



ESS Business Meeting Minutes

Sheraton Portsmouth Harborside Hotel and Conference Center, Grand Ballroom
 Portsmouth, NH
 Tuesday September 25, 2012

Time	Agenda Item	Topic and Presenter(s)
10:30am	1.0	<p>Call to Order – Lee Sommers, Chair</p> <p>1.1. Approval of the Agenda</p> <p>1.2. Approval of September 28, 2011 ESS Meeting Minutes (in Estes Park, CO) – http://escop.ncsu.edu/ezcontainer.cfm?pg=meetattach/310_ESS%20Meeting%20Agenda.htm</p> <p>1.3. Approval of Interim Actions</p> <p>Action: The motion made to approve the above was seconded and passed.</p>
10:35	2.0	<p>BAA-Policy Board of Directors – Steve Slack/Eric Young</p>
10:40	3.0	<p>Science and Technology Committee – Bill Ravlin/Dan Rossi</p> <p>[Presentation]</p> <p>3.1 Multi-state Research Award winners and 2013 funding approval (vote with NRSP requests)</p> <p>The winner of the 2012 National Multistate Research Award for Excellence is NCERA208 - Response to Emerging Threat: Soybean Rust</p> <p>3.2 Science Roadmap Update</p>
11:05	4.0	<p>NRSP Review Committee Recommendations - Abel Ponce de Leon /Arlen Leholm</p> <p>[Presentation]</p> <p>4.1 NRSP Review Committee Recommendations for FY'13 off-the-top funding (ballots distributed during regional meetings)</p> <p>4.2 NRSP RC recommendations on operations</p>
11:35	5.0	<p>Communications and Marketing</p> <p>5.1 Communications and Marketing Committee Report – Gerry Arkin/Jenny Nuber-kglobal ESCOP Chair Lee Sommers commended and thanked Gerry Arkin for his long and dedicated service as Chair of the Marketing Committee. Nancy Cox will take over as Chair.</p> <p>5.2 ESCOP Multistate Impact Reporting Project – Sarah Lupis Thanks to ED Mike Harrington, Sarah Lupis and Sara Delheimer of WAAESD will be working closely with CMC on writing impacts.</p>
Noon		<p>Lunch</p>
1:00	6.0	<p>Results of NRSP balloting/discussion – Abel Ponce de Leon /Arlen Leholm</p> <p>NRSP Ballot Results - [Presentation]</p> <p>NRSP_temp216 - “ipmPIPE National Research Support Project” Disapprove project proposal for 2012-2017 (35 for, 11 against)</p> <p>NRSP-1: \$50,000 FY'13 budget recommendation - Approved (46 for, 0 against)</p> <p>NRSP-3: \$50,000 FY'13 budget recommendation - Approved (44 for, 2 against)</p> <p>NRSP-4: \$481,182 FY'13 budget recommendation - Approved (43 for, 3 against)</p>

		<p>NRSP-6: \$150,000 FY'13 budget recommendation - Approved (39 for, 7 against)</p> <p>NRSP-7: \$325,000 FY'13 budget recommendation - Approved (43 for, 3 against)</p> <p>NRSP-8: \$500,000 FY'13 budget recommendation - Approved (41 for, 5 against)</p> <p>NRSP 9: \$175,000 FY'13 budget recommendation - Approved (44 for, 2 against)</p> <p>NRSP-RC review process changes as outlined in the NRSP-RC agenda brief below - Approved (42 for, 2 against, 2 abstained)</p> <p>Excellence in Multistate Research Award Funds Recommendation to approve FY'13 budget of \$15,000 - Approved (44 for, 0 against, 2 abstained)</p>
1:15	7.0	<p>NIFA Update – Meryl Broussard</p> <p>NIFA will be three years old on October 1, 2012, and already had three Directors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cathy Woteki is working with chief scientists in other agencies and also at the international level • The REE Action Plan will serve as scorecard to measure accomplishments • Emphasis on STEM – looking at pipeline for STEM education <p>Sonny Ramaswamy's focus are on the 3C's – Competitive, capacity and construction of aging physical infrastructure in universities.</p> <p>Without an extension of the Farm Bill after October 1, NIFA's mandatory funding lines will be impacted. No new RFAs will be released, but NIFA will keep funding existing grants. FY12 formula fund has gone out. FY13, similar to FY12 base, will be under the Continuing Resolution, but Secretary is cautious as there may be significant cuts in the new FY.</p> <p>Thorough evaluation of AFRI - Cathy Woteki is working with the National Academy of Science and the National Research Council (big vs. small grants, peer review process, etc.). This is a 3-year activity with \$900K funding. Representation from the Land-grant will be requested.</p>
1:30	8.0	<p>ARS Update – Ed Knipping [Presentation]</p>
1:45	9.0	<p>Committee Reports</p> <p>9.1 B&L and BAC Reports - Steve Slack 2014 Budget and Legislative Priorities [Presentation]</p> <p>Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of capacity programs as top priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hatch • Evans Allen • McIntire-Stennis • Maintain other formula based capacity programs at least level if not increase • Significantly increase AFRI • Continuation of mandatory grants programs • Communicate priorities from Science Roadmap as agency grant opportunities • Support ESCOP/ECOP IPM Working Group Paper <p>9.2 Advocacy Update - Hunt Shipman, Cornerstone Government Affairs - [Presentation]</p> <p>9.3 Crop Protection Program Update – Mike Hoffman</p> <p>9.4 ECOP Liaison Report – Doug Lantagne (see agenda brief below)</p>

2:30	10.0	<p>NPGCC Update – Lee Sommers [Presentation] Incoming Chair of NPGCC is Tom Burr, Cornell Geneva Station Director.</p>
2:35	11.0	<p>REE Partnership Discussions – Clarence Watson The two-page document reaffirming commitment to the Morrill Act and how to strengthen the NIFA-LGU partnership is being finalized. Sonny Ramaswamy has assumed leadership for NIFA.</p>
2:40	12.0	<p>ESS Rules of Operation Changes – Lee Sommers [Presentation] Action: A motion was made to approve the proposed changes to the ESS Rules of Operation. The motion was seconded and passed.</p>
2:50	13.0	<p>Nominations Committee Report – Lee Sommers (for Orlando McMeans) Action: A motion was made to approve the Nomination Committee's recommendation for Steve Slack to be the 2012-13 Chair-Elect and 2013-14 Chair for ESCOP. The motion was seconded and passed.</p>
2:55	14.0	<p>Resolutions Committee Report – Greg Weicko Action: The motion made to approve the Resolutions put forward by the Committee was seconded and passed.</p>
3:00	15.0	<p>Remarks, Announcements and Changing of the Guard – Lee Sommers, Chair Chair Lee Sommers thanked the UNH hosts and welcomed new ESCOP Chair Mike Hoffmann.</p>
3:05	16.0	<p>Final Remarks and Adjourn – Mike Hoffmann, Chair Chair Mike Hoffmann thanked former Chair Lee Sommers for his service and adjourned the meeting at 3:06PM.</p>
	17.0	<p>Lead21 Update – Jeff Jacobsen/Carolyn Brooks (Written agenda brief only)</p>
	18.0	<p>Tentative Plans for 2013 ESS meeting – Steve Slack, Chair elect (Written agenda brief only) The ESS Meeting will be held at Hilton Easton, Columbus, Ohio, on September 23-25, 2013.</p>
3:10		<p>Break – Discussion Session 1 begins @ 3:30</p>

Agenda Item 1.1: Approval of the Agenda**Presenter:** Lee Sommers**Background:**

ESS Business Meeting Agenda
Sheraton Portsmouth Harborside Hotel and Conference Center, Grand Ballroom
Portsmouth, NH
Tuesday September 25, 2012

