We have 95 people that contributed to 24 chapters with the PIs and their researchers. We bring these new opportunities that they would not have without us. And then we bring them together in webinars and we have a student working group and they all work together and learn together. That is a lot of the collaboration.

In the Northeast Big Data Innovation Hub, we went from 1400 humans. At the end of 2019, beginning of 2020, we had the executive director that had collaborated with us to over 24,000 now, which is kind of wild.

The Northeast Student Data Corps, which became the National Student Data Corps, started from scratch when

I got there in 2020. Now, it has over 18,000 educators and students around the planet. How amazing is that. Right? Mostly in the US. And we keep going and growing.

The current situation of our network is that we have all these humans and we want to keep it going. We are very fortunate that other organizations will come and say will you collaborate with us. We want to market to your network. We are like sure. We are lucky. We have gotten NIH funding, working with Howard University for the AIM-AHEAD program. We just got our first DARPA award, which is exciting. We have another NSF award for the prototype Open Knowledge Network. We are very network-y.

I am here to say I am happy to partner with you. Let us go forward together. That is what we are doing. Currently, we have enough funding through 2026 and we want to keep growing. We want to keep giving ourselves a little facelift.

We just announced our Quantum Initiative, an NSDC-QI. And one of our collaborators at Perdue wants to create a Quantum AI for Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. He asked me to say that out loud here today so that we can figure out how to do it together. I promised him I would.

And I also want to share -- we listen and then we give. We had students who were working in the COVID

Information Commons saying we like to network with each other. What a great idea. We created this portfolio and network building group. But that now has thousands of people in it. We have a LinkedIn network. We do webinars. And they learn how to build their digital portfolio, how to write a cover letter, how to collaborate with other people. We encourage them to put their LinkedIn in the chat. And all of this helps us grow and network with each other. That is what we do and I am done.

DR. D. LEVINE: Thank you very much. Thanks, Florence. My name is Dovev Levine. I am at the University of New Hampshire. I have a couple of roles there. My main day job is I am the assistant dean for student affairs for our graduate school and also the assistant vice provost for Outreach and Engagement for the university as well. As part of that work, I have also been running a consortium of local governments within the New England area for the last ten years. That is what I am going to talk to you all about today.

First, I want to say thanks to Anita and Seth for the great framing remarks. I am really excited. That really maps onto what I am talking about. I am sure the panel will have a great discussion based around all the different things that you brought up that are really important.

I am going to spend my ten minutes talking about a story that really runs along four core themes. One is really the network that I am going to tell you about -- this is really about fortifying local government efforts on sustainability and climate action. It is about mapping scale with deep relationship building across multiple sectors. It is about getting from peer sharing and learning to collaborative action on the ground, talking about how we get, as Anita pointed out very astutely, how to get from that surface level, we share information and peer learning to actual real action on the ground.

And then finally, strengthening mutually beneficial connections between local governments and higher ed. I am sure a lot of you are doing that. Nothing new. I am always interested in better models for how we get that done in a really actionable and impactful way.

Real broad-based information about the network. We are the New England Municipal Sustainability Network. We were born in 2010 out of the Urban Sustainability Directors Network, USDN. Some of you may know them. They are one of the preeminent organizations in the US. I think they have Canadian local governments as well. But they help to really bind local governments together on issues of sustainability and climate action.

Back in 2010, they recognized that it would be really smart to try to get from having a big, big -- I think they have 500 or 600 members in their cast, maybe more than that, and recognize that also continuing that but also having some more regional focused discussions and hopefully some collaborative work would be smart. They established about 10 to 12 hubs, and we are the New England based one.

We have roughly 40 local governments in our network, representing all six New England states and we have grown considerably since I came into the role back in 2016, which I will go back to in a moment. But again, 40 local governments representing roughly 2.5 million individuals across those different municipalities.

Each of those local governments is represented by at least one full-time staff member in that government. It is usually the director of planning, director of sustainability, that type of person. It has mayoral commitment. We know that those governments are there and everyone is on the same page that they are committing to working together with us.

The mission has stated by NEMS is to elevate the impact of municipalities by aligning shared interests in a community of peer learning and collaboration, comprised of

representatives from local governments along with support from higher ed and other civil society actors.

Briefly, why NEMS is important. This is not anything new to you. Sub-federal activity is critical for advancing climate and sustainable action. In the absence of the US federal government, especially now, places like local governments but also states, NGOs, and higher ed industries are often the place where creative solutions are tested and implemented.

An example being -- I think the last time I checked, there were over a thousand mayors who committed their cities to the Paris Accord level climate target. Really, that is where the action is that keeps me insane. My background is in climate policy. If you look to up at federal and intergovernmental approaches, I find a lot of hope and work to be done at those different sub-federal levels.

Local governments play a key role in several key ways. First, they are at ground level with the populations. They know their local environments. They are particularly accountable to their constituents and thus much more likely to take decisive action, reflecting demands. An example of that is Love Burlington Vermont and has this really great chart showing how they have been able to reduce energy usage and also implement clean energy into all of their

energy users, which is the entire city over the course of time. You have this trend going downwards over ten years. Then also a similar -- it is almost like two at the same degree of scale. Decrease in energy costs for those individuals as well. It is showing that you have these win-win-win types of approaches that can be scaled across regions. Really great living lab type of initiatives.

And then finally, innovative efforts that can scale up broader impacts. When they work together, you can see that dissemination of policy in action. And if done well, it can really ripple across both municipalities but hopefully to regions and beyond.

This brings us to the NEMS Network, again New England Municipal Sustainability Network, a lot of syllables. I did not name it. I got the name when I took over. Local governments are doing a ton but they are often hindered by capacity and bandwidth issues, particularly for medium and small-sized towns, which are the vast majority of local governments.

An example is my town, which is very well resourced. We have a director of sustainability. And he handles climate action both on the mitigation and resiliency. He handles hazardous waste. He handles PFAS issues and on and on. He is amazing. He probably has seven hats. Again, we all do too but certainly that really brings

to bear what could he do if he had more capacity and bandwidth at the fore.

The NEMS Network works to mitigate those bandwidth issues through collaborative activity and also connection to higher ed, in this case, University of New Hampshire where I work. And our theory of change is that facilitating the sharing of information and demonstrating efforts through our region results in a system of positive feedback loops where those local governments are watching each other's innovations, competing with each other, and finding legitimacy and encourage to keep going.

The NEMS leadership, as far as the structure goes, is through a steering committee that we have. It is usually built with seven different local governments. They are running on usually two-year terms with myself providing the administrative backbone. My job is really to tee it up. I make it easy for them, setting the agenda, make sure you be there on time. It is a monthly meeting. It is online. Here are the notes. Here are the things we talked about and here is how we can keep going.

How we are funded. Up until this spring, the only funding for the network was through a 10 percent buy-out of my time from UNH, which we got a lot done. But that is four or five hours a week. We have always hindered ourselves in trying to address the hindrance of capacity issues.

What the sub-story is that we just got a two-year grant from the Bar Foundation, which we are really excited about. Not huge. It is a C grant. It is \$50,000 a year for the next two years and that has allowed us to get our first official staff person. Gina, who is amazing, may be watching right now. She works 20 hours a week for the network. That has quintupled our effort and that has led us to be able to do a lot of things, which I talked about going forward.

How NEMS operationalizes its efforts. It is kind of through two main avenues. First is that we pay a lot of attention to that deep relationship building. We really leverage the fact that we are within driving distance. We do a lot of things in our face-to-face because we recognize for us at least, if we can do that consistently over time and keep building on those connections that we can get a lot done and also provide a lot of trust and authenticity.

We do that through a couple of ways. One is we have a biannual meeting so usually every spring and fall we get together. Every NEMS member kind of rotates. We just were in Burlington, which is beautiful in the fall. Pretty much the entire network shows up. It is a two-day meeting. We do a lot of business meetings like this and we go around and do a rose, bud, and thorn thing. We hear about all the issues. But then we spend a lot of time actually having

dinner and then post-dinner drinks, which is really where, A, I love it, and, B, it is where the work gets done in a lot of ways because we have a second day, which we come back. We were talking last night with Cameron and he said this thing and it really resonated across. Let us talk about that and try to build off of that. We really try to lean into that and it works. For me, it is also -- it is not about having fun but it makes it very socially benevolent. It is like seeing your cousins. I love my cousins. It is kind of seeing work cousins and there is just a deep connection that we foster over the 15 years, the last 10 of which I have been heavily involved. We just really like each other's company and that is through, again, I think having a very --

On the back side of that, we have actually done a lot of formalizing of how to make that work. Going back to also how we make those connections happen. I am sure a lot of you have this. You come out of these meetings. You are energized. I met Florence. I met Erin. That is awesome. We are going to talk and then a year passes. You pick up. You kind of lose momentum. We recognize that. We are talking about this four or five years ago and we realize we need to sustain momentum. We have to do that in a way that is not just on website and we email each other. But we cannot get together in person all the time.

What we did was build in a bimonthly brown bag series, which was basically we have a running list. I keep it in my files. Common themes that pop up. Natural gas markets, community engagement, equity and justice, et cetera. And then we ask someone that is particularly knowledgeable in that area just to -- could you take an hour to basically run a discussion? And they will present for 20 minutes. We tell them little notes we want to be in discussion, conversation. They will do 20 minutes, a couple of slides, and then really open it up for Q&A. And the network shows up. We usually have about three-quarters of our network pop in. It is a great way both to continue the conversation on important things but also getting together and seeing each other as much as we can. That really helps quite a bit.

What I wanted to point out is I love this quote. I had someone tell me at our last meeting, this is the one network where I can truly speak my mind and receive real answers and contexts and not have to be coy and not talking to. They get real answer and advice.

Second avenue is now that we have staffing through Gina, it also frees up my time to do more higher-level stuff. We are trying to really take the network from that. Again, how do we just peer share, resource share? That is really important. We want to maintain that and be

the best network that is doing it. Maintain that and then also really start to create collaborative projects that are meaningful to municipalities.

What we are doing is standing up three working groups that are across network. We are asking every municipality to join. And we are going to theme those around one common issue, which is not to get too technical, but there is an issue that we refer to as split incentives for landlords and renters. Big in the climate world. It comes up every meeting over and over because it is so vexing which basically is that in cases where renters are paying energy bills, which is pretty much every renter. There is very little incentive then for landlords to do energy upgrades to bring in clean energy and also to do efficiency and weatherization and also health upgrades as well. More than the bare minimum. That impacts millions of people.

I think last stat I saw was 40 percent of households in the US are renter based. I think a little higher in New England. It cuts across every single member - - found that low-hanging fruit that we thought would be very compelling to our members because it is a climate issue. It is an energy savings issue. It is a health issue for these renters and we think that we have something that we can really dig into.

We actually just closed up the -- I did a little survey, of which there are three working groups. I will not get too much into it. It is based on clean energy, health and climate change, and community resilience. You can pick one of three. And I think we have had 90 percent of our members sign on to it to commit to working together with UNH. We are not telling them what to do. We are not going to repeat the classic hire mistake by telling communities what to do. We are there to support, provide assessment and measure, and really particularly put the grad student's population to work, which they are compelled to do this work. We find it is a great mutually beneficial connection across the board for them. We are really excited about that.

