

**Science and Technology Committee Meeting**  
**Dallas, TX**  
**March 29-30, 2010**

**Minutes**

**In Attendance:** Bill Ravlin (Chair), Steve Meredith (Vice-Chair), Ambrose Anoruo, Larry Curtis, Jozef Kokini, Abel Ponce de Leon, John Liu, Tom Brady, Dan Rossi, Travis Park, Carolyn Brooks, and Mike Harrington.

- I. Welcome and Introductions
- II. Committee Charge and Membership
  - A. No changes recommended
- III. Responding to NIFA Research Funding Changes
  - A. Role of Multistate Projects
    - 1. Potential catalytic role that multistate projects can play, though projects tend to be narrow in scope
    - 2. Suggestion to bring chairs of multistate project committee together to discuss opportunities (likely impact would be on future rounds)
    - 3. Need to alert 1890's of new projects in the development stage
  - B. Role of Individual Institutions
    - 1. Minnesota example of identifying specific opportunities prior to the release of the RFA
    - 2. Directors can serve as facilitators/catalysts for larger multi-institutional projects
  - C. General Comments
    - 1. Need to emphasize the opportunity to use AFRI planning grants to develop teams
    - 2. Large integrated projects will need dedicated leaders/coordinators
    - 3. There is overall concern about the lack of funding for individual investigators
    - 4. There is also concern about the perceived lack of support for specific areas of science – animal, food, etc.
    - 5. There was a recommendation that selected directors/scientists meet with Dr. Beachy to discuss some of these issues.
- IV. ESCOP Research Priorities for Plant and Pest Biology Presentation Recommendations
  - A. There was a recommendation to delete specific listing of Science Roadmap challenge areas
  - B. Need to highlight specific research needs (such as basic biology of pest management) rather than reviewing total list on handout
  - C. The final set of recommendations can include:
    - 1. Need for balance approached to funding that include funding for fundamental science

2. Need to attract young brilliant minds to agricultural research
3. Animal systems are as important as plant systems

V. Multistate Research Award Program

- A. Recommendation to forward to APLU the list of regional award winners in addition to the national winner – **Dan will follow up**

VI. Science Roadmap

A. Challenge Area Team Progress Reports

1. Teams are at various levels of progress from draft documents to identification of key research needs/priorities
2. There are areas of overlap among teams such as agricultural water – **Executive Directors will coordinate.** May require identification of cross cutting issues.
3. Recommendation that the drafts of the white papers are shared with all participants on the teams and not the writers. **Executive Directors will communicate this recommendation.**
4. There is a clear advantage when the teams have a single individual willing to prepare a draft including the conceptual framework.

B. Process Recommendations

1. Identify several reviewers for the draft white papers. **ED's will recommend to the writing teams.**
2. Proposed timetable: Drafts of white papers by mid-May  
Reviews completed by end of May  
Revised drafts submitted by mid-June
3. Potential broader review by the system could be accomplished by providing opportunity to individual directors following the ESCOP meeting. The idea is to share draft with directors with very specific instructions concerning a review by their faculty. The advantage of such a procedure would be greater ownership and completeness. The disadvantage would be that associated with writing as a “committee of the whole.” If the recommendation is adopted, the directors would need to receive specific and carefully worded directions.

C. Report Outline

1. Introduction
2. Recommendations
3. Conceptual Framework
4. Methodology/Roadmap Process
5. Seven Challenges
6. Challenge Sections:
  - Framing the Issue/Background
  - Rationale/Justification
  - Assessing Current Capacity and Science Gaps
  - Research Needs and Priorities

- Expected Outcomes with Investments

#### D. General Comments

1. Add cross-walk table to explain the process and relationship to other roadmaps. **Dan will incorporate.**
2. Develop overall costs in terms of dollars and resources to implement the Roadmap. Can use CRIS, NSF and NIH databases for current investments and possible survey for new investments. **ED's will investigate.**
3. Suggestions to better market the final document:
  - a. A need to focus beyond the 7 challenge areas
    - Identify up to three areas of highest priority that cross cut the 7 challenges such as “food for health.”
    - Need equivalents areas to reflect importance of the environment and the economy
    - **Dan will draft with input from the Committee.**
  - b. Title
    - Consider rewording to reflect more than traditional definition of agriculture
    - Possible phrases include: agricultural science, health, environment, communities, economy
    - **Will be considered at a later date**
  - c. Targets
    - Funding agencies beyond Department of Agriculture
    - 2013 Farm Bill development
    - Developing effective partnership with the NIFA leadership
  - d. Previous accomplishments/impacts of the System
    - A separate project may be needed to document previous impacts of agricultural research
    - Need to be performed by someone outside of the System with credibility with funding agencies
    - Attempt to tie accomplishments to previous Roadmap
    - Look for possible financial support from NIFA
    - **Bill Ravlin will suggest to ESCOP**
  - e. Compelling arguments need to be made
    - For significant increases in investment
    - Potential use of arguments based on “fears” such as cancer
    - Examples of compelling research as boxed inserts for each challenge areas
    - Impact on 100% of population not 1-2%
    - Roles of Land Grants in solving problems

#### E. Introduction and Conceptual Framework

1. Incorporate the following changes to discussion paper:
  - a. Goal of tripling research budget over next \_\_ years
  - b. Refer to Friedman's work on explaining changing context for issues

- c. Add the need to integrate research beyond traditional outreach to commercialization
  - d. Remove “childhood” from reference to obesity
  - e. The need to attract “and develop” the next generation of scientists
  - f. The need to sustain current “and productive” research programs
2. **Dan will draft this section**