

**NRSP-RC Updated NRSP Guidelines and Overall NRSP Program Discussion Call MINUTES**

**June 3, 2020, 3-4 pm ET**

**Current Membership:**

<p><b>Chair:</b> Doug Buhler (NCRA)  <b>Past Chair:</b> Fred Servello (NERA)</p> <p><b>Executive Vice-Chair:</b>                  Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA ED)</p> <p><b>Assistant Director, Ex-officio:</b>                  Chris Hamilton (NCRA AD; Recorder)</p>	<p><b>Delegates:</b>                  Shirley Hymon-Parker (ARD)                  Mark McGuire (WAAESD)                  Keith Owens (SAAESD)                  Don Latham (CARET)                  Tom Bewick (NIFA)                  Mike Schmitt (ECOP)                  Bret Hess (WAAESD ED)</p>
---	--

**Committee Page:** <http://escop.info/committee/nrsp-rc/>

**Call Agenda**

Item #	Topic	Presenter	Action Requested
1.0	Welcome and roll call	Doug	None, for information only.
2.0	Finalize NRSP6 renewal recommendation	Doug	Revisit 5/27/20 NRSP6 recommendation and develop final wording for a motion for the Fall ESS vote.
3.0	NRSP program discussion (refer to Input Summary attachment)	Doug	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review the seven questions proposed and comments from the NRSP-RC</li> <li>Reflect on our NRSP-RC discussions from 5/27/20</li> <li>Develop a summary with two types of NRSPs: capacity/core NRSPs at some modest sustaining level and new, emerging competitive NRSPs</li> </ul>
4.0	NRSP Guidelines (refer to revised NRSP Guidelines attachment)	Jeff/Doug	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review overview of substantive changes (e.g. Transition Plan elevated to consistent requirement; Added Budget Narrative and Data Management Plans; Changed Review Forms, Format and Narratives, Redundancies and Simplified throughout)</li> <li>Integrate items from Item 3.0, then propose new NRSP Guidelines for Fall ESS vote.</li> </ul>
5.0	Other business, as needed.		For information/discussion, as appropriate.
<i>Adjourn at 4 pm ET</i>			

**Participants:** Doug Buhler, Shirley Hyman-Parker, Keith Owens, Fred Servello, Mike Schmitt, Mark McGuire, Bret Hess, Don Latham, Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton (recorder)

**Call Minutes:**

Item #	Topic	Notes	Actions Taken
1.0	Welcome and roll call	See participant list above.	None, for information only.
2.0	Finalize NRSP6 renewal recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jeff summarized the 5/27/2020 notes and the motion made for NRSP6's renewal. Call participants were still in agreement with the motion.</li> <li>• Doug made a motion to keep NRSP6 at its current reduced amount of \$135,000 for its final year in FY21. Mark seconded. Motion passed unanimously.</li> </ul>	Doug made a motion to reject the renewal proposal as submitted. Mark seconded. Per the NRSP Guidelines this would provide one additional year of funding beyond the current approved project. This was reaffirmed at \$135,000 for Oct 1, 2020 to Sept 30, 2021. Motion passed unanimously.
3.0	NRSP program discussion (refer to Input Summary attachment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doug reviewed the seven questions proposed in the original survey from March, along with the NRSP-RC responses on the attached Input Summary and then polled the group for what kind of changes they would like to see in the program going forward.</li> <li>• Fred: There are two types of projects, capacity and seed. It's also important that projects include at the start, a business plan that will show progress towards moving off NRSP funds at the start of a seed project. Doug agreed with this. If renewal, the proposal must show a firm business plan.</li> <li>• Keith: Agree on two types of projects. However, it may be hard to have a solid plan to get off seed funding by</li> </ul>	Jeff will summarize the NRSP program discussions, to include the two types of proposed NRSPs (capacity/core NRSPs at some modest sustaining level and new, emerging competitive "seed" NRSPs). He will also summarize the discussion regarding requiring a business plan for NRSPs to transition off OTT funds during their second 5-year term.

