



# PINEMAP

## Aim 6 Team Science Report

October 2013


Wendy-Lin Bartels, Ricardo Mello, and Jessica Ireland

This report is customized for Aim 6 to illustrate interactions among participants and network structure. This should be read with the complementary “Team Science in PINEMAP Report” and “PINEMAP Whole Network Team Science Report.”

Your feedback on the usefulness and limitations of this research is welcomed and important. Please send any questions and input to [wendylin@ufl.edu](mailto:wendylin@ufl.edu).

# WHOLE PINEMAP Network: Aim 6 highlighted

Visualization is based on strong ties (3 & 4). Node Size is betweenness centrality for the whole PINEMAP network. Leaders = boxes




The Aim 6 sub-network is the same size as Aim 4, representing 11% of the whole PINEMAP network (14 members). Several Aim 6 participants occupy central positions with the whole PINEMAP network. Larger nodes indicate key brokerage positions. These individuals are well connected to participants in the whole PINEMAP network and may facilitate strong cross-Aim interactions.

## Reflection Questions

- Where are students located in this network?
- Are mechanisms being explored to facilitate changes in students' positions over time?

## Aim 6 Sub-network: DISCIPLINES

Visualization based on strong ties (3 & 4). Node size indicates betweenness centrality for the Aim 6 sub-network. Node color = **DISCIPLINE**, Leaders = boxes.




The Aim 6 sub-network brings together multiple disciplines but is dominated by extension experts. Climatology, education, and silviculture are also represented. Larger nodes represent key brokerage positions. Individuals in these positions likely facilitate strong interactions among members WITHIN Aim 6.

### Reflection Questions

- To achieve Aim 6 goals, are disciplines appropriately integrated?
- Do you notice differences among Aim 6 brokers in cross-Aim interactions (previous network diagram) vs. within-Aim interactions (this diagram)?

## Aim 6 Sub-network: INSTITUTIONS

Visualization based on strong ties (3 & 4). Node size indicates betweenness centrality for the Aim 6 sub-network. Node color = **INSTITUTION**, Leaders = boxes



The Aim 6 sub-network is dominated by NCSU. UGA, UF, VSU, NCAT are also represented

### Reflection Question

- How well is Aim 6 integrating with the universities that are not represented in this group?

## Aim 6 Sub-network visualized differently

Figure 1 is based on strong ties (3&4).  
Figure 2 also includes communication (2).  
Node size = betweenness centrality for the  
whole PINEMAP network.

### Reflection Questions

- The Aim 6 network displays differently when we consider different types of interactions.
- Notice the greater number of ties when we include communication.
- Do you notice changes in the nodes that occupy brokerage positions? Remember, larger nodes are facilitating interactions across the whole PINEMAP network. Collaboration and communication may require different types of brokers...





Figure 1



Figure 2

## Communication and Integration

In the April 2013 survey, we asked respondents to rate their level of agreement with the statements “Communication within my Aim is working well” and “Communication across Aims is working well.” Responses to these questions are summarized in the graphs below. In addition, during an activity at the annual meeting, we asked Aim groups to brainstorm and identify platforms that promote integration among Aim 6 and other Aims. The platforms identified by Aim 6 are listed below.



**PLATFORMS** identified at the 2012 annual meeting for how Aim 6 integrates with others in PINEMAP:

- Climate forestry modules
- Grad student scholarships
- Field trips
- Research result sharing (presentations, etc.)
- Workshops
- Partnering on fact sheets
- DSS
- Webinar series (internal and external)
- Grad class
- Annual meeting
- Executive committee meeting
- Other Aim calls/meetings
- Climate data acquisition
- Professional forester survey

### Reflection Questions

- It appears that within Aim 6, some members do not think that communication is working well across Aims. Does Aim 6 need to improve communication pathways to reach other Aims?
- Are mechanisms in place to facilitate on-going interaction within the integration platforms that have been identified?