Time	Agenda Item	Topic and Presenter(s)
10:30am	1.0	Call to Order – Lee Sommers, Chair 1.1. Approval of the Agenda 1.2. Approval of September 28, 2011 ESS Meeting Minutes (in Estes Park, CO) – http://escop.ncsu.edu/ezcontainer.cfm?pg=meetattach/310_ESS%20Meeting%20Agenda.htm 1.3. Approval of Interim Actions
10:35	2.0	BAA-Policy Board of Directors – Steve Slack/Eric Young
10:40	3.0	Science and Technology Committee – Bill Ravlin/Dan Rossi 3.1 Multi-state Research Award winners and 2013 funding approval (vote w NRSP requests) 3.2 Science Roadmap Update
11:05	4.0	NRSP Review Committee Recommendations - Abel Ponce de Leon /Arlen Leholm 4.1 NRSP Review Committee Recommendations for off the top funding (ballots distributed during regional meetings) 4.2 NRSP RC recommendations on operations
11:35	5.0	Communications and Marketing 5.1 Communications and Marketing Committee Report – Gerry Arkin/Arlen Leholm 5.2 ESCOP Multistate Impact Reporting Project – Sarah Lupis
Noon		Lunch
1:00	6.0	Results of NRSP balloting/discussion – Abel Ponce de Leon /Arlen Leholm
1:15	7.0	NIFA Update – Meryl Broussard
1:30	8.0	ARS Update – Ed Knipling
1:45	9.0	Committee Reports 9.1-9.2 B&L and BAC Reports and Advocacy Update – Steve Slack, Steve Pueppke, Hunt Shipman, Jim Richards, Cornerstone Government Affairs 9.3 Crop Protection Program Update – Mike Hoffman
2:30	10.0	NPGCC Update – Lee Sommers
2:35	11.0	REE Partnership Discussion – Clarence Watson
2:40	12.0	ESS Rules of Operation Changes – Lee Sommers
2:50	13.0	Nominations Committee Report – Orlando McMeans
2:55	14.0	Resolutions Committee Report – Greg Weicko
3:00	15.0	Remarks, Announcements and Changing of the Guard – Lee Sommers, Chair
3:05	16.0	Final Remarks and Adjourn – Mike Hoffmann, Chair
	17.0	Lead21 Update – Jeff Jacobsen/Carolyn Brooks (Written agenda brief only)
	18.0	Tentative Plans for 2013 ESS meeting – Steve Slack, Chair elect (Written agenda brief only)
3:10		Break – Discussion Session 1 begins @ 3:30

Action Requested: Approve Agenda

Agenda Item 1.2: Approval of September 28, 2011 ESS Meeting Minutes (in Estes Park, CO)

Presenter: Lee Sommers

Background:

Minutes from the ESS Meeting held September 28, 2011 ESS in Estes Park, CO:

http://escop.ncsu.edu/ezcontainer.cfm?pg=meetattach/310_ESS%20Meeting%20Agenda.htm

Action Requested: Approve Minutes from September 28th ESS meeting.

Agenda Item 1.3: Interim Actions

Presenter: Lee Sommers

Background:

1. Nancy Cox was appointed as the new chair of the ESCOP Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC).

Action Requested: Approve interim actions.

Agenda Brief 2.0: Policy Board of Directors Report

Presenter: Steve Slack, Eric Young

Background:

The Policy Board of Directors met on July 24 in Savannah, GA prior to the Joint COPs meeting. Below are some highlights from that meeting.

1. NIFA Update - Sonny Ramaswamy

- Challenge of really large grants versus small foundational grants
 - May need to scale back the CAP grants, but already committed for next couple years
 - First flexibility comes in 2014
- Lack of investment in production agriculture research and extension
 - Large data analysis showed level went from \$146M to \$136M and from 70% to 50% of pool. Note that plant research went from \$60M to \$40M while animal sciences went from \$40M to \$30M. This is a reduction across our production systems. In percentage terms, plant science in same period went from 38.7% to 22.4% and animal science went from 18.4% to 9.4% of competitive pool.
 - Food and agriculture will remain at forefront of investment.
- Past few years earmarks have disappeared, they funded site specific locally relevant work
 - These funds mostly went into Hatch and Smith-Lever, but that's being used more for salaries
 - So funding for local needs has gone way down
 - Current grants have an ROI from 5-10 years
 - Unable to make investments on short term work, 1-3 years
 - Should NIFA be investing in this type of work, answer generally is yes
- Foundation grants are ~30% for 3-5 year basic research and extension by small faculty groups
 - Some pressure to change that ratio
 - Currently have ~ 35% in CAPs and 25% in minority grants and fellowship.
 - Goal is to move the 30% Foundation to 50% of portfolio
- Pre & post doctoral fellowships have a very limited pipeline of candidates, not many young students moving toward food & agriculture
 - How do we make sure we have new people coming in these areas?
 - PCAST has recommended increased funding in food & agriculture, students, & infrastructure
 - PCAST scholarship level is 30 currently and desire is to double the number.
- Bruce McPherson – Does all the planning efforts done by COP's have a significant impact on decisions?
- Sonny- Yes, these documents as well as listening sessions are key input
- Bruce – Members of Policy Board of Directors and in COPs have best integrated perspective on how to move total agriculture enterprise forward. We can help in NIFA meetings where science priorities are decided
- Sonny – I want to take you up on that offer
 - NIFA Science Council meets regularly at the Waterfront Center
 - Representatives of the PBD and COPs potentially could meet with the Council, maybe quarterly
- Lee Sommers – What are your personal goals for NIFA?
- Sonny – Top two are
 - Food & agriculture enterprise recognized as an important aspect of our country's endeavors

- Increase interactions with folks on Hill, make NIFA proactive rather than just reactive to Congressional requests
2. Budget and Advocacy Committee Report
 - Received initial report of ESCOP/ECOP Working Group on budget line consolidation in IPM
 - IR-4 still wants to stay independent
 - Budget and Advocacy Committee would like them to be part of it
 - Motion made that Administrative Heads Section leaders would meet with IR-4 leaders to try to convince them to join consolidation (approved)
 - If this is unsuccessful, the WG will propose plan without them
 - Congress wants Land Grant Universities & NIFA to work together then develop a plan for IPM consolidation
 - Need plan by January 1 so NIFA can approve and include in FY'14 budget
 3. Farm Bill & CLP Report
 - Matching requirements is biggest discussion item for Land Grant Universities
 - CLP had conference call with John Goldberg from House on July 19
 - John wants Land Grant Universities & NIFA to devise a plan for consistent match policy across all competitive grant programs
 - CLP will set up small committee to draft plan, working with NIFA and stakeholders
 - Timeline is "sooner the better" need to develop framework by early September
 - Senate has interest in this but not driving factor, House has historical perspective
 - House has not set any constraints on match mechanism, including use of federal funds as match, but has certain principles they want followed
 - Please note on the matches, that all institutions are impacted regardless of size; a harmonized policy must be an equitable policy across the system.
 4. Congressional Oversight of AFRI Funding Priorities
 - Scott Angle has received calls from NIFA and staffers from both sides on Congressional oversight of NIFA research funding priorities
 - House has put language in Farm Bill that requires NIFA to indicate areas in which AFRI funds will be spent in President's budget request
 - Congress is reacting to large awards that haven't gone to production agriculture and overall decrease in production agriculture funding, as well as grants for work that could benefit US agriculture's competitors
 - There are on-going discussions with Congress on how this oversight should occur
 5. Policy Board of Directors By-law Changes
 - AHS have brought motion to PBD to make chairs of the Budget & Advocacy Committee and Committee on Legislation & Policy ex-officio voting members of PBD
 - COP's will discuss this at their meetings and PBD will have conference call to decide whether or not to put this proposed change on BAA ballot in September
 - Proposed motion – change BAA by-laws to include chairs of BAC and CLP as ex-officio voting members of Policy Board of Directors and associated changes related to term lengths and appointments vs. elections
 - (PBD conference call the following week indicated that COPs were either in favor of this change or fairly evenly split, decision was made to place proposed change on the BAA ballot)
 6. PBD Elections
 - One half of the PBD members are up for election, including ESS, ballots will be sent out first week of September
 - Steve Slack and Clarence Watson will be the two ESS nominees

Action Requested: Information only

Agenda Item 3.0: ESCOP Science and Technology Committee

Presenter: William Ravlin/Daniel Rossi

Background:

1. Committee Membership:

- Chair
 - William Ravlin (NCRA)
- Delegates
 - John Liu (SAAESD)
 - John Russin (SAAESD)
 - Tim Phipps (NERA)
 - Cameron Faustman (NERA)
 - Steve Meredith (ARD) – Vice Chair
 - _____ (ARD)
 - Larry Curtis (WAAESD)
 - David Thompson (WAAESD)
 - Jozef Kokini (NCRA)
 - Abel Ponce de Leon (NCRA)
- Executive Vice-Chair
 - Dan Rossi (NERA, Executive Director)
- NIFA Representative
 - Muquarrab Qureshi
- Social Science Subcommittee Representative
 - Travis Park
- Pest Management Strategies Subcommittee Representative
 - Frank Zalom

2. Meetings

The Committee met on July 24, 2012. The next face-to-face meeting of the committee has not yet been scheduled.

