

# Experiment Station Section Annual Meeting

September 22, 2003  
 1:30 PM ~ 6:00 PM  
 Ritz-Carlton Hotel  
 Dearborn, MI

## Action Items

Approved <a href="#">Agenda</a>
Approved <a href="#">2002 ESS Meeting Minutes</a>
Approved interim action of ESCOP Chair
Approval of authorization of expenditure of up to \$100,000 in support of NIAS and, if other income is raised, the additional income will be used to offset \$100,000. Motion failed upon a roll call vote.
Approved support of NIMSS at \$30,000 Approved to allow the use of residual funds at NASULGC to support NIMSS at \$30,000
Approved support of NIMSS at \$30,000 Approved to allow the use of residual funds at NASULGC to support NIMSS at \$30,000
Approved change of name of Advocacy and Marketing Committee to Communications and Marketing. Approved addition of NRSP Review Committee to ESCOP committee list. Approved authorization of ESCOP Chair to expend up to \$5,000 with approval of ESCOP Executive Committee.
Approved changes to the Guidelines for Multistate Research Activities
Elected D. C. Coston as Chair-Elect of ESCOP for 2004
Approved resolutions for departing directors, for Dr. Scott Angle, Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, Charles J. Scifres, Anna Marie Rasberry
Adjourned the meeting

## Agenda

<b>Monday, September 22, 2003</b>	
01:30	<a href="#">Call to order</a> - Scott Angle
	Approval of Agenda and <a href="#">2002 ESS Meeting Minutes</a>
	Interim Action - Scott Angle
01:35	<a href="#">USDA-NRI Update</a> - Brad Fenwick, Chief Science Advisor, CSREES Competitive Programs

01:55	<a href="#">CSREES Update</a> - Gary Cunningham
02:15	<a href="#">BAA-PB Update</a> - Colin Kaltenbach
	(ESS meeting in recess)
02:25	(Reconvene ESS meeting)
02:25	<a href="#">NIAS Update and Business Meeting</a> - D. C. Coston Additional Documentation: <a href="#">NIAS Agenda &amp; Bylaws</a> <a href="#">NIAS Report</a>
03:05	Break
03:20	<a href="#">Recommendations from the NIAS BOD</a> - D. C. Coston
03:30	<a href="#">NIMSS Update</a> - Daryl Lund
03:40	<a href="#">ESS Assessment</a> - Scott Angle
04:05	<a href="#">NRSP Oversight Committee</a> - Gary Lemme
04:15	<a href="#">ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee</a> - Richard Jones
04:30	<a href="#">ESCOP Advocacy and Marketing Committee</a> - Tom Fretz
04:40	<a href="#">ESCOP Science and Technology Committee</a> - Nancy Cox
04:50	<a href="#">Partnerships Committee</a> - D. C. Coston
05:00	<a href="#">Planning Committee</a> - Virginia Clark Johnson
05:10	<a href="#">Proposed Changes to the ESS Rules of Operation</a> - H. Michael Harrington
05:20	<a href="#">Proposed changes to the Guidelines for Multistate Research Activities</a> - H. Michael Harrington
05:30	<a href="#">Nominations Committee Report</a> - Richard Heimsch
05:40	<a href="#">Resolutions Committee Report</a> - Colin Kaltenbach
05:50	<a href="#">Passing the Gavel</a> - Scott Angle
05:55	<a href="#">Final remarks/ announcements</a> - Ian Gray
06:00	<a href="#">Adjourn</a>

## Agenda Briefs

**Item: Call to order; Approval of Agenda and 2002 ESS Meeting Minutes; Interim Action**  
**Presenter: Scott Angle**

The meeting was called to order by Scott Angle.

**Action requested: Approval of Agenda, 2002 ESS Meeting Minutes and Chair's interim action**  
**Action taken: Agenda was approved and 2002 ESS Meeting Minutes were approved. Chair's interim action approved.**

**Item: USDA-NRI Update**  
**Presenter: Brad Fenwick, Chief Science Advisor, CSREES Competitive Programs**

Fenwick commented that it is very important to increase communications with the CSREES partners. Meetings

can be scheduled with the regional associations.

CSREES recognizes the budget challenges that institutions are facing. An extramural revenue stream can bolster budgets. CSREES is to distribute all NRI funds and, thus, is accountable for the funding.

The OSTP intends to improve accountability for expenditures. The NRI has had three NRC reviews.

Opportunities for funding have come and died out such as the Fund for Rural America and IFAFS.

There are changes in the NRI: The Fiscal Year (FY) 2004 National Research Initiative (NRI) Request for Applications (RFA) is on the way...although it will come out later than usual. Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service (CSREES) Administrator Colien Hefferan announced Friday, August 15, that the FY 2004 NRI RFA would be delayed due to changes in the program's size and scope that were authorized by Congress in FY 2003. The changes included increased funding, coupled with an opportunity to use as much as 20% of the total available funding to support integrated research, education, and extension activities. When the added funds became available in FY 2003, the NRI published a supplemental RFA to announce a number of new funding opportunities.

In FY 2004, the NRI will publish one consolidated RFA that will include most of the NRI portfolio of programs. The release of additional RFAs for programs offered jointly with other agencies is also planned. Revised submission deadlines will be included in the new RFA, with the earliest deadlines occurring no sooner than six weeks after publication. A projected release date for FY 2004 NRI RFA will be provided in the near future.

The NRI is changing to problem based funding from program based funding. The areas for funding will follow many of the CSREES base programs. There will be new type of award as a supplement. It will be for an Organized Research Unit (ORU) whose projects will foster collaboration and integration for emerging and competitive needs. These ORU projects are to be visible to solve national problems as block grants.

NRI recognizes the need to increase the size and length of awards.

With regard to the Department of Homeland Security, the NRI does not plan to fund enforcement projects, but can fund diagnosis projects.

#### **Action Requested: For Information**

#### **Item: CSREES Update**

**Presenter: Gary Cunningham**

Cunningham provided an overview of the budget status. The 2004 appropriations are still unknown and may provide some increase in funding.

The first draft of the 2005 budget has gone to OMB. The NRI RFA for 2004 will show the direction for the budget request.

The following six topics were presented by Cunningham:

1. The NRI is the place where the budget is likely to grow.
2. Homeland Security Diagnostic Networks are up and running. The laboratories will be expanded when increased funds are available.

The research agenda should look to the NRI for direction.

#### **Action Requested: For Information**

**Item: BAA-PB Update****Presenter: Colin Kaltenbach**

The Board on Agriculture Assembly, Policy Board of Directors met in Jersey City, N.J. on July 20, 2003. Following is a summary of actions taken that may be of interest.

