



**North Central Regional Association of State Agricultural  
Experiment Station Directors**

**NCRA**

**200th Meeting**  
**Madison Concourse Hotel (Capitol Ballroom B)**  
**Madison, WI**  
**11:30 am to 1:30 pm, Tuesday, July 15, 2014**

**FINAL AGENDA and MINUTES**

| <i>Time</i> | <i>Item #</i>       | <i>Topic</i>   | <i>Presenter</i>   |
|-------------|---------------------|--|--|
| 11:30 am    | 1.0                 | Welcome and Call to Order  | Ernie Minton,<br>NCRA Chair 2014                                 |
|             | 2.0                 | Approval of Spring 2014 Minutes, see:<br><a href="http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/April2014.pdf">http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/April2014.pdf</a>   |  |
|             | 3.0                 | Adoption of the Agenda   |  |
|             | 4.0                 | Interim Actions of the Chair   |  |
| 11:35 am    | 5.0                 | Executive Director's Report<br><a href="#">5.1</a> ED Activities<br><a href="#">5.2</a> ESS Leadership Award<br><a href="#">5.3</a> NIMSS Update<br>5.5 2015 Plan of Work Panel ( <a href="#">Previous panel recommendations</a> )<br><a href="#">5.6</a> NCRA Office Budgets Update | Jeff Jacobsen and<br>Chris Hamilton                              |
| 12:00 pm    | <a href="#">6.0</a> | MRC Report<br>6.1 Revised Projects Approved for FY2014<br>6.2 NRSP Report  | Deb Hamernik,<br>MRC Chair 2014;<br>Doug Buhler,<br>NCRA NRSP-RC |
| 12:10 pm    | <a href="#">7.0</a> | ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee Update  | Ernie Minton,<br>Karen Plaut                                     |
| 12:20 pm    | <a href="#">8.0</a> | Nominations Committee Update   | Ernie Minton   |
| 12:25 pm    | <a href="#">9.0</a> | ESCOP Science and Technology Committee Report  | Joe Colletti, Deb<br>Hamernik                                    |
| 12:35 pm    | 10.0                | Other ESCOP Updates, as needed<br><a href="#">10.1</a> Communications and Marketing<br>10.2 Water Security Working Group<br>10.3 National Integrated Pest Management<br>Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC)<br><a href="#">10.4</a> Futuring Task Force                                  | Steve Slack, Jeff<br>Jacobsen, Daniel<br>Scholl (CMC)            |

|          |                      |  |                             |
|----------|----------------------|--|-----------------------------|
|          |                      | <a href="#">10.5</a> Capital Infrastructure Task Force   |                             |
| 12:50 pm | 11.0                 | Grand Rapids 2014 NCRA Spring Meeting Follow-up<br>11.1 Hatch Project Rejections<br>11.2 P-CAST Institutes<br>11.3 Other   | Ernie Minton, Jeff Jacobsen |
| 1:10 pm  | 12.0                 | Spring Meeting 2015, Preliminary Ideas for Special Topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Danforth AgTech Report</li> </ul>   | Ernie Minton, All           |
| 1:20 pm  | <a href="#">13.0</a> | Resolutions  | Marc Linit                  |
| 1:25 pm  | 14.0                 | Other Business <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fall NCRA Meeting topics</li> </ul>  | Ernie Minton                |
|          |                      | <p>Future Meetings:<br/> <a href="http://ncra.info/Organization_UpcomingMeetings.php">http://ncra.info/Organization_UpcomingMeetings.php</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fall ESS/AES/ARD Meeting and Workshop, September 30-October 2, 2014, Jekyll Island Club Hotel (<a href="http://www.jekyllclub.com/">http://www.jekyllclub.com/</a>), Meeting registration/website: Registration opens July 15 at <a href="http://www.areg.caes.uga.edu/">http://www.areg.caes.uga.edu/</a></li> <li>• Annual APLU Meeting, November 2-4, 2014, Bonnet Creek Resort, Orlando, FL</li> <li>• NCRA Spring Meeting 2015, Embassy Suites San Antonio Riverwalk, March 30-April 1, 2015</li> </ul> |                             |
| 1:30 pm  | <i>Adjourn</i>       |  |                             |

## MEETING MINUTES

**Attendees:** Ernie Minton (KS; NCRA Chair 2014), Dave Benfield (OH; NCRA Past Chair), Deb Hamernik (NE; MRC Chair), Archie Clutter (NE), Rick Lindroth (WI), Joe Colletti (IA), Neal Merchan (IL), Steve Slack (OH), Marc Linit (MO), George Smith (MI), Karen Plaut (IN), David Jackson (NE), Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA), Chris Hamilton (NCRA, recorder)

| Item # | Topic                                | Notes  | Action Items   |
|--------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| 2.0    | Approval of Spring 2014 NCRA Minutes |  | Approved   |
| 3.0    | Adoption of the Agenda               |  | Approved   |
| 5.1    | ED Update                            | See <a href="#">brief</a>  | For information only   |
| 5.5    | NIFA 2015 Plan of Work (POW) Panel   | Marshall Martin of Purdue University has agreed to serve again as our rep to the panel. David Jackson volunteered as well. | Please be prepared to share your POW needs/thoughts at our fall NCRA meeting on 10/12/2014. We will share these with Marshall to take forward to the panel. NIFA will also be providing questions that the NCRA will have to respond to. |
| 6.1    | MRC project approvals for FY2015     |  | All MRC recommendations were approved, all NC project renewals approved for FY2015.<br><br>Chris will inform NIFA and the region.  |
| 6.2    | NRSP Report                          | Voting on new budgets and projects/renewals will occur during the Fall ESS business meeting in Georgia.                    | Please share comments/concerns regarding the NRSP-RC recommendations with Doug Buhler before August,   |

|              |   |  |  |
|--------------|---|--|--|
|              |   |  | to share with the rest of the NRSP-RC during their next call.  |
| 8.0          | Nominations   | Still seeking a replacement NC AA for NRSP7/NRSP_temp301. NCRA members indicated that John Baker is still the best to serve in this role and perhaps could take it back as he settles into his new job.  | George Smith and Chris Hamilton to encourage John Baker to take the role back over as his new position allows. |
| 10.1 to 10.5 | ESCOP Committee Reports   | More information/actions to occur during July Joint COPs meeting next week, July 22, 2014.   | For information only.  |
| 10.3         | National Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC) | Committee is still working to put together a management committee. Group will be meeting with USDA-NIFA at the end of September.   | For information only.  |
| 11.1         | Hatch Project Rejections of Basic Research PIs                      | Jeff Jacobsen brought up the NC Hatch Project rejections with other regional EDs during the NMCC meeting; none of the other EDs were aware of this issue in their regions, other than basic researchers being put on non-Hatch funds. Next year, EDs plan on meeting face-to-face with NIFA to further discuss this and other issues, which hasn't been done in several years. | For information only.  |
| 11.2         | P-CAST Institutes   | Sonny Ramaswamy has indicated that the institutes will be included in the FY2016 budget. Magnitude of funding  | For information only.  |

|      |  |   |   |
|------|--|---|---|
|      |  | is a concern.   |   |
| 11.3 | Including NCCEA in review process for NCERAs | Robin Shepard has indicated that NCCEA is supportive of engaging Extension directors in the review process. Chris Hamilton and Jeff Jacobsen will work with Robin Shepard to include them in this process. It was pointed out that we must be sure not to make the process more labor intensive, given our years of work to reduce transaction costs of multistate reviews. It was suggested that NCCEA could review projects and provide suggestions to the MRC in advance of the regular review process and/or to help if there are significant revisions needed on a given proposal. NCCEA may be able to help with ideas for improvement. | Chris Hamilton and Jeff Jacobsen will work with Robin Shepard to include NCCEA in the NCERA multistate proposal review process going forward.   |
| 12.0 | Spring NCRA Meeting 2015 Topics              |   | Please send Chris Hamilton and Jeff Jacobsen any ideas for topics beyond the regular committee reports. Jeff will also contact associates in TX to solicit relevant ideas and activities. |
| 14.0 | Other business                               | ECOP's MOU with the USDA Climate Hubs was discussed<br><br>Fall NCRA meeting will occur on Wednesday, 10/1/2014 from 8 to 10:30 am. Start time will be 8 am, not 7:30 am, as stated in the draft workshop program.  | For information only<br><br>Please send any desired meeting topics, beyond the usual committee reports, to Chris Hamilton.  |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|

## AGENDA BRIEFS

---

### Item 5.1: NCRA ED Update

Presenter: Jeff Jacobsen

**Jeff Jacobsen**

**Current and Future Activities** (July 2014)

#### General

-Move, Orientation, Acclimation and Engagement – Listen, Ask Questions, Learn and Create

#### NCRA

- Transitions with two locations and institutions (CH and JJ)
- MSU Acclimation and Establishment
- Review Minutes, Reports, Planning Documents
- NCRA Summer and Fall Meetings/Agenda
- State Visits (see status below)
- NCCEA Executive Director (Robin Shepard) and research ED Interactions
- USDA Panel Manager (A1701 CARE – Critical Ag Research and Extension), Summer-Fall
- NRSP 1 (NIMSS RFP, lead subcommittee for the review and recommendations)

#### Executive Committee

- NCRA Plan (review existing documents, minutes, state visits, Chris Hamilton contributions)
- August/September meeting ????

#### ESCOP

- Support Chair (Climate Hub MOU, CAC pre and regular calls)
- ED Support for Core Committees and Functions (Science and Technology Exec Vice Chair; ESS Leadership Award; provide leadership to agenda; NIPMCC)
- Fall Meeting Agenda
- B&L, S&T conference calls

#### Existing Collaborations

- Climate Hubs (Summer Meeting)
- Dairy Research Institute (email, and phone communications, on-hold)
- 2014 Organic Forum (email and conference calls, survey, identify future activities)
- Sun Grant Annual Meeting and Advisory Board
- Climate and Corn-based Cropping System CAP (Lois Wright Morton at ISU)
- Canada Partnerships (Jamshed Merchant I29-I35 H75 Agri-Innovation Corridor discussions)
- Cornerstone Government Affairs and USDA (Fall 2014 and Winter 2015)

#### State Visits

- Kansas State University (March 12-13)
  - \*Arlen Leholm (March 14) and Chris Hamilton (March 15) informal visits
- University of Nebraska and South Dakota State University (May 18-23)

- The Ohio State University (June 25-27)
- Iowa State University **tbd**
- Michigan State University **tbd**, periodic
- North Dakota State University (with NCCEA Fall Conference September 8-12)
- Purdue University (July 1-3)
- University of Illinois (September 2-5)
- University of Minnesota (June 16-18)
- University of Missouri (July 7-10)
- University of Wisconsin (and Chris Hamilton, Robin Shepard) **tbd**

### **Selected Summary of State Visits**

- Thank you for the opportunity for the view into your world. The time and energy put into these state visits has been outstanding.
- Faculties are appreciative of your efforts and are very optimistic about the future.
- Connected with research leadership and others at each institution.
- Obtained perspectives on NCRA functions, operations and past practices.
- Major investments (people, facilities, programs) are being made across the region to enhance the strategic core strengths in key areas.
- The institutional investment and future directions with commercialization of technologies, creation of unique discovery/research parks (and more) is large. Public-private partnerships are being explored with emphasis on workforce development and economic diversification and growth.
- Institutions have unique facilities and service centers that might be strategically linked in order to fully capture value through utilization by leveraging across the Region.
- State challenges with greenhouse (availability) and field centers/stations, O&M and replacement.
- Opportunities potentially exist for future strategic effort(s) with NCRA and NCCEA.
- Opportunities exist to explore enhanced linkages with graduate programs, international programs/experiences and CVM/Med School.
- Explore Multistate Committees and optimize function without increasing transaction costs.
- Battelle study needs to be used to catalyze some key strategic activities.
- Institutional initiatives may also provide opportunities to enhance collaborations across the region (global food systems, water quality/quantity, Great Lakes Initiative, Scientists without Borders, Plant Science programs, big data, open data access and so on).
- Identified feedback to USDA competitive and capacity funds processes and procedures that can be improved from both faculty and staff perspectives.
- The local knowledge of multistate programs is variable. Nevertheless, the impact on faculties and programs has been very strong over time.

