



## Winter ESCOP Meeting Agenda

Omni Shoreham Hotel  
Congressional Room (West Lobby)  
Washington, DC

Monday, March 3, 2014  
8 am to 12 noon

Time	Agenda Item	Topic and Presenter(s)
8:00 am	1.0	<b>Welcome and Approval of July 24-25, 2013 ESCOP Minutes</b> – Steve Slack, 2014 ESCOP Chair
8:05 am	2.0	<b>Cornerstone Report</b> – Hunt Shipman/Jim Richards
8:25 am	<a href="#">3.0</a>	<b>kglobal/Marketing Report</b> – Darren Katz (kglobal), Nancy Cox
8:45 am	4.0	<b>NIFA Update</b> – Meryl Broussard (Invited)
	5.0	<b>Discussion Topics:</b>
9:00 am	<a href="#">5.1</a>	<b>Water Working Group</b> - Robin Shepard/Mike Harrington
9:30 am	<a href="#">5.2</a>	<b>Impact Database and Training Update</b> --- Bill Brown, Eric Young, Mike Harrington, and Faith Peppers (ACE)
10:15 am	<a href="#">5.3</a>	<b>Pest Management/ IPM Progress Report</b> --- Mike Hoffman, Daryl Buchholz, Mike Harrington
10:30 am	<i>Break, as needed</i>	
10:45 am	<a href="#">5.4</a>	<b>Futuring Task Force Update</b> - Mike Hoffman, Dan Rossi
11:05 am	<a href="#">5.5</a>	<b>Capital Infrastructure Committee Update</b> -Mike Hoffman, Dan Rossi
11:25 am	6.0	<b>ESCOP Committee Reports</b> (Approximately 5 min for each, beyond submitted written briefs)
	<a href="#">6.1</a>	<b>Science and Technology Committee</b> - John Russin, Dan Rossi
	<a href="#">6.2</a>	<b>Budget and Legislative Committee Agenda</b> - Bret Hess, Mike Harrington
	<a href="#">6.3</a>	<b>NRSP Review Committee</b> - Bret Hess, Mike Harrington
11:50 am	7.0	<b>Other Business</b> –Steve Slack
	7.1	<b>Joint ESCOP/ECOP Meeting Fall 2015</b> – Jimmy Henning
11:55 am	8.0	<b>Final Remarks and Adjourn</b> – Steve Slack

Written Briefs: [ECOP Report to ESCOP](#)

## AGENDA BRIEFS

---

### Item 3.0

**Agenda Brief:** AES/CES Communications and Marketing Committee

**Date:** March 3, 2014

**Presenter:** Nancy Cox/Daniel Rossi

### Background Information:

#### 1. Committee Membership:

Wendy	Wintersteen	AHS
Ian	Maw	APLU Representative to CMC
Hunt	Shipman	Cornerstone Government Affairs
Nancy	Cox	ESCOP CMC Representative to NC-FAR; CMC ESCOP Co-Chair
Steve	Slack	ESCOP Chair, FY2014
Michael	Harrington	ESCOP ED
Mary	Duryea	Southern Region ESCOP
Ronald	Pardini	Western Region ESCOP
Jenny	Nuber	kglobal
Bill	Ravlin	North Central Region ESCOP
Robin	Shepard	ECOP ED&A Point Person
Jane	Schuchardt	ECOP ED&A Point Person
Carolyn	Brooks	1890s Region ESCOP; ESCOP ED&A Team
Kirk	Pomper	1890s Region ARD
William	Hare	Northeast Region ECOP
Tom	Coon	North Central Region ECOP
Gina	Eubanks	1890s Region ECOP
Darren	Katz	kglobal
Tony	Windham	Southern Region ECOP
Daniel	Rossi	ESCOP ED&A and Point Person
Connie	Pelton Kays	CARET
Jimmy	Henning	ECOP Chair, FY2014
Richard	Rhodes	NERA ESCOP
Scott	Reed	CMC ECOP Co-Chair
Faith	Peppers	ACE Representative to CMC
Linda	Martin	ACOP Representative to CMC

2. Meetings – A face-to-face meeting was held on March 2, 2014. The Committee will meet quarterly by conference calls starting in May 2014.
3. Update:
  - The Directors voted at the Fall ESS meeting to commit another three years of support for the AES/CES Communication and Marketing Project. We are into the second year of a two year partnership with ECOP to support the Project. ECOP has not yet made a decision to extend the partnership.
  - The Committee continues to provide guidance and feedback to kglobal and Cornerstone on various educational initiatives.
  - The Committee is monitoring and providing input into the development of the ESCOP-ECOP Impacts Training program.
  - There has been no action on a BAA PBD proposal to expand the scope of the project.
  - The agenda for the March 2 meeting:
    - Review/reflection on the past year's CMC activities
      - Cornerstone (Hunt Shipman)
      - kglobal (Darren Katz)
      - ECOP/ESCOP (Scott Reed/Nancy Cox)
    - Current issues
      - Update from Cornerstone (Hunt Shipman)
      - Update from kglobal (Darren Katz)
      - Is the system both supporting and using kglobal in an optimum way?
    - Going forward
      - Handling of kglobal reports
      - Future scale and partners in the Communications and Marketing Program
      - Themes for the coming year
    - Other Business

**Action Requested:** For information only.

[Back to Top](#)

## **Item 5.1**

### **Agenda Brief**

#### **Water Working Group**

**Presenters: Mike Harrington/Robin Shepard**

For information only

The ESCOP and ECOP B&L Committees as well as the BAC and the Policy Board endorsed the recommendation that a Water Working Group be established in the vein of the Pest management Working Group with a charge of developing a set of programmatic and funding recommendations that would be returned to the ECOP and ESCOP B&L Committees, the BAC and the Policy Board of Directors. This intent is to identify possible budget initiatives and provide guidance to NIFA. The committee co-chaired by Steve Slack and Jimmy Henning has been constituted with broad representation of research and extension faculty from across all regions (see attached). Several conference calls have been held during which the committee charge and an initial description of the issues were discussed (see attached). A larger strawman document has been prepared for release to the committee within the next week. A draft WG document is expected by the Joint COPS meeting.