Real quick, challenges and opportunities, current political environment. We can spend the rest of the day talking about that if we want to. But really for us beyond that, it is getting from that peer sharing to cloud of projects. It is a short-term horizon of funding. It is also about that capacity and bandwidth for measuring and assessing what we are doing.

Opportunities. Particularly the flipside of what is going on now is that there is more attention than ever on local governments and what they can do. Similarly, higher ed is struggling to really tell its story, the

narrative that Anita and Adam were talking about. We find that there is an opportunity for UNH to really dive into that to demonstrate what we can do in local communities.

With that, I will pause there and I will hand it to Maria. Thank you.

MS. FLYNN: Good morning, everyone. It is terrific to be here. My name is Maria Flynn and I am the president and CEO of a national nonprofit organization called Jobs for the Future. We have been around since 1983. And our mission is to drive equitable economic advancement for all. You can really think of us as a national intermediary that is focused on systems change across the education and workforce ecosystem in the US.

A couple of years ago, we rolled out a big North Star goal, which is that by 2023, we want to see 75 million workers in the US who face systemic barriers to advancement working and quality jobs. You can generally think about that as workers that fall into four categories. Any worker without a four-year college degree, women, workers of color, and workers who have been impacted by the criminal justice system.

Really a hallmark of our work over the four plus decades that we have been around is doing a lot of our work through networks and some people call us a network of networks because sometimes we have many networks that are

operating at the same time. I just want to spend my few minutes here just giving you a few examples of what those networks are and then to give you some themes of what we have learned both in terms of what works and what some of the challenges are. You will hear a lot of common strands to what others have said, which I think is terrific.

One and this is the network that is highlighted on our poster outside is our Pathways to Prosperity, which has been around for over 12 years. Over the years, we have had 32 states participate in over 150 regional economies. The members of this network are really folks who are leading K12 systems, community colleges, economic development entities, anyone who is really looking at how to better connect roughly grades 11 through 14 at the state or the local level.

Components of that have been, as others have said, in-person peer learning, virtual learning, site visits, case studies, and so on. That is funded by a mix of grants, contracts, and member dues. It is really a mix funding model, which I think has contributed to the longevity of the network.

Another one that we have, which is 100 percent philanthropically funded, is we run a congressional staff network and an executive branch network focused on economic

mobility issues. This has been around also for about 12 years.

One, I think, strong similarity to what was just mentioned is the social aspect of that network. For example, two times a year we take congressional staff, bicameral, bipartisan appropriators, authorizers, and member staff out into the field to see innovative practices across the country. And we have found that the social connections that are formed through those visits have really played a role in helping to get policy and legislation moving through committees in ways that probably would not happen otherwise.

Another example, which is 100 percent federally funded, is we run the community of practice for the Department of Commerce's Good Jobs Challenge Grantees. It is about 3200 regions around the country that we convene a community practice as part of that work.

And then we have a corporate-facing network, which is comprised of both CSR leaders and HR leaders and corporations who are committed to transforming their talent practices to being more worker centered and that is also philanthropically funded.

I will go through this quickly because I think others have really said this. Why we think networks are so important. One is the ability to accelerate the adoption of

proven effective practices, the ability to diffuse knowledge and relationships through peer learning, to drive policy change and not just in that congressional staff network example, but overall, at JFF, we really drive our federal and state policy agenda through what we are learning from the individuals in these networks. There is a very strong feedback loop between the practitioners and how that gets translated for us at the policy level.

When done right, we do feel it helps to drive innovation and sustain that innovation after a grant has ended so after the dedicated funding has ended. Hopefully, the network is picking that up and continuing it. And then obviously, ideally, we are seeing improved outcomes at the individual worker-learner level as well.

Some elements of these networks that we think work well are, one, when there is a strong, shared framework so common language, common structures, common toolkits that folks are using. Again, we think site visits are always helpful to really help make the lessons real.

We see a benefit in what I would call ROI-like networks so the Congressional Staff Network being one of those. But also, cross role networks where folks are learning from each other where economic developers can be learning from the public workforce, system leaders, and so on.

We think there is an ability to really de-risk innovation in that network space where it gives folks a little more confidence to try something new. And then at the end of the day, it really leads to practical problem solving versus theoretical directives.

The challenges. Again, I think we have heard a lot of this already. One, sustainability, in general, but I would say specifically in this funding environment. I think we are seeing impact obviously in federal funding and philanthropic funding and corporate funding in terms of ability to keep some of this work going.

I think the ability to really tangibly show the ROI of network work can be very hard. I would say we have had mixed success in doing that.

You had the example of having an open network. I think we have seen challenges of having open networks versus closed networks. Most of our networks are closed networks because of how they are funded. We, as an entity, as an organization, have tried to find ways of how we can bring those closed networks together in an open way. For us, right now, that looks like a national conference once a year that we call Horizons. That is open to all of our networks and really anyone who wants to come because I think what we often find is I am in this network but I think that network sounds really interesting. Sorry, you

cannot be in that network because you are not funded by that funder. I think that structure becomes very cumbersome.

And then very much what Adam said at the opening around communication. I think we have been struggling to find the right technology that folks will actually use to keep the conversation going whether that is LinkedIn or Slack or a built-for-purpose platform. I really have not seen anything that really cracks that challenge quite the right way yet. But hopefully, someone has solved for that.

Other things to wrap up that we really tried to bake into everything that we do in this area is really working to focus equity and lived experience in the networks in terms of membership, in terms of voices that we are bringing to our sessions and our presentations and the site visits. And then also where possible and where funding allows, really being able to build data infrastructures into this work so that we can have a stronger ROI story to tell on the back end. I know it was a lot in a short amount of time but happy to be here.

MS. O'MALLEY: Thank you and good morning. It is so great to be here to learn from everybody and to share stories. I am Erin O'Malley. I am the inaugural executive director of the Coalition for Trust in Health & Science. We are a somewhat new nonprofit. We were formed back in March

of 2023, coming out of the COVID pandemic and really out of concern about both the declines and trust that we had been seeing as it relates to health, science, and public health as well as the proliferation of falsehoods, information that is not exactly accurate, but is leading people to make unhealthy choices.

We are unique in that we have members -- as a coalition, we have about 100 members and they are the national trade associations, foundations, societies, and nonprofits that represent the entities across the health and science ecosystem. The trade associations that are representing scientists in labs today, engaging in biomedical research. The associations representing public health officials of all stripes, various professionals, doctors, nurses, et cetera. We have bioethics organizations in our membership and we round out with both patients and consumers.

This really is one of the first times that many of these entities -- here, in Washington, we use the word strange bed fellows. Oftentimes, many of the organizations within our membership cannot sit down and agree on most policy issues but they can and have committed to working with us to rebuild trust with the American people.

We are a 501c3. We do not engage in policy and advocacy, which is a very important note in this moment in

particular. And to become a member, our members sign a three-point pledge, which is detailed on our website, again, committing to work together out of the recognition that one entity alone cannot fix the problem that we have.

We know that trust in health and science is deep and personal and really nuanced. There are historical reasons why individuals in communities do not trust the system. And it evolves. We absolutely note that in this moment, in particular, due to the availability of all kinds of information whether it is accurate and evidence-based or not, people are making decisions that really do impact their health.

How we work is essentially two-fold. One, recognizing that on the professional side, if you will, of our membership spectrum, we have the reach to upwards of 200 million professionals in the science public health and health care space. We are working through those trade organizations to help them engage in trustworthy behavior.

On the second pillar of our work, we are working to help educate individuals, patients, and communities about various aspects of what is quality information. Who are the people that you should trust as it relates to getting information that is evidence based?

As you can imagine, a big part of our work is education. On a biweekly basis, we have a virtual -- we

call them learning lunches, similar to the brown bag model, where we bring in experts to help our members understand the lay of the landscape, best practices, and how to be trustworthy. We engage in training workshops.

We are a collaborator, a curator. I am not the expert. It is our members who are the experts. We are constantly trying to amplify the great work whether it is a one individual case study or the work of an entire field within health and science.

Some of the challenges. As you can imagine, there are a lot of competing issues taking place right now and many of them do impact trust. For all of our members, they are busy fighting political battles right now. There are hits whether they are legislative, regulatory, legal. From our point of view, we recognize that our members are out front fighting for their aspect, their corner of the health and science ecosystem. We are fighting behind the scenes to ensure that we are taking those steps to rebuild and maintain trust with the American people behind the scenes essentially.

One of the other elements of our work because we are not engaged in policy and advocacy, but it is so connected, especially in this moment, to understanding health information, understanding who are the trusted messengers and where to go. We work behind the scenes. We

have a web-based infrastructure where our members can contribute their content and we contribute as well. Talking points.

For example, today, one of the hot issues, not just in health and science, but as a national debate is vaccines. I spent most of my morning populating content around the data, the talking points, resources, social media posts to that infrastructure.

We do a lot of matchmaking. I have a very unique seat in that I am aware of not just what our 100 plus members are doing in this space but many of the allies, the other partners, individuals who want to start work in this space out of just pure concern about the lack of trust right now.

Again, the current situation of our network -- I am always really pleased that our members, one, really appreciate the work that we do and see it as a complement to their work. All of our members care about rebuilding trust, which is why they are part of our membership. But, again, every day, they are fighting their little corner and recognize that one entity cannot go it alone.

Some of the big challenges we have. I have a very wide swim lane. All things health. All things science. All things public health. You could have a coalition and a massive grassroots and PR campaign on one element of

science alone. I try to keep all of my content as issue agonistic as possible. I just cited vaccines. It is hard not to address vaccines in the context of our work.

But even earlier today, we talked about loneliness. Think about the role of loneliness as it relates to trusting the system. AI is a big component. Climate change and the nexus with health. As we create and curate content, I am thinking about how is this broadly applicable whether you are sitting in a health care system or a pharmacy today.

Looking forward, some of the work that we are doing have started. We will definitely continue to engage in this. It is thinking through who are the trusted messengers. I personally very strongly believe that the great voices of health and science and health care delivery are not always connecting with the American people. How do we find the right voices to answer people's questions, to build trust, build common ground?

Another component of our work, as already noted today, is we are funded through philanthropic grants, individual donors. We will be putting a member due structure in place for the first time in year three. There is a very competitive funding landscape at this point.

I will close by saying we run this coalition with the idea that there are competitors. We are not competing.

We want to collaborate. It has been, I think, a really refreshing approach that our board leadership really drives for us to be as collaborative as possible because again the foundation of if we think we alone have the answer even with this big coalition, we will not rebuild trust with the American people. Thank you.

DR. A. LEVINE: Thank you all for such a wonderful panel and for sharing all of your experiences, successes, and challenges. I am going to open up the floor both for folks in the room as well as folks online for Q&A just to kind of tee that up a little bit.

First of all, I want to say that during lunch, the four people who are sitting up here are all going to be available and eager to talk about specific examples and details related to their work.

One thing we were hoping for the Q&A right now is if we can get people to think about cross-cutting themes, challenges, opportunities, things like that that might apply to all of them. Thinking about the question that basically all four of them might have some insights to share on.

Just as a way of connecting some of the things that they all said to things that we talked about earlier. I think one thing is really just underscore the way in which we heard a wide variety of collaborative goals across

all the things that folks talked about. Florence talked about providing networking opportunities to share information and informal collaboration but also research lightning talks and grants for formal collaboration.