### **Travel and Actions**

2014 Mini Land-grant meeting; NC/NE Joint Summer Session, July 13-15, Madison WI

[**Action:** Summer meeting support; Develop NC and NC/NE agenda; Regional network]

2014 Joint COPS, July 21-24, San Diego, CA [**Action:** National network and support]

NCCEA Fall Conference, September 8-12, Fargo, ND [**Action:** NC CES Network and NDSU state visit]

National Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC), September 23-25, Washington, DC [**Action:** Initiate the ESCOP/ECOP concept with the IPM community]  
Fall ESS/AES/ARD Meeting, September 30-October 2, Jekyll Island, GA [**Action:** National support; Fall NCRA meeting]  
2014 APLU, November 2-4, Orlando, FL [**Action:** National support]  
Fall 2014, CARE Panel Manager, numerous timeframes, Washington, DC [**Action:** Secure insights and perspectives with a new competitive grant program; connect with USDA]  
Fall 2014, State Visits to Iowa State University, Michigan State University, University of Wisconsin [**Action:** Complete orientation in region]

[Back to Top](#)

**Item 5.2: ESS Leadership Award**  
**Presenter: Jeff Jacobsen**

*Final version of award announcement:*

**Experiment Station Section Awards for  
Excellence in Leadership (June 2014)**

**Purpose**

To recognize those who have served the Regional Associations, the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP), the Experiment Station Section (ESS) and/or the national Land-grant System with exemplary distinction. Through this person's leadership, he/she shall have personified the highest level of excellence by enhancing the cause and performance of the Regional Associations and ESS in achieving their missions and the Land-grant ideal.

**Award and Presentation**

Up to five awards, one from each ESS region, will be presented each year. The awards shall be signified by the creation of a suitably inscribed piece approved by the ESCOP Executive Committee and presented to the recipient or his/her proxy at the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) annual meeting and will be further memorialized by a resolution to be read during the ESS fall meeting. The home institution shall be made aware of the recognition by formal letter from the ESCOP Chair to the Chief Executive Officer of the institution and its governing body (Board of Trustees, Board of Regents, etc.) with others copied as appropriate. The expense of the actual award recognition will be borne by the Regional Association, while the expenses associated with travel of the winners to the APLU meeting will be borne by the Associations and/or home institutions.

**Eligibility**

Eligible for this award are former or current State Agricultural Experiment/Research Station (SAES or ARD) leaders who have provided service as assistant director, associate director, director, or as chief operating officers with equivalent, but variant titles (e.g. vice chancellor, associate vice chancellor, associate vice president, dean for research) and/or as a regional executive director. This award is distinctive in its expectations and not necessarily coincident with retirement, election to specific office or any other specific professional benchmark.

**Nominations**

Nominations shall include a statement of accomplishments prepared by the nominator(s) unbeknownst to the candidate and supported by letters from up to five (5) former or current members of the ESS. Other letters of support from the home and other institutions may be submitted with the discretion of the nominator(s). Nominations shall address the contributions of

the nominee to the Land-grant ideal through service to include offices held, committee assignments, other service and, in particular special and extraordinary service activities. Such service should include for example: active participation in affairs of the Regional Association and/or ESCOP; regional, national and/or international special assignments with distinctive performance that has advanced the mission of the ESS and the land-grant ideal; and a record of significant accomplishments in the agricultural sciences. Specific examples of contributions may include the enhancement of cooperation across institutions, creation of model administrative systems useable by other institutions, and development of new strategic directions for the Regional Associations or the ESS. Although testimony as to the nominee's contributions to his/her home state and institution are welcomed, they are not pivotal to assessing the contributions to ESS and related activities.

### **Submission and Review**

Nominations for the recognition should be submitted to the Regional Associations by February 1 of each year. The Regional Associations will review the nominations and will select one regional winner. The Associations will submit the names of the winners to the ESCOP Chair by July 1 and he/she in turn will forward them to APLU. The winners will be announced at the fall ESS meeting and the awards will be presented at the APLU annual meeting. Regional Associations may also choose to recognize the Awardee in addition to the above venues.

***Resolution for Fall ESS meeting minutes:***

**A Resolution to Recognize the 2014 Experiment Station Section Awardees  
for Excellence in Leadership**

***WHEREAS***, the following individuals have served their own institutions, their Regional Associations, the Experiment Station Section and the Land-grant System in various leadership positions with exemplary distinction:

**Dr. Carolyn Brooks, Executive Director, Association of 1890 Research Directors**

**Dr. Colin Kaltenbach, Dean and Director Emeritus, University of Arizona**

**Dr. Arlen Leholm, Executive Director (retired), North Central Regional Association**

**Dr. Bruce McPheron, Dean and Director (former), Pennsylvania State University;  
Vice President and Dean (current), The Ohio State University**

**Dr. Craig Nessler, Director, Texas A&M AgriLife Research**

***WHEREAS***, these leaders have personified the highest level of excellence by enhancing the cause and performance of the Regional Associations and Experiment Station Section in achieving their mission and the Land-Grant ideal; and

***WHEREAS***, these leaders have, through their many service activities exhibited by offices held, committee participation and unique assignments, made very significant regional and national contributions that build programs and capacity; and

***WHEREAS***, these leaders have provided significant, dynamic and high quality performance with regional, national and/or international impacts and have a record of significant accomplishments in the agricultural sciences; and

***THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED***, the members of the Experiment Station Section assembled at their annual meeting in Jekyll Island, Georgia, on October 1, 2014 congratulate Drs. Brooks, Kaltenbach, Leholm, McPheron and Nessler for their recognition as the 2014 Experiment Station Section Awardees for Excellence in Leadership; and

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED***, we express sincere appreciation and gratitude to these leaders for their dedicated service and many valuable contributions to the Regional Associations, Experiment Station Section and the Land-grant System; and

***BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED***, that original copies of this resolution be provided to Drs. Brooks, Kaltenbach, Leholm, McPheron and Nessler that a copy be filed as part of the official minutes of this meeting.

### **Item 5.3 NIMSS Update** (as of 7/11/2104)

**Presenters: Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton**

**Current NIMSS** – NIMSS System Administrators, NIFA and others have been manually maintaining the system and its services, while under repair. Recently, important functions have been fixed and NIFA can approve participants and projects. Approval letters are not automatically sent, yet can be copied and pasted to committees as needed. The transfer from UMD to Amazon Web Services, under the auspices of Rutgers (and NRSP 1) is a work in progress. At this time, the system appears to be stable with the intent of a maintenance management program 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 (YLI) to respond to provided questions and offer additional insights. Several follow-on calls were made to 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 YLI for the redesign and operations/maintenance of the new system. The one-time cost of the redesign is: \$265,000 and the cost of the on-going maintenance is: \$128,500. This would require: 1) a mid-cycle budget adjustment to NRSP1 and 2) a contract service to be developed with YLI. The approved 5-year period for NRSP1 is 2011-2016.

With the above financial recommendations, our discussion has been to develop a 3-year contract. One year of redesign and two years of operations and maintenance with the new system. This would result in a completed redesign that is responsive, operational and optimally tested by the system over two years and refine on-going costs based upon need.

Somewhat concurrently, the NRSP Review Committee at their national review approved a modified budget for FY2014 up to an additional \$200,000 as one-time costs for redesign (total of \$275,000) and an additional \$75,000 as on-going costs (total of \$150,000). These were estimated for an undetermined need at the time. The NRSP RC recognized that a conference call might be needed if these did not reflect the needs in the successful proposal.

Given the approved NIMSS funding level of \$21,590 and carryover funds at Rutgers in the amount of \$18,410 that can be applied to the redesign cost, approval will be needed for a one-time increase in funds in FY2015 for NIMSS redesign in the amount of \$225,000. Approval will also be needed for an increase in funding in FY2016 to support NIMSS on-going maintenance in the amount of \$106,910. Finally, approval will be needed for a one-year NRSP-1 proposal for FY2017 that includes a total of \$128,500 to support on-going maintenance of NIMSS in the third year of the Clemson contract.

**Items to be discussed:** financial approaches, ESS approval processes, Redesign team membership, terms and conditions of contract, contracting entity.