[Back to Top](#)

## Item 5.2

### ESCOP Agenda Brief March 3, 2014

**Agenda Item:** Impact Database Update

**Presenters:** Bill Brown and Eric Young

The ESCOP Impact Database Working Group (Bill Brown, Chair (UTIA), Cathy Gant-Hill (NC A & T), Sarah Lupis (WAAESD), Dave Benfield (OSU), and Eric Young (SAAESD)) were charged last July “to consider mechanisms, including the ECOP Strategic Opportunities and Measuring Excellence System, for collecting and making readily available to NIFA, other federal agencies, AES and CES directors, and others information on impacts of AES research”. The Working Group’s recommendation to ESCOP was that ESS joins CES in utilizing the impact database that has been developed at TAMU to make available for search and retrieval impact statements of AES research. This recommendation was unanimously approved at the Nov 11 ESCOP meeting in DC.

The estimated cost to ESS for development of the research impact portion of the database at TAMU will be \$12,500 for the first year. This will include development, testing, and implementation of the system; ESS’s share of developing a 'Land-Grant' public front-end web site; and other modifications of the current sites to reflect the whole land-grant system. This expenditure was approved by the Section in a vote conducted in mid-January. An invoice for the development work will be sent in late summer or fall of 2014. Continuing maintenance cost for ESS is expected to be approximately \$2,000 to \$2,500 total per year after the development phase is complete.

The Extension/Research impact database development is being led by Scott Cummings (Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service) and his IT group at TAMU. Database development is now being guided by an integrated steering committee, the National Impact Database Committee, chaired by Tim Cross (UTIA). Other members include: Bill Brown (UTIA), Eric Young (SAAESD), Tom Coon (OSU), Jenny Nuber (kglobal), Faith Peppers (UGA), and Scott Cummings (TAMU). This group is charged with advising Scott on such aspects as web page and input screen components, URL name, categorization and tags, search capabilities, output format, etc.

The committee considered a number of URL’s and, on kglobal’s advice, decided on [landgrantimpacts.org](http://landgrantimpacts.org). Jenny Nuber said it was important in this case for the URL to indicate exactly what the web site is so that it will come up first on a Google-type search. This URL can be changed in the future if a better name is identified. The research impact input page is being designed to accommodate appropriate fields and cataloging options for research. A mock-up of this page is shown below.

The front end web site will have an advanced search option that allows the user to search on any of the field parameters shown in the input page (ex. research or extension, institution, state, funding source, challenge area, etc). Also on the front end will be broad integrated categories and tags under those categories that will allow a user to narrow their search by subject matter. These categories and tags were derived from an integration of the goals and objectives from the ESCOP’s Science Roadmap and ECOP’s Strategic Opportunities documents. The current list of categories and tags is shown below.

The quality control point for the impact statements being entered is at the CES and AES directors’ level. Each director will designate one or more inputters and they will be the only ones with access to the input site. The directors are responsible for assuring their designated inputters are trained in writing impact

statements. Periodically, a committee will evaluate quality of the impact statements contained in the database and give feedback to the directors and imputers.

Annual reports are the basis and foundational source material for the impact reporting conducted by science communicators at Land Grant Universities. In an effort to improve the quality of reports submitted to NIMSS and other databases by all research and Cooperative Extension personnel with reporting responsibilities, Sara Delheimer, the Impact Communication Specialist, has developed a short presentation that explains what good reporting looks like, including examples. All Multistate Committees are encouraged to view this presentation as part of their regular annual meetings and make adjustments to their annual reports, accordingly. In addition, directors are encouraged to share this presentation with faculty. The presentation can be found here: <http://www.waesd.org/research-reporting>

# ADD AN IMPACT STATEMENT

Institution

Texas A&M AgriLife Research

State

Texas

Region

Southern

Title

Issue: A statement of the problem or issue being addressed by the research.

(max 1,000 characters, 1,000 remaining)

Resolution: Statement of how this project or activity is contributing to finding a solution to the problem or addressing the issue and what was learned.

(max 1,000 characters, 1,000 remaining)

Impact: Statement of the impact (not outputs or outcomes) of this project or potential impact if the project is successful.

- Quantifiable difference in economic, environmental, or social quality of life
- Significant change in understanding or technology within a discipline
- Measurable benefits to those who utilize the knowledge or technology

Please check the box below if you (Scott Cummings) are the Primary Contact for this statement. Otherwise, please fill in the Primary Contact information below.

Primary Contact - Name

Primary Contact - Email

Primary Science Roadmap Challenge Area

None Selected



Secondary Science Roadmap Challenge Area

None Selected



Tags

Save

Statement Year

2013



Primary Funding Sources (choose all that apply)

Capacity Funds



Resource Links

Add Link

Statement Synopsis (130 characters)

For social media, rss, etc.

(max 130 characters, 130 remaining)

Funding Sources Drop-down List –

- Hatch Regular
- Hatch Multistate
- Evans-Allen
- 1994 Research
- Animal Health
- AFRI
- Other USDA Grant
- Non-USDA Federal Grant
- State Appropriations
- Industry Grant, Contract, or Gift
- Other Private Grant, Contract, or Gift
- Other

Challenge Area Drop-down Lists –

- Sustainability, competitiveness, & profitability of U.S. food & agricultural systems
- Adaption & mitigation of climate change impacts on food, feed, fiber, & fuel systems
- Energy security & bioeconomy from renewable natural resources
- Safe, secure, & abundant food supply for U.S. and world
- Human health, nutrition, & wellness of U.S. population
- Environmental stewardship through sustainable management practices
- Individual, family, & community development & resilience