Lobbying: In response to the recent fine assessed by the IRS the Board took the following actions:

Will now require any Section wishing to implement additional advocacy efforts to consult with the Policy Board of Directors and the Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC) before initiating negotiations with any advocacy firm(s); the Policy Board of Directors will coordinate information with the BAC

Will request that all Sections report on all outside advocacy activity when reporting to the Policy Board of Directors

\* Agreed that language should be placed in all future contracts with advocacy firms about how they report their time and the Policy Board of Directors will establish an upper limit to avoid having to pay another excise penalty tax to the Internal Revenue Service for exceeding the limit on lobbying

Budget: Chairman Moser will request that BAC Chairman Tom Payne and Advocacy Chairman Fred Cholick inform the Policy Board of Directors of the Budget and Advocacy Committee's strategy on advocacy for foreign operations budgets or other international opportunities.

Future Meetings: The PBD requests that the section hosting future Joint AHS/COPs meetings report to the Policy Board of Directors on the agenda for the meeting and to reserve one hour of the joint session for reports to be presented by the Policy Board of Directors, Budget and Advocacy Committee, the advocacy organization, and (when needed) the Farm Bill Committee

Reports: All representatives to the BAA-PBD have been asked to submit Section Update reports to the PBD that are consistent with BAA Strategic Plan (i.e., we need to consider working toward the goals of the plan and report accordingly)

Election: Kirklyn M. Kerr, Dean and Director, University of Connecticut was designated as Chair Elect of the Policy Board of Directors replacing James J. Zuiches who has stepped down from his AHS position at Washington State University; Neal Van Alfen, University of California, was elected as the AHS alternate

Respectfully submitted,

Colin Kaltenbach

**Action requested: For information**

**Item: NIAS Update and Business Meeting (held while ESS Meeting was in temporary recess)****Presenter: D. C. Coston**

Information on the NIAS is available at: <http://www.agriculturalsecurity.homestead.com/index.html>

Additional Documentation:

[NIAS Agenda & Bylaws](#)

[NIAS Report](#)

**Item: Recommendations from the NIAS BOD****Presenter: D. C. Coston**

The status of ESCOP funds at NASULGC is as follows:

Current balance	79,454
BAA loan	<u>46,500</u>
Balance	125,964
Uncollected	4,445

Projected needs:

NIMSS	30,000
NIAS	100,000

Proposed scenario:

Carry forward	125,964
2004 Assessment	<u>100,000</u>
Total	225,964
Projected expense	<u>130,000</u>
Balance	95,864

A new assessment requires a two-third vote of ESS.

Comments made regarding NIAS:

Would like an account of three-fourths of a year of activities.

Suggest that the time line for collection of dues be moved up to 2004 instead of 2005.

The NIAS by-laws allow NIAS to collect dues. If others outside of ESS want to join NIAS as members, they can provide support through payment of dues. The purpose of NIAS is to work for the system so that everyone benefits.

No business plan was presented for NIAS and concern was expressed for next year's plan.

It was suggested that ESS authorize up to \$100,000 and, if NIAS is able to obtain funds from elsewhere, the additional funds would be credited against the \$100,000.

The motion was made and seconded to authorize expenditure of up to \$100,000 in support of NIAS and, if other income is raised, the additional income will be used to offset \$100,000; with a two-thirds vote required to approve the motion.

**Action requested: Approval of authorization of expenditure of up to \$100,000 in support of NIAS and, if other income is raised, the additional income will be used to offset \$100,000.**

**Action taken: Motion failed upon a roll call vote.**

**Item: NIMSS Upddate**

**Presenter: Daryl Lund**

Agenda Brief: NIMSS Report-NIMSS Oversight Committee

September 15, 2003

**NIMSS Expenditures (July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003)**

Programmer salary	\$ 15,500
-------------------	-----------

Server space rental and consultations	2,000
---------------------------------------	-------

Equipment and materials	6,800
(includes new computers, software upgrade and books)	
Travel	2,100
Communications (ISP, phone)	3,300
Training (staff development)	200

**TOTAL Expenditure, July 2002 to June 2003: \$29,900**

---

**Projected Expenses (July 1, 2003 to June 30, 2004)**

Programmer salary	\$17,000
Server space rental and consultations	2,000
Equipment and materials	1,000
Travel	2,000
Communications (ISP, phone)	2,000
Training (staff development)	1,000
Documentation	5,000

**TOTAL Projected Expenditure, June 2003 to July 2004:  
\$30,000**

Note that in both budgets, Rubie Mize's and Judy Sun's salaries for their work in NIMSS are not included. Rubie continues to supervise NIMSS' modifications and upgrades, meets with CSREES and CRIS staff, provides training, demonstrations, and support to system administrators and users.

Judy is the back-up cold fusion programmer and she assists in system development as well as provide technical support to users. Her role is expected to increase significantly.

Contributions of the other Regional System Administrators (NC-Nikki Nelson, S-Anna Marie Rasberry and W-Harriet Sykes) are also being acknowledged. Their inputs are valuable in identifying and determining how NIMSS can be enhanced to better serve the land-grant system. They are also responsible for maintaining the database for their respective regions and providing training for their users.

**Accomplishments (July 2002 to June 2003)**

**NIMSS Modifications and Upgrade:**

1. Modified the Appendix E form and submission/notification process to accommodate the revised requirements of CSREES.
2. With UMD-OIT's system upgrade, it was necessary to design short vs. long forms. Using the short forms enabled writers to save the sections they are working on. The upgrade caused some problems on cache overload that created the impression that information were not captured by the database.
3. Increased character limit by 10% of all text boxes in the project proposal forms.
4. Added an "AP" (approval pending) status to distinguish projects that are not yet officially approved by CSREES.
5. Improved the "upload file" capability so that not only html files can be uploaded. File format can be .html, .htm, .txt, .doc, .gif and .jpg
6. Publications sections were increased to 50,000 characters.
7. Added the function to view meeting authorization before sending out the notification.

8. Allowed chronological sorting of annual meetings by date or project number. Simply click on the column heading on the "List of Annual Meetings".
9. Allowed stations to edit their participants' information and giving them the choice whether to send out e-mail notifications.
10. Advisors can now edit e-mail addresses of members of their technical committees.
11. Advisors can now send invitations to participate in proposed multistate projects, and set up a cut-off date for submission of Appendix E in NIMSS.
12. Modified the Annual and Termination reports as two separate forms but using the same format to avoid confusion. The database was adjusted accordingly. Functions were also added to enable editing of annual and termination reports.
13. Expanded the listserve for notifications to include the Extension Directors, ARS Directors and ERS-Susan Offutt.
14. Modified the NIMSS generated notification to reviewers to now include a step-by-step direction on how to use NIMSS to submit reviews.
15. Technical Committee comments and Multistate Research Committee comments were added to the Main Menu. Comments can now be submitted and viewed online.
16. Gave access to Extension Directors to have the same authorization to approve participants as the Experiment Station Directors.
17. Modified the NIMSS Main Menu to reflect all of the above changes.
18. Revised the User Manual with the help of NC-Nikki Nelson to reflect the new modifications and upgrades to make it easily comprehensible and hence, user-friendly. The html version was dropped and a PDF format is in place.
19. The System Administrators Menu had undergone considerable upgrade in the past year to expand navigation capability and increased access to the database.