[Back to Top](#)

**Item 5.6: NCRA Office Budgets, Summary of FY2014 Spending**

**Presenters: Jeff Jacobsen and Chris Hamilton**

**As of 7/1/2014:**

| <b>UW-Based Assistant Director Account: FY2014 Budget Summary (7/1/2013 to 6/30/2014)</b> |                   |                   |                   |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Item</b>   | <b>Budgeted</b>   | <b>Actual</b>     | <b>Difference</b> |
| Salaries  | \$ 238,504        | \$ 135,082        | \$ 103,422        |
| Fringe  | \$ 82,284         | \$ 46,603         | \$ 35,681         |
| Travel and Reg fees   | \$ 35,000         | \$ 23,492         | \$ 11,508         |
| Telephone   | \$ 2,000          | \$ 1,320          | \$ 680            |
| Publications  | \$ 1,000          | \$ 1,000          | \$ -              |
| Supplies/Web fees/Postage   | \$ 2,500          | \$ 1,294          | \$ 1,206          |
| Training  | \$ 1,600          | \$ 1,758          | \$ (158)          |
| Collaborations/Meetings   | \$ 2,000          | \$ 3,818          | \$ (1,818)        |
| Contingency (2%)  | \$ 7,226          |                   | \$ 7,226          |
|   |                   |                   |                   |
| <b>Totals</b>   | <b>\$ 372,114</b> | <b>\$ 214,367</b> | <b>\$ 157,747</b> |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| 2013/2014 Assessments received from states to UW: | \$370,763 |
| 2013 Carryover:                                   | \$14,824  |
| Remaining UW funds to carry-over into FY2015:     | \$171,220 |

| <b>MSU-Based Executive Director Account: FY2014 Budget Summary (3/1/2014 to 6/30/2014)</b> |                  |                 |                   |
|--|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| <b>Item</b>  | <b>Budgeted</b>  | <b>Actual</b>   | <b>Difference</b> |
| Salaries   | \$246,667        | \$61,667        | \$185,000         |
| Fringe   | \$59,200         | \$16,095        | \$43,105          |
| Moving Costs   | \$10,000         | \$8,476         | \$1,524           |
| Travel and Reg fees  | \$35,000         | \$6,593         | \$28,407          |
| ED Office Expenses   | \$20,000         | \$3,759         | \$16,241          |
| MSU Admin Fees   | \$-              | \$1,555         | \$(1,555)         |
|  |                  |                 |                   |
| <b>Totals</b>  | <b>\$370,867</b> | <b>\$98,145</b> | <b>\$272,722</b>  |

† Note: Fringe was originally budgeted at a 24% rate, but actual MSU rate is 26.1%.

†† \$35,000 travel budgeted for FY2014 and 2015.

**2014/2015 Assessments Received from States (as of 6/20/2014; Due August 31, 2014)**

| <b>Assessments</b> | <b>Requested</b>  | <b>Received</b>   |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Illinois           | \$ 33,161         |                   |
| Indiana            | \$ 30,862         |                   |
| Iowa               | \$ 34,184         | \$ 34,184         |
| Kansas             | \$ 29,869         | \$ 29,869         |
| Michigan           | \$ 31,515         | \$ 31,515         |
| Minnesota          | \$ 31,470         |                   |
| Missouri           | \$ 30,091         | \$ 30,091         |
| Nebraska           | \$ 31,648         |                   |
| North Dakota       | \$ 27,244         |                   |
| Ohio               | \$ 32,553         | \$ 32,553         |
| South Dakota       | \$ 27,318         |                   |
| Wisconsin          | \$ 30,847         | \$ 30,847         |
| <b>Totals</b>      | <b>\$ 370,763</b> | <b>\$ 189,059</b> |

## **Item 6.0: MRC Report**

**Presenter: Deb Hamernik, 2014 MRC Chair**

**Action requested: Approval of the below MRC recommendations.**

### **6.1 Remaining NC Project Renewals**

The MRC recommends approval of all additional revised projects listed below. Following USDA/NIFA approval, projects will renew on 10/1/2014:

- NC229 (NC\_temp229), Detection and Control of Porcine Reproductive and Respiratory Syndrome Virus and Emerging Viral Diseases of Swine
- NC1171 (NC\_temp1171), Interactions of individual, family, community, and policy contexts on the mental and physical health of diverse rural low-income families
- NC1173 (NC\_temp1173), Sustainable Solutions to Problems Affecting Bee Health
- NC1177 (NC\_temp1177), Agricultural and Rural Finance Markets in Transition
- NC1178 (NC\_temp1178), Impacts of Crop Residue Removal for Biofuel on Soils
- NC1179 (NC\_temp1179), Food, Feed, Fuel, and Fiber: Security Under a Changing Climate
- NC1180 (NC\_temp1180), Control of Endemic, Emerging and Re-emerging Poultry Respiratory Diseases in the United States
- NC1181 (NC\_temp1181), Sustaining Forage-based Beef Cattle Production in a Bioenergy Environment
- NC1182 (NC\_temp1182), Management and Environmental Factors Affecting Nitrogen Cycling and Use Efficiency in Forage-Based Livestock Production Systems
- NCCC9 (NCCC\_temp9), MWPS: Research and Extension Educational Materials
- NCCC210 (NCCC\_temp210), Regulation of Adipose Tissue Accretion in Meat-Producing Animals
- NCERA215 (NCERA\_temp215), Contribution of 4-H Participation to the Development of Social Capital Within Communities
- NCERA217 (NCERA\_temp217), Drainage design and management practices to improve water quality

No renewal submitted, will expire as scheduled on 9/30/2014:

- NCERA211, Potato Research and Extension Program
- NCERA213, Migration and Dispersal of Agriculturally Important Biota

## Item 6.2: NRSP Report

**Presenter: Chris Hamilton for Doug Buhler**

**Action Requested:** For information

### Background:

The NRSP Review Committee (NRSP-RC) met in Denver, CO on June 17, 2014 for their annual meeting.

The meeting included discussion of two renewing proposals (NRSP\_TEMP003 and NRSP\_TEMP301), one new project proposal (NRSP\_TEMP321), NRSP-1s midterm review and pending updates to the NIMSS, and the NRSP Guidelines.

### The following actions were taken by the NRSP-RC:

Motion and second and unanimous approval of the following recommendation for substantive changes to the NRSP Guidelines:

- Section III. A. General: Change bullet four under delegated authority to “delegate authority to the NRSP-RC to invest up to 1% of total Hatch Funding in NRSPs.”
- Section IV. B Management and Business Plan: Add the following “For the multistate program, including NRSPs; leveraging shall mean funding brought to bear on the project objectives regardless of source, not including in-kind support from host institution(s).”

| NRSP Project | Title  | Request for FY15 | NRSP Review Committee Action       |
|--------------|--|------------------|------------------------------------|
| NRSP_TEMP003 | The National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)                   | \$50,000         | Approve 5-year budget              |
| NRSP_TEMP301 | A National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs           | \$325,000        | Approve 1-year budget <sup>1</sup> |
| NRSP_TEMP321 | Database Resources for Crop Genomics, Genetics and Breeding Research | \$398,631        | Approve 5-year budget <sup>2</sup> |

<sup>1</sup> NRSP7 must demonstrate that they have secured new (not in-kind) funds that are equal to or more than 2x the off-the-top funding requested prior to submitting another renewal proposal.

<sup>2</sup> Pending formal response to NRSP-RC questions about database platform selection and communication with the National Animal Genome Research Program (NRSP-8) database manager.

### Summary of Key Discussion Points

In 2012, ESCOP capped the total off-the-top budget at \$2M, which represents less than 1% of federal formula funds. If all new and renewing projects are approved for FY15, when combined with existing projects, total off-the-top spending would exceed this cap at \$2,035,868. In addition, it is widely anticipated that the NRSP-1 Management Committee will request a mid-cycle budget increase to facilitate a critically-needed upgrade to the NIMSS. The NRSP-RC felt strongly that the system requires a functional NIMSS database; there was widespread and strong support for completely revamping NIMSS, and even for putting other things on hold to ensure that the NIMSS is functional. For these reasons, the RC recommends extending their flexibility in decision-making by amending the NRSP guidelines to allow the RC to recommend approval of off-the-top budgets up to 1% of Hatch formula funds. Hatch funding for FY15 is currently

proposed at \$243.701 million; 1% would equal \$2.43M, which would accommodate all existing, renewing, new, and potential (i.e., NRSP1) off-the-top budgets.

The NRSP-RC discussed the tenuous status of the National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs (NRSP\_TEMP301/NRSP7), noting that the group has struggled to leverage both funds and stakeholder support. The current off-the-top budget cannot support the program because it requires at least \$1M to approve a new drug. The RC strongly recommends that, if approved, this group use their FY15 funding to enhance stakeholder engagement and further recommended that NRSP7 demonstrate that they have secured new (not in-kind) funds that are equal to or more than 2x the off-the-top funding requested prior to submitting another renewal proposal to ensure that the project is viable and sustainable in the future.

Based on questions received from new and renewing project committees regarding leveraging, the RC recommends clarifying the definition of leveraging in the guidelines by adding the language to Section IV., B Management and Business Plan, that reads: “For the multistate program, including NRSPs; leveraging shall mean funding brought to bear on the project objectives regardless of source, not including in-kind support from host institution(s).” A summary of the NRSP portfolio, including NRSP-RC actions, is below.

## NRSP 2014-2015

| Project              | Request FY2012 | Authorized FY2012 | Request FY2013 | Authorized FY2013 | Request FY2014 | Approved FY2014 | †Request FY2015     | NRSP Review Committee Recommendation |
|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| NRSP1                | 50,000         | 50,000            | 75,000         | 75,000            | 75,000         | 75,000          | 75,000 <sup>1</sup> |                                      |
| NRSP3                | 50,000         | 50,000            | 50,000         | 50,000            | 50,000         | 50,000          | <i>see below</i>    |                                      |
| NRSP4                | 481,182        | 481,182           | 481,182        | 481,182           | 481,182        | 481,182         | 481,182             |                                      |
| NRSP6                | 150,000        | 150,000           | 150,000        | 150,000           | 150,000        | 150,000         | 150,000             |                                      |
| NRSP7                | 325,000        | 325,000           | 325,000        | 325,000           | 325,000        | 325,000         | <i>see below</i>    |                                      |
| NRSP8                | 500,000        | 500,000           | 500,000        | 500,000           | 500,000        | 500,000         | 500,000             |                                      |
| NRSP9                | 175,000        | 175,000           | 175,000        | 175,000           | 175,000        | 175,000         | 175,000             |                                      |
|                      |                |                   |                |                   |                |                 |                     |                                      |
| NRSP_TEMP003 (NRSP3) |                |                   |                |                   |                |                 | 50,000              | Approve 5-year budget                |
| NRSP_TEMP301 (NRSP7) |                |                   |                |                   |                |                 | 325,000             | Approve 1-year budget <sup>2</sup>   |
| NRSP_TEMP321         |                |                   |                |                   |                |                 | 279,686             | Approve 5-year budget <sup>3</sup>   |

### Requests for Off-the-Top Funding

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

<sup>1</sup>NRSP-1 is anticipated to request additional funding during the September ESS meeting to facilitate an overhaul of the NIMSS and maintenance of the new system.

<sup>2</sup>NRSP7 must demonstrate that they have secured new (not in-kind) funds that are equal to or more than 2x the off-the-top funding requested prior to submitting a renewal proposal.

<sup>3</sup>Pending formal response to NRSP-RC questions about database platform selection and communication with the National Animal Genome Research Program (NRSP8) database manager.