## **Categories and Tags**

### **Food Security**

- Productivity
- Plant and Animal Improvement (breeding & genomics)
- Reduced Chemical Use
- Nutritional Value
- Food Availability
- Food Affordability
- Plant and Animal Food Products
- Chronic Disease Prevention and Management
- Food Safety
- Food Preservation
- Food Supply Systems

### **Nutrition & Health**

- Human Health
- Genomics
- Nutrient Delivery Systems
- Physical Activity
- Wellness
- Human Nutrition
- Chronic Disease Processes
- Functional Foods

### **Youth, Family & Communities**

- Economic Development
- Community Development
- Leadership
- Technology Use
- Financial Management
- Entrepreneurship
- STEM
- Youth Development & 4H

### **Environmental Stewardship**

- Environmentally Sustainable Ag Systems
- Ecosystem Services
- Pest Control
- Stewardship
- Energy Conservation
- Water Quality
- Water Availability
- Water Conservation
- Waste Management

### **Agricultural Systems**

- Alternative Agriculture
- Food Systems
- Fiber Systems
- Profitability & Competitiveness



Climate Change  
Sustainability  
Crop Management  
Livestock Management  
Integrated Pest Management  
Economic Modeling  
Irrigation  
Local Foods

**Energy & Bioproducts**

Bioproducts  
Biofuels  
Biomass  
Biofuel Incentives  
Energy Technologies  
Energy Efficiency & Conservation

[Back to Top](#)

# Draft Outline for Online Impact Statement Course

## Timeline:

Ongoing: course materials submitted

February 28: voiceover recording for animation

March 26: presentation on course at NEDA/eXtension conference

April: video shoot with talent

May: course registration opens

June: final user testing and course edits

July: course launches

**Time:** 3-5 hours total for 7 modules

**Course audience:** Faculty, communicators and administrators at land-grant universities who are planning to submit impact statements to the LGU Excellence database.

## Modules:

**Module 1: Introduction: What Is An Impact Statement, and Why Should You Write Them?**

**Module 2: Know Your Audience**

**Module 3: Definition Of Impact**

**Module 4: How To Write An Impact Statement**

**Module 5: Impact Statement Review**

**Module 6: Submitting Your Impact Statement**

**Module 7: Market Your Impact**

**Additional Course Resources**

---

## Module 1:

### Introduction: What Is An Impact Statement?

#### Learning Objectives

The learner will be able to identify different ways in which an impact statement impacts the university and policy.

The learner will identify ways in which impact statements have impacted their university.

#### **What is an impact statement?**

- *Video: good impact statement example, pulled from an LGU website*
- Why are impact statements important?
  - Reporting meaningful impact to policymakers and the public.
  - *Case studies, testimonial, or video here of impact statements affecting policy.*
- How do they help?
  - Bring in funding.
  - Highlight the important work of a university.
  - *Links to different University websites and potentially Kglobal, showing a collection of impact statements.*
- Where else can they help?
  - Other communications efforts

# Draft Outline for Online Impact Statement Course

## Module 2:

### Know Your Audience

#### Learning Objectives

The learner will identify topics in their research/at their university that a congressional staffer will pay attention to.

The learner will identify topics in their research/at their university that a state legislature will care about.

#### **Define your audience**

- Congressional aides.
- *Activity: define a congressional staffer, either in multiple choice or short paragraph form*
  - *Conclusion of activity gives an accurate description of a congressional staffer: busy, nontechnical, generalists (Know a little about a lot).*
- *Video: Interview with Niki Newberry Coody, UGA: Communicating with congressional staffers.*
- Federal legislators
- Stakeholders, advocates, news media.
  - *Video: Kglobal activities.*
- State legislators, county commissioners, voters.
  - *Case study of state-level policy affecting universities.*

#### **What's important to your audience?**

- The target audience as the most important critic of your message and approach.
- Focus on key players to achieve goals-congressional aids, local legislators, etc.
- What are their hot buttons?: Social, economic, environmental issues.
- It is easier to motivate someone around something they already believe than to convince them of something new.
  - *Testimonial: enduring topics in Congress are jobs, national security, health, food and nutrition.*
- Assess belief system, find common ground.
  - *Activity: list your current programs and how they fit into the list of enduring topics or other topics that are currently in the national spotlight.*
- What do they need to know in order to make decisions?

#### **What does your audience want to know?**

- Why did you do what you did?
  - *Show example of first section of impact statement.*
- How did you do what you did?
  - *Show example of second section of impact statement.*
- What was the outcome of what you did? (most important part!!)
  - *Show example of third section of impact statement.*

*Activity: Modules 1&2 quiz*

# Draft Outline for Online Impact Statement Course

## Module 3: Definition Of Impact

### Learning objectives

- The learner will generate examples of outputs.
- The learner will generate QQTP indicators.
- The learner will be able to identify sources for impact statement data
- The learner will generate examples of societal, economic and/or environmental impact from university projects.

### **What is “Impact”?**

- Reportable, quantifiable *difference or potential difference* program makes in real people’s lives.
- Not an output or outcome but a sustainable societal, environmental and/or economic change.
- Impacts Show Key Change
  - Economic value or efficiency
  - Environmental quality
  - Social well-being
  - Health and well-being
- *Activity: show impact statements, highlight the “impact section.”*
- *Activity: Either-or exercise showing impact sentences v. sentences of outputs, activities, etc. Learner must select the impact sentences.*

### **What is *not* Impact?**

- Long, detailed, technical account.
  - *Activity: learner must read through over-long account and find the impact statement within.*
- Description of process, activities.
  - *Activity: show examples of activities v. impact. Next is either-or activity where students can select impact sentences.*
- Numbers of people reached, acres served, meetings held.
- Success stories are different from impact statements.