### **Meetings/Presentations/Training:**

1. Met with CSREES (Dr. Gary Cunningham, Dr. Cheryl Oros and Lizette Williams) to demonstrate NIMSS and explain how it handles the entire process from drafting of proposal, to review and approval by the associations and then to CSREES. Changes to the Appendix E form and memo/notifications proposed by CSREES were also discussed. (August and Sept. 2002)
2. Conducted a NIMSS demonstration for National Program Leaders at CSREES on October 7, 2002.
3. Participated in North Central training for project advisors and coordinators.
4. Gave two presentations on NIMSS at the 2003 CSREES Administrative Meeting in Albuquerque, NM, on April 14-15, 2003.
5. Gave NIMSS presentations to three technical committee meetings: NE103, NE164 and NE172. (May and June 2003)
6. Participated in all the conference calls of the NIMSS Oversight Committee, delivered updates and completed tasks in the Job Jar.

### **Maintenance/Troubleshooting:**

1. Provided solutions to problems whenever feasible from the NERA office. Technical problems were directed to the programmer or the UMD-OIT.
2. Made changes/updates to the database when requested by the Regional System Administrators and AES coordinators.
3. Advisors, reviewers, proposal writers and program coordinators were assisted by walking them through the process, majority over the phone, and sometimes by giving them step-by-step instructions via e-mail.

## **Future Activities/Upgrades:**

1. Reconstruct NIMSS to address performance issues. Specifically, NIMSS will be redesigned to accommodate the growing user population. There are underlying design aspects that can be streamlined to increase the system's functionality and decrease, or totally eliminate the need to duplicate data entry in different forms in NIMSS. This is a tall order and needs considerable programming work. **All other**

- activities will hinge on the completion of this task.** Why is this reconstruction necessary? NIMSS' potential is now apparent to a lot of users and leaders in the multistate agricultural research arena. NIMSS, in its present state, could no longer accommodate modifications without it becoming unstable. With the reconstruction completed, programming for future upgrades will be simplified.
2. As part of the reconstruction, a new system for assigning access and authorization to users will be designed.
  3. Subsequently, once the system is brought to the next level, the programmers will devote a great deal of time to ensure data integrity. There may be a need to re-enter some information that cannot be captured in the new format. The programmers will handle this data entry.
  4. NRSP reporting will be enhanced. NRSPs have not been given the same attention as the other multistate projects in NIMSS programming. NIMSS will be modified in accordance with the reporting requirements and review process outlined in the new NRSP Guidelines. We will seek guidance from the NIMSS Oversight Committee and the NRSP Review Committee on how they want forms set up in NIMSS for the NRSPs.
  5. Documentation is a significant part of the NIMSS development that has to be completed.
  6. Add a "Project Tracking Tool" that will show a project's old number and the new number and dates when new submissions were made.
  7. Add "Technical Committee Officers" in the project homepages.
  8. Modify the Main Menu, User Manual and System Admin. Menu to reflect new updates. More modifications will be done to simplify instructions in the System Admin. Menu.
  9. Work with NRSP-1 to incorporate NIMSS in their new proposal.
  10. Explore opportunities with CRIS on how NIMSS and CRIS can be interfaced to share databases, and in the future be able to organize analytical reporting (expenses vs. outcomes).

### NIMSS Job Jar

#### Arranged according to Oversight Meeting Date

**November 2002**

**December 2002**

**February 2003**

**May 2003**

<b>November 1, 2002</b>	<b>Completed?</b>
<b>NCRA volunteers to update NIMSS User Manual and add to main menu</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Western Region volunteers to create System Administrator Manual</b>	<b>Mike and Harriet aiming to complete this by 10/1/03.</b>
<b>Character limit increased by 10%</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Add "Approved Pending" notation to identify project status. The System Administrators will change the status.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Termination Report added to main menu. (Final version not approved by CSREES)</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Add "browse" function to the SAES-422 form to upload files.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Increase publications section to 50,000 characters</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Future Versions: Appendix E will include "save as working copy" so that participant can put in his/her own participation.</b>	<b>Part of future reconstruction (9/4/03)</b>



<b>Future Versions: Cut-off date will not allow participants to be entered after a certain date. This will ensure that participants are not entered after the review has been submitted for review.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Identifying a "guest members" in Appendix E. This will allow more people associated with committees to be contacted using NIMSS.</b>	<b>8/03</b>
<b>Have stations make their own changes to mis-spelled participants, missing emails, etc.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Allow ARS Regional Directors and Extension /Academic Program Directors (who request it) to authorize their own participants.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Arrange Annual Meetings by Date or Project Number</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Designate which AA represents Research and Extension entities for SERAs.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Add "Tech Committee Comments" and "MRC Comments" to main menu.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>In the System Administrator menu, for the "list of participants not yet approved," add the date that the participant was originally added so we know how long he/she has been pending.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Add AA listserve to contact all AAs for a region through NIMSS</b>	<b>Desirable, but not urgent (5/13/03) (9/4/03)</b>
<b>Correct system so that the server does not lose information. (The short forms have been added as a possible solution, but there are still problems)</b>	<b>Yes</b>

<b>December 19, 2002</b>	<b>Complete?</b>
<b>Include a link on the Appendix E form to the Appendix E Regional Requirement Matrix. Participants need to be made aware to which region his/her project belongs. This will be printed in the NIMSS manual as well.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>The System Administrator menu will now show the password for each project. The System Admin can then "lock" a proposal once it is submitted as final.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>All NRSP advisors will be posted on NRSP projects with an * next to the lead advisor.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Automatic notification sent to Susan Offutt, Administrator/Director of USDA's Economic Research Service, for each project as it is approved by CSREES or by a regional association.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>February 7, 2003</b>	<b>Complete?</b>

