

Minutes of the Meeting of The Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors



**Sheraton Society Hill Hotel
Philadelphia, PA
September 17, 2007**

Summary of Actions/Assignments

1. Approved the agenda for the September 17, 2007 Fall WAAESD Meeting and the minutes of the July 15-18, 2007 Summer WAAESD Meeting 1
2. Jacobsen, Sommers, and Dutson are to work with Harrington in developing a new regional survey 16
3. Unanimously approved one resolution 69
4. Kaltenbach and Daugherty to serve on One Solution Study Group 71

Table of Contents

- Agenda 1
- 1.0 Introductions and Announcements 3
- 2.0 Adoption of Agenda, Approval of Minutes July 2007 Meeting (see -
<http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/WAAESD/WAAESD/S07Min.pdf>) 4
- 3.0 Interim Actions of Chair 5
- 4.0 Treasurer’s Report 6
- 5.0 NRSP Balloting 9
- 6.0 REE Energy Science Workshop 10
- 7.0 USDA Laboratory Security Briefing 11
- 8.0 ED Report 15
- 9.0 Regional Survey Results Discussion 16
- 10.0 Resolutions 69
- 11.0 Other Business 70
 - 11.1 ESCOP Communications & Marketing Subcommittee 70
 - 11.2 One Solution 71
- 12.0 Future Meetings: 72
 - 12.1 Spring Meeting 2008 72
 - 12.2 Joint Summer Meeting 2008 73
- 13.0 Changing of the Guard 74
- Adjourn 74

WAAESD Meeting

Participants:

Alaska	Carol Lewis	Nevada	Ron Pardini
Arizona	C. Colin Kaltenbach		David Thawley
Colorado	Lee Sommers	New Mexico	LeRoy Daugherty
Guam	Greg Wiecko	Oregon	Thayne Dutson
Hawaii	C. Y. Hu	Washington	Ralph Cavalieri
	Doug Vincent	Wyoming	Steven Miller
Idaho	Greg Bohach	OTHERS:	
Montana	Jeff Jacobsen	W. Exec. Dir.	H. Michael Harrington
		OWDA	Harriet Sykes

AGENDA Fall WAAESD Meeting 8:00 am. -10:00 am September 17, 2007 Sheraton Society Hill Room TBA

8:00	1.0	Introductions and Announcements	CY Hu
8:05	2.0	Adoption of Agenda, Approval of Minutes July 2007 Meeting (see - http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/WAAESD/WAAESD/S07Min.pdf)	CY Hu
8:10	3.0	Interim Actions of Chair	CY Hu
8:15	4.0	Treasurer's Report	J. Jacobsen
8:20	5.0	NRSP Balloting	L. Sommers
8:30	6.0	REE Energy Science Workshop	R. Cavalieri/M. Harrington
8:40	7.0	USDA Laboratory Security Briefing	L. Daugherty/M Harrington
8:50	8.0	ED Report	M. Harrington
9:00	9.0	Regional Survey Results Discussion	D. Snyder/M. Harrington
9:40	10.0	Resolutions	J. Auyong/G. Bohach

9:50	11.0	Other Business	CY Hu
9:55	12.0	Future Meetings:	
	12.1	Spring Meeting 2008	C. Kaltenbach
	12.2	Joint Summer Meeting 2008	C. Lewis
10:00	13.0	Changing of the Guard	CY Hu/G. Bohach
10:00		Adjourn	G. Bohach

Agenda Item 1.0: Introductions and Announcements

Presenter: CY Hu

Background:

Hu called the meeting to order and welcomed the attendees to the meeting. The attendees introduced themselves.

Harrington announced that the WRDC was searching for a new director.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 2.0: Adoption of Agenda, Approval of Minutes July 2007 Meeting

Presenter: C. Y. Hu

Background:

The motion was made and seconded to approve the agenda as circulated.

The motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes (see - <http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/WAAESD/WAAESD/S07Min.pdf>) of the July 2007 Meeting as posted on the WAAESD web page.

Action Requested: Approval of agenda and minutes

Action Taken: Approved agenda as circulated; Approved minutes of the July 2007 Meeting as posted on the WAAESD web page.

Agenda Item 3.0: Interim Actions of Chair

Presenter: CY Hu

Background:

Hu noted that he had not taken any interim actions.