### **Outputs/outcomes vs. impact**

- Examples of a good impact statement include knowledge/behavioral change, long-term differences. They also highlight social, economic, behavioral changes that have been effected through organizational action.
- Examples of output include: number of people reached, acres served, meetings held.
  - *Activity: show examples of outputs v. impact. Next is either-or activity where students can select impact sentences.*

### **Indicators**

- SMART, QQTP, Testimonials, Case studies, Statistics, Survey results
- QQTP: Quality, Quantity, Time, Place
- Examples of QQTP
  - *Activity: learner must identify quantity, quality, time, place in one-two indicators. Then they must generate their own QQTP indicator.*

### **Where to find data**

- National trends and statistics
- Local/regional trends and statistics
- Economic data

*Module 3 quiz (20-30 questions)*

# Draft Outline for Online Impact Statement Course

## Module 4:

### How To Write An Impact Statement

#### Learning objectives:

- The learner will generate examples of impact.
- The learner will generate examples of anecdotal impact.
- The learner will create brief statements for each of the three sections of an impact statement.

#### **What is an impact statement?**

- A brief summary, written in lay terms.
- Provides only enough detail to be easily understood.
- Impact statements capture:
  - Quantifiable, *social, environmental* and/or *economic* outcomes.
  - Accomplishments & payoffs to society.
  - Public – not internal, personal – benefit.
- Answers key questions:
  - Who cares and why?
  - So what?

#### **What does an impact statement look like?**

- Strong impact statements:
  - Tell what the problem is.
  - Explain what you did about it.
  - Are clear, concise.
  - Show quantifiable/qualifiable difference.
  - Show the outputs *and* the impact of your work.

#### **Impact statement format**

- Broken into three parts:
  - Issue
  - What was done to address the issue?
  - What was the result?
  - *Activity: From a case study or other content, identify the issue, what was done, and the result.*

#### **Anecdotal impact/potential impact**

- **Examples of anecdotal impact**
- Why anecdotal impact is used
- When anecdotal impact is used

# Draft Outline for Online Impact Statement Course

## Module 5

### Impact Statement Review

#### Learning objectives:

The learner will generate ideas for programs at their university that are good choices for an impact statement.

The learner will identify the differences between a strong impact statement and a weak impact statement.

The learner will create an impact statement.

#### **Grading impact statements**

- *Activity: three examples to be graded. Consider how these can be improved.*

#### **Choosing which program makes a strong impact statement**

- What is important to your audience?
- *Activity: List issues of importance to your audience and rank these issues according to which might get the most attention.*

#### **Create your own Impact statement**

- *Fill out template*

## Module 6

### Submitting Your Impact Statement

#### Learning objectives:

The learner will identify the contact person at their institution for submission to the impact database.

The learner will be familiar with the impact database format and contacts.

#### **Submitting your impact statement**

- Role of communicators, faculty, administration
- LGU Excellence database tour
- Find your institution's contact for submission to database

## Module 7

### Market Your Impact

#### Learning objectives:

The learner will generate ideas for marketing their impact.

The learner will identify ways in which their university markets impact.

#### **Market your impact**

- Where is your audience looking?
  - *Video: Kglobal*
- What do they care about?
  - *Video: Kglobal*
- Websites and press releases
  - *Examples from different universities*

#### **Additional Course Resources:**

[Timeline: Brief history of Impact Statements](#)

[Links to different university impact websites](#)

[Glossary of terms](#)

### Item 5.3

#### Agenda brief

#### Pest Management Working Group Update

Presenters: Mike Harrington/Mike Hoffman

For information and follow up action

Currently there is a so called National IPM Committee (NIPMC) consisting of IMP Center Directors, Regional IPM Committees, State IPM Coordinators, and Community IPM practitioners, the IPM Voice as well as others. This group has been meeting annually for a number of years and makes recommendations on programs; however, this group has no official status or no ties to either ESCOP or ECOP. This group was asked to respond to the recommendations contained in the Pest Management Working Group White paper that was developed last year. Many participants in the Work Group are also members of the NIPMC

There have been a number of iterations in response to the White Paper (most recent is attached). It is my recommendation that steps be taken to move forward with the formation of a Joint ESCOP-ECOP Pest Management Coordinating Committee. At a minimum this would entail development of rules of operation for the committee to be endorsed by ESCOP and ECOP. Careful consideration should be given the committee charge, structure, size, roles, responsibilities and reporting lines, etc. As currently recommended by the NIPMC, the "Pest Management Coordinating Council" may be too large to be effective. After further discussion with one of the principals who led the development of the recommendations, the following committee composition is suggested:

- At least one officer and administrative adviser from the regional technical committees for IPM (NCERA 222, NEERA 1004, SERA 3, and WERA 1017), N=8
- Directors of the four Regional IPM Centers, N=4
- E-IPM representative from each of the 5 regions, N=5
- One sitting AES and Extension Director, N=2
- One ESCOP and one ECOP regional executive director, N=2
- Non-voting *Ex officio* members, liaisons, N=?
  - IR-4
  - Other Land Grants programs related to pest management
  - Agencies and programs within USDA including NIFA, APHIS, ARS, SARE.
  - Other Departments of the Federal government including EPA, HUD, GSA and DOD.
  - Private-sector organizations including IPM Voice, IPM Institute of North America, and the National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants (NAICC).

This is still a sizeable committee but may be workable. The regional EDs could assist with strawman draft rules that are in line with other COPS Committees. ESCOP and ECOP should move forward with formalizing the committee as soon as possible.