### Summary of NRSPs

| Project Number        | Project Name  | Project Period | Midterm Review Year |
|-----------------------|---|----------------|---------------------|
| NRSP-1                | National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS)  | 2011-2016      | 2014                |
| NRSP-3 (NRSP_TEMP003) | The National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)  | 2015-2019      | 2017                |
| NRSP-4                | Enabling Pesticide Registrations for Specialty Crops and Minor Uses   | 2010-2015      | 2013                |
| NRSP-6                | The US Potato Genebank: Acquisition, Classification, Preservation, Evaluation and Distribution of Potato ( <i>Solanum</i> ) Germplasm | 2010-2015      | 2013                |
| NRSP-7 (NRSP_TEMP301) | A National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs  | 2015           | -                   |
| NRSP-8                | National Animal Genome Research Program   | 2013-2018      | 2016                |
| NRSP-9                | National Animal Nutrition Program   | 2010-2015      | 2013                |
| NRSP_temp321          | National Animal Genome Research Program (NRSP8 renewal)   | 2014-2019      | 2017                |

**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 that have generally been well attended. The current B&L Committee membership is shown below.

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

**Water Working Group:** The B&L Committee endorsed an initial description of the issues and strawman document. A draft WG document is expected by the Joint COPS meeting. The B&L Committee supports bringing forward a “Big Audacious Ask” on Water Security based on the Water Working Group efforts. This effort is in conjunction with our Extension colleagues, in consultation with Cornerstone and endorsed by ESCOP and ECOP, the BAC and the Policy Board. The Initiative is for \$100m/yr. for 5 yrs. The Committee recognizes that it may take a year or two to accomplish this.

**Status of NRSP-7 Minor use Animal Drug Program:** The project has requested a one year budget (NRSP-RC approved \$325,000) which does not provide for program sustainability and is insufficient to cover a single drug approval. This may be a terminal year for the project unless they are successful in obtaining additional funds. At this time, the amount of money coming to the project is insufficient to cover the cost of a single drug approval.

The NRSP-7 Committee has developed a request for approximately \$6 m which would provide realistic support for the project. Unfortunately, it is difficult to rally the diverse stakeholder groups e.g. sheep goats, llamas, catfish, deer etc. There is language in the Farm Bill that authorizes this type of program. They intend to spend the year exploring alternative funding options and bolstering stakeholder support for a proposal that would provide realistic funding.

**Survey in Science Roadmap Implementation:** The B&L Committee is conducting a survey to determine the impact of the Science Roadmap has had on decision making in the SAES system. A full report will be presented at the Annual Meeting; however, as of this writing, there have been 41 responses. Preliminary results indicate:

- 67% of respondents report that the Science Roadmap has guided programmatic decisions.
- Of those reporting no change, 60% reported the priorities were already aligned with the Roadmap.
- Challenges 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 were most influential in programmatic decisions:

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Challenge 1: We must enhance the sustainability, competitiveness, and profitability of U.S. food and agricultural systems.                 | 88.24%<br>N=30 |
| Challenge 2: We must adapt to and mitigate the impacts of climate change on food, feed, fiber, and fuel systems in the United States.      | 82.35%<br>N=28 |
| Challenge 3: We must support energy security and the development of the Bioeconomy from renewable natural resources in the United States.  | 73.53%<br>N=25 |
| Challenge 4: We must play a global leadership role to ensure a safe, secure, and abundant food supply for the United States and the world. | 82.35%<br>N=28 |
| Challenge 5: We must improve human health, nutrition, and wellness of the U.S. population.   | 88.24%<br>N=30 |
| Challenge 6: We must heighten environmental stewardship through the development of sustainable management practices.                       | 82.35%<br>N=28 |
| Challenge 7: We must strengthen individual, family, and community development and resilience.  | 64.71%<br>N=22 |

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| Improving agricultural productivity by sustainable means, considering climate, energy, water, and land use challenges | 79.41%<br>N=27 |
|---|----------------|

|  |                |
|--|----------------|
| Developing new plant and animal production systems, products, and uses to increase economic return to producers  | 82.35%<br>N=28 |
| Improving existing and developing new models for use in climate variability and change studies; addressing carbon, nitrogen, and water changes in response to climate; assessing resource needs and efficiencies; identifying where investments in adaptive capacity will be most beneficial; and addressing both spatial and temporal scale requirements for agricultural decision making | 61.76%<br>N=21 |
| Developing economic assessments to provide more accurate estimates of climate change impacts and the potential costs and benefits of adaptation, and to validate and calibrate models  | 29.41%<br>N=10 |
| Developing technologies to improve production-processing efficiency of regionally-appropriate biomass into bioproducts (including biofuels)  | 61.76%<br>N=21 |
| Assessing the environmental, sociological, and economic impacts of the production of biofuels and coproducts at local and regional levels to ensure sustainability   | 47.06%<br>N=16 |
| Developing technologies and breeding programs to maximize the genomic potential of plants and animals for enhanced productivity and nutritional value  | 79.41%<br>N=27 |
| Developing effective methods to prevent, detect, monitor, control, trace the origin of, and respond to potential food safety hazards, including bioterrorism agents, invasive species, pathogens (foodborne and other), and chemical and physical contaminants throughout production, processing, distribution, and service of food crops and animals grown under all production systems   | 64.71%<br>N=22 |
| Investigating the potential of nutritional genomics in personalized prevention or delay of onset of disease and in maintenance and improvement of health   | 47.06%<br>N=16 |
| Developing community-based participatory methods that identify priority areas within communities, including built environments, that encourage social interaction, physical activity, and access to healthy foods—especially fruits and vegetables—and that can best prevent obesity in children and weight gain in adults   | 64.71%<br>N=22 |
| Reducing the level of inputs and improving the resource use efficiency of agricultural   | 64.71%<br>N=22 |
| Developing ecologically-sound livestock and waste management production systems and  | 70.59%<br>N=24 |
| Understanding how local food systems actually work, particularly for small producers and low-income consumers, and how local food production contributes to the local economy, to social and civic life, and to the natural environment  | 64.71%<br>N=22 |
| Understanding the relative merits of people-, sector-, and place-based strategies and policies in regional economic development and improving the likelihood that rural communities can provide supportive environments for strengthening rural families and spurring a civic renewal among people, organizations, and institutions  | 50.00%<br>N=17 |
| The action items have had little to no impact on programmatic decisions for my unit.   | 14.71%<br>N=5  |

- **Types of Programmatic Decisions Influenced:**

|   |                |
|---|----------------|
| Created new faculty/staff positions that were better aligned with Roadmap priorities            | 33.33%<br>N=10 |
| Allocated funds to new programs/projects that were better aligned with Roadmap priorities       | 60.00%<br>N=18 |
| Redirected funds to existing programs/projects that were better aligned with Roadmap priorities | 70.00%<br>N=21 |

- **Responses by Region:**

|        |              |
|--------|--------------|
| ARD    | 11.43%<br>4  |
| NCRA   | 25.71%<br>9  |
| NERA   | 14.29%<br>5  |
| SAAESD | 28.57%<br>10 |
| WAAESD | 20.00%<br>7  |

[Back to Top](#)

## **Item 8.0: Nominations Committee Update**

**Presenter: Ernie Minton, Nominations**

### **AA still needed for the following project:**

- **NRSP7** (NRSP\_temp301), A National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs:  
Needs a new NC AA until it expires on 9/30/2015

### **Recently Filled Positions:**

- **NC1192:** Neal Merchen, IL
- **NCAC2:** Shawn Donkin, Purdue
- **ESCOPE Science and Technology Committee:** Deb Hamernik, UNL
- **NCRCRD:** Doug Buhler to serve as John Baker's replacement from MSU

**Action Requested:** Volunteer needed to serve as NC's AA to NRSP7/NRSP\_temp301.

---

## **NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS**

2015 Officers and Committee Members  
(Fiscal Year 2015 begins **October 1, 2014**)

Last Updated: 6/16/2014

### **Officers:**

- E. Minton, KS, NCRA Chair (14 and 15) ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))  
D. Benfield, OH, Past Chair (14 and 15) ([benfield.2@osu.edu](mailto:benfield.2@osu.edu))

### **Executive Committee:**

- D. Benfield, OH, Past Chair (13) ([benfield.2@osu.edu](mailto:benfield.2@osu.edu))  
E. Minton, KS, NCRA Chair (14 and 15) ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))  
D. Hamernik, NE, Chair-Elect (14) ([dhamernik2@unl.edu](mailto:dhamernik2@unl.edu))  
J. Jacobsen, NCRA, Exec. Vice Chair (Perm) ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

### **Multistate Research Committee (3-year term):**

- Archie Clutter, NE, MRC Chair (15) ([aclutter2@unl.edu](mailto:aclutter2@unl.edu))  
J. Colletti, IA, (13-16) ([colletti@iastate.edu](mailto:colletti@iastate.edu))  
R. Lindroth, WI, (14-17) ([lindroth@wisc.edu](mailto:lindroth@wisc.edu))  
N. Merchen, IL, (15-18) ([nmerchen@illinois.edu](mailto:nmerchen@illinois.edu))  
J. Jacobsen, Ex-Officio ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**Resolutions Committee (3-year term):**

M. Linit, MO, (15-18) ([linit@missouri.edu](mailto:linit@missouri.edu))

**Nominating Committee (2-year term):**

Ernie Minton, KS (15-17) ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))

**Committee on Legislation and Policy**

S. Slack, OH (Effective 7/2013) ([Oardc@osu.edu](mailto:Oardc@osu.edu))

J. Jacobsen, Ex-Officio ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**NRSP Review Committee Representative (4-year term):**

Doug Buhler, MI (14-18) ([buhler@msu.edu](mailto:buhler@msu.edu))

**ESCOP (3-year term):**

E. Minton, KS, NCRA Chair ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))

D. Benfield, OH, NCRA Past Chair ([benfield.2@osu.edu](mailto:benfield.2@osu.edu))

Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA (Perm Alt) ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**ESCOP Executive Committee:**

E. Minton, KS, NCRA Chair ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))

Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA (Perm Alt) ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**ESCOP Chair's Advisory Committee:**

Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA (Perm Alt) ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee:**

J. E. Minton, KS ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))

Karen Plaut, IN ([kplaut@purdue.edu](mailto:kplaut@purdue.edu))

**ESCOP Communications and Marketing Committee:**

W. Wintersteen, IA ([agdean@iastate.edu](mailto:agdean@iastate.edu))

D. Scholl, SD, ([daniel.scholl@sdstate.edu](mailto:daniel.scholl@sdstate.edu))

**ESCOP Science and Technology Committee:**

J. Colletti, IA, ([colletti@iastate.edu](mailto:colletti@iastate.edu))

D. Hamernik, NE, (14) ([dhamernik2@unl.edu](mailto:dhamernik2@unl.edu))

Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA (Perm Alt) ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**ESCOP Science and Technology Committee Social Science Sub-Committee (3-year term):**

Abigail Borron, IN (13) ([aborron@purdue.edu](mailto:aborron@purdue.edu)) - Ag Communications

Scott Loveridge, MI (13) ([loverid2@anr.msu.edu](mailto:loverid2@anr.msu.edu)) – Ag Econ (Joe Colletti will replace when Scott steps down)

Mike Retallick, IA (13) ([msr@iastate.edu](mailto:msr@iastate.edu)) – Ag Education