<b>Make new templates for NRSP proposal information (ie. budget tables, etc.)</b>	<b>Desirable, begin to consider (5/13)</b>
<b>May 13, 2003</b>	<b>Complete?</b>
<b>Finalize Termination Reports vs. SAES-422 forms</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>NCRA will draft memo to Gary Cunningham requesting that CSREES revise the participation memos sent to stations.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>HTML User Manual dropped. PDF version to remain.</b>	<b>5/03</b>
<b>Change Appendix E wording in desired locations.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Staff backup and NIMSS funding to be discussed at summer ESCOP meeting.</b>	<b>7/03</b>
<b>Add Extension Directors listserve to NIMSS e-mailings – HIGH PRIORITY.</b>	<b>7/03</b>
<b>Allow AAs to make changes to participant email addresses</b>	<b>8/03</b>
<b>Change NIMSS so that submission letter can be sent out while project status is set at “AP.”</b>	<b>8/03</b>
<b>Southern region volunteers to draft memos inviting participation and notifying peer reviewers. Participation memos will be similar to meeting authorization functions in NIMSS.</b>	<b>7-8/03</b>
<b>Check into how SY information in NIMSS will fit with CRIS. NIMSS SY information will be changed to allow two decimal places.</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Change the archive function available to System Admins so that a project automatically archives to the year in which it terminated.</b>	<b>8/03</b>
<b>Email distribution of termination reports – who receives notification that a report has been submitted?</b>	<b>Same as Annual Report</b>
<b>When using "Search Participants by Extension Program," NIMSS is generating a list of participants, most of who show no Extension program or FTE when you look at the individual project's Appendix Es.</b>	<b>8/03</b>
<b>Allow users to change their own email addresses in the user profiles. Natalie has been toying with the idea of after a user registers, they would get a confirmation number sent by email to them, and in order for them to use NIMSS they would have to confirm that they own the email address. Each time they change their email they would need to go thru the same process.</b>	<b>Part of reconstructions. AAs can change participant emails.</b>
<b>Set up Extension Director/ARS Director authorization codes.</b>	<b>Yes</b>

**Action requested: For information****Item: ESS Assessment****Presenter: Scott Angle**

The ESS voted to assess itself a total of \$100,000 for 2003 with funds earmarked as follows: \$50,000 advocacy contingency, \$30,000 NIMSS, and \$20,000 communications and marketing. Implementation of the assessment resulted in actual billing of \$97,779. As of September 10, 2003 collections totaled \$93,334 with \$4445 uncollected. The uncollected funds are from four unpaid entities that have not yet paid any part of the assessment. At least one of those indicated that they had not received the initial billing.

The accompanying [spread sheet](#) shows a detailed accounting of the current financial status of the advocacy account held at NASULGC as of September 10, 2003.

At the Summer ESCOP meeting the mater of assessments was discussed and it was recommended that some level of assessment should be continued.

The ESS must decide its position on a possible assessment and the amount so that this action can be communicated to the Policy Board and to NASULGC.

The motion was made and seconded to support NIMSS at \$30,000.

The motion was made and seconded to allow the use of residual funds at NASULGC to support NIMSS at \$30,000.

**Action requested: Discussion and action on the ESS assessment for 2004.**

**Action taken: Approved support of NIMSS at \$30,000**

**Approved to allow the use of residual funds at NASULGC to support NIMSS at \$30,000**

**Item: NRSP Oversight Committee****Presenter: Gary Lemme**

Additional Documentation:

<http://www.cals.ncsu.edu:8050/escop/nrsp-eval-report.pdf>

Report of NRSPRC to ESS 9/22/03

ATTENDEES: Gary Lemme, Daryl Lund, Don Latham, Al Parks, Bill Brown, Keith Cooper, Eric Young. Guests: Mike Harrington, Tom Fretz, Nicole Nelson

## 1. Criteria for evaluation

- a. Gatekeeper Criteria (prerequisites)
  - i. Mission
  - ii. National Issue
- b. Rationale Criteria (20 points each)
  - i. Priority Established by ESCOP/ESS
  - ii. Relevance to Stakeholders
- c. Implementation Criteria (15 points each)
  - i. Management and Business Plan
  - ii. Objectives and projected outcomes
  - iii. Integration
  - iv. Outreach, Communications, and Assessment

## 2. Timeline for Renewal of NRSP 1, 4, and 7

- a. Established a timeline for completion of review by the CSREES review team and regional associations
- b. Established a process for final recommendation to ESS in Sept 04

3. Timeline for review of remaining 4-year budgets for NRSPS 3, 5, and 8.
  - a. Ask each regional association chair to communicate to the lead AA and NRSPRC and budget concerns on NRSP 3, 5, or 8 that were identified in the regional review in Spring 2003. Respond by November 1 to the lead AA and NRSPRC.
  - b. Ask lead AA to submit to the NRSPRC a management and business plan for the remaining four-year budgets by January 15.
  - c. Established a process for four-year budget recommendation to ESS in Sept 04
4. Recommendations for additional NRSPs to be considered for support.
  - a. Ask ESCOP to charge the science and technology committee to identify appropriate subject matter for NRSP projects.
  - b. Ask regional association representatives to NRSPRC to engage regional association to consider potential subjects for NRSPs
5. Nicole Nelson will contact the lead AA of NRSP7 for follow-up regarding renewal intentions
6. NRSP6 scheduled for 2006 termination
7. ESCOP approved at the July meeting the NRSPRC recommendation that ESCOP fund the expenses associated with stakeholder participation in NRSPRC.

Name	Association	Calendar Start Date	Calendar End Date
Keith Cooper	NERA	2003	2004
Gary Lemme	NCRA	2003	2005
Bill Brown	SAAESD	2003	2006
Lee Sommers	WAAESD	2003	2004
Al Parks	ARD	2003	2005
Richard Wootton	ECOP	2003	2006
Larry Miller	CSREES	2003	2004
Don Latham	CARET	2003	2005
Daryl Lund	NCRA	2003	2005
Eric Young	SAAESD	2003	2006

**Action Requested: For information**

**Item: ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee**

**Presenter: Richard Jones**

Additional Documentation:

[BLCommAgendaBrief09222003.htm](http://www.escop.info/meetattach/ESSMinutes2003.htm)

**FFY 04** See the analyses below prepared by the BRT.

**FFY 05**

At the July meeting of the BAC, the overall themes supporting the FFY 05 budget were established. The four themes the BAC/BRT will use in support of the USDA/CSREES budget are: (1) HEALTHY SOCIETY: Understanding the links between human health and nutrition, with a particular emphasis on the problem of obesity, (2) NATURAL RESOURCES SECURITY: Protecting natural resources from natural or introduced

threats, (3) ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP: Enhancing environmental stewardship through new agricultural technologies and approaches, and (4) PRODUCT-BASED AGRICULTURE: Helping American agriculture transform itself from a primarily commodity-based to a product-based system.