3. Multistate Research Award

The Committee reviewed the following nominations for the 2012 National Multistate Research Award for Excellence:

- NCERA208 - *Response to Emerging Threat: Soybean Rust*
- NE1025 - *Biology, Ecology and Management of Emerging Pests of Annual Bluegrass on Golf Courses*
- S009 - *Plant Genetic Resources Conservation and Utilization*
- WERA1009 - *Systems to Improve End-use Quality of Wheat*

The Science and Technology Committee selected **NCERA208** and forwarded this recommendation to

the ESCOP Executive Committee for approval. The Executive Committee approved this recommendation. The award will be presented at Annual APLU Awards Program.

The Science and Technology Committee recommends that MRF off-the-top funding in the amount of \$15,000 be provided to the 2013 winner to support travel to award ceremony and activities which enhance and contribute to research and/or outreach objectives of project.

4. Science Roadmap

Over the last two years ESCOP has gone through a process of developing “A Science Roadmap for Food and Agriculture.” This process involved all parts of the system and culminating with ESCOP approval. The Roadmap describes seven “grand challenges” including 35 focus areas involving scientist-years and physical resources well beyond current system capacity. To address this issue and to facilitate communication, Experiment Station Directors prioritized the focus areas in a survey by the Budget and Legislative Committee. The S & T Committee in collaboration with the S & T Committee developed a simple framework to communicate the complexity of the Roadmap in general and the need for public and private investment. This process resulted in a model that includes human health and food security, economic growth and jobs, and sustainable environmental and natural resources. This worldview encompasses all of the Roadmap Grand Challenges and focus areas. A draft synthesis paper has been prepared that allows ESCOP to communicate direction and priority to sponsoring and supporting agencies and organizations.

5. Engaging the Social Science Subcommittee

The Science and Technology Committee have been discussing opportunities to more actively engage social scientists. It received and is reviewing a report prepared by the Social Sciences Subcommittee intended to provide stakeholder feedback to AFRI. The report is based on the results of a gap analysis conducted by members of the Subcommittee. A summary of this report will be presented at the ESCOP Executive Committee meeting in Denver.

Action Requested: Approval of MRF off-the-top funding for 2013 Multistate Research Award winner.

2013 Experiment Station Section Award for Excellence in Multistate Research

Purpose

The fundamental mandate of the Multistate Research authority allows State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES) to *interdependently* collaborate in projects that two or more states share as a priority, but for which no one state could address singularly. This is a very high standard for any research project, and has become a hallmark of the Multistate Research Program's management objectives.

The Multistate Research authority allows other non-SAES partners to join in these project-based collaborations. Thus, many multistate projects include extension specialists as members as well as Agricultural Research Service or Forest Service research scientists. In addition many projects even have private sector and foreign participants. Moreover, the majority of multistate projects have participants from more than a single region, with many having representation from all regions such that they are national in scope.

To many the Multistate Research Program is one of the "best kept secrets" of the Land-Grant University System.

The purpose of this Experiment Station Section Excellence in Multistate Research Award program is to annually recognize those scientists who are conducting exemplary multistate activities and in doing so enhance the visibility of the multistate program. A recipient Multistate Project will be selected from the pool of nominees submitted by the five regional research associations (NCRA, NERA, SAAESD, WAAESD, and ARD), and deemed by the review panel to exhibit sustained, meritorious and exceptional multistate activities.

Award and Presentation

The national winning project will be recognized by the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) Chair and USDA/NIFA Administrator during the Awards Program held at the APLU Annual Meeting. The title of the national winning project will be added to a plaque located at the USDA Waterfront Centre.

At the 2012 Experiment Station Section Meeting in Portsmouth, NH, the Directors approved the monetary prize of \$15,000 of Hatch MRF for the Excellence in Multistate Research Award. Up to \$5,000 will be used to cover travel for two members of the recipient project, the Administrative Advisor and Chair or their designees, to attend the awards ceremony at the APLU annual conference. The remaining \$10,000, and any unused travel funds, will be used to support activities which enhance and contribute to the research and/or outreach objectives of that multistate project, consistent with the appropriate use of Hatch funds. Use of these funds will be a project committee decision made in conjunction with its Administrative Advisor.

Eligibility

Any current Multistate Project listed in the NIMSS (<http://nimss.umd.edu/>) is eligible for consideration for an Excellence in Multistate Research Award.

Basis for Nomination

Each of the five regional research associations may nominate one Multistate Project chosen from the entire national portfolio of active projects. Nominations shall be made to the Chair of the respective regional multistate review committee (MRC) via the regional Executive Director's office.

Such nominations should describe the:

- Accomplishments that have been realized by the Project as measurable outputs, outcomes and benefits (either directly or through indicators); and
- Synergistic advantages of the particular project derived through interdependency.

The documentation for this type of nomination should be sufficient to allow the review committee members to evaluate the Project according to the criteria listed below.

Criteria and Evaluation

Selection of multistate teams for an Award for Excellence will be based on panel evaluations of nominations that demonstrate: high standards of scientific quality; research relevance to a regional priority; multistate collaboration on the problem's solution; and professional leadership in the conduct of the project. All nominated shall be evaluated using the same criteria including, in descending order of importance, the Project's:

1. Accomplishments, indicated by outputs, outcomes, and impacts,
2. Added value, from the Project's interdependency;
3. Degree of institutional participation (SAES and others as well);
4. Extent of multi-disciplinary activity; and,
5. Amount of integrated activities (i.e., is it multi-functional).
6. Evidence of additional leveraged funding to further the goals of the project.

Selection Process

The ESCOP Science and Technology Committee will serve as the review panel and will select from among the regional nominees a national winner in time for public announcement and award presentation at the APLU Annual Meeting each year.

Timeline

- October 1 – Announcement sent to Directors, Administrative Advisors and NIMSS participants by ESCOP Chair
- February 28 – Nominations due at Offices of the Executive Directors
- March – Nominations reviewed by regional multi-state research review or multi-state research collaboration committees and recommendations submitted to regional associations
- March/April – Regional associations approve regional nominations at Spring meetings
- April 30 – Associations submit regional nominations to ESCOP Science and Technology Committee
- May – ESCOP Science and Technology Committee reviews regional nominations and submits recommendation for national winner to ESCOP Executive Committee
- June – ESCOP Executive Committee selects national winner
- July – National winner submitted to APLU
- September – National winner announced at ESS meeting
- November – Award made at APLU meeting

Format for Applications or Nominations

An application or nomination should be a very concise statement. It should include:

Nominating Region: _____

Nominator: _____ **E-mail:** _____

Project or Committee Number and Title: _____

Technical Committee Chair: _____ **E-mail:** _____

Administrative Advisor: _____ **E-mail:** _____

Summary of Significant Accomplishment(s) (noting the following):

- The issue, problem or situation addressed by the project or committee;
- The project or committee's objectives;
- The outcome(s) of the research;
- The impacts of the project or activity (actual or anticipated);
- The extent of links to extension that have been formed; and
- Any additional and relevant partnerships, associations or collaborations that deserve mention.

