North Central Regional Association of State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Spring Meeting
March 30 to April 1, 2015
The San Antonio Riverwalk Embassy Suites
San Antonio, TX

MRC: Empire Boardroom
Business Meeting: Texas A [Call-in (210) 226-9000 ext.6613]

Final AGENDA and MINUTES (Click here to link directly to meeting minutes)

Date/Time	Agenda Item	Topic	Presenter
Monday, March 30:			
3:00-5:00 pm		Multistate Research Committee (MRC) Meeting (for MRC members only, although others are welcome to attend if interested). _Empire Boardroom_	Archie Clutter, 2015 MRC Chair
5:30-6:30 pm		_Welcome reception, then dinner on your own._	
Tuesday, March 31:			
7:00 am		_Breakfast_	
8:00 am	1.0	Call to Order and Introductions	Ernie Minton, 2015 NCRA Chair
	2.0	Approval of September 2014 Minutes: (http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/Sept2014.pdf)	
	3.0	Adoption of the Agenda	
	4.0	Interim Actions of the Chair 4.1 DRAFT NCRA Process for ESS Leadership Award	Ernie Minton
8:05 am	5.0	Executive Director's Report 5.1 NCRA Office Budget FY2016 5.2 Activities Summary 5.3 NIMSS Update 5.5 General Discussion Items	Jeff Jacobsen Chris Hamilton
8:30 am	6.0	NCRA Plan	Jeff Jacobsen, All

9:00 am	7.0	ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee Update	Ernie Minton, Karen Plaut
9:05 am	17.0*	USDA Climate Hubs/NC Climate Update (schedule change for Jerry Hatfield, topic continued at 1:30 pm)	Jerry Hatfield, USDA Midwest Climate Hub
9:35 am	8.0	Cornerstone Update	Cornerstone (call-in)
9:45 am	9.0	MRC Report 9.1 New/Renewal NC Projects 9.2 Midterm Reviews 9.3 NRSP Report 9.4 NC Nominee for Multistate Award 9.5 Other MRC Business	Archie Clutter Doug Buhler, George Smith (NRSP7)
10:00 am	10.0	ARS Report	JL Willett
10:15 am	11.0	NCRCRD Update	Scott Loveridge
10:35 am	Break		
10:50 am	12.0	ESCOP Science & Tech Committee Update	Jeff Jacobsen, Joe Colletti, Deb Hamernik
11:00 am	13.0	ESCOP Communications & Marketing Committee Update	Daniel Scholl
11:10 am	14.0	Nominations Committee Update 15.1 New MRC Member Needed 15.2 Other projects needing AAs 15.3 NCRA/ESS Leadership Award (2016 ideas?)	Ernie Minton
11:20 am	15.0	POW/AR Panel in DC	David Jackson, All
12:00 noon	Lunch		
1:20 pm	16.0	NIFA Update/Discussion	Parag Chitnis, NIFA
1:45 pm	17.0	USDA Climate Hubs/NC Climate Update	Justin Derner, USDA NPA Hub Contact Call-in (Justin Derner, Jerry Hatfield)
2:10 pm	18.0	FFAR Board Update	Doug Buhler
2:20 pm	19.0	Other business/follow-up as needed	All
2:30 pm	Break		
3:00 pm	20.0	Open Data Session I	Marianne Stowell Bracke

4:20 pm	21.0	Future Meetings: http://ncra.info/Organization_UpcomingMeetings.php • NC Joint CARET/AHS Summer Session, July 12-14, 2015, The Rushmore Plaza, Rapid City, SD • Joint COPs Session, July 19-22, 2015, Marriott Downtown, Providence, RI • Fall ESS/AES/ARD Meeting and Workshop, September 28 – October 1, 2015, Ballantyne Hotel & Lodge (https://www.theballantynehotel.com), Charlotte, NC • APLU Annual Meeting, November 15-17, 2015, JW Marriott Hotel, Indianapolis, IN • For discussion: Chicago, IL as location and dates for NCRA Spring Meeting 2016? • Fall ESS Meeting, September 19-23, 2016, Jackson Lake Lodge, Jackson Hole, WY	Ernie Minton, All
4:20 pm	22.0	Executive Session	NCRA Directors Only
4:35 pm		*End for the day, dinner on your own.*	

Wednesday, April 1			
7:00 am		*Breakfast*	
8:00 am	23.0	Open Data Session II	Marianne Stowell Bracke, Meredith Morovati Executive Director, Dryad
10:00 am	24.0	Industrial Hemp – Programs in the NC region	Doug Buhler, All
10:15 am		*Break*	
10:30 am	25.0	State Highlights Roundtable Discussion Hatch/Umbrella project management Multistate funding approaches across NCRA (funding for multistate participants – practice and guidelines) State of the state with Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS)	All
12 noon		**Adjourn (Boxed lunch provided)**	

MEETING MINUTES

Item #	Notes (not in briefs)	Action Taken
2.0		September 2014 meeting minutes approved
3.0		April 2015 agenda approved
4.0	NCRA process for selecting our ESS Leadership Award winner	Process was approved
5.1	NCRA FY2016 Budget Discussion • We need to have traceable, solid process and calculations. • Origin of 60/40 split is unknown • IA was concerned with accuracy of NIFA actual Hatch and Hatch Multistate numbers published on website, Paraq Chitnis of NIFA sent an email asking Cynthia Montgomery about how these values are calculated. • All other regions do it differently • What to do it Hatch switches to a competitive model? How to address? We will revisit if/when this is an issue. • Decided to table discussion for the 3/31 afternoon Executive Session.	Scenario #1 was chosen as best option for calculating state assessments going forward. Jeff Jacobsen will follow up with NIFA to confirm whether or not NC7 and NC1100 (and other NRSPs) were included in the published actual Hatch Multistate allocated amounts for IA and MSU, respectively. State assessments will then be calculated without including any off-the-top funded project values. Chris Hamilton will send out FY2016 invoices to states, payable to the MSU NCRA account (same as in 2014)
5.2	• Jeff requested directors please add him and Chris to state level email lists to keep them aware of local activities. • CARE grant deadline is June 24, 2015; please share the RFA with your faculty. We need more quality proposals for applied and basic research. Recommend proposals are narrow and focused in scope, ideally addressing a critical issue that can be solved during the life of the award. Awards have increased from $150,000 to $200,000 for next RFA. Contact NIFA for examples from successful past recipients/proposals.	Please add Jeff Jacobsen and Chris Hamilton to your state level email lists to keep them aware of local activities. Please share the CARE grant RFA with your faculty, submission deadline is June 24, 2015.
5.3	The new NIMSS and REEport must communicate effectively, with NIMSS able to pre-populate as many sections as possible in REEport.	Chris Hamilton will re-emphasize this request with Clemson and NIFA, before they begin working together on interfacing the two systems.
5.4	NCRA Plan discussion, main points: • Directors are happy to have a Plan and direction, especially so early in Jeff's tenure as ED.	Jeff/Chris will routinely incorporate best-practices sessions into meetings.

	- Directors want Jeff/NCRA office to help them do their jobs and increase efficiency, recognizing their time limitations and that they may not be able to participate in NCRA activities as much as they would like. Initiating and organizing the April Great Lakes Specialty Crops/Climate meeting is an excellent example of this type of activity. - Directors appreciate sharing best practices and learning from each, would like to try to incorporate more of this into NCRA meetings. - Directors value innovation, creativity, and better marketing, perhaps using the Battelle study. Routine is good, but they also hope Jeff will go out and search for new opportunities for the NC. - Are their better ways to interact at the tech transfer level? - We should prioritize plan items, and align with Jeff's interests and strengths. We should be careful as group on what we want to do, what do we have time for, what is valuable – perhaps block off time at a NCRA meeting to work on some of the topics? This is the time when we are most active and engaged in ONLY NCRA activities. It's hard to find time once directors are back on campus. - Jeff 's request from the Feb NCRA Plan distribution was to have the directors select the 7 top priorities from the plan.	Jeff/Chris will add the NCRA Plan as an agenda item to each meeting. Directors, within the next week or two, please select your top priorities from the Plan and let Jeff know. He will then restructure the plan, as needed.
7.0	ESCOP B&L Committee: - Last meeting focus: priority setting and advocacy, water security. How do we keep water in the front burner as next big ask? We need to keep this focus as our best option to receive a funding increase. - Committee members are conducting an inventory of water related impacts in national database and working to define and formalize an advocacy structure with Cornerstone. - Created a subgroup to inventory regional efforts in water and report back to B&L discussions. Ernie will reach out to NCRA members on state level water related efforts. - AES and EXT have decided that water should be highest FY2017 priority for the Ag Appropriations Committee and the BAA agrees. It is recognized that it may take a few years before it sees action in President's budget, but now is the time to get it on the table. Note: A crop production focus for water is probably a better approach for success than a	For information only.

	conservation focus. • NIFA's written response on the Water Security white paper will be released soon.	
8.0	Cornerstone Update – Hunt Shipman • President Obama released his FY 2016 budget request today which includes a top-line increase of $213 million for the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA). The President proposes $20 million for new competitive capacity programs. Under this proposal, a portion of Evans-Allen, Hatch Act, Smith-Lever, and Payments to 1890 Institutions for Research programs would be made available for competitively awarded grants. See also: http://www.land-grant.org/documents/02022015CornerstoneReportfromWashington.pdf • The BAA is not interested in converting Capacity funds to competitive • The 1890s saw an increase for Central State University, the new 1890 in OH. • Increase in funds for the Innovation Institutes • Congress completed work on their versions of the FY16 budget, will work on resolving differences and common proposal. Process is underway and moving quickly. • Priority lines are the same as always and received same level of funding as FY14, except AFRI, which receive $8M increase.	For information only.
9.0	MRC Report: • 9.1-9.2: All renewals and midterm review MRC recommendations approved • 9.3: NRSP-RC Report, George Smith (MSU) replaced John Baker as the NC AA. Discussion on NRSP7 and NRSP6's new proposals and budgets ensued. Alternative funding methods for some of the NRSPs was discussed, such as converting to regional trusts (OTT funded projects) • NC140 was approved as our NC nominee to the National Excellence in Multistate Research Award	Renewals and midterm review recommendations approved. Chris Hamilton contacted NC140 on 3/31/2015 to congratulate them on their nomination. Jeff and Doug will work with Holly Whetstone and Ron Perry (NC140 AA) at MSU to polish the nomination document prior to submitting it to the ESCOP Sci & Tech committee. Jeff will draft a letter for the

		MRC Chair (Archie Clutter) to thank the other nominees for submitting, encourage them to resubmit next year, and provide ideas for improving their submissions, if applicable.
11.0	NCRCRD Update, link to Dr. Loveridge's slides: http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/April2015files/NCRCRD%20Directors%20Update%20NCRA%202015.pdf	For information only.
13.0	Communications and Marketing Report • AHS has joined CMC, which is good from cost sharing and messaging perspective • kglobal has conducted a messaging study over the past few months and found that that "water" resonates the most with stakeholders over health and nutrition • The roll out of the national impacts database was successful. • The CMC plan of work will be developed by a standing subcommittee, Dan Scholl (AES), Wendy Wintersteen (AHS), Tony Windham (EXT). A draft will be out by the July meeting.	For information only.
14.0	Nominations Committee: • Greg Cuomo (MN) volunteered to serve as the new MRC member, effective 10/1/2015. George Smith will join on 10/1/2016. • No open AA roles to fill at this time. • NC ESS Leadership Award recipient: Fred Cholick nominated and approved	NCRA directors signed a memo congratulating Fred on the award; Ernie Minton will send it on to him. Chris Hamilton will forward Fred's name on to ESCOP for inclusion in the national award. (done, 4/1/2015)

15.0	POW Panel Input Discussion (detailed state responses added to Item 15.0 brief here):
	• Received a lot of feedback from NC states
	• Timing: April is OK, no strong feelings on changing that
	• Connecting projects to programs, several elements
	    ▪ Why is NIFA not mining REEport for information? Too much duplication
	    ▪ There is inconsistency; EXT doesn't have REEport but AES does.
	    ▪ Data doesn't come out of REEport easily, hard to assign in the POW
	    ▪ Time % tracking allocation exists in REEport, but it's hard to pull out.
	    ▪ How is EXT and AES integration being captured?
		For information only.

	• Reporting Outcomes and Impacts o No federal requirement to report impacts, so maybe focus on stakeholder evaluation/review and annual report? o Can't impacts be pulled from the impact database? Including impacts in POW is duplicative. o NIFA is asking for the same info so many times, which makes a lot of extra work. If REEport worked better, we could actually pull this data out and not need to do these reports over and over. Can NIFA mine this data from REEport? o **Guidance for David Jackson: Eliminate reporting outcomes and impacts from REEport, these are available to NIFA in other ways** o Quantitative outcome component, **Guidance for DJ: They are important but our faculty may not be able/prepared to do these analyses. Congress wants good stories, not numbers, which can be obtained in different ways** • Software Functionality: Issues with formatting, pasting, field limitations, browser issues. Generally cumbersome. • Ultimately, take POW and annual report down to only required factors. David Jackson will push for maximum simplification at the POW Panel meeting in June.	
16.0	NIFA Update, Link to Dr. Chitnis' slides: http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/April2015files/Chitnis%20NCRA%20Spring%20Meeting%202015.pdf	For information only.
17.0	Midwest Climate Hub Update, Jerry Hatfield: • Vulnerability assessment was just completed. Jerry will send that out for distribution to directors soon. • Jerry described several ways in which the Midwest Climate Hub is partnering with different groups, such as the NCRS adaptation toolkit, conservation planning in a Nebraska research forest, working with specialty crops groups and developing better long range forecasts for decision making, etc. Northern Plains Area Hub, Justin Derner: • Regional Outreach Director – Windy Kelley – starts April 20 (she will also be the University of Wyoming Extension Specialist in Extreme Weather Events and	Jeff will forward the vulnerability assessment report on to NC directors upon receipt.

	Agricultural Resiliency) - Vulnerability assessments for Northern Plains coming out shortly - Cooperative Extension meeting of the 6 states will be in Colorado on June 9-11 - Presentation at Future of Beef Industry in Nebraska in early January - Looking at Ag Economics aspects with University of Wyoming Ag Experiment Station agreement with livestock gains from long-term grazing treatments (evaluating influence of climate) - Developing Powell Center grant looking at primary and secondary production from 18 Long-Term Agro-ecosystem Research (LTAR) network sites - Developing a NIFA Climate Resilient Land use grant on livestock grazing focus (due in June 2015) with Texas A&M leading (David Briske) - Climate Hub is a partner in funded grant with Colorado State University, National Drought Mitigation Center, High Plains Regional Climate Center, and North Central Climate Science Center evaluating drought resiliency on the Wind River Indian Reservation (1.3 million acres)	
18.0	Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research (FFAR) Board Update, Doug Buhler - Next board meeting is in June - Background: - Little guidance was given on how to spend $200M allocated to the Board - Match specifics unknown - Board contracted with a consulting firm to help organize the group and get things going, a lot of activity occurring around building a financial model - Now: - During their Feb meeting, the Board laid out scientific program 7 subgroups of board working on concepts in the different areas. - Committed to having something out the door before the end of calendar year	For information only.
20.0	Open Data Session I, link to Marianne Stowell Bracke's slides: http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/April2015files/2015%20Spring%20NCRA%20Bracke.pdf	For information only.
21.0	2016 NCRA Spring Meeting location A motion to consider the NCRA spring meeting	Motion passed to regularly include locations outside the

		locations to include locations outside the region on a regular basis was passed. • Concerns on cost and the perception of hosting meetings outside our region were discussed • The 2016 meeting location was discussed (Chicago, Puerto Rico, etc.), but none were decided upon. Chicago is still on the table. • Jeff, Chris, and the NCRA Executive Committee will discuss ideas over the next month and secure a location. • Hector Santiago from UNL would be able to help with educational/speaker/tour contacts in Puerto Rico.	NC region for the annual NCRA spring meeting. Jeff, Chris, and the NCRA Executive Committee will discuss ideas over the next month and secure a location.
23.0	Open Data Session II, link to Meredith Morovati's slides: http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/April2015files/Updated%20Dryad%20Presentation%205.26.15.pdf	For information only
24.0	Industrial Hemp in the NC Region Discussion • Background: Farm Bill wording opened up the option for industrial hemp research, if allowed at the state level. Significant state regulations must be in place to use federal money. Please refer to Farm Bill Language .pdf and letter from Sonny Ramaswamy here: http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/April2015files/ • S region is working on multistate project, led by KY and TN • MSU: lots of interest. Seed documentation needed to ensure it is actually "industrial" (THC levels, etc.). There are some DEA issues, so MSU is concerned about their federal funding being used for hemp research. • MO: Two bills are currently in the general assembly, allowing for "those licensed by Dept of Ag", which adds protection, but nothing has been passed yet. • NDSU: 1st state to authorize, has approval for research, very interested in this work, they have the seed from Canada due to connections with Manitoba. No med marijuana laws in the state anywhere near approval. • IL: Industrial hemp research is legal in the state, but has been complicated by the medical marijuana law implementation delayed. UIUC barraged with requests for partnerships. Waiting on medical marijuana before proceeding further. • NE: Bill approving industrial hemp research passed last year, and it's fallen to the NE Dept of Ag to develop the regulations. Probably not planting any hemp this year. Hector Santiago is the hemp contact at UNL. • Purdue: Planning to grow this year, DEA finalizing	For information only

	approval now. The Indiana state chemist, who works on the state regulations, is currently on campus working with researchers on applications. No medical marijuana complications in Indiana. Probably planting in an out-of-the-way, not very visible field. Ron Turco is the contact for industrial hemp at Purdue.	
25.0	State Reports: Directors each discussed budget, facilities, enrollment, and other issues of importance in their individual state.	For information only.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:15 pm on April 1, 2015.

