

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF
THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS**

**ALASKA
AMERICAN SAMOA
ARIZONA
CALIFORNIA
COLORADO
GUAM
HAWAII
IDAHO
MICRONESIA
MONTANA
NEVADA
NEW MEXICO
NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
OREGON
UTAH
WASHINGTON
WYOMING**



**KANSAS CITY AIRPORT HILTON
KANSAS CITY, MO
SEPTEMBER 22, 1998**

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

1.0	Adopted the agenda as modified	1
2.0	Approved the minutes of the July 7-10, 1998 meeting as posted on the WDA web page .	1
3.0	Appointed a committee composed of the WDA Chair, Executive Director and RIC Chair to identify potential projects and to work with the Administrative Advisors to sort out the mechanics for appropriate actions in the coming year	3
4.0	Appointed a committee to solicit proposals for an IPM host institution and have a recommendation for the location in March 1999	4
5.0	Accepted the recommendation of the Review Committee and the Board of Directors to move the Western Rural Development Center to Utah State University	4
6.0	Adjourned the meeting	5

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Call to Order	1
2.0	Introductions & Announcements	1
3.0	Adoption of Agenda	1
4.0	Approval of Minutes of Summer Meeting	1
5.0	Interim Actions of Chair	1
6.0	Treasurer's Report	2
7.0	Status of RCIC	2
8.0	Regional Impact Assessment	2
9.0	Regional Partnership Committee	2
10.0	RR Paperless Management	2
11.0	CRIS	2
12.0	ESCOP Committee Restructuring & Strategic Plan	2
13.0	RR Manual	3
14.0	Update on WAAESD Paperless Management	3
15.0	Implementing RR Project Visits With Stakeholders & Congressional Delegations	3
16.0	Future Meetings	3
16.1	Spring - 1999	3
16.2	Summer - 1999	3
17.0	Resolutions	4
18.0	Other Business	4
18.1	IPM	4
18.2	WRDC	4
18.3	AESOP	4
18.4	CSREES	4
18.5	CSREES Plan of Work	5
19.0	Changing of the Guard	5
20.0	Adjourn	5

INDEX OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Agenda	6
APPENDIX B	Status of RCIC	7
APPENDIX C	Regional Impact Assessment	11
APPENDIX D	ESCOP Regional Research Partnership Subcommittee	12
APPENDIX E	RR Paperless Management	13
APPENDIX F	CRIS Enhancement Report	14
APPENDIX G	ESCOP Committee Restructuring & Strategic Plan	22
APPENDIX H	WAAESD Annual Spring Conference	30
APPENDIX I	Relocation Recommendation for WRDC	33
APPENDIX J	Land Grant Plans of Work	35

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS
Kansas City, MO
September 22, 1998

MINUTES

ATTENDANCE:

ALASKA	G. Allen Mitchell	NEW MEXICO	LeRoy Daugherty
AMERICAN SAMOA	Carol Whitaker	OREGON	L. J. (Kelvin) Koong
ARIZONA	C. Colin Kaltenbach		Sandra Helmick
CALIFORNIA	Henry J. Vaux	Utah	H. Paul Rasmussen
	Barbara Schneeman	WASHINGTON	James R. Carlson
COLORADO	Lee E. Sommers	WYOMING	James J. Jacobs
HAWAII	H. Michael Harrington	AESOP	Terry Nipp
IDAHO	Richard Heimsch	CSREES	E. M. (Ted) Wilson
	Donald Robertson	EXECUTIVE DIR.	Robert D. Heil
NEVADA	Ronald S. Pardini	OFFICE-EXEC. DIR.	Harriet Sykes

1.0 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Carlson.

2.0 Introductions & Announcements

The attendees introduced themselves.

3.0 Adoption of Agenda

Items to be added to the agenda are: a discussion on IPM; a recommendation from the study group evaluating proposals on the location of the Western Rural Development Center; AESOP; CSREES; and CSREES Plan of Work. The motion was made and seconded **to adopt the agenda as modified. MOTION CARRIED.** The Agenda is attached as Appendix A, p. 7.

4.0 Approval of Minutes of Summer Meeting

The motion was made and seconded **to approve the minutes of the July 7-10, 1998 meeting as posted on the WDA web page. MOTION CARRIED.**

5.0 Interim Actions of Chair

Carlson commented that he had attended the Joint ECOP/ESCOP Summer meeting. There has been heavy ESCOP involvement due to the Farm Bill.

The project for the administrative component of Western Regional Research (W-106) is to terminate on 9/30/99. What is needed is to file for an extension through a letter of request. That letter has been submitted.

The Memorandum of Understanding with Colorado State University regarding continuance of the Association headquarters has been extended under the same terms and conditions as on the previous contract.

6.0 Treasurer's Report

No report was presented.

7.0 Status of RCIC

Heil presented information on RCIC, attached as Appendix B, pp. 7-10.

8.0 Regional Impact Assessment

Heil presented information on the Regional Impact Assessment, attached as Appendix C, p. 11. At the October 15-16, 1998 meeting of the Image Enhancement project training session, the suggested format for inclusion of regional projects will be presented. In the West, coordinating committees are also being asked to develop impact statements using the same format. The Administrative Advisors will be asked to develop impact statements on multistate, multidisciplinary activities.

9.0 Regional Partnership Committee

Heil provided information on the ESCOP Regional Research Partnership Subcommittee, attached as Appendix D, p. 12.

10.0 RR Paperless Management

Heil reported on the Regional Research Paperless Management (electronic reporting) conversion project, attached as Appendix E, p. 13. The model developed by Pat Downer for CRIS is ready to beta test. Each region has identified four people to serve in the beta test in loading project outlines, annual reports and minutes of meetings. It is hoped that the system will accommodate electronic approval. The members in the West who have agreed to participate in the beta test are: P. A. Roberts, L. E. Sommers, H. G. Vest, and Harriet Sykes. It is hoped that the process can be fully implemented by the first of the year.

11.0 CRIS

Bauer reported on and distributed information for the CRIS Enhancement Project, attached as Appendix F, pp. 14-21.

12.0 ESCOP Committee Restructuring & Strategic Plan

Heil reported on activities regarding proposed ESCOP committee restructuring. It is hoped that the core committees will implement the action items of the Experiment Station Section's Strategic Plan. Background information is attached as Appendix G, pp. 22-29.

13.0 RR Manual

Heil reported that, once the RR Paperless Management system for electronic reporting is ready, the regional research guidelines will also be available on the same database. The old CSREES Regional Research Manual is currently available on the beta test site and will need to be updated before it is made available to everyone.

14.0 Update on WAAESD Paperless Management

Heil reported that the WAAESD Office was continuing to convert documents to electronic format. Electronic submission of project outlines and reports is currently being developed by CRIS for CSREES. Problems with the one-stage project review and acceptance of summary CSREES Forms 89 by the Regional Research Office were discussed.

15.0 Implementing RR Project Visits With Stakeholders & Congressional Delegations

Carlson commented that the suggestion was made earlier this year that the regions have congressional people look at some of the regional projects. Some of the regions have been developing procedures for this.

Heil reported that the North Central Region had identified 5-6 projects and are going to write impact statements and then follow up with stakeholder input to try to engage policymakers in discussions regarding the projects. The Southern Region is also going to develop a similar process. Some projects are more visible, just by their nature and bringing people to the research site may be helpful.

NRSP projects may be a good start and are a good example of how formula funds are used for long-term base support. How to handle the logistics to get the congressional delegations from several states to participate in a visit to only one site presents a problem. Identifying one or two projects every year over time would be a good way to obtain visibility.

Heimsch suggested that the regional projects that are identified might consider having their annual meeting in Washington, DC in order to invite staffers.

The motion was made and seconded **that a committee composed of the WDA Chair, Executive Director and RIC Chair identify potential projects and to work with the Administrative Advisors to sort out the mechanics for appropriate actions in the coming year. MOTION CARRIED.**

16.0 Future Meetings

16.1 Spring - 1999

Harrington provided information on the Spring 1999 WDA Meeting to be held March 22-24 in Kona, Hawaii, attached as Appendix H, pp. 30-32.

16.2 Summer - 1999

Rasmussen reported that the Summer 1999 Joint Meeting will be held July 11-14 at Sun Valley Lodge, Ketchum, ID. Registration materials will be mailed at a later date.

17.0 Resolutions

No resolutions were presented.

