

Agenda

ESS Meeting

Monday September 23, 2002

1:30-5:35 pm

✓	1:30	1	Call to order/Opening Remarks	Richard Heimsch
✓		2	Approval of Agenda and 2001 ESS Meeting Minutes	Richard Heimsch
✓	1:35	3	Intellectual Property Sharing for Public-sector Agricultural Research and Development	Johnny Wynne
✓	2:00	4	Planning and Accountability	Cheryl Oros
✓	2:15	5	CSREES Departmental/Program Reviews	Larry Miller
✓	2:45	6	AESOP Update	Terry Nipp
✓	3:00	7	BAA-PB Update	Colin Kaltenbach
	3:15		Break	
✓	3:30	8	ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee	Richard Jones
✓	3:45	9	ESCOP Advocacy and Marketing Committee	James Fischer
✓	3:55	10	ESCOP Science and Technology Committee	Randy Woodson
✓	4:05	11	ESCOP Partnerships Committee	Lee Sommers
✓	4:10	12	ESCOP Planning Committee	Eric Young
✓	4:20	13	ESCOP Ad hoc Committee on Committees	Scott Angle
✓	4:30	14	NRSP Task Force Report	Liesel Ritchie/Tom Helms
✓	4:50	15	Multiple Activity Programs (MAPS) Procedures	Eric Young
	5:10	16	Nomination Committee Report	MacArthur Floyd
	5:20	17	Resolutions Committee Report	
	5:25	18	Passing the Gavel	Richard Heimsch
	5:30	19	Final remarks/announcements	Scott Angle
	5:35		Adjourn	

AGENDA BRIEFS

Agenda Item 1

Opening Remarks

Presenter: Richard C. Heimsch

Background:

**Preliminary Announcement
Joint New Directors' Workshop
December 10-11, 2002 in Washington, DC**

New Dean, Director, Administrator Orientation Conference

Normal attrition plus retirement incentives at several universities have resulted in many leadership changes over the past few years. The four COP's have joined CSREES in developing an orientation conference that will be helpful to those who made a recent move to administration. Organizational structures and titles vary significantly among institutions, but this conference is designed primarily for the chief operations officer for research, teaching, extension and international programs. Associate and assistant directors to are encouraged to attend.

The conference will begin at 8:00 a.m. on December 10 and adjourn at 4:30p.m. on December 11. Lodging arrangements and the program are in the final stages of completion. This announcement is intended to alert new administrators that this conference is being planned and to get dates on calendars.

Some highlights that will be included on the agenda:

- Tips on dealing with the competitive grants environment
- Understanding outcomes and impacts
- How to build and nurture political support
- The significance of the Farm Bill to Land-Grants
- The Federal budget process
- The Land-Grant and NASULGC structure

Additionally participants will meet with new colleagues within their areas of assignment to discuss some of the day-to-day tasks that are unique to their position. Participants will meet and interact with many of the leaders of CSREES, NASULGC and their section with whom they will have regular contact during their administrative career.

The content and opportunity to network with colleagues in Washington and throughout the Nation presents a unique option for professional development that isn't available elsewhere. Please share this preliminary announcement with those in your University who might benefit from attending.

Organizers: Al Lingg, NASULGC-ACOP, Richard Wootton, NASULGC-ECOP, H. Michael Harrington, ESCOP, Kerry Bolognese- NASULGC-ICOP, Gary Cunningham, CSREES

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 3

**Intellectual Property Sharing for Public-sector
Agricultural Research and Development**

Presenter: Johnny Wynne

Background:

Introduction

At a time when biotechnology and other advanced agricultural technologies hold the promise of revolutionizing agriculture, current practices in patenting and intellectual property (IP) protection have created potential barriers to the creation and commercialization of new crop varieties containing these technologies. The complex and cumulative nature of biological innovation requires access to multiple, often exclusively owned or licensed, technologies. To obtain "freedom to operate" (1) for improved crop

varieties involves high cost and uncertainty of finding out who holds what rights to what technologies, and negotiating freedom to operate (FTO) under those rights. This is a problem for the major international agricultural companies that focus primarily on high-volume crops (corn, wheat, cotton, etc.), for research institutions that work on specialty crops of economic importance to various states (tomatoes, strawberries, apples, etc.), and for public institutions that work on staple crops for humanitarian use in developing countries. The international agricultural companies have taken steps to solve their problems with FTO through mergers and/or cross-licensing agreements that bring large bodies of IP within one company. Public-sector institutions such as universities, government agencies, international agricultural research centers, and others working on specialty and staple crops are still struggling, however, with ways to gain FTO.

The Rockefeller and McKnight Foundations have a long history of investing in agricultural research that benefits subsistence farmers in developing countries. Even though agricultural biotechnology has the potential to address some of the constraints faced by small-holder farmers in developing countries, the foundations have found that IP constraints have reduced the flow of technology to international agricultural research centers and national agricultural research systems in developing countries. Public-sector research institutions in the United States, whose missions include improving food security for poor people in developing countries and contributing to development of the agriculture sector in their states, have found that the same IP barriers are impacting their ability to carry out their public missions.

Overview

Over the past year, the Rockefeller and McKnight Foundations have convened representatives of U.S. public sector agricultural research institutions (2) to discuss access to patented technologies and commercialization of new crops. In support of the discussions, the University of California conducted a study that found that with a few important exceptions (e.g., selectable markers), the public sector holds or has held rights to a sufficient body of IP to ensure FTO for new crop varieties being developed by public-sector researchers. The study underscores that public-sector research institutions have been and will remain important sources of technological innovation. However, the reality of achieving FTO using public-sector IP would require institutions to retain rights to its technologies for humanitarian and specialty crop use and to make the technologies more easily available to each other. In turn, the success of these public-sector strategies depends on developing and maintaining the valuable relationships with private-sector companies, and participating public-sector institutions recognize that transfer of rights to the private sector will remain an important means of capitalizing on the commercial benefits of new technologies.

Based on its discussions, the group has posed a series of questions and has begun to seek input from a range of stakeholders on issues relating to licensing practices, developing and maintaining a database of public-sector assets, and the possibility of creating technology packages.