Action Requested: For information

**WESTERN DIRECTOR EXPERIMENT STATION
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2008**

07-Sep-07

ASSESSMENTS	FY08 Assessments	Outstanding FY06/FY07	Payment Received	Balance Due
Am Samoa	600.00	1,200.00		1,800.00
Micronesia	600.00			600.00
Northern Marianas	600.00			600.00
Alaska	9,664.65			9,664.65
Arizona	16,802.54			16,802.54
California	25,771.68			25,771.68
Colorado	19,990.87			19,990.87
CSU Rent	(7,800.00)			-7,800.00
Guam	9,425.32			9,425.32
Hawaii	12,463.61			12,463.61
Idaho	14,940.04			14,940.04
Montana	15,772.43			15,772.43
Nevada	12,255.53			12,255.53
New Mexico	12,682.13			12,682.13
Oregon	19,008.43			19,008.43
Utah	16,567.25			16,567.25
Washington	24,449.25			24,449.25
Wyoming	14,201.27			14,201.27
Assessment Total	\$217,995.00	\$1,200.00		219,195.00

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/07	Balance forward			\$7,518.21
	YTD Assessments Receive			7,518.21
	July Interest	57.89		7,576.10
	August Interest	58.05		7,634.15
	September Interest			7,634.15
	October Interest			7,634.15
	November Interest			7,634.15
	December Interest			7,634.15
	January Interest			7,634.15
	February Interest			7,634.15
	March Interest			7,634.15
	April Interest			7,634.15
	May Interest			7,634.15
	June Interest			7,634.15
	MT Accounting Fee		3,500.00	4,134.15
	CSU First Qtr			4,134.15
	CSU Second Qtr			4,134.15
	CSU Third Qtr			4,134.15
	CSU Fourth Qtr			4,134.15
	TOTAL	115.94	3,500.00	4,134.15

**WESTERN DIRECTOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2008**

7-Sep-07

ASSESSMENTS	FY08 Assessments	Outstanding FY06/FY07	Payment Received	Balance Due
Alaska	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
American Samoa	200.00	\$400.00		\$600.00
Arizona	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
California	1,181.93	1,120.21		\$2,302.14
Colorado	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
Guam	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
Hawaii	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
Idaho	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
Micronesia	200.00			\$200.00
Montana	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
Northern Marianas	200.00			\$200.00
Nevada	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
New Mexico	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
Oregon	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
Utah	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
Washington	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
Wyoming	1,181.93			\$1,181.93
Assessment Total	\$17,147.00	\$1,520.21	\$0.00	\$18,667.21

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/07	Balance forward			\$1,029.07
	YTD Assessments Received	0.00		1,029.07
	July Interest			1,029.07
	August Interest			1,029.07
	September Interest			1,029.07
	October Interest			1,029.07
	November Interest			1,029.07
	December Interest			1,029.07
	January Interest			1,029.07
	February Interest			1,029.07
	March Interest			1,029.07
	April Interest			1,029.07
	May Interest			1,029.07
	June Interest			1,029.07
	CSU First Qtr			1,029.07
	CSU Second Qtr			1,029.07
	CSU Third Qtr			1,029.07
	CSU Fourth Qtr			1,029.07
TOTAL		\$0.00	\$0.00	1,029.07

Agenda Item 5.0: NRSP Balloting

Presenter: L. Sommers

Background:

Sommers commented that the NRSP Review Committee was recommending changes to the NRSP Guidelines to be voted on at the ESS Meeting.

After the amended guidelines are approved or disapproved, a ballot with the NRSP Review Committee recommendations for 2008 Off-the-Top funding would be taken.

It is anticipated that there will be questions and discussion on NRSP6 and NRSP7. Harrington commented that having Cornerstone support a budget line for funding for NRSP7 is not within their process.

Thawley, as Western AA for NRSP7, indicated that the funding request is for approximately \$100,000 for each participating state. NRSP7 is made up of faculty who don't have lobbying contacts. Research that is done on many campuses for NRSP7 will come to an end if funding is ended.

Thawley suggested that the NRSP Review Committee recommendation for funding for NRSP7 be rejected and that a replacement recommendation for \$360,000 for FY2008 be approved.

Hu reported that NRSP6 had made an error in their budget request. It should have been \$150,000, not \$110,000. He is going to request an increase to \$150,000 for FY2008 at the ESS Meeting.

Sommers indicated that the NRSP Review Committee is going to recommend that a task force be appointed to look at funding for NRSP1.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 6.0: REE Energy Science Workshop
Presenters: Ralph Cavalieri and Mike Harrington
Background:

USDA hosted a strategic planning workshop for REE on September 5-6 in Washington DC. The workshop was attended by approximately 80 people; participants were from ARS, ERS, CSREES, as well as both LGU and other universities.