Nominations should be **no more than 3 pages** and should be submitted by email to the Office of the regional Executive Director, by **c.o.b. February 28, 2013:**

Dr. Arlen Leholm, North Central <leholm@cals.wisc.edu>

Dr. Dan Rossi, Northeast <rossi@aesop.rutgers.edu>

Dr. Eric Young, South <eyoung@ncsu.edu>

Dr. Mike Harrington, West <wdal@lamar.colostate.edu>

Dr. Carolyn Brooks, ARD-1890's <cbbrooks@umes.edu>.

Item 4.0: NRSP Review Committee Report**Presenters: Abel Ponce de León, NRSP-RC Chair****Item 4.1: NRSP Review Committee Recommendations for off the top funding (ballots distributed during regional meetings)**

NRSP Project	Title	NRSP Project Request	NRSP Review Committee Motion
NRSP-1	National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS) [2011-16]	\$50,000	Approve FY13 budget of \$50,000
NRSP-3	The National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP) [2009-14]	\$50,000	Approve FY13 budget of \$50,000
NRSP-4	Enabling Pesticide Registrations for Specialty Crops and Minor Uses [2010-15]	\$481,182	Approve FY13 budget of \$481,182
NRSP-6	The US Potato Genebank: Acquisition, Classification, Preservation, Evaluation and Distribution of Potato (Solanum) Germplasm [2010-15]	\$150,000	Approve FY13 budget of \$150,000
NRSP-7	A National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs [2009-14]	\$325,000	Approve FY13 budget of \$325,000
NRSP-8	National Animal Genome Research Program [2008-13]	\$500,000	Approve FY13 budget of \$500,000
NRSP-9	National Animal Nutrition Program [2010-15]	\$175,000	Approve FY13 budget of \$175,000
NRSP_temp261	ipmPIPE National Research Support Project	\$150,000	Disapprove this proposal and budget
NRSP review process changes as outlined in the NRSP-RC agenda brief below.		N/A	Approve these recommend changes to the NRSP project review process

Item 4.2: NRSP RC Program Management and Recommendations

Background: The ESS expends considerable time and resources in managing the National Research Support Program which is intended to provide off the top funding in support of research. Currently there are 7 NRSPs receiving a total of \$1.731 million. Management activities include those of the NRSP Review Committee whose responsibilities include reviewing proposals progress and annual budgets. This committee meets a minimum of 3-4 times per year usually by conference call. In addition each regional association sets aside time for discussion of renewal or new proposals as well as for discussion of annual budgets. Taken together these activities constitute considerable transactional costs for a program that comprises less than 1% of Hatch funds.

After a year of deliberation, an NRSP Task Force made series of far reaching recommendations in 2002 on how the Program should be implemented and managed. These recommendations were adopted by the Section in 2003. However, one of the provisions, approval of 5 year budgets that included a caveat to reduce project funding if Hatch funds were reduced, was reversed the following year as Directors wanted to maintain annual budget approvals.

With the exception of the reversal for the NRSP-5 reduction in 2009, there have been few questions about annual budget approval and no reversal of the Committee recommendations. With this in mind, perhaps it is again time to consider the matter of providing 5 year budget approvals.

A second major provision was the requirement that each NRSP develops a Management and Business Plan indicating how the project would reduce off the top funding to a low maintenance level. This would potentially free up funds allowing the Directors to consider implementation of new projects as appropriate. Thus, NRSPs should expect a finite period of off-the-top funding; however some projects may not be readily transitioned to other sources of funds.

The requirement for a Management and Business Plan must be examined. The program requires submission of a plan that must include "provisions for developing alternative funding or reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level". Included would be an assessment of transition options, and alternative funding sources, but few projects actually do this.

There are several examples where off the top funds have been reduced (NRSP-3) or eliminated (NRSP-5). However, there are other projects that continue to have large, if not growing, contributions from off the tops funds.

Proposed Changes to Operational Guidelines

1. The NRSP RC would recommend 5 year budget approvals for new and renewing projects, with the stipulation that if Hatch funds are reduced, NRSP funding will also be reduced by the same percentage. Typically there would be no more than 2-3 projects under consideration for five year renewal in any given year. This would allow for in depth discussion if needed.

- There would a 3rd year review to assess progress toward goals, objectives and funding targets. The interim review would be provided to the Directors as part of the committee's report at the regional association summer meetings and may include a recommendation for the reduction of funding if adequate progress has not been made.
- Approval of NRSP RC recommendation on five year budgets, new projects and other actions would be by a simple majority vote of those voting at the ESS Annual Meeting

2. All NRSPs should expect a finite time frame for off the top support after which resources would decline to a maintenance level (e.g. \$50,000 to \$100,000/year). This would allow the project to maintain visibility as an NRSP and provide a conduit for outside resources to leverage AES funds. An excellent example of this can be found in the history of NRSP-3.

3. The NRSP RC recommends that an upper limit be established on the total funds that can be expended on NRSP projects. The committee suggests \$2,000,000 annually, which is slightly higher than the current \$1.731 million but still well less than 1% of Hatch. This limit combined with more effective management and planned reduction of funding to existing projects would facilitate the development of new high priority NRSPs.

Action Requested: Approve the NRSP-RC's budget/proposal recommendations and the recommended changes to the NRSP Program Management, as outlined above.

Agenda Item 5.1: AES/CES Communications & Marketing Project Agenda Brief

Presenters: Gerald Arkin, Jenny Nuber, Hunt Shipman, Sarah Lupis, Arlen Leholm

Background:

The Marketing Project has made a great deal of progress this year. This presentation is an overview of activities and a look ahead.

Purpose of the effort

The Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) and the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) joined together in 2012 to coordinate a targeted educational effort to increase awareness and support of basic and applied research and transformational education provided by land-grant universities through the Agricultural Experiment Stations (AES) and Cooperative Extension System (CES). [kglobal](#), a public affairs/marketing firm, in cooperation with [Cornerstone Government Affairs](#), are assisting with this educational effort. Guided by the AES/CES Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC), ESCOP and ECOP have entered into a two-year agreement effective May 1, 2012 with kglobal and Cornerstone, with annual renewal. The annual commitment is \$400,000 split equally between ESCOP and ECOP. See link below for a more complete description of the effort.

Information for Directors, Administrators and University Communications Professionals:

http://escop.ncsu.edu/comattach/3_CMC%20Directors%20Info_Final_20120814.pdf

Monthly kglobal Report

Each month kglobal provides an electronic update to the Communication and Marketing Committee (CMC) of their work which is conducted in close coordination with Cornerstone and the CMC. These updates will now be shared monthly through the Research/Extension EDs. **Jerry Arkin, co-chair of CMC, and Jenny Nuber of kglobal and Hunt Shipman of Cornerstone will provide a short update for us during the ESS Business meeting. Sarah Lupis will give a brief update on the use of Impact Reports in the Marketing Project.** View the August kglobal report: http://www.waaesd.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/9.6.12_KgloAugReport.pdf

Role of Primary/Secondary Contacts

AES and CES Directors and Administrators, or other designees, will be the Primary Contacts for kglobal staff as they reach out to the target audience. It is the responsibility of the AES and CES State Directors and Administrators to contact their Dean/AHS member to inform/approve (as appropriate to the institution) on any contact information, data, etc., that are generated from their respective institution and shared with kglobal. Communication from kglobal will flow through the regional Executive Director or Administrator's office, at least initially, to assure State Directors and AHS administrators are informed. Brief follow-up reports by kglobal will be sent back to the State primary contacts and the regional Executive Director or Administrator's office.

kglobal's work may involve reaching out to key citizens, local and state community decision-makers, and others who regularly interact with national leaders who work on important policy issues relevant to agriculture and our Land Grant Universities. Before such efforts occur in your state, Primary and Secondary Contacts would be informed of its strategies and targeted messaging. This may also involve coordination with you on specific success stories that your

institution can share on a given topic, local need or science-based problems solving solutions that have impacted the lives of their constituents.