Licensing Practices

The public-sector group believes that retaining the right to use new inventions for specific humanitarian and specialty crop applications, instead of granting worldwide, exclusive licenses, will allow inventors to benefit financially from their work while at the same time making new technologies available to the public sector, and facilitating FTO in the future. To clarify the implications of such a strategy, the public-sector group is developing a draft definition of "humanitarian use", which focuses on an approach that would retain the right to use a specific technology or material in specific territories (i.e. developing countries). The next step is for the group to explore licensing language for specialty crop applications. This exploration will build on experience with the development and application of a definition of "humanitarian use", and will take the differences in circumstances between staple and specialty crops into account. The group is looking for input on whether the approach of retaining rights for specific humanitarian and specialty crop applications might be practicable, and how it might be implemented. Key questions include:

- Who needs to be involved in implementing the new licensing practices and how should the licenses be written?

- How would changing the licensing strategies be received by the private sector?
- Would changing the licensing strategies affect royalties?

The Public Sector Asset Base

Several efforts are underway to develop databases of patented agricultural technologies to inform public sector researchers about FTO obstacles at the front-end of their research. These efforts by, for instance, the USDA Economic Research Service and CAMBIA (the Center for Application of Molecular Biology in Agriculture), although valuable, lack important information about the current status of patented technologies. The group is exploring the development of a database that builds on existing efforts by including licensing information about technologies that were patented by the participating public-sector institutions. This database would provide an overview of IP assets that are currently available to participating public sector institutions. The database will help clarify if those institutions, collectively, have a sufficient body of IP to create FTO for specialty and staple crop projects. It will also help to identify if there are key technologies that are not currently held by the participating public-sector institutions and will need to be negotiated separately.

Looking to the future, the database could be maintained and expanded to become a single source of information on available agricultural technologies for the public sector. The group is looking for input on how the database should be structured to be of greatest use to the diverse stakeholders across public-sector institutions. Other key questions include:

- Should the public-sector institutions make more of an effort, or even a commitment, to make their technologies available to each other for research and commercialization of specialty and staple crops?
- How could this asset base of IP be expanded to increase the number of specialty and staple crop projects that could gain FTO?

Ad-Hoc Technology Packages

The group has also exchanged ideas regarding the possibility of participating public-sector institutions pooling specific technologies and making technology "packages" available to each other, to other public-sector institutions, and possibly to the private sector for licensing. Patent pools have been used effectively to expedite the development of more than 70 technologies (including farm implements, sewing machines, and digital video disks), and initial discussions suggest that an IP packaging function that builds on the participants' experience with the asset base, and makes complementary sets of key technologies ("technology packages") available to researchers, might over time facilitate obtaining FTO for specialty and staple crops. Key questions regarding this approach include:

- How could this function be developed to be of benefit to the public sector and increase the number of specialty and staple crop projects that could gain FTO?
- Would these technology packages increase the revenue institutions could gain from their licensing activities?
- What key legal issues need to be addressed if this function were to be developed?

Next Steps

The public-sector group is at the beginning of an important collective process. Members of the group believe that the public sector needs to address these issues and find better ways to manage IP collectively or it will not be able to fulfill its robust public missions in agriculture. They acknowledge the important role the private sector plays in developing commercial applications for new inventions. They intend to engage the private sector in developing IP management strategies that help the public sector achieve its mission, and at the same time meet the interests of private companies in obtaining rights to public-sector inventions. The group suggests that other important issues, including public acceptance and the costs of regulatory compliance, impact the commercialization of new crop varieties containing advanced agricultural technologies, but that these issues need to be addressed in other fora.

To answer the groups' concerns, it has developed a steering committee to guide initial activities as they explore ways to collaborate--developing case studies to demonstrate the types of collaboration that are most needed to achieve FTO; assembling a database that contains licensing as well as patent information on agricultural biotechnologies; involving additional public-sector institutions, and engaging private sector and other key stakeholders; and ultimately, sharing technologies and retaining rights for researchers working on specialty and staple crops.

An important part of these activities is to initiate vigorous discussion at public institutions about the issues and related questions described above. There are many special circumstances that must be uncovered and understood--one size will not fit all. The group looks forward to your support in helping to find appropriate ways to meet the challenges of overcoming IP barriers and helping to maximize the public benefits of agricultural innovation.

For more information on this initiative, please contact the point person at your institution, or contact The Rockefeller Foundation: Debby Delmer, (212) 852 8342 / ddelmer@rockfound.org, or Meridian Institute: Jack Clough, (202) 354-6444 / jclough@merid.org or Rex Raimond, (970) 513-8340 x 230 / rreimond@merid.org.

1. Freedom to operate is the ability to clear all intellectual property barriers and bring a product to market.
2. Participants in the discussions include individuals from the following organizations: Cornell University, Donald Danforth Plant Science Center, Michigan State University, National Science Foundation, North Carolina State University, Pennsylvania State University, Purdue University, Rutgers University, The McKnight Foundation, The Rockefeller Foundation, Texas A&M University, University of California, University of Wisconsin-Madison, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington State University.

Information also provided in a PowerPoint presentation.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 5

CSREES Departmental/ Program Reviews

Presenter: Larry Miller

Background:

The "traditional" CSREES-led reviews of Departmental programs at Land Grant Universities have changed to a programmatic focus emphasizing visioning and planning for the future. In the past, these were primarily reviews of research encompassing disciplines funded by Hatch and McIntyre-Stennis, and Evans-Allen; now, these typically involve all three functions – teaching, research and extension, and more frequently reviews cut across traditional disciplinary boundaries (e.g., IPM, issue-based programs).

There are some changes occurring that we'd like input from SAES Directors on, in order to make CSREES participation more relevant to current situations and the on-campus climate at partner Land Grant institutions. Reviews should be mutually beneficial to all involved while emphasizing programmatic accountability/response to stakeholders through strategic planning activities.