Dovev talked about brown bag lunch series on common themes as a way of spurring informal collaboration and also collaborative projects on clean energy and climate resilience for formal collaborations.

Maria talked about a wide variety of informal collaborations, communities of practice, knowledge exchange to the congressional staff networks and communities of practice for the Department of Commerce grantees.

And then Erin also talked about a wide of variety of informal collaboration related to the biweekly learning lunches for members, training workshops, and how the agenda for those are set.

You are starting to see all of these kinds of things. We have these diverse networks, a wide variety of collaborative goals. I encourage folks to think about in their own work, what do you think the goals should be. What do people want? What kind of unmet desire exists?

I am going to start. I am going to ask the first question just to again while people are thinking about what they might want to talk about. This is similar. This is for everybody. Whoever wants to answer it. This is definitely

similar to the question I asked Anita, which is I wanted to -- I would love to invite you to talk about not just what are the challenges but what is an example of something that did not work and you were like this did not work and we had to learn from it and we had to do something different.

I will say I am an optimistic person by nature. I am not asking this because I really like talking about failure that much. But I am actually really asking about it from the perspective of -- I have many people when I talk about the failures of Reserach4Impact 1.0, people will say I really appreciate you sharing that. It is so easy to talk about successes. And from the perspective of people maybe in the room, people online, who are like I want to do more of this in my own work. I am not as successful maybe as the folks on this panel but I would like to be. I think it is helpful just to demystify. How did you get from here to there and what kinds of things did you have to learn? That is the question. Is there an example of a failure and what did you do in response? Who wants to go first?

MS. O'MALLEY: I am happy to start with that hard question. As I noted, we were founded in March of 2023, coming out of COVID. We are in such a wildly different position right now than we were then and really pause and think about. There was so much scrutiny and so much

distrust in health and science and it is even worse now.

How do we get a hold of this problem?

In all honesty, we have evolved a lot in our thinking. And one of the things that when our organization came together, we purposefully made it the coalition, as I articulated. There is no one entity who can go this alone. But in doing so, when you bring 100 diverse organizations to the table who raise their hand on one element, even if that one element has a lot of different viewpoints. Initially, we thought we would be the arbiter of all things truth and trust and be on social media and put out this information. We have no audience. Who are we talking to? Are we trusted? Can we get that one voice across these diverse organizations? That was a massive pivot, recognizing that as altruistic as it sounded and as needed in March of 2023 as it was. That is not the model that we moved forward with.

DR. A. LEVINE: That also echoes what Maria said before about scientists at least are starting with the best possible intentions. I have amazing things to share. Wait a minute.

MS. FLYNN: I would share what is a current challenge around our Pathways to Prosperity Network, which is we did not do something that I think, Anita, you pointed to earlier, which I do not think we have thought far enough

in advance of what should this network look like three or five years from now. My concern is because of that, I feel it is losing its innovation edge. I would say the failure was probably not doing enough multi-year planning.

DR. A. LEVINE: You can also skip if you want by the way.

DR. D. LEVINE: We can talk about the Levine versus Levine thing down the road -- our own lunch time cross-cutting situation. I think that as much as I was talking about the working groups that we are standing up now that they are already showing signs of success. Actually, this is the second time we did this. We tried to launch it years ago. And what we learned was at the time, we did not really put a clear apparatus infrastructure in terms of again how do you get these things to meet regularly, who shows up, who keeps notes. All that basic logistical stuff we did not really have a place. It fell apart quite fast. It took us another year to come back to say this is all volunteer, value-add type of stuff for all the different governments. We want to make sure this time around that we put in a much more clearly coordinated effort and that is so far working out quite well.

MS. HUDSON: I am inspired by my colleagues up here. This is under the frame of the impossible just takes longer which you have probably heard or lived through

before. One of the initiatives -- we have four main focus areas at the Northeast Big Data Innovation Hub. We have education data literacy that the National Student Data Corps talked about. We have health -- the COVID Information Commons is our main program. Responsible data science, including security, privacy, and ethics is a really big one. And we have urban rural communities, which was a Department of Transportation project that we did.

But under the security, privacy, and ethics, we envisioned in 2016 actually here at a workshop at GW University right around the corner with IEEE, the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, the need to create better security and privacy around the Internet of Things, the data, the devices, the humans, implanted medical devices, all these things. It sounds impossible but we decided we were going to give it a try. And it took us six years or something like that to do it. We talked about it in 2016. Actually, I guess eight. We won the Emerging Technology Award last year. We had 300 people around the planet do it. It took a long time but it was worth it.

Sometimes the impossible just takes longer. And it is this umbrella of trust, identity, privacy, protection, safety, and security. Oy vey you would say. Right? But it all comes together and everything is connected to everything now. You really have to worry about

it as a system of systems, as you said. Give yourself a break. The impossible sometimes just takes longer.

DR. A. LEVINE: Thank you. Questions in the audience and then also I see -- let me go to Chelsea first online and then I will go to Anna afterwards.

MS. FOWLER: Thank you. This is a bit of the flipside of Adam's question. A question we received from the virtual audience is how do you measure success whether that is for your network, for a project, what have you. What do you consider success? I will add that part myself.

MS. HUDSON: I will go first. Having been a VP and a CTO at IBM, I am very much fix oriented. We counted everything in the SCC carrot every quarter. We look at the number of humans collaborating with the hub, engaging with each other. We have these asynchronous, open, online data science projects. Students said to get a job, they said I have to have used real-world data. But I told them, I am just graduating. I have not done that. We are like we can help you with that. We created these asynchronous data science projects.

We have had over 8000 people participate in them. We have given out thousands of certificates and stuff. We look at engagement. We look at success of our members. And then we are very fortunate. We have gotten \$10 million in awards. We have gotten a couple of hub awards. We have

gotten an NIH award (inaudible) program. We got a Department of Transportation -- Transportation Data Science Project Award. We just got a DARPA award. We got another Prototype Open Knowledge Network. We look at our funding. We look at the success of our community from their perspective that they have been more successful. And then the number of people we are engaging in and impacting in a positive way, including collaborators, industry, and nonprofit.

DR. A. LEVINE: Whoever wants to go next.

MS. FLYNN: I can give some examples from the Department of Commerce, the community practice project there. We are really going by percentages of those grantees of the 32 communities who are taking action on different components of the assistance being offered.

For example, 72 percent of them said that they benefited directly from coaching from our staff or other experts. Sixty-eight percent have directly utilized data that has been provided to drive their decision making so things like that are what we are tracking.

MS. O'MALLEY: Happy to jump in. As a newer organization, as you can imagine, we do not have the numbers that others do. But I think of it essentially in three tiers. We are not even at noon and I have written

down so many things to take back. Anita, thank you for introducing this tiered-based model.

At a high level, yes, we know what our member engagement is like, whether it is participating in trainings, pushing out materials. That is a little bit harder to get to. That, to me, would really be my second tier. Again, we have quantified that we have a reach of upwards of 200 million people, barely a drop in the bucket in terms of our ability in the last three years to actually reach those 200 million. Thinking more strategically about how do we get our members to be really active and pushing information out.

And then the final element I will say which might be unique in many different contexts is when we think of our ultimate end goal, which is getting the American people to re-trust us and maintain trust. There are a number of national surveys that are in newspapers or on the national news. We have an internal debate about do we just follow those. Every year Gallup, Edelman, Pew -- they are studying views on trust in health and science. Do we leverage that? Do we create yet another survey and poll? That is an outstanding question for us but I would say at least to date, we have been looking at those annual existing polls on trust.

DR. D. LEVINE: Great question. I would say for the NEMS Network, probably two main approaches to that. One is are people showing up. Check. That is going well. Two is again in that vein of actionable impact on the ground, going back to the working groups, we have made it very clear that each working group within two years, that is about a year and eight months from now, must have operationalized and actually put into place at least one intervention related to this issue on the ground, test it in at least one community and also measure it, which is where the UNH grad students come into place.

DR. A. LEVINE: I saw Anna's hand before.

MS. RICKLIN: Thank you. Really interesting examples and thank you for sharing your stories. It was occurring to me, as you were talking, that essentially network management is volunteer management in a way. You have folks for the most part who are volunteering to be members of your network. Keeping people engaged and motivated beyond the first time that they joined. They have a lot of enthusiasm. They are very motivated about the topic and sometimes we think as network managers or as nonprofits who are trying to bring in volunteers to work in the soup kitchen or whatever that we think that enough is going to keep them coming back and we find that that is not enough that we have to do more for all our volunteers than

just think that they are going to be motivated to participate or move a topic forward. I am just wondering how you are doing that as you move beyond the fresh, new students that join your network and then they become adults.

DR. A. LEVINE: I will just add. We only have two minutes left. Tell us everything quickly.

MS. HUDSON: I can talk fast. What we do is we listen to them when they come to us and say, well, they are telling us we have to use real data. We are like we can create a project that you can do that. If you go in thinking I know what you need, it is like your parents. You are like right. But if you listen to them, then they will tell you where to go and then they will engage more.

MS. O'MALLEY: What Florence said.

DR. D. LEVINE: I talk pretty quick so I can try to be quick as well. I would say for our network, we think about that a lot, and it is really trying to remember that we are a value-add to our constituents and our members. A couple of things we really try to think about are what are the things of value we can give them. Again, that student engagement really matters because it adds capacity. We are able to really leverage that in a way that they see that as it is not just, oh, I'll take an intern. Is that really trying to plug them in to have this really high-impact

experience that they then find to be adding to the workload and really lessening it for them?

MS. FLYNN: I will just add for us. Our network members are typically leaders of agencies or organizations. I think a part of the incentive is that by being part of these networks, they have more likelihood to get selected to be part of grant applications or have access to other opportunities. I think that is a common thread for us as folks see it as a way to get a light shine on their work.

DR. A. LEVINE: Great. Thank you so much. At this point, I am all that stands between all of the people in the room and lunch. The people online -- whatever meal you are about to eat if anything. I am just going to wrap up with a couple of thoughts.

First of all, for people in the room, for lunch, all four of our panelists are going to be available to talk more, especially if you want to talk to them about anything in general but in particular, anything about their specific networks. I know they are more than happy to do that. They are going to be at particular tables to do that.

And then just in terms to wrap up and kind of connect to a couple of things from earlier, actually really appreciate -- Anna's question sort of centering the people who are part of these networks. In a lot of ways, what is really amazing about the people on our panel is that they

are creating a key element of the infrastructure of civil society.

To come back to the point about democratic self-governance that I mentioned at the beginning of this session, it is all voluntary, as Anna mentioned. They are creating opportunities and moments for people who want to and are working to improve communities that they care about and to solve problems and things like that all across the country. They are creating opportunities for them to get new ideas, work with others, and really super charge those goals. I think that that is really amazing and really part and parcel of what it means for us to chart our own path. I think that is awesome.

Thank you, everybody. Why don't we just give everybody a round of applause? With that, it is lunch time. 12 o'clock. Wait. There is an announcement.

MS. KELLY: Just a little bit of adaptive management. Actually, they are each going to go stand by their posters, which are at the far end of the lobby. And we are really trying to keep that in 15 minutes so they can also have a break and enjoy their lunch. Little, mini poster session. Thanks.