# National IPM Committee

## Recommendations regarding the National IPM program

December 13, 2013

### Introduction

The genesis of the National IPM Committee (NIPMC) was in 1985 when the Pest Management Strategies Subcommittee of the Experiment Station Committee on Policy (ESCOP) Science and Technology Committee was charged with providing coordination among the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Programs and with USDA, the sponsoring agency. The Subcommittee was expanded to include Extension representation in 1986 to better integrate regional research with activities occurring through Smith Lever 3d IPM funds. At that time, the group began to refer to itself as the National IPM Coordinating Committee, later shortened to simply the National IPM Committee. Over the years, the NIPMC has functioned to provide advice and communications regarding Integrated Pest Management (IPM) programs carried out by USDA-NIFA (and its predecessors) and land-grant universities from across the region. Core membership was originally comprised officers of the four ESCOP regional technical committees for IPM (now NCERA 222, NEERA 1004, SERA 3, and WERA 1017), administrative advisors to those committees, and competition managers of the four Regional IPM grants programs (NC-RIPM, NE-RIPM, S-RIPM and W-RIPM), with USDA-NIFA IPM-related National Program Leaders serving as *ex officio* members. USDA-ARS-OPMP (1996) and Regional IPM Centers (2000) were added after these groups were established. Key partner organizations including US EPA and USDA-IR-4 have also participated. The committee is led by its liaisons to the Extension Committee on Policy (ECOP) (currently Ed Rajotte, PSU) and ESCOP (currently Frank Zalom, UC-Davis), with facilitation by the National IPM Center Directors.

The APLU-BAA requested that NIPMC provide feedback on the paper “New Pest Management Program: A summary of recommendations from the BAA Working Group on Pest Management,” particularly on aspects of organization and integration of the national program. Much of the agenda of NIPMC’s annual meeting (Oct. 1 & 2, 2013) was devoted to this topic. This document is a summary of the NIPMC process and resulting recommendations.

### Process

*Pre-meeting survey.* Prior to the October 2013 NIPMC meeting, a survey questionnaire was constructed and sent to IPM Coordinators/Directors in each state/territory. The purpose of the survey was to respond to the APLU-BAA position paper and elicit opinions about how IPM programming should be structured to be more effective and responsive. Specifically, respondents were asked how a future NIPMC-like committee should be structured and operated to provide better communication among state IPM programs, land grant institutions, regional IPM centers, the federal government and various stakeholders of IPM programs. The questionnaire was administered using Survey Monkey in September



2013 by asking the leadership of the Regional Technical Committees to encourage participation by the IPM Coordinators/Directors in their regions. A few other respondents included various administrators and researchers. Of about 64 potential respondents (1 IPM Coordinator per 56 states and territories, 2 leaders per Regional IPM Center), 46 filled out questionnaires giving response rate of about 70%. A brief summary of survey results can be found at <http://www.ipmcenters.org/NIPMC/>.

*Participation at the NIPMC meeting.* At the October 2013 NIPMC meeting a summary of survey results was presented to committee members. A brainstorming and round-robin reporting session was held with the committee members to construct a set of recommendations to respond to the APLU-BAA position paper. The question posed during the brainstorming session was “What should we do in the next year to take advantage of the formation of the new IPM Coordinating Committee?” Brainstorming results are shown in the file available at <http://www.ipmcenters.org/NIPMC/>.

*Post meeting remote deliberations.* A subcommittee was assigned to develop the first draft of this document and feedback was solicited from the NIPMC membership. Subsequent drafts were resulted from online exchanges, and approval ratified during a teleconference on INSERT DATE HERE?? .

The survey results and brainstorming results were incorporated with the APLU-BAA white paper to form the following recommendations.

#### **Endorsement of the APLU-BAA Working Group Recommendations:**

The existing National IPM Committee supports the recommendations put forth by the APLU-BAA Pest Management Working Group and recommends that they be implemented to more fully realize the impact that IPM programs can have on the U.S. economy, environment, and human well-being. To further enhance the Working Group's concepts, the NIPMC suggests the following recommendations to effectively address all components of a truly national IPM approach as envisioned in the National IPM Roadmap (Appendix A).

1. *Integrated Pest Management Program.* We recommend the program be named Integrated Pest Management or IPM vs Crop Protection. We make this recommendation to be consistent with the *National IPM Roadmap*, because of the historical broad acceptance of IPM and the fact that it includes the management and control of pests in all settings including but not limited to: agricultural crops, food animals, urban environments, and much more. Using the term IPM will allow the program to grow as needs and opportunities present themselves.
2. *IPM for all settings.* Though USDA has provided effective and productive leadership in the IPM arena for decades, we recognize that IPM is useful many settings beyond domestic agriculture such as: pests in urban environments, natural areas, human health situations and international arenas.
3. *Enhanced involvement of Research and Academic sectors.* The existing national program has for various reasons, had a decided emphasis on program and information delivery (i.e., Extension) with much less involvement by the land-grant institution research and academic teaching communities. The future IPM program will benefit from full participation of researchers, teachers, and Extension professionals.

4. *Strategic Planning for Functionality.* Existing IPM structures such as the EIPM grants program, Regional IPM Centers, Regional Technical Committees, Regional IPM Competitive Grants, and the NIPMC may each likely be useful components of the new national IPM program. However we should plan and implement the new national program with functionality – effectiveness and efficiency in addressing the entire issue as laid out in the *National IPM Roadmap* – as the primary objective. Existing organizational structures and procedures should be reviewed relative to their functions and contributions to the Roadmap. Adjusting roles and procedures by existing structures to better serve the national strategy is a likely outcome. Termination of existing components and procedures to better serve a new, more comprehensive, national approach should be given strong consideration. For example, we recommend replacing the NIPMC with the proposed Pest Management Coordinating Council as a standing subcommittee of ESCOP or another recognized entity within the APLU structure (i.e., if possible, a joint ESCOP and ECOP subcommittee). This Pest Management Coordinating Council should include:
- Officers and administrative advisers of the regional technical committees for IPM (NCERA 222, NEERA 1004, SERA 3, and WERA 1017)
  - Directors of the four Regional IPM Centers
  - Extension Committee on Policy (ECOP) and Experiment Station Committee on Policy (ESCOP) Directors from each of the four regions.
  - One ESCOP and one ECOP regional executive director.
  - IR-4 and other programs related to pest management within the Land Grants.
- (liaisons (*ex officio* members) could be invited from:
- Agencies and programs within USDA including NIFA, APHIS, ARS, SARE.
  - Other Departments of the Federal government including EPA, HUD, GSA and DOD.
  - Private-sector organizations including IPM Voice, IPM Institute of North America, and the National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants (NAICC).
5. *National IPM Coordinator.* A National IPM Coordinator should lead the new program. Ideally this office would be located and funded outside of any one cabinet-level department, for instance in the White House Office of Science and Technology.
- If the National IPM Coordinator office cannot be structured as above, it should at least be adequately funded by multiple stakeholder agencies including: several agencies within USDA, EPA, DOD, HUD, FDA and GSA. The purpose of distributing funding sources is in part, to provide a required level of funding but more important, this approach will engender lines of accountability and ownership by all partner agencies.