Minutes respectfully submitted by C. Hamilton, NCRA Assistant Director.

Back to Top

AGENDA BRIEFS

Written Briefs:
Impact Database Update
ESCOP Futuring
ESCOP Capital Infrastructure
1890s' Wellness Walk

Item 4.1: NCRA/ESS Excellence in Leadership Award
Presenters: Ernie Minton and Jeff Jacobsen

Action Requested: Approval of this process for selecting future NC winners

Draft Process

NCRA Leadership Award Selection Process (2015)

The NCRA will participate in the ESS Leadership Award process and recognize outstanding leadership following the recognized national guidelines at:
http://escop.ncsu.edu/Docs/ESS%20Leadership%20Excellence%20Awards%20FINAL.pdf

Nominations and applications will be solicited from the NCRA Office in the fall with designated deadlines. The Office will review the nominations for compliance and completeness. The final material will be prepared for Committee review and selection prior to the spring meeting. The selection Committee will be comprised of the Chair, Incoming Chair, Past Chair (in practice, the Executive Committee) and a past award recipient (if available). The Committee will be assisted by the Executive Director and Assistant Director. If it is determined by the Office that a conflict of interest exists, at-large director(s) will be solicited for participation. The Incoming Chair will serve as chair of the Committee and make the recommendation(s) to the Committee. The Committee recommendation will be forwarded to the NCRA directors for final approval at the Spring meeting.

This award will be presented as deserving nominees are made known to and accepted by the Committee and will not necessarily be presented every year. Normally, one award may be presented annually during the spring NCRA meeting. However, under extraordinary circumstances as defined by Committee, and pursuant to the meritorious achievements of the nominees, as many as three awards may be issued in any given year.

Back to Top

Item 5.1: NCRA Budget
Presenters: Jeff Jacobsen and Chris Hamilton

Action Requested: Approval of the FY2016 NCRA office operating budget and a decision on which assessment calculation scenario (0, 1, or 2) to use.

INCOME

	FY2014*	FY2015		FY2016
Description	Final	Budget	Estimated	Budget
State Assessments	370,763	370,763	370,763	370,763
Account Carryover (MSU & UW)	14,824	171,220	171,220	95,985
TOTAL INCOME	**385,587**	**541,983**	**541,983**	**466,748**

EXPENSE

	FY2014	FY2015		FY2016
Description	Final	Budget	Estimated	Budget
NCRA				
Regional Initiatives	-	-	-	12,000
NCRA Contingency (2% of budgeted expenses)	7,226	10,200	7,480	8,198
NCRA Subtotal	**7,226**	**10,200**	**7,480**	**20,198**

	FY2014	FY2015		FY2016
MICHIGAN STATE				
Executive Director Salary	61,667	185,000	185,000	185,000
Fringe	14,800	48,285	48,285	48,285
Office Operating	-	60,000	8,000	5,000
Travel	-	35,000	28,000	35,000
Training	-	-	-	9,500
Moving Costs	9,406	-	-	-
MSU Administrative Fees (2.04% actual expenses)	-	-	5,493	5,779
MSU Subtotal	**85,873**	**328,285**	**274,778**	**288,564**

	FY2014	FY2015		FY2016
U of WISCONSIN				
Assistant Director Salary	54,614	61,141	61,141	61,141
Fringe	18,842	21,399	21,399	21,705
Office Operating	3,614	5,000	5,000	5,000
Travel	23,492	8,000	8,000	10,000
Training	1,758	1,600	1,659	9,500
Meeting Support	3,818	2,000	2,000	2,000
UW Subtotal	**106,138**	**99,140**	**99,199**	**109,346**

TOTAL EXPENSE	**199,237**	**437,625**	**381,457**	**418,108**
BALANCE	**186,350**	**104,358**	**160,526**	**48,640**

NOTES:

*ED Directors transitions

NCRA assessments have not changed since FY10

MSU FY16 fringe: 24% estimated (24% FY15)

UW FY16 fringe: 35.5% (35% FY15; 34.5% FY14; 41% FY13)

UW FY16 salary increase: 1% estimated

ED FY16 training: Wharton Executive Education program

AD FY16 training: LEAD21, UW Grant Writing Class

Decision item

NCRA Accounts at MSU and UW

Account at MSU	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17
MSU Starting Balance	-	-	95,985	103,859
MSU Income*	-	370,763	370,763	370,763
MSU Expenses	85,873	274,778	300,564	287,950
MSU Expenses + UW invoice	85,873	274,778	362,889	387,950
MSU Ending Balance/Carryover	-	95,985	103,859	78,913
NCRA Contingency (2% of budgeted expenses)		*7,480*	*8,198*	*7,759*

Account at UW	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17
UW Starting Balance	14,824	171,220	47,021	-
UW Income*	370,763	-	-	-
UW Expenses	214,367	99,199	109,346	100,000
UW Ending Balance/Carryover	171,220	72,021	-	-
UW Operating Reserve (3 mo)		*25,000*	*25,000*	*25,000*
*Estimated UW Invoice to MSU***			*62,325*	*100,000*

NOTES:

*NCRA assessment same level since FY10

**UW will invoice MSU quarterly for actual expenses

State	Scenario 0 FY 15 Assessment	60% State Equal Share Assessments	Hatch Multistate Allocations by State 40% Proportional to State's Share of MRF*		Scenario 1 Proposed FY16 Assessment	Hatch Total Capacity Allocations by State Total Average Capacity Funds	% of Total Capacity Funds	Scenario 2 Proposed FY16 Assessment	Difference from Existing	FY2016 with 1% increase from MRF 40% Proportional to State's Share of MRF*		Proposed FY16 Assessment
Illinois	$33,161	$18,538	$148,305	9.48%	$14,063	$32,601	6,681,549	10.03%	$33,406	$245	9.48%	$14,200	$32,923
Indiana	$30,862	$18,538	$148,305	7.70%	$11,417	$29,955	6,154,923	9.24%	$32,235	$1,372	7.70%	$11,534	$30,257
Iowa	$34,184	$18,538	$148,305	15.27%	$22,640	$41,178	7,465,051	11.20%	$35,150	$966	15.27%	$22,873	$41,596
Kansas	$29,869	$18,538	$148,305	7.08%	$10,496	$29,034	4,232,618	6.35%	$27,957	-$1,912	7.08%	$10,605	$29,329
Michigan	$31,515	$18,538	$148,305	8.58%	$12,728	$31,266	6,305,604	9.46%	$32,570	$1,055	8.58%	$12,852	$31,575
Minnesota	$31,470	$18,538	$148,305	8.08%	$11,980	$30,518	6,144,520	9.22%	$32,211	$741	8.08%	$12,103	$30,826
Missouri	$30,091	$18,538	$148,305	7.22%	$10,702	$29,240	5,942,315	8.92%	$31,761	$1,670	7.22%	$10,815	$29,538
Nebraska**	$31,648	$18,538	$148,305	8.19%	$12,145	$30,683	4,154,450	6.23%	$27,783	-$3,865	8.19%	$12,268	$30,991
North Dakota	$27,244	$18,538	$148,305	5.44%	$8,064	$26,603	2,895,329	4.34%	$24,981	-$2,263	5.44%	$8,148	$26,872
Ohio	$32,553	$18,538	$148,305	8.75%	$12,983	$31,521	7,347,052	11.02%	$34,887	$2,334	8.75%	$13,106	$31,830
South Dakota	$27,318	$18,538	$148,305	5.48%	$8,133	$26,671	3,049,679	4.58%	$25,325	-$1,993	5.48%	$8,208	$26,932
Wisconsin	$30,847	$18,538	$148,305	8.73%	$12,954	$31,492	6,272,921	9.41%	$32,497	$1,650	8.73%	$13,077	$31,800
TOTAL	$370,763	$222,458		100.00%	$148,305	$370,763	66,646,012	100.00%	$370,761		100.00%	$149,788	$374,471

NOTES:

*UPDATED: Proportion of State share of MRF based upon rolling 3-year average (FFY2012-14) as published by NIFA (www.csrees.usda.gov/business/awards/formula/hatch.html).

** Nebraska's duplicate 2015 payment of $31,648 will be applied to FY2016.

Back to Top

17

Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA Executive Director
Summary of Recent and Future Activities (2014-2015)

NCRA Activities

- Completed NCRA State visits in first year (MI in progress)
- Developed NCRA Plan with a suite of activities identified, vetted by Executive Committee and Chris Hamilton/others which will be discussed and prioritized by NCRA Directors at the Spring meeting, ultimately, leading to numerous priority future initiatives/activities
- Participated with the MRC, Multistate Award, ESS Leadership Award reviews and selection
- NRSP1 as NCRA representative; NIMSS RFP and award to Clemson ITT; Redesign Team with Chris Hamilton
- NCRA Executive Committee (monthly Zoom calls and other correspondence/ communications, agenda planning, NCRA Plan discussions and future path forward)
- Participate with Climate Hubs, NC climate-connected AES and CES faculties, Dairy Research Institute, NC Sun Grant Program, Climate and Corn-based Cropping Systems CAP, NCRA Initiatives, NCRA Plan (tbd)
- Worked with Chris Hamilton on developing a new NCRA office budget format, to encompass the NCRA offices and to potentially include a three-year rolling average of state Hatch Multistate allocations to more consistently provide a basis to calculate each state's (40% share) assessment amount
- Explore opportunities for Canadian – US partnerships with an I29-I35 H75 Agriculture Innovation Corridor with Jamshed Merchant and his office
- Attend Webinars important to NCRA and ESS (Sightlines Capital Infrastructure, AFRI Review, Open Access Data, Centers of Excellence)
- Serve on Search Committee for the Director of the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development (NCRCRD)
- Administrative Advisor to NC Multistate Committees as opportunities arise (tbd)
- Serve on the Sightlines Infrastructure Steering Committee
- Other short-term activities as needed

National Activities

- Completed ~6 months of support to ESCOP Chair Steve Slack
- Provide ED support for the ESCOP Science and Technology (S&T) Committee as Vice Chair with linkages to the Pest Management Strategies subcommittee (NIPMCC) and the Social Sciences subcommittee; Refined Multistate Research Award narrative; Created S&T topical path forward with monthly phone conferences; Facilitate the Multistate Award Review
- Refined the ESS Leadership Award process and reassigned to ESCOP Chair responsibilities with regional rotation
- Provided leadership for the Open Access Data Workshop session during the Fall ESS meeting
- Participate in the monthly Chairs Advisory Committee (CAC) calls, participate (as available) in the monthly Budget and Legislative (B&L) calls
- Instigated a half day visit with research EDs and NIFA leadership, NPLs, Budget, Reporting and Communication staff
- Create and edit communication materials as needed

Updated Travel and Activities

APLU Annual Meeting, November 2-4, 2014, Orlando, FL (**Action:** National network and

support)

NIFA and CES Retreat, November 12-13, 2014, Washington, DC [**Action:** ESS support to CES initiative along with ESCOP representative Clarence Watson]

University of Wisconsin Visit, December 1-4, 2014, Madison, WI [**Action:** Orientations to WI people and programs]

CARE Panel Manager, January 27-30, 2015, Washington, DC [**Action:** Complete the inaugural CARE Panel activities, provide future recommendations and orient to critical issues across U.S. and in particular the North Central region]

New Director Discussion at the University of Minnesota, February 3-5, 2015 [**Action:** System orientation and relationship building]

CARET/AHS and ESCOP Meeting, March 2-4, 2015, Washington, DC [**Action:** Network, participate in ESCOP meeting, Social Sciences subcommittee (S&T), NIFA meeting]

North Central Region SUN Grant, March 17-19, 2015, Minneapolis, MN [**Action:** Participate in the annual reporting session and Advisory Board meeting]

Michigan State University Visit, March-April-May, 2015, East Lansing, MI [**Action:** Orientation to MSU people and programs, Complete NCRA State visits]

NCRA Spring Meeting, March 30-April 1, 2015, San Antonio, TX

National Multistate Coordinating Committee, April 15-17, 2015, Washington, DC [**Action:** Participate with research and Extension EDs, APLU, Cornerstone and NIFA]

Great Lakes Specialty Crop Climate Consortium, April 21-22, 2015, Chicago, IL [**Action:** Create the 'pilot' opportunity to explore research consortium with MI, OH, PA, NY]

Canadian-US Agriculture Innovation Corridor, April 26-27, 2015, Minneapolis, MN [**Action:** Network and create opportunities for partnerships and economic development]

Healthy Soil for Healthy Waters, Hypoxia Task Force, SERA-46 Meeting, May 18-21, 2015 Columbus, OH [**Action:** Network, technical interest and NCRA issue of interest]

Mini-Land Grant and NCRA Summer Meeting, Rapid City, SD July 12-14, 2015

1890 Institutions 125th Celebration, Washington, DC, July 15-16, 2015 [**Action:** Network and support of key LGU partner]

Joint COPS, Providence, RI, July 19-22, 2015 [**Action:** Network, support, ESCOP and Science and Technology committee meeting]

National Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC), Washington, DC, September 2015 [**Action:** Network and support as S&T responsibility]

Fall ESS, SAES, ARD Meeting, Charlotte, NC, September 28-October 1, 2015 [**Action:** National and NCRA meeting support and participation]

CARE Panel Manager, November 2-6, 2015, Washington, DC [**Action:** Complete final year as Panel Manager]

APLU Annual Meeting, Indianapolis, IN, November 15-18, 2015 [**Action:** Network and ESCOP support]

Chris Hamilton, NCRA Assistant Director
2014-2015 Tasks and Accomplishments

1. **REGIONAL ACTIVITIES**

   NCRA
   - Manage all aspects of the NCRA office (meetings, financials, website maintenance, etc.), working closely and effectively with UW's CALS business services and also MSU (NCRA and ED budget).
   - Worked with NCRA ED on developing a new NCRA office budget format, to potentially include a three-year rolling average of state Hatch Multistate allocations to more accurately calculate each state's assessment amount.
   - Participate in monthly NCRA Executive Committee calls
   - Continue to work closely with Robin Shepard of NCCEA to maintain strong communications between NCRA and NCCEA. Our current focus is on the regional USDA climate hubs and the role of EXT and AES.
   - Create reports and spreadsheets useful to the NC region, as needed and upon request (salary data, AES allocations, etc.).
   - Continue to maintain NCRA Twitter account (@NCRegionalAssoc), posting relevant stories about AES research, news, etc. and leveraging stories to national attention. Twitter account now has 129 followers, including several association colleges and universities, national organizations, government partners, industry, and others.
   - Provide high-level technical services to the NCRA and other regions
     - Webinar hosting
     - Conduct remote screen shares with users to help solve local and NIMSS issues/questions, as well as lead training sessions
     - Regular back-ups of all NCRA office files at UW-Madison
     - Facilitate easy data sharing through cloud-based file servers (MRC files, ESCOP materials, etc.)
     - Online Qualtrics Survey creation
     - Manage all NC email lists and NCRA Directories
     - Can create WordPress websites now, if needed by the region

   North Central Region Multistate Research Portfolio

   - **Regular Support:** Regularly provide support to Administrative Advisors and SAES staff on navigating the NIMSS and interpretation of national and regional multistate guidelines. Over the past year, I have also continued to answer questions and provide information on ways around NIMSS' malfunctions and manually complete many NIMSS tasks and messages that used to be automated.
   - **FY2016 Renewing NC Projects**: Facilitated the renewal of 12 projects expiring in 2014 and 14 midterm reviews. Coordinated the NC AAs, NC Advisory Committees, and the Multistate Review Committee. See the April 2015 MRC report for details.