(Lunch Break)

AFTERNOON SESSION

Agenda Item: Session 2: Designing for Durability:**Field Notes and Futures of Networked Action**

DR. ANGELL: Welcome back, everybody in the room, from lunch. As we come back together again, we are going to do a little bit of the same thing from this morning, and a little bit different from this morning. But first of all, all of us, myself and the panel here, have been invited to introduce ourselves, so I'll do that quickly.

My name is Sonia Angell. I'm on faculty at Johns Hopkins in the department of epidemiology with joint appointment in environmental health and engineering. I'm also a practicing physician, and I've spent almost 20 years in government public health. Before I came to Hopkins, I was at the New York City health department as a deputy commissioner. I directed the California health department. I've been at the CDC.

So I'll say that I come into my academic position really thinking about how can we use evidence, how do we use the tools of academia, to make them help support and be a backbone for change, but really that change comes from our communities at large. And that's my general belief.

Before I became a physician, before I got my master's degree in public health, I was an organizer. I was a trained organizer, I've organized networks on the

west coast and the east coast, I've gotten in cars and driven across the United States meeting with catfish workers and warehouse workers and others to just bring together and find how we work. At that time I was working in economic development, but very quickly came to understand and appreciate how much the health of our economy depends upon the physical health of our communities. And that was very evident from just working with folks, which is how I sort of moved into health.

But I will say to this day the most important skills that I have and have continued to use are not the skills as a physician or the skills in public health that I learned there, but the skills that I learned as an organizer. So this is very near and dear to me.

I am thrilled and very humbled to be a part of this conversation, because what we learned this morning is that when you've seen one network, you've seen one network. So I am continuing to learn from every single one of these conversations, and we all get used to the kind of people that we work with, our constituencies, we learn to understand them very well, and it's very humbling to be pushed outside of that thinking to think about other people's constituencies, constituencies that maybe we don't engage with daily, to understand what a network means to them, and from that we learn more.

So we've got a panel of four leaders from very different networks. Like this morning, they're going to share with us and help us understand their networks. But we're also challenging them to move from what we learned this morning, which was very network- and topical-specific, to help us maybe think about some of the things that you all believe can really help and be more generalizable, helping us to understand how networks can evolve, how they can adapt, and particularly in these times, in very challenging situations.

So I'm going to go ahead and turn it over to Terri first, and each one of our panelists will introduce and turn it over to the next person in the panel, and then at the end we'll come back again and have the opportunity to learn more and ask specific questions.

Thank you so much, Terri.

DR. FERINDE: Thrilled and humbled is right.

Thank you, Sonia.

Thank you to Chelsea Fowler and the team at SEAN for having me. It's quite an honor. I'm Dr. Terri Ferinde. I'm a partner at Collaborative Communications Group. For more than two decades, I've had the privilege to lead and learn alongside the 50 State Afterschool Network as we work to expand opportunities and supports for young people in after-school and summer learning programs.

The 50 State Afterschool Network was seeded by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation beginning in 2001, with just eight states. Today every state has a statewide afterschool network. They all have different names, we'll come to that in a minute. They're coordinated by lean teams, often just a few staff members, and a modest budget. Every network has some funding from the Mott Foundation, but they also have another mix of funding from state government, from philanthropy, fee-for-service. Many of them do professional development, trainings, different things like that.

All of our networks bring together what we call the grassroots and the grass tops. The grassroots are the folks, parents, young people, local afterschool providers like Boys & Girls Clubs, YMCAs, Campfire, the folks who are working every day with young people. And the grass tops, those who are making the decisions about funding, about regulations, including state and local policymakers, business, corporations, philanthropy, education leaders, researchers, and state agencies.

With a focus on policy, quality, and sustainability, our networks serve as conveners and capacity builders in their states, connecting community voices with decisionmakers, ensuring practice, policy, and evidence are interwoven.

So my network is both one network, the 50 State Network, and all of these 50 networks that comprise it. My organization's collaborative serves as the backbone organization for this network. We are connecting the state networks at all of the places where they come together. We support two meetings annually, a website, much more, including an online community. I was going to tell Maria, we use Mobilize and have had success with that, happy to talk more about it.

Our network is really privileged to be surrounded by an extensive technical assistance support system funded by the Mott Foundation. That includes national organizations like the Afterschool Alliance, that supports our policy work, and specialists in communications, governance, leadership, and more.

Importantly, these networks are nested and they're key connectors in our broader learning and development ecosystem, so they often link the parts of the ecosystem that best serve children and shape children's lives, including educational, social services, health, and workforce.

We are very honored that in the May 2025 National Academies report, the Future of Youth Development, we were cited, they cited the 50 State Afterschool Network, as one of the most comprehensive intermediary systems in the

country, bridging federal funding, state policy, local practice, and community voice. So really honored by that recognition.

We were asked to look at the kind of navigating demographic, political contests. I say that's what we do every day, all the time. Every one of our states is demographically, economically, politically different, and they are all navigating those unique and dynamic contexts all the time. Our work is to support that work, help communities of practice form within the network so that they can talk about those with the most similar contexts.

We've learned a few things from that work. Commitment is key for these networks and how we can help them stay at the table through leadership changes and through funding shifts. Adaptability, tailoring language and strategies to local contexts. We have a key strategy across our network of positioning afterschool programs as the solution to whatever the community need or policymaker priorities are, so how can we really shape our language to meet that context?

And then collaboration. One of the key strategies of our networks is always being willing to set the table. So they're setting the table for other leaders across the space.

Really important across our network, and an important takeaway, is this balance of flexibility and coordination. We use the network code framework from Grantmakers for Effective Organizations, is a 2013 report that provided some simple but counterintuitive principles. We talk about it, and we see it reflected in our networks, this idea of mission over organization, the network prioritizes this goal of expanding opportunities for young people over a shared logo or a shared name. Again, never in our 50-state history have we forced someone to have a specific name or a brand. They've all had unique branding.

Trust over control. Our state networks have a lot of flexibility to adapt to locally and grounded in trust, rather than a very heavy-handed coordination on their workplans. Humility over brand, successes are shared. Who gets credit matters less than whether the mission advances. I have a great example in Nebraska. They launched a Think, Make, Create mobile lab that's this kind of brilliant idea to bring afterschool activities to rural programs, and that idea got picked up and replicated in many of our rural states, with a shared knowledge base.

And node over hub. States act as equal nodes, innovations spread peer-to-peer rather than flowing through a central hub. This was really apparent during the pandemic when our network really coalesced. Our members

sprang into action showing how afterschool could and should be positioned as a response for essential workers. As the health crisis spread across the country, our members were able to share information and position states ahead of the curve.

This symposium gave us a chance to think about enduring lessons and strategies. I have five Rs for you: roots, relationships, results, resilience, and reach.

We have learned that networks need deep roots that are watered frequently. So this is the funding many of you have talked about. We've been very blessed and it's been a great support to have continuous support from the Mott Foundation throughout our 25 years as a network. Even a small amount of money matters in keeping these roots watered.

Relationships, trust is the currency. Relationships are what help us bridge government, community, and academia. For example, in government, the key part for all of our work is being bipartisan. Our bipartisan coalitions have protected afterschool funding for more than two decades. The state education agencies have always been a priority partner in our coalitions, and we create roll spaces in all of our meetings to keep them engaged and coming back to the table.

With community, we really respect that parents and young people provide the lived experiences that makes our work matter, and we engage them through a variety of exercises. The After School Alliance hosts an annual lights-on event in October that engages young people where they live in their programs. And every five years, the alliance conducts a parent survey that shows consistent demand for afterschool program. The new data will be released in about two weeks and we're very excited about that.

In academia researchers are core. We always have a researcher at our meetings, on our peer learning communities. We have a great stable of researchers who help us show impact on the ground. Last year, a longitudinal study showed that at age 26 young people who have participated in programs were more likely to graduate from high school, earn more money, and be better participants in communities. So we take their research, we distill it down to soundbites like that, and then we get it out through the network so they're better able to talk about research in real on-the-ground ways. So bridging perspectives is what gives our networks influence.

Back to our Rs. Results, wins matter and we celebrate wins all the time. That's a very important strategy. Keeping the federal 21st Century Community

Learning Center alive through different administrations has given the networks a common goal and rallying cry. When our allocated funding was threatened just this year, the networks went into action, I can talk more about the strategies they did. And the funds for afterschool were reinstated before many of the other funding streams in education. An important win that we don't brag about too loudly but we're very proud of.

Resilience, we accept that our networks are going to ebb and follow. We know that some of the networks will be stronger and then one of the legs of our stool will fail and we will need to go into gear to support them. Our resilience says it's okay to falter, and we have great TA that helps those networks come back and be part of the full network.

And our reach. We believe, as we heard this morning that our networks multiply impact. We help pilot programs, small grant programs, to ripple across the 50 state network. Over time, we don't just grow programs, we really help build a field.

Quickly, our challenges will seem very familiar to you. I am a communications professional, and it is incredibly difficult to show visually what this network is. It's so nuanced, and so complex, that I've looked through 1,000 different slides to bring one to you today. I

couldn't find one, so I gave up on that. We've done ripple mapping, impact mapping, there's just so many ways to look at our network and how it's connected, and very hard to summarize it.

As others have mentioned, capturing the return on investment for funders is especially difficult, especially around the peer learning and how ideas spread throughout the network. And as a closed network, we're 50 states, and obviously by our name we're very committed to the 50 states. So keeping members as part of the main network to have the breadth is really important and challenging.

My takeaway is this -- our networks endure not because of our control but because of the collaboration and connection amongst them. Our five Rs, roots, relationships, results, resilience, and reach create a forcefield across our people, policies, and evidence, that turns ideas into action and sustains networks, providing young people with more opportunities.

That's all I have so thank you for listening. It's my pleasure to now turn it over to my neighbor in Fairfax, Anna.

MS. RICKLIN: Good afternoon. As Terri said, my name is Anna Ricklin. I'm the Health in All Policies manager in Fairfax County Health Department, and I'm going to talk a little bit differently about networks. So I'm

going to introduce myself and talk about the network building that I do in Fairfax for the cause of Health in All Policies. And then I'm going to talk a little bit about a professional network that I am part of.

I was actually trained as an undergraduate in anthropology, and this was, I've learned, probably the best choice for the type of work that I ended up doing because of the cultural nuances of working across sectors. Looking at the world almost as a network, that's what anthropologists are trained to do, look at how family trees are organized, look at how family and social structures are organized, so that is how I approach my work.

And then I did a graduate degree in public health, also at Hopkins. So here we are, a whole family.

My first job out of graduate school was working at the Baltimore City Department of Transportation. I was very interested in how transportation is a social determinant of health, and then I worked for many years for the American Planning Association, kind of scaling up from just the transportation piece in the built environment, to looking at urban planning and the larger built environment.

In those roles I was always the lone public health person, in these non-health sectors. So I like to say when I came to Fairfax Health Department, that was my

first job after being a professional for over 15 years, working in public health.

Just a very brief overview of Health in All Policies, for anybody who hasn't dived deep into that literature. It's based on the social determinants of health, so the idea that we're working to help change or advance non-health sectors and the factors in our social and environment contexts that actually shape most of our health, you know, the zip code is more important than your genetic code, et cetera.