1. CSREES builds on a long term commitment and history of providing leadership to departmental and program reviews at Land Grant Institutions. However, as best as can be determined, a formal appraisal of the process has not been conducted. We believe such an appraisal is needed. We are seeking your views on the process and thoughts on ways that quality can be improved.
2. The CSREES leadership role is changing; more institutions are planning reviews, often in conjunction with other review requirements, with or without CSREES participation. What role should CSREES play in the future? How can CSREES make departmental/program reviews more useful and responsive to your priorities?
3. Program review activities increasingly have a programmatic focus emphasizing more visioning and

**CSREES Departmental/Program Reviews
Input Requested**

1. CSREES builds on a long term commitment and history of providing leadership to departmental and program reviews at Land Grant Institutions. However, as best as can be determined, a formal appraisal of the process has not been conducted. We believe such an appraisal is needed. *We are seeking your views on the process and thoughts on ways that quality can be improved.*

2. The CSREES leadership role is changing; more institutions are planning reviews, often in conjunction with other review requirements, with or without CSREES participation. *What role should CSREES play in the future? How can CSREES make departmental/program reviews more useful and responsive to your priorities?*

3. Program review activities increasingly have a programmatic focus emphasizing more visioning and strategic planning with minimal attention to performance evaluation. *What are your expectations for departmental/program reviews? What is the relative importance of strategic visioning vs. performance evaluation?*

How shall we proceed to revise the guidelines for departmental/program reviews? (e.g., form a joint CSREES-COPS task force)

PLEASE RESPOND TO: Rick Meyer, 202-401-4888 (FAX); hmeyer@reeusda.gov
or Larry Miller, 202-401-1602 (FAX); lmiller@reeusda.gov

strategic planning with minimal attention to performance evaluation. What are your expectations for departmental/program reviews? What is the relative importance of strategic visioning vs. performance evaluation?

Action Requested: Response from SAES Directors to the above questions. How shall we proceed to revise the guidelines for departmental/program reviews? (e.g., form a joint CSREES-COPS task force)

In addition, on-site post award grant reviews provide useful information CSREES uses for accountability purposes in response to inquiries by Congress and to help establish program priorities. Feedback from all of these review processes has been used by CSREES for program planning direction, focus, efficiency, and accountability.

Agenda Item 7

BAA-PB Update

Presenter: Colin Kaltenbach

Background:

The PBD met in Washington DC on September 9-10, 2002 at which time several significant actions were taken. The Proposed Rules of Operation and the Strategic Plan for PBD were both approved in final form subject to Assembly approval at the NASULGC meeting in Chicago. A "work plan" for the coming year to begin implementation of the Strategic Plan was also developed. Input to this document will be sought prior to and during the annual meeting followed by adoption in the Assembly business meeting.

The Board also directed the BAC to begin negotiations with the successful advocacy firm. An announcement on this will be forthcoming as soon as the negotiations are complete.

Further to this action, a revised system for assessing the various states to pay for the advocacy effort (including CARET) was adopted. Rather than pay on the basis of "small, medium and large" universities as is the present system the assessment will be made on the basis of the amount of formula funds (Hatch/ Smith-Lever and S/L 3D) received which will account for 60% of the assessment. The remaining 40% will be based on total additional CSREES administered funds (comp grants, special grants, etc) that are received by each institution. These figures will be based on average income in each category for the past three years. There will be one bill sent to each institution and it will be up to the Administrative Head to sort out who pays on each campus. The non land-grant institutions who participate in the process will be asked to pay a single, yearly \$10,000 payment for a seat on the BAC as will the other Boards of CFEER (Forestry, Vet Med, etc). The 1994's will be asked to make a single, yearly \$5,000 payment.

The total assessment for the coming year will be approximately the same as this past year but some institutions will be paying more and some less because of the change in the formula.

Action requested: Discussion and recommendations on the "work plan".

Agenda Item 8

ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee

Presenter: Richard Jones

Background:

The information is provided as a PowerPoint presentation

Agenda Brief Science and Technology Committee

Presenter: Randy Woodson

Background: Dr. Nancy Cox assumes the position of Chair, Science and Technology committee at the ESS meeting in Baltimore. The active sub-committees include Social Sciences, Pest Management, Food Safety, and the Agricultural Implementation Task Force. Plans are underway to establish a new task force in the area of biobased products and to continue the planning in Agricultural Security through a standing subcommittee.

- The Social Sciences subcommittee met in Washington in early September and developed a white paper entitled "Homeland Security and the Role of Social Sciences in Securing America's Food and Fiber System". This will be vetted with the Science and Technology committee and moved through the Planning Committee for further consideration by ESCOP. The subcommittee is also developing an "environment" position paper.
- The Agricultural Biotechnology Implementation taskforce is working to wrap up their duties by the end of the calendar year. This committee was charged with making recommendations regarding the implementation of the plans developed by the Agricultural Biotechnology task force. Current activities include a national survey of Land Grant University faculty on issues related to Ag biotechnology under the leadership of Nick Kalaitzandonakes at the University of Missouri. The status of committee activities are posted on their website at <http://www.cals.ncsu.edu/agcomm/biotech/>
- The Science Roadmap Task Force, chaired by Colin Kaltenbach and David MacKenzie developed an executive summary of the science roadmap that has been broadly distributed and have been well received by stakeholders.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 9

ESCOP Advocacy and Marketing Committee

Presenter: James Fischer

Background:

The A & M Committee has focused this year on a number of small projects while we awaited the completion of the BAA Committee structure, and understood better BAA expectations for our alignment with them.

We published a handbook on how to state the value of your research with an audience of research faculty.

The intent of the publication is to explain how to communicate the worth of one's research to elected officials and government executives. This is the first in a series of seven planned publications aimed at supporting those who want to advocate on behalf of the system.

On another front it was decided that one project from each of the five regions would be nominated by the Executive Directors for study as to how the Committee could promote the good works of the projects, individually and collectively. More activity is planned on this project.

Given the recent turn of events by the BAA on its committee structure, the A & M Committee expects its attention now to turn more to public communication and public relations activities, rather than the "advocacy" activities that will be the responsibility of the BAA's Budget and Advocacy Committee. How we might contribute to their objectives is still a point of discussion.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 11

ESCOP Partnership Committee

Presenter: Lee Sommers

Background:

Partnership Task Force.

A major recommendation of the earlier joint ESCOP/ECOP/CSREES Task Force was to create an ongoing task force with broadened participation to facilitate communication and coordination between CSREES and the land-grant teaching, research, and extension programs. The new task force would include representation from CSREES, ECOP, and ESCOP as well as ACOP and ICOP. All parties have endorsed the concept of an ongoing joint task force and membership has been selected. D.C. Coston, Oklahoma State University, and Lee Sommers, Colorado State University, were asked to continue as ESCOP representatives.