18.0 Other Business

18.1 IPM

Sommers reported that Gary McIntyre had expressed interest in continuing to coordinate the IPM Grants Program for another year. The motion was made and seconded **to appoint a committee to solicit proposals for an IPM host institution and have a recommendation for the location in March 1999. MOTION CARRIED.** The committee will be composed of J. J. Jacobs (Chair), L. E. Sommers, and C. W. Laughlin.

18.2 WRDC

Carlson presented the recommendation of the Review Committee of Proposals for the Western Rural Development Center on behalf of J. J. Zuiches, Chair of the Committee. The report and relocation recommendation are attached as Appendix I, pp. 33-34. Acceptance of the recommendation will require approval of both the Agricultural Experiment Stations and Cooperative Extension. The motion was made and seconded **to accept the recommendation of the Review Committee and the Board of Directors to move the Western Rural Development Center to Utah State University. MOTION CARRIED.**

18.3 AESOP

Nipp commented on activities of the Appropriations Committee and stated that he would present a more detailed report at the afternoon session.

Nipp reported that, if a regional project wanted to have a meeting in Washington, DC, it would be easy to arrange in either the House and Senate rooms. The delegates and staffers from states that were being highlighted could be invited. State funds should be used to fund this sort of educational project.

18.4 CSREES

Wilson commented that CSREES was developing guidelines for implementing the Plans of Work to comply with the Farm Bill.

In 1996 the USDA cosponsored a conference on biological control. The biological control community has been asking what the Secretary of Agriculture was going to do about the recommendations of the conference. The Secretary has appointed a committee to develop a plan of action.

18.5 CSREES Plan of Work

Rasmussen distributed a draft document on the CSREES Plan of Work, attached as Appendix J, pp. 35-40.

19.0 Changing of the Guard

Carlson thanked the members of the Association for their support in the past year. He presented Heimsch with a gavel for his use during the next year as Chair of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and turned control of the meeting over to Heimsch.

20.0 Adjourn

Under Heimsch's chairmanship, the motion was made and seconded **to adjourn the meeting.**
MOTION CARRIED.

APPENDIX A
 AGENDA
 WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS
 September 22, 1998
 Kansas City, MO

8:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon

8:30	1.0	Call to Order	J. R. Carlson
	2.0	Introductions & Announcements	J. R. Carlson
	3.0	Adoption of Agenda	J. R. Carlson
	4.0	Approval of Minutes of Summer Meeting	J. R. Carlson
	5.0	Interim Actions of Chair	J. R. Carlson
	6.0	Treasurer's Report	S. Knapp
8:50	7.0	Status of RCIC	R. D. Heil
9:00	8.0	Regional Impact Assessment	R. D. Heil
9:10	9.0	Regional Partnership Committee	R. D. Heil
9:20	10.0	RR Paperless Management	R. D. Heil
9:30	11.0	CRIS	T. Bauer
10:00		Break	
10:30	12.0	ESCOP Committee Restructuring & Strategic Plan	R. D. Heil
10:45	13.0	RR Manual	R. D. Heil
10:50	14.0	Update on WAAESD Paperless Management	H. Sykes
11:00	15.0	Implementing RR Project Visits With Stakeholders & Congressional Delegations	J. R. Carlson/R. D. Heil
11:15	16.0	Future Meetings	
	16.1	Spring - 1999	M. Harrington
	16.2	Summer - 1999	R. Heimsch
11:20	17.0	Resolutions	K. Koong/G. Vest
	18.0	Other Business	
	18.1	IPM	
	18.2	WRDC	
	18.3	AESOP	
	18.4	CSREES	
	18.5	CSREES Plan of Work	
11:30	19.0	Changing of the Guard	J. R. Carlson
11:35	20.0	Adjourn	

APPENDIX B
WAAESD AGENDA BRIEF

Date: September 22, 1998
Agenda 7.0
Presenter: R. D. Heil
Agenda Item Title: Status of RCIC
Background Information:

August 26, 1998

TO: Western CES Directors
Western AES Directors
Western ACOP Directors
Western Administrative Heads

FROM: Lyla Houglum, Chair, Western CES Directors
Jim Carlson, Chair, Western AES Directors
Kirvin Knox, Chair, Western Administrative Heads

THROUGH: Bob Heil
WAAESD Executive Director

SUBJECT: Implementation of Regional Coordination and Implementation Committee (RCIC)

This memo is to apprise everyone of actions taken and those proposed to implement the establishment of multifunctional coordinating (Integrating) committees for the Western Region per the decisions made at the joint meeting in Park City, UT, July 7-10, 1998. (See attached agenda brief [revised] which articulates the proposal that was approved.)

Actions Taken:

1. Following approval of the proposal, the Western Extension Directors decided to assess each state \$1,000 and each territory \$500 to support the Office of the Executive Director, WAAESD, which has agreed to assist in implementing this proposal. This is a temporary assessment to cover costs of integrating the Extension component of this activity. During the trial period, the Western AES and CES Directors will be the primary monetary contributors to this effort.
2. The attached proposal identifies membership on RCIC and, by this memo, we are asking the Executive Director, WAAESD, on our behalf to contact each group for identifying their respective representative.
3. Once the RCIC is formed, the Executive Director, WAAESD, will work with the committee to begin establishing guidelines, etc., utilizing the WAAESD guidelines as a framework of operation.

4. As shown in the proposal, RCIC will become effective March, 1999 and will meet for the first time immediately prior to the summer joint meetings. The Office of the Executive Directors, WAAESD, will assist RCIC in preparation for this meeting.

ATTACHED AGENDA BRIEF:

WAAESD AGENDA BRIEFS

Date: July 7-10, 1998
 Agenda Item: 8.4
 Presenter: Vicki A. McCracken
 Agenda Item Title: Research/Extension/Academic/International Programs Task Force

PROPOSAL FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF MULTIFUNCTIONAL COORDINATING (INTEGRATING) COMMITTEES FOR THE WESTERN REGION

The critical issues facing citizens in the Western Region during the 21st century will require comprehensive approaches to adequately address their increasing complexity. These approaches often require involvement of individuals representing a broad range of skills, expertise, and experience. The organizational structure to stimulate, implement, and oversee regional programming across the boundaries of research, extension education, academic, and international programs is inadequate. The importance of such integrated activity and the inadequacies of the current structure were identified in studies of the land-grant system, including the NRC's committee on the Future of Land-Grant Colleges of Agriculture (LGCA). They recommended that the LGCA system and federal government revitalize the linkages among teaching, research, and extension. Likewise, the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 identifies that research, extension, and education activities are accomplished in a manner that integrates agricultural research, extension and education functions to better link research to technology transfer and dissemination activities.

Therefore, we are proposing the establishment of coordinating (integrating) committees across the lines of research, extension, academic, and international programs, similar to the Western Coordinating Committees (WCCs) that currently exist within the regional research structure. The WCCs bring researchers together to coordinate related research, without the need for a formal regional research plan, to organize technical conferences, work groups, task forces, or symposia for exchange of experience and opinions. Several years ago the importance of extension to the success of the WCC structure was recognized, and extension faculty were encouraged to join WCCs. We are now proposing that the participation of research, extension, academic, and/or international programs' personnel on some WCCs is critical for their success. We recommend the establishment of a Regional Coordination and Implementation Committee (RCIC) that will provide leadership and oversight to the WCCs.

The formation of the RCIC and the attendant procedures and processes will adhere to the following organizational concepts.

1. The RCIC will be delegated the responsibility for review, evaluation, and recommendation of all aspects of western regional coordinating committees. Programs may involve one or

- more functional areas, i.e., research, academic programs, extension, or international programs.
2. The approval process will include a rigorous review (that may include external ad hoc reviewers) to ensure the highest possible potential for success.
 3. Individual faculty participation will be reviewed and approved by state directors or deans during the proposal formation process, prior to the regional review.
 4. Funding to support faculty involvement in approved regional programs must be provided by the faculty members institution.
 5. Proposed projects may originate from one or more Western Region institutions and from one or more functional components (research, extension, academic programs, or international programs), including the ranks of faculty or the regional committee itself.
 6. The RCIC will recommend disposition of program proposals to state directors of the impacted functional areas who will reserve authority for final approval.
 7. The RCIC will recommend the assignment of administrative advisors.
 8. Oversight and review of approved projects will include regular (annual) progress reports and statements of impact submitted to the RCIC.
 9. Members of the RCIC will be appointed by the relevant state directors and deans. The proposed composition of RCIC is

Experiment Stations	2 members
Cooperative Extension	2 members
Academic Programs	2 members
International Programs	1 member
Board on Human Services	1 member
CSREES	1 member
ARS	1 member
Forest Service	1 member
NAPFSC	1 member
Veterinary Medicine	1 member

The RCIC will review and provide oversight for all coordinating committees, with the exception of formal regional research projects (these will continue to be processed through the RIC). The 2 experiment station members and 1 of the cooperative extension members of RCIC will also serve on RIC. There will be overlap of members from other functions with other functional committees. This will provide coordination between RIC and RCIC.