We are collecting Primary and Secondary Contact information via an online survey (see link below). To date, the number of submissions received is:

AES: 24

CES: 19

Both: 13

TOTAL: 56

If you have not completed the Primary/Secondary Contact Survey (see link below), please do so now. Primary/Secondary Contact Survey:

<http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/WEB22GFFDWG3TM>

Action Requested: Information only

Agenda Brief 5.2: ESCOP Multistate Impact Reporting Project

Presenter: Sarah Lupis

Background:

Impact Statements: What & Why

Effective communications of research outcomes is crucial to maintaining as well as building support for such programs. In order to effectively communicate impacts and outcomes of the multistate research program in each region, impact statements will be developed for all terminating multistate research/coordination projects. As part of the approved NRSP001 plan, a professional writer (Sara Delheimer) has been engaged to help prepare effective impact statements for the multistate research activities.

The WAAESD Office (WDO) is providing coordination, editorial oversight, and physical space for this effort to ensure a common voice and consistent approach to impact reporting efforts. The WDO is also providing coordination between this effort and the ongoing efforts of ESCOP and ECOP (i.e., with kglobal, Cornerstone, the ESCOP/ECOP Communications and Marketing Committees, and any joint ECOP/ESCOP joint committee on Marketing and Communication). A total of \$24,000 per year has been allocated from NRSP001 Off-the-Top funding to support this effort.

A 2-page template has been developed with input from kglobal and the NRSP001 Coordination Committee; see examples from each region, attached. Drafts are shared with the multistate project committee for comment/improvement. The entire process, from initial draft to final, complete PDF takes approximately four weeks. Committees are given two weeks to respond to drafts, after which the process moves forward, regardless. Final Impact Statements are sent to the appropriate region, NIFA (Bart Hewitt), and will also be archived in NIMSS.

Ms. Delheimer is also working with multistate project committee members to increase distribution of final impact statements to other outlets. For example, Dr. Way has distributed the final impact statement for S-1029 to:

- Various departments and publications at participating universities (e.g., Texas A&M)
- Texas Department of Agriculture
- USA Rice Federation
- US Rice Producers Association
- USEPA

We have received positive feedback from AAs/participating scientists that the impact statements, especially in a layout that includes photos, are helping to make “their research shine” and will be useful for sharing impacts with legislators and stakeholders.

2011/2012 Terminating Projects Impact Statement Status

	Region				TOTAL
	Northeast	North Central	Southern	Western	
2011 Terminating¹	6	26	5	12	49
Complete/Pending Review	2	16	4	12	34
Incomplete/NA²	4	1	1	0	6
Not yet written	0	9	0	0	9
2012 Terminating^{1,3}					
Complete/Pending Review	0	0	2	7	9
Incomplete/NA²	0	0	2	1	3
Not yet written	5	15	19	6	45

¹Terminating project total reflects research, ERA, and CC projects; Development Committees (DCs) are not included. ²Some projects will not have impact statements written because they lack sufficient source material. This includes projects with no or few annual reports and/or no or few impact statements included in their annual SF-422 reports. ³We are still waiting for many 2012 projects to submit terminating reports.

Issues and Potential Solutions

As projects have been reviewed and impact statements written, a few issues have been identified:

- Projects with no annual reports
- Annual reports that lack statements of impact/sufficient information from which to develop an impact statement
- Projects with no final/terminating annual report
- Differences between regions with respect to reporting requirements; some regions do not require the same reporting for ERAs and CCs, which leads to insufficient source material
- The review process is slowed when the project AA has retired and/or a new AA has been assigned with the project renews

We propose the following potential solutions to address some of the above issues:

- EDs/Regional Offices take steps to inform/educate Administrative Advisors about the importance of impact reporting in annual reports and provide regular instruction/guidance on how to effectively report impact of multistate work.
- EDs/Regional Offices assure that annual reports are submitted on a timely basis and *before* the next meeting is authorized.
- Use MRC mid-term reviews as an opportunity to get a project “back on track” when annual reports are missing/incomplete.
- Standardize reporting requirements across regions to ensure that source material is consistently available and all projects are included in the impact reporting process.

Action Requested: Information only

Agenda Item 8.0: ARS Report

Presenter: Ed Kipling

Background:

The ARS Capital Investment Strategy (CIS) report published in April 2012 will be reviewed. Requested by the Secretary and both the Senate and House Subcommittees on agriculture appropriations, the CIS report provides an inventory of major ARS-owned research facilities and their relative physical condition and adequacy. These data combined with an assessment of the relative priority of the research carried out in the facilities provided the basis for determining investments needed and recommendations made to renovate, modernize, or replace those facilities in greatest need. Some university and other cooperator facilities that house ARS research are addressed in the CIS report to a limited extent. While not a request for funding, the strategy report will guide the development of future budget proposals as economic opportunities permit. The facility recapitalization principles and priority setting criteria and processes used by ARS may have application to other organizations, institutions, and partnerships for developing infrastructure investment strategies and priorities.

Action Requested: For information.

Agenda Item 9.1: ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee/BAC Agenda Brief

Presenters: Steve Slack and Mike Harrington

Background:

The committee holds regular monthly conference calls that are well attended. The current B&L Committee membership is shown below.

<p>Chair: Steve Slack (NCRA)</p> <p>Delegates:</p> <p>William (Bill) Brown (SAAESD)</p> <p>Jeff Jacobsen* (WAAESD)</p> <p>Ernie Minton (NCRA)</p> <p>Karen Plaut (NCRA)</p> <p>Orlando McMeans (ARD)</p> <p>Carolyn Brooks (ED-ARD)</p> <p>Bob Shulstad (SAAESD)</p> <p>Tim Phipps (NERA)</p> <p>Thomas Burr (NERA)</p> <p>Bret Hess (WAAESD)</p> <p>Executive Vice-Chair</p> <p>Mike Harrington (WAAESD)</p>	<p>NIFA Liaison</p> <p>Paula Geiger (NIFA)</p> <p>Representatives</p> <p>Caird Rexroad (ARS)</p> <p>Glen Hoffsis (APLU Vet Med)</p> <p>Eddie Gouge (APLU)</p> <p>Ian Maw (APLU)</p> <p>Dina Chacon-Reitzel (CARET)</p> <p>Cheryl Achterberg (APLU - B of Hum Sci)</p> <p>Jim Richards (Cornerstone)</p> <p>Hunt Shipman (Cornerstone)</p> <p>*Chair elect</p>
--	---

Crop Protection:

The Committee reviewed and approved the July 2012 working paper from the Crop Protection Working Group (WG). The working paper describes a single that was also submitted to the BAC. The WG, which consists of more than 30 members representing all parts of the crop protection community and stakeholder, continues to refine with working paper with completion by the November. The document will come back to the B&L Committee as well as the BAC for further action.

An essential element of this effort is that all programs are included within a new crop protection/IPM program a single budget line. This could be accomplished with full authority and functional intent of the legislation such that the several programs highlighted above will maintain form and function. However, consolidation into a single budget line (within NIFA) should only be done in such a way to enhance the

coordination among essential elements described in the working paper (e.g., IR-4, Regional IPM and EIPM). Such consolidation SHOULD NOT be interpreted as justification for overall budget reductions.

The concept of functional equivalency (described below) is critical to the success of this effort. It is important to protect program integrity, including maintaining current eligibility for accessing the funding. Without functional equivalency many currently successful programs will only be asked to do more with less when in fact need for these programs has never been greater.

Guiding Principles:

The following principles were developed and endorsed by the ESCOP and ECOP Budget and Advocacy Committees, and provide the foundation from which the Working Group on IPM has developed its rationale for this report.

- Protect/maintain the funding for E- IPM, Regional IPM Centers, and IR-4 programs of the Land Grant Universities This includes local capacity as well as competitive support for important programs and projects;
- Consolidate budget lines where it makes sense, doing no harm;
- Maintain intent (functionally equivalent) of programs (e.g., integrated activities regardless of where the budget resides within the USDA/NIFA Budget);
- Expand our ability to integrate research, education, and Extension functions of the nation's Land Grant Universities in local and multistate problem solving;
- Ensure regional multistate collaboration focused on sharing and cooperating among Land Grant Universities and NIFA;
- Acceptable to those directly affected and supported by the COPs, BAC and PBD; and
- Acceptable to appropriators.