And it's of course to influence policies and procedures in fields other than public health. And we think of policy as both a big-P policy, so formal policies that are passed by legislative bodies, as well as those smaller policies and procedures that operate maybe at the department level, that are very influential on decision-making and ultimately what material gets fed up to our legislative bodies to make formal decisions.

And of course Health in All Policies is inherently intersectoral, and I believe that we need more of it across our communities.

Briefly how the role came about. It was spearheaded by the director of our health department, Dr. Gloria Addo-Ayensu, who is actually here today, who was also invited to participate in today's session, who started

to build an informal network with other leaders of county agencies. So she talked with people in our permitting agency and our urban planning agency and our transportation agency and others, who actually are in, thinking about how government is structured, in a whole other branch of government than the health and human service agencies.

Later, we were able to get a federal grant that supported some of the early work, building up those cross-sector relationships among staff, and eventually were able to establish a fulltime position funded by general funds.

Who here lives in Fairfax County? Fairfax County is a very well-resourced county, and so we're very lucky to have the position that we do have, as well as many other unique positions in our health department. But nonetheless, I am currently a team of one, officially, but have to rely on my network to actually help me get my work done.

The approach of Health in All Policies is really connecting people, thinking about building that network and ultimately elevating health. it's based on relationships, and it really has to be because helping non-health professionals understand the potential health impacts of their work, even if those impacts are unintentional -- these are mostly unintentional consequences -- can't be done from a purely academic or arms-length approach. We

can't just say well here's the obvious, and assume that people will act on that, and we can't just do that from the health department. We have to do it much closer to them.

And of course if we want them to take our input we have to build trust. So building that network, some of the strategies we employ: informational interviews, wanting to understand the details of their process, to get a sense of where health can be included. Personal follow-up, like lunch and coffee. Those things are actually very valuable for building our networks.

Actively participating in non-health teams. So I participate in a lot of teams that are policy and planning teams in the land use, transportation, or housing fields. I also connect with board staff at the staff level to ensure that they know that the health department has resources beyond what they might think on the surface of traditional public health.

And I also think it was a very savvy decision by leadership in the health department to actually use their relationships with those other agency leaders and get me an office in the building where the land development agencies reside. It's a completely different building than the health department, not even in the same neighborhood. So by being physically collocated with those folks I think I have an advantage, and thankfully I started my job before

COVID, so I actually have a lot of in-person relationships built.

Of course, throughout all of this network building, using that anthropological lens to look at power dynamics and who is in the room.

Some of the challenges, being a strategic advisor but with limited human and financial resources, because I don't have a budget, I can't walk to the table and say I think you guys should have more active transportation, and then they say where's your budget to help us build sidewalks? And I don't have that. Sometimes people think of the input from the health sector as kind of an unfunded mandate. Okay, you want us to do this, but where's your money? So that's one challenge.

Sometimes I grapple with the sheer number of possible options to work on. Health in all policies, I could be working on criminal justice, I could be working on land use, I could be working on all these things. And also with people wanting me to sometimes be involved at a more granular level. Can you go do a literature review for this? And can you do these other very granular things?

Like I mentioned, my work itself is building networks. But yet sometimes the people I'm working with don't even know what each other is doing, so sometimes I'll be talking to planners, and they didn't know about this

thing going on in transportation and I'm able to make that connection, so that's kind of neat. But it can also be a challenge because clearly they're not aligned.

And another thing that can facilitate network building is supporting other staff priorities. So really not diving into it with my own agenda, but understanding what their agenda is and where I can fit health in along the way. It's not necessarily an either-or.

Culture change takes a really long time. You need to keep showing up. And I appreciate what one of our morning speakers, Anita, was talking about, where she talked about the natural ebb and flow of networks. So as staff turnover -- and I've built this network and then that person leaves, and then that person leaves, or as we have political changes in the county -- there's a need to constantly refresh and constantly keep building that network.

Lastly, in my last couple of minutes, I want to talk about SOPHIA. It says health impact assessment on the agenda, I believe, but they've really pivoted to be more involved in Health in All Policies. It's a national and international network. There are some members from Europe, so that's the international piece. I'm on their steering committee.

It's a small organization. We only have 90 members. And the mission is to provide leadership and promote excellence in the practice of health impact assessment and health in all policies. The organization develops valuable, high-quality resources that help build capacity among practitioners, support networking and peer mentoring, and it was initially formed in 2012 to support the growing practice of health impact assessment, and like I said has since expanded to include health in all policies.

Members are mainly Health in All Policies and HIA practitioners and academics, as well as some people from a variety of fields like advocacy organizations and planning, and having an organization, I think, to help normalize health in all policies as a field, and even if most people don't have the title I have, so they're doing health in all policies as a second or third hat in their main job, really helps us to connect and feel more supported even if only in spirit because we're so dispersed across the country, by people working on similar efforts.

That concludes my remarks, and I'm going to pass it off to Sacoby.

DR. WILSON: Happy to be here. Sacoby Wilson. Was running a little late, because I had to talk to a publicist this morning. Sorry about that.

I was just announced as one of the Heinz Foundation, Heinz awards, I'm the environment category winner, was just announced yesterday. So I had to get a publicist to amplify, and I was in -- great to be here and thanks for the invitation again, because my work is really in environmental justice. As you all know, environmental justice under attack by the current administration, and that award that I received, the recognition is really recognizing the community partners that I've been working with for decades.

Before I get too far into my comments about the Mid-Atlantic Justice Coalition, some of the other things I'm doing, I was raised up in the EJ movement, which started in North Carolina in the North Carolina Environmental Justice Network. It's one of the oldest state-level EJ networks in the country. Some of you may know that the environmental justice movement started in Warren County, North Carolina. Whenever you drive through Virginia down to North Carolina, that's the first county you pass through in North Carolina when you're on the highway.

So that network was very instrumental in my sort of training in the movement and being able to understand, create an ecosystem where that network is really grounded in community. So community, community led, community

driven, and creating an ecosystem where frontline fence line communities that experience environmental climate energy justice issues can come together and drive the work, right?

So I was trained at UNC Chapel Hill under Dr. Steve Wing, who was known as the people's professor. So you had this combination of this community grassroots component and then this strong academic partner whose ethos, training, and spirit was about uplifting communities. Not extractive science, not colonial science, but solutions, justice, a changed science.

So that's my foundation, and so my work, I'm a professor at the University of Maryland College Park, I run the EJ lab that's the Health Environmental Economic Justice Lab, and also I'm executive director of CEEJH, Inc., the Center for Engagement Environmental Justice and Health, empowering communities.

We just had our 11th symposium this weekend in Baltimore. It was a rousing success. So when you think about this great conversation about networks, at Maryland we had our first symposium in 2012. What emerged out of that was the DMV environmental justice coalition. The model for that coalition was the work in North Carolina. Unfortunately, getting to the challenges, we didn't have a

lot of funding, we didn't have any stuff. It kind of petered out.

Now more recently, the second generation of that coalition, it's called the Mid-Atlantic Justice Coalition, that again emerged out of the space that we created with the symposium, where folks come together from impacted communities, those of you who live in the D.C. area, we have folks from Ward 7, Ward 8. We work with Empower DC, some of you may know Empower DC, they work in the criminal school fighting against trying to make it a parking lot. Working with folks in Prince George's County, Maryland. We have a lot of environmental issues. Some of you may live in Brandywine, Maryland. Brandywine is unincorporated, it's contamination without representation. Superfund sites, coal-fired power plant, all that stuff.

Some of you may know about the issues in Baltimore where the ship crash was. That's Turner Station. Some of you may know about the issues with the medical waste incinerator, largest one in the country. That's in Curtis Bay. They have over 70 permitted facilities under the Clean Air Act. So it's a sacrifice zone.

Those are the communities that we work in. We work with folks on industrial chicken farms. Those of you who drive to Ocean City for vacation, I call it the

forcefield of funk that you smell. That's chicken waste. So the impacts on air quality and water quality.

So we work with communities across the region and we created that space so to bring people together to talk to policymakers to talk to the D.C. Department of Energy and Environment. Is the acronym DOEE? I know it's a new acronym, right.

Talk to the folks at the D.C. Department of Health. Talk to people in the Department of the Environment in Prince George's County. And we do a lot of engagement, creating a space for policymakers to come in that symposium. MDE, Maryland Department of the Environment. We actually had MDE volunteers, MDE staff who volunteered at the symposium this past weekend, because they have some -- I'm not sure why they didn't pay. They couldn't pay to participate. So they volunteered. It was great.

So you have MDE, other agencies, who come into that space with frontline fenceline grassroots organizations in the symposium space, and a few years ago, many of you if you're in the environmental space, you may know this whole issue of cumulative impacts is a huge issue. In many ways it connects to the Health in All Policies thing, but health impact assessments, cumulative impact assessments, right.

So this big cumulative impacts bill that had been passed across the country, we've been trying to pass a bill since 2014. So we were ahead of the curve in 2014. Well, now states like Minnesota, Colorado, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and others have passed bills and we haven't. California of course.

And so in a conversation at the symposium in 2021, I believe, the Mid-Atlantic Justice Coalition emerged out of that conversation. So it's the second generation of the DMV EJ coalition. So we have right now, we have four state tables. The main state table is Maryland. We have D.C., Virginia, and Delaware. Over time, since the coalition developed, the Maryland state table is the strongest one. We have some instability in the Virginia one. We have some instability in the Delaware one. We had some instability in the D.C. one. So we're trying to do a reset right now, because we had to be able to make sure that those who are the most impacted, again, not sure how familiar you all are with environmental justice. But there are these principles of environmental justice, and one principle is the principle of self-determination, so making sure the communities speak their own voice. That's about representative justice.

So this coalition is really ran by grassroots organizations, but we do have some green groups that

participate in the coalition. We have a more kind of grass tops organizations like Maryland League of Conservation Voters participates as well, Clean Water Action participates. We have academic partners who participate in coalition, too. Again, I, in many ways the EJ Lab and my nonprofit, they're kind of like the supporting infrastructure for the coalition, but then we have another Hopkins reference, we have colleagues at Hopkins. I am academic co-director of the community engagement core for our P30 environmental health center. It's called the CHARMED center.

We have folks in the Department of Environmental Health Sciences Engineering who also contribute to the academic expertise to MAGIC. So MAGIC in many ways is our advocacy infrastructure for D.C., Delaware, Virginia, and Maryland. We're trying to engage folks in Pennsylvania. We have partners in Philadelphia as well, and Overbrook Center, and I'm also we're trying to engage groups in Pittsburgh. I'm a hardcore Steelers fan, but it has nothing to do with it.

Part is in Pittsburgh, and I was a hardcore Steelers fan before Heinz even gave me the award. So nothing there for giving me the award.

But we're trying to have -- so we have this coalition, but we also have this hub and hub, hub and spoke

model. So another sort of coalition that we have or infrastructure we have is called the Mid-Atlantic Climate Action Hub, and the acronym is MATCH. That was funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and the Waverley Street Foundation, and the idea is those groups I just mentioned, like Empower DC, Center (inaudible) South Land Trust in Baltimore, (inaudible) Environmental Health Network, Eastern Shore, and southern Delaware chicken farms, overextended Philadelphia. We also have UPAL, United Parents Against Lead, Richmond for those in Virginia, Richmond, they do a lot of work in Richmond.