The existing process for reviewing proposals for WCCs will be appropriately modified for review of new coordinating committees. The RCIC will meet face-to-face once a year immediately prior to the summer joint meetings of the deans and directors. First submission of projects will be accepted only at the summer meetings. The RCIC will meet once a year by conference call or other means to deal

with re-submitted projects (that were not approved at the summer meetings). The RIC will continue to meet twice a year.

The proposed RCIC will be effective March 1999, will be implemented on a trial basis for two years, and then reviewed in the third year. Continuation/ modification/discontinuation of RCIC will be determined by the third-year review. It is envisioned that this committee could eventually have other responsibilities.

APPENDIX C
WAAESD AGENDA BRIEF

Date: September 22, 1998
Agenda Item: 8.0
Presenter: R. D. Heil
Agenda Item Title: Regional Impact Assessment
Background Information:

Subject:
Date: Wed, 2 Sep 1998 13:44:32 GMT
From: owner-impact99@maat.reeusda.gov

Greetings!
Sender: owner-impact99@reeusda.gov
Precedence: bulk

It's time once again to begin the ECOP/ESCOP Image Enhancement project (Impact Statements) for 1999. To kick off this effort a training session will be held October 15 & 16 in Chicago. The meeting will run from 1 p.m. on Thursday, October 15 with adjournment at noon on Friday, October 16. We'll be meeting at a hotel near O'Hare Airport with shuttle service provided.

More information will follow this announcement with a detailed schedule of the program, but we wanted to get these dates on your calendars so you can begin processing travel to and from Chicago. Information on rooms at the Ramada Plaza Hotel will be provided within the next two weeks.

The schedule is being planned so many of you can fly in on October 15 and depart on October 16. Thursday afternoon we'll hear from several speakers discussing accountability and impact writing; Thursday evening will provide breakout sessions for each region to plan its impact efforts; Friday morning will provide a time for sharing state success stories and products and instruction on adding impact statements to the 1999 database.

We'll provide more a more detailed schedule as well as more information on accommodations within the next two weeks.

Terry Meisenbach, CSREES/CTDE
Dave King, Purdue University

Terry Meisenbach, Director
Communication and Information Access
CTDE, CSREES
US Department of Agriculture
Washington DC 20250

(202) 720-2677 [phone]
(202) 690-0289 [fax]
tmeisenbach@reeusda.gov

APPENDIX D
WAAESD AGENDA BRIEF

Date: September 22, 1998
Agenda Item: 9.0
Presenter: R. D. Heil
Agenda Item Title: ESCOP Regional Research Partnership Subcommittee
Background Information:

Several directors have recommended the expansion of the ESCOP Regional Research Partnership Subcommittee, which was created to replace the Committee of Nine as a mechanism to coordinate regional research between the CSREES Regional Research Office and the regional associations. It is recommended that a director be appointed from each of the associations to serve on this subcommittee. The appointee could be the current chair of the regional association Research Committee. It is anticipated this committee would conduct the majority of its business by conference calls and/or electronically, perhaps meeting one time a year.

APPENDIX E
WAAESD AGENDA BRIEF

Date: September 22, 1998
Agenda Item: 10.0
Presenter: R. D. Heil
Agenda Item Title: RR Paperless Management
Background Information:

The conversion to electronic reporting for the conduct of Regional Research business is nearing implementation. The program is now being "beta tested" by each region with a target date of October for completion. Guidelines for electronic reporting and the newly revised regional research guidelines should both be available before the end of the year.

APPENDIX F
WAAESD AGENDA BRIEF

Date: September 22, 1998
Agenda Item: 11.0
Presenter: T. Bauer
Agenda Item Title: CRIS Enhancement Report
Background Information:

CRIS ENHANCEMENT COMMITTEE

NATIONAL TASK FORCE

1. *Chaired by Dr. Colin Kaltenbach and Dr. Kurt Feltner (AZ); funded by a "special allocation" from CSREES; initiated late 1995; approximately 40 persons attended.*
2. *Focus on the improvement and expansion of CRIS to better meet the needs of the state partners, USDA agencies, OMB, Congress, and grantees.*
3. *Participants on the taskforce include both users and producers of CRIS data: OBPA, OMB, GAO, Congress, DOE, NASA, FSF, NIH, NIST, USDA agency supporters of CRIS, Farm Foundation, National Academy of Sciences, the Agricultural Research Institute, and other agricultural organizations.*
4. *The purpose of National Task Force is to improve user access to CRIS information; update/expand the taxonomy to include emerging fields of science and to provide data on broad programs as well as individual projects; improve operational efficiency; and to enhance the timeliness and accuracy of data.*
5. *The enhanced CRIS will lend itself to bridging with other information systems, including the eventual REE-wide information system, REEIS.*
6. *Four working groups:*
 - taxonomy/classification (Frank Flora - CSREES)*
 - communications/customer relations (Len Carey - CSREES)*
 - support for project planning (Tom Helms - MIS)*
 - user friendly/system attributes (Pat Downer - VT)*

*CLASSIFICATION A ND TAXONOMY TASK GROUP**CHARGED WITH:*

1. *Enhancing or redesigning the classification to capture emerging areas of research and current topics of national interest (e.g. sustainable agriculture, biotechnology, and global change).*
2. *Reviewing utility of RPG and RP categories and recommend modifications.*
3. *Review RPAs, fields of science, activities and commodities for currentness, duplication, logical combinations and imprecise wording and recommend changes or additions. Reduce or eliminate subcategories of classification that have outlived their utility.*
4. *Review the AD-417 form and recommend appropriate changes, additions, or deletions.*
5. *Recommend a means to monitor and adjust the system of classification on an ongoing basis.*
6. *Assess need to link the new and old classification schemes for assembling historical data and time series management reporting.*

Recommendations:

1. *Redo the RPA structure*
 - *from 98 to 81 in 9 topic areas (formerly Goals)*
 - *deleted, combined, redefined, and created new*
2. *Eliminate the need for RPAs to be tied to commodity and activity code*
3. *Eliminate the “special classification” codes- except for “Forestry” and “Animal Health”*
4. *Eliminate activity codes*
5. *Commodity Codes changed to “Subject of Investigation”*
 - *expanded to include subcommodities*
6. *Proposed classification structure*
7. *Drafted new AD-417*

- *4 columns*
- *still 10 lines, minimum 10%*
- *no restrictions on combinations*
- *retained basic, applied and development percents*

COMMUNICATIONS AND CUSTOMER RELATIONS

TASK GROUP

Charged with:

- 1. Identify potential users of CRIS who are unaware of its capabilities and develop recommendations for CRIS to better communicate its capabilities.*
- 2. CRIS should determine what national and international audiences needs are for access to related data bases and value-added data (sub-files).*
- 3. Suggest specific improvements in instructional manuals that would result in greater accuracy and faster updating.*
- 4. Recommend how CRIS can better inform users and provide information about methods of access and data entry procedures by developing novel communication approaches.*
- 5. Recommend improved approaches for evaluating customer satisfaction with CRIS products and services.*
- 6. Suggest methods for soliciting and evaluating user needs for new types of information.*

Survey Findings:

- 1. Most users of CRIS use it for its technical information.*
- 2. Users of the CRIS system include both data providers and data users.*
- 3. Maximum exposure of CRIS to potential users and maximum accessibility of CRIS information are best accomplished through the world wide web.*
- 4. The formal structure of the CRIS classification system and rigor of its search engines improve its utility for users needing accurate financial information.*

Preliminary recommendations:

- 1. Establish higher internet profile mail groups; listservers; publicize the web address.*
- 2. Improve user utility
add a field for media and public contact; add a field for a "non-technical" summary of the research; and focus on the web access.*