The initial meeting of the Partnership Joint Task Force was held on July 24-25 in Salt Lake City following the ESCOP meeting. Task Force members are:

ACOP: Eric Hoiberg, Iowa State, Roger Lewis, Nevada, Karen Kubena, Texas A&M, Al Lingg, NASULGC

AHS: Pat Jensen, North Dakota State

CSREES: Saleia Afele-Fa'amuli, Henry Bahn, Mark Poth, Jane Schuchardt, Gary Cunningham

ICOP: B. Onuma Okezie

ESCOP: D. C. Coston, Oklahoma State H. Michael Harrington, Western Region ED, Lee Sommers, Colorado State

ECOP: Richard Wooton, Extension System Director, Lavon Bartel, Maine

Gary Cunningham, Pat Jensen and Mike Harrington were selected by the group as co-chairs. The meeting focused on reviewing activities prior to and after the joint ESCOP/ECOP/CSREES meeting in Baltimore in February, 2001 and the role and function of this Task Force. Additional representation was desired from the AHS and particularly the 1890 community. Alfred Parks, Prairie View A&M, and Jackie McCray, University of Arkansas Pine Bluff have agreed to join the Task Force. The next meeting of the Task Force will be on November 8-9 in Chicago, IL.

Partnership Committee

The efforts of the Partnership Committee have focused on the above ESCOP-ECOP-CSREES Task Force. A regular meeting of the committee was not held in the past year. The Committee leadership will be seeking input from Director's on the future role and mission of the group.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 12

ESCOP Planning Committee

Presenter: Eric Young

Background:

The minutes of all committee meetings and various working documents are available on the web site at <http://www.escop.msstate.edu/committee/plan00.htm#Action> Significant committee actions during federal FY 2001/02 are:

1. Continuing the ESCOP-PC's charge of linking planning with budget development, future research priorities were identified by the Directors at the September, 2001 SAES/ARD Workshop in Idaho. The resulting deliberation established Agrosecurity as the highest priority area for an ESCOP budget initiative.
2. The ESCOP-PC coordinated a request for 45 directors of state agricultural experiment stations in 1862 and 1890 institutions to estimate the appropriate mix of faculty expertise that will be required to address each challenge area identified in the "Science Roadmap for Agriculture". Twenty-two directors responded with estimates for each field of science in each challenge area. This information was passed to the Budget & Legislative Committee to develop and justify federal budget requests to increase the agricultural research system's capacity and support in expertise/discipline areas with the greatest need.
3. Potential future actions for follow-up on the Science Roadmap for Agriculture were discussed. Suggestions to consider include:
 - o Report to ACOP on the Roadmap and expertise needs estimate in terms of training needed for future scientists. ACOP could also assess the implications for student support programs like National Needs Fellowship, Challenge Grants, etc.
 - o Information is needed on forecast of private sector research investment in the challenge areas.
 - o Budget requests from ESCOP for BAC budget should reflect Roadmap challenge areas and needs, or at least refer to it, to indicate the system is using the information.
 - o An analysis is needed of the implications for space (labs, offices, greenhouse, field, etc.) and other infrastructure needs on campuses.
4. Emerging areas for future Science & Technology Task Forces were discussed and the following

list suggested.

- o Child obesity, nutrition and healthy food choices (joint with ECOP)
 - o Producing healthier food products
 - o Bio-based products, other than fuels
 - o Alternative medicines/treatments, plant and animal-based medicines, historic use of natural medicines (joint with ECOP and 1994 Tribal Colleges)
 - o Non-timber forest products
 - o Bio/nano-technology
5. As a follow-up on two action items from the Partnership Workshop held in February 2001, the ECOP / ESCOP Joint Planning Committee (JPC), including several CSREES representatives, developed a joint document describing a shared vision for the partnership and a process for establishing joint national initiatives. This document was subsequently accepted by the ESCOP and ECOP Executive Committees and by CSREES. The partnership vision is as follows:

Vision

The Partnership functions in an environment of harmony and trust and creates alliances around mutual issues and opportunities. These alliances create and expand mutual programs, projects and activities to better serve the public.

Definitions

Partners: Partners currently refer to the cooperative extension system, agricultural experiment stations, academic programs, international programs and the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service.

Alliance: An alliance exists when two or more Partners and/or other entities develop a mutually agreed upon written program or project based on a priority issue which is intended to result in joint outcomes.

The complete document is available at

<http://www.escop.msstate.edu/committee/partnership-vision.pdf>

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 14

NRSP Task Force Report

Presenter: Liesel Ritchie/Tom Helms

Background:

(DRAFT) REPORT OF THE NRSP TASK FORCE September 2002

Introduction. This report represents the penultimate step in our effort to make much needed improvements in our National Research Support Project (NRSP) program and portfolio. We expect the final step to be adoption of its recommendations by the Experiment Station Section of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and the Cooperative State Research, Education and Extension Service, USDA. Activities et sequence that have lead to the development of this report include:

1. An informal, on-line survey conducted by Dr. David MacKenzie (two reports available at <http://129.2.12.6/nrpsurvey/shortresults.cfm> and <http://129.2.12.6/nrpsurvey/longresults.cfm>).
2. Subsequently an in-depth survey and analysis was conducted by Liesel Ritchie and her staff from the Social Science Research Center (SSRC), Mississippi State University under sponsorship of a Cooperative Agreement from CSREES. The survey included three groups: the first was individuals who

had served on the Committee of Nine (C-9); the second were persons who currently serve as administrative advisors for NRSPs; and, the third were directors who were not currently and/or had not previously been directly involved with NRSPs. The report from this activity entitled, "National Research Support Projects: An Evaluation of Processes" is available on the ESCOP website at <http://www.escop.msstate.edu/nrsp-eval-report.pdf>.

3. These survey efforts led to the establishment of the current NRSP Task Force charged to develop recommendations on a new management structure and policies for the NRSP portfolio. The Task Force held a one-day, noon to noon, facilitated planning session led by Liesel Ritchie and her staff from the SSRC Decision Support Laboratory (DSL). Participating Task Force members included: Nancy Cox, Gary Cunningham, Sam Donald, Mike Harrington, T. J. Helms, Preston Jones, Gary Lemme, Daryl Lund, Sally Maggard, Vicki McCracken, Larry Miller, Alfred Parks, Daniel Rossi, Robert Seem, Lee Sommers, William Trumble, Richard Wootton, and Eric Young.