- **ESS Award**: Coordinated NC nominations for the Excellence in Multistate Research award. Received one nomination.
- **National Excellence in Multistate Research Award:** Solicited and coordinated the NC nominations for this award. I also read and will assist with the review and selection process during our spring MRC meeting. We received four nominations this year.

2. NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

- Continued to provide ESCOP administrative assistance to Steve Slack (ESCOP Chair, FY2014) through the end of FY2014. (CAC call agendas/notes, July 2014 ESCOP Meeting, and Fall ESS Business meeting agenda for Jekyll Island).
- With the NCRA ED, provide administrative leadership and assistance to NRSP1. Schedule calls, take minutes, coordinate committee activities, etc.
- With the NCRA ED, provide administrative leadership and assistance to the ESCOP Science and Technology (S&T) Committee. Schedule calls, take minutes, coordinate committee activities, etc.
- Covered all W-region NIMSS duties for three months (Dec – Feb) while Sarah Lupis was on maternity leave.
- Assisted Sarah Lupis with NRSP-RC tasks while she was on maternity leave (coordinated renewals, peer reviews, provided NIMSS support, etc.).
- Provided support to Rick Lindroth (lead AA) and John Bamberg (ARS, NRSP6 technical lead) for NRSP6's renewal and peer review process.
- Will participate in NIMSS update at the NERAOC meeting again in May.
- Currently serving as the ESCOP-side project manager for the Clemson ITT NIMSS redesign. Hold monthly calls with the ESCOP team, take call notes, primary point of contact for Clemson ITT developers.
- Partner with NIFA multistate team to coordinate NIMSS project/participant approvals, occasionally serve as regional liaison for REEport issues, and other regional-USDA administrative tasks, as needed.

3. PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- Successfully completed UC Berkeley's Project Risk Management class (obtained a grade of A), within their graduate project management series
- Obtained a UW-Madison Continuing Education Project Management Certification (2/18/2015), part of their Certified Public Manager series.
- Successfully completed both the basic and advanced (server-side management) WordPress class to learn other options for creating and managing web pages. Installed and successfully set up a development server on my computer to be able to easily create and upload WordPress webpages if needed by the region.

Item 5.3

Agenda Brief: NIMSS Redesign Update
February 22, 2015
C. Hamilton, NCRA Office

Clemson ITT (Information Technology Team) has completed all aspects of user registration and management. Systems are in place for allowing users to register for stations that already exist, as well as an approval process (through regional system administrators) for users who cannot find a station for themselves from the available options.

The proposal/project management system has been finished and is currently being themed to match with the design documents, sent as an attachment. That process should be completed during the week of February 23, 2015. The Appendix E system and the project invitation system are currently under development.   Clemson ITT has begun work on migrating in the legacy data from the old system and will conclude that process this month (February 2015). Currently, they are on schedule to complete all aspects of the system no later than August 31 of this year.   Beta testing discussions by the NIMSS Redesign Team have begun and we hope to begin testing within the next month or two.

The official ESCOP/Clemson contract is still pending approvals, and the NRSP1 funds have been approved and sent to USDA/NIFA for allocation to Clemson AES (NIMSS) and Colorado State (Impact Writer) from the FY2015 appropriation.

Action requested: None; for information only.

Back to Top

NCRA Activities (2014 to future)

MISSION:

The North Central Regional Association (NCRA) of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors will be a leader in efficiently and effectively promoting and building research capacities relevant to the North Central Region and Nation.

The NCRA is an association of research directors/administrators in the state agricultural experiment station system with the 1862 Land-grant Universities in the North Central (NC) Region that:

- seeks input to identify challenges in agriculture, environmental, food and natural resource systems important to the North Central Region that can be addressed by research;
- facilitates the cooperative and collaborative management of high quality regional and national research programs in partnership with the public and private sectors;
- encourages and establishes relevant research activities that are multistate, multi-institutional, multi-disciplinary and multi-functional; and
- links with Extension and others to translate NCRA research impacts across regional, national and international audiences to address societal challenges.

The NCRA will:

- solicit stakeholders' and NCRA members' opinions in a systematic planning and prioritization process that updates the North Central Region research focus;
- provide a forum for interaction of scientists and research administrators to coordinate and promote research activities;
- provide and support a regional office to serve, represent, network and enhance priority research programs;
- communicate the impacts and outcomes of regional research to interested groups and advocate for the NCRA research system with other partners;
- facilitate the integration of research activities with teaching, Extension and international activities; and
- participate in regional and national activities with relevant agencies, organizations and alliances.

MULTISTATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE (MRC):
1) Improve the effectiveness of research portfolio management
   a. Ensure that the current suite of multistate projects are linked to priority NC research themes (NOTE: this assumes there are agreed-upon themes)
      i. Cross reference (matrix) NC multistate projects with Battelle Study, ESCOP Roadmap, USDA NIFA priorities, PCAST Report, ECOP Strategic Opportunities, Natural Resources Roadmap, NCCEA, key federal agencies, others. Also, need to account for NCR faculty participation in other regional committees.
      ACTION: Align MRC priorities and review processes. Consider all options (combine, terminate, create). Identify research gaps and emerging issues and determine next steps.
      ii. Future Multistate projects – Industrial hemp (SERA likely developing), big data, open access data, unmanned aerial systems, viticulture, microbiome, oats, organic systems, local/urban/regional food systems, others?
      ACTION: Openly consider priority of NC projects and the various committee options.
   b. Create/enhance assessment methods to get stakeholder (groups vary by task/issue) and peer input
      i. Do we routinely ask the same (or any) questions of NCAC groups?
      ii. Do we ask anything of the state/regional/national commodity groups or organizations, foundations and other federal agencies?
      ACTION: Review the interactions and review contributions from NCAC groups. Encourage stronger NCAC discussion and input. Discuss existing state mechanisms to receive input and determine if these could (should) be scaled up or other alternatives considered.
   c. Are MRC funding approaches across the NCR appropriate and adequate? Are there alternative models to be considered?
      ACTION: Inventory of use, needs/opportunity. NCRA could discuss implications and alternatives.
   d. Assist in the training of new AAs and resourcing new directors
      ACTION: Review current approaches, materials and information. Create and update as needed.
   e. Other

CATALYZE GROWTH AND QUALITY IN PARTNERSHIPS:
1) Explore new networks across thematic areas with faculty expertise, shared analytical/service/pheno and genotyping/clinical facilities, watershed/wetland labs, climate science centers, geospatial technologies and many others. Integrate and optimize the LTARs, LTERs, forest stations and field station system investments in regional/national system.
      ACTION: Create an inventory template(s) for each state to complete prior to meeting and conduct a 'speed dating' session(s).
2) What is the strategic relationship between NCRA and NCR Administrative Heads, Extension, CARET and Academic Programs? Is there any type of regional (maybe national) programmatic aspirations to identify and articulate an NCR agenda or enhance key programs (e.g. across climate, water, health and other themes)? NCCEA is a recognized regional entity with potential priority focus given the NCRA.

> ACTION: Directors discuss potential opportunities within and across mission areas, approaches to future conversations and desired outcomes.

3) Enhance graduate student training and synergies across the NCRA (e.g. graduate student exchange and experiences, recruitment, shared NCR courses)

> ACTION: Discuss with directors, identify other key groups, topics and approaches necessary for potential collaborations.

4) Strategic discussions, actions and leveraging with regional faculty expertise across NCRA institutions and:
   a. USDA ARS, National Animal Disease Center and other national labs
   b. Danforth Center and others
   c. Research centers and stations (with faculty and/or staff) and others
   d. Existing Centers/Institutes at LGUs and programs in veterinary medicine, biomedical and engineering
   e. Private sector research programs

> ACTION: to be determined

5) Explore the strategic opportunities for programmatic collaborations
   a. Canadian and Mexican universities (given the recent addition into APLU and potential existing linkages as well as proximity to several NCRA States)
   b. Commodity groups in region/nation
   c. NRCS, Forest Service, BLM, Conservation Districts and others
   d. 1890, 1994, other institutions
   e. Regional Governor's Association or State Departments of Ag/Environment/Natural Resource Agencies

> ACTION: Discuss, prioritize organizations and alignment with priorities.

6) Create new and expand stakeholder assessment, consultation and implementation activities

> ACTION: to be determined

7) Other

ENHANCE THE NCRA:

1) Periodic communication (e.g. conference calls or emails) with Executive Committee
2) Add value to the region and NCRA brand
   a. Communication - E-news blast/NC News….consider developing an electronic one
   b. Website (Overarching purpose, Who uses it, Quick vs Full information, can it handle phone/tablets?, directors only portal needed?, RSS feeds or other mechanisms to dynamically highlight research from members or have a rotating version of the periodic publications, home page link priority/new ones, etc.) [NOTE: website redone in 2011]
3) Engage with and build relationships with key groups (USDA NIFA, Cornerstone Government Affairs, APLU)
4) Professional development for AD and ED
   a. Project management, strategic persuasion workshops, rotation to regional/national officer meetings, LEAD21, FSLI and others
5) Promote regional multistate awardees through NCRA action
6) Regional meetings (in general)
   a. Spring focus (in-depth sessions)
      i. Open access data
      ii. P&T (with the changing dynamics in grant success and changing expectations, are we prepared with our academic requirements?) and TT or NTT faculty options

        iii. Other themes – water, climate, soil health, organic systems, microbiomes, anti-microbial resistance

  b. Mini Land-grant focus (best practice sessions)
      i. Approaches with start-up and retention packages
      ii. Ins and outs of program redirection, evolution or elimination
      iii. New LGUs (e.g. Central State University)
      iv. Innovative arrangements or actions tied to space renovations and (re)allocation
      v. Succession planning with faculty programs and including administrative positions
      vi. State sharing based upon topic guidance
      vii. Creating educational opportunities for faculty, legislators, state agencies, federal officials, upper administration regarding stations/centers and other aspects of unique operation

  c. Fall (state and federal budget, topics more directly related to budget)
      i. How has the off-the-top funding mechanism been used in the NCRA?
      ii. Current practices and future trends with licensing, patents and trademarks for domestic and international markets. Feedback from tech transfer experiences from faculty
      iii. Funding alternatives targeted to operations, maintenance, renovations or new construction at centers or stations (e.g. timber, gravel, livestock, stone, farmer-owned, foundation/gifts, endowments, development professional focus)
      iv. Pros and cons of user fees associated with greenhouses, labs, centers/station, equipment
      v. Uses of NIFA capacity funds and leveraging to capture competitive funds
      ACTION: Discuss idea, approaches, remain nimble and integrate into meetings.

7) NCRA Activities
  a. Professional advancement and best practices exchange for staff and leaders at centers/stations organized as NCCC?
  b. Diversity initiative in research administration (or a multistate committee)
  c. Create initiatives (courses, training, joint committees; discussion with grad program leaders) with graduate students to leverage and grow the NC enterprise
  d. Provide seed money for regional initiatives to leverage with external groups and other institutions (Organic, Dairy Research Institute, Climate, Water, Big data, Open Access Data, others)
  e. Provide accountability actions with USDA and others (e.g., NIMSS, Impact Database)
  f. Facilitate a service for dept/unit reviews (like USDA used to do; recently this has been mentioned as a restart within the agency)
  g. Initiate a rotation of state visits for ED
  h. Several states conduct a Washington, DC visit for new faculty. Should there be an analogous program for existing faculty and/or NCRA directors?
  i. Has there ever been an organized suite of state visits for NCRA directors?
    ACTION: Discuss and prioritize.

8) Other

_____

NCRA Historical Themes (1999-2003)
-Agricultural Production, Processing and Distribution
-Genetic Resources Development and Manipulation
-Integrated Pest Management

-Natural Resources and the Environment
-Economic Development and Policy
-Social Change and Development
-Food and Nutrition

ESCOP Science Roadmap Thematic Areas (November 2010)
-Sustainability, Competitiveness and Profitability of Food and Agricultural Systems
-Adapt to and Mitigate Climate Change
-Energy Security and Development of Bioeconomy
-Safe, Secure and Abundant Food Supply
-Human Health, Nutrition and Wellness
-Environmental Stewardship
-Individual, Family and Community Development and Resilience

Natural Resources Roadmap (May 2014)
Sustainability, Water, Climate Change, Agriculture, Energy, Education

USDA AFRI (2014 grants)
-Plant Health and Production and Plant Products
-Animal Health and Production and Animal Products
-Food Safety, Nutrition and Health
-Renewable Energy, Natural Resources and Environment
-Agriculture Systems and Technology
-Agriculture Economics and Rural Communities

GENERAL
-Sustainable Plant and Animal Production
-Natural Resources and Ecosystems
-Environmental Stewardship
-Development of Human and Community Resources
-Food Safety and Security
-Bioenergy and Bioproduct

[Back to Top](#)

Item 7.0: ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee Agenda Brief
Presenters: Karen Plaut and Ernie Minton
For information only

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

Chair: Gary Thompson (NERA)	**Liaisons**
Delegates: Barry Bequette (ARD) Carolyn Brooks (ED-ARD) Karen Plaut (NCRA) Ernie Minton NCRA Tim Phipps (NERA) John Wraith (NERA) Bill Brown (SAAESD) Saied Mostaghimi (SAAESD) Jim Moyer (WAAESD) Jeff Steiner (WAAESD)	Rick Klemme (ECOP Liaison) 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) Jim Richards (Cornerstone) Hunt Shipman (Cornerstone) Vernie Hubert (Cornerstone)
Executive Vice-Chair Mike Harrington (WAAESD)	*****Chair elect

The B&L Committee will be holding a breakfast meeting on March 3 in conjunction with the AHS-CARET meetings. Discussions will focus on how the committee can be effective in working with the ECOP Budget and Legislative Committee to provide integrated approaches and leadership in developing a defined "advocacy infrastructure model" for future budget efforts such as the Water Security Initiative.

BAC Priorities: The BAC met by conference call on Feb 10, 2015 to finalize the system's response to the President's FY 2016 Budget Proposal   The BAC approved appropriations requests for the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) with the exception of the competitive programs that had been incorporated into the capacity programs. Capacity programs should remain as such, not competitive. A slightly modified "Dear Colleague" letter has been distributed to all institutions with a request that members be contacted. Small changes to the McIntire Stennis (+5%) and 1994 (+$3 Million) requests were approved. No other changes in 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. The system will remain silent on the "Innovation Institutes." In keeping with past practice, The BAC position is to endorse the President's Budget or our 2016 numbers whichever are higher.

All documents related the federal budget and the Farm Bill are located at the land-grant.org website.

Back to Top

Item 9.0: MRC Report
Presenter: Archie Clutter, MRC Chair FY2015

Action Requested: Approval of below MRC recommendations for project renewals, revisions, midterm reviews, and approval of MRC recommendation for NC nomination to the ESCOP Excellence in Multistate Research Award 2015.

Item	Proj Type MRC Rvwr	Current Proj # (Temp #)	Title	NCRA AA	MRC Recommendations
1.00	**New/Renewal Projects**				
1.10	**NC-Type**				
	Merchen	NC1023 (NC_temp1023)	Engineering for food safety and quality	D. Jackson, NE (10)	Proposal for renewal of a long-standing multistate project whose membership includes most of the food engineers working on food safety and quality in the U.S. Committee members have a very productive history and have been important contributors to developments in technology in the food processing industry. The group continues to transition to a model of working collaboratively on true multi-institutional projects rather than working independently towards common objectives. This proposal expands the multi-state collaborative process by developing an "equipment registry" that would allow accessibility of equipment among institutions to help obtain preliminary data. The committee seems to offer progressive thought in transition of foci from the old project to a primary new focus on characterization of physical, chemical and biological properties of food, biological and engineered materials using advanced analytical techniques in the renewal project. Other objectives of the proposal include development of new and sustainable technologies for food processing, mathematical modeling to predict and optimize safety and quality, and knowledge dissemination to various stakeholders. Experimental plan is broad but sufficiently descriptive in identifying contributions of individual institutions to each objective and subthemes within objectives. Good plans are presented for outreach activities including "boots on the ground" food industry workshops. Annual reports that document extensive participation by the membership have been filed each year for the previous five-year cycle. Administrative advisor provides strong supportive comments. This is a good proposal with ambitious but realistic deliverables and strong promise of impact. Recommend Approval.
	Clutter, Colletti	NC1100 (NC_temp1100)	Land Grant University Innovation Diffusion Enhancement	S. Lovejoy, MI (09)	J. Colletti: A project designed to "identify and develop new strategies to increase the efficiency of agricultural innovation diffusion systems". An important project that seeks to enhance the success of IP generated by NC land grant universities and deployed in rural America. This project extends the work from NC1100 by connecting NC faculty with "ready-to-go" technologies with potential investors through a series of webinars. Faculty participants are coached and mentored prior to the webinar. The audience is comprised of individuals (investors, business owners, venture capitalists, etc.). There are four objectives, all clearly stated and relevant

| | | | | | to the project. The methods section could be re-written to more clearly link methods to objectives, but it is acceptable.   The methodology is basically have webinars and assess them via a set of surveys to the faculty and audience. The output and impact from the previous project are modest - 15 webinars and no clear "win" in terms of the project causing additional technology to be deployed in NC region, although there seem to be some "in-process" technology transfers. The apparent engagement (Appendix E- Participant List) in the NC regions is very modest. (I could not find annual reports for all five previous years. I may be looking in the wrong place.)