		<p>year 3, though. Hard limits are acceptable, but perhaps a 10 year limit is more realistic than 5. Perhaps we could consider setting aside a percentage of total NRSP funds for seed funded NRSPs. No hard limits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mark: Not in favor of hard deadlines, either. Might be more than just two types of funding, also (NRSP1 example). There is value in these projects, but we also have shown that we can terminate projects now, as needed.</li><li>• Shirley: Agrees with above comments. Five years is good, renewals should have clear plan for transition off NRSP funds. Perhaps stronger language should be in the Guidelines stating that these funds are not available in perpetuity. Seed funding initiative is a great idea and directors could provide guidance on what these projects should be.</li><li>• Don: Also agree with above comments. Committee could recommend some projects have a special definition to not need to comply with sun-setting requirement (NRSP1 example). 60, 40, 20% funding reductions during renewal term could be an option to facilitate transitioning.</li><li>• Mike: Considering who audience and stakeholders are could help with decisions on project funding. Different</li></ul>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>values exist for researchers versus administrators.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bret: Concerned about a project being able to show a true transition after just 5 years, but it would be helpful at the second renewal midterm time to have them provide the transition plan. We don't want to be too restrictive, but we also want to work towards at least reducing support (NRSP3 example with \$50,000) to encourage transitioning off NRSP OTT funding.</li><li>• Jeff: Acknowledge that NRSP1, NRSP3 confound the program, so he used seed versus capacity labels with the call materials today to help differentiate between types. These terms are potential labels for types if we desire for the new Guidelines.</li><li>• Doug: Should we take these discussion ideas back to the region for further consideration or go forward right away with an NRSP program recommendation for the Fall ESS meeting? Alternatively, how about three options on the ballot: accept, reject, or take back to regions for more discussion?</li><li>• Bret: Hesitant to delay program updates further, so maybe we could add in an NRSP discussion to summer ESCOP meeting (July 21) at Joint COPs and summer regional meetings for</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>discussion/feedback prior to a fall vote.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jeff: We'll need to synthesize the larger concepts and re-review as a committee prior to summer meetings. Bulleted concepts and implications could give enough information for good regional discussion.</li> <li>• Regions could discuss these ideas in advance of Fall ESS via Zoom if summer meetings aren't happening or are occurring very soon in June.</li> <li>• Jeff will finalize the material, send on to regions, and we can hold a quick Zoom call to finalize recommendations for the Fall ESS vote.</li> </ul>	
4.0	NRSP Guidelines (refer to revised NRSP Guidelines attachment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jeff: Would like to have updated Guidelines up for an approval vote (at a minimum) at Fall ESS meeting.</li> <li>• Current version of the NRSP Guidelines has been cleaned up, is much more consistent, no longer redundant, and review forms not used have been removed.</li> <li>• We need to now add elements of today's program discussion on the different project types and transition off OTT plans for projects identified as seed NRSPs.</li> <li>• Shirley: Could we make these more of an outline form, especially for new NRSP process? Might be more clear to separate out new versus renewal processes. Jeff indicated that this will</li> </ul>	<p>Jeff will work on the new NRSP Guidelines' headings, consider means to differentiate the narrative, remove any residual redundancy, clarify regional appointment process, and create the Table of Contents based on document headings. These materials will provide a basis for discussions at summer meetings resulting in regional feedback to NRSP RC. NRSP RC will integrate and respond (as appropriate) with the goal of providing final documentation no later than 30 days prior to the Fall ESS vote.</p>

		<p>be clearer after the Table of Contents is in place.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding SAES membership on NRSP-RC, are there other options for re-appointment? These appointments are up to the regions, but we will add more descriptive text about this, as well.</li> <li>• Jeff noted that NIMSS will be changed to reflect NRSP changes after they've been fully approved, which should go smoothly since we have the Clemson development team on retainer. The EDs and Chris Hamilton will lead this effort.</li> </ul>	
5.0	Other business, as needed.	None.	None.

Call adjourned at 3:56 pm ET.