

ESCOP Science & Technology

Call Agenda: 4 pm ET, June 5, 2017

Via Zoom: <https://msu.zoom.us/j/6522976848> or by phone +1 415 762 9988 or +1 646 568 7788 US,
Meeting ID: 652 297 6848

Committee Members:

<p>Chair: Marikis Alvarez (ARD)</p> <p>Delegates: Ken Grace (WAAESD) Laura Lavine (Chair-elect; WAAESD) Joe Colletti (NCRA) Deb Hamernik (NCRA) Cameron Faustman (NERA) Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA) Nathan McKinney (SAAESD) Harald Scherm (SAAESD) John Yang (ARD) Ed Buckner (ARD)</p> <p>Executive Vice-Chair Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA ED) Chris Hamilton (NCRA AD; Recorder)</p>	<p>Liaisons: Terry Nelsen (ERS) TBD (OSTP) Robert Matteri (ARS) Doug Walsh (Pest Mgmt Subcom) Edwin Price (ICOP) Dwayne Cartmell (Social Sci Subcom) Parag Chitnis (NIFA) Denise Eblen (NIFA)</p>
--	--

Please mute your phones when not speaking.

Participants: Laura Lavine, Joe Colletti, Deb Hamernik, Adel Shirmohammadi, Nathan McKinney, Harald Scherm, Denise Eblen, Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton (recorder)

Call Notes:

1. Welcome and roll call (Laura Lavine, Chris Hamilton)

Roll call completed, see participants listed above. Jeff Jacobsen introduced Laura Lavine as the new WAAESD rep and Chair Elect for S&T. The other S&T members then introduced themselves to Laura.

2. Discussion on 2017 multistate award nomination rankings (please refer to the [initial award ranking table and comments](#) below, as well)

Mean nomination rankings, in general, were similar to individual committee member responses and the committee was in agreement with the final table, with NC1186 as the recommended winner. Some discussion also ensued on the value of including historical background on prior versions of the project, as compared to stronger accomplishments and impacts. Members liked

that NC1186 wrote accomplishments based on each objective. NC1186 also has received SCRI grants, which indicate collaborative fund leveraging and team efforts. The nomination also showed good industry collaboration across the country, something not illustrated as clearly in the other nominations. NC1186's www.cleanwater3.org website is an excellent resource. For the APLU Program write-up on NC1186, it is recommended that: 1) more information be provided on the PD, co-PIs and other as new and/or unique with each one to showcase collaborations, 2) if possible, information on climate influences should be added and 3) under Outcomes and Impacts the SCRI grant is listed as WaterR³ in one place and Water³ in another.

Nominated projects will each receive a summary of S&T Committee comments as feedback.

Action taken: Joe Colletti put forth a motion to recommend NC1186 as the 2017 winner of the ESS Excellence in Multistate Research, Deb Hamernik seconded the motion, and the committee unanimously voted to approve this recommendation, which Chris Hamilton will forward the ESCOP Executive Committee for a final vote of approval.

3. Updated 2018 Call for Nominations

Additional changes were discussed, Jeff made these edits to the 2018 award call, which will also go to the ESCOP Executive committee for approval.

4. Other business, as needed

How can we encourage ARD to have a nomination? Jeff will follow up with L. Washington Lyons and Alton Thompson for 2018. There are not 1890s projects specifically included in NIMSS, but 1890s members are listed as participants on some multistate projects.

Call adjourned at 4:58 pm ET.

**2017 Excellence in Multistate Research Award Nominations: Initial Rankings and Comments by
S&T Members (6/5/2017)**

Criteria Ratings Table, based on the mean of 8 responses out of a possible 11.

Project #	Issues (5 pts)	Objectives (5 pts)	Accomplishments (40 pts)	Added Value/ Synergistic (30 pts)	Leveraged Funding (15 pts)	Participants (5 pts)	Total
NE1227	4	4	33	22	11	4	78
NC1186	4	4	36	27	14	5	90
S1065	4	4	29	23	9	4	73
W3112	4	4	33	27	11	5	84

Ken Grace could not complete the survey, but indicated that his first choice was NC1186, with W3122 second. His rating is not included in the above table, yet this evaluation was integrated into the overall review discussion and conclusion.