<mark>Recommend approval.</mark>

A. Clutter: This committee/project aims to develop strategies to increase the efficiency of agricultural innovation diffusion systems (technology transfer), with a focus on transfer from universities to firms and especially rural firm owners. The challenges because of the complexity of university tech-transfer processes, policies and concerns, and the tendency for firms to be reluctant to engage universities for technology even though there is great potential value for them at the university, are real and well articulated by the committee participants. The committee previously began a webinar series to help disseminate land-grant, university developed technologies to business owners and entrepreneurs, and produced fifteen webinars, each targeting a different group of industry and firms, and achieved a combined participation of approximately 1,200 business owners, entrepreneurs, and community leaders. The proposed renewal includes a stated goal to continue pushing forward with testing innovative systems to improve technology transfer outcomes through centrally managed webinars and a multi-tiered marketing strategy to continue to build a network of stakeholders and researchers. They intend to hold 50 webinars and extend their network to 100,000 participants, but the connection between what was achieved in the previous period, the stated goal, and the methods that will achieve that goal is not entirely clear. There is a relatively small scope to the backgrounds and institutions of the participants, but there is an effort to engage a wide scope through the methods and webinars. The committee appears to have only met virtually in 2011, and reporting during the previous period does not appear to be complete. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Lindroth	NC1183 (NC_temp1183)	Mycotoxins: Biosecurity, Food Safety and Biofuels Byproducts	D. Jackson, NE (11)	Mycotoxins are a chronic and serious problem for cereal- and forage-producing regions of the U.S. They pose significant health hazards to humans and livestock, and are an important national security concern. The project as proposed fits multistate and multidisciplinary requirements. Three objectives are proposed: 1)Develop data for use in risk assessment of mycotoxins in human and animal health, 2) Establish integrated strategies to manage and reduce mycotoxin contamination in cereals and in forages, and 3) Better understand the biology and ecology of mycotoxigenic fungi. The new NC1183 project represents a transitional change: many of its members are faculty not previously involved in the writing of the previous 5-year project. Despite limited resources, the committee members have outlined research that clearly benefits from multistate participation, and have a well-developed outreach plan. Specific benefits will accrue from the proposed: 1) sharing of contaminated samples, 2) sharing of analytical resources, and 3) symposium sponsorship. The milestones section is somewhat under-developed. ==Revision requested: Approve pending revision of milestones section, due in NIMSS by June 1, 2015.==

| Clutter | NC1184 (NC_temp1184) | Molecular Mechanisms Regulating Skeletal Muscle Growth and Differentiation | D. Hamernik, NE (09) | This is a proposed renewal of a long-standing committee studying the regulation of skeletal muscle growth and differentiation, with a goal of more efficient and profitable meat production for livestock producers, and delivery of low cost, high quality food for consumers. The proposed objectives are not significantly different from the previous period, but the planned work has been updated to leverage recent research results from the group and technological advances in the field. |

This is a proposed renewal of a long-standing committee studying the regulation of skeletal muscle growth and differentiation, with a goal of more efficient and profitable meat production for livestock producers, and delivery of low cost, high quality food for consumers. The proposed objectives are not significantly different from the previous period, but the planned work has been updated to leverage recent research results from the group and technological advances in the field.

The committee has demonstrated enhanced impacts through the multi-state model, and the present proposal seems well conceived and positioned to continue similar impacts in the next 5 years. There is expertise represented by the committee that spans the spectrum from very basic muscle biology to livestock production and meat industry applications. The committee has met on a regular basis during the previous 5-year period, and appears to have submitted adequate annual reporting. A milestone/deliverable in the present plan is a symposium at National ASAS meetings.

The Members of the NC-1184 committee have continued to demonstrate success in obtaining outside support from a variety of sources to fund this research, and to publish in quality journals. The committee points out that they have established a strong collaborative environment there have been exchanges of data, scientists, students, samples, cell lines, and reagents, as well as sharing of techniques and on occasion, use of equipment only available at particular stations. There are some specific collaborations outlined in the present plan (e.g., a collaboration of the Iowa and Virginia stations to study heat stress and cellular developments before and following return to thermoneutral conditions; collaboration of the Michigan, Minnesota and Ohio stations to study the effects of acute thermal change on turkey satellite cell growth and development; extension of methods of endocrine profiling for evaluating environmental impacts across work at Missouri, Virginia, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, Florida and Nebraska; a collaboration of the Florida and Virginia stations in which the Rendement Napole model is used to study mechanisms responsible for changes in muscle metabolism and protein turnover). The committee is encouraged to continue to leverage these and search for other ways that the multi-state structure can enhance impacts.

==Recommend Approval==

	Lindroth	NC1186 (NC_temp1186)	Water Management and Quality for Ornamental Crop Production and Health	D. Buhler, MI (10)	Water quality, quantity and management in relation to plant production are major issues for the green industry. This project has been productive in its first five years of existence and this proposal is a strong next step, if not a bit overly ambitious, for the group. The project proposes to address six objectives, ranging from improved irrigation, stormwater, and nutrient management to development of outreach programs to change producer behaviors. The group has a history of strong interaction, which bodes well for the ambitious scope of this project. Overall, this is a well-organized and strong proposal. <mark>Recommend approval.</mark>
	Jacobsen	NC1187 (NC_temp1187)	The Chemical and Physical Nature of Particulate Matter Affecting Air, Water and Soil Quality	J. Harsh, WA (14)	The proposal focuses on the characterization and behavior of particulate matter (PM), sized from silt particles to nanoparticles, across rural and urban systems impacting air, soil and water resources. For example, these PMs are derived from agricultural practices and their interactions with plant nutrients, soil materials, contaminants, engineered nanoparticles in agricultural and natural systems. Elucidating their characteristics and behavior through the quality scientific expertise, while leveraging the sophisticated analytical instrumentation present at universities and national laboratories is commendable. This will enable the full characterization of PMs resulting in an improved ability to fully understand problems related to their behavior and impact in the environment. As a review summary, this proposal should build upon the prior effort (2010-2015). This renewal would be strengthened by additional editing, more direct narrative (see NC guidelines) and advancing the accomplishments with non-duplicative sections. Revisions 1) The Statement of Issue(s) and Justification (and other sections) is largely a copy of the earlier project. Given the performance and collective scientific contributions in the 2010-2015 timeframe, contemporary changes and scientific advancements should reflect the continuing importance of the topic as well as future challenges to be addressed. 2) The Objectives should be 'clear, concise, attainable one-sentence statements' that will aid the participants in making significant progress during the life of the project and will also enable individuals to evaluate joining the project. As written, they are lengthy and include descriptions more suitable to the methods or another section. Lastly, this will enable a clearer path to Outputs, Outcomes and Milestones. 3) The Method section should more closely follow

					the Objectives (as rewritten). 4) The respective roles of the scientists from each participating station are not articulated. In addition, the narrative should describe the nature of collaborative activities more explicitly to ensure that this goes beyond a collection of individual activities. 5) Citations in the text not listed in the Literature Cited section: Scott and Chen (2003), {Service, 2005}, Hanley and Murphy (1970), Madrid et al. (2008), Chen et al. (2014), Ananyeva et al. (2013), Pitumpe Arachchige et al. (2013[two listed], 2014), Zhang et al. (2013), Bose et al. (2009), Wan et al. (2008, 2009), Zhang et al. (2009) and Hess et al. (2009). Citations in the Literature Cited section that are not in the text: Avolio et al. (2014), Genter et al. (2014a, b), Goldstein et al. (2014), Goldstein et al. (2013), Park et al. (2013), Pitumpe Arachchige (2013[two listed]), and Zhao et al. (2013a, b, c). Recommendation: Revise proposal and resubmit in NIMSS by June 1, 2015. Proposal will be re-evaluated before July NCRA meeting.
	Colletti	NC205 (NC_temp205)	Ecology and Management of Arthropods in Corn	S. Pueppke, MI (01)	A continuation of a model NC research project. A critically important research project that is applying cutting edge science and a clear "teamscience" approach to a dynamic problem. The project is exceptionally well written with clear objectives (4) linked to well -developed methods and participants (by state). The previous project produced many outputs and impacts including joint work products with NCCC46. A unique feature of this project is the self-governance via a technical committee, executive committee and subcommittees. Recommend approval.
1.20	NCCC				

	Clutter	NCCC134 (NCCC_temp134)	Applied Commodity Price Analysis, Forecasting, and Market Risk Management	A. Hallam, IA (04)	This is a Regional Coordination Committee that has been active for more than 25 years and has effectively provided sharing of information and facilitating of communication among stations involved in research related to applied commodity price analysis, forecasting and market risk management. The committee annual meetings are part of an annual symposium/conference hosted by the committee each year in St. Louis that includes an excellent program of speakers and topics of value to academicians and the private sector. The committee participants are very productive in this field and publish effectively. The committee has a website that is very informative, including an archive of conference papers. This is an effective and impactful NCCC, and has presented an appropriate plan for the next 5 year term. Recommend approval.

	Jacobsen	NCCC211 (NCCC-temp211)	Cover crops to improve soil health, agricultural sustainability, and environmental quality in the upper Midwest	K. Lamkey, IA (10)	The project provides a mechanism to evaluate the use of cover crops to enhance agricultural sustainability and environmental stewardship of soil, water and air resources. Efforts in the Midwest would continue to collaboratively evaluate agronomic practices (species selection, seeding rates and methods, planting time), dual-use potential, ecosystem benefits and the economics in numerous production systems. These research efforts have been highly integrated and coordinated with extension educators and other stakeholders to develop recommendations for plantings that inform state and federal agency implementation practices. In particular, the collaborative effort with the Midwest Cover Crop Council (MCCC) has resulted in the development of a Field Guide and crop selector tool. These have been used in workshops, field days, webinars, training modules and on extension and the MCCC websites. Future efforts will address: local adaption of species selection, addition of new cover crops, seeding methods, grazing potential, growth estimates and impacts on soil and water resources. The project has a good feedback loop to ensure the research and educational outcomes provide new knowledge, recommendations and, ultimately, increased use of cover crops throughout the region. Revisions 1) The expectations from the project title and the alignment of project activities were questioned. Specifically, the inclusion of soil health and the upper Midwest were highlighted. Should the title or narrative be changed? 2) Are there any other regional projects that address cover crops? How does NCCC211 interface with those projects? 3) Literature citations for the NASS, CTIC, SARE and NC Soybean Research Program should be provided. The following citations were not found in the project: Buhler et al. (1998), Kaspar et al. (2008), Lal et al. (1991), Singer et al. (2007) and Snapp et al. (2005). In addition, no full citations were found for: Kaspar et al. (2012), Dabney (1998), Moore et al. (2014), Blanco-Canqui et al. (2012), Samarappuli et al. (2014), Gentry et al. (2013), and Henry et al. (2010). 4) Under 'Expected Outcomes and Impacts' the final bullet needs content editing. <mark>Revision s above requested: Due in NIMSS by June 1, 2015.</mark>

	Merchen	NCCC31 (NCCC_temp31)	Ecophysiological Aspects of Forage Management	J. Kells, MI (10)	Proposal for renewal/continuation of the activities of a long-standing committee (began its work in 1966) that includes an eclectic mix of forage scientists and grassland ecologists from institutions within and beyond the NC region. The committee emphasizes an integrated approach to define and develop roles of forages and grasslands to benefit multiple aspects of the landscape including water quality and quantity; soil health; wildlife habitat and pollinators; and production of food to meet global demands. Priority research areas targeted in the proposal include: (i) Develop improved forage-based animal and plant production systems; (ii) Integrated pest management of forage systems; and (iii) Understand and apply ecosystem management principles to utilize and protect natural resources and manage rural landscapes. The proposal does a good job of identifying educational resources that have been developed in part through collaboration of committee members. Another benefit that is cited is "development of multidisciplinary research proposals" but no examples are identified. Overall, the committee seems to function well as a venue for information exchange; however, there is little exemplification of the ways in which the committee addresses the expected outcome of "coordination of common research and extension proposals and projects." Reviews of Administrative Advisor and NCAC-1 attest to an active group with committed participation and high functionality. Revisions requested: We suggest that the committee endeavor to plan and provide illustration of more specific research collaboration that stem from committee activities. Revisions due in NIMSS by June 1, 2015.

	Colletti, Lindroth	NCCC52 (NCCC_temp52)	Family Economics	C. Jasper, WI (09)	(Lindroth review) Family economics problems (e.g., low savings rates, high household debt, lack of financial capability, and low health insurance literacy) are a concern to U.S. households and government policy makers. In this next 5-year project, the NCCC052 committee will continue to enhance research and set research priorities for multi-state and national work on issues germane to the economic well-being of families. The committee proposes six objectives ranging from promoting relevant research to increasing the number of multi-state, multidisciplinary research projects on family economics issues, to writing synopses on the implications of the research for online posting via Extension. Proposed activities are thoroughly described, with achievable expected outcomes. Recommend approval. J. Colletti: A continuation of a coordinating committee that has helped to launch other NC research projects (NC2172 and NC1013. The project addresses an important issue regionally and nationally that of family economics. It organizes its coordination around four objectives the address enhanced methodologies, empirical results, dissemination of best practices, and new research to ensure the economic "health" of families. The procedures are reasonable and address all objectives. A strength of the project is the breath and depth of connection with professionals/stakeholders at four major conferences. I could not find annual reports for all five previous years. I may be looking in the wrong place. Recommend approval.
1.30	NCERA				

Clutter	NCERA197 (NCERA_temp197)	Agricultural Safety and Health Research and Extension	M. Martin, IN (03)	NCERA 197 was initiated in 2000 to address areas of agricultural occupational safety and health, and facilitate the integration of research and extension in those areas. The committee has met on an annual basis with educational programming, and has published minutes from those meetings. The committee also has two publications, each from a previous 5 year appointment term: National land grant research and education agenda for agricultural safety and health (2003), and Agricultural equipment on public roads (2009). The committee has published their impact statement in an informative and effective manner via a webpage, and uses eXtension to facilitate communication. An aim of the committee is to connect with organizations with more general scope in occupational safety, but to fill gaps related to focus on agricultural issues. The committee seems to be effective in this regard, and has members from both agricultural background and more general (human medicine/public health) backgrounds, but is encouraged to continue to find these cross-disciplinary linkages. While the objectives for the next 5 years seem reasonable, the topic areas and justification of those topic areas based on progress from the previous 5-year period are not well-defined. The committee is encouraged to focus on this discussion and refine those plans as they enter the next 5 years. Revision requested: Recommend NCERA_temp197 refine the topic areas and topic area justifications based on the previous 5-year cycle. Revisions are due in NIMSS by June 1, 2015.
2.00	**Mid-Term Reviews**			
2.10	**NC-Type**			
	NC1198	Renewing an Agriculture of the Middle: Value Chain Design, Policy Approaches, Environmental and Social Impacts	J. Colletti, IA (12)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. Extramural funding included with annual report. Favorable AA review. Recommend continuation.
	NC1199	N-3 Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids in Human Health and Disease	D. Jackson, NE (09)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. Please include external funding with every annual report within the accomplishments section. Favorable AA review. Recommend continuation.
	NC1200	Regulation of Photosynthetic Processes (NC-142)	C. Benning, MI (11)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. External funding listed in 2012 report but not in 2013 report. Perhaps include this with every report. Fvaorable AA review. Recommend continuation.