Soyeon Shim, WI (13) ([sshim7@wisc.edu](mailto:sshim7@wisc.edu)) – Human Sciences

Linda Lobao, OH (14) ([lobao.1@osu.edu](mailto:lobao.1@osu.edu))– Rural Sociology

**ESCOP NIMSS Oversight Committee/NRSP1:**

J. Colletti, IA ([colletti@iastate.edu](mailto:colletti@iastate.edu))  
Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**Other Appointments**

**North Central Rural Development Center Board (2-year term):**

J. Baker, MI (perm, MSU rep), ([baker@anr.msu.edu](mailto:baker@anr.msu.edu)) (Doug Buhler will replace when John steps  
down)

N. Merchen, IL, (14-16) ([nmerchen@illinois.edu](mailto:nmerchen@illinois.edu))

CY Wang, SD, (14-16) ([cy.wang@sdstate.edu](mailto:cy.wang@sdstate.edu))

**North Central Bioeconomy Consortium**

NCBEC Vice President, J. Colletti, IA ([colletti@iastate.edu](mailto:colletti@iastate.edu))

**North Central Regional Aquaculture Center**

NCRA Representative, J.E. Minton, KS ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))

[Back to Top](#)

**Item 9.0: Science and Technology Committee Report**  
**Presenter: Joe Colletti, Deb Hamernik, Jeff Jacobsen**

***2014 National Multistate Research Award***

The Science and Technology committee received four nominations for the National Multistate Research Award this year:

- NCERA197: Agricultural Safety and Health Research and Extension
- NE9: Conservation and Utilization of Plant Genetic Resources
- W2128: Microirrigation for Sustainable Water Use
- S1049: Integrated Management of Pecan Arthropod Pests in the Southern U.S.

W2128: Microirrigation for Sustainable Water Use was chosen as the 2014 winner and was approved by majority vote of the ESCOP Executive Committee; we received back 9 out of 10 possible votes and all were for approval.

The National Multistate Research Award call for nominations document was updated to reflect current practices.

***Other Business***

The ESS Excellence in Leadership Award call and processes document was updated. This Award call will reside with the rotating ESCOP Chair in the future.

Appointed Jeff Jacobsen, Executive Vice Chair, with S&T support through Chris Hamilton NCRA Assistant Director.

Appointed Dr. Deb Hamernik (University of Nebraska – Lincoln) as the new NCRA representative, replacing Dr. John Baker.

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

[Back to Top](#)

## Item 10.1

**Agenda Brief:** AES/CES Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC)  
**Date:** July 15, 2014  
**Presenter:** Daniel Scholl

### Background Information:

#### 1. Committee Membership:

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

2. Meetings – The CMC held a face-to-face meeting on March 2, 2014 and met by conference call on May 22, 2014. It will next meet by conference call on September 25, 2014.

#### 3. Update:

- The CMC continues to work 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.

- We are into the second year of a two year partnership with ECOP to support the Project. ECOP has not yet made a decision to extend the partnership. The AHS have indicated an interest in joining the effort and a proposal for possibly expanding the effort is under consideration if additional funds are made available through the AHS.
- An expansion proposal was prepared by kglobal in response to a request from the CMC. It includes three potential alternatives for expanding the initiative:
  - Being Smarter: Messaging – includes regional focus groups and national survey for message validation, \$80,000 – 100,000
  - Being Broader: Targeting More Districts – adding 10 additional target districts, \$120,000
  - More Integrated: Leveraging the Power of the Communicators – working with all communicators from system rather than only those in target districts, \$75,000
- The CMC is preparing a set of recommendations that will be presented to the PBD at their July meeting.
- The CMC has focused its messages during the past year on nutrition and health. It is now considering adding a second focus – water security.

---

## **Communications and Marketing Project Recommendations**

*Prepared by*

**AES-CES Communications and Marketing Committee**

**Scott Reed and Nancy Cox, Co-Chairs**

**July, 2014**

### **Background**

The Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) and the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) joined together in 2012 to coordinate an educational effort, specifically targeted at legislators in Washington D.C., to increase awareness and support of basic and applied research and transformational education provided by land-grant universities through the Agricultural Experiment Stations (AES) and Cooperative Extension System (CES). kglobal, a public affairs/marketing firm, in cooperation with Cornerstone Government Affairs, assists with this educational effort. Guided by the AES/CES Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC), ESCOP and ECOP have entered into agreements with kglobal and Cornerstone negotiated annually through contracts with APLU. The total cost of the project for the years 2013 and 2014 was \$400,000 annually split equally by ESCOP and ECOP.

The overall purpose of the project is to increase federal funding flowing through competitive and capacity lines to AES and CES. In FY 2014, the seven core programs as advocated by the APLU Board on Agriculture Assembly (BAA) Budget and Advocacy Committee (see [www.land-grant.org](http://www.land-grant.org)) are at or above the FY 2012 levels. Further, increases are reported to be higher in comparison to other USDA programs. Other factors associated with return on investment are:

- 1) Asking what would happen to funding levels without this project.
- 2) How helpful kglobal efforts provide the education Congressional members need in order to respond positively to advocacy efforts by Cornerstone.
- 3) Moving from reactive to proactive messaging, such as the focus during the last year on nutrition and health research and Extension.
- 4) Working closely with the communications experts across the land-grant system, especially in selected Congressional districts, in order to maximize the impact story.
- 5) Outputs related to social media, articles in traditional media, and visibility through [www.agisamerica.org](http://www.agisamerica.org).

## **Current Status**

ESCOP has committed to another three years of support for the project. ECOP will discuss continuance; however, this is not possible at the current funding level (\$200,000 annual) beyond 2015 without an increase in assessments or change in current ECOP expenditures.

There is interest by the BAA Policy Board of Directors, particularly with the Administrative Heads Section (AHS), in joining the effort as a funding partner, especially if all three missions of the land-grant university – teaching, research, and Extension can be adequately represented. An expanded scope could allow the addition of more student stories. These stories would be of interest to our target audience and also could result in additional benefits including attracting more undergraduate and graduate students to land-grant programs, thus feeding the pipeline for future professionals.

In order to accommodate an expanded scope of the project and to maximize its impact, the CMC tasked kglobal with providing a proposal on how the Communications and Marketing Project could be expanded.

## **Expansion Proposal**

The kglobal proposal includes three potential alternatives for expanding the Communications and Marketing Project:

### Being Smarter: Messaging

- Provide better understanding of target audiences—what they think, what issues concern them, and what drives them to action

- Support programs that are more efficient and effective
- Includes regional focus groups and national survey for message validation
- Budget: \$80,000-100,000 depending on scale of the national survey

Being Broader: Targeting More Districts

- Currently working with 12-15 target districts
- Add 10 additional target districts to grassroots efforts
- Identify, mobilize and activate more voices in more districts to educate legislators on the importance of the work of their local land-grant university
- Budget: \$1000 per district per month. Total budget: \$120,000 per year

More Integrated: Leveraging the Power of the Communicators

- Currently working closely with the universities in target districts
- Expand the program to include and involve communicators in every state with land-grant universities
- Educate communicators on current efforts, training them in current messaging, and leveraging their local relationships
- Result in more stories, more local buy-in and greater access to our target audiences across the nation
- Budget: \$75,000 per year

**Cornerstone Comments on the Communications and Marketing Project and the Expansion Proposal**

Kglobal brings resources to our effort that Cornerstone does not possess – digital media, social media and grassroots/grasstops communications (especially from non-agriculture alumni). It is impossible to compartmentalize the actions and payoffs to directly connect any one action with any outcome. However, given the results we have had recently, we believe that the mix of lobbying activities from Cornerstone with kglobal’s educational efforts is working well.

The AHS members’ interest in expanding the current activities is one which we support. kglobal has been judicious in its allocation of resources given the budget. We believe that their proposal will accomplish/contribute to key objectives:

- Recognizing that the natural turnover in Congress (members and staff) requires some repetition in our ongoing activities, the expansion would allow for this while further building on past educational efforts.
- It would better leverage the existing infrastructure and investment that each university has made in its communications staff.
- The message testing is one component we believe would pay particular dividends in targeting what we are saying to what resonates with members and staff rather than telling them what we want them to hear (or *think* they want to hear).

Understanding that there may be insufficient funds to do all 3 of kglobal's proposed activities, we think each has individual merit and defer to Darren Katz and his team on how to get the best "bang for the buck" if scaling is necessary.

### **CMC Recommendations**

Based on a series of committee discussions and a survey of its members, the CMC makes the following recommendations:

- There is strong support for continuation of the current program.
- If the AHS were to decide to join the effort, all expenditures should be split evenly among participating sections to ensure equal partnership. If the current program were continued as is with a budget of \$400,000, it would be funded equally at \$133,333 from each the three sections.
- Depending upon the availability of additional funds, the expansion proposal alternatives should be implemented in the following priority order:
  - I. More Integrated: Leveraging the Power of the Communicators
    - The total program cost would be \$475,000
    - The cost to each section would be \$158,333
  - II. More Integrated: Leveraging the Power of the Communicators and Being Broader: Targeting More Districts
    - The total program cost would be \$595,000
    - The cost to each section would be \$198,333
  - III. All three alternatives
    - The total program cost would be \$685,000 (assuming the cost of the messaging alternative would be \$90,000)
    - The cost to each section would be \$228,333

**Action Requested:** For information only.

[Back to Top](#)

## Item 10.4

**Agenda Brief:** Futuring Steering Committee

**Date:** July 22, 2014

**Presenter:** Mike Hoffmann/Daniel Rossi

### **Background Information:**

#### 1. Committee Membership:

|                          |       |
|--------------------------|-------|
| Michael Hoffmann (Chair) | ESCOP |
| Daryl Buchholz           | CES   |

|                              |     |
|------------------------------|-----|
| John Stier (or Josef Broder) | APS |
|------------------------------|-----|

|              |     |
|--------------|-----|
| John Ferrick | IAS |
|--------------|-----|

|                |     |
|----------------|-----|
| Craig Beyroudy | AHS |
|----------------|-----|

|           |            |
|-----------|------------|
| Dan Rossi | ED support |
|-----------|------------|

2. Background – ESCOP proposed to the BAA PBD and the Board approved embarking on a system-wide futuring initiative to help position the Land-grant System to address the grand challenges facing society, now and as they intensify in the future. This futuring initiative will not duplicate the roadmapping and strategic planning efforts made by the various BAA sections in recent years, but rather use those and other relevant plans as a starting point to develop a long-range integrated vision for the system 20 - 25 years in the future. The first step was the appointment of a steering committee consisting of representation from the various BAA sections. The charge to the Steering Committee was to determine the charge, goals, outputs, timeline and composition of a Futuring Task Force that would guide the initiative.
3. Update – The Task Force has prepared a draft report, “Land Grant University Futuring Task Force Plan,” a copy of which is attached. The Task Force is currently developing estimates of the financial resources that will be needed to implement the plan. The plan will be presented to the PBD at their July meeting

### **Land Grant University Futuring Task Force Plan<sup>1</sup>**

#### Task Force Charge

The Task Force is charged to conduct a futuring exercise that will help position the Land-grant University System (System) to address the intensifying grand challenges facing humanity including a rapidly warming climate and the need to feed another two billion people by 2050. In this global context, we need to take full advantage of the opportunity to change, or even transform, as we transition to a new generation of faculty. The System is

---

<sup>1</sup> The suggested process and outcomes of this plan were taken in part from the following articles: Sobrero, P. (2004). The steps for futuring. *Journal of Extension* [On-line], 42(3).