Task Force Meeting

Many issues were discussed during the Task Force meeting as reflected by the volume of comments recorded by the DSL staff. A 45-page summary of all input during the NRSP Task Force meeting is available upon request. Identification of those issues of greatest immediate importance were:

- a. Lack of consistent and strenuous review process.
- b. Need to streamline current convoluted and cumbersome processes.
- c. Perceived lack of national focus.
- d. Perceived sense of entitlement; i.e. once established, NRSPs continue in perpetuity.
- e. Need to transition projects to other sources of funding.
- f. Need to gain flexibility to initiate new efforts in high priority areas.
- g. Need to distinguish between 'research support' and 'research' projects.
- h. Need for relevance review and stakeholder input.
- i. Need for a formal oversight committee
- j. Need for improved communications of accomplishments and impacts.

The next step was to identify teams (subcommittees) to address these issues and to prepare written reports for presentation during the ESS meeting in Baltimore, MD, in September 2002. Four writing teams were identified to focus on the following broad areas:

- a. Criteria for Project Establishment and Renewal; Procedures for Review and Approval. Team members were Lee Sommers (Lead), Mike Harrington, Bill Trumble and Larry Miller.
- b. Role of the (an) Advisory Committee. Team members were Daniel Rossi (Lead), Preston Jones and Vicki McCracken.
- c. Timelines for Project and Budget Processes (including sequence and time frame of key events). Team members were Eric Young (Lead), Daryl Lund, Robert Seem and Nancy Cox.
- d. Communications: Communicating Accomplishments and Impacts. Team members were Gary Lemme (Lead), Sally Maggard and T. J. Helms.

Each writing team was asked to examine the following areas related to their assignment:

- Current Situation (How does the system now operate?)
- Problems with the Current Situation (A brief explanation of problems or concerns.)
- Recommendations

Reports of each of the writing teams have been integrated in subsequent sections herein.

I. Criteria for NRSP Establishment and Renewal

Current Situation

The policies and procedures governing National Research Support Projects (NRSPs) are detailed in the national "Guidelines for Multistate Research Activities" that were originally adopted by the Experiment Station Section at the annual meeting held in New Orleans, LA on September 26, 2000. The current version of these Guidelines is available at <http://www.escop.msstate.edu/draftdoc.htm>.

According to the "Guidelines", the definition of an NRSP and the policies governing the program are as follows:

"National Research Support Projects (NRSP): NRSPs are made up of 4 administrative advisors (one appointed from each SAES regional association) a CSREES representative, and scientists from SAES and elsewhere, as appropriate. This type of activity focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store and distribute materials, resources, and information) or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research. NRSPs are eligible for of-the-top funding.

NRSP AAs will present budgets to their regional associations at their spring meetings. SAESs will vote on the NRSP budgets and the votes (electronic or otherwise) from each region will be tallied by the respective ED no later than June 1. The EDs will then pool the votes and forward a single recommendation to CSREES for funding in the next fiscal year. Requests from a NRSP for budget changes that are necessitated by extraordinary situations should be brought to the attention of the regional associations for consideration at their spring meetings.

NRSPs will be reviewed in their fourth year (i.e., one year prior to the scheduled termination date) and the results of this review will be available prior to the spring meetings of the regional associations. Projects may be reviewed at other times during the course of the project if a review is deemed necessary based on consultation with the project AA's."

The format for requesting the establishment of an NRSP appears in Appendix B of the National Guidelines available on the ESCOP website (<http://www.escop.msstate.edu/guidelines.pdf>).

Problems with Current Situation

Specific criteria for evaluation and review of current and proposed new NRSPs do not appear in the guidelines. This fact is clearly reflected in the concerns voiced by respondents to the surveys of the Directors with similar concerns also expressed by members of the NRSP Task Force.

II. NRSP Advisory Committee

Current Situation

Since the dissolution of the Committee of Nine, there has been no single SAES entity with the general oversight responsibility for national research support projects. Existing projects receive very limited annual progress reviews at the regional level. Annual budgets are reviewed and are typically funded at the previous year's level plus or minus any proportional change in Hatch appropriations. Once projects reach the end of their approval terms (typically five years), a revised project proposal is reviewed by each region. More recently projects have undergone an external review. Approval for renewal of a project requires support from at least three of the four regions. Once projects are initially authorized, they usually are reauthorized. With the exception of NRSP 7, reauthorization of the project is also reauthorization of off-the-top funding, even though annual approval of project budgets is required from 3

of the 4 regions.

In theory, new NRSP's are initiated by (a) scientist(s) and/or director(s). Before a proposal can proceed it must be sponsored by a region and an administrative advisor is assigned to work with a writing committee. When the proposal is finalized, it is reviewed by each of the four regions and must be approved by at least three of the four regions. In reality, there have been very few new projects proposed in recent years and none actually approved. Hatch funding for the NRSP portfolio has remained relatively constant at \$1.6 million. Directors have been reluctant to approve any additional off-the-top funding.

Problems with the Current Situation

There is overall dissatisfaction with the current process for review, approval, funding of NRSP's and with the composition of the NRSP portfolio. Neither directors nor scientists have confidence that the current process yields the highest and best use of the limited resources available to the SAES system.

Under the current system, there is no systematic linking of the NRSP portfolio with national priorities. The review and approval process occurs at the regional level and in turn focuses on regional needs rather than national needs. Without a mechanism like the Committee of Nine, there is no national oversight or discourse concerning national needs relative to research support. Current ESCOP mechanisms focus on research needs but not needs relative to research support activities.

There are also no commonly accepted and applied standards or criteria for reporting or evaluation of the progress of individual projects. As a result, there is no serious annual progress reviews conducted on existing projects. Such standards and criteria also do not exist to evaluate project revisions or new projects. Without commonly applied criteria or a mechanism for general oversight, there tends to be little consistency in decision-making concerning NRSP's with the exception of a consistency in the lack of real decisions being made. There is also no current mechanism for obtaining stakeholder input on the portfolio of approved projects.

Current projects have no required sunsets relative to off-the-top funding. There is no requirement or incentive for projects to transition to other sources of funding. Decisions concerning the approval of a project are not separated from decisions concerning off-the-top funding. Current projects tend to continue to receive funding year after year with no expectation that they will migrate off these funds. As a result, directors tend to be reluctant to authorize or even entertain proposals for new projects. The current portfolio, therefore, has become stagnant and is not responsive to changing needs.

Finally, there is no single SAES institution which is responsible for marketing this aspect of our system. While NRSP projects have made a very significant difference to land grant research capabilities and the constituents we serve, outcomes are generally not well documented nor are impacts demonstrated in a systematic way which promotes the overall system.