In addition, the BAC/BRT will develop appropriate initiatives for funding from the Department of Homeland Security. The exact nature of these initiatives will become more defined as DHS gets its priorities established. The BAC/BRT has begun to identify teams to serve as resources when the BRT writers begin the process of putting together the one-pagers in support of the budget recommendations for USDA, DHS and other federal agencies (the documents, for example, used by the CARET delegates in March).

The time frame for writing the support documents is between the NASULGC meeting and December 10 with final copy coming immediately after the President releases his FY 05 budget (early February).

To assist the resource teams and the writers, at the appropriate time the B/L Committee will request that the NIAS prepare a document in anticipation of a homeland security initiative by working with Academic Programs, Extension and International Programs to identify funding needs.

To support the themes identified by BAC/BRT within the USDA CSREES budget, the B/L Committee is encouraging each Agricultural Experiment Station to prepare statements that identify impacts and research needs (i.e. what would you do within the project if additional resources were available). In addition, the Committee has asked the Executive Directors to generate statements that support the themes using the multistate research portfolio. The EDs are using the following process: (1) Each ED will categorize the multistate research portfolio of research projects and information exchange groups/coordinating committees into the four themes and agrosecurity, (2) The EDs will select several projects from each theme and each region to develop impact and research needs statements, (3) Working with the project members, 1-2 pagers of impact and research needs will be generated for the selected projects, and (4) The impact and research needs statements will be available to the writing and resources teams for possible use in support of the FY 05 budget request from BAA.

Although still under discussion, it is suggested that each impact and research needs statement follow a consistent outline such as:

Theme: the title of one of the four themes or agrosecurity that this project impacts  
 Issue: Statement of the problem being addressed by the project  
 Resolution: Statement of how this project is contributing to a solution to the problem  
 Impact: Statement of the impact of this project (impact, not just outputs and outcomes)  
 Research Needs: Statement of the research needs that could be addressed with more resources (not necessarily USDA funds)  
 Finally, using this same information, the writers may also develop support documents for use with federal funding agencies outside USDA and DHS (for example, DHHS, DOD, DOE, EPA, NASA, NOAA, etc.).  
**FFY 06** The B/L Committee will be seeking input into the priorities for the FFY 06 budget. The Committee will be assessing how the Agriculture Science Roadmap can be utilized in this process.

**Action requested: For information**

**Item: ESCOP Advocacy and Marketing Committee**

**Presenter: Tom Fretz**

The ESCOP Advocacy and Marketing Committee Chair-Elect nominee has declined to accept the position. The committee needs a new leader and has not met for one year.

**Action requested: For information**

**Item: ESCOP Science and Technology Committee**

**Presenter: Nancy Cox**

The Science and Technology Committee met March 3, 2003 and had a conference call on June 16, 2003 and have the following actions to report.

1. Progress of all standing committees has been reviewed.
2. Supported the Social Science Subcommittee's recommendation to name Stephan Goetz from Pennsylvania State University as chair and recommended that the Chair of ESCOP support re-filling of the John Michael position with CSREES. The CSREES representatives to the Science and Technology Committee encouraged the development of a vision for a new position
3. Received a report from Eldon Ortman from the Integrated Pest Management Subcommittee on the extensive evaluation of the IPM program conducted in response to GAO. Supported Eldon's recommendation that ESCOP appoint Dr. Frank Zalom as cochair representing ESCOP
4. Ag Biotech Implementation Task Force and suggest re-focusing this Task Force after it completes its current activity, a large survey of land-grant faculty on attitudes toward biotechnology.
5. The Food Safety Committee had been inactive for about one year, and Jim Denton of Arkansas recently agreed to serve as chair. We will need to consult with ECOP on progress and direction, as this is a joint committee.
6. A committee was appointed, chaired by Dan Rossi, to review the National Academies report, Frontiers in Agricultural Research. This committee's report is below. Action Required: Discussion and endorsement as appropriate.

#### Draft

A Response to the National Academy of Science 2002 Report  
Frontiers in Agricultural Research: Food, Health, Environment, and Communities

Prepared by:  
ESCOP Science and Technology Committee

August 28, 2003

The ESCOP Science and Technology Committee has prepared a series of responses to the specific recommendations of the NAS report. The Committee highly recommends that, prior to forwarding a formal response to the report, ESCOP coordinates its response with any being prepared by ECOP.

#### General Comments

We commend the authors for an insightful and comprehensive report and are in general agreement with the vision statement and recommendations. Their vision for agricultural research is as follows:

Agricultural research will support agriculture as a positive economic, social, and environmental force and will help the sector to fulfill ever-evolving demands. These include further gains in food and fiber production and such other benefits as enhanced public health, environmental services, rural amenities, and community well being. USDA's REE agencies will provide leadership in fostering this concept. Agricultural research will be anticipatory, strategic, collaborative, cost-effective, and accountable to a broad client base. Agricultural research will engage relevant biophysical and socioeconomic disciplines in a systems approach to address new priorities.

Even though the report primarily addresses the role of USDA REE agencies, its recommendations have important implications that cut across the entire public agricultural research system including the land grant institutions. In addition, while we interact primarily with one REE agency, CSREES, we are intent on enhancing our relationships and partnerships with all REE agencies.

Recognizing the need for planning that is both strategic and anticipatory relative to stakeholder needs, ESCOP formulated a "Science Roadmap for Agriculture." The Roadmap was developed with the support from a task force of nationally recognized scholars that charted the major directions of agricultural science over the next 10 to 20 years. The task force assessed the scientific feasibility of meeting the needs of diverse groups of stakeholders ranging from the food production and processing sectors to consumers and the general public. This effort included prioritizing stakeholder needs; determining the scientific feasibility of solving the most important needs with current scientific methods and tools; and predicting the positive impacts of successful research outcomes.

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** REE should provide leadership for the agricultural community in exploring research frontiers in food, health, environment, and communities. REE should build on its historical strengths and become a scientific leader in using new technologies and emerging scientific paradigms to pursue strategic, long-term research goals. A greater emphasis on multidisciplinary work that engages all relevant disciplines will be needed to address many new research frontiers.

We agree that REE should provide leadership but we believe that such leadership should be in close collaboration with the land grant system. This leadership should also provide better linkages to other federal agencies supporting research in order to leverage limited resources. It is also important to note that any expansion of the research mission should be accompanied by an influx of new resources. It is critical that we enlarge the "pie" rather than just reallocate existing resources. Just reallocating existing funds will reintroduce previous conflicting views and disputes that will likely inflame traditional constituencies that have provided political support for public funding of agricultural research.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** The REE agencies need to identify clearly their unique positions relative to the other components of the agricultural research system, identify high-impact activities through which targeted funding and resources could generate substantial and measurable progress toward meeting national needs, and coordinate planning and research support across the agencies to minimize unnecessary duplication and maximize effectiveness. Those efforts should be informed by a clear articulation of the national priorities for research and education and a system for anticipating, reporting on, and identifying strategies to address emerging research needs.