There are hubs that cover geographic area, and then we collaborate, share best practices, and we use the symposium as the umbrella to bring all those folks together, both through MATCH and MAGIC.

So we're able to bring in active experts, bring in policymakers. Our theme of our last symposium was actually this past weekend was the people's agenda, resistance, resilience, and restoration. So as you're fighting in this moment, you got to be able to restore yourself.

And then how do you use cultural wellness as part of your resilience? Then how can in part -- the theme that emerged from the symposium, which I think is important for this discussion, how do we move forward better together?

Networks, coalitions, right? We are stronger together, and so we have learned that over the years, and how do you build durable infrastructure through networks, coalitions, that regardless of which way the wind blows, in your face or on your back, you have infrastructure that's durable, that's sustainable and that's people -- that's justice focused and people driven, and so that's been really important for us.

So we have lost grants, right? We have lost grants on the nonprofit side, lost grants on the university side, but I think because we built that social, as Jerome Shabazz with Overbrook Center said, we built that social architecture that allows us, and we have relationships, a lot of work has grown in Paulo Freire's Pedagogy of the Oppressed. I mentioned Dr. Steve Wing, the people's professor, also the principles of community engagement and community-based participatory research. So in those 17 principles of environmental justice, so representative justice, people's justice, trust, transparency, some Aretha Franklin, respect, those are the building blocks of strong relationships. Those are the building blocks of strong networks. Those are the building blocks of strong coalitions.

I'll pass the mike to Jennifer. Thank you.

DR. MAZE: Thanks very much. I am Jennifer Maze, and as I've listened to every speaker today, I've changed up what I wanted to say about ten times. But maybe I'll hit some of the similar themes.

I am one of the co-directors of the UCLA Duke University National Center for Child Traumatic Stress, and the National Center is the coordinating center for the National Child Traumatic Stress Network, or NCTSN. We're a federally-funded network of child trauma centers, some that provide direct services to children and families, and when I say child trauma, I mean psychological trauma. There are so many health and public health people here, we're mental health people, on the whole. Our network provides direct services, a lot of training, a lot of consultation. We collect a lot of data on the experiences of children and families who've experienced trauma, and we respond to major events, disasters, mass violence, and a lot of local events impacting local communities.

I've been with the National Center and our network for 25 years, and again, as a clinical psychologist and child trauma person didn't really know anything about networks. So most of what I have to share is stuff that we learned by doing it wrong and trying to kind of pivot and regroup and rely on our kind of mental health backgrounds

and that's why I'm going to talk about how central relationships are to all of this.

Briefly, the National Child Traumatic Stress Network was created by Congress in 2000 as part of the Children's Health Act, and the stated purpose was to close the gap between research and practice and to help build the evidence base for effective child trauma treatments. Back in 2000, the evidence base wasn't there. The interventions were just being developed. The field of child trauma was really just getting started in comparison to adult trauma.

So the network has carried on with this federal support where the SAMHSA, the Substance Abuse Mental Health Services Administration, administers our network and all of the members of the network are independent, independently funded grantees funded by SAMHSA. So we're highly reliant on federal funding. We're highly reliant on congressional support. So we're highly reliant on educating policymakers and making the case for the work that we do.

We have about 200 funded sites right now and over 275 affiliates, and our affiliates are former grantees. So folks who were funded aren't funded anymore, but didn't want to leave the network. So I'm going to talk a little bit about that in a minute.

The kind of questions that were posed to me to try to speak to are how have we managed periods of growth

and change within our network and how have we managed to keep members engaged through all of that so this kind of combining those two and have a few points that I wanted to share that, again, I think echo just a lot of what we have heard on this panel and already today.

One point that I want to share is that having continuity in the backbone organization for the network I think has made a huge difference, and speaking as representative of the backbone organization, we are really the keepers of the history of the network. We're keepers of that narrative and the story about why we were formed, about what we're here to do, about who we are, and we're keepers of the institutional knowledge, the lessons learned, what has worked, what hasn't worked, how something that might have worked in the past, we could pull it back up and apply it in this current challenging situation.

We are also the keepers in a large way of relationships. We take it as our primary role as coordination center to try to get to know every member of the network to the extent that we can. So it's been challenging as we've grown. Now we're facing some budget cuts or stagnant budgets, so we'll have more time to get to know all the folks who are part of our network.

But it really is about kind of personal, those personal relationships. A lot of what we do is brokering

relationships as well, doing that matchmaking that we heard about earlier. And so really getting to know people and having the members of our network know who we are, getting to know people fairly personally and not just like your specialization is this or you're at this institution has been really important for us.

A second point I wanted to make or really echo that others have said is about anticipating change and that we didn't really do it. We didn't really -- we never get it right. We're always like anticipating the wrong change. But one of the things I think that was a success for us was early on not anticipating that members of our network would not continue to receive funding from SAMHSA. So we didn't really think it through. We were really like, okay, SAMHSA has made these awards. We're a network, we're closeknit, there were 17 of us at first, and we all loved each other and that was great, and then we came to the end of the first five years of funding and then SAMHSA put out a new funding announcement and half of the members lost their funding.

So that quickly led to this movement within our own network to create what we call the affiliate program. I think for those of us within the network for the coordinating center, we really want to preserve the expertise. We don't want to lose the connections to all of

the knowledge of folks who've been funded and aren't currently funded, and for those who have lost the funding, I think it's the power of relationships, that sense of belonging, and the sense of mission within our network that kind of keeps them connected and not wanting to leave. There's also kind of a set of benefits and things that we can offer to affiliates in terms of being able to come to our conferences, and we're proud at this point, after about 15 years of building up this program, that most people don't know who's a funded grantee or who's an affiliate, and our affiliates co-lead, represent about half the co-leaders of all of our collaborative groups, our communities of practice, and things like that.

Let's see. The other thing briefly, because now I don't know how much time I left. Well, I'll just kind of skip to the last thing. Three minutes, okay. Skipping to the last thing and a little bit more about relationships that I just wanted to share.

We talk a lot about relationships and doing relational work, and some of the ways that that's kind of - - and I love the term social architecture. I just grabbed that. I'm going to try to use that. But some of the ways that we do this, one is that we established a set of values for our network. It's not values in terms of like our outward-facing work, what we do in communities with

children and families. It's the values that we hold in terms of our collaborative relationships with one another, and this had been percolating for a while, but during the Me-Too time, it became essential to start kind of codifying this, having real active discussions, and really keeping it in the forefront in our work, like in our committees and collaborative groups.

We also have invested quite a bit in peer to peer support in our network. Again, we're mental health people. So we're really attuned to folks being burned out, having secondary traumatic stress, being in the position of responding as leaders to crisis after crisis, including disasters and mass violence and so forth. So we have a number of buddy programs, peer support hours, professional growth networks for early career professionals, and so forth.

And the last thing I want to say that we've been really proud of is that we have kind of a mantra in our network that everyone can lead and everyone has something to offer, and we really feel like we kind of walk the talk with that by being very intentional about who is leading our committees, who is presenting at our conferences, who's doing the keynotes, who is authoring our publications. It's not always -- it's definitely not always the academics, and it's not always the subject matter, the --

well, I guess the subject matter experts, it's the folks who are really doing the work and living and have the lived experience and are living in community, who's featured in our social media posts and so forth.

So I think I'll just wrap up with that. Thanks very much.

Agenda Item: Facilitated Room Discussion

DR. ANGELL: That was terrific. I think we have 12 minutes for discussion, and I think we should all take a deep breath, because there was just so much information. Every presentation was just packed and very unique also.

I'm going to go ahead and maybe open up with a question, but I invite all of you in the room and all of you online also to be online submitting your questions and in the room to be thinking and formulating, and I'll just throw out one right now.

I want to build off Jennifer's last comment. It was something also that, Sacoby, you brought up that sort of made me think of this. You've all talked about how important relationships are in building networks, more important than the evidence, the data, than any of those other things. It's about relationships.

And you've all talked about how you've dealt with challenges with geography, some at different states, different locations. I think, Sacoby, you ended up

creating networks and networks and networks within networks to be able to deal with all of these connections.

Because these relationships are so essential, how do you within -- as individuals, as leaders, or how do you structure into your network the way it functions dealing with burnout, disappointment, the really tough things that are reality at any time. Networks come together because people volunteer, because they care passionately about these issues. The majority aren't being paid. There is some funding, but funding can disappear that was just described.

How do you build into your networks ways to sustain individuals through these times so that they can bring their best self to the table and they continue to be nourished and to be able to be strong and enthusiastic about the topic?

Open that up to all of you. I know, Jennifer, you started to mention some of the ways, but you're welcome to expand, all of you. I'd love any answers on that.

DR. MAZE: I think we started putting lots of things into place around COVID that just scaled up so that now really on like every committee call that we have, it feels like one third of the time is spent in this what I guess you could call relational time. We are deep

breathing together. We are doing community circles. We're doing a lot of that.

The buddy program in particular, we call it NCTSN Cares, and it's voluntary for folks who are interested. They say a little bit about like what kind of person they would want to be matched with, whether it's around their common role or the kind of a community challenge that they're having, and then we try to literally do the matchmaking, and kind of put people together who don't know each other, because we are this national network, geographically dispersed, lots of grantee cohorts, people don't necessarily all know each other.

And we send them prompts every week and encourage them to text each other or get on a call every once in a while I talk to my buddy every month, and we kind of text back and forth. We send each other like, oh, look at this cool PowerPoint or this YouTube video. So it's just literally like that, like person to person.

DR. WILSON: I will chime in real quick. It reminds me, I'm not sure who said, but I say it in my work, look at what worked in the past and bring it forward. I did it as a kid, the buddy system. It works, and we haven't done -- so the EJ movement for everybody. People die in our movement, I just want to let you all know.

Folks are dying because they are fighting for justice, and also, they're being poisoned at the same time, right?

So think about that, all the stuff in public health about stress, oxidative stress, allostatic load, weathering, you know, the Geronimus concept, how stuff gets in your skin. They are living with that, and they're bringing the trauma, they're bringing the trauma, the trauma.

So we actually the restoration for us in the symposium was new, because we have to do a better job of supporting folks in this movement, before this administration. It's always been an issue.

I have people in my head right now that I didn't mention them in my -- like Elsie Herring is a mentor of mine who passed away in the last four years. She was in industrial hog farms. Nan Free(ph.), there's other folks who died young, because they're dealing with that stress of fighting, they're dealing with stress and being poisoned, and also some of these folks of color, Black, dealing with racism, too. They're dealing with all these stressors, so how do we help people navigate that.

So we had this restoration piece in the symposium where we had early morning yoga, we had meditation. We've had meditation rooms. So I think it's a start. But you just gave me an idea, like just real buddy system, and it's

finding ways -- I'll pass the mike -- the whole cultural wellness, bringing cultural wellness into the work, too.

So we have -- I'll say this because I'm really excited about this -- on Friday night we had a cultural night. We had African drumming. We had the Bowie State choir at the symposium. We had art, right? It was great. I loved it.