III. NRSP Project and Budget Initiation and Renewal Process and Timeline

Current Situation

The current NRSP approval process is listed below as it appears in the Guidelines for Multistate Research Activities (Appendix N). No time frame is indicated, only the sequence of actions and who is responsible.

Action	Responsibility
1. Preparation of proposal (Appendix B) and a Table of Resources (Appendix E)	Sponsoring Director and Selected Participants; Directors
2. Approval of proposal to create the Activity	Regional Associations
3. Notify Multistate Research Office, CSREES	Executive Director
4. Assignment of Administrative Adviser(s)	Chairs, Regional Associations
5. Assignment of CSREES Representative	Multistate Research Office, CSREES
6. Authorization of first meeting and invitation to participate	Lead, Administrative Adviser

Currently, NRSP budgets are presented to the regional associations by their Executive Directors (ED) at their spring meetings. SAES members of each regional association vote on the NRSP budgets and the votes (electronic or otherwise) from each region are tallied by the respective ED no later than June 1. The EDs meet with a CSREES representative and make decisions on funding for the next fiscal year based on the regional votes. Requests from a NRSP for budget changes that are necessitated by extraordinary situations are also brought to the attention of the regional associations for consideration at their spring meetings. NRSPs are to be reviewed in their fourth year (i.e., one year prior to the scheduled termination date) and the results of this review are to be available prior to the spring meetings of the regional associations. Projects may be reviewed at other times during the course of the project if a review is deemed necessary based on consultation with the project AAs.

Problems with the Current Situation

Primary problems and concerns with the current project and/or budget approval process and time line are listed below.

1. Annual approval for budgets are regionally based, rather than nationally based and may not necessarily represent the majority opinion of the Directors.
2. The annual budget approval process used currently is not appropriate. Any new process should have tentative budget approval for the entire 5 years. A change in the annual budget should only be made for exceptional circumstances and when unexpected needs arise in the project.
3. Time-line for process of initiating a new project or revising a current project is not defined.
4. Project reviews are not completed in a consistent manner prior to project rewriting and initiation of the approval process.
5. Budget must be approved on a yearly basis for projects approved for a five-year period.

IV. Communications: Communicating Accomplishments and Impacts

Current Situation

Organized efforts to communicate accomplishments and impacts vary greatly among the NRSP groups. Some, like NRSP-4 for example, have budgeted for a communications professional who prepares quality print and web-based information for stakeholders, SAES administrators, congressional delegations, and project participants. However, most of them do not have an organized communications effort as part of their activities, communicating their accomplishments and outputs through presentations at professional society meetings and industry activities.

Websites have been established for all the projects. A Google search for "NRSP" identified projects 3-8. However, the content and user friendliness of these websites varies greatly. Many of them are located on regional SAES servers and are difficult for the uninformed user to navigate. (The very excellent

website for NRSP-1 is administered through CSREES and thus, is not specifically identified as a part of the NRSP program.)

Stakeholder communities of some NRSPs are actively engaged and lead organized communications efforts with industry members and congressional delegations. Generally those that have made serious efforts to communicate accountability and impact have been successful in increasing budgets through industry contributions or congressionally directed USDA allocations.

Problems with Current Situation

Scientific assessment of project impact is not an objective of any of the NRSPs and little effort is made for most projects to measure the impact of their accomplishments. Most communications efforts have focused on outputs and accomplishments and not impacts. Generally, if impacts are reported, they are merely estimates and do not represent the project in its totality.

Many NRSPs have been in existence for an extended period of time; their mission and audience have evolved and they find it very difficult to begin a communications program at this late date. Project membership does not generally include a communications or impact assessment specialist. And, although they may be excellent scientific writers, few scientists have been appropriately trained to write impact statements.

Stakeholder engagement throughout the life of a project is critical to an effective communications program. It is difficult to bring stakeholders into the process if they have not been actively involved in the past. One project that recently began to rotate their annual meeting among the regions as a means to encourage communications had three industry representatives in attendance at their meeting.

Shrinking NRSP budgets have increased the difficulty to hire communications professionals to lead their public awareness and accountability efforts. Some groups have utilized SAES communications specialists in developing educational material, whereas others have relied solely on the scientists within the project team.

V. Task Force Recommendations

The following recommendations are made by the NRSP Task Force for changes in the NRSP process and management.

A. General

1. Develop a specific definition for an NRSP considering the difference between 'research support projects' and 'research projects' including criteria addressing who benefits from the project, what data/products result from the project and the project outputs (e.g., what they are and who uses them).
2. Encourage use of a NRSP approach for activities requiring the existing mechanism for multi-agency funding of a program while also needing minimal off-the-top funding.
3. Establish and implement a rigorous review process for new and existing NRSPs with the costs shared by CSREES and the NRSP.
 - a. Use external scientific peer review panels to address program quality
 - b. Involve stakeholders in the review process to address program relevance
4. Develop and implement a transition plan for certain of the current NRSPs. This plan may include some continued minimal investment in each NRSP from off-the-top funding.

B. Criteria

1. Establish specific criteria for initiating and renewing NRSPs in the "Guidelines for Multistate Research Activities." Subject new and existing NRSPs to a rigorous external review conducted by a review team consisting of scientists and stakeholders utilizing the following criteria:

- a. Contribution to national priorities established by ESCOP, CSREES, NAREEB and/or other relevant entities. Using this input, the Advisory Committee will propose suitable national priorities to the ESS.
- b. Relevance to stakeholder needs.
- c. Extent of partnering with other agencies and subsequent leveraging of off the top funds.
- d. Relationship of project to other NRSPs and national priorities
- e. Review of a common set of measures for each NRSP:
 - i. Outcomes
 - ii. Outputs
 - iii. Impact
 - iv. Leveraging of funds
 - v. Stakeholder feedback

C. Procedures Related to Criteria

1. Revise current guidelines on format and process for submitting NRSP proposals. Currently, the brief, 3-page format used for a coordinating committee/information exchange group (Appendix B of the guidelines) is completed to propose a NRSP. Modify the guidelines to require information on the following:
 - a. Relationship to national ESCOP and CSREES priorities.
 - b. Timelines, outcomes, and impacts.
 - c. Budget based on annual off-the-top funding needed for 5 year period.
 - d. Funds contributed by other federal/state/private sources.
 - e. Plan and timeline for transitioning to other funding sources (project may require 5, 10 or more years before transitioning can occur).