ESCOP supports this recommendation but wants to emphasize the need to maintain a balance between short-term research needs and longer term needs. It is critical that REE continues to support long-term basic research and research and educational infrastructure that are supported through base funds.

**RECOMMENDATION 3:** The REE agencies should direct new and existing resources that currently support agricultural productivity research toward new research opportunities in health, environment, and communities.

It is important to recognize that reallocation of resources has and will continue to occur to new and emerging issues and needs. However, any reallocation of existing resources is not easy and reintroduces previous frictions not only between the research and extension leadership but also among our various clientele groups. The political support for public funding of agricultural research has historically been based in the agricultural community. Any discussion of reallocation of existing resources raises questions of political legitimacy and efficiency. The real issue is one of securing new resources perhaps through partnerships both with other federal agencies and with new constituent support groups.

**RECOMMENDATION 4:** To ensure that research funds are used to advance science in new directions and to address emerging and emergency issues in a timely and responsible fashion, the committee recommends the following:

1. Total Competitive grants should be substantially increased to and sustained at 20-30% of the total portfolio.

ESCOP agrees with an increase in the availability of competitive funding for agricultural research but this increase must come through new funding and not through reallocating the existing portfolio. The availability of base funds maintains flexibility and enhances the competitiveness of institutions in attracting support for those

issues of importance to the publics they support. Base funds serve as the "glue" that binds the state and federal institutions into a national system capable of addressing the complex problems of economic viability of agriculture, a safe and secure food system, a sustainable environment and natural resource base, and human and community development. These funds support the research and educational infrastructure and are necessary to maintain state and local funding support. Competitive funding then serves to add value and expands the capacity of the system to address emerging issues.

2. Action agencies should receive or control discretionary funds to be used to meet critical programmatic needs complementary to those currently served by REE agencies. The agencies could thereby fund intramural USDA scientists, other agency scientists, or university researchers competitively on the basis of the researchers' availability and match of expertise to agency needs.

We support increased discretion over the use of resources by USDA action agencies. It is important to note that the agricultural research system is much broader than just the REE and requires a solid foundation in of biological, physical and social sciences. The overall system, which has been primarily supported by base funds, is best capable of dealing with emergencies. Competitive programs are less flexible, less timely, and less responsive in dealing effectively with emergencies. New funds should be made available to address crisis management and homeland security issues. These funds are needed to increase the capacity of the system to address the environmental, community and family dimensions of crisis management.

3. The REE agencies should pursue complementary research activities and tap broader expertise by dedicating a higher percentage of new funds to cooperative arrangements, to be awarded on a competitive basis for large awards, with academic or other public-sector researchers.

CSREES has administered a number of very successful grant programs focusing on the integration of research and outreach across disciplinary areas and across institutions. These programs have been highly effective in mobilizing multidisciplinary, multi-institutional expertise to address clientele identified needs. The agricultural research and extension system demonstrated an excellent ability to respond to large-scale proposals involving a broad spectrum of individuals. This ability to respond is in large part due to the base funded infrastructure which can utilize these types of funds to complement and enhance existing programs. ESCOP strongly recommends that these programs receive funding. The previous success of these programs proves that they can tap into knowledge base that exists within the system to effectively provide a response structure capable of addressing events before they occur.

4. Congress should increase REE budgetary flexibility to move resources toward emerging and emergency needs.

It is important that agricultural research and extension system be involved in decisions to direct resources toward emerging and emergency needs, not just the REE administration. ESCOP and ECOP committee structures can effectively work in an advisory role to support REE leadership if additional flexibility is provided.

**RECOMMENDATION 5:** To provide a forum for shared learning across agencies, REE should conduct a national summit every 2-3 years that would engage the four REE agencies and a broad representation of stakeholders at the local, national, and regional levels. The summit could assess national research needs and inform stakeholders how their input is used in agency decision-making.

It should be noted that broad-spectrum national summits are not the only method for capturing stakeholder input and are not without problems. They tend to end up in "free-for-all". Those individuals or groups who make the most noise receive the most attention. It is very difficult to add the appropriate weights to the information collected in order to extrapolate findings. Individual institutions within the research and extension system already collect detailed information with broad constituency support. This information should be used along with any collected through national level forums.

**RECOMMENDATION 6:** REE should provide national leadership in developing intellectual property policy for agricultural research. REE should address the potential consequences of public-private collaboration with



appropriate policies, practices, and organizational arrangements that

- Promote the greatest public benefit from agricultural research.
- Protect the public investment in research.
- Prevent diversion of public resources away from research that can be carried out only in the public sector.
- Pursue strategic private-sector collaboration necessary to achieve public goals.

To achieve these objectives, REE should establish ways to measure the effectiveness of technology generation and transfer through private-sector collaboration.

ESCOP applauds the goals of this recommendation and particularly that of stressing the importance of focusing on public goods research. However, the structure of intellectual property rights is much more complicated than suggested here. While there may be certain basic principles where there may be consensus, each institution will determine its own intellectual property policy. Public rights laws are a politically determined issue and it is not likely that much impact will result from efforts in this area. Institutions generally do not look to USDA leadership in this area and any actions could lead to a gridlock between the individual state institutions and the USDA. We also want to recognize the current attempts to develop public/private partnerships relative to intellectual property rights led by the Rockefeller and Pew Foundations.

**RECOMMENDATION 7:** The REE intramural research system should strengthen quality control for poor research performance. Mechanisms used in other federal intramural research agencies, including the redirection of human or financial resources when quality is poor, could be implemented.

ESCOP supports in principle any efforts to strengthen quality control in research management and to scrutinize alternative internal mechanisms.

**RECOMMENDATION 8:** REE agencies should develop and adopt ways of measuring the national, long-term impacts of their research on the environment, human health, and communities. The tools should include measures and indicators that are influenced by agricultural research or that can be attributed to research outcomes, including how research supports the needs of action agencies. REE should strive to achieve greater transparency in communicating these impacts through timely electronic publishing of peer-reviewed results and through greater efforts to interpret these results for a general audience.

There is a clear need to initiate a national effort to establish a system of stakeholder accepted indicators to measure impacts of research on the environment, human health, and communities. However, it is recognized that such an effort will be a long and difficult process, and will require many years and many resources to be successful.