		NC1201	Methods to Increase Reproductive Efficiency in Cattle (NC1006)	D. Hamerik, NE (14)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. Excellent AA review. Recommend continuation.
		NC1202	Enteric Diseases of Swine and Cattle: Prevention, Control and Food Safety (NC-1007)	F. Blecha, KS (14)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. Favorable AA review. Recommend continuation.
		NC140	Improving Economic and Environmental Sustainability in Tree-fruit Production Through Changes in Rootstock Use	R. Perry, MI (11)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. Excellent AA review. Recommend continuation.
		NC170	Personal Protective Technologies for Current and Emerging Occupational Hazards	M. DeLong, MN (04)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. Please be careful with formating the reports in NIMSS, some of the sections do not include any line breaks and are hard to read (although with the new NIMSS, this will no longer be an issue). Excellent AA review. Recommend continuation.
		NC7	Conservation, Management, Enhancement and Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources	W. Wintersteen, IA (02)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. Excellent AA review. Recommend continuation.
2.20	NCCC				
		NCCC214	Biology, Etiology, and Management of Dollar Spot in Turfgrasses	R. Hammerschimdt, MI (12)	Committee has not met at all since inception. Reminder sent to AA to have committee submit evidence of activity by 12/1 or face early termination, evidence was not sent, so AA recommends termination Recommend early termination.
		NCCC215	Potato Breeding and Genetics Technical Committee	R. Hammerschimdt, MI (14)	All reports available, committee meets annually and will be working with the AA on better reporting in the future.
	NCERA				
		NCERA103	Specialized Soil Amendments and Products, Growth Stimulants and Soil Fertility Management Programs	C. Rosen, MN (09)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. Good AA review. Recommend continuation.
		NCERA184	Management of Small Grains	K. Lamkey, IA (06)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. Favorable AA review. Recommend continuation.
		NCERA224	NCR-193: IPM Strategies for Arthropod Pests and Diseases in Nurseries and Landscapes	T. L. Payne, MO (97)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. Favorable AA review. Recommend continuation.

		NCERA225	Implementation and Strategies for National Beef Cattle Genetic Evaluation	K. Bertrand, GA (14); C. Hamilton, NCRA (14; admin only)	All reports available in NIMSS, committee making good progress. Good AA review. Recommend continuation.
3.00	**NRSP Proposals/Budgets**				
Renewing (2015 to 2020):					
NRSP-4 Facilitating Registration of Pest Management Technology for Specialty Crops and Specialty Uses					
NRSP-6 The US Potato Genebank: Acquisition, Classification, Preservation, Evaluation and Distribution of Potato (Solanum) Germplasm					
NRSP-7 A National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs					
NRSP-9 National Animal Nutrition Program					
4.00	**Other funding decisions**				
4.01		NC7	Conservation, Management, Enhancement and Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources	Wintersteen	Review annual budget and business plan at summer 2015 NCRA meeting.
4.02		NC1100	Enhancing Rural Development Technology Assessment and Adoption Through Land Grant Partnerships	Lovejoy	Review 5year budget with renewal proposal. See above, under "NC-type Projects"
5.00	**Other MRC Issues**				

[Back to Top](#)

Item 9.3: ESCOP NRSP Review Committee Agenda Brief
Presenter: Doug Buhler, NCRA Rep to NRSP-RC

For information only

NRSP Review Committee Members

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

Background:
The NRSP Review Committee (NRSP-RC) will meet in Denver, CO on May 28, 2015 for its annual meeting to review proposals, budgets, and guidelines and make recommendations for funding. Recommendations will be presented at the Fall ESS/SAES/ARD Meeting.

A summary of the NRSP portfolio, including proposed projects, follows.

NRSP 2015-2016

Requests for Off-the-Top Funding

Project	Request FY2013	Authorized FY2013	Request FY2014	Authorized FY2014	Request FY2015	Approved FY2015	†Request FY2016	NRSP Review Committee Recommendation
NRSP-1	50,000	50,000	75,000	75,000	300,000	300,000	183,500	-
NRSP-3	50,000	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	*see below*	-
NRSP-6	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	*see below*	-
NRSP-7	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	*see below*	-
NRSP-8	500,000	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-10[1]					398,631	398,631	*see below*	-
NRSP_TEMP004 (NRSP-4)							481,182	*Pending May 28th meeting*
NRSP_TEMP006 (NRSP-6)							150,000	*Pending May 28th meeting*
NRSP_TEMP7[2] (NRSP-7)							325,408	*Pending May 28th meeting*
NRSP_TEMP9 (NRSP-9)							225,000	*Pending May 28th meeting*

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

[1]Unlike other NRSPs, the NRSP10 MRF budget varies. The 5-year budget is as follows (please reference NIMSS for complete budget details):

	FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019	FY2020
NRSP-10 MRF Funding	398,631	370,165	381,834	433,969	406,591

[2]As required by the NRSP Review Committee, NRSP_TEMP7 has demonstrated that they have secured new (not in-kind) funds that are equal to or more than 2x the off-the-top funding requested. The 5-year budget is as follows:

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
NRSP_TEMP7 MRF Funding	325,408	325,408	325,408	325,408	325,408
Other Funding	1,204,857	1,204,857	1,204,857	1,204,857	1,204,857
Total Project Budget	*1,530,265*	*1,530,265*	*1,530,265*	*1,530,265*	*1,530,265*

Summary of NRSPs

Project Number	Project Name	Project Period	Midterm Review Year
NRSP-1	National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS)	2014-2017	2016
NRSP-3	The National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)	2014-2019	2017
NRSP-4 (NRSP_TEMP4)	Enabling Pesticide Registrations for Specialty Crops and Minor Uses	2015-2020	2018
NRSP-6 (NRSP_TEMP6)	The US Potato Genebank: Acquisition, Classification, Preservation, Evaluation and Distribution of Potato (Solanum) Germplasm	2015-2020	2018
NRSP-7 (NRSP_TEMP7)	A National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs	2015-2020	2018
NRSP-8	National Animal Genome Research Program	2013-2018	2016
NRSP-9 (NRSP_TEMP9)	National Animal Nutrition Program	2015-2020	2018
NRSP-10	Database Resources for Crop Genomics, Genetics and Breeding Research	2014-2019	2017

Project Number: NRSP-1

Project Title: Multistate Research Information Management and Impact Communications Program

Requested Duration: October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2017

Administrative Advisors: William Brown, Jeff Jacobsen, Steve Loring, Adel Shirmohammadi

NIFA Representative: Bart Hewitt

STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND JUSTIFICATION

NRSP-1 serves two critical functions for the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) System. First, it supports the National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS). NIMSS was designed to facilitate the management of multistate research and Extension activities supported by the Hatch Multistate Research Fund (MRF), from conception of the proposal to project termination. NIMSS is a web-based application allowing: (1) online submission of proposals, peer reviews and progress reports, and (2) ready access to this information. An automated e-mail notification function prompts users to take action and sends out notifications for meetings and report deadlines. Researchers, Extension educators, stakeholders and other cooperators can search NIMSS for relevant and timely information related to multistate research projects. In addition, the public has access to research project outlines and impacts. NIMSS is now serving all of the 1862 and 1890 Land-grant institutions, allowing them to manage, in a totally paperless system, their multistate research portfolios. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA) also uses NIMSS to download and integrate data into its management dashboard and pre-populate federal forms.

The second important function that NRSP-1 serves is the communication of impacts of multistate research and Extension activities. The impact communications component of NRSP-1 enhances the visibility of Land-grant institutions and the success of the multistate research projects. Impact statements are prepared by a communications specialist at the termination of every project (approximately 60 per year) and are sent to: Administrative Advisors, Regional Executive Directors and their assistants, NIFA representatives and the ESCOP marketing agency kglobal. Administrative Advisors share the statements with project participants, partner trade associations, regulatory organizations, and other stakeholders. The impact statements are posted on the Regional Association websites and are also entered into the National Land-grants Impact Database (http://www.landgrantimpacts.org). They are used by NIFA staff in the preparation of reports and responses to Congressional and other inquiries. kglobal features the impact statements on the Ag Is America website (http://agisamerica.org/), and on the Ag Is America Twitter feed (reaching over 26,000 users) and Facebook page with about 4,000 followers. This relatively new component of NRSP-1 has been extremely effective and very well received within the Land-grant University system, its public and private partners, its stakeholders and the public in general. Collectively, the NIMSS database system and the impact communications program provide for open and transparent systems that enhance compliance and accountability for SAES.

The Experiment Station Section is entering into a three-year contract with Clemson University to redesign, host and maintain NIMSS. The first year will be focused on the redesign of NIMSS, while the following two years will provide ongoing maintenance and the opportunity to further enhance NIMSS. The NIMSS redesign will provide substantial direct benefits to administrators and staff of SAES, participating scientists, federal agencies, and many others utilizing this system. There will also be indirect benefits to the public through increased access to current activities and outcomes from the Multistate Research portfolio.

The contract with Clemson will be for the period October 1, 2014 to September 30, 2017. The NRSP-1 Management Committee requests that the current NRSP-1 be terminated effective September 30, 2014 and that this new project be approved for a three year period, October 1, 2014 to September 30, 2017, to correspond to the contract with Clemson. Approval of this request will allow the project to continue to provide critical research support services to the SAES system during the three year contract with Clemson. During the final year of this project, a new five year NRSP-1 project proposal will be developed to support the enhanced NIMSS and the impact communications programs.

IMPLEMENTATION

Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Objective 1:   Maintain and enhance the effectiveness and functionality of NIMSS and access and utilization of the NIMSS database.

Objective 2:   More effectively document and communicate impacts of the multistate research activities

Outcomes:

At any given time, there are about 300 active multistate research projects and activities recorded in NIMSS. At its peak period, NIMSS gets 28,000 hits per day, and an average of 15,000 hits per day during normal operations. Data transferred varied from 2GB to 4GB per day, during slow to heavy periods. New users register daily and the number of registered active, frequent users are recorded at over 11,000. NIMSS will continue to serve this clientele and the public during the project period, allowing for timely submission of proposals and reports, conduct of peer reviews, meeting notifications, participation and access to information in real time.

In addition, new functionalities will be introduced in NIMSS to enhance access to and quality of information available to users. It is anticipated that participation will continue to be expanded to include those outside the Land-grant system, and will include additional federal and state partners, producers, commodity groups, foundations and foreign scientists. NIMSS will serve as an effective communication tool to share research data and hence, ease the application of new discoveries and technology transfer.

Since its inception in 2002, NIMSS has been used to collect and store information on hundreds of scientists working in multistate projects in specific Knowledge Areas (KAs), Subject of Investigation (SOI) and Field of Science (FOS). NIMSS serves as a national repository of experts and their specializations. This capability will be explored further to build programs to analyze where expertise can be tapped to address national and regional priorities and to solve emerging problems.

NIMSS will be transformed into an even more effective tool in reporting the accomplishments and impacts of agricultural research carried out by Land-grant institutions. This impact information will be used to prepare more effective impact statements from multistate research activities. The Impacts Communication Specialist will continue to refine and enhance the impact statements. More effective ways to communicate impacts will be developed to reach a broader audience. Timely and relevant impact stories will continue to be identified and targeted to popular press outlets such as newspapers (local and national), university publications, industry magazines, agriculture magazines and online news sites. These efforts will greatly enhance the visibility of the Land-grant universities and specifically demonstrate the return in public investment in the multistate research system.

Management Budget and Business Plan

General oversight, policy development, proposal preparation and budget recommendation will be provided by a Management Committee composed of: four Administrative Advisors, representing each of the four SAES regions; an ARD Director; a Cooperative Extension Director; the NIMSS Manager; the four Regional System Administrators; two director's administrative assistants who use NIMSS routinely; and two communicators/writers to advise the impact reporting program. The Administrative Advisors will elect one of their representatives to be the Lead Advisor and Chair of the Committee. NIFA will assign one or more non-voting representatives to the Committee.

NIMSS is managed by each of the Regional Associations serving the SAES. The Regional System Administrators handle the day-to-day tasks related to maintaining the system and answer queries from their users.

The WAAESD Office (WDO) provides coordination, editorial oversight, and physical space to the impact communications component of NRSP-1. The WDO also provides coordination between this effort and the ongoing efforts of ESCOP and ECOP (i.e., with kglobal, Cornerstone, the ESCOP/ECOP Communications and Marketing Committee, and the National Land-grant Impacts Database Project).

Funding for NRSP-1 will be provided through an off-the-top allocation from the Hatch Multistate Research Fund. NRSP-1 will provide important administrative support services to research administrators and staff, project participants and other users of NIMSS and the impact communication efforts. Funding for NRSP-1 is seen as an administrative expense and alternative sources of funding are not anticipated.

Integration and Documentation of Budget Support

NRSP-1 was developed to facilitate the management and communication of the impacts of integrated research and Extension activities supported by the Hatch Multistate Research Fund. It supports all 1862 and 1890 Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension participants. The program can also accommodate integrated education activities as the need arises.

Outreach, Communications and Assessment

Input from SAES administrators and scientists on issues of policy, planning, and management of NRSP-1 is essential element in sustaining it as an effective support system. The approval of this NRSP provides the mechanism to support the representation of user interests and provide a forum to assess the effectiveness of the outreach of the NRSP-1 programs.

The Regional System Administrators will serve as the primary contacts and source of information and training for university administrators, program managers, investigators, business officers, and station staff using NIMSS. The WDO will serve as the primary contact and source of information on the impact communications component. The NRSP-1 Management Committee will serve as stakeholder representatives in addressing assessment issues and to help evaluate the effectiveness of outreach efforts. The representatives will be responsible for collecting information from the institutions in their respective regions or associations to reflect the effectiveness of the NIMSS and the impact communications programs in meeting their needs and objectives. The Committee will provide an annual report outlining the accomplishments of the previous year in support of the objectives at the ESS fall meeting. A copy of the report will accompany the annual budget request.

PROJECT PARTICIPATION: All 1862 and 1890 Land-grant Institutions

LITERATURE CITED: N/A

BUDGET:	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17
NIMSS:	$245,000[1]	$128,500[2]	$128,500[2]
Impact Communications Project:	$ 55,000	$ 55,000	$ 55,000
TOTAL	$300,000	$183,500	$183,500

---

[1] The 2014-15 NIMSS budget request of $245,000 corresponds to the first redesign cost of $265,000 proposed by Clemson minus $20,000 in carry-over NRSP-1 funds residing at Rutgers.

[2] The 2015-16 and 2016-17 NIMSS budget requests of $128,500 reflect the on-going operations and maintenance cost proposed by Clemson.

NIMSS Update (9/2014)

Presenters: Jeff Jacobsen, Dan Rossi

Current NIMSS - NIMSS had undergone two transfers in 2014. The first involved moving the system from the Univ. of Maryland to an external server, and the second to a Rutgers' Amazon Web Service account. The transfer to the Rutgers' server account was completed on August 27. Coding adjustments are underway to correct glitches due to a software upgrade (to ColdFusion ver.11) related to the second migration. Data entry is working and upload to the NIFA REEport has been restored. Approval letters and meeting authorizations are not automatically sent yet, but can be copied and pasted to committees as needed. At this time, the current system will be maintained and used until the newly re-designed NIMSS is ready for rollout. Maintenance of the current system is planned for the remainder of CY2014 and CY2015.

Future "NIMSS"- A subcommittee of NRSP1 [Jeff Jacobsen (chair), Bill Brown, Steve Loring, Adel Shirmohammadi, Shirley Hymon-Parker, Chris Hamilton] reviewed the responses to a national solicitation for a redesign of NIMSS. Available members of this group and two IT professionals (Robert Ridenour UTIA; John Chamberlain NMSU) participated in a conference call with Clemson's Youth Learning Institute Information Technology Team (ITT) to respond to provided questions and offer additional insights. Several follow-on calls were made to clarify residual questions. In addition, two other IT professionals reviewed this proposal with favorable recommendations. These details were provided to NRSP1 electronically and discussed in conference calls.

NRSP1 recommends developing a contract with Clemson's ITT for the redesign, operations and maintenance of the new system. The one-time cost of the redesign is $265,000 and the on-going cost of operations/maintenance is $128,500. This would require: 1) termination of NRSP1 on September 30, 2014, and renewal with a 3-year proposal and budget and 2) a contract for service with ITT.

Our discussion has been to develop a 3-year contract. One year of redesign and two years of operations/maintenance with the new system. This would result in a redesign that is responsive, operational and optimally tested by the national system over the following two years.

Recommended ESS Actions for NIMSS:

NRSP1 recommends that the new, 3-year NRSP1 budget for NIMSS be:

- $245,000 one-time NIMSS redesign ($265,000 - $20,000 in carry-over funds) for FY2015

- $128,500 on-going NIMSS operations/maintenance for FY2016

- $128,500 on-going NIMSS operations/maintenance for FY2017

- The new 3-year budget would also include an increase the budget for the Impact Communications Specialist to $55,000 (from $53,410) for FY2015, FY2016, and FY2017 to accommodate variable fringe benefit rates.