And then at the award ceremony, this is our first time giving people awards. So we gave Charles Lee, some of you may know Charles Lee, gave him a lifetime achievement award. We gave Vernice Miller-Travis a lifetime achievement award. We gave Dr. McLean, love Dr. McLean, lifetime achievement award. Give them something while they're still here. They're all in their 70s.

Then we had a DJ and music and did a lot of little slides and shuffles, you know some of all those dances, electric slide, Cuban shuffle. All this stuff.

So that's what we did in the symposium. But we have to bring that into beyond the symposium, to celebrate. Celebrate, bring the joy, joy into the work. Because people are in the movement because they want to see things happen, because they had that joy, they had that love, for that beloved community.

So that's something we have done with -- this is our first time for the nonprofit running the symposium, but

we're going to bring more of that joy and restoration into the work moving forward. So just want to share -- it was great, y'all. Loved it. It was so beautiful. I was somewhat crying a little bit. So many tears. So many tears. So much joy, and I think that, those were the highlights, all the joy that people expressed, because they needed it. They've been beat down in this moment. They needed it.

And that's what at the movement, the movement has to have joy, love, and care throughout as we move forward, in whatever spaces we're in.

I'll pass the mike.

DR. FERINDE: Sacoby, I think in-person meeting is critical, just to be able to come together in community to build those relationships.

DR. WILSON: I always joke with folks; you can't break emoji bread.

DR. ANGELL: Did you want to add anymore?

DR. FERINDE: No, I just think that balance of in-person, if you have the funding, is critical.

DR. ANGELL: Anna, what about you?

MS. RICKLIN: Sure, I will just add that I think some of what I mentioned, like having lunch and coffee, is both a network-building activity, but it's also literally nourishing, and taking the time to connect with people one

on one can really help if you're feeling like overwhelmed and burnt out by the politics of big group meetings and that kind of thing.

And then also for me at least, finding mentors outside of the work that I'm doing directly has been really helpful also. So the opportunity to talk to people who are either older than me or more experienced than me in some way and they're able to guide or say the light is at the end of the tunnel or you will get through this, like that is really important to have some co-counseling with people who understand what you're going through.

DR. ANGELL: Thank you. Let me go ahead and I think we have a question from the field.

MS. FOWLER: We have a question from the virtual audience, which I'm going to expand upon just a little bit from what this contributor wrote, and they asked what can you do to significantly -- and I'm going to say meaningfully -- expand the network that you have to include -- and here I'll edit -- to include folks who you wouldn't maybe intuitively think would be part of your network?

DR. WILSON: I will jump in real quick. As the EJ movement and coalition building we've doing involves -- I think EJ needs to be everywhere, because it impacts all of us, and so one thing we talk about is trying to engage unions, trying to engage farmers, trying to engage first

responders, emergency workers. Trying to engage teachers. Think about getting this into schools more, because you have students who come from these communities.

And also, some people who may, they may have -- there's a lot of anti-science sentiment in the country, right? For me, how do you engage folks who have the anti-science sentiment, make your coalition network, make the issues working on everyday proximal and pocketbook, connect it to food, faith, family, health, and jobs.

So bridge, how do we bridge to bring those folks in, because we all got to feed our families. All of us don't have a faith tradition, some of us do. But at least two of those things on that list, you got to have some kind of job, maybe, to take care of folks.

So that's the way that you can break down these barriers, bridge with folks, and then, and because you connect to the things that are important to them, that's how you can -- that's fundamentally, I call it the two hands of engagement. First hand is what are the issues, impacts, opportunities for collaboration, benefits -- I'm missing a finger.

And then food, faith, family, health, and jobs. That's how you can connect the people to bring them into your network.

DR. FERINDE: I just have one partner in the work who I constantly watch building a bigger and bigger tent, and I said, you know, you've stopped expanding your tent. You've just taken the walls off the sides. So this idea and framing in our work to say everybody is connected to our work. You just don't know you're connected yet.

And I can tell you how we're a solution to your problem and therefore we should be working together. So that's a lot of our framing.

DR. ANGELL: It is so much about figuring out who is not at the table, right? Questions from the room? We have just a couple of minutes.

AUDIENCE: I will try to make this quick. Kind of the converse of that is our network is very broad and has people who come from various different walks of life. I think that's true for all of us to some extent, right, and sometimes there are challenges within that where you have people who have different kinds of expertise, they don't necessarily always respect immediately each other's perspectives and expertise.

Do you have any recommendations, especially I think most of us in the room probably know some of the best practices, but anything unexpected or anything creative to help sort of break down those walls and get people to

really treat each other as equals within the network and move together effectively?

DR. MAZE: I could just say one tiny, baby thing, which is we don't use titles, we don't refer to people other than by largely by their first names, and with our affiliate program, we also stopped indicating is this person a grantee. It's just in some of the language that you use or you don't use.

I would say this is probably off topic, but right now we're having the challenge of having welcomed everybody in and now that the network is being challenged to say we're going to stop work on this area, we're not going to talk about this population, now people are pulling their chairs back and leaving the table, and then the people who are -- and it's really clear who's getting left at the table, it's the more academic people and the more white people.

So it is challenging, I think, right in this moment to think, because now it's going beyond like, oh, just call me by my first name. There's something kind of deeper about how we're going to hold it together.

MS. RICKLIN: One of the things that I do with the Health in All Policies work is to build trust and to build faith in my own accountability that they can trust me to do something is I sometimes have helped partners in other

agencies do something that is not Health in All Policies exactly. So I will help them do a project or help them find data or whatever, or connect them to a person who is in my broader network that is helpful to them on something that doesn't necessarily have an obvious public health outcome, and I think that that helps cement the relationship and help everybody understand.

And then sometimes those people that I've helped might send another colleague to me to connect on something. Just yesterday a colleague from the planning department sent me something based on somebody had reached out to her saying from the university they're doing a study, something, something. She said, oh, here, Anna can help you, and it could be an interesting study from a health perspective for us to participate. If I had not cemented some of those relationships prior, then I wouldn't have gotten that email or I wouldn't have been asked in another case for data to put together a brief for one of our elected officials.

So it's sometimes going outside of what the initial mission is to get to your mission.

DR. FERINDE: It is this being generous idea. Networks are all about generosity.

DR. ANGELL: So we have hit the end of our time. I just want to first of all say thank you to all of you for

the work that you do. It's incredibly important. Everyone in the room is doing similarly important work. That's why they're here. But we're really blessed to be able to learn from your experiences.

A couple of the key themes that seemed to emerge was flexibility and willingness to hear and listen to the people within your networks, to be able to adapt to their needs when they come up, to be willing to shift to incorporate to create a bigger tent to move it forward, and if you need to, I think, Sacoby, you showed us that even if you have one tent, you can build a few more other tents when one gets really filled to make sure that everybody has a place to have their voices heard and the work move forward.

So I want to thank you all. With that, we are going to move on -- oh, I'm supposed to tell you also that there's going to be recordings of this as well. So if you didn't get all the notes taken, you will have them.

I'm going to pass it over to Bridget, who is going to come up and take us through the next steps.

Session 3: Identifying Opportunities for Action

Agenda Item: Review of the Day's Themes

DR. KELLY: As you already mentioned, my name is Bridget Kelly. I'm part of the SEAN team. I'm a National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine veteran,

but I now work as a consultant. But I'm very happy to always get to come back and help out with SEAN things.

And my role now is to try to help us bring together kind of the cumulative wisdom of the day and then add to it with your collective wisdom in the room. So we're going to do some tabletop small groups discussions in a moment, which I will explain, and before we do that, I am just going to put up a couple of the themes that I've been hearing throughout the day and kind of accumulating.

I want to shout out that we do have a beautiful graphic notetaking happening as well. A bit of it was up during lunch. We'll put some more at the end, and then it will get polished up and finished and shared. So that's happening as well.

But I have been listening to some of what I've been hearing and trying to capture it all, mostly to kick off this activity. It is much less artistic than what's happening with the graphic notetaking.

I have to give the obligatory caveat that these are not conclusions on behalf of SEAN or on behalf of anyone in the room. They're definitely not comprehensive, but there are a lot of words and that's mostly your faults, because you've said so many wonderful insightful things during the day and I was really trying to be synthesizing them, but I didn't always succeed.

So I think that I say that it's your fault, but really that is meant to be gratitude for all of the wonderful wisdom that we've already heard from all of you so far. I'm going to talk through them very briefly, and they're still going to be up there during the tabletop conversations, so we'll be able to glance back at them.

Really the purpose of this is for you to be thinking about, well, what of this resonates with you and what you've heard today, what do you see differently than what's there, and what might you add, and that will be -- reflecting on that will be your first step in the tabletops.

So I split it into two categories. One I called the Factors that Affect Networks. Depending on the circumstances, these might be challenges or they might be facilitators. They're kind of neutral in that regard. And I'm going to start with the note on the bottom, which is that no perfect model. It's what fit for your purpose, what's fit for your context. So what's the right scale for what you're trying to do? What is the purpose or multiple purposes and the scope of what you're trying to do and how much clarity do you have around that?

So these all kind of fall into that category. What does your governance look like? Where is your funding? How are you going to be communicating? What do

you need to respond to in your context? What are the prevailing narratives? That's something that we heard from the very beginning of the day that might affect your work.

What kind of shared resources are you talking about gathering as a network? And then what are the motivators, incentives, and infrastructure that you might need for whatever kind of the continuum of collaboration you're doing.

The quality and types of partnerships, relationships, really was the word that was used more in the last panel.

And then that capacity, comfort, readiness to collaborate. The practices of engagement, we heard a lot about different people's strategies and best practices around that. How much stability you have, which may or may not be guaranteed, because you also are going to have a lot of transitions, and sometimes that might be on purpose, and sometimes it might not. But it's definitely a factor that's going to affect you.

And then those maybe lead into the how much flexibility and adaptability and agility you can have, and I definitely heard that there will always be tensions or tradeoffs. So there's going to be things where you're trying to decide between two good things. If we get bigger, we'll reach more people, but we don't have enough

capacity to do that or we'll become too diffuse, and there's -- I probably could name 20 of those that I heard today.

So then some of the strategies. Throughout the day, we've heard many great examples of when you have succeeded and maybe sometimes failed at the like kind of how to do these strategies, but I really just tried to capture kind of the intent that you are going for in all of these examples. So navigating between the network's priorities and the network member priorities might be the same, might not. Might have to navigate that.

I think this is a pattern for all of them is that for most of these there's not a right or wrong. It's which to what extent when. When are you focusing on the additive members' priorities? When are you focusing on a shared priority and you really need to be able to articulate that and make that clear? There's not an always to that.

Hopefully most of these will sound familiar. This idea of synchronizing with parallel initiatives. That might just mean awareness, it might mean actively -- networks of networks was a theme throughout the day. What's the right balance for you between flexibility and consistency or control? We heard about that in the last panel.

Being able to tell the story of your additive value. The ROI of the network itself. Cultivating relationships, we very much heard about that.

Knowing who has the power to support the collaboration, endorse collaboration, incentivize collaboration. So power mapping in general, but for the sake of the network, it's really knowing who needs to give permission to whom for this network to work.