3. *Cooperate with other organizations serving international audiences. The CRIS home page should link to CARIS and AGRIS as they become available.*
4. *Provide web based assistance and instructions.*
5. *Implement artificial intelligence for both input and output functions.*
6. *Simplify!*
7. *Know and ask the customer.*
8. *Evaluate customer satisfaction.*
9. *Fund a customer relations position.*

RESEARCH PLANNING

Charged with:

1. *Recommend how CRIS could better provide customized management and technical reports for external users.*
2. *Identify how CRIS might create a more open system with capability to accept, process, and provide new forms of data including budget data.*
3. *Recommend how CRIS might expand input from individual projects or work units to include program information.*
4. *Recommend how CRIS might optimize the time between update cycles for CRIS files, internet systems, and CD-ROM and reduce the need for manual editing and validation of data.*

Recommendations:

1. *Expand the AD-421 to allow entry of more information.*
2. *Impact statements are needed as part of the final progress report.*
3. *Look-up tables of CRIS code combinations are needed.*
4. *Form 662 (Assurance form) should be eliminated.*
5. *Add GPS (Geographic Positioning System) coordinates to assist those interested in putting CRIS data into a GIS.*
6. *There must be continuity between the existing CRIS and the enhanced CRIS.*
7. *Budget and expenditure data should be available to users; however, public access should be limited to only fixed reports.*
8. *“Off-the-shelf” technology must be used.*

USER FRIENDLY/SYSTEM ATTRIBUTES

TASK GROUP

Charged with:

1. *Improve accessibility and utility of CRIS worldwide and broaden the user base to include the larger body of consumers, producers, educators and decision makers.*
2. *Recommend ways to simplify the procedures for assigning input codes and percentages in order to assure consistency and logic in classification input.*
3. *Develop specific recommendations for new formats and procedures that will improve ease of data/information input from different sources, including budget data.*
4. *Recommend specific ways in which CRIS can improve the speed and ease of providing CRIS information and custom outputs for traditional and new users.*
5. *Recommend ways in which CRIS might reduce effort spent on manual editing, validations, and processing of incoming data.*
6. *Recommend specific ways in which CRIS can become a more flexible and dynamic system to respond to future change.*

Recommendations:

1. *Using the web solves the cross platform problem.*
2. *Audience evaluation must be an ongoing process.*
3. *Make the system as simple and unencumbered as possible.*
4. *The web makes it possible to have central data management functions while taking advantage of local web accessibility, input, and reporting capabilities.*
5. *Collect cris data via the web - would ease burden for CRIS which now processes inputs from different sources.*
6. *Use a combination of web forms and CRISFRMS to update CRIS.*
7. *Reduce reliance on main-frame system.*
8. *Host a web newsgroup.*
9. *Make HTML the standard text format for project outlines.*

10. *Add e-mail address of principal investigator.*
11. *Non-technical summary.*
12. *CRIS manuals should be available on the web - completed.*

The final recommendations of the committee are available on the web through the CRIS Homepage (<http://Cristel.nal.usda.gov:8080>) under the selection “CRIS Enhancement Effort.”

APPENDIX G
WAAESD AGENDA BRIEF

Date: September 22, 1998
Agenda Item: 12.0
Presenter: R. D. Heil
Agenda Item Title: ESCOP Committee Restructuring & Strategic Plan
Background Information:

<http://www.agnr.umd.edu.users/escop/workroom/restruct.html>

ESCOP Restructuring Activities
Committee Reorganization

PREAMBLE

ESCOP is currently considering a reorganization of its committee structure to better accomplish its purposes. To this end it has been proposed to limit the number of committees to five core committees. To provide continuity to the committees it has been proposed to appoint, through the ESCOP nominations process, a Committee Chair and a Committee Chair-Designate, each for two year terms. Furthermore, to provide staff support to core committees each would be assigned an Executive Director from one of the five regional associations, to serve as an Executive Vice Chair. However, this designation should not preclude an Executive Director from serving as a Core Committee's Chair-designate or Chair. Additionally, it has been proposed that inter-committee overlaps should be reduced by carefully charging each of the committees with its specific responsibilities. And, to better implement the Experiment Station Section's Strategic Plan, the 32 Action Items associated with the Plan's eight Strategic Targets will be apportioned to the core committees.

It has been further proposed that each core committee be authorized to form Sub-committees. Such Sub-committees should be appointed by the Core Committee's Chair. Sub-committees would, in turn, elect their own Chair. Sub-committees would not be permanent, but would function for defined periods of time, working with specific charges, and reporting to its sponsoring Core Committee.

The following DRAFT Core Committee charges are for discussion purposes only. ESCOP is requesting your responses to these proposed organizational changes. Additionally, this topic will be on the agenda for future meetings of the Experiment Station Section, with time made available for collecting your opinions and suggestions.

ESCOP COMMITTEE I (Budget, Legislative, Advocacy and Marketing)
ESCOP COMMITTEE II (Science and Technology)
ESCOP COMMITTEE III (Partnerships)
ESCOP COMMITTEE IV (Planning)
ESCOP COMMITTEE V (Executive)

<http://www.agnr.umd.edu.users/escop/workroom/budgdev8-98.html>

ESCOP RESTRUCTURING ACTIVITIES
BUDGET, LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY AND MARKETING COMMITTEE

ESCOP COMMITTEE I (Budget, Legislative, Advocacy and Marketing)

Charge- The ESCOP Committee on Budget, Legislation, Advocacy and Marketing is charged with responsibility for:

developing annual justifications for the federal budget process, in consultation with the Board on Agriculture, AESOP Enterprises, Ltd. and others; recommending appropriate science and technology programs that are linked to multi-state and national research initiatives; providing guidance in the assessment of impacts resulting from the State Agricultural Experiment Station System; and leading ESCOP's advocacy efforts.

Membership- The membership of this committee shall be comprised of:

- Two delegates from each of the five SAES/ARD regions
- One Executive Director to serve as Executive Vice-Chair, to assist the Chair
- Two CSREES representatives
- One ARS representative
- One representative each from CROPs 99, and FAIR 2002

Expected Targets-

Strategic Target 1. Place greater emphasis on identifying and serving the needs of stakeholders and clientele.

Action Item: Expand consultation, participatory planning and stakeholder involvement in program implementation.

Action Item: Emphasize the development of science-based information, technologies, and knowledge through a diverse portfolio of priority research activities.

Action Item: Provide knowledge and services equitably for all citizens, including the historically underserved and small-scale farming enterprises, for a broad base of service and appreciation.

Strategic Target 3. Expand the research capability of the SAES's to respond to stakeholder needs.

Action Item: Involve faculty-colleagues from non-traditional disciplines in the conduct of SAES research.

Action Item: Maintain and expand a diversified portfolio of funding sources for research, including the development of non-traditional sources of funding.

Strategic Target 6. Be more accountable to our stakeholders.

Action Item: Improve the effectiveness of our communications with stakeholders, including legislators and the public.

Action Item: Directly contribute to the reporting requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA).

Action Item: Support the SAES System's growing commitments to Image Enhancement, jointly with the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP).

Strategic Target 7. Couple the process of national strategic planning with federal budget development and advocacy.

Action Item: Work with CSREES in the "outyears" to identify joint budget priorities.

Action Item: Identify areas of emphasis to be targeted with additional formula appropriations from Congress.

Action Item: Work with other federal agencies in support of their budget requests, when those requests are congruent with the priorities of the SAES System.

Expected Outputs- The committee shall make available to ESCOP, and in turn to ESS and the wider community we serve, recommended plans and strategies for effective budget, legislative, and advocacy efforts.

Expected Outcomes- The resulting outcome of this committee's efforts will be enhanced research capacity within the SAES System. Additionally, improved communication, within our community and with our partners, will result in greater efficiency and effectiveness of our research activities.

<http://www.agnr.umd.edu.users/escop/workroom/scitech8-98.html>

ESCOP RESTRUCTURING EXERCISE
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

ESCOP COMMITTEE II (Science and Technology)

Charge- The ESCOP Committee on Science and Technology is charged with the responsibility for organizing the collection of national research projects into a cohesive portfolio of research programs that will support sustained federal appropriations for SAES research endeavors. In this process, the Committee will strive to link regional and national multi-state, multi-functional and multi-disciplinary activities. Additionally, coordination of regional and national research programs with national initiatives such as CROPS 99 and FAIR 2002 is expected.