- The total request for NRSP1 is $300,000 [FY2015], $183,500 [FY2016] and $183,500 [FY2017]as presented in three-year NRSP1 proposal [FY2014-17].

A proposed NIMSS redesign team composed of: four regional NIMSS System Administrators (Chris Hamilton, Sarah Lupis, Rubie Mize, Donna Pearce), one Executive Director (Jeff Jacobsen), Director (Steve Loring), four State staff regional representatives (Shelley Whitworth [NC], Tammy Heil [S], Angie Dangerfield [W], Rachel Unger [NE]), NIFA representative (Katelyn Sellers). In addition, ITT recommends that 1-2 people become the day-to-day contacts for their programmers. Chris and Sarah have volunteered to be these contacts.

Back to Top

Item 9.4: NC Nominee for National Excellence in Multistate Research Award
Presenter: Archie Clutter, 2015 NCRA MRC Chair

Nominations Received:

NC140, Improving Economic and Environmental Sustainability in Tree-Fruit Production Through Changes in Rootstock Use

NC1193, Assessing and addressing individual and environmental factors that influence eating behavior of young adults

NC213, Marketing and Delivery of Quality Grains and BioProcess Coproducts

NC1201, Methods to Increase Reproductive Efficiency in Cattle

(Please contact Chris Hamilton if you wish to view the submission forms)

Action Requested: Approval of the MRC's nomination choice.

Back to Top

Item 10.0: ARS Report
Presenter: JL Willet, Associate Director, MWA, USDA ARS

USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS)
Report to NCRA State Agriculture Experiment Station Directors

March-April 2015

Area Leadership

Plains Area (formerly Northern Plains Area)
    Area Director: Larry Chandler
    Associate Area Directors: John McMurtry; Bryan Kaphammer (Acting)
Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming; *New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas*

Midwest Area
    Area Director: Robert Matteri
    Associate Area Directors: J.L. Willett; vacant
    Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Wisconsin; *Kentucky*

Budget Information

FY 2015 Appropriations
- ARS Salaries and Expenses:
    o $1,132,625,000
    o Increase of $10 million over the FY 2014 spending level
- ARS Buildings and Facilities:
    o $45,000,000

FY2016 President's Budget for ARS
- ARS Salaries and Expenses:
    o $1,191,540,000
    o Represents an increase of $59 million from the FY 2015 appropriation
    o Increases
        ▪ Pay Cost $7,120,000
        ▪ Program Increases   97,273,000
            ✓ Climate Change Resilient Crops 11,000,000
            ✓ Transformational Genetics   11,100,000
            ✓ Apprentice Farmer Program   150,000
            ✓ Antimicrobial Resistance   7,000,000
            ✓ Improving Agricultural Sustainability   8,000,000
            ✓ Reduce Vulnerability to Climate Change 8,000,000
            ✓ Big Data, Earth Sciences, and Earth Observation 2,523,000
            ✓ Vertical Farming   5,000,000
            ✓ Sustainable Small Farms 7,500,000
            ✓ Presidential Initiatives
                o Combating antibiotic resistant bacteria 10,000,000

- o Pollinator Health   7,000,000
  - ✓ Repair and Maintenance   20,000,000
- o Decreases   (47,383,000)

  - ▪ Proposed Redirections   (25,986,000)
  - ▪ Proposed Terminations (21,397,000)

- ARS Buildings and Facilities: 205,901,000
  - ▪ Poultry Research Facility, Athens, GA   113,701,000
  - ▪ Other locations   92,200,000

New Leadership and Vacancies

Midwest Area (MWA)
- Illinois
  - o National Center for Agricultural Utilization Research (Peoria)
    - Plant Polymer Research Unit (vacant, Gordon Selling, Acting RL; new RL pending)

- Iowa
  - o National Animal Disease Center (Ames)
    - Food Safety and Enteric Pathogens Research Unit (vacant, Shawn Bearson, Acting RL)
    - Virus and Prion Research Unit (Kelly Lager, new RL)
  - o National Laboratory for Agriculture and the Environment (Ames)
    - Soil, Water and Air Research Unit (Tom Sauer, new RL)

- Kentucky (Area realignment)
  - o Bowling Green: Food Animal Environmental Systems Research Unit (Karamat Sistani, RL)
  - o Lexington, KY: Forage Animal Production Research Unit (Glen Aiken, RL)

- Minnesota
  - o Plant Science Research Unit (vacant, Debby Samac, Acting RL)

- Wisconsin
  - o Dairy Forage Research Center (Madison)
    - Center Director: (Mark Boggess, new CD)
    - Dairy Forage and Aquaculture Research Unit (vacant, Heathcliffe Riday, Acting RL)

Plains Area (PA)

- Kansas
  - o Center for Grain and Animal Health Research (Manhattan)
    - Center Director (vacant, Tom Herald, Acting CD)
    - Stored Product Insect Research Unit, Vacant (James Campbell, new RL).

    - Nebraska

- o U.S. Meat Animal Research Center (Clay Center)
  - New Unit: Nutrition and Environmental Management Research Unit, Harvey Freetly, RL
  - New Unit: Genetics, Breeding and Animal Health Research Unit, Gary Bennett, RL
- o Lincoln
  - Grain Forage and Bioenergy Research Unit, Ken Vogel retired, Robert Graybosch, new RL
- North Dakota
  - o Red River Valley Agricultural Research Center (Fargo)
    - Insect Genetics and Biochemistry Research Unit, Vacant (Bill Kemp, Acting RL)
- Oklahoma
  - o El Reno
    - Forage and Livestock Production Research Unit (Acting RL, Patrick Starkes)
  - o Stillwater
    - Hydraulic Engineering Research Unit (New RL, Sherry Hunt)
- Colorado
  - o Ft Collins
    - Water Management Research Unit (Acting RL, Dana Blumenthal)
    - Soil Plant Nutrient Research Unit (Acting RL, Jorge Delgado)
- Texas
  - o Bushland
    - Renamed Unit: Livestock Nutrient Management Research Unit (Andy Cole, RL)

Item 12.0: ESCOP Science and Technology Committee Agenda Brief
Presenters: Deb Hamernik, Joe Colletti, and Jeff Jacobsen

For information only

The committee has begun to hold regular conference calls on the fourth Monday of each month. These are scheduled from February through June. Tentatively, we are planning a face-to-face during the July Joint COPS meeting. The current S&T Committee membership is shown below.

Chair: John Russin (SAAESD)	
	Liaisons:
Delegates:	Terry Nelsen (ERS)
Larry Curtis (WAAESD)	Cliff Gabriel (OSTP)
David Thompson (WAAESD)	Adrianna Hewings (ARS)
Joe Colletti (NCRA)	Frank Zalom (Pest Mgmt Subcom)
Deb Hamernik (NCRA)	Edwin Price (ICOP)
Cameron Faustman (NERA)	Scott Loveridge (Social Sci Subcom)
Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA)	Bob Holland (NIFA)
Nathan McKinney (SAAESD)	Muquarrab Qureshi (NIFA)
Harald Scherm (SAAESD)	
Teferi Tsegaye (ARD)	
Marakis Alvarez (ARD)*	
Executive Vice-Chair	
Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA)	***Chair elect**

The S&T Committee initial discussion (2/23/15) was focused on the NRC Report on Spurring Innovation in Food and Agriculture: A Review of the USDA AFRI Program and the subsequent webinar with the Committee and the NIFA Response.

HORIZON TOPICS for S&T Committee:
+Future of down-sized signature research programs (e.g. plant breeding)
+Water security
+Participation in NIFA and other stakeholder listening sessions
+Broader engagement with other groups (e.g. Task Force on anti-microbial resistance)
+Open Access Data

+NEW REPORT (12/2014): Pursuing a Unifying Message – Elevating Food, Agricultural and Natural Resources Research as a National Priority (www.rileymemorial.org)

+NEW NRC REPORT (1/2015): Critical Role of Animal Science Research in Food Security and

Sustainability (www.nap.edu)

[Back to Top](#)

Item 13.0: Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC)

Presenter: Daniel Scholl

For information only

Background Information:

1. <u>Committee Membership</u>: The Committee membership is in transition as the new Operational Guidelines are implemented.

2. <u>Meetings</u> – The CMC met by conference call on November 20, 2014. It is scheduled to meet on March 2, 2015.

3. <u>Update:</u>

   - The CMC works closely with kglobal and Cornerstone on a targeted educational effort to increase awareness and support for basic and applied research and transformational education provided by Land Grant Universities through Agricultural Experiment Stations and Cooperative Extension.

   - The AHS had decided to join as equal partners and the $400,000 budget will now be equally shared by ESS, CES and AHS. The ESCOP Executive Committee decided to reduce the total CMP assessment from ESS institutional members will be assessed from the previously approved level of $300,000 to $200,000.

   - The PBD voted to approve the expenditure of $55,000 to support the message testing expansion recommendation. kglobal has conducted a series of focus groups and will conduct a national survey to test messaging around the themes of Health and Nutrition and Water Security. It has also prepared a 4th quarter report for 2014.

   - With the addition of AHS as an equal partner the CMC has revised its previous Operation Guidelines. The attached set of Guidelines was approved during the November 20th conference call.

   - The CMC is in the process of implementing the new Operation Guidelines. Scott Reed has agreed to serve as this year's Chair. Nancy Cox will be an AHS representative and has agreed to serve as the Past Chair. Rick Rhodes has agreed to serve as the Incoming Chair and Daniel Scholl as the ESCOP representative.

   - The next project for the CMC will be to develop a plan of work for the coming year.

Communication and Marketing Committee (CMC)
Operating Guidelines
April 17, 2012
Updated November 20, 2014

Purpose

The Communication and Marketing Committee (CMC) oversees and guides the Communications and Marketing Project (CMP). The CMP is a coordinated and targeted educational effort to increase awareness of the Land-grant University agricultural and related programs, Agricultural Experiment Stations (AES) and Cooperative Extension Services (CES). The CMP is supported by three sections of the APLU Board on Agriculture – Administrative Heads (AHS), Cooperative Extension (CES) and Experiment Station (ESS).

The CMC is the policy making body that oversees the development, implementation and effectiveness of this targeted educational effort, including coordination with APLU and consulting firms hired to advance this initiative. It is the responsible entity specified in the contract between APLU and kglobal and in the contract between APLU and Cornerstone Government Affairs for oversight of the work as it relates to the CMP.

Membership

The membership of the CMC is as follows:

- Chair (1)
- Incoming Chair (1)
- Past Chair (1)
- One AHS, one CES and one AES Dean/Director/Administrator (3)
- AHS, ECOP and ESCOP Chairs (3)
- One ACOP representative (1)
- One ACE representative (1)
- One CARET representative (1)
- One APLU CGA representative (1)
- One member of the ECOP-ESCOP National Impacts Database Committee (1)

Members serve two year terms and may be reappointed indefinitely. The term of Chair, Incoming Chair and Past Chair are one year. The sections are encouraged to consider rotating their representatives among the five regions.

Non-voting members include one point person from kglobal and one from Cornerstone, serving as liaisons to the CMC. In addition, ECOP, ESCOP and AHS will each name one representative (e.g. Executive Director/Administrator) and Assistants as appropriate to work with the committee.

Organization and Function

The CMC will meet in person at CARET's annual meeting in Washington DC. The CMP annual plan of work will be approved at this meeting. Other in-person meetings can be scheduled by the chair as necessary.

The CMC will meet by telephone conference quarterly for CMP plan of work updates, coordination, issue or problem solving, contract oversight, and policy decision approval.

It is expected that programmatic and policy decisions are to be made by consensus. If necessary, formal decisions are to be determined by simple majority of a quorum of CMC members.

The CMC may create work groups that assist in development and implementation of the CMP communication protocols, including data mining, lay audience reports, and other efforts that leverage the work of kglobal. The work groups will be responsible to the CMC.

The kglobal and Cornerstone point people will attend annual meetings of the sections to provide updates.

Working closely together and with input from CMC, Cornerstone and kglobal strategically identify key targets to focus communication and education efforts. This includes earned media including op-eds, the use of grassroots and grasstops connections (as defined by kglobal), and digital and social media approaches. Communicating the value of Land-grant agricultural and related program impacts through Cooperative Extension, Agricultural Experiment Stations, and academic programs to key decision makers is a key goal of the CMP. Every effort will be made to take maximum use of the ECOP-ESCOP impacts database at www.landgrantimpacts.org.

It will be the responsibility of the regional Executive Directors/Administrators in Cooperative Extension and the Experiment Stations working together with deans/directors/administrators to assist kglobal in developing the proper communication contacts for each state. Each state may have unique external communication protocols that must be followed for success. Points of contact for Cooperative Extension, Experiment Station and academic programs will be identified for each institution. It is expected that these points of contact would include the deans of agriculture, directors/administrators of Cooperative Extension and the Experiment Station or their designees to assure appropriate communication protocols internal to a specific university are followed.

Officers

The chair of the CMC will be a representative from one of the three Board on Agriculture Assembly sections providing financial support for the program. The chair serves for one year. The position will rotate among the sections. At any given time, the three sections will be represented by the chair, incoming chair or past chair.

The chair organizes and facilitates the meetings of the CMC. The chair provides updates at the BAA Policy Board of Directors meetings and will meet with kglobal and Cornerstone on annual performance reviews. The chair will work with APLU in the development of contracts with kglobal and Cornerstone for the CMP.

The incoming chair will discharge the duties of the chair such as presiding over meetings when the chair is not available and guide the work of the Plan of Work Development Committee.

Committees

- **Executive Committee –** The Executive Committee (EC) includes the Chair, Incoming Chair, and Past Chair working together with the non-voting AHS, ECOP, and ESCOP representatives and assistants. The kglobal and Cornerstone representatives will participate in EC meetings as appropriate. The EC will meet quarterly at least one week prior to the meetings of the CMC and develop the agenda for those meetings. It is also empowered to handle the immediate affairs of the CMC between meetings.

- **Plan of Work Development Committee –** The Plan of Work Development Committee will prepare an annual CMP plan of work including goals, theme and strategies for the CMP. The Committee will seek input on the plan from CMC members and present a draft plan for approval at the annual meeting. The committee membership will include one AHS, one CES and one AES Dean/Director/Administrator from the CMC and appointed by the CMC chair, and Cornerstone, and kglobal, AHS, ECOP, and ESCOP non-voting representatives. It will be chaired by the CMC incoming chair.

Quorum

For purposes of doing business, a quorum shall consist of a simple majority of the duly constituted members at any officially called meeting for which written notice is sent in advance of the meeting. A simple majority of the quorum resolves all issues.

Parliamentary Authority

The emphasis in all CMC meetings shall be on orderly process to achieve an objective decision by those present and voting. Should there be a parliamentary challenge, it shall be answered by referring to the most current edition of Robert's Rules of Order.

Funding

AHS, ESCOP and ECOP will share equally in financing the Communication and Marketing Program.

Amendments

These operating guidelines may be amended at any business meeting of the CMC provided the proposed amendment has been sent to all members in advance of the meeting, and the question is passed by a simple majority of a quorum of the voting members present at that meeting.

Back to Top

Item 15.0: Plan of Work (POW) 2015 Panel Feedback from NC AES
Presenter: David Jackson (by phone)

Action Requested: NC AES feedback on topics below and ways to improve POW process
--

Agenda Topics

The following topics will guide the panel discussion over the two and half days we are together in Washington, D.C. (not necessarily in the order they appear here). Panelists, both LGU partners and NIFA staff, are expected to come to panel prepared with their own and their respective colleagues' (other regional LGU partners, stakeholder groups, etc.) thoughts organized in a way that allows them to contribute to the panel discussion in a fruitful and efficient manner.

TOPIC: Timing of Submissions

The current due date for the POW and Annual Report each year from the states is April 1. Are there different dates that would make more sense for when the Plan and Annual Report should be due to NIFA? Consider the following:

- Having an approved POW in place is a requirement for being eligible for receiving the applicable capacity funds; the capacity RFAs come out each year in the August/September timeframe. In this regard, the POW is functionally part of the "application" to the RFA; essentially, it serves as the project narrative.

- For most other NIFA programs/projects, annual progress reports are due within 90 days after the period of performance being reported on. The AREERA Annual Reports are currently due approximately 180 days after the close of the previously federal fiscal year's period of performance (related: the individual Hatch and Evans Allen Project Progress Reports in REEport are due by March 1 annually, 120 days after the close of the previous federal fiscal year).