**RECOMMENDATION 9:** There is a national need for a high-level leader to represent food and agricultural research and to promote opportunities for the research system. Such a leader should be vested with the authority to develop the food and agricultural research agenda, redirect funds to emerging issues and emergency needs, integrate the efforts of the individual agencies, and facilitate collaboration and coordination with scientists outside USDA and elsewhere in the federally supported research system. The leader should be selected on the basis of outstanding scientific and administrative accomplishments and must command the respect of the agricultural community and the broad scientific community.

ESCOP agrees with the intent of this recommendation and believes it is of utmost importance. However, it is not sure of how it may be best accomplished. Strengthening of the undersecretary's position is a possible option. It is clear that this individual needs to be someone at the political level of the White House. It is also important to give the system a stake in this process.

**RECOMMENDATION 10:** REE should increase the hiring of scientists in research fields that have the greatest opportunities to address societal goals. Those include integrative environmental science, ecology, economics, and sociology; human genetics (including statistical human genetics) and bioinformatics; and human nutrition, public health, and food safety. REE agencies should continue to develop new methods for recruiting and retaining women and members of ethnic minorities.

ESCOP strongly supports this recommendation. As noted previously, ESCOP has formulated a “Science Roadmap for Agriculture” to define the needs and set the priorities for research and education at both the regional and national levels. The Roadmap sets forth seven challenges, each with under-girding goals on which the agricultural science research community must focus. These challenges relate to developing new products and markets, climate change, the environment and natural resources, profitability and competitiveness, families and communities, and food safety and health.

RECOMMENDATION 11: REE should undertake an analysis of the data development, management, and dissemination needed to support environmental and nutrition policy analysis. REE should work with other USDA mission areas to conduct an inventory of available social, economic, biologic, chemical, and physical datasets and to take stock of the data needs of the future. REE should take the initiative in coordinating with other USDA agencies and with other federal agencies to identify where and how data can be more efficiently and effectively used and shared. REE should put into place structures and systems to support data management and dissemination across its agencies.

There is a clear and immediate need to assess and to address data needs and availability but such an effort needs to be supported by the Secretary of Agriculture. REE is already moving in this area with its REEIS project and other agencies such as the National Forest Service and NRCS are also taking steps. It is logical that the REE take the lead in a more comprehensive effort.

RECOMMENDATION 12: The committee recommends that REE use objective criteria to decide which USDA facilities merit investment of budget resources for repair, modernization, or security improvement and which should be consolidated or closed because they are incapable of cost-effectively contributing to the REE research strategy without renovation. These criteria should be established in the public interest and mutually agreed on by key members of Congress and state and local legislators, as articulated in the principles and recommendations of the 1999 Report of the Strategic Planning Task Force on USDA Research Facilities. The closing, consolidation, or renovation of facilities should be implemented.

ESCOP supports this recommendation in principle but also acknowledges the political sensitivities associated with these types of decisions. Because of the strong collaborations and partnerships between REE facilities and personnel and those in land grant institutions, it also recommends the reinstatement of USDA funding for facilities at State Agricultural Experiment Stations. There is a need for investment in facilities throughout the public agricultural research system.

In closing, ESCOP is ready and anxious to work with REE as it implements many of these recommendations. We are convinced that if we partner in their implementation, the result will be a strengthening of the productive and synergistic collaborations that already exist.

**Action Requested: For information**

---

**Item: Partnerships Committee**

**Presenter: D. C. Coston**

The committee was constituted to work jointly with CSREES and ECOP to facilitate a better working relationship with USDA which culminated in the Baltimore partnership meeting. With this activity, a major recommendation of creating a follow-on working group consisting on representative from CSREES and all of the COPs as well as the administrative heads was realized.

The ESCOP Committee has not held a regular meeting in the past year but committee leadership has focused on the Partnership Working Group. The PWG appears to be functioning well having developed a general set of operational guidelines. The PWG was instrumental in organizing the plenary session on Effective Teams for the 2003 Joint COPS meeting. In discussion with CSREES, the PWG has obtained promises that the family will participate with agency personnel in the drafting of white paper documents. This will assure that white papers

are both timely and address matters of high importance. The PWG met after the Joint COPS meeting in Jersey City and will also meet in New Orleans at the NASULGC annual meeting.

Lee Sommers will become chair of this committee in September. The Committee will hold a conference call to determine future activities and will also be seeking input from Directors on the future role and mission of the group.

**Action requested: For information**

**Item: Planning Committee**

**Presenter: Virginia Clark Johnson**

The focus of the Planning Committee, since the July report, has been on finalizing plans for the Tuesday afternoon session at the Fall Workshop. The session will focus on planning for management to meet the challenges identified in the Science Roadmap. The areas of management to be discussed include: structure/organization; personnel/expertise; infrastructure/facilities; and funding/support). A summary of the strategies will be provided on the web shortly after the session.

No further information has been available about joint planning efforts with ECOP, or the futuring workshop.

**Action requested: For information**

**Item: Proposed Changes to the ESS Rules of Operation**

**Presenter: H. Michael Harrington**

Additional Documentation:

[ESS\\_Rules\\_Proposed\\_Modifications.pdf](#)

The following are changes proposed to the ESS Rules of Operation:

Change name of Advocacy and Marketing Committee to Communications and Marketing.

**Action requested: Approval of change of name of Advocacy and Marketing Committee to Communications and Marketing.**

**Action taken: Approved**

Add the NRSP Review Committee to ESCOP committee list.

**Action requested: Approval of addition of NRSP Review Committee to ESCOP committee list.**

**Action taken: Approved**

Authorize the ESCOP Chair to expend up to \$5,000 with approval of ESCOP Executive Committee.

**Action requested: Approval of authorization of ESCOP Chair to expend up to \$5,000 with approval of ESCOP Executive Committee.**

**Action taken: Approved**

**Item: Proposed changes to the Guidelines for Multistate Research Activities**

**Presenter: H. Michael Harrington**

Background:

The Executive Directors developed language reflecting the wisdom of the directors regarding the addition of participants to existing multistate projects. This language and action is taken to clearly indicate that Directors approve participation and to facilitate orderly incorporation of new participants.

The North Central, Western, Northeast and Southern Associations have approved this change. On approval by the ESS, this statement will replace previous language and be inserted on page 11 of the Guidelines to read as follows (new language in italics).

