

# 202010- XSEDE Social Media Strategy

**Decisions:**

Summary	Description
Revert back to social media strategy of focusing on telling more science & human stories. Note that human stories should be a focus whenever possible.	
CEE to work to feed ER human interest stories whenever possible.	
Move % increase in social media impressions over time to an annual measure. Report # of impressions in each RP and the % in the annual total.	

**Action Items:**

Summary	Description	Responsible	Due Date

**Notes/ Discussion items:**

Present: Phil, Linda, Ron, Leslie, John, Boz, Ruth

Sept. 2019 request to add more workforce development content to social media.

Implemented strategy to try to make more posts with emphasis on WD. (middle of RP2). Can see significant decline in number of impressions since then.

Since have seen decline in all impressions.

3000 FB likes—FB algorithms determine who sees content. When we switched to more WD content, decline in all impressions regardless of if science story or WD post.

What is our main goal with social media? If to raise total awareness, should revert to more science story content to boost total impressions. If to raise attendance and don't care about number of impressions, keep as-is.

Understanding of goal was to increase impressions.

WD posts will inherently generate less impressions, so post more but still not meeting # of impressions goal.

Science impressions declined because our page is now associated with content targeted to people who use symposia/workshops. The more our page becomes associated with workshop posts the less impressions we'll get from science story posts.

Don't currently ask when people sign up, where did you hear about this. So don't know if FB is driving registrants to us. Can't imagine FB drives that many people to us. We have other ways to drive people to trainings. Telling the science & human stories is more important. Human stories perform best far & away.

Science stories provide awareness factor. Training is at a user level.

Go back to what is the goal that we're trying to support: Raising Awareness. More public appreciation of value. When legislators make decisions, want them to be aware that this is valuable. If impression for a science story, and we state it was supported by us, we can hope they make the leap that the science is cool but is happening because of our support. That is about impressions—not driving attendance.

Attendance at trainings & ECSS symposia has been decent.

This is about what we define our voice as. We can post more science stories and post ECSS symposia from YouTube.

Rather have us put energy on human interest stories. Get picked up by student's institution and really spread.

Student program running mini-survey to see where some previous participants are today. Hoping to get some stories from that.

Most stories get 3-4 posts. Starts to drop off after that. If we had more stories we could have more posts. Currently have 3 stories in the pipeline which will all get 3-4 posts. Staff constraints within ER contributes to less science stories.

If fully staffed, would generate more stories. Typically come in as science nugget or ER science writer seeks them out. Capacity would increase with more staffing.

KPIs:

% increase is confusing. Suggest we go to just reporting on the count. Probably not the best one to use as a project KPI. % growth annually for entire year would be less confusing than comparing to same RP in previous year. Is there a better way to do % increase from prior year? Don't know that it provides greater value to have quarterly comparison vs. annual growth rate.

- Guessing there was a lower impression quarter that made it look bad, but natural decline that comes every year. Comparing previous year's RP shows that you are on-track with previous year...
- You can report raw numbers on quarterly basis and say this is normal variation and still on target to meet annual growth rate.
- % increase is easier for reviewers to digest & understand.

**Details:**