

ESCOP Science & Technology: <http://escop.info/committee/scitech/>

Call Minutes: 6/6/2018

4 pm ET, via Zoom

Multistate Award Selection Call

**Committee Members:**

<p><b>Chair:</b> Laura Lavine (WAAESD) <b>Past Chair:</b> Marikis Alvarez (ARD)</p> <p><b>Delegates:</b> Gene Kelly (WAAESD) Chris Davies (WAAESD) Joe Colletti (NCRA) Deb Hamernik (NCRA) John Kirby (NERA) Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA) Nathan McKinney (SAAESD) Susan Duncan (SAAESD) John Yang (ARD) Alton Thompson (ARD)</p> <p><b>Executive Vice-Chair</b> Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA ED) Chris Hamilton (NCRA AD; Recorder)</p>	<p><b>Liaisons:</b> Terry Nelsen (ERS) TBD (OSTP) Robert Matteri (ARS) Patrick Beauzay (NIPMCC) Edwin Price (ICOP) Kristina Hains (SSSC) Parag Chitnis (NIFA) Denise Eblen (NIFA)</p>
--	---

**Participants:** Susan Duncan, John Yang, Adel Shirmohammadi, Laura Lavine, Nathan McKinney, Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton (recorder)

**Call Notes:**

1. Welcome and roll call – Done, see participants list above.
2. Today's call topic was limited to the selection of the recommended national winner of the Excellence in Multistate Research Award.
  - a. Please refer to [ranking table and online comments](#) below.
  - b. Most of the committee was in agreement with the online ranking results and comments and were supportive of NCERA217 winning the national award. Directors were asked to elaborate on their comments and reflections across all nominations.
  - c. Adel disclosed to the group that he is the AA to NE1335. Jeff and Chris had previously decided that he could still review and rank the submissions, since scores would balance out across the group. This same practice was employed in a prior year. Adel also indicated that NE1335 had indeed leveraged significant external funding, despite one reviewer comment to the contrary. He was also in agreement with the other comments on S1064 and W3008.

- d. Adel reiterated his [comments below](#) over concerns that NCERA217 appeared to be taking credit for accomplishments belonging to ASABE (American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers), citing his involvement over many years with ASABE and work on drainage design. Committee discussion ensued on this issue. Nathan suggested that we normally do not have such background information on projects and can only review based on the 4-page submissions as they stand. Susan would have liked NCERA217 to indicate which accomplishments were specifically ASABE, but also noted that NCERA217 co-membership in both allowed for a larger platform from which to disseminate information. Laura did not feel it was an issue. She spoke on the current occurrence of increasing partnerships across multistate and professional societies and related groups than has occurred in the past, allowing for NCERA217 to more synergistically and impactfully interact with ASABE as well as leverage opportunities with other groups.
  - e. Following these discussions, the group decided by acclamation to reaffirm the ranking/summary. NCERA217 is the recommended winner of the 2018 Excellence in Multistate Research.
3. Other business
- a. Next call is June 25 at 4 pm ET during which the committee will discuss the available team Roadmap Grand Challenge documents, due to Chris and Jeff by June 18.
  - b. The committee also agreed with Chris that May 15, 2019 should be the deadline for regions to submit their final nominations to S&T (via its supporting regional office, currently the NCRA). This earlier date will allow more time for review and ranking. We'll keep the in-person call to the first week in June, as was done this year and in 2017.
  - c. Jeff outlined the next steps in the Award process
    - i. Call notes will be finalized and approved by Laura
    - ii. S&T's recommendation will be sent with the notes and ranking summary to the ESCOP Exec committee for approval
    - iii. Once approved, Jeff will continue the development of materials to be included in the APLU Awards Program for both the national and regional winners. Pictures will be secured for use with the national awardee.
    - iv. Sara Delheimer will receive the NCERA217 nomination and will work with the project's writing team to develop the NCERA217 national winner summary (APLU Program) and impact statement.
    - v. The NCERA217 AA and Technical Committee Chair will be invited to accept the award at the national APLU meeting in November per the Award guidelines.

Call adjourned.

## 2018 Excellence in Multistate Research Award Nominations: Summary Scores and Comments by S&T Members (6/5/2018)

**Criteria Ratings Table, based on the mean of 7 responses out of a possible 12\*\*.**

Project #	Issues (5 pts)	Objectives (5 pts)	Accomp. (40 pts)	Added Val/Syn (30 pts)	Lev. Funding (15 pts)	Particip (5 pts)	<b>Total (100 pts)</b>
NE1335	4	3	33	25	9	5	<b>79</b>
NCERA217	4	4	36	28	13	5	<b>90</b>
S1064	4	4	29	22	9	4	<b>72</b>
W3008	4	5	33	23	11	4	<b>80</b>

\*\*Please Note: John Kirby (and eighth respondent) was unable to complete the survey, yet indicated over email to Chris that NCERA217 was his first choice.