- Workload Burden: Having the same due date requires the states to work on both the POW and AR report submissions at the same time each year; could workload burden be reduced if they could work on and submit the two reports separately/consecutively? Also, the same submission date means that NIFA NPLs have to work on their reviews of each submission simultaneously, effectively cutting their allotted 60 day review period for each report in half and reducing the opportunity for meaningful feedback.

TOPIC: Connecting Projects to Programs

- This currently applies to Hatch/Hatch Multistate and Evans Allen research funds only; individual projects of each PD (or co-PD) at an institution being supported by these funds must have a documented project in REEport.

- The Programs in the Plan of Work should encompass all of the projects an institution has submitted to REEport.

- How can we do a better job of showing how each project supports a particular program?

  - What challenges do states face when trying to associate projects in REEport to Planned Programs in the POW (currently a requirement at project initiation)?

  - What challenges do NPLs face when reviewing a POW and trying to understand how all of an institution's research projects support a program?

  - How can we assure that Annual Reports clearly show activity and results of both research and extension functions, as appropriate to the various planned programs?

- How can we standardize reporting between Research and Extension? The first bullet above of this topic says "projects to programs" applies to Research only, but what if it could apply to Extension (Smith-Lever 3b&c and 1890 Extension) as well?

  - Let's consider a scenario where the work being done, both in Research and Extension, is documented via "projects" in REEport while the "Programs" in the POW are significantly pared down into lists of those projects (states would no longer need to include such lengthy narratives of activities being done in those programs):

    - Could this reduce reporting burden in the POW and Annual Report?

    - What would be the benefits of this approach?

    - What would be the negatives of this approach?

TOPIC: Software Functionality

- Is there anything about how the software functions that you particularly like? Why?

- Is there anything about how the software functions that you particularly do not like? Why and what about it would you like to see changed?

- For LGU partners: Is there anything about the software that impedes your institutions from reporting high quality data?

- For NPLs: Is there anything about the software that impedes your ability to provide a comprehensive, high quality review of the POW and Annual Report?

TOPIC: Reporting Outcomes

Ensuring that high quality outcomes are present in Annual Reports is in the best interest of the states and NIFA. Successful impacts can be reported in the form of an aggregated national number or individual qualitative story by NIFA to defend and support the capacity funds and their importance to agricultural research and extension and subsequently link those outcomes to higher level impacts. What

can we do to collect outcomes and impacts in a better way, both at the nationally aggregated level and individual state level? Consider the current ways each of these is reported on:

- National Outcomes:

    o The national outcomes are quantitative only; the purpose is to be able to aggregate them so that NIFA can report a "national" impact.

    o NIFA has used Google Forms for three years now; does this positively or negatively affect a state's option to report on any of the indicators?

    o There are just over 200 disparate data points that make up the national outcomes and indicators; is this too many? Is it overwhelming to know which ones are or are not important?

- State-Defined Outcomes

    o Currently, the software is set up with a 1:1 ratio for quantitative measure to qualitative story (i.e. for each outcome measure a state enters into their Annual Report, they are able to report a success story related to that one measure); there is no ability for a state to relate multiple quantitative measures with one qualitative statement.

    o Should we change the software to collect these data differently? If yes, how?

        ▪ Consider: For reporting purposes (to USDA, Congress, etc.) , NIFA's view is that the most useful qualitative data the agency receives in the Annual Reports are those that truly follow reporting on; 1) what the "issue" was, 2) "what was done" about it, and 3) what the "results" were. Further, linking such an alliterative to quantitative data adds power to the personal.

TOPIC: What does NIFA need?

Plans of Work and Annual Reports should serve the specific purposes of allowing states to meet the legislative requirements for receiving the applicable capacity funds and allowing NIFA to monitor and report out on the impacts of those funds. In thinking about those two purposes, we need to ask the question: what data does NIFA really need to carry out its "monitoring"?

- There are only two components in AREERA reporting that are legislatively required: Stakeholder Input and Merit Reviews; all other data currently collected in the POW and Annual Report are discretionary.

- Are there parts of a POW/AR that the states find burdensome to report on? Why? Let's consider if any of those overlap with NPL reviewers' perception:

    o Are there parts of a POW/AR that NPLs do not find very useful in determining if a state is producing useful outcomes and meaningful impacts?

- o Are there parts of a POW/AR that NPLs rely on in order to determine overall acceptability of a state's programming and integration of research and extension?

NIFA Plan of Work Feedback Summary: NC Region

Latest Update: March 25, 2015

Compiled by C. Hamilton, NCRA

Agenda Topic	Feedback

Timing of Submissions	• **Ohio State (OSU):**
	    ○ Due date of April 1 is OK but not any sooner, as the individual progress reports due on March 1 are used as resource for the AREERA annual.
	    ○ Having same April 1 due date for both Annual report and POW has not been an issue for preparation of financial data.
	    ○ Separate due dates for annual report and POW would spread the overall administration burden and allow separate focus on each document. What if the ROA was due in 120 and the annual report in 150 days?
	• **UW-Madison**: The April 1st deadline for both reports work great for the University of Wisconsin-Madison, since we need information from the annual progress reports that are due in March.
	• **UIUC**: On the research side, the financial reports [formerly known as the AD-419] and the investigator progress reports [formerly known as the AD-421] are critical inputs to drafting the Annual Report. The current timeline is to try to have all of these done at some point in February and then draft the Annual Report in February/March. Moving the due date up significantly from April first would make this much more difficult. I prefer to have the annual report completed to review as I update the Plan of Work, so the easiest way to submit the reports consecutively would be to have the Annual Report due on April first and the Plan of Work due on May first.
	• **Michigan State (MSU):**
	    ○ Pushing the due date back one month (or even a couple weeks) would be helpful—we have several other programs with submission and award cycles in January-March, so it is a particularly busy time for our office. I understand though why it is April 1 since the reviews need to happen before the next funding cycle.
	    ○ Workload burden: This is not really an issue for us. Once I am working on the annual report and POW, it is just as easy to complete them both at the same time.
	• **Purdue:**
	    ○ It may be helpful to have separate due dates for the AR and the POW.
	    ○ Financial REEport and PD annual & final reports could be 2/1 (like before), AR could be 3/1, and the POW could be 4/1.
	• **Iowa State (ISU):**

	o In theory, having the due dates spread out should help one reporting process feed into the next
	  ▪ Feb 1 = Financial Report (formerly AD419) due
	  ▪ Mar 1 = Progress/Final Reports due (formerly AD421) for all formula projects
	  ▪ Apr 1 = POW/Annual Reports due
	o Unfortunately, we have trouble meeting the March 1 deadline, and then end up working on both. I don't think we should try to delay the Apr 1 deadline, but perhaps move up the other 2 so the deadlines are all 2 months apart… No matter when we tell the faculty we want the progress reports, some will see in the online instructions that they are due March 1, and they procrastinate accordingly.
	o How about Dec 1, Jan 1, and Apr 1?

Connecting Projects to Programs	• **OSU:** o It is a challenge to associate projects in REEport to Planned Programs in the POW. Question as to what to do the NPLs need in the ROA to know that capacity dollars have been appropriately invested? Can be a challenge to associate financial data and KAs with these reports. o Interesting that reporting between research and extension is not standardized as the "projects to programs" applies to Research only and not Extension. Since we submit a combine report, should not guidelines for ROA be similar? o As to the suggestion that the work being done in Research and Extension is documented via projects in REEports while the programs in the POW are significantly pared down into lists of those projects (states would no longer need such lengthy narratives of activities being done in these programs. o Not sure what Panel is proposing here? o Does this reduce importance of KAs in reporting? o List of programs in POW would simplify narrative and reduce administrative burden of writing and reviewing. Simpler presentation may actually make POW more concise and clear. o Question as to whether a list of projects makes it more difficult to report from other collective sources such as annual faculty reports, department impact statements, etc.? • **UW-Madison:** o Does NIFA want to see projects under two programs, if it applies? What if a PD categorizes their project between two programs at an 80/20 split? Would we need to report under both programs? o The use of success stories would clearly show the activity for both research and extension. o If we just list the projects under each program, is any value added to the report? • **UIUC:** o I ask each investigator initiating a new project to stop by my

	office to complete the section of the forms that includes selecting planned programs, so each PI has input into which planned program[s] their project is associated with. Of course the planned programs are not independent silos but rather have a great deal of overlap; almost always we are able to identify a small number of planned programs that are most relevant to a given project rather than spreading it across four or five planned programs.

- o Using lists of project titles to replace the project narrative would certainly reduce the reporting burden for the activities section. The negative of this approach would be that when I draft the activities section I review the annual report and identify the sentence that best describes the project accomplishments for that year; often times this sentence provides a better and more interesting description than the title.
- **Missouri:**
  - o How often do/should an AES evaluate their Planned Programs for inclusiveness, timeliness, etc. and adjust them (if needed)?
  - o This is a technical problem and it may be something that doesn't need to be addressed at this meeting, but I am finding that the timing of project initiation in REEport impacts the associated planned programs significantly. The rate at which the data connects seems to be quite fast, for example. So, if I am in REEport initiating a project and Sandy is working on the plan of work at that moment, then I may have different planned programs for that single project initiation or I may have no planned programs for that single project initiation depending on where she is in her processes. This could lead to a series of five year projects with different planned programs associated with them in REEPort based on the timing of the project initiations.
  - o Is there a plan to incorporate McIntire Stennis into the planned programs or will these always be excluded?
  - o I presume that this pre-emptive association with a planned program in project initiation in REEport will eventually lead to an ability for the PoW to auto-populate and associate these projects with their associated planned program. Is there a timeline for that functionality?
- **MSU:**
  - o It seems like there should be a mechanism where the program area could stay with the project (this may be a field that can be selected, but I am not certain if it were populated that it would carry to the POW). Then when I pull up a program area and it would pre-populate with the number of projects in each knowledge area and the FTE's if it were populated as well. Even if it allowed us to make changes to it,

it would save time. I spend several hours just doing the prep work of putting everything in the proper category. Same goes for the patent data and other information. It would be much easier if I could enter a lot of the date on the project itself and have it pull it all together in the report. If this data could be held with each project it would be a time saver. Even if it didn't carry over to the POW, if I could print or download a report with everything in an assigned program area it would be better.

- o Challenges of associating projects with REEport to Planned Programs in POW: I would like to be able to pull something from REEport that I can export into excel with this data. I don't think it is available.
- o Standardizing reporting btw Res and EXT: A lot of time is spent putting all of the projects into the various program areas and calculating that data. Having this done and not needing to complete the narrative would allow more time to be spent on reporting the outcomes.

- **Purdue:**
  - o Since we have combined research and extension for quite some time now, we have managed to include planned programs to cover both, and work to select impact statements to include in a balanced format between research and extension.
  - o I hope that we don't add more to the report to "standardize reporting between research and extension".
  - o Scenario:
    - Are they proposing that Extension input "projects" in REEport? There are fields in REEport that do not apply to Extension educators…FTEs, others?
    - I'm not sure that providing a list of titles of projects under a planned program heading would give the NPL the richness and depth of understanding of the type of impacts being made with the funding

- **ISU:**
  - o *Challenges of Assoc REEport with Planned Projects*: Programs can change annually; projects usually initiated for 5 years. They could indicate one program, but then be switched if programs are redefined. We still have many projects started before REEport and are not linked to POW programs. Is there a convenient way to extract those POW assignments out of REEport?
  - o *How can we assure that Annual Reports clearly show activity and results of both research and extension functions, as appropriate to the various planned programs?*
    - Publications and Patents
    - It is difficult to include research outcomes when they only want demonstrable impacts with qualitative and

	quantitative measures.
	○ *Let's consider a scenario where the work being done, both in Research and Extension, is documented via "projects" in REEport while the "Programs" in the POW are significantly pared down into lists of those projects (states would no longer need to include such lengthy narratives of activities being done in those programs)*: Awesome idea. Let's explore this further.
	▪ Could this reduce reporting burden in the POW and Annual Report? For AES, absolutely.
	▪ What would be the benefits of this approach? Reduce burden, reduce duplication of reporting. SIMPLIFICATION!
	▪ What would be the negatives of this approach? For NPLs, loss of higher level overviews (which may or may not be of any value anyway); issues with Extension.
	▪ Is there a reason Smith-Lever and Hatch reporting need to be combined? Allow AES/Hatch to be reported mostly in REEport; Extension/Smith-Lever to continue the current reporting model, could combine the "required components" of Stakeholder Input, Merit Review.
Software Functionality	• **UIUC:** Software seems to work pretty well as long as you use Firefox rather than Internet Explorer; in the past the system would do strange things to the formatting of the text [or the text would look fine on the screen but be jumbled when printing] but a lot of these seem to have since been corrected. The Plan of Work system doesn't seem to have the crashing/down/running slowly issues as frequently as REEport has.
	• **MSU:**
	○ Process generally works fine. Submission tools work well. I like being able to copy/paste information from various sources without having to retype everything (horror stories of POW submission from the past sounds like this is a fairly new feature). Multiple people being able to submit and work on the report at the same time is great. I really like being able to view the entire report as a pdf as I go. I like being able to get to prior year reports. Combined reports with Experiment Station and Extension
	○ Suggest allowing better formatting in text boxes that would make more readable reports (i.e., pastes from Word and Excel that now gets scrambled).
	○ Allow attachments.
	○ Using only IE11+ or Firefox. The software for our HR/Finance system requires a lower version of IE. I generally use Chrome, not Firefox. Not a big deal, but I have to download Firefox if I use a different computer.

	o Being able to download in several formats is good.
	• **Purdue:**
	o Like = Can work on individual sections at a time, then save.
	o Do not like = The text you enter and can see on the screen….is not how it prints out on paper. Spacing between paragraphs is often lost, for example.
	o Do not like = The USDA – NIFA header at top of screens - covers over parts of the top navigation so you can't select items there
	o What to change:
	▪ need to number the outcome indicators on the screen where you can select EDIT or DELETE from the listing
	▪ Is there a way to avoid getting scrambled characters of text when cutting and pasting into the portal?
	• **ISU**:
	o Fairly quick and responsive in terms of loading pages (especially as compared to REEport). They've tried to add formatting features, but we rarely use them because of issues noted below.
	o FORMATTING ISSUES for both POW and Annual Report: If the field allows formatting, it doesn't work well – what you see isn't necessarily what you get. If the field doesn't allow formatting, then it also results in any special characters (e.g., curly apostrophes and quotes, n-dashes, characters with accent marks or umlauts) as "?", but you won't see that unless you revisit the page or generate a pdf.
	o The text and docx exporting feature, while nice if it worked, often won't load correctly into Word and is virtually uneditable because of everything being in table-nested-within-table format.
	o How about adding page numbers to the program table of content? We do this manually before printing our documents.
	o Additional error checking (e.g., the checkboxes for outputs that say "clicking this box affirms you will continue to collect data on these items and report the data in the Annual Report…". We check the boxes, and later find them once again unchecked.
	o Overall, system impedes our institution from reporting high quality data
Reporting Outcomes	• **OSU:**
	o Reporting on national impacts should hopefully improve through the National Impact Database.
	o REEport is not necessarily the best source of impact statements,
	• **UW-Madison:** Entering several impact/success stories under each

| | state outcome would be very beneficial to the report and add value by showing Congress how the funds are being used. Quantitative data can only show so much. The success stories take the data one step further and show the NPL and Congress a more realistic picture of the outcome. **UIUC:** The system is currently set up where the Plan of Work submitted populates the Annual Report two years into the future [for example, state defined outcome indicators selected now will populate the 2016 annual Report; quality indicators would be easier to select if they populated the next year's annual report rather than the one two years from now]. It would help to clean up the annual report if we were allowed to remove those "predicted" indicators that we wind up not using; currently we can mark them as "not used this year" but they still print to add unneeded clutter. For state-defined outcomes most of our best information is qualitative rather than quantitative but for Extension it is not unusual to have multiple quantitative outcomes tied to a program that could be described by a single narrative. Originally the list of national outcomes was several pages long; I found it overwhelming and I'm sure any faculty member who took the time to thumb through it would also. NIFA has addressed this by selecting seven that they consider to be a higher priority. After several years of attempting to solicit input from faculty the response continues to be very weak. I suspect that Extension is able to do a better of identifying Quantitative indicators than research, for whom most indicators are qualitative in nature [knowledge developed]. Also, if we received data from two or three faculty members out of a half dozen or more working in that area, then does this drastically undervalued number become "the number" for Illinois and is assumed to be a total? **MSU:** Be clearer on what should be in the report (i.e., Some states put everything in for outputs numbers. while others only put what comes from the Smith-Leaver funds plus match - we describe only 25% of our whole for this reason). Expand the Knowledge areas in youth, family and community development areas. **Purdue:** Create outcome indicators that are more broadly written to capture key concepts in knowledge, behavior, condition, rather than very specific, individual items. Not all of the research is translated into an impact directly into the field (i.e. The number of people who have….). Instead, the units could be people, cows, fields, cells, parasites, etc. How do we reconcile this without having to write 20 new outcomes each year for a program? |