D. Advisory Committee

1. Role of the Advisory Committee

Creation of a National NRSP Advisory Committee (hereafter referred to as Advisory Committee) with broad oversight responsibility for the NRSP portfolio is recommended. The proposed committee is to be charged with providing general oversight, consistency in review and approval processes, and a national perspective relative to research support needs. It is important that the committee avoid micro management of individual projects.

While playing a gatekeeper function for the SAES system, it is also important that the committee's role is clearly advisory to the system. It should make recommendations to the Experiment Station Section (ESS) concerning existing and new projects. A key component of their role is the implementation of sun-set clauses. The committee would be expected to bring its recommendations to the annual ESS meeting, currently held in September.

As the committee will be representative of the SAES system and expected to know more about the

NRSP portfolio and their individual directions, it is important that its recommendations are seriously considered. In fact, it has been recommended that to reverse or reject one of its recommendations, the ESS should require a three-quarter plurality in voting against the recommendation.

One of the specific charges to the committee will be the use of national priorities and needs as a basis for the review and evaluation of existing and new NRSP projects. It will be responsible for assuring that the NRSP portfolio is monitored and is responsive to needs. The committee will be expected to identify specific areas of research support needs or at least utilize input from an established ESCOP mechanism such as the Planning Committee because of their focus on emerging issues and needs. The committee should have the authority to proactively identify research support needs. It has also been suggested that the committee have resources available to seed the creation of new NRSPs responsive to emerging needs. One way to make such resources available to the committee would be to establish it as a new NRSP, thus allowing the use of off-the-top funds for the conduct of its business.

The committee will be directly responsible for the annual review of progress for existing NRSPs. It will need to establish and communicate to participants in the NRSP system, appropriate criteria for evaluating project progress towards stated goals.

Relative to the evaluation of revised and new projects, the committee will oversee review by peer and merit panels. It should develop criteria for the reviews, select reviewers, assist in establishing protocols for review, and prepare the specific charge to the panels. Utilizing the results of the reviews and the committee's understanding of national research support needs, the committee will prepare recommendations concerning revised and proposed projects to the ESS.

A final role for the committee will be one of broad advocacy for the NRSP system. It will insure the documentation of system and individual project impacts. It will serve as the point entity for marketing the system and bringing it to national level prominence.

2. Advisory Committee Composition

Of utmost importance, the committee should have representation from each of the regions. Other possible representation might include:

- Executive Directors
- CSREES
- Stakeholders
- Cooperative Extension
- ARD
- Scientists
- ESCOP/ESS

The committee should be representative of the diversity of the SAES system including the breadth of areas of research and education not necessarily well represented under current structures. At the same time, it is critical that the size of the committee remain manageable (as suggested at the Task Force meeting in Memphis ("the best committee is two folks when one is absent").

We recommend the following possible composition in light of these criteria:

- a. One representative from each of the five regions; the representative would be appointed by the regional association chair and should be a current or past member of a MRC. Each region should also designate an alternate to insure representation.
- b. One representative from Extension appointed by the ESCOP Chair following the recommendation by the ECOP Chair.
- c. One representative from CSREES, preferably a National Program leader appointed by the Administrator, CSREES and appointed by the ESCOP Chair.
- d. One stakeholder representative, perhaps a CARET representative, also appointed by the

ESCOP Chair.

e. Two regional executive directors also appointed by the ESCOP Chair. One of the executive directors should be from the same region as the chair of the committee, serving as vice chair.

f. The chair of the committee will be one of the representatives from the four SAES regions. This position should rotate among the four regions.

3. Terms of Appointment

The term of appointment to the committee should be three years. The terms should be staggered so as to provide continuity to deliberations. The chair of the committee should rotate among the four SAES regions.

The committee should meet physically once per year prior to the September ESS meeting. Other business of the committee should be conducted electronically through conference calls and e-mails. All expenses will be borne by their respective institutions. An alternative source of funding for travel could be off-the-top funds if the committee were to be established as a NRSP.

E. Review and Approval Timelines for a New NRSP or Renewal of an Existing NRSP

1. NEW NRSP

Anytime	<p>Sponsoring Director(s) submits request to establish an NRSP writing committee to the sponsoring regional association's Executive Director following that region's standard process for initiating new multistate activities. Sponsoring regional association assigns lead Administrative Advisor and solicits names of Co-advisors from other Executive Directors. Sponsoring regional association follows normal process for approving the establishment of a writing committee and solicit additional participants.</p> <p>NRSP writing committee membership, in consultation with Administrative Advisors, prepares initial project proposal, including projected five-year budget. Administrative Advisors submit the project proposal and projected five-year budget, along with names of several qualified peer reviewers, to the NRSP Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee solicits peer reviews by scientist familiar with the area and transmits review results along with Committee comments to Administrative Advisors.</p> <p>NRSP writing committee revises proposal and budget based on review.</p>
Not later than Oct 1	Administrative Advisors submit revised proposal and five-year budget, along with peer review comments, to Advisory Committee and Executive Directors (transmission of materials to Executive Directors throughout this process implies subsequent transmission to members of corresponding regional associations)
Oct-Feb	<p>Advisory Committee reviews proposal and budget and sends comments with initial recommendation to Executive Directors.</p> <p>Appropriate regional committees review the project proposal and projected five-year budget and report to association at their Spring meeting</p>
Feb-Mar	Regional associations discuss project proposal and projected five-year budget, along with Advisory Committee recommendation, at their Spring meetings and Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns to the Administrative Advisors and Advisory Committee.
Apr-June	NRSP Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns through further project and/or budget revisions and/or separate responses.

July 1	Final project proposal, projected five-year budget, and any additional responses are transmitted to Advisory Committee and the Executive Directors.
July-Aug	Regional associations discuss the final proposal and budget at their summer meeting, or the appropriate regional committee reviews the proposal and budget, and Executive Directors transmit comments to Advisory Committee.
September	Advisory Committee reports at the ESS Fall meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. SAES Directors vote (one vote per institution contributing off-the-top funding) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A two-thirds majority vote is required to overturn the Advisory Committee recommendation.
October 1	Approved NRSP starts five-year cycle with five-year budget approved.