Membership- The membership of this committee shall be comprised of:

- Two delegates from each of the five SAES/ARD regions
- One Executive Director to serve as Executive Vice-Chair, to assist the Chair
- Two CSREES representatives
- One ARS representative
- One representative each from CROPS 99, and FAIR 2002

Liaison representatives may include ERS, OSTP, other COPS, and other federal agencies as appropriate, (i.e., NASA, EPA, DOE)

Expected Targets-

Strategic Target 2. Improve the effectiveness of agricultural research management.

Action Item: Share research management approaches and successful leadership experiences through professional development programs, seminars, workshops, and in other ways.

Action Item: Develop improved performance and accountability measures to better assure scientific quality and research relevance.

Action Item: Develop, maintain, and share methods for documenting the impacts of research.

Action Item: Maintain an inventory of SAES System's capacity (human, fiscal, and physical resources) to better plan and direct activities for solving relevant problems.

Action Item: Verify the quality of scientific research, utilizing peer review where appropriate, to ensure that research investments are effectively allocated.

Strategic Target 8. Organize the national research portfolio into a set of discrete programs.

Action Item: Give the SAES System's diversity of disciplines a voice in the creation of a consensus ordering of the research portfolio's programs.

Action Item: Reorganize the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy's (ESCOP) Technical Committees for greater cost efficiencies and effectiveness.

Action Item: Partner with the professional society activities (e.g., FAIR 2002, CROPS 99) for planning national program activities.

Action Item: Liaison with commodity groups to establish agreed programmatic priorities, for mutual support.

Action Item: Charge the identified program areas with responsibility for: monitoring and projecting needed capacity; planning research activities; and reporting accomplishments.

Expected Outputs- Direction and guidance to the ESS and to other partners, both public (CSREES, ARS, USDA Advisory Board, etc.) and private (industry, CARET, etc.) on matters dealing with science and technology.

Expected Outcomes- Improved research capacity within the ESS, improved direction of research with our partners, increased information exchange with other ESCOP committees. In addition, the committee will help to formulate a consensus on science and technology programs and subject matter expertise, especially in the context of federal funding structures (e.g., the base program, competitive grants, special research grants).

<http://www.agnr.umd.edu/users/escop/workroom/partner8-98.html>

ESCOP RESTRUCTURING ACTIVITIES
PARTNERSHIP COMMITTEE

ESCOP COMMITTEE III (Partnerships)

Charge- To create through sustained dialogue, formal and informal networks, and with collaborative arrangements greater opportunities for agricultural research partnerships between Land-Grant Universities and other public and private sector groups to address Experiment Station Section priorities and areas of focus. Efforts will be made to engage traditional and non-traditional partners who have the potential for supporting the Section's broad research agenda. Emphasis should be focused on opportunities for multi-state, multi-disciplinary, and multi-institutional collaborations.

Membership- The membership of this committee shall be comprised of:

- Two delegates from each of the five SAES/ARD regions
- One Executive Director to serve as Executive Vice-Chair, to assist the Chair
- Two CSREES representatives
- One ARS representative
- One person from each of the four agencies in the Research, Education and Economics Mission Area of USDA (4)
- The Executive Director of ARI
- The Executive Director of CoFARM
- The Executive Director of CFARE
- The Chair-Elect of CARET
- One person from each of the other COPs (3)
- Five non-Land-Grant members appointed by the Chair of ESCOP (from private sector, other universities, etc.)

Expected Targets-

Strategic Target 4. Expand and reinvigorate our strategic partnerships.

Action Item: Strengthen our partnership with CSREES.

Action Item: Jointly plan and conduct research activities with traditional (e.g., ARS, ERS, FS) and new partners (e.g., private labs, research-based companies, commodity groups, non-governmental organizations).

Action Item: Develop stronger collaborative relationships with additional federal agencies (e.g., NASA, EPA).

Action Item: Develop and enhance appropriate collaborative arrangements with the private sector.

Action Item: Develop and enhance partnerships among states.

Action Item: Provide leadership for expanded international partnerships.

Strategic Target 5. Foster improved integration of research, extension, and academic programs.

Action Item: Expand cross-functional collaborations within and among institutions.

Action Item: Encourage more participation by extension specialists in Regional Research projects, and in Regional Coordinating Committees.

Expected Outputs- The Committee shall make available to ESCOP, and in turn the broader Land-Grant University's research community it serves, a futuristic, mission-oriented and visionary partnership action plan for the SAES/ARD System. The plan will identify potential partners, and strategies for engaging partners in ways to enhance research partnerships.

Expected Outcomes- The successes of this Committee, when measured as outcomes, will include, but will not be limited to:

- Strengthening and enhancing existing partnerships;
- Establish new and more meaningful partnerships; and
- Providing access to more resources and research opportunities for the Land-Grant University community and its partners.

<http://www.agnr.umd.edu.users/escop/workroom/planning8-98.html>

ESCOP RESTRUCTURING ACTIVITIES
PLANNING COMMITTEE

ESCOP COMMITTEE IV (Planning)

Charge- This committee is to create a forum within the Land-Grant University community, its partners, and with our stakeholders to solicit information on research issues and priorities, and incorporate them appropriately into the Experiment Station Section's ongoing strategic planning process. Concomitantly, the committee should develop recommendations on new research initiatives, and strategies for implementing strategic plans in ways that benefit multi-state, multi-institutional, and multi-disciplinary approaches. The committee should also recommend ways to support the development of impact statements derived from the implementation of the ESS Strategic Plan.

Membership- The membership of this committee shall be comprised of:

- Two delegates from each of the five SAES/ARD regions
- One Executive Director to serve as Executive Vice-Chair, to assist the Chair
- Three CSREES representatives
- One person from each of the other COPs (3);
- Three non-Land-Grant members appointed by the Chair of ESCOP (from private sector, other universities, etc.) , and
- One representative from each of the following liaisons:
 - CARET
 - USDA/ARS
 - Industry

Expected Targets-

Strategic Target 7: Couple the process of national strategic planning with federal budget development and advocacy.

Action Item: Create a process for consensus building on a limited set of strategically important national priorities.

Action Item: Provide a process for identifying national initiatives, suitable for concerted promotion.

Action Item: Join with ECOP to plan and promote common priorities and initiatives.

Expected Outputs- The Committee shall make available to ESCOP, and in turn to ESS and the broader community we serve, a current and visionary strategic plan for the SAES System. Other products and activities of the Committee should include: at least one annual forum with stakeholders to discuss research priorities and prepare a synthesis document for ESCOP to highlight priorities, and recommend strategies to address those priorities.

Expected Outcomes- The products and activities of the ESCOP Planning Committee should: more clearly identify the needs of the System's stakeholders; help to focus the System's research resources on an agreed set of research priorities; provide greater communication and coordination with our functional partners; and substantially advance the collective purposes of the SAES System and the Federal-State Partnership.

<http://www.agnr.umd.edu.users/escop/workroom/executive8-98.html>

ESCOP RESTRUCTURING ACTIVITIES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ESCOP COMMITTEE V (Executive)

Charge- The Executive Subcommittee assists the Chair on actions needed between regular meetings of ESCOP including, but not limited to:

- Handling the continuing business of ESCOP and the Experiment Station Section, subject to the will of those bodies;
- Attends to all organization and policy matters with NASULGC, agencies of the federal government, farm (commodity and agribusiness) organizations and groups;
- Assessing the goals and purposes of the organization on a continuing basis;
- Recommending needed change in the structure and organization of ESCOP to meet society's needs and the needs of the Section;
- Assuring that all appropriate lines of communication are identified and effectively implemented and maintained; and,
- Identifying expertise among stakeholders and within the Section for possible service in various roles (e.g., advisory groups).

Membership- The Executive Committee members are:

- ESCOP Officers
- Chair
- Chair-Elect
- Executive Vice-Chair (Executive Director within the Chair's region)
- Immediate Past Chair
- Senior ESCOP Representatives from each region (5)
- Regional Executive Directors (4)
- Chair of Planning, and Budget, Legislative, Advocacy and Marketing Committees (2)

Liaison Representatives

Administrator, CSREES

NASULGC Director, Federal Relations for Agriculture

CARET Representative

Committee Operations- Three meetings of the Executive Committee are held annually: one in the Winter (January or February), one in the Fall (September), and a third meeting in the Summer (usually July), which is held jointly with ECOP, ACOP and ICOP.

Expected Outputs- The Committee communicates recommendations and results of its actions to ESCOP, and in turn, to the Experiment Station Section, the Board on Agriculture, NASULGC, CSREES, other federal partners, and others.