Requests to join an on-going multistate research project must originate with the administrator of the proposed member's institution; in the case of a SAES that would be the director; for ARS that might be a laboratory director; for a private laboratory that might be the scientist's supervisor. This correspondence must include the information required in Appendix E. *It is the responsibility of each Experiment Station Director to monitor their faculty members' participation in multistate projects. Although it is preferred that all participants be involved prior to the writing stage of new projects, it will occasionally be necessary to add a participant to an active project. After an Experiment Station Director approves a faculty member to join a project, it is the responsibility of the AA to facilitate incorporation of the new member into that project. If a concern arises regarding a member's participation in a project, the AA should discuss this concern with the member. If the concern is not resolved, the AA should discuss the member's participation with that member's Experiment Station Director. It is the responsibility of that Director to take whatever action is appropriate relative to that member's future participation.*

**Action requested: Approval of changes to the Guidelines for Multistate Research Activities**

**Action taken: Approved**

#### **Item: Nominations Committee Report**

**Presenter: Richard Heimsch**

The Nominations Committee recommends that D. C. Coston (OK) be selected as Chair-Elect of ESCOP for 2004.

**Action requested: Election of D. C. Coston as Chair-Elect of ESCOP for 2004.**

**Action taken: Approved**

#### **Item: Resolutions Committee Report**

**Presenter: Colin Kaltenbach**

**Resolution of Appreciation to Agricultural Experiment Station Administrators who left their positions and responsibilities in the 2002-2003 year.**

**WHEREAS**, the following have served as Administrators of their respective State Agricultural Experiment Station, and

**WHEREAS**, they have actively participated and served in various capacities at the state, regional and national level on behalf of the Agricultural Experiment Station system, Now, therefore be it

**RESOLVED** that the State Experiment Station Directors at their annual meeting on September 22, 2003 recognize the contributions and service toward strengthening the State Agricultural Experiment Station System, and wish them success and happiness in all their future endeavors.

#### **North Central Region:**

Marc Johnson, Kansas State University  
Dale Vanderholm, University of Nebraska

#### **Southern Region:**

James R. Fischer, Clemson University  
Robin Huettel, Auburn University

#### **1890 Research Directors:**

Bobby R. Phills, Florida A & M

#### **Northeast Region:**

Cathy Roheim (RI)  
William Berndtson (NH)

Johnny C. Wynne, North Carolina State University  
 Alberto Pantoja, University of Puerto  
 Kriton Hatzios, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State  
 University  
 Charles J. Scifres, Texas A&M University (accepted passed  
 away in July, 2003)

**North Central Region:**

Marc Johnson, Kansas State University  
 Dale Vanderholm, University of Nebraska

**Western Region:**

Carol Whitaker, American Samoa  
 Community College  
 Jim Zuiches, Washington State Univ  
 Sharon Quisenberry, Montana State Univ.  
 Kelvin Koong, Oregon State University  
 Laverne Weber, Oregon State University  
 Marlin Van Der Veen, Northern Marianas  
 Craig Smith, Northern Marianas

**Action Requested: Approval.**

**Action Taken: Approved**

**Resolution of appreciation for Dr. Scott Angle**

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Scott Angle, Chairman of the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy and Experiment Station Section, has provided selfless and committed leadership and keen oversight to enhance the system, and

**WHEREAS**, under Dr. Angle's leadership and support, the activities of ESCOP committees have been greatly enhanced and have achieved significant accomplishments, and

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Angle has provided outstanding leadership in the area of agrosecurity, and

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Angle has provided outstanding leadership in building interrelationships with ECOP, ACOP, ICOP, NASULGC, and CSREES/USDA, and

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Angle has been efficient and timely in the conduct of ESCOP business, therefore

**LET IT BE KNOWN**, that the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy and the Experiment Station Section recognize Dr. Angle's invaluable contribution and service to the national agricultural research system, and

**THEREFORE**, on this day of September 22, 2003, the Experiment Station Section and the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy resolves to extend their sincere gratitude for his commitment, service, and leadership for help in making the system more effective in addressing current and future needs, challenges and opportunities in agricultural research.

**Action Requested: Approval.**

**Action Taken: Approved**

**Resolution of appreciation to the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station**

**WHEREAS** The Agricultural Experiment Station Section met in Dearborn Michigan, September 21-24 2003; and

**WHEREAS** those attending were educated and stimulated by the meetings; and

**WHEREAS** the location for the meeting was outstanding and the accommodations were both compatible and

conducive to effective interaction resulting in a successful meeting; therefore be it

**RESOLVED**, That the Agricultural Experiment Station Section expresses its appreciation to Dr. J. Ian Gray, his colleagues and staff for arranging the facilities and coordinating the meeting and ; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, That an original of this resolution be provided to Dr. Gray and that a copy be filed as part of the official minutes of this meeting.

**Action Requested: Approval.**

**Action Taken: Approved**

---

### **Resolution in Memory of Charles J. Scifres**

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Charles Scifres served the Agricultural Experiment Station Section of NASULGC with great distinction and in an exemplary manner from 1990 until the time of his death on July 28, 2003; and

**WHEREAS**, he provided superior leadership to the Section and ESCOP having served in numerous capacities including the Chair; and

**WHEREAS**, he provided great vision and leadership on a range of issues important to the Section; and

**WHEREAS**, all members of the Section were greatly saddened by his untimely death; now therefore, be it

**RESOLVED** that the Experiment Station members extend our deepest sympathy to the Scifres family and to recognize him with a moment of silence at the September meeting of the Section; and be it further

**RESOLVED** that the Section forward a copy of this resolution to the Scifres family in recognition of his service to higher education and his leadership to the Section.

**Action Requested: Approval**

**Action Taken: Approved**

---

### **Resolution of Appreciation to Anna Marie Rasberry**

**WHEREAS**, Anna Marie Rasberry will be retiring at the end of September after many years of outstanding and faithful service to SAAESD, ESCOP, and the land grant system; and

**WHEREAS**, she has managed the ESCOP web site for over seven years; and.

**WHEREAS**, she supported the ESCOP Chair through two consecutive terms; and

**WHEREAS**, she has contributed to improvement of ESCOP processes, functions, and information management in an untiring, patient, cheerful, and thoughtful manner; now therefore be it

**RESOLVED** that the Experiment Station Section at its annual meeting on September 22, 2003 express their thanks for her many contributions to the State Agricultural Experiment Station System, and wish her success and happiness in all future endeavors.

**Action Requested: Approval.**

**Action Taken: Approved**

**Item: Passing the Gavel****Presenter: Scott Angle**

Angle presented the gavel and ESCOP responsibilities for 2004 to Ian Gray.

**Action Requested: For information****Item: Final remarks/announcements****Presenter: Ian Gray**

Gray thanked Angle for his efforts for 2003.

**Action Requested: For information****Item: Adjourn****Presenter: Ian Gray**

The motion was made and seconded to adjourn the meeting.

**Action Requested: Approval****Action Taken: Approved**