Available at: <http://www.joe.org/joe/2004june/comm2.php>

Sobrero, P. M. (2004). Futuring: The implementation of anticipatory excellence. *Journal of Extension* [On-line], 42(2). Available at: <http://www.joe.org/joe/2004april/comm1.php>

offered a unique opportunity to shape its future if we plan strategically and in anticipation of the great change that will occur over the next 20-25 years. This futuring effort would move the System into a visionary and anticipatory mode – one critically needed at this time in human history and one willing to fully embrace the enormity and urgency of the challenges. Bold and difficult decisions must be made if the System is to achieve its fundamental mission – *Knowledge with Public Purpose* – in a rapidly changing world.

### The Process

Futuring follows the anticipatory techniques of: 1) understanding the local, national and international political, social, and economic drivers that influence the landscape in which our institutions work, 2) analyzing underlying assumptions that influence the roles of land grant institutions, 3) creating multiple simulations of how changing landscapes, both here and abroad, that influence the direction and impact of land grant institutions, 4) developing resulting forecasts from the outcomes of the simulations, 5) preparing concept papers that reflect various scenarios and outcomes, 6) making sure that decision makers within the System understand possible outcomes and are ready to address anticipated changes, and 7) providing frequent feedback on impact from new directions so that continual improvement can be achieved.

### Expected Outcomes for the System

- More relevant and higher quality teaching, research, and extension programs.
- Timelier decision-making in developing strategic directions for our institutions and programs.
- Shifting from reactive to proactive modes in anticipation of change.
- More effective and timely framing, valuing and ranking of priorities.
- Positioning current and future assets to address emerging challenges and opportunities both here and abroad.
- Development of mutually beneficial globally focused partnerships that address the Systems domestic agenda while at the same time address global challenges that intersect with our domestic priorities.

### Guiding Principles

- The System is a unique institution in that it encompasses teaching, research and Extension – all with public purpose.
- The System must respond quickly, boldly and proactively to the unprecedented grand challenges now facing society, in particular a burgeoning global population and climate change, which is threatening food and water security and social stability worldwide.
- The System will continue to face financial challenges and needs to seek new and creative ways to sustain our human and operational capacity.
- The System could function better with more purposeful and strategic collaboration both here and abroad.
- The System operates in an increasingly diverse and interconnected global community.
- Changes in communications technology are rapid and greatly impact the teaching, research, extension, and outreach functions of land-grant universities and we must make optimal use of these technologies.

- Discussions related to the futuring exercise should be open and participatory. Results should be readily available (open access).
- A wide range of discussants should be engaged for futuring conversations.

### Task Force Goals

- Create a data driven process using existing databases and previously published strategic plans and roadmaps<sup>2</sup> to support analysis of trends, to track emerging and critical issues through environmental scanning and to use that information to project future change.
- Develop forecasts and visionary plans that provide basic understanding of future possibilities to inform planning, programming, and operations.
- Utilize existing information dissemination systems to communicate futuring activities and results.
- Develop a baseline and process for evaluating the impact of using futuring to inform decision making.
- Establish a culture at all levels in the System for sustained futuring activities so that futuring becomes the foundation upon which substantive long-range planning is based.

### Task Force Outputs

- A summary report that provides an assessment of challenges and opportunities for society and the Land Grant System supported by a series of issue briefs and recommendations.
- Specific recommendations relative to resource needs to support future programming, system-wide recruitment and staffing models, and alliance and partnership development.
- A system-wide data driven process for futuring, planning and impact monitoring.

### Task Force Composition

A relatively small team (5-7) of thought leaders who fully recognize the enormity of the challenges faced by humanity and the need for a rapid response by the System and who will engage as necessary a wide range of discussants internal and external to the System. Engagement of a public or private resource to organize the futuring exercise is likely, e.g., The Rand Corporation (<http://www.rand.org/pardee.html>) or Future Search (<http://www.futuresearch.net>).

### Timeline

- July, 2014 – Approval by Policy Board of Directors (PBD) of Task Force plan and budget

---

<sup>2</sup> Including *the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities Report*, *PCAST Report on Agricultural Preparedness and the Agriculture Research Enterprise*, *ESS Science Roadmap for Food and Agriculture*, *CES Strategic Opportunities for Cooperative Extension*, *APS Human Capacity Development – The Road to Global Competitiveness and Leadership in Food, Agricultural, Natural Resources and Related Sciences*, and the *APLU Science, Education and Outreach Roadmap for natural Resources*.

- July – August, 2014 – Appointment of Task Force members; securing a facilitator
- September - October, 2014 – Initial conference call; confirm operational plan; identify and recruit discussants
- November, 2014 – Face-to-face meeting at APLU Annual Meeting; interim report to PBD
- November, 2014 – February 2015 – Futuring sessions conducted; populating and analysis of data bases; establishing baseline and process for evaluating impacts;
- March and April, 2015 – Interim reports at AHS/CARET and PBD meetings; analysis of initial information; identification of issues; appointment of concept paper writing committees
- April – June, 2015 – Projections and scenarios developed; issue concept papers prepared; summary report with recommendations drafted
- July, 2015 – Presentations at Joint COP’s meetings
- August – October, 2015 – Finalize concept papers and summary report; prepare issue briefs; develop marketing and advocacy plan
- November, 2015 – Final report to the PBD

Budget Needs

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| Professional facilitator expenses:                    | \$28,000*     |
| Task force travel expenses:                           | 7,000         |
| Meeting expenses:                                     | 5,000         |
| Publishing costs for summary report and issue briefs: | <u>10,000</u> |
| Total   | \$50,000      |

\* The cost of facilitation will vary depending if it is done internally (Land Grant personnel) or externally (e.g., Rand Corp., Future Search, etc.).

**Action Requested:** For information only.

[Back to Top](#)

## Item 10.4

**Agenda Brief:** Capital Infrastructure Task Force

**Date:** July 22, 2014

**Presenter:** Mike Hoffmann/Daniel Rossi

**Background Information:**

4. Committee Membership:

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Michael Hoffmann<br>(Chair) | Experiment Station Committee on Organization & Policy<br>(ESCOP)                |
| Jim Kadamus                 | Sightlines  |
| Dale Gallenberg             | Non-land-grant Agricultural & Renewable Resources Universities<br>(NARRU/NLCGA) |
| Pamela J. White             | Board on Human Sciences   |
| Tim White                   | National Association of University Forest Resources Programs<br>(NAUFRP)        |
| Eleanor M. Green            | Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges (AAVMC)                     |
| Carolyn Brooks              | 1890 Land Grant Institutions  |
| Dan Rossi                   | ED Support  |

5. Background – Sonny Ramaswamy has requested an estimate of the backlog of capital infrastructure needs among APLU institutions. ESCOP was asked to coordinate a process to develop such an estimate. A Capital Infrastructure Task Force with representation from all elements of our system was appointed with the charge to work with Sightlines to design a survey to collect information to allow Sightlines to extrapolate capital infrastructure needs on our campuses.
6. Update – The Committee worked with Sightlines in the development of a survey proposal. The proposal with a price tag of \$100,000 was presented to the Policy Board of Directors at their March meeting. The Committee has been asked to prepare a plan for funding this project through assessments from the participating institutions. We are working with Ian Maw to prepare such a funding plan which will be presented to the PBD at their July meeting.

**Action Requested:** For information only.

[Back to Top](#)

**Item 13.0: Resolutions**

**Presenter: Marc Linit, NCRA Resolutions**

**A Resolution of Appreciation to Dr. Bill Ravlin  
The Ohio State University**

**WHEREAS**, F. William (Bill) Ravlin has recently left his position as Associate Director at The Ohio State University, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center (OARDC); and

**WHEREAS**, Bill has had a distinguished career as an administrator at OARDC as Associate Director, Fiscal Officer and Assistant Director resulting in the building of public-private partnerships, forming interdisciplinary teams, increasing funding and overall program growth; and as a Professor of Entomology; and

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Ravlin's expertise is in integrated pest management in crop and forest systems with research and Extension emphasis on the gypsy moth through application of innovative decision-support systems; secured over \$15M in external funds as PI and co-PI; resulted in his mentoring and participation on 30 graduate committees; published nearly 60 articles, proceedings and book chapters; numerous invited presentations and hundreds of Extension multi-media materials; developed and taught IPM, Insect Systematics and other courses; and

**WHEREAS**, Bill's career has enhanced programs in the North Central Region; facilitated economic development through local through regional council participation; contributed to the national multistate multiagency Slow the Spread effort; facilitated and partnered with USAID and other agencies to enhance programs in Iceland, Bangladesh, Kuwait and the Caribbean; and

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Ravlin successfully served in many capacities as member and Chair ESCOP Science and Technology Committee in developing A Science Roadmap for Food and Agriculture for the Land Grant University System; member ESCOP Communications and Marketing; member LEAD 21 Board; member NRSP 1; NCRA member (1998-2014), Chair (2008-2009); Administrative Advisor to at least six multistate research committees; and

**WHEREAS**, Bill will continue to contribute to academic, research, Extension and engagement programs in the North Central Region as the Department Head of Entomology at Michigan State University, his alma mater; and

**FURTHER**, Bill has a very thoughtful, direct and can do approach that enriches all interactions and enhances the impact and outcomes of the activity that he is involved with; and

**THEREFORE**, the NCRA hereby expresses its appreciation, respect and sincere thanks to Bill Ravlin for his long-term dedication, leadership and impact on advancing research programs and people throughout the Region, Nation and globe.

**A Resolution Recognizing Dr. Arlen Leholm as the NCRA Selection for the 2014 Experiment Station Section Award for Excellence in Leadership**

**WHEREAS**, the North Central Regional Association (NCRA) of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors recognizes Dr. Arlen Leholm with the 2014 Experiment Station Section (ESS) Award for Excellence having served with distinction as the Executive Director of NCRA from 2007-2013.

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Leholm is known for generously sharing his considerable expertise and experience in building successful partnerships and collaborations among academic institutions and between academic institutions and the public and private sectors. Not the least of which is his collaborative system-wide training in Winning Teams/Winning Grants Workshops and indoctrinating the System to the value and necessity of *Emotional Intelligence* © throughout our interactions with each other and across all segments of the Land-grant University System.