Expected Outcomes- All matters of business related to organization and policy of ESCOP and the Experiment Station Section are handled in an orderly fashion.

APPENDIX H
WAAESD AGENDA BRIEF

Date: September 22, 1998
Agenda Item: 16.1
Presenter: H. Michael Harrington,
Agenda Item Title: WAAESD Annual Spring Conference
Background Information:

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources
Hawaii Institute of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources
Gilmore Hall 202 - 3050 Maile Way - Honolulu, Hawai'i 96822-2271

Office of the Director

September 15, 1998

TO: WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF AGRICULTURE EXPERIMENT
STATION DIRECTORS (WAAESD)

FROM: H. Michael Harrington, Interim Director
University of Hawaii

SUBJECT: WAAESD Annual Spring Conference - March 22-24, 1999

The WAAESD Annual Spring Conference will be held from March 22-24,1999 in Kona, Hawai'i. The conference will be held at the King Kamehameha Kona Beach Hotel at 75-5660 Palani Road, KailuaKona, Hawai'i. The hotel is offering a special room rate of \$80.00/day (plus 11.41% tax) if reservations are made by February 20, 1999. This rate will be extended to "pre/post" meeting dates subject to hotel availability. Please refer to the "Official Housing Request" form attached and book reservations directly at (800) 367-6060 or (808) 923-4511. A special car rental rate is being offered for conference attendees through Budget Rent A Car. Please refer to the Budget Rent A Car flyer attached and book reservations directly at (800) 777-0169.

The \$150.00 conference registration fee includes:

- Continental Breakfasts (Mon/Tues/Wed)
- Reception (Monday Night)
- Luncheon Buffets (Tues/Wed)
- Dinner Buffet (Tuesday Night)
- Morning & Afternoon Breaks (Tues/Wed)

The \$125.00 Companion Guest registration fee includes all meals except the morning/afternoon breaks.

OPTIONAL additional events are listed below but are NOT included in registration fee and must be paid SEPARATELY:

- HAWAIIAN LUAU DINNER/SHOW:** \$42/person (includes tax & tip)
(Sunday Night) Need head count confirmation by Dec. 1, 1998
- VOLCANO TOUR:** \$28/person
(All Day Sunday - Pending Sufficient Interest) Minimum of 40 people required
Need head count confirmation by Dec. 1, 1998

OFFICIAL HOUSING REQUEST FORM
KING KAMEHAMEHA'S KONA BEACH HOTEL

75-5660 Palani Road
 Kailua-Kona, HI 96740
 Telephone (808) 329-2911

WAAESD
March 20 - 25 '99

Use this form ONLY or call **HTH Central Reservations, (800) 387-8060 / (808) 923-4511**. Reservation requests must be received by **February 20, 1999** or be subject to hotel availability.

Name: _____
 (Last) (First) (M.I.)

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____ Country: _____

Phone: _____ (day) _____ Facsimile: _____

Arrival Date: _____ **Time:** _____ **G a.m. G p.m.** **Departure Date:** _____ **Time:** _____ **G a.m. G p.m.**

Sharing With: _____ / _____ / _____
 (Last) (First, M.I.) (Last) (First, M.I.) (Last) (First, M.I.)

Room Rates: Run of House \$80 net, non-commissionable
 Applicable for single/double occupancy.
 Extra person charge is \$20 net; maximum 4 per room.

*** RATES ARE EXTENDED TO PRE/POST MEETING DATES SUBJECT TO ROOM AVAILABILITY**

Tax: 11.41%

Family Plan: No charge for children 18 and under occupying the same room with parents unless additional bedding is requested.

Guarantee: A one night's room rate deposit **is required** within 14 days of confirmation to **guarantee** hotel reservation.

Method of Payment: Check Credit Card

Please make checks or Money Orders payable to HTH Corporation or provide Credit Card information:

Credit Card Holder: _____

Type of Card: Visa MasterCard American Express Discover
 Carte Blanche Diners Club Japan Credit Bureau

Card Number: _____ Expiration Date: _____

Signature: _____

Credit cards will be charged with one night's room rate plus tax upon receipt of Registration Form.

Cancellation Policy: Deposit will be forfeited if cancellation is not received 72 hours prior to confirmed arrival date.

Hotel check-in time is 3:00 p.m. Check out time is Noon. Specific accommodations cannot be guaranteed. Requests for Suites must be made directly with the Hotel.

Please Return To: HTH CENTRAL RESERVATIONS
 2490 Kalakaua Avenue
 Honolulu, Hawaii 96815
 Fax: (808) 922-8061

Budget.

WAAESD
MARCH 22-24,1999
HOTEL KING KAMEHAMEHA

ALOHA!

Special rates and a rate I.D. code has been created for your group.

The rate I.D. code must be given when calling in your reservation and at time of rental in order to receive the special rates below and to acknowledge your organization appropriately.

<u>CAR-TYPE/NO MILEAGE CHARGE:</u>	<u>DAILY</u>	<u>WEEKLY</u>
Compact: Escort or similar	\$37.99	\$227.99
Intermediate: Contour or similar	\$40.99	\$245.99
Full-Size: Taurus or similar	\$46.99	\$281.99
Convertible: Mustang or similar	\$74.99	\$449.99
Luxury: Lincoln Town Car or similar	\$74.99	\$449.99
7-passenger Van: Windstar or similar	\$74.99	\$449.99
Jeep: Wrangler or similar	\$74.99	\$449.99

All rates are plus 4.166% General Excise tax, \$2.00 per day (of fraction of a day) Hawaii State Surcharge tax, Vehicle License Fee, optional Less Damage Waiver, Personal Accident & Effects Insurance, Supplemental Liability, surcharges, drop charges, and refueling service charges.

Daily rental is based on a 24-hour period. Weekly rates are based on 6 or 7 days on one island only. Rates are subject to rental requirements and are guaranteed for this group movement. Cars are subject to availability.

You will receive Certificates for free admissions, meals and gifts and a FREE Drive Guide at time of rental as a special thanks for renting with Budget Rent a Car.

Rental requires that each driver be 25 years or older with a major credit card in driver's name. A \$20.00 underage surcharge applies to driver's 21-24 years of age with a major credit card in their name,

To make reservations, call Budget Rent a Car Hawaii's
GROUP TOLL FREE RESERVATIONS NUMBER: 800 777-0169
FROM KONA: 329-1229
AND MENTION RATE ID CODE: U054155
and write in your CONFIRMATION NUMBER: _____

Budget
Rent A Car
Systems, Inc.
P.O. Box 15188
Honolulu, HI
96830-0188
Phone:
808/838-2221
Fax:
808/838-2220

This letter will be used as your written confirmation.
Please present upon check-in at the rental counter.
MAHALO!

APPENDIX I
WAAESD AGENDA BRIEF

Date: September 22, 1998
Agenda Item: 18.2
Presenter: J. R. Carlson
Agenda Item Title: Relocation Recommendation for WRDC
Background Information:

Washington State University

College of Agriculture and Home Economics

P.O. Box 646242
Pullman, WA 99164-6242
509-335-4561
FAX 509-335-1065
TDD: 1-800-833-6388

Office of the Dean

September 21, 1998

MEMORANDUM

TO: James R. Carlson
Chair, Western Agricultural Association of Experiment Stations
Lyla Houglum
Western Extension Directors Association

FROM: James J. Zuiches
Dean and Chair of the Western Rural Development Center Relocation Review
Process

SUBJECT: Relocation Recommendation

The Board of Directors of the Western Rural Development Center met today and unanimously accepted the recommendation of the Review Committee concerning the relocation of the Western Regional Rural Development Center. I have attached a copy of the Review Committee's summary of their review process and recommendation. The Committee recommended that the Western Rural Development Center be relocated to Utah State University.

Board members in attendance at the telephone conference call board meeting included Terry Salmon, California; David Reid, California; Bob Koopman, CSREES; Lyla Houglum, Oregon; Thayne Dutson, Oregon; and James J. Zuiches, Washington. Kent Briggs was absent.

The Board discussed the review process and the criteria and unanimously accepted the recommendation. According to our procedures, the final selection is subject to approval by the Western Extension Directors and Agricultural Experiment Stations Directors associations. I am submitting this motion to the respective associations for their consideration and approval.

988.494

Att.