Should appointment of a National IPM Coordinator be established, a National Pest Management Coordinating Council should then be appointed to serve as advisors to the National IPM Coordinator. The Council should be broad-based and chaired by the National IPM Coordinator. It should systematically address all pertinent venues for IPM research and implementation, not solely those related to agriculture. Council members will provide leadership as appropriate to their own core mission. For instance, USDA would focus on agricultural settings, HUD and DOD on IPM in public housing, and so forth. EPA would lead on issues related to environmental impacts of IPM, and HHS, FDA and CDC might lead on human health impacts. The Council would also include membership from the land grant Pest Management Coordinating Council described in Item 4 above, private sector organizations (e.g. IPM Voice, IPM Institute of North America, and NAICC), and professional societies (e.g., Entomological Society of America, American Phytopathology Society,

Weed Science Society of America, and Society of Nematology). As with the National IPM Coordinator, if possible the Council should be housed outside of any one department. This is the preferred option. Sponsorship by USDA-NIFA is the second choice providing there is a broad enough focus to effectively address all agencies and stakeholders involved with IPM and the economic, environmental and human impact areas as delineated in the *National IPM Roadmap*. Committee membership would be similar to that described in Item 5a.

[Back to Top](#)

## Item 5.4

**Agenda Brief:** Futuring Steering Committee

**Date:** March 3, 2014

**Presenter:** Mike Hoffmann/Daniel Rossi

### **Background Information:**

#### 1. Committee Membership:

Michael Hoffmann (Chair)	ESCOP
Daryl Buchholz	CES
John Stier (or Josef Broder)	APS
John Ferrick	IAS
Craig Beyroudy	AHS
Dan Rossi	ED support

2. Background – ESCOP proposed to the BAA PBD and the Board approved embarking on a system-wide futuring initiative to help position the Land-grant System to address the grand challenges facing society, now and as they intensify in the future. This futuring initiative will not duplicate the roadmapping and strategic planning efforts made by the various BAA sections in recent years, but rather use those and other relevant plans as a starting point to develop a long-range integrated vision for the system 20 - 25 years in the future. The first step was the appointment of a steering committee consisting of representation from the various BAA sections.
3. Charge to the Steering Committee – To determine the charge, goals, outputs, timeline and composition of a Futuring Task Force that would guide the initiative.
4. Activities - The Task Force is scheduled to meet by conference call on February 25<sup>th</sup>.

**Action Requested:** Uncertain pending discussions during the February 25<sup>th</sup> conference call.

[Back to Top](#)

## Item 5.5

**Agenda Brief:** Capital Infrastructure Task Force

**Date:** March 3, 2014

**Presenter:** Mike Hoffmann/Daniel Rossi

### **Background Information:**

#### 5. Committee Membership:

Michael Hoffmann Experiment Station Committee on Organization & Policy  
(Chair) (ESCOP)

Jim Kadamus Sightlines

Dale Gallenberg Non-land-grant Agricultural & Renewable Resources Universities  
(NARRU/NLCGA)

Pamela J. White Board on Human Sciences

Tim White National Association of University Forest Resources Programs  
(NAUFRP)

Eleanor M. Green Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges (AAVMC)

Carolyn Brooks 1890 Land Grant Institutions

Dan Rossi ED Support

6. Background – Sonny Ramaswamy has requested an estimate of the backlog of capital infrastructure needs among APLU institutions. ESCOP was asked to coordinate a process to develop such an estimate. A Capital Infrastructure Task Force with representation from all elements of our system was appointed.

7. Charge to the Task Force – Work with Sightlines to design a survey to collect information to allow Sightlines to extrapolate capital infrastructure needs on our campuses.

#### 8. Activities:

- Provided a list of institutions to Sightlines to be included in the survey
- Confirmed the types of facilities to be included in the analysis – academic buildings, research buildings, greenhouses and greenhouse head houses, barns and large animal facilities, small animal facilities, etc.
- Received a proposal from Sightlines and will review it during a February 25th committee conference call

**Action Requested:** Uncertain pending discussions during the February 25<sup>th</sup> conference call.

[Back to Top](#)

## Item 6.1

**Agenda Brief:** ESCOP Science and Technology Committee

**Date:** March 3, 2014

**Presenter:** John Russin/Daniel Rossi

### **Background Information:**

#### 4. Committee Membership:

- Chair
  - John Russin (SAAESD)
- Delegates
  - Marakis Alvarez (ARD, Vice-Chair)
  - Teferi Tsegaye (ARD)
  - Joe Colletti (NCRA)
  - John Baker (NCRA)
  - Tom Burr (NERA)
  - Cameron Faustman (NERA)
  - John Liu (SAAESD)
  - Nathan McKinney (SAAESD)
  - Larry Curtis (WAAESD)
  - David Thompson (WAAESD)
- Executive Vice-Chair
  - Dan Rossi (NERA, Executive Director)
- NIFA Representative
  - Muquarrab Qureshi
- Social Science Subcommittee Representative
  - Scott Loveridge
- Pest Management Strategies Subcommittee Representative
  - Frank Zalom

5. ESS Excellence in Multistate Research Award – The announcement for the 2014 Multistate Research Award has been forwarded to the Directors. Nominations were due by February 28, 2014 to the regional association offices. The regional associations will select regional winners and these will be forwarded to the Committee for its review and recommendation for the national winner. The Committee will meet in May and forward its recommendation to the ESCOP Executive Committee.