**WHEREAS**, his outstanding participatory leadership at both the regional and national levels, with particular emphasis on thrusts with the ESCOP Communications and Marketing Initiative are notable. Arlen consistently provided enthusiastic support and, ultimately, leadership as Chair of the LEAD21 Board of Directors, during a particularly challenging transition period.

**WHEREAS**, Arlen Leholm, with his co-author Raymond Vlasin, published a book “Increasing the Odds for High Performance Teams--Lessons Learned” in 2006. He has helped public universities across the U.S. build research/extension teams and private sector firms establish cross-functional teams at the top of their organizations. Dr. Arlen Leholm served as a consultant to the World Bank on research-extension linkages and participatory methods. The focus of these activities has been on building trust and team and organizational basics and has resulted in groups exceeding their performance metrics.

**WHEREAS**, in total, Dr. Leholm has more than 30 years of experience in higher education with program and leadership positions with Michigan State University, North Dakota State University and the University of Wisconsin. Arlen was Dean and Director of the University of Wisconsin Extension and Director and Associate Director of Michigan State University Extension. He holds a B.S. and M.S. from North Dakota State University and a Ph.D. from the University of Nebraska. Arlen serves as a consultant to agribusiness firms and as an owner/operator of a large multi-enterprise farm.

**THEREFORE**, the NCRA expresses its thanks and congratulations to Dr. Arlen Leholm for his regional and national leadership and quality contributions to ESS and the Land-grant system with exemplary distinction.

[Back to Top](#)

## **For information only: NIFA Plan of Work**

---

### **A Report on the Initial 5-Year Plan of Work and Annual Report of Accomplishments Review and Recommendations Panel**

#### **Background**

The 2008 Farm Bill (H.R. 6124) contains a provision which states in Section 7505 that “The Secretary shall work with university partners in extension and research to review and identify measures to streamline the submission, reporting under, and implementation of plan of work requirements, including those requirements under – (1) sections 1444(d) and 1445(c) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221(d) and 3222 (c) respectively); (2) section 7 of the Hatch Act of 1887 (7U.S.C. 361g); and (3) section 4 of the Smith-Lever Act (7 U.S.C. 344). ... In carrying out the review and formulating and compiling the recommendations, the Secretary shall consult with the land-grant institutions.”

#### **Five-Year Panel of Experts**

On May 4 – 6, 2010, a Panel of Experts was convened to review and make recommendations to the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) regarding streamlining the submission, reporting, and implementation of the Plan of Work requirements. The Land-Grant University members of the panel were chosen by nomination input from each of the ten Regional Executive Directors for Research and Extension. NIFA panelists were chosen by nomination from the Office of Planning and Accountability (OPA) and the panelists’ supervisors. An expert panel will convene every five years to continue assessing the relevance, quality, and usefulness of the performance data received from the Plan of Work and Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results and make recommendations to further its improvement, as necessary.

The sixteen member panel included eleven professionals from the Land-Grant University partners. Five members of the panel were from NIFA, including Planning and Accountability staff, Policy staff, National Program Leaders (NPLs), and Information Technology staff. The Accountability and Reporting Leader from the Office of Planning and Accountability provided primary panel support.

The panelists were:

- Bill Brown – Dean & Director, University of Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station
- Nancy Franz – Professor/Extension Specialist, Program Development, Virginia Tech
- Karen Hinton – Dean & Director, University of Nevada Cooperative Extension
- \*Steve Loring – Associate Director, New Mexico State University Agricultural Experiment Station
- Deb Segla – Grant Coordinator and Property Officer, University of Alaska Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station
- Mary Jane Willis – Associate Director, Rutgers Cooperative Extension and Urban Programs

- Charlene Herrick – Program Compliance & Reporting Officer, University of Maine Agricultural and Forest Experiment Station
- Marshall Martin – Sr. Associate Director of Ag Research & Assistant Dean of Agriculture, Purdue University Agricultural Experiment Station
- Ellen Taylor Powell – Distinguished Evaluation Specialist, University of Wisconsin Cooperative Extension
- Oscar Udoh – Coordinator, Planning & Evaluation, Southern University Extension
- Jose Ulises Toledo – Associate Dean and Director of Business & Finance, West Virginia State University Gus R. Douglass Land-Grant Institute
- Ellen Danus – Branch Chief, Policy and Oversight, Office of Extramural Programs, NIFA
- Marty Draper – National Program Leader, Plant and Animal Systems, NIFA
- Gary Jensen – National Program Leader, Plant and Animal Systems, NIFA
- John Mingee – IT Project Leader for Plan of Work and REEport, Information Systems and Technology Management, NIFA
- \*Bart Hewitt – Accountability and Reporting Leader, Office of Planning and Accountability, NIFA

\* Co-Moderators of the Panel

The OPA provided the panelists with a set of questions to consider in preparation for the meeting (see Appendix A). These questions were used to focus the panel's discussion and led to additional issues being raised and addressed. Various panel members solicited input from members of their regions and contributed that input over the course of the discussions.

OPA answered questions about use of data and the value of data coming from the system in meeting NIFA's reporting needs. In particular, data are used to:

1. Facilitate communication between the Institutions and their NIFA NPL Liaisons;
2. Help in assessing NIFA Portfolios;
3. Complete Office of Management and Budget (OMB) performance reports;
4. Provide evidence of past performance for the NIFA budget process;
5. Answer Government Accountability Office (GAO), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Congressional, and Departmental (USDA) inquiries;
6. Bring greater visibility of the successes of Formula funded grant programs.

### **Panel's Findings and Recommendations**

Overall comments and recommendations:

1. The current Plan of Work and Reporting process appears to be meeting Congressional and OMB needs and is a vast improvement over the burdensome Plan of Work process that was in place from FY 2000 – 2006. The panel congratulated OPA on its approach and work.

2. The panel found places within the current reporting system where data no longer needs to be collected.
3. Through this review process, the panel expects to enhance the quality and usefulness of information collection and lessen the reporting burden.
4. OPA and NPLs should continue to provide Institutions feedback including useful comments about the Plan of Work and Annual Reports. According to the panel, OPA webinars, newsletters, and other technical assistance and NPLs comments have helped to enhance the quality of the POW and Annual Reports. Feedback on submitted reports and clear guidelines regarding expectations and information to be submitted only serves to improve motivation to report and data quality.

The panel identified as most relevant and focused on the following issues with specific recommendations for action to improve and streamline the Plan of Work and Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results.

Specific issues addressed:

**Issue #1: The usability of quantitative targets for Outputs and Outcomes.**

Discussion: The panelists discussed the usability of quantitative targets for NIFA. The discussion centered on States guessing at targets for outputs and, in particular, numeric targets for outcomes. Some States overestimate data, setting themselves up for failure. Other states deliberately underestimate data to ensure success. It is extremely difficult to project performance targets five years into the future. Outcome and impact data are more important for reporting purposes than outputs, although linking outputs to outcomes helps to link investments to results. In terms of planning, the panelist found that numeric targets were not particularly helpful or used by NIFA in its reports. Moreover, the quantitative reporting of targets may perpetuate the confusion about reporting outputs rather than outcomes.

Panelists discussed the need for patent information. NIFA's concern is that patent information from the Plan of Work and Annual Report reflects work done not by the Formula Grants, but by a variety of funding mechanisms unrelated to Formula Grants. Reporting patents is useful when it is directly linked to the Formula Grants that lead to commercialization of a product. As long as patent information is linked to NIFA funding, it helps tell part of the story. Patent registration was found to be not an optimal indicator of economic benefit due to the fact that not all of these patents become commercial. However, they are still a good indicator of Institutional discovery.

In the Annual Report, quantitative data is useful for reporting outputs and outcomes, especially when backed up with qualitative information to help explain the numbers. NIFA agrees that the most useful outcomes for external reporting purposes are those that combine quantitative data with qualitative explanations, done in number and text format.

Numbers representing faculty FTEs are considered useful data.

**Panel Recommendation #1:** Eliminate quantitative targets in the Plan of Work, but enable quantitative and qualitative reporting in the Annual Report. Maintain the reporting of faculty FTEs in the POW. Maintain indirect and direct contact data, patent information, and publications information as standard outputs in the Annual Report.

**Issue #2: Rolling 5-Year Plans versus New 5-Year Plans every five years.**

Discussion: The rolling Plan of Work is seen as preferable to completing a new Plan of Work every five years. The rolling plan allows for nimbleness in making changes without waiting five years. Institutions need the flexibility to make changes when they occur. With the rolling plan, stakeholders can be asked annually about thoughts and opinions; there is a perceived open door policy with this input. Major efforts are being made for collecting this input from underrepresented groups.

The panelists' concern is that Institutions may be tweaking the Plan, without a conscious comprehensive planning effort that a new Plan requires. The five-year time frame was instituted beginning with the FY 2000 – 2004 Plan of Work based on recommendations by a committee made up of both land-grant university and federal agency members. The five-year time frame is also the maximum number of years for the life of research projects. Before FY 2000, Plans of Work for Extension were based on four-year time frames.

Time frame: The panelists recommended keeping the concept of the rolling Plan of Work. However, there was much discussion on the time frame of the Plan of Work. The discussion then turned to whether the time frame should be three years instead of five. Some panelists felt that a three-year rolling plan would be better because a five-year reporting cycle may be too long and three years would minimize the burden. Other panelists felt that a plan needs to be five years because planning for major issues requires longer-range planning than a five-year time frame offers. A concern is that shortening the cycle to three years would put too much focus on short term outcomes. Other panelists did not see this as a problem. This discussion was linked to Issue #1. Institutions have a difficult time making meaningful output and outcome targets five years out. Three years would be a better time frame for quantitative targets. However, the problem of whether to choose a five-year time frame versus a three-year time frame would be alleviated if Issue #1 recommendations were adopted by NIFA.

**Panel Recommendation #2:** Keep the five-year rolling Plan of Work if the recommendation for deleting the quantitative targets, discussed in Issue #1, in the POW is accepted by NIFA. Otherwise, the panel recommends a three-year rolling Plan of Work. The three-year rolling plan suggestion is to help reduce burden and to better reflect the frequent change in the planning environment.

**Issue #3: Right now the evaluation plans and reports section is optional. Should it be a required part of the Plan and Report?**

Discussion: There was much discussion on this issue. NIFA was asked to explain why this was a part of the Plan of Work and, if it is important, why it is optional. When this was instituted into

the Plan of Work for FY 2007, the purpose of this section was to heighten the awareness of the need for evaluation and to identify formal evaluation studies going on for possible follow-up. The agency also recognized at the time that formal evaluations, although preferred, may be cost prohibitive to some institutions, thus they were made optional.