Cc: WRDC Board of Directors

Cooperative Extension



Serving People and Industries through: Instruction, Research, and Extension

Office of the Director

The University of Arizona - College of Agriculture
Forbes Building, Room 301, Tucson, Arizona 65721
(520) 621-7209 - FAX: (520) 621-1314

September 18, 1998

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Western Rural Development Center Board of Directors
(via Dr. James Zuiches, Dean, Washington State University)

FROM: Committee of Proposals for Western Rural Development Center
James A. Christenson (Chair), Arizona Cooperative Extension
Anthony Nakazawa, Alaska Cooperative Extension
James G. Thompson, University of Wyoming
Tom Harris, University of Nevada-Reno
Robert Koopman, ECS/CSREES

SUBJ: Report to Committee

We were most impressed with the quality, institutional commitment, and creativity of the six proposals submitted for review. The University Administration of the six institutions (University of California, Colorado State University, Montana State University, Oregon State University, Utah State University, and Washington State University), along with appropriate subunits indicated strong support and monetary incentives for locating, or relocating, the Western Rural Development Center (WRDC) at their institution. Such quality and commitment made our task truly difficult.

We used the weighting system as outlined in the April 3, 1998 Request for Proposal document which was sent to all Western AES and ES Directors. Each member of the Review Committee independently evaluated each proposal using the weighted evaluation criteria as outlined in the aforementioned RFP. In addition, the Review Committee met by teleconference on September 10, 1998 to discuss their individual ratings and to prioritize the proposals.

Based upon our evaluation of the six proposals, we rate the proposal submitted by Utah State University as the best of the six. We recommend that the WRDC be relocated to Utah State. We found that their proposal manifested good integration between Research and Extension; strong background in applied research; partnerships with other agencies and organizations within and across states; good financial support; and we liked the idea of a national search for the director (tenure track).

Our second choice would be Colorado State University. We found their proposal to demonstrate vision and innovation such as the fellows approach; working partnerships with community and programs at local levels; institutional support from related organizations such as the Center for Rural Assistance, and an attractive indirect cost/overhead arrangement. We did have some concerns about the Coordinator/Director roles and overall leadership.

Our third choice was Oregon State University. We found their proposal manifested strong research; links with professionals outside the University, ties with Rural Development Councils across states; clear leadership and a strong track record. We did have some concerns about indirect cost and other financial arrangements.

We appreciate the opportunity to review these six excellent proposals. We have kept our notes if additional input is needed.

The University of Arizona. College of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture and Arizona Counties Cooperating

APPENDIX J

DRAFT - FOR DISCUSSION

9-21-98

GUIDELINES

for

Land Grant Institution Plans of Work**Introduction**

Sections 202 and 225 of the “Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998” (AREERA) require all institutions eligible for research and extension Federal formula funds authorized under the Hatch Act of 1887, as amended, the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, and Sections 1444 (1890 Extension) and 1445 (1890 Research) of the National Agriculture Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended, to prepare, submit, and have approved a Plan of Work (POW). This document provides guidance for preparing the POW, with preservation of institutional autonomy and programmatic flexibility within the Federal-State Partnership. Establishing protocols as required by Section 202 and 225 will be addressed in a subsequent document.

The legislation specifies identical POW requirements for the 1862 Research, 1862 Extension., 1890 Research, and 1890 Extension.¹ 1994 institutions are required to report related to stakeholder input and merit and peer review. All components of the legislation have been considered in formulating these guidelines. Each component of the legislation related to 1862 and 1890 institutions contains an item titled “Treatment of Plans of Work for Other Purposes.”² Guidelines to meet Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) and Civil Rights reporting requirements are included to meet the spirit of this language.

Planning Options

The POW submitted is a 5-year plan with an opportunity for the submission of an optional annual update. POWs may be prepared for an institution's individual functions (i.e., research or extension activities), for an individual institution (integrating planning the functions of research and extension), or they may be state-wide (integrating the planning of all the State's institutions). Regardless of the reporting combination chosen, the plan of work submitted should reflect the content of the program of the unit reporting and how this program relates to and is part of the national system.

Stakeholder Input³

POWs should identify the processes used to develop the programs targeted to address the critical issues of the State. To obtain agricultural research, extension., or education formula funds from the Secretary, each 1862 Institution, 1890 Institution, shall, and 1994 Institution should establish and implement a process for obtaining input from persons who either conduct or use agricultural research, extension, or education concerning the use of the formula funds.

To report stakeholder input consistent with the language of the AREEPA, each institution shall address all the following criteria through the appropriate section in the plan of work. Failure to complete and document the following 3 items will result in the withholding of Federal formula funds for non-compliant institutions.

1. Institutions will seek input in an open and fair process that encourages the participation of diverse individuals and groups.

¹Section 202 requires plans of work for 1862 research and extension formula funds. Section 225 requires plans of work for 1890 research and extension funds.

²Section 202 (a)(1)(e), Section 202 (b)(1)(g), Section 225 (a)(1)(d)(5), and Section 225 (b)(1)(c)(5) directs the Secretary to consider a plan of work to satisfy other appropriate Federal reporting requirements.

³102 © requires stakeholder input for all research, education, and extension formula funds at 1962, 1890, and 1994 institutions.

2. Institutions will, provide a brief statement of the process used to identify individuals who conduct or use agricultural research, extension or education and to collect input from such individuals.
3. Institutions will provide examples that demonstrate how consideration was given to the input.

Merit and Peer Review⁴

Each 1862 and 1890 Institution eligible to receive agricultural research and extension funds and each 1994 Institution eligible to receive agricultural extension funds shall provide the following documentation for each program in the plan of work.

1. A description of the merit and/or peer review process which shall include but not be limited to priorities as reflected in the plan of work, the selection of reviewers with expertise relevant to the effort, and appropriate scientific and technical standards. Put simply, merit review is an assessment of "doing the right things;" peer review is an assessment of "doing things right."
2. Certification of the process by individual(s) with USDA signature authority at institutions.

Goals

The POW should be based on the 5 national goals established in the Research, Education, and Economics (REE) Mission Area and Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) Agency Strategic Plans (<http://www.reeusda.gov>). The body of the plan of work should focus on these goals and outcomes. The 5 Goals are:

Goal 1. Through research and education, empower the agricultural system with knowledge that will improve competitiveness in domestic production, processing, and marketing.

An agricultural system that is highly competitive in the global economy.

Goal 2. To ensure an adequate food and fiber supply and food safety through improved science based detection, surveillance, prevention, and education.

A safe and secure food and fiber system.

Goal 3. Through research and education on nutrition and development of more nutritious foods, enable people to make health promoting choices.

A healthy, well-nourished population.

Format

As mentioned under the Planning Options section, a institution or state may opt to submit independent plans for the various units (e.g. 1862 research) or an integrated plan which includes all units in the institution or state. Regardless, the plans of work should be reported in a matrix format each cell of which aggregates and summarizes all programs that fall under one of the national program goals. If an integrated plan is submitted, the various units within the entity for which POW has been developed (i.e., 1862 research, 1890 research, 1862 extension, 1890 extension, or 1994 program) would appear on the vertical axis. Teaching programs could be reported in this matrix if the institution chooses. Individual cells within the matrix would be used to summarize the state programs and/or projects, along with their respective indicators and outcome measures.

This matrix does not mandate that various units submit a combined Plan of Work. If a single unit chooses to submit an independent plan, the matrix may or may not be used. If it is used, it would have only one component in the vertical axis. Each cell in this matrix should include the items listed under Planned Program outlined in the following section. This information could be in narrative form and should include quantifiable data, where possible.

⁴Section 103(e), 104(a)(2), 105(l), and 212 requires that institutions receiving special research or extension grants conduct a peer or merit review.

The following example illustrates the desired matrix.

	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4	Goal 5
Research					
Extension					
Teaching					

Planned Programs

Program descriptions presented in narrative form or in each cell of the matrix will be related to each of the 5 strategic plan goals and should reflect the following planning components:

- The **statement of the issue** should include an environmental scan and reflect the input of the stakeholders.
- **The performance goal(s)** is a target level of performance expressed as a tangible, measurable objective against which actual achievement can be compared, including a goal expressed as a quantitative standard, value, or rate.

Each Program Description in the matrix cell or narrative should contain:

- **Statement of Issue(s)**
- **Performance Goal(s)**
- **Key Program Component(s)**
- **Internal and External Linkages**
- **Target Audiences**
- **Evaluation Framework**
- **Output Indicators**
- **Outcome Indicators**
- **Program Duration**
- **Allocated Resources**

- The **key program component(s)** should identify the major efforts included in the curriculum, research protocol or activities to be conducted.