During Project Term (years 2-4)

January	<p>NRSP Committee submits annual report and detailed budget for subsequent fiscal year to Advisory Committee and Executive Directors by January 15.</p> <p>Advisory Committee reviews annual report and budget and transmits any comments to Administrative Advisors and Executive Directors.</p> <p>If there's no change in total annual budget from approved five-year budget, Executive Directors transmit report and budget to regional associations for their information.</p> <p>If a change in the annual budget from the approved five-year budget is requested, a detailed justification must be submitted to Advisory Committee and Executive Directors, and change request is reviewed through the following process.</p>
Feb-Mar	Regional associations review budget change request during Spring meetings and transmit comments to Advisory Committee.
Apr- Sep	Advisory Committee interacts with CSREES and NRSP Administrative Advisors to determine and approve any budget changes for the next year.

2. RENEWAL OF AN EXISTING NRSP

Year 4	<p>NRSP committee decides to renew project as NRSP and notifies Advisory Committee and CSREES.</p> <p>NRSP committee drafts initial renewal proposal and five-year budget.</p> <p>CSREES and the Advisory Committee jointly arrange for review of NRSP that is due to terminate at the end of year 5. Review organizer consults with the Advisory Committee and NRSP Administrative Advisors regarding review protocol, charge, etc.</p>
Not later than Sep 1	Administrative Advisors submit renewal proposal and five-year budget to Advisory Committee and Executive Directors.
Sep-Nov	Review team conducts review of past four years progress and renewal proposal and transmits report to Advisory Committee and Administrative Advisors.
Oct-Feb	<p>Appropriate regional committees review report and renewal proposal with five-year budget and report to association at Spring meetings.</p> <p>Advisory Committee reviews proposal and budget and sends comments with initial recommendation on renewal to Executive Directors.</p>
Feb-Mar	Regional associations discuss renewal proposal and budget along with Advisory Committee recommendation, at their Spring meetings and Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns to the Administrative Advisors and Advisory Committee.
Apr-June	NRSP Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns through renewal proposal and/or budget revisions and/or separate responses.
July 1	Final renewal proposal, five-year budget, and any additional responses are transmitted to Advisory Committee and the Executive Directors.
July-Aug	Regional associations discuss the final renewal proposal and budget at their summer meeting, or the appropriate regional committee reviews the proposal and budget, and Executive Directors transmit comments to Advisory Committee.
September	Advisory Committee reports at the ESS Fall meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. SAES Directors vote (one vote per contributing institution) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A two-thirds majority vote is required to overturn the Advisory Committee recommendation.
October 1	<p>NRSP approved for renewal starts five-year cycle with five-year budget approved.</p> <p>NRSP not approved for renewal receives one-year extension (with budget equal to 5th-year budget) to transition off NRSP funding to other sources or downsize project.</p>

F. Communications

1. A communications plan with identified target audiences should be a component of all new and renewal project proposals.
2. A plan to measure project impacts should be included in all new and renewal project proposals.
3. Stakeholder communities should be identified and an engagement plan outlined in all new and renewal project proposals.
4. Annual reports should identify communication activities, accomplishments, and impacts.

5. Stakeholder communities should be encouraged to coordinate educational efforts with Congress.
6. A professional quality communications piece highlighting the unique national role of the National Research Support Projects and their impacts should be prepared for use by SAES Directors with their congressional delegations and stakeholder organizations.
7. CSREES Communications should highlight the unique role of NRSP projects and their impacts as part of the agency's communications related to its overall portfolio of research support activities for use by the research community, congressional delegations, and stakeholder organizations.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 15

Multiple Activity Programs (MAPS) Procedures

Presenter: Eric Young

Background:

Attempts to enhance federal support for agricultural research and extension activities conducted at Land Grant Universities have met with concerns that accountability is inadequate for any new formula funding increases for specific initiatives. To address this concern a joint ESCOP/ECOP task force has proposed a new organizational framework, referred to as Multiple Activity Programs or MAPs, to rapidly respond to new formula funds with national research and extension initiatives and track expenditures, outcomes and impacts. Their purpose is to greatly facilitate reporting multistate and multi-functional collaborations with direct accountability of outcomes and impacts whenever practical, and to link those reports to investments and USDA performance plans. MAPs are organizing frameworks for tracking expenditures of new formula funds (and funds from other sources) for research and extension initiatives of national scope, and for reporting results from and impacts of those programs.

In August the ESCOP and ECOP chairs appointed a joint ad hoc committee to (1) develop implementation details for MAPs, and (2) to recommend procedures for reporting and accounting of new formula funds that are programmatically directed.. The committee consists of Daryl Lund, Eric Young, and Jim Jacobs from ESCOP, Dick Wootton, Mary Gray, and Keith Smith from ECOP and Cheryl Oros from CSREES. The committee has had one conference call on August 16, 2002.

It was decided during the conference call that due to the changes within CSREES and the new extension reporting system under development (EASE), that there may be a solution to the accountability problem without developing a new procedure. Dr. Oros is investigating what barriers exist to USDA/REE/CSREES accepting new formula funds that are programmatically directed, including accountability requirements and current reporting mechanisms. This analysis will provide the committee a rationale for the desirability of continuing with the developing of the new MAP procedure to account for integrated, programmatically directed formula funds through CSREES.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 16

Nomination Committee Report

Presenter: San Donald**Background:**

ESCOP's Nomination Report

July 23, 2002

Salt Lake City, Utah

Position	Nominee
1. Chair-Elect - ESCOP	J. Ian Gray
2. ESS-Representative to Board on Agriculture Assembly Policy Board	C. Colin Kaltenbach (Primary) Charlie J. Scifres (Alternate)
3. Core Committee (Chair/Chair-Designate)	
Planning Committee	Virginia Clark-Johnson - Chair LeRoy Daugherty - Chair-Designate
Science and Technology	Nancy M. Cox - Chair Steve G. Pueppke - Chair-Designate
4. The following Committees will select Officers in 2003 (Current Officers)	
Partnerships	D.C. Coston - Chair Lee E. Sommers - Chair - Designate
Advocacy and Marketing	James R. Fischer - Chair H. Paul Rasmussen - Chair-Designate
Budget and Legislative	Richard L. Jones - Chair Darrell Nelson - Chair - Designate

Submitted by:

ESCOP Nominating Committee/Regional Representatives

ARD Dr. McArthur Floyd, Chair

Northeast Dr. J. Scott Angle

Southern Dr. Bill H. Brown

Western Dr. James J. Jacobs

North Central Dr. Virginia Clark-Johnson

Action Requested: Election of Officers and Committee Members