The BAC submitted a motion to PBD stated that BAC supported inclusion of all IPM working group elements including IR-4 and recommended to PBD that a directed discussion be held with IR-4 and appropriate representatives from AHS related to inclusion in a comprehensive IPM program and a combined budget initiative.

Review of Roadmap Priorities:

This Committee supports all 7 challenges and the top two priorities from each of the seven challenge areas. However, it was suggested that focus be on the top 2 from each of the 7 challenge areas. For example, there are also some that are overarching, cross-cutting issues, such as climate, water and IPM. There may also be regional priority differences as well.

The Science and Technology Committee is developing a short 4-5 page synthesis document. Three overarching themes have emerged: "human health and well-being" as a function of "food safety and security", "socioeconomics and the bioeconomy", and "ecosystems and the environment". The committee agreed with the Science and Technology Committee on to better sharpen the focus of the Roadmap more manageable segments. This input will be provided to NIFA through a formal letter to Sonny Ramaswamy and others from the B&L, S&T Committees and ESCOP. However, every opportunity to provide more detailed input will be taken to provide advice to federal agencies on targeted investments.

2014 Priorities: The committee reaffirmed a continuing commitment as top priorities: Hatch, Evans Allen, McIntire-Stennis and other formula based capacity programs which should remain at least level if not increase. In addition the committee supports continuation of the mandatory grants programs and significant increases in AFRI.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Brief 9.3: Crop Protection Program Update

Presenter: Mike Hoffmann AES, NY and Daryl Bucholtz, CES, KS, Co-Chairs

Background:

An Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Working Group consisting of over 40 members and representing the key stakeholder groups with interest in crop protection/IPM was formed in May 2012. The group was appointed by the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU) Board on Agriculture Assembly (BAA), Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC). It was charged to produce a set of recommendations that will guide the budget authorization process and ultimately any implementation of a new crop protection program. In forming the IPM Working Group, the BAC notes an erosion of previous funding for IPM from the National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA) within its integrated activities accounts by approximately \$34M in the last five years.

The working group has been engaging by way of conference calls and emails to formulate recommendations on programmatic approaches defined as “Essential Elements” to a national Integrated Pest Management Program. Those Essential Elements include: the IR-4 (Interregional Research project #4), Regional IPM Centers, Extension IPM (E-IPM), Competitive Grants Programs, the Integrated Pest Management Information Platform for Extension (IPM PIPE_ and Community IPM. The Working Group recommendations attempt to retain functional equivalency of existing programs that align with the “essential elements.” At a minimum the recommendations seek to maintain funding, and improved coordination and efficiency. Emphasis on coordination also includes attention to structural change at national, regional and at the state levels.

The Working Group’s recommendations are targeted for implementation during the federal budget year of 2014. The resulting working paper (which includes several draft recommendations) was shared with the BAC and Policy Board of Directors during their July 23-24, 2012 meetings in Savannah, Georgia. The BAC recommended to the Policy Board of Directors that it is important to retain all “essential elements” (as described above) in the integrated IPM program. Furthermore, the BAC approved a specific resolution to the Policy Board of Directors that called for “a directed discussion be held with IR-4 and appropriate representatives of the Administrative Head Section related to IR-4’s inclusion in a comprehensive IPM program and combined budget initiative.” The working paper was also forwarded to NIFA for their consideration.

The Working Group will continue its activities through the fall. The working group will be tapped for input if issues arise before or when the President’s 2014 budget is released early in 2013. Cornerstone will also be engaged as needed. During a recent conference call (Aug. 31) additional input was sought from working group members to further refine the working paper and its recommendations. A recurring theme from working group members is the diversity of stakeholders for which IPM is important ranging from growers to homeowners. Likewise there exists a number of organizations and state and federal agencies practicing IPM but more coordination, especially at the federal level is needed. Some type of national coordination such as a National IPM Coordinator position or National IPM Coordination Council, with appropriate authority, is seen as important.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Brief 9.4: ECOP Liaison Report

Presenter: Doug Lantagne

ECOP continues to position Cooperative Extension as the local and online transformational education leader to prepare and respond to economic and natural disasters; protect our rich natural resources and environment; ensure an abundant and safe food supply for all; foster greater energy independence; help families, youth and individuals to be physically, mentally and emotionally healthy; enhance workforce preparation and life skills, and strengthen the profitability of animal and plant production systems. Selected current actions are reported against four core themes.

1. Build partnerships and acquire resources

- Development of MOU between USDA and Dept. of Energy on energy literacy and State Energy Extension Partnerships
- Initiate task force on Nutrition, Health and Health Care (working title) under the leadership of Daryl Buchholz, ECOP Chair-Elect and Assoc. Dir., Kansas State Univ. Research and Extension
- Continued dialogue with NIFA in support of Dr. Ramaswamy's emphasis on national leadership for partnership development, Extension involvement in grants review, global involvement, and reporting impacts of capacity funding.

2. Increase strategic marketing and communications

- Joined ESCOP to educate Congressional leaders about the results of research and Extension capacity funding.
- Authorized the formation of a task force to plan and implement a 100-year anniversary celebration of the Smith-Lever Act, which established Cooperative Extension in 1914.
- Joined the National Council on Food and Agriculture (C-FAR) to advance advocacy for food and agriculture research, extension and education.

3. Enhance leadership and professional development

- Funded research conducted by Purdue University to identify the characteristics of the 21st Century Extension Professional.
- Framed the National Extension Directors and Administrators (NEDA) meeting on March 18-20, 2013 at San Antonio, on the theme *Strong Partnerships, Sustainable Resources*.

4. Strengthen organizational functioning

- Completed a national process to identify *Cooperative Extension Opportunities*.
- Approved funding for an ongoing effort to report program impacts and outcomes using the Measuring Excellence in Extension data base.
- Assessment review

For information, contact Douglas L. Steele, Chair, dsteele@montana.edu or Jane Schuchardt, Executive Director Jane.Schuchardt@extension.org

Action Requested: Information only

Agenda Item 10.0: National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee

Presenters: Lee Sommers/Eric Young

Background:

The National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee (NPGCC) met in Beltsville, MD on June 19, 2012 at the USDA/ARS George Washington Carver Center. The meeting attendees were Lee Sommers, Jerry Arkin, Ed Knipling, Ed Kaleikau, David Baltensperger, Joe Colletti, Gary Pederson, Dan Upchurch, Peter Bretting, Ann Marie Thro, Thomas Burr, Tim Cupka, Eric Young, and Kay Simmons. Below are some highlights of the presentations and discussion.

1. Ed Knipling

- National Germplasm Resources Advisory Council (NGRAC) re-established officially in April, first meeting this summer or fall
 - NPGCC connected through Peter and Gary as ex-officio members
 - Scope is on all life forms
 - Focus on plants because motivation for establishing it is deregulation of GMO alfalfa
 - Council will be standing subcommittee of NAREEA Board
 - Forum for coordination and stakeholder input as well as advisory to Secretary
- NPGS remains a core program of ARS
- Global food security is high priority for government and germplasm is key
- ARS budget – 7-8% reduction over past two years
- Genetic resources program has been mostly protected from cuts
- Closing 10 locations this year due to cuts, Palmer, AK is only germplasm facility and its collection is being moved to Pullman & Corvallis
- FY'13 budget so far looks flat
- Senate Ag Committee has asked GAO to assess how well ARS and NIFA are coordinating with each other and avoiding duplication. NPGCC is great example
- Chavondra Jacobs-Young is new Associate Admin for National Programs
- Is there a change in focus of breeding? Some shift to nutrition traits and biotic/abiotic stress resistance, but yield is still high priority.
 - In private sector big push is toward crop stability through stress resistance, particularly through national tolerance rather than GMO.
- Free exchange of international germplasm and data sharing is high priority of administration