NPLs on the panel stated that they experienced limited detail in this section other than very brief descriptions of general methods. For many cases it was difficult to know if the evaluations were actually implemented for reporting outcomes. The data were not as informative or complete as other sections. The inadequacy of information provided in this section may be a result of a lack of human resources to complete evaluations, or the nature of the instructions that are provided in the POW guidance.

There was considerable agreement about the need for evaluation, the need for better evaluation, and the need for evaluation plans. There was less agreement on requiring an evaluation plan in the POW. All agreed that it is difficult to justify the expenditures of federal dollars if one cannot document accomplishments and the relationship between investments and results. In the end, most agreed that including an evaluation plan in the POW is a good idea. It reinforces the need for quality evaluation; encourages documentation to see if outcomes achieved are what was planned; and connects with good scholarship and research-based programming. Having an evaluation would be helpful for other university needs, as it helps to collect and analyze data.

The problem may be in the way the instructions in the POW are expressed regarding the evaluation plan. Panelists made several suggestions about how to better word what would be required. For example, one suggestion was that the required evaluation plans simply include: what will be evaluated, how will it be evaluated, and to whom will these results go. It was agreed that making an optional evaluation plan in the POW, as in past guidance, is not useful. Panelists agreed that there should be an evaluation plan per planned program. A proposal was made that institutions choose a few programs to evaluate in depth to report in the Annual Report. Some institutions do that now, but they do not always have something to report annually. NIFA indicated that this would be okay.

In the Plan of Work, NIFA does not need a detailed plan: submitters need to indicate that there is an evaluation plan and describe it in general. There was some discussion about the NIH and NSF expectations for evaluation; resources invested in evaluation and rigor of evaluation being conducted by other federal agencies. At this point, NIFA has no additional money for evaluation studies. NIFA leaves program evaluation up to the states. NIFA is serious about accountability and post-award management, but resources are limited.

**Panel Recommendation #3:** Evaluation is important, but the Plan should leave the details up to the state; it should not be optional. Eliminate the current check box structure in this section. NIFA should provide a text box that lets the States describe their evaluation plans for each Planned Program. The panel suggests having a “help rollover” to explain the box and to also provide examples. It also recommends reducing redundancy by adding instructions to the evaluation plan explaining that including text such as “see outcome #4” (for example) is allowable in the evaluation plan. It is also recommended that there be evaluation training for personnel; NIFA

should take the lead on having large scale, targeted evaluations on a national level with rigorous evaluation designs.

**Issue #4: NIFA guidance for Knowledge Areas (KAs).**

Discussion: The panel believes the new NIFA priority areas do not cover all areas of work and that Knowledge Areas (KAs) are needed to describe these areas, especially in the areas of family and consumer sciences and 4-H Youth Development. The discussion included an acknowledgement that institutions can have more than the five NIFA priorities as Planned Programs in the Plan of Work. The NIFA priorities are not intended to cover 100 percent of the Formula Grant work. But focus is currently on these areas and will be for the foreseeable future. The panels discussed increasing NIFA guidance for KAs, including their relationship to the five NIFA priority areas.

**Panel Recommendation #4:** NIFA should share the KAs that have been designated to a Priority Area for the three areas which have been done as soon as possible. As soon as the other priorities areas have been classified with KAs, these should be communicated to the states. Expand KAs for Family and Consumer Sciences and Youth Development.

If there are additional KAs that support cross-cutting priorities and national work, a petition should be made to the NIFA classification board to consider these KAs. It is not just assisting with clarifying the relationship between priority areas and KAs, but to also add more classification definitions and increase the breadth of programs. NIFA should act on these recommendations immediately.

**Issue #5: Multistate Extension and Integration Research and Extension Reporting are not included in the online software.**

Discussion: Multistate Extension and Integrated Research and Extension requirements provide an excellent opportunity for cross-faculty interaction and enhanced programming. The majority of faculty are not aware of the multistate Extension requirement. The panel feels that the multistate extension and integrated research and extension requirements under AREERA sections 105 and 204 should have been a part of the original software package. This requirement had been moved under NIFA's Awards Management Branch in the Office of Extramural Programs, and they will be working with OPA to get a system in place for reporting to this requirement in the Plan of Work software in the future.

**Panel Recommendation #5:** The Multistate Extension and Integrated Research and Extension Reporting, which currently is sent via Email to the Office of Extramural Programs, should be included in the online Plan of Work software. Until it can be implemented in the software, a link should be provided to upload the existing file in PDF format as an attachment to the Annual Report.

**Issue #6: A conscious effort was made to gather data in the Plan of Work around a simple logic model structure (Situation, Ultimate Goal, Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes, Evaluation), so that if States had a logic model drawn up for each Planned Program it would be relatively simple to complete each Planned Program. Is there a better structure for the Planned Programs, and if so, what is it?**

Discussion: The consensus of the panel is the logic model format has been useful and is now widely understood and should be continued. It helps program folks plan better and point to expected outcomes; and provides a consistent language and approach across the system. The research panelists want to keep it because researchers are just getting an understanding of the logic model and its purpose and are seeing value in it. More support and guidance is needed, however, to help people understand the difference between outputs and outcomes. Assumptions and External Factors are being used by NPLs to help assess program plans. Moreover, an explanation of the external factors is useful in Annual Reports to explain why something did or did not happen.

**Panel Recommendation #6:** Continue using the logic model as the framework for planning and reporting.

**Issue #7: Should a budget be introduced in the Plan of Work?**

Discussion: The consensus of the panel is that any budget number for Planned Programs is meaningless for Formula Grants because of the nature of the grant. These dollars can be reallocated from year to year at the discretion of the directors because of emerging and unforeseen needs. Thus, a budget at the Planned Program level three or five years out would be guessing. The panel agreed that an overall budget can be brought forward for each Formula Grant through the Grants.gov process and thus is not needed in the Plan of Work.

**Panel Recommendation #7:** The panel recommends that budget information be excluded from Plan of Work. This overall budget data can be collected through the Grants.gov process.

**Issue #8: Formula Grants from NIFA provide value above and beyond outcomes reported through planned programs that are in the current POW and report.**

Discussion: Over the course of the two days, the panelists continued to refer to the value of the research-extension system that goes unreported and unknown by many. The panelists believe that there is a bigger story (which the current plan of work reporting system does not capture) to tell regarding the value NIFA and the land-grant universities provide in sustaining a research, extension, education capacity (human, technical, physical) that makes it possible to respond to current and emerging food and agricultural issues. It is the total system that enables the discovery, development, and diffusion of research-based knowledge and technical expertise for enabling the solution of food and agricultural problems; that provides for the professionalization of the agricultural sector (e.g., research and extension play a prominent role in the professional development of crop consultants, seed dealers, veterinarians, etc.); that develops the next generation of agricultural and food scientists and extension professionals; and that sustains a

entrepreneurial and innovative food and agricultural system. This is accomplished through the one-of-a-kind federal, state, county partnership, linkage to the land-grant system, and ability to use the federal dollars to leverage resources and create and sustain networks and collaborations across multiple levels and boundaries. The panelists reported time and again the multiple sources of funding that support research and extension initiatives and the way in which states and institutions use the federal funds to leverage additional resources to support important work. The panelists believe that measureable outcomes can be developed so that the system can document the continuous need for this capacity building with the purpose of sustaining a vibrant food and agricultural infrastructure in a measurable way, and which can be communicated to stakeholders.

**Panel Recommendation #8:** Task a group 1) to further define and bring meaning to this concept; 2) identify measureable outcomes; and 3) propose a process for collecting data to measure this impact.

### **Other recommendations:**

Discussion: After short discussions, the following recommendations were also made by the panelists.

1. Include McIntire-Stennis and its funding in the Plan of Work and Annual Report. The panel recommends exploring the possibility of including Animal Health and Renewable Resources Extension Act to the Plan of Work also. The panel believes including these in the Plan of Work and Annual Report will help tell the whole story of Formula Grants.
2. Add eXtension to the Extension Methods check boxes. This is a delivery method that should be captured. Explanation on how eXtension is used can be done in a text box.
3. The panel supports an existing effort to develop national outcome indicators for the NIFA priority areas and other common national programming efforts for institutions to voluntarily adopt.
4. Continue providing consistency in language between NIFA reporting systems. NIFA has done an excellent job making reporting consistent.
5. Link the Plan of Work system to REEport and NIMSS to enable FTEs, classification data, and financial data to be uploaded automatically into the Annual Report.
6. Provide the Institutions with a model Plan of Work and Annual Report. Continue providing examples in the POW that are relevant to both Extension and research.
7. NIFA should continue having a POW panel to provide feedback on an annual basis as to what has been done in the system and to recommend and validate new applications for the system.
8. The panel recommends that NIFA continue to provide constant feedback regarding Plans of Work and Annual Reports to institutions submitting the POW and AR.
9. Provide a way to capture the value of volunteers.

To: Plan of Work Panel Members

The panel to improve and streamline the Plan of Work and Annual Report begins two weeks from today.

Dr. Steve Loring, Associate Director of the New Mexico State University Agricultural Experiment Station has agreed to help me co-moderate the Panel so we can keep the discussions moving and help draw out all ideas.

Steve and I would like you to consider the following set of questions before you arrive to help spur discussion.

1. Rolling 5-Year Plans versus New 5-Year Plans every five years. What are the pros and cons of each?
2. What data can be reused directly from CRIS/REEport?
3. State use of data versus NIFA need for data in the Plan of Work and Annual Report
4. What do the NIFA NPLs want to see in a Plan of Work and in an Annual Report?
5. What data is NIFA missing that the States think is valuable? And why?
6. What data is NIFA asking for that the States think is meaningless? And why?
7. A conscious effort was made to gather data in the Plan of Work around a simple linear logic model structure (Situation, Ultimate Goal, Inputs, Activities, Outputs, Outcomes, Evaluation), so if States had a logic model drawn up for each Planned Program it would be relatively simple to complete each Planned Program. Is there a better structure for the Planned Programs, and if so, what is it?
8. Should the Annual Report be based on the approved Plan for the fiscal year for which it is approved? Should it mirror the approved Plan of Work? Should it be a blank slate? Should it be something else?
9. Right now the evaluation plans and reports section is optional. Should it be a required part of the Plan and Report?
10. Should a budget be introduced in the Plan of Work?

We look forward to a constructive discussion and panel recommendations to help NIFA improve the Plan of Work and Annual Report of Accomplishments process.

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Bart

Bart Hewitt  
Accountability and Reporting Leader  
Office of Planning and Accountability  
National Institute of Food and Agriculture  
Voice: 202-720-0747  
Fax: 202-720-7714  
Email: [bhewitt@nifa.usda.gov](mailto:bhewitt@nifa.usda.gov)

*Agency Web site:* <http://www.nifa.usda.gov>

*Planning and Accountability Web site:* <http://www.nifa.usda.gov/opa/>

*Investing In Science | Securing Our Future*

[Back to Top](#)