The workshop was facilitated with combined sessions and breakout groups to discuss the following topics:

- Set the Vision, Goals
- Identify program areas of focus
- Identify critical cross cutting issues
- Establish agencies' responsibilities
- Suggest the process to achieve goals

Expected outcomes of the workshop are:

- Vision and Goals established.
- Program areas of focus established
- REE responsibilities and comparative advantages identified
- Agencies responsibilities accepted
- Cross cutting issues integrated into program areas
- Initial program priorities identified
- Process for moving forward presented

The workshop summary report should be available to the participants for additional input by this meeting.

Action requested: For information

Agenda Item 7.0: USDA Laboratory Security Workshop
Presenters: LeRoy Daugherty and Mike Harrington
Background:

USDA hosted workshop in laboratory security on September 7 in Washington DC.

Several interesting presentations were made including one from USDA/APHIS on select agent registration associated issues and another from DHS on the TOPS screen processes. The former presentation discussed the Select Agent requirements and some of the problems that have been found in recent security audits, most notably recent problems at Texas A&M.

The latter presentation covered the TOPS program that will eventually regulate facilities that have over a certain amount of selected chemicals. This was the first time that any of the university workshop participants had heard of the TOPS program. However, during the comment period there was a rather unfortunate letter from a university association that suggested that universities didn't know the status of chemicals on their campuses. I am trying to determine where the letter came from so that any misunderstandings can be clarified. The agenda is attached.

Topic: LABORATORY SECURITY WORKSHOP
Date: September 7, 2007
Time: 8:30 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Location: USDA Economic Research Service, Waugh Auditorium, 1800 M St., NW,
Washington, DC
Emcee: Ralph Otto, CSREES Associate Administrator

Purpose - To increase awareness of potential security threats and to encourage the implementation of protective measures at laboratories engaged in agricultural and food-related programs in partnership with USDA.

Audience – USDA Research and Diagnostic Laboratory Security Points of Contact; USDA Leaders and Laboratory Directors; Integrated Consortium of Laboratory Network NCG Members; Steering Committee Representatives from NAHLN, NPDN, and FERN; University Research Leaders (including the Executive Directors of the Regional Associations of State Agricultural Experiment Stations) and Laboratory Security Points of Contact.

Draft Agenda -

Registration and Light Fare	8:30
Welcome from the USDA REE Under-Secretary’s Office – Merle Pierson	9:00
Opening Remarks – USDA Secretary (scheduled)	9:15
Threat Briefing – DHS	9:30
Break w/ Light Fare	10:15
Select Agent Registration and Associated Issues – Lee Ann Thomas	10:30
Current State of the Select Agent Security at Land Grant Universities – Mike Harrington (Colorado State)	11:15
Lunch (on your own)	12:00
Recommendations for Non-select Agents – Terry Nipp, National Institute for Agricultural Security	1:00
DHS Chemical Facility Security: TOP Screen Process for Laboratories – Dennis Deziel, DHS (invited)	1:30
Break w/Light Fare	2:00

Moderated Panel Discussion with Q & A	2:10
Adjourn	3:00

Annotated Draft Agenda

Welcome and Opening Remarks 9:00 – 9:30

The USDA is concerned about the prospect of our laboratory technology being used against America’s agricultural infrastructure. The Secretary’s office suggested this workshop as both a security refresher and a security update for USDA laboratories as well as laboratories that receive USDA extramural funding. This event is currently on Secretary Johanns’ calendar.

Threat Briefing 9:30 – 10:30

Department of Homeland Security officials will provide a 45 minute unclassified briefing on potential threats to laboratory security and take questions for approximately 15 minutes.

Select Agent Registration and Associated Issues 10:30 – 11:15

The APHIS/CDC registration process for laboratory possession, use, or transfer of select agents and toxins will be described by APHIS officials. These officials will go on to: 1) Describe recently posted guidance to assist laboratories in complying with the security requirements as well as 2) Provide insight on additional laboratory precautions.

Current State of the Select Agent Security at Land Grant Universities 11:15 – 12:00

One of the four regional directors of the state agricultural experiment stations will give a presentation on the institutional and organizational bio-security infrastructure at land grant universities. This infrastructure ensures that university research and diagnostic laboratories not only comply with federal regulations but also adopt best practices regarding bio-security.

Recommendations for Non-select Agents 1:00 – 1:30

Dr. Terry Nipp with the National Institute for Agricultural Security has worked cooperatively with Oklahoma State University to draft guidelines for non-select agent bio-security precautions. He will present these guidelines and recommendations for their use at land grant university laboratories.