2. Peter Bretting

- 5-year retrospective review for 2006-2011 has been completed and reports are on web at link in PowerPoint
- Review panel met only virtually on conference call
 - Advantage – able to have international members
 - Disadvantage – less informed interaction and hard to schedule across time zones
- Commented that NPGS needs to do a customer satisfaction survey but OMB regulations on surveys are very complicated so haven't done one
- New Action Plan for national program 301 has been developed and is on ARS website

- Covers 2013-2017
- NPGS will now include microbial collections
- NPGS would like to obtain microbial collections from retiring scientists if that collection is not going to be maintained by university
- Still negotiating with APHIS to reduce cost of phytosanitary certificates for exported samples
- Possibility of making requestor pay this fee
- Dutch genebank is looking into charging a 50 Euro fee per distribution packet
- International discussion on this topic is occurring
- International accession trips are still possible in former Soviet Union republics, and North African countries, other countries are difficult or impossible

3. Gary Pederson

- GRIN- Global training is occurring and programmers are fixing bugs
- Not ready yet but making progress
- PGOOC would like to ask international requestors to pay for sanitary certificate fees directly to APHIS with some consideration for developing countries.
- Would start in 2014 and only apply for samples that go through Beltsville
- PGOOC will not meet in 2013 due to budget cuts, next meeting in spring 2014 in Davis, CA
- Distributions so far this year are very high, for S-9 it already equals all of 2011 distributions

4. Ann Marie Thro

- NIFA is getting a lot of inquiries about increasing support of plant variety improvement
- New REE Action Plan includes plant variety improvement in multiple places
- Stakeholder session at ASHS on August 1 in Miami
 - How would you manage awards to support breeding?
 - How to manage lack of competitiveness?
 - Should we document public investment?
 - Should we document demand for public cultivars?
 - What is role of public plant breeders?
- Looking for a novel way of funding plant breeding in a sustainable manner, which is difficult in normal AFRI mechanisms

5. Ed Kaleikau

- AFRI guidelines for grants related to germplasm and variety improvement to include curator in proposal development early

6. Tim Cupka – ASTA Liaison

- Training and retaining breeders is a huge issue for industry
- Need combination of classical selection and genomic analysis in training and practice
- Hiring more international students so it's harder to retain them
- How can industry help with germplasm distribution?
- Industry is currently subsidizing education of many breeders
- Final draft of International Seed Federation documents on intellectual property rights has been released and ASTA support it.
 - Patents and PVP's require permission from owner for use.
 - No farmer saved seed with patented traits

7. Chavondra Jacobs-Young
 - NSTC Interagency Working Group has been established to coordinate work in plant and animal germplasm
8. David Baltensperger– NAPB Liaison
 - Meeting August 6-8 in Indianapolis
 - TAMU is now the accountant for organization and will be transferring official accounting structure to ACCESS (ASA-CSSA-SSSA umbrella organization) by the end of the year.
 - Conference will focus on international breeding
 - CSSA is doing a policy white paper on plant breeding and germplasm, with the help of many NAPB members
 - Distance education program for plant breeding at Ph.D. Level to be launched by TAMU in Jan.
9. NGRAC & NPGCC
 - NGRAC has only had one organizational conference call
 - Appears that agenda items from NPGCC may be suggested through Peter and Gary
10. Wheat MTA
 - Colorado State, Kansas State, Oklahoma State, and Texas A&M University signed original MTA, other states have joined since then
 - ESCOP will post document on web site and keep list of signers
 - Some discussion on a master research agreement, but that was too complicated
 - Plant breeders are currently reviewing it at 4 universities
 - Once it's all finalized it will be put on web
 - Participation in regional variety traits used to mean any participant could take germplasm for use, but now they are for testing only
11. New Chair
 - Lee is retiring May 2013, so need to choose chair
 - Tom Burr (Cornell) will become chair after fall ESS meeting
 - Committee will change chairs every 3 years

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 11.0: REE Partnership Discussions

Presenter: Clarence Watson

Background:

Shortly after the Minneapolis fly-in in 2011, Dr. Cathie Woteki assembled a group to discuss the “partnership” (i.e., between the LGU system and USDA-NIFA) and efforts to improve it.

The group, representing all parts of the system including NIFA staff, has met by conference call and email to develop a “principles document” as a first step in reaffirming the “partnership” which is near final form. The final document is expected soon. The BAA representatives are Clarence Watson (ESCOP), Doug Steele (ECOP), Mark Hussey (AHS), and Ken Esbenshade (APS), and Ian Maw. Dr. Sonny Ramaswamy has assumed the lead role for USDA-NIFA.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 12.0

Proposed Changes to ESS Rules of Operation

Goals

- Make necessary housekeeping changes regarding APLU and NIFA
- Align rules with practice
- Create consistent nominations process and clarify appointments
- Clarify committee membership and operations

Housekeeping Changes

- Clarified confusing language and references
- Replaced NASULGC with APLU
 - Corrected Ian Maw's title
- Replaced CSREES with NIFA
 - Replaced Administrator with Director of NIFA
- Replaced NAPFSC with National Association of University Forestry Resources Programs (NAUFRP)
- Deleted Nominations and Partnership Committees
- Relocated article on assessments into the body of the document
- Clarified notice on intent to revise Rules requirement to 30 days

Align Rules with Practice

- Selection/nomination of ESS Chair-elect by regional association (EC endorses)
 - Rotation: ARD, W, NE, NC, S
- Selection/nomination of PBD nominees (EC endorses)
 - Clarifies 1862 and 1890 reps

Committee Operations and Appointments

- Codified rotation of Budget and Legislative committee chair and term
Rotation: NC, W, NE, S
- Committee chairs drawn from within committee based on experience and willingness to serve
- Created Vice Chair position allowing chairs to serve more than one term (except B&L)
- Appointments by ESCOP Chair

Voting Process

Proposed changes to the ESS Rules of Operation will be brought to the Section as a seconded motion from the Executive Committee. We will ask for a single vote on all changes. Should there be individual items that need attention, the vote will be amended to exclude those items from the vote and they will be subsequently handled on an individual basis.

Agenda Item 13.0: Nominations Committee Report

Presenter: Orlando McMeans

Background:

The National Nominations Committee for ESCOP Chair-Elect included:

Orlando F. McMeans, Chair (West Virginia State University) -- 1890 Region

Doug Buhler (Michigan State University) - NCRA

Brad Hillman (Rutgers University) - NERA

Jeff Jacobsen (Montana State University) - WAAESD

Bob Shulstad (University of Georgia - SAAESD

The National Nominations Committee for the ESCOP Chair-Elect has completed their work. Steve Slack, of the North Central Region, was nominated and unanimously voted upon by the ESCOP Nomination Committee. Steve has accepted this nomination and his name is being put forward for the 2012-2013 ESCOP Chair-elect role at this time.

Action Requested: Approve nominations brought forth by the Nominations Committee

Agenda Item 14.0: Resolutions Committee Report

Presenter: Greg Wiecko

Background:

Resolution of Appreciation to Agricultural Experiment Station Administrators who Left Their Positions and Responsibilities in the 2011-2012 Year.