6. ESS Leadership Excellence Awards – The announcement for the five regional 2014 Leadership Excellence Awards has been forwarded to the Directors. Nominations were due by February 1, 2014 to the regional association offices.

7. Science Roadmap – Copies of the Science Roadmap brochure have been distributed to various individuals and organizations. CARET members will receive copies at their March meeting.

8. Next Meeting – A face-to-face meeting is being scheduled for May 2014.

**Action Requested:** For information only.

[Back to Top](#)



**Item 6.2**

**ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee Agenda Brief**

**Presenters: Bret Hess and Mike Harrington**

**For information only**

The committee holds regular conference calls on the last Tuesday of each month that have generally been well attended. The current B&L Committee membership is shown below.

<p><b>Chair:</b> Bret Hess (WAAESD)</p> <p><b>Delegates:</b> Barry Bequette (ARD) Carolyn Brooks (ED-ARD) Karen Plaut (NCRA) Ernie Minton NCRA Tim Phipps (NERA) Gary Thompson (NERA)* Bill Brown (SAAESD) Bob Shulstad (SAAESD) Jim Moyer (WAAESD) Jeff Steiner (WAAESD)</p> <p><b>Executive Vice-Chair</b> Mike Harrington (WAAESD)</p>	<p><b>Liaisons</b></p> <p>Paula Geiger (NIFA) Emir Albores (NIFA) Caird Rexroad (ARS) Glen Hoffsis (APLU Vet Med) Eddie Gouge (APLU) Ian Maw (APLU) Dina Chacon-Reitzel (CARET) Cheryl Achterberg (APLU - BoHS)</p> <p>Jim Richards (Cornerstone) Hunt Shipman (Cornerstone) Vernie Hubert (Cornerstone)</p> <p>*Chair elect</p>
---	--

The B&L Committee endorsed the recommendation that a Water Working Group be established in the vein of the Pest management Working Group with a charge of developing a set of programmatic and funding recommendations that would be returned the ECOP and ESCOP B&L Committees, the BAC and the Policy Board of Directors. This intent is to identify possible budget initiatives and provide guidance to NIFA. The committee co-chaired by Steve Slack and Jimmy Henning has been constituted, an initial description of the issues has been drafted/distributed and a larger strawman document has been prepared for release to the committee within the next week. A draft WG document is expected by the Joint COPS meeting.

The B&L Committee has held two discussions on the possibility of bringing forward a Big Ask; that is an audacious initiative, which we could all endorse. Such an initiative would necessarily have performance targets, timelines and deliverables as well as both competitive and capacity program funding. Several possibilities have been advanced including water or pest management.

The B&L Committee held a face to face meeting earlier today during which approaches to working with Extension to identify the Big Idea/Big Ask were discussed. Details from this discussion will be presented.

**BAC Priorities:** The BAC met by conference call on Feb 18 to finalize the system's FY 2015 appropriations requests for the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA). Unfortunately, the President's 2015 Budget had not been released prior to this discussion. President's Budget is expected March 4th.

**2015 Budget Request:** No changes to priorities as stated to the seven core priorities: AFRI, capacity funds for Hatch, Evans-Allen –McIntire-Stennis, Smith-Lever, 1890 Extension and 1994 Research and Extension. First priority is to lose no ground relative to 2014.. Cornerstone expects 2015 to potentially be a difficult budget year. In keeping with past practice, The BAC position is to endorse the President's Budget or our 2014 numbers whichever are higher.

Each of these priorities will be documented in a one-pager (two-sided) at [www.land-grant.org/documents.html](http://www.land-grant.org/documents.html)

[Back to Top](#)

## Item 6.3

### NRSP Review Committee Agenda Brief

**Presenter: Bret Hess, Mike Harrington**

**Revised Guidelines:** At the 2013 Fall ESS Business Meeting in Portsmouth, NH, the directors approved several changes to the NRSP-RC's process in an effort to streamline the NRSP review process. Since then, the EDs have been working with the NRSP RC to complete an official, revised version of the NRSP Guidelines. These revised guidelines, dated January 2014, are now available on the ESCOP website: <http://escop.ncsu.edu/docs/Revised%20NRSP%20GUIDELINES%20FINAL%2020140124%20.pdf> .

**Impact of the sequestration:** The sequestration imposed a budget cut of 7.62 % on Hatch funds and the NRSP rules that have been in place for many years require that NRSPs share a proportionate cut. Based on action at the 2012 ESS meeting, Chris Hamilton communicated unchanged budgets to NIFA. The possibility of a sequestration was unknown at that time. In a follow up communication, a 7.61% cut was communicated to NIFA. Since the specified cuts had still not been made by August, Mike Harrington, NRSP-RC Vice-Chair, sent a memo to NIFA reinforcing the earlier communications. In a recent phone conversation with staff from the NIFA Award Management Division Office of Grants and Financial Management, it was clarified that no cuts were made to NRSPs in FY 2014.

### New/Renewing Projects

- **NEW:** NRSP\_TEMP321, "Database Resources for Crop Genomics, Genetics and Breeding Research," was submitted this fall. This project has submitted all required materials and will be distributed to the NRSP-RC members in March.
- **RENEWING:** NRSP\_TEMP003 (NRSP-3), "The National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)." This project has submitted all the required materials and is in the process of being peer reviewed. After responding to peer reviewers, the submission will be distributed to the NRSP-RC.
- **RENEWING:** NRSP\_TEMP301 (NRSP-7), "A National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs." This project is requesting one year of funding to explore additional and alternative funding models.

### Mid-Term Reviews

- NRSP-1 will undergo a mid-term review by the project's Administrative Advisors in February. The outcome of that mid-term review will be disseminated to the NRSP-RC.