- The **internal and external linkages** might include identification of research/extension joint efforts, multi-disciplinary, multi-institutional, and/or multi-state activities in the program.

- The **target audiences** identifies the set of stakeholders, customers, and/or consumers for which the program is intended to influence.

- The **evaluation framework** should identify the context in which the program will be evaluated when completed.

- The **output indicators** should reflect the tabulation, calculation, or recording of activity or effort expressed in quantitative or qualitative manner which measures the products or services produced by the program planned.

- The **outcome indicators** should assess the results of a program activity compared to its intended goal.

- **The program duration** should be expressed as short term, intermediate term or long term.

- The **allocated resources**, including fiscal, human, and information, must be described for each planned program.

Multi-Institutional, Multi-disciplinary, and Multi-State Programs

Descriptions of programs included in each cell of the matrix should reflect appropriate multistate, multi-institutional, multi-disciplinary or multi-functional activities, if appropriate.

Beginning October 1, 1999, Cooperative Extension programs at 1862 institutions have a new requirement that up to 25% of their program supported by Federal funds include activities in which two or more states cooperate to solve problems that concern more than one state. As required by the law, CSREES will work with each 1862 institution's business officer to establish the institution's baseline for multi-state extension activities for fiscal year 1997. For fiscal year 2000, cooperative extension programs for 1862 institutions must commit two times their 1997 baseline or 25% (whichever is less) for multi-state activities. Institutions will be asked to describe the contributions of Extension staff and programs toward impacts rather than to describe the programs.

Beginning October 1, 1998, the Hatch regional research program will become the Hatch multi-state, multi-disciplinary research program. Amendments to the Hatch Act require that not less than 25% of the funds be used for multi-disciplinary approaches to solve research problems that concern more than one state. State agricultural experiment stations may partner with another experiment station, ARS, or another college or university. This multi-state, multi-disciplinary work will be reported in the plan of work.

Beginning October 1, 1999, up to 25% of Smith-Lever and Hatch Rinds must be used by the institution for integrated/multi-functional activities. As required by the law, CSREES will work with each 1862 institution's business officer to establish the institution's baseline for integrated research and extension activities for fiscal year 1997. For fiscal year 2000, 1862 institutions must commit two times their 1997 baseline or 25% (whichever is less) for integrated activities.

Multi-state, multi-disciplinary, and multi-functional programming must be reported in the POW and be consistent across the units of the institutions as well as the POW submitted by the cooperating state(s). Federal formula funds used by a state for integrated activities may also be used to satisfy the multi-state activities requirements.

Projected Resources

The resources that are intended to be made available to the various activities of the POW, in terms of human and fiscal measures, should be projected for the next five years. Anticipated funding sources, especially required matching funding should also be included. The matrix, noted above, might be a useful means of assembling this information.

Civil Rights

As recipients of Federal financial assistance, all land grant institutions (1862, 1890, and 1994) are required to develop a civil rights plans to ensure equal access and nondiscrimination in all terms and conditions of research and extension programs, including employment, work assignments, educational and training opportunities, research opportunities, use of facilities, and opportunities to serve on committees or decision-making bodies.

The plans of work should address the institutions' commitment to creating a nondiscriminatory atmosphere at the institutions and facilitating equality of service and ease of access to all research and extension programs and services. Attention must be given to programs that focus on the needs and interests of diverse audiences as defined from the perspective of those audiences. Hence, program development with diverse audiences must be based on interactive confirmation with the audiences to be served. Plans should also address outreach efforts focused on providing technical assistance to underrepresented communities and underserved customers and the strategy to correct known disparities in research and extension programs, technical services, and employment administration. The plans of work should include background information on past performance/accomplishments, and describe how the institution plans to move into the future, including a delineation of methods for measuring results. The plans should include adequate information to determine that they are in line with the requirements in civil rights/equal employment opportunity regulations. The plans should also include narrative and statistical information addressing goals and procedures to access both diverse and traditional audiences, and efforts to increase and sustain the diversity of the workforce.

CSREES' Review

All POWs will be evaluated by CSREES. The submitting institution(s) will be notified by CSREES of its determination within 120 days (review to be completed in 90 with a 30 day negotiation period) of receipt of the document. POWs will be either:

1. Accepted by the agency without change, or
2. Returned to the institution, with clear and detailed recommendations for its modification.

Agency accepted POWs will remain in force for 5 years, and will be publicly available in an agency maintained data base. The Agency will notify all institutions of the pending need for a revision at least 8 months prior to a POW's expiration.

CSREES Review Guidelines

When the plan and related GPRA matters are addressed as described in the document, it should result in a response to the following points and, as such, shall serve as guidance to CSREES for evaluation.

1. Address issues of strategic importance to the state.
2. Identify the realignment of programs to address priority issues.
3. Identify the involvement of stakeholders in the planning process.
4. Give appropriate attention to civil rights.
5. Indicate the level of Federal formula funds to all other funds at the state director level.
6. Provide evidence of multi-state, multi-institutional and multi-functional collaborations.
7. State the expected outcomes and impacts from the proposed POW.

Planning Period Covered

The 5-year Plan of Work should reflect programs planned for each of the fiscal years (October 1 through September 30) included in the 5-years of the plan. The optional annual updates can amend the 5-year plan when program direction changes. The annual modifications in the 5-year POW must be approved by the Agency.

The annual update would be submitted to CSREES, along with the annual report of accomplishments, for the preceding annual cycle. The updated POW would be a refinement of the 5-year plan based on accomplishments during the preceding cycle and current stakeholder input. It is anticipated that the institution would use this opportunity to report back to its stakeholders on progress made and goals met on the 5-year plan to, date.

Certification

An institutions POW, as submitted and signed by USDA authorized signatures certifies the following:

- Stakeholder input
- Multi-institutional and Multi-state requirements
- Civil Rights Plans
- and GPRA requirements,

Due Date

All 5-year plans of work and/or the annual update will be due submitted no later than June 1 (Due June 1, 1998 in order to receive FY2000 funding on October 1, 1999). This allows the CSREES four months to complete the review of the POW and advise each component included in the POW the status of plan prior to the beginning of the fiscal year, October 1. Failure on the part of the institution reporting unit to submit by June 1 may prevent completion of the review by the beginning of the fiscal year. Formula funds cannot be released without an approved POW.

Reporting Accomplishments and Results

The POW for a reporting unit (i.e. 1862 research), an institution, or a state should form the basis for annually reporting its accomplishments. Accomplishments reporting should two approaches. The first approach for reporting should be annual results statements, based on the indicators of the outputs and outcomes for the activities undertaken during the preceding year. These should be identified as short, intermediate and long term critical issues in the POW. Attention

should be given to highlighting multi-state, multi-institutional, and multi-functional activities, as appropriate to the POW.

The second approach for reporting should be an annual set of impact statements. **Strict attention to just the preceding year is not necessary.** Some impact statements may need to cover ten or more years of activity. A focus should be given to the benefits received by the targeted end-users.

Submission of the report of accomplishments and results will be due on January 1 of each year (Due January 1, 2001 for reporting on FY2000).

Glossary of Terms

A complete glossary of terms will be developed as an appendix to these POW guidelines. The following is a beginning attempt at developing this glossary.

Multi-institutional refers to two or more institutions that have a different CEO who can make decisions for his/her institution. This would also link public or private organizations with the expertise or capability to collaborate in a research, extension, or education program to bring the best knowledge and technology to bear on a need or problem.

Multi-state refers to collaborative efforts that reflect the programs of institutions located in at least two or more states or territories. Such programs must solve problems that concern more than one state or territory; and demonstrate that each participating state or territory will be a collaborator towards objectives and is involved in setting outcomes. Evidence of the proposed collaboration must be provided in the plan of work submitted by each state or territory of the effect of the work. This planning can be documented through formal agreements, letters or memorandums of understanding, contacts or other instruments that provide primary evidence that a multi-state relationship exists.

Multi-disciplinary refers to efforts that represent research, education and/or extension programs in which principal investigators or other collaborators from two or more disciplines or fields of specialization work together to accomplish specified objectives.

Integration refers to jointly planned, funded and interwoven activities between research and extension to solve problems. This includes the generation of knowledge and the transfer of information and technology. It represents more than co-funding of a program.

Long Term

Intermediate Term

Short Term

Underserved Populations

Outcome indicator

Output indicator