### Comments by Project – Online Survey

#### NE1335:

- This was a strong project with good participation. Particularly nice was the book, articles, and electronic grower resources this group has developed. The level of participant interaction is high in outreach and teaching. Research funding is good, but collaboration in this area is not as extensive.
- Good project with measurable outcomes and impacts. This project should continue to measure the impact to industry and seek extramural, multistate funding.
- This project has all of the three components of the Land Grant mission (Research, Extension, and Teaching) covered. Their collaboration with industries not only has saved them money in energy usage and water efficiency, but also is helping create jobs by partnering with Monsanto for the development of a \$100 M Greenhouse Complex. Their 62 YouTube modules, book, and publications in trade magazines with significant power of outreach to both classroom students and industry are all commendable. Weakness: Objectives were not listed separately in the write-up, rather it was embedded within the text of each "impact sub-section."
- Objectives were not clearly stated.
- Important topic. Document is not well-written and does not provide strong summaries of accomplishments, impacts, and leveraged funding. Overall, little funding has been leveraged by this group.

**NCERA217:**

- This is a strong project, clearly written essay on products, outcomes, and impacts, and nicely showcased the collaboration amongst the participants. Also impressive was the work with the NRCS, non LGU, Government collaborators, Industry collaborators, and NGO collaborators as well as the LGU folks.
- The issue addressed is definitely regional in scope, with broad, long-range consequences if successful. Very good organization of outcomes, impacts and accomplishments. Excellent history of grant activity. Excellent collaboration with regulatory bodies, industry and NGOs.
- This project seems to be reporting on all the activities of the ASABE (American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers) Drainage group under the Soil and Water Division for which I was part of and was involved in development of the design guidelines for drainage systems. It is almost reporting more than 40 years of work that really may or may not have anything to do with this project activities. I should note that the reported progress and achievements in the area of drainage and water table management combined with agricultural cropping management systems is significant, especially in light of current climate conditions. Developed standards that are part of ASABE's Handbook of Engineering Standards is very beneficial for design engineers and the drainage industry as a whole. The committee's publication of several papers in the Transactions of ASABE in a series is commendable. Weakness: I believe the project team is taking credit for what ASABE's Drainage Group and the ASABE Society's Meeting department has done in terms of organizing Tenth International Drainage Symposium. I am certain that some of the members were part of the organizing and publication committee of the Symposium, but it was ASABE that led this Symposium.
- This research was to address the national environmental issue, which is relevant to agriculture operations. Objectives were clearly stated. Accomplishments were impressive and have a broad impact. The project led to large additional funding with a broad collaboration.
- Very well written document. Clearly stated and documented accomplishments/impacts/leveraged funding. Nice job of leveraging funding. Committee membership should include more land grant universities.

**S1064:**

- This project seemed to focus on the Florida participants. It was not clear how the participants collaborate or interact.
- Need to address funding opportunities outside Florida. Perhaps a little premature for this award. This project should continue to publish and measure impact to be competitive. I like the way the narrative is organized showing Output, Outcome and Impact for each objective.
- This project focuses on genetic modifications in order to improve production of cow-calf in the Southern US. The group seems to have separate projects looking at tick loads and calf health, growth rate based on calf gender, early hair-shedding cows versus late hair-shedding cows and its impact on the birth weight of the calves, and finally collecting phenotypic and genotypic data on Brahman herds in Florida, thus establishing a DNA Bank. Genomic evaluations showed that pure Brahman tolerated heat best. The project is producing good level of research data on the above topics. However, I did not see quantitative outcomes on publications or economic benefit

to industry. Weakness: Extension component seems to be weak and the student involvement is not reported in any significant manner.

- Measurable outcomes and a diverse collaboration may be needed.
- Project focuses on Brahman cattle, which do not do well outside of the Southern US states. Heat stress is an issue for many states in the US and if more scientists on this committee from outside the Southern region were included, the committee would have more of a national impact. Very little funding has been leveraged and most of this funding comes from Florida. It is not clear if the committee members are collaborating or if individual states are contributing the accomplishments/impacts.

**W3008:**

- This is an important project with clear economic impacts, strong collaboration and participation and strong products, outcomes, and impacts.
- Good narrative and organization. Shows multidisciplinary approach to problem solving and achievement. I really like how private industry is involved and participates.
- This project has focused on the thorough understanding of Iris Yellow Spot Virus (IYSV), practical management tools to prevent bacterial damage during storage, impact of climate conditions on IYSV and overall pest management for onions. They have good level of outreach to growers through newsletters, annual reports, and websites. Economic benefit to the growers in terms of reducing damage to their crop has been significant. Weakness: It has no student involvement reported and also not much of refereed publication is reported in the outcome section. Funding for this project seems to have been sporadic as well. I am surprised that the growers' industry has not put forth some funding for this group's activities.
- Project impacts may be limited.
- This project has very good collaboration/partnership/engagement with industry. Only 12 land grant institutions are involved and it is not clear if the problem being studied is significant for the US or for the relatively few states that produce onions. The committee has some examples of leveraged funding--mostly from commodity boards and state departments of ag.