- o National outcomes: 200 outcome indicators are too many.
- o State-Defined outcomes:
  - ▪ Would be nice to be able to share 2 impacts relating to one measure. We do currently bring projects together in our narrative to make them fit into one outcome indicator.
  - ▪ We use the POW as an opportunity to showcase significant impacts and we are generally able to find at least one big story for each program—in fact, we can often find many! Some schools may not have researchers working in a particular area and have few, if any, impacts to describe. While this would keep their report short with a 1:1 ratio of stories to measures, it doesn't allow the school to fully capture the impacts. It might be valuable to allow 2 or 3 stories as an option.
- **ISU:**
  - o The national outcomes are quantitative only; the purpose is to be able to aggregate them so that NIFA can report a "national" impact. We have had very little success in pushing these out to the folks that gather data. They are voluntary only, and we found little interested among our program folks in gathering even quantitative data. The only times we have reported on these is if we happen to notice that something being reported in our state-defined outcomes is close enough to fit the national outcome to count, and then we have to explain the "duplicate" reporting (or else not report it as a state-defined outcome).
  - o Google Forms: Not convenient; extra effort (duplicative); need to remember to do it; but really no effect.
  - o *There are just over 200 disparate data points that make up the national outcomes and indicators; is this too many? Is it overwhelming to know which ones are or are not important?* As long as the reporting on these is voluntary, it doesn't matter how many there. We still can only report against 2 or 3. However, if it is not important to NIFA, don't even include it.
  - o *State-Defined Outcomes: Currently, the software is set up with a 1:1 ratio for quantitative measure to qualitative story (i.e. for each outcome measure a state enters into their Annual Report, they are able to report a success story related to that one measure); there is no ability for a state to relate multiple quantitative measures with one qualitative statement.* If you mean multiple measures (e.g., impacts # of people, # of businesses, and # of communities, for a rural development program), these would currently need to be listed under separate outcome statements, even if the qualitative "story" was the same. (see also ISU's separate Qualitative Outcome

	example)
	o Perhaps allow for BRIEF narrative in the qualitative data field so that descriptors could be included. It is implied that a qualitative measure must be included with every outcome statement, and we understand that outcomes must be demonstrated, not predicted or projected. Researchers are not comfortable extrapolating field plot data to demonstrate a state-wide impact, especially when it is "potential" impact, which could be years in the future, and not measured impact.

What does NIFA need?	• **OSU:**
	
	    o The two questions posed as to what NPLs need to determine if a state is producing useful outcomes and impacts; and what parts of the POW/AR NPLs rely on to determine over acceptability of a state's programming and integration of research and extension. These conversations with NPLs need to happen so that redundancy in the POW and AR can be eliminated and that any gaps of information/impacts that exist in the information desired by NPLs are included.
	
	       Overall, the POW and AR need to be simplified. We limit competitive grants to 18 pages, perhaps this should be similar for the POW. It would require brevity with the number of project but could be done. Or set a longer page limit within reason
	
	• **UW-Madison**: If the stakeholder and merit review sections are most useful to NIFA, would they consider removing the outcomes measures, external factors and evaluation studies from each program, so states wouldn't feel the need to enter information? These boxes require a lot of text and annual updating, which seems to not add any extra value. Understanding what the NPL would like to see in both reports would be helpful. The annual report would focus on success stories, where the POW would focus on what?
	
	• **UIUC:** Given the amount of time it takes to draft the Annual Report and revise the Plan of Work every year, it would be helpful to have a stronger case made that this document is having a significant impact [NIFA drafts a national Annual Report, of which only a few pages from each state's annual report are included]. On the research side, we already submit reports at the individual project level which in total serve as a de facto annual report [progress reports] and Plan of Work [forms submitted to initiate new projects].
	
	• **MSU:** In general it seems like there should be better tools to pull data from the system and have it come into the report in a more automated way—especially on the research side. This would allow us to focus on including outcomes in a readable (story like) format, which is important to reviewers.
	
	• **Purdue:**
	
	    o Too much duplication between REEport and POW

	○ Executive summary of report is duplicative of the impact statements. ○ Required box for text about evaluation seems to be repetitive – already shared that information in the impact statements. ○ In POW, showing (selecting from provided listing) what methods we use for direct and indirect methods for each planned program is duplicative. Could just do that once for the whole report. **ISU:** ○ *Are there parts of a POW/AR that the states find burdensome to report on?* Meaningful and measurable (quantitatively) outcomes for research (beyond publications and patents). *Why?* Often progress is incremental, and anything measurable may be years removed from when the work was done. ○ HATCH only: Acknowledge that Extension does not have a comparable project system. ○ Less is definitely more. If it is not legislatively required, then for Hatch dollars, the monitoring NIFA has been charged with can be accomplished via projects in the REEport system. Why do duplicate reporting? ○ It would be great if AES POW and reporting could be reduced to Stakeholder Input, Merit Review, and the supplemental Integrated Activity (brief summaries along with forms NIFA-REPT and NIFA

Back to Top

Item 21.0: Future Meetings (Written Brief Only)

ESS 2016 Meeting Joint with the Extension Section
Presenters: Bret Hess and Mike Harrington
For information only

The University of Wyoming, on behalf of the Experiment Station Section, is pleased to host the 2016 Joint Experiment Station Section-Cooperative Extension Section Meeting, Monday September 19, 2016 – Friday, September 23, 2016 at the Jackson Lake Lodge in Grand Teton National Park near the town of Jackson Hole, Wyoming. Information regarding meeting registration, agenda/schedule, and hotel reservations will be provided closer to the meeting date. In the meantime, you are welcome to view hotel information here: http://www.gtlc.com/lodging/jackson-lake-lodge-overview.aspx.

While it is too early to plan a detailed agenda, there have been some preliminary discussions with ECOP leadership on possible discussion items and joint work products.

We look forward to seeing you all in 2016!

Back to Top

Agenda Item: Impact Database Update

For information only

Background:

A new joint ECOP/ESCOP National Impacts Database Committee (NIDC) was appointed last December to replace the *ad hoc* committee that had been guiding development of the database. The charge to the new committee is to monitor and advise the TAMU development team on the refinement and implementation of the database and the public-facing website (http://landgrantimpacts.tamu.edu/), provide updates to ECOP and ESCOP as needed, encourage necessary training on how to use the database, promote use of the NIDB by Extension and Research, and publicize use of the information on the website. An additional charge to the NIDB is that at the approximate 2.5 year point, the committee is asked to provide a written report to ECOP and ESCOP with recommendations regarding if and how monitoring and improvement of the database should be continued. If this standing committee is recommended for continuation, the report should include guidance on terms, rotation, composition and operation of the NIDB.

The committee is co-chaired by Tim Cross, Extension Director, and Bill Brown Experiment Station Director, both at Univ of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Below is the representation and current membership of the NIDB.
1. Two Director/Administrator-level representatives from the Cooperative Extension Section
    a. Tim Cross
    b. Michael Ouart
2. Two Director-level representatives from the Experiment Station Section (one of whom serves as AA for NRSP-1)
    a. Bill Brown
    b. Steve Loring
3. One representative from K-Global
    a. Ashley Hawn
4. One representative from the ECOP MEiE Implementation Team
    a. Joe Zublena
5. One representative from the ESCOP Multistate Impact Writing Project
    a. Sarah Lupis
6. One Land-grant Communications representative
    a. Faith Peppers
7. One Land-grant Evaluation representative
    a. Tyrone P. Miller, Jr.
8. One NIFA representative to serve in a liaison role
    a. Adele Turzillo
9. One Extension and one Research ED to serve as support staff

a. Ron Brown
b. Eric Young

K-global has developed a national press release to announce the database availability, as well as releases for individual Land-grants Universities and APLU to use which will be distributed on February 23. The hashtag #LGUimpact has been developed to bring focus on Twitter.

<div align="right">
Contact: X

Email
</div>

February X, 2015

<div align="right">
Ph
</div>

one

<div align="center">

X UNIVERSITY ANNOUNCES NEW LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY SYSTEM-WIDE ONLINE RESOURCE
Website Provides Access to Research and Extension Impact Statements Across State and University Lines

</div>

[CITY, STATE] – Today, X University announced the official launch of and participation in the National Land-grant Impacts website, a centralized online resource that highlights the teaching, research, and extension efforts by Land-grant universities. Specifically, the website provides access to university or regional-specific impact stories, which document the research and Extension programming planned, performed, and implemented by X University and other Land-grant universities. The website, as a cooperative effort of the Land-grant universities, represents a single voice for the Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension arms of the Land-grant universities.

"The Land-Grant Impacts website is a new tool that will better inform the American people and the international community of the significant agricultural research, education and extension impacts taking place at land grant universities across our nation, which offer practical solutions to today's critical societal challenges. This website will help policy makers and the public learn more about this work that is partially supported with NIFA funding," **said Dr. Sonny Ramaswamy, director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture**.

Impact statements relay the results and impact of research and Extension education programming. Information lists include contact information for university research and Extension project leads and updates on funding, project implementation, or Extension education impact. Impact statements are categorized according to six focus areas: Food Security; Nutrition and Health; Youth, Family, and Communities; Environmental Stewardship; Agricultural Systems; and Energy and Bioproducts.

"Articulating positive changes as a result of Agriculture Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension research and education is critical today. The Board on Agriculture Assembly (BAA) celebrates the launch of this web site," **said Barbara Allen-Diaz, vice president, University of California, and chair, BAA Policy Board of Directors.** "Having a searchable source for outcomes of our work will help to communicate the value of our research and extension programs in our land grant universities."

The website also informs users about the history of the Land-grant university system and how its mission has evolved since the systems' founding. X University, like all Land-grant universities, is committed to a three-fold mission of teaching, research and Extension. The website fully demonstrates

why teaching, research, and Extension are interrelated and how they better X University students, improve communities in X University state, and benefit the nation.

[University QUOTE]

X University is one of the 238 public research universities, Land-grant institutions, state university systems, and affiliated organizations represented by The Association of Public and Land-grant Universities. The Land-grant university system has affiliations in all 50 states, the four U.S. territories, the District of Columbia, Mexico, and Canada.

X University was founded in X Year as a result of the Morrill or Second Morrill Act, which granted each state funding to charter a university with the purpose to teach agriculture, military tactics, and the mechanic arts as well as classical studies to help members of the working class obtain a liberal, practical education.

Back to Top

Agenda Brief: BAA Futuring Initiative
Date: March 3, 2015
Presenter: Mike Hoffmann/Daniel Rossi

Action Requested: For information only.

Background Information:
1. <u>Task Force Membership</u>:

Josef Broder	APS
Tim Burcham	Non-Land-grants
Wendy Fink	APLU
John Ferrick	IAS
Mike Hoffmann	Chair
Jody Jellison	ESS
Govind Kannan	1890s
Doug Lantagne	CES
Ian Maw	APLU
John Phillips	1994s
Dan Rossi	ED support
Lou Swanson	AHS

2. <u>Meetings</u>: The Task Force held its first conference call on October 10, 2014. It met in person on November 3, 2014. It also held two conference calls on December 18, 2014 and January 21, 2015. It is scheduled to meet by conference call monthly. A special conference call was scheduled on January 29th with a potential facilitator.

3. <u>Update</u>

   • The Task Force has reviewed the proposed futuring process, timeline, budget and task force composition.

   • An initial and critical first step in the process is the identification of a professional facilitator/consultant to further develop a conceptual framework for the process and to guide the process. To date, the Task Force has received and reviewed two proposals:
      ○ C. Clinton Sidle, a strategic change consultant associated with Cornell
      ○ Cambridge Leadership Associates (CLA), an international leadership development practice
   Discussions are underway with a third consultant, Karl Albrecht International (KAI). Karl Albrecht is a well-known executive management and futurist.

   • If the futuring initiative is to have a meaningful impact in our institutions, buy-in on the part of the institutional leadership (such as presidents and provosts) will be

important. The Task Force is working with APLU to identify ways to further involve institutional leaders.

- The Task Force has funding of $50,000 from the BAA and is exploring with APLU other funding opportunities.

- The futuring effort will also need to address the importance of learning ecology platforms in the educational process.

- The proposed timeline had completion of the futuring activity during the coming year with a goal of having a draft of the futuring report ready for the next APLU meeting. The meeting would provide an opportunity to engage attendees and obtain feedback. However, this timeline may need to be adjusted.

Agenda Brief: Capital Infrastructure Initiative
Date: March 3, 2015
Presenter: Mike Hoffmann/Daniel Rossi

Action Requested: For information only.

Background Information:
- The BAA PBD approved a proposal from the Capital Infrastructure Task Force for a survey of institutions to generate an estimate of total capital infrastructure needs on our campuses. The approval included a plan to pay for the survey cost through an assessment of institutions included in the survey.
- A letter from PBD Chair, Barbara Allen-Dias, along with the individual institutional assessment invoices, was sent to Administrative Heads in November. A reminder letter was sent out on January 18th and extensive follow-ups were conducted with many institutions. Nearly all land-grant institutions are participating.
- A contract with Sightlines was signed by APLU to conduct the survey and generate estimates of capital infrastructure needs that can be aggregated across the entire system. Sightlines is a firm that specializes in the measurement and strategic assessment of facilities assets. It has extensive experience in working on a number of the APLU campuses and has a strong baseline of information on many of our institutions.
- Sightlines will produce a written report and Power Point presentation that will document the amount of deferred maintenance at the universities that can be aggregated by region of the country. They will provide campus data, analysis and the report on-line in a format that can be regularly updated. In addition, Sightlines will provide recommendations for actions that can be taken at the campus, state and national levels to address and manage deferred maintenance.
- A steering committee was appointed to work with Sightlines. The committee will provide feedback and guidance, assist with institutional contacts and follow-up, review drafts of the preliminary and final reports, and generally serve as a sounding board. The committee is composed of selected institutional facilities directors that Sightlines have contacted through their previous experiences, along with the five Research Executive Directors, an Extension Executive Director, and Ian Maw. The Steering Committee held its first conference call with Sightlines on December 11th. The Committee provided feedback on the (1) types of facilities to be included in the study; (2) general methodology; and (3) schedule of activities.
- Sightlines is in the process of scheduling two one-hour webinars for those participating in the survey to explain how the survey forms should be completed.
- The study will begin in March and be completed by May/June.

Agenda Brief

Celebrating '1890 Day' on April 23, 2015

National '1890 Day' will be celebrated on all nineteen 1890 campuses on April 23, 2015. In keeping with the nation-wide land-grant mission to improve communities through education, research and outreach, anniversary observance activities will include a health and wellness walk. This event will be broadly publicized in order to enlighten a variety of audiences about this important part of history for this country, the signing of the Second Morrill Act of 1890. Authored by Senator Justin Morrill, a man ahead of his time, it stipulated that African Americans, some 25 years beyond the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation, should be included in the U.S. Land-Grant University Higher Education System without discrimination. Now, 125 years later, nineteen 1890 universities are still providing access and enhancing opportunities for people from all walks of life. Celebratory events will take place throughout 2015, and many of our sister 1862 institutions and BAA colleagues have indicated they wish to celebrate '1890 Day' with us. The actual day of the signing was August 30, 1890 and, as this is a Sunday in 2015, all the campuses will hold 'A Day of Prayer' on August 30, 2015.

While all campuses will participate in a wellness walk for 1.890 miles and seek the participation of at least 1,890 walkers, the accompanying programs will vary by campuses. Administrators, faculty, university and K-12 students, alumni, legislators, community leaders, and members of the community at large will walk together in celebration of the millions of 1890 students and alumni who are brilliant, contributing members of our global society. Will you carve out some time in your busy schedule to grace us with your presence?

The 1890 website, www.1890universities.org will allow credit card donations in the near future, and those who cannot join the walks may wish instead to make contributions. All proceeds will go the 1890 system-wide Justin Morrill Scholarship fund.

To see the continually updated list of celebratory activities and for more information, visit www.1890universities.org .

The 125th Anniversary of the Second Morrill Act Committee

Back to Top