Preparing for nonlinear change, planning for both immediate needs and the long term, whether that long term is forever or whether you know you have a sunset, whether this is a network for one day, which is what we've created, or a network forever is your hope and dream.

I kind of collapsed this listen together, learn together, decide together. Again, not all decisions are going to need to be made together. Not all of your learning is going to be together. But you're going to have to have at least some intention around when you're doing those things.

Creating conditions that actively reduce competition. I'm not sure anybody said this in exactly these words, but it emerged for me that we do live in an environment of scarcity and division, and it's not just about fostering collaboration. You could try to foster collaboration all you want and it might fall short if

you're not actively -- I just heard these examples where you were actively trying to reduce the competitive mindset in your spaces.

And then fostering productive narratives around your network yourself, around the context that you're trying to feed into.

So that was a very rapid-fire synthesis. We'll leave it up there, and really what we're hoping in this next conversation is that you'll be able to do a little bit of reflecting on this together in small groups and then some imagining. So really thinking about the opportunity space. That's going to be the first discussion.

In the second discussion, we're going to be talking a little bit more about the how. So whether that means you pick up on a how that you heard; we just heard those last examples about how do you help with the burnout. Do you really want to go deeper on that and think about, well, how do we generalize that tactic that we heard from those four, or other action ideas that you have that you come out of, and we're hoping that you'll be able to think kind of what needs to be done, but also who needs to do it, and then also what will you do. You know, what can you do?

In this case, we really are about how to support networks. So it's less about how to help the network achieve its mission. We're a network for the day whose

goal is to support networks. So that's really the -- somebody on one of the prep calls was like, well, what's the noun for this activity? I was like the noun is the networks. That's the result we're going for.

Each of your tables has a table host. Table hosts, raise your hand. They will be able to help walk you through things. We're going to be at the tables that you're at now. I think they're pretty evenly grouped. If somebody at a bigger table wants to move up here, this is a slightly smaller table.

We're going to do about 20 minutes, and then we're going to change groups and tables and do a big shuffle, and I will remind you again of what the purpose is at that time.

The first conversation is reflecting on what you've heard today and then thinking about where's the opportunity space. Don't worry for the first conversation about what's feasible. Think about what's possible. We'll worry about feasibility a little more in the second one.

We have some foam boards in kind of royal café style that we're going to put on top of the table. If you have ideas that you want to capture, we have post-it notes. We don't need comprehensive notetaking, but put all the brilliant ideas. You can write right on them, or you can add a post it note to them.

Hosts, do you feel ready? I'll help you keep time.

(Break into small groups)

Agenda Item: Sharing Takeaways and Facilitated Discussion

DR. KELLY: Thanks, everyone, for that. We have just one last bit of kind of cumulative wisdom, and then we'll wrap up for the day. What I'm going to do next is ask each of the table hosts to share just a couple of highlights from the table conversation. So that might be something that really resonated for you, an idea you're really excited about. They are not going to try to summarize the conversations or share everything back. That would be way too much to ask. But just a few takeaways that stood out to you, and after we've done that with the table hosts, we'll open it up for the room.

DR. ANGELL: My reflection was that my tables were awesome. Just the one thing that I'll mention, our first group brought up intentionality as sort of their area that they wanted the next group to move forward on, so we dove deep into that, and we were talking about specifically the mission and how you can use the mission and all of the elements around the mission, in terms of defining it, as a way of making sure that it's resilient over time, but we were acknowledging this tension between trying to remain

flexible so that it can grow, but at the same time making sure that everybody understand what the mission is and people stay true to the mission.

The very last thing that we touched on was this challenge about who gets to be in the network and who sort of owns the network, to maintain the legacy of the mission itself, that conversation, and that's where we ended. We could have talked for hours more about that piece. It was really fabulous, and I want to thank both of my tables for being such great collaborators on this conversation.

DR. LUPIA: I also had amazing, amazing groups. So thank you.

The first part of the conversation really focused on trust and relationships, trust being the core of so much of what networks do. Relationships, really thinking about reciprocal relationships as opposed to something transactional.

What we did with the conversation afterwards was really thinking about how you build those things. So the importance of knowing the members, the importance of understanding the motivations of people in the room. And then moving to can you map the landscape to figure out where you are in relationship to other things. The importance of asset mapping and in particular institutional

knowledge as an asset, so you know what you did now, what you did 20 years ago, to set up what you can do later.

I think the big action that we wanted was is there a toolkit or a resource guide to help people navigate this? Like could you tailor actions to network scale, because some people are in networks of networks, and some people are in smaller groups. How do you think about peer-to-peer support within a network to deal with some of the stress problems that were introduced?

And then topical, how would you help networks navigate political change, so they can maintain their effectiveness?

DR. ALBURRACIN: We had a lot of different issues that came up. I'm going to highlight one, which is this type of meeting is acting as a convener, but what could really be a next step is acting as a platform to develop knowledge on these processes.

There wasn't a lot of discussion of what data do we have, how are we collecting the data, what sort of assessments can we have to learn from all these different networks that come to life and survive or not? What is actually going on? And then storing that knowledge for the future and also to guide operations in the present.

So a lot was about that, and also ensuring that there is ways of preserving the history -- videos, training

programs, along the lines, I can't think of what else was mentioned.

DR. HOUT: Two things I want to highlight from two really rich discussions. One was a reflection that led to an opportunity which is almost its own action built-in, which is to build an evidence base of what works and what doesn't for building network resilience so others can access it. That is kind of the whole point of today, but also making sure that that becomes a repository that lasts beyond SEAN's current funding cycle.

The other also came up during the reflections portion, and that is that funders and stakeholders want evidence of return on investment, and often it is an experience and not a quantifiable metric-driven set of outcomes. And how do we meet that challenge?

DR. LEMOS: So the only conclusion is that this is the most awesome meeting with the awesome people, because of course every table was the best. I think that our discussions resonate with a lot of the other discussions. Maybe I'll bite a little bit tangentially.

We discussed about sustaining versus goals. How to always be vigilant to think about sustaining what with what goal. And somehow also think about the art of let go. Sometimes sustaining is something that is not doing its job is an opportunity cost for doing something else.

We also talked about this idea of who is going to continue this work at the Academy level to continue to convene this, because everybody found value on being here and exchanging experiences and learning from each other.

And I think that the last thing that we discussed is this idea of reflect and reflex. We reflect a lot, how we are going to reflect the things that we have, think about the reflexivity of the things that we have discussed in a practical level. Because we know that each -- I'm quoting Sonia -- each network is a network, that's what I learned as well, and sometimes when you try to generalize you go to a level of abstraction that may make it less action-oriented. So it's about collecting evidence but also letting people learn what works for them, for their network.

DR. KELLY: Thank you. Does anybody else in the room want to share anything, any takeaways? Anything from the day that you want to voice out loud in the room?

MS. HUDSON: I think you brought folks together that I would not normally meet. And how many of you feel that way? Yeah. So that's what's really cool, because then you're connecting to new networks, right? Which is really neat, creating this network of networks and system of systems we were talking about. So I'm not sure how you

figured that out, but you did it, so that might be a best practice to share.

As we try to evolve and grow our networks, how do you get out of your box or your circle or your maze or whatever it is, and how do you get more ideas and more thinking and more people involved? Because you did a really good job of doing that, and don't take it personally, it kind of shocks me. Because it was like through NSF, going to be like the standard -- but you know, I don't know any of these people. This is so cool. Can you tell us how you did it?

DR. KELLY: That is the brilliance of the four members of the SEAN team, Sean and Malvern and Annie and Chelsea. And it is a lot about, I would say the answer to that question is that in the time that SEAN has been operating, they have bridged so many different spaces, and we accumulate that network.

So every topic we've worked on in a rapid response during COVID, and then that expanded to other areas, really trying to bring lots of different kinds of research expertise, experiential expertise, community-based knowledge -- that accumulated ripple effect of then those people know people. So the ability to be able to call on people and say who else do you know. It's been a wide enough reach over time that that is a very wide reach, so

it's a lot of finding people and a little bit of that matchmaking skill, to this topic.

MS. HUDSON: My request would be that you actually document that. Sometimes people have superpowers, and they'll be like what the heck. They don't realize they have this superpower. So you have a superpower. This is a superpower, I think. So one of the things that should come out of the documentation of this whole effort if it's going to be sunsetting is to document that superpower. It's looking at yourself in the mirror, but having other people look at you and say, oh, you didn't know you're really good at this, and you're like good at what? How did you find all these people? I don't know, I just kind of called them. But how did you know who to call?

Because I think that's what I assumed, I was talking to Sean, I'm like why did you call me? And you said we wanted to talk about networks, so we called you. I don't understand the connection. How did you find me? Who told you to call me? I have no idea.

So I think that would be very interesting to document, and that's one of the longitudinal values that you bring to the community, I think, and the broader ecosystem.

DR. KELLY: Thank you for that. Okay, a round of applause for all of you for being here today.

(Applause)

And then I have two takeaway questions for you and then we'll get the final word from Maria Carmen.

So the first takeaway question builds wonderfully on what you just said, which is think to yourself who is at least one person here today that I'm going to follow up with afterwards. If you haven't already gotten their contact information, be sure to get it on your way out. Most of you I think have done that, I've noticed.

The other takeaway question involves a post-it note, and the question is what are you going to do differently because you were here today? What's one thing that you're now going to do differently in your network, in your day job that might not be your network because it might be your third or fourth hat? Just one thing that you're going to do differently. Write that down on a post-it note, you don't have to put your name on it, and leave it on the door on your way out. Literally just put it somewhere on the door, your post-it note. One thing you're going to do differently.

Over to you. Last word.

Agenda Item: Final Reflections and Adjourn

DR. LEMOS: They also wrote notes for me to close the meeting. I will wait while you write down on your Post-Its.

(Pause)

DR. LEMOS: I have my closing remarks here. And the rebel that I am, I'm going to break with the closing remarks and I'm going to ask the staff to stand up. Malvern, Annie, Sean, Chelsea, and Bridget. And I want us to really thank them and clap for them.

(Applause)

We are going to miss you, but we are going to miss even more the impact that you have had all these years. It's a fantastic group, and I have to say -- I have had a lot of great things about the Academy; having fun all the time is not one of them. So I have to say that these meetings have been fantastic and the impact on the community, especially during COVID and the real groundwork that we heard so many testimonials through the years on the great work that you guys did, is really commendable. So you should be super proud of it, and we should be super grateful and thankful for it.

So in the name of the Academy and all the participants here I want to thank you so much for being here, for participating so brilliantly and so frankly, and imparting your experiences with us. I hope that we can have more than one post-it of things that we are going to do after this meeting, but I am also happy that we are documenting some of them, at least. Because then of course

we are going to call each one of you and figure out if you have already done that. And you're going to get a reminder every week, have you done that?

All joking aside, thank you so much for being here. I also have a few things that I have to say. A post-event questionnaire will be mailed to you soon and we appreciate any feedback you can provide on your experience in attending this symposium. We want to document the SEAN's impact, so this is something that is memorialized at the Academy, so this is particularly important right now as we go through those challenges.

In the next week or so, a video recording of today's panel discussions will be available on the event webpage. The symposium materials, activity worksheet, and graphic notes will also be posted on the symposium web page.

Thank you all.

(Adjourned at 3:30 p.m.)