## **NRSP Review Committee**

- Chair
  - Bret Hess (WAAESD)
  
- Delegates
  - Shirley Hymon-Parker (ARD)
  - Doug Buhler (NCRA)
  - Tom Bewick (NIFA)
  - Clarence Watson (SAAESD)
  - L. Washington Lyons  
(Cooperative Extension)
  
- Executive Director
  - Eric Young (SAAESD)
  
- Executive Director/Executive Vice-Chair
  - Mike Harrington (WAAESD)
  
- Interim Delegate
  - Fred Servello (NERA)
  
- Representative
  - Don Latham (Stakeholder  
(CARET))

The NRSP-RC will meet in person in mid-June to discuss the three new/renewing projects and one mid-term review. If needed, a follow-up call will be scheduled for later in the summer.

- A summary of NRSP budgets and projects up for review is listed below:

**NRSP 2014-2015  
Requests for Off-the-Top Funding**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Request FY2012</b>	<b>Authorized FY2012</b>	<b>Request FY2013</b>	<b>Authorized FY2013</b>	<b>Request FY2014</b>	<b>Authorized FY2014</b>	<b>†Request FY2015</b>
NRSP-1	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
NRSP-3	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	-
NRSP-4	481,182	481,182	481,182	481,182	481,182	481,182	481,182
NRSP-6	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
NRSP-7	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	-
NRSP-8	500,000	500,000	500,000	-	500,000	500,000	500,000
NRSP-9	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
NRSP_temp003 (NRSP-3)							50,018
NRSP_temp301* (NRSP-7)							325,000
NRSP_temp321							398,631

†Assuming an acceptable midterm review during year three, all NRSP budgets were approved during 2012 Fall ESS Meeting for the duration of their current, five-year cycle.

\*Only one year of funding is being requested.

Project Number	Project Name	Project Period	Midterm Review Year
NRSP-1	National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS)	2011-2016	2014
NRSP-3	The National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)	2009-2014	-
NRSP-4	Enabling Pesticide Registrations for Specialty Crops and Minor Uses	2010-2015	-
NRSP-6	The US Potato Genebank: Acquisition, Classification, Preservation, Evaluation and Distribution of Potato ( <i>Solanum</i> ) Germplasm	2010-2015	-
NRSP-7	A National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs	2009-2014	-
NRSP-8	National Animal Genome Research Program	2008-2013	-
NRSP-9	National Animal Nutrition Program	2010-2015	-
NRSP_temp003 (NRSP-3)	The National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP) (NRSP-3 renewal)	2014-2019	2017
NRSP_temp301 (NRSP-7)	A National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs	2014-2015	-
NRSP_temp321	Database Resources for Crop Genomics, Genetics and Breeding Research	2014-2019	2017

**Action Requested:** None, for information only.

[Back to Top](#)

# COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

## Extension Committee on Organization & Policy (ECOP)

### Report to the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy Daryl Buchholz, ECOP Liaison (2.10.14)

#### **Build Partnerships and Acquire Resources**

- The ECOP National Task Force on Health chaired by Michelle Rodgers, University of Delaware, completes its work in March 2014. The task force will outline priorities for Cooperative Extension health programs for the next 3-5 years, and name potential partners, public and private, to be engaged in resource development and program implementation.
- The Extension Centennial Celebration Task Force, co-chaired by Doug Steele, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension, and Frankie Gould, Louisiana State University AgCenter, has scheduled Washington, DC, events on 3.5.14 (Capitol Hill Reception) and 5.7-8.14 (Convocation) along with 100 days of social media pushes leading up to May 8<sup>th</sup>, the day the Smith-Lever Act was signed. The original act will be on display at the National Archives. See [www.extension100years.net](http://www.extension100years.net) for a communications toolkit and other details.
- The NACo-Cooperative Extension National Leadership Team meets on a quarterly basis and is investigating ways to work together on urban programming, emergency preparedness, civility in public discourse, and educational tools for local leaders and government officials.
- ECOP Budget and Legislative Committee, chaired by Rick Klemme, University of Wisconsin, continues efforts to communicate the “both-and” of federal competitive and capacity funding, and work collaboratively with ESCOP on pest management/crop protection and water resources priorities.

#### **Increase Strategic Marketing and Communications**

- The AES-CES Communications and Marketing Committee, co-chaired by Scott Reed, Oregon State University, and Nancy Cox, University of Kentucky, continue work to educate decision-makers about results of research and Extension investments. The current emphasis at [www.agisamerica.org](http://www.agisamerica.org) is nutrition and health research and Extension.
- The database at [www.excellenceinextension.org](http://www.excellenceinextension.org) has been expanded to include program impacts. Efforts are underway with the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) to reflect research and Extension results. Learning modules on writing impacts will be available in 2014.

#### **Enhance Leadership and Professional Development**

- *Launching Cooperative Extension's Next 100 Years: Celebrate, Innovate, Engage* is the theme of the 2014 National Extension Directors and Administrators (NEDA) meeting March 24-26, 2014 in Sacramento, CA. NEDA meets in conjunction with the National eXtension Conference this year.

#### **Strengthen Organizational Functioning**

- With leadership by Charlotte Eberlein, Idaho State University, efforts are underway to form the 4-H National Leadership Team. The Memorandum of Understanding outlining the responsibilities of Cooperative Extension at the state level, USDA-NIFA, and the National 4-H Council has cleared USDA legal counsel and is ready for signature.
- Keith Smith, Ohio State University, is leading a strategic planning effort to define the “new” eXtension.
- The ESCOP-ECOP strategic alliance continues in 2014 with strong leadership by the chairs including a series of meetings with USDA-NIFA senior leadership on 2.19.14.

For more information, contact Jimmy Henning, Chair, or Jane Schuchardt, Executive Director, [jane.schuchardt@extension.org](mailto:jane.schuchardt@extension.org).

ECOP is the representative leadership and governing body of Cooperative Extension, the nationwide transformational education system operating through land-grant universities in partnership with federal, state, and local governments.