WHEREAS, the following have served as Administrators of their respective State Agricultural Experiment Stations; and

WHEREAS, they have actively participated and served in various capacities at the state, regional and national level on behalf of the Agricultural Experiment Station System. Now, therefore be it

RESOLVED that the State Experiment Station Directors at their annual meeting on September 25, 2012, recognize the contributions and service of the following individuals toward strengthening the State Agricultural Experiment Station System, and wish them success and happiness in all their future endeavors:

ARD <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Samuel Donald from Florida A&M University (interim)• Jurgen Schwarz from the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (interim)• Garlen Wesson from South Carolina State University	NERA <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Robin Morgan, University of Delaware• Gloria Wyche-Moore, University of the District of Columbia
WAAESD <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Neal Van Alfen, University of California• James (Jim) MacDonald, University of California	SAAESD <ul style="list-style-type: none">• W. David Smith, North Carolina State University

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

WHEREAS, Dr. Lee Sommers, Chairman of the Experiment Station Section [ESS] of the Board on Agriculture Assembly has provided selfless and committed leadership and keen oversight to enhance the system; and

WHEREAS, under Dr. Sommers' leadership and support, the priorities of the Experiment Station Section of the Board on Agriculture Assembly have been greatly enhanced and have achieved significant accomplishments; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Sommers has provided outstanding leadership in the area of planning and building relationships with other research, extension and academic units; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Sommers has been visionary and timely in conducting ESS business,

LET IT BE KNOWN, that the Experiment Station Section of the Board on Agriculture Assembly recognizes Dr. Sommers' invaluable contributions and service to the national agricultural research system; and

THEREFORE, on this day of September 25, 2012, the Experiment Station Section resolves to extend its sincere gratitude for his commitment, service, and leadership in making the system more effective in addressing current and future needs, challenges and opportunities in agricultural research, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an original of this resolution be provided to Dr. Lee Sommers and that a copy be filed as part of the official minutes of this meeting.

RESOLUTION OF APPRECIATION

WHEREAS, the Experiment Station Section of the Board on Agriculture Assembly met at the Sheraton Portsmouth Harborside Hotel and Conference Center, Portsmouth, NH on September 24-27, 2012; and

WHEREAS, those attending were educated and stimulated by the meetings and associated events; and

WHEREAS the location for the meeting was outstanding and the accommodations were both compatible and conducive to effective interaction resulting in a successful meeting;

THEREFORE be it resolved that the Experiment Station Section of the Board on Agriculture Assembly expresses its appreciation to Dr. Dan Rossi, Dr. Jon M. Wraith, Dr. Mike Hoffmann, Ms. Rubie Mize, and Ms. Marge Joy for arranging the facilities; handling the logistics; and coordinating the meetings, breakout sessions and social events, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that an original of this resolution be provided to Dr. Dan Rossi, Dr. Jon M. Wraith, Dr. Mike Hoffmann, Ms. Rubie Mize, and Ms. Marge Joy, and that a copy be filed as part of the official minutes of this meeting.

Action Requested: Approval of resolutions



Agenda Item 17.0: LEAD 21 Update

Presenters: Jeff Jacobsen, Carolyn Brooks

Background:

Fall 2012 Update

On behalf of the LEAD21 Board of Directors and the LEAD21 Program, we send you mid-summer greetings and provide highlights from Class VIII which began this past June.

The current program:

- Class VIII is comprised of 83 participants from across the United States.
- Class VIII has the largest number of participants since the beginning of LEAD21.
- Institutions and agencies include:

Auburn University	Purdue University
Clemson University	Sisseton Wahpeton College
Fort Peck Community College	South Carolina State University
Fort Valley State University	South Dakota State University
Kansas State University	Tennessee State University
Lincoln University of Missouri	University of Arizona
Louisiana State University	University of Arkansas
Michigan State University	University of Connecticut
Mississippi State University	University of Florida
Montana State University	University of Georgia
National Institute of Food and Agriculture	University of Idaho
New Mexico State University	University of Illinois
North Carolina A&T State University	University of Kentucky
North Carolina State University	University of Minnesota
North Dakota State University	University of Missouri
Ohio State University	University of Nevada
Oklahoma State University	University of Tennessee
Oregon State University	University of Wyoming
Pennsylvania State University	Virginia Tech
Prairie View A&M University	West Virginia University

- The University of Tennessee has the most participants with seven!
- Class VIII consists of 58 males and 25 females, 9 participants from the 1890s, 2 participants from the 1994s, 5 from USDA/NIFA, and 67 from the 1862s.

The overall program:

- LEAD21 Classes I through VIII has had 559 participants.
- Precursors to LEAD21 include ESCOP/ACOP (278 participants) and NELD (80 participants).
- The total number of alumni in leadership development programs in the Land-grant University System and with our strategic partners is 917.

- Across all institutions and agencies, these leadership development programs include 775 1862s, 39 1890s, 10 1994s, 12 insular areas, 62 USDA NIFA, 1 APLU, and 18 strategic partners.

The LEAD21 Board of Directors include Jeff Jacobsen (Chair, AHS), Carolyn Brooks (Program Chair, At-large), Jon Boren (ECOP), Sam Comer (ICOP), Michel Desbois (USDA/NIFA), Mary Duryea (ESCOP), Cary Green (ACOP), Jim Hafer (1994 Tribal Colleges), Laurie Kramer (ACOP), Beth Olson (At-large), Dan Rossi (ESCOP), Dick Senese (ECOP), and David Wehner (At-large).

The primary purpose of LEAD21 is to prepare you to lead more effectively in an increasingly complex environment, either in your current position or as you aspire to other positions. LEAD21 accomplishes this through the actions of the Board of Directors representing all sections (AHS, ACOP, ECOP, ESCOP, and ICOP), NIFA, related institutions and LGUs (1862, 1890, and 1994). The LEAD21 Program is delivered through the highly skilled group of facilitators with combined 86 years of experience with LGU leadership development programs.

Through Sessions I, II, and III, self-directed learning, and peer coaching, a number of competencies are identified, studied, reinforced, and actively applied throughout the 9 month LEAD21 Program. The primary competencies include:

- **Developing self and others:** to seek and use self-assessment and feedback to enhance understanding and performance; to provide others with appropriate and timely feedback to enhance performance; to create opportunities for development of self and others; and to create long-term self-directed and life-long learning and professional development.
- **Leading with integrity and values:** to understand and honor organizational and cultural values; to communicate personal values that influence personal leadership; to demonstrate consistency between espoused values and values in action; and to respect the values of others.
- **Resolving conflict:** to use a range of strategies to deal with conflict between self and others; to mediate conflict among others; to recognize the root causes of conflict; and to engage in difficult conversations appropriately to both resolve the conflict and strengthen the relationship.
- **Fostering collaboration:** to see issues and opportunities from many perspectives; to balance the needs and expectations of many stakeholders; and to facilitate programs that collaborate across structural, organizational, and international boundaries.
- **Managing change:** to recognize the need for innovation without indulging in change for change sake; to have a vision for the future and communicating that to others; to understand the range of reactions to change; to develop and implement a change process appropriate to the organization and the degree of change; and to measure the progress of change and ensure the benefits.

Secondary competencies include:

- **Communicating effectively:** to listen carefully and use questions skillfully to encourage honest responses; to communicate clear, direct, and honest messages to individuals and groups.
- **Valuing diversity:** to express cultural sensitivity and awareness of the diversity inherent in and vital to a modern society; to appreciate cultural differences; to build and value collaborations; and to effectively form teams which balance leadership and followership.
- **Developing a deeper knowledge and appreciation of higher education:** to understand higher education in its many different models; and to understand the role of research, academics, and extension and how it depends on local, state, and federal partnerships.
- **Developing and managing resources:** to identify resources needed and to develop new resources; to redistribute resources to accomplish key goals or succeed in strategic directions; and to foster support through state and federal political processes.



Applications for Class IX will be available by mid-September and will be due November 30th. Dates for Class IX are:

- Session I, Minneapolis, MN: June 23rd – 28th, 2013
- Session II, Kansas City, MO: September 30th – October 2nd, 2013
- Session III, Washington, DC: February 11th – 15th, 2014.

Tuition for Class IX is \$9,500 which includes all participant materials, lodging, and meals.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Brief 18.0: Tentative Plans for 2013 ESS Meetings

Presenter: Steve Slack, Chair Elect

Background:

Location: Hilton Easton, Columbus OH

<http://www3.hilton.com/en/hotels/ohio/hilton-columbus-at-easton-CMHCHF/index.html>

Free Airport Shuttle Service

Dates: September 23-25, 2013

Day 1 – AM Travel, Afternoon Breakout Sessions for Regional Associations, and Evening Reception

Day 2 – Full Day Meetings and Evening Banquet

Day 3 – Morning Meetings, Adjourn Noon, PM Travel

Prices for hotel and registration should be comparable to previous years.

Action Requested: For information