S&T Committee Review Comments by Project

NE1227:

- Synergies not well addressed. Regarding the \$10 M in extramural funding, what is the time period? Smallish number of states/institutions involved. Publications emphasized in outputs and outcomes. Needed more details on the improved dairy conception rates.
- Did not follow format guidelines.
- Well-written nomination that describes many accomplishments and impacts of this multistate research project that has been in existence since 1948. Many of the participants of NE1227 are national and international leaders in their field. Have the members collaborated to obtain external funding to support the NE1227 activities? Is the "\$1 B in additional income for US dairy farms" due solely to NE1227 efforts? Did all or most NE1227 members contribute to the impacts or are these impacts from individual scientists or stations?
- This project has a very productive history and has been able to bring scientists from multiple agencies together. The objectives of this project are solid and attainable in addition to making future innovations in reducing infertility and addressing animal health possible. The economic impact of this project to the producers is significant. The group has also been able to contribute to the body of knowledge and training of future generations of scientists. The outreach component of the project is also steady and appropriate.
- It seems your major audience is largely untouched by the project. I suggest a targeted audience and focus on impacting their pocketbooks.
- Demonstrated a strong and high level of multi-disciplinary, and multi-institutional, cohesive collaboration and very sharp focus. Strong linkage with Extension and provided open online courses.
- Solid project with long history of fundamental science discovery; fails to meet the impressive and detailed record of accomplishment provided by another regional nomination. A bit verbose.

NC1186

- Awkwardly presented information. Hard to determine added-value and accomplishments.
- Excellent project on an important topic. Well written. The ability of the NC1186 members to work together to obtain external funding to support the committee's efforts is impressive. The group has secured 1 SCRI planning grant and 4 SCRI grants to support their efforts, which is outstanding. The group has developed an App to meet the needs of users. Collaboration and engagement with industry across the US is outstanding.
- The project is on solid ground regarding water management and water quality in Ornamental crops. The project has well-established objectives and it is heavily survey based. Strong multi-institutional participation and significant collaboration. I am surprised to see that the group have not included the relevance of climate variability and its impact on water management and quality in their objectives.
- The impacts are a bit premature, as we are awaiting the results of a follow up survey. But good metrics of accomplishments overall.
- One of the best nominations in recent memory. Quantifiable outputs and impacts by every measure. Written with winning as the goal (and it should).

S1065

- Issue and problem needed to be more clearly stated. Four (4) objectives yet almost all accomplishments focused on only two - #2 economics and #3 consumer preferences. Synergies needed to be better addressed. Very modest leveraging. Modest number of scientists and institutions involved.
- Good project in an area that accounts for \$14B (wholesale). In general, it is not clear if the accomplishments and deliverables have been generated by collaborations across stations or if these are due to individual efforts. Good examples of leveraged funding. Have members of the S1065 committee collaborated to obtain extramural funding to support the committee's efforts?--This is not clear.
- This project has excellent participation. It has a solid history of 40 years in working. However, I think their leveraging of funding is weak.
- Not many metrics of group accomplishments. I also think there are impacts, but they need to be measured and reported on an annual basis, if possible.
- Broad-based collaboration and identified novel marketing strategy.
- Verbose and lacks quantitative impacts/outputs. Justifies nomination by citing number of years in existence, or by the fact that it provides information for others to use without noting what this led to.

W3112

- Strong nomination. Long record of impacts. Synergies needed to be better addressed. Strong leveraging. 23 institutions involved.
- Best nomination in terms of documenting or extrapolating monetary impacts.
- Excellent project on an important topic. This committee has made many significant contributions to the livestock (cattle, sheep, reindeer) industries for many years. Members are

recognized as national and international experts in their areas of expertise. The committee has some engagement with industry "when appropriate"--would like to see more details (do the companies do more than contribute reagents for experiments?). Have members of the W3112 committee collaborated to obtain extramural funding to support the committee's efforts? This is not clear.

- This project has similar overall goals as that of another regional nomination in conducting basic research to find strategies and mechanisms to reduce infertility in ruminants. It has a very high economic impact to stakeholders and has been able to leverage significant support. It also has over 47 years of history with high scientific accomplishments.
- Little evidence of extension outreach presented here. A few metrics of accomplishments, but could be stronger.
- Verbose and lacks quantitative impacts/outputs.