DHS Chemical Facility Security: TOP Screen Process for Laboratories 1:30 – 2:00

The Department of Homeland Security has recently published regulatory language in the federal register that will eventually regulate facilities that have over a certain amount of selected chemicals. A DHS official will outline how this could affect research and diagnostic laboratories as well as their parent organizations.

Moderated Panel Discussion with Q & A 2:10 – 3:00

Representatives from the NAHLN (Barbara Martin), NPDN (Kitty Cardwell and Phil Berger), and FSIS (Pat McCaskey) will each present a short summary relating the day’s

program to their individual networks. They will be joined by other presenters to answer questions from the workshop participants.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 8.0: Executive Director Report, July-September, 2007

Presenter: H. Michael Harrington

Background:

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

WAAESD

Summer Meeting: Worked with CY Hu to develop the WAAESD meeting agenda and with Charley Kinoshita, Linda Fox and Lyla Houglum, on the joint WAAESD-WED-WAPD agenda.

Fall Meeting: Worked with CY Hu to develop the WAAESD meeting agenda. Sent survey to Directors and synthesized responses.

Spring Meeting 2008: Participated in the initial planning session for the Spring 2008 meeting covering hotel and meeting needs.

Western SunGrant Feedstock Workshop: Served on the steering committee for this workshop and as a moderator for the opening session.

REE Energy Science Program Survey: Developed and deployed an online survey to obtain regional input on the proposed energy science program as presented by Jim Fischer at the spring meeting in Hawaii. Encouraged additional participation to obtain robust a response. Finalized survey responses and provided results to WAAESD, WAPD, WEDA and W-AHS.

CSREES Grantsmanship Workshop, October 2-3, 2007: The western grants workshop will be held in Denver in partnership with the University of Wyoming, Colorado State, WAAESD and CSREES. Serve as the event coordinator and work closely with Lee Sommers, Steve Miller, Glen Whipple, the CSREES team and Chris Harndin (conference coordinator) at UWY. Worked with hotel staff to finalize catering and AV needs, facilities including rooms for the various sessions. Facilitated changes to the registration and meeting websites. Reviewed travel grant applications and made awards.

Committee Activities

- **Western SARE Administrative Council:** I serve as the Western Directors' representative on this activity. Provided lead or secondary review comments for some 20 pre proposals for Chapter 1 Research and Education grant proposals and read all pre-proposals submitted. Reviewed applications and made recommendations for graduate student fellowship awards. Attended Council meeting in Bozeman MT

NRSP-7 Assessment: Other efforts included working with Jeff Jacobsen to assure that all stations received the NRSP-7 assessments notices

WESTERN ACADEMIC PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Agenda Item 9.0: Regional Survey Results Discussion

Presenter: M. Harrington

Background:

Harrington distributed a questionnaire regarding Hatch/State Fund Allocations prior to the meeting. Those submitted follow. The questionnaires will be summarized and sent to the AES Directors. In addition, an additional query regarding how each AES handles appointments will be circulated, and the impact of bringing department chairs back into the AES and closing branch stations should be included.

Action Requested: For information

Action Taken: Jacobsen, Sommers and Dutson are to work with Harrington in developing a new survey.

Western Region Questionnaire Regarding Hatch/State Fund Allocations

AMERICAN SAMOA

This questionnaire deals primarily with Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis (where applicable) funds, but some questions also are directed at state matching funds as required by law. Also, we are primarily interested in *faculty* salary and operating funds.

I. Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis

1. Faculty receiving Experiment Station funding are on

11 or 12-month (fiscal or calendar year) contracts

9-month (academic year) contracts

Combination of 9- and 12-month

If a combination, what determines what types of contracts incoming faculty receive?

2. Are Hatch/McIntire-Stennis (as applicable) used as part of the 9-month/12-month salaries?

Yes

No

If *No*, are these funds used to augment 9-month salaries?

Yes

No

3. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause faculty to be released?

Yes

No

Explain Faculty 100% funded by Hatch.

4. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause staff to be released?

- Yes
- No

Explain Staff 100% funded by Hatch. _____

5. If Hatch funds were lost, would your state funding be affected?

- Yes
- No

Explain Can't say. _____

6. With respect to Hatch (formula) funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through

- A strictly historical basis
- Based on FTE
- An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
- All on a competitive basis

How long are the competitive allocations based?

- 1-2 year
 - 3 years
 - 3 years
 - 4-5 years
 - Other (explain) _____
- Part historical, part competitive

7. Are the Hatch (and McIntire-Stennis where applicable) funds held

- Centrally by the station
- Allocated to departments
- Part centrally and part allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

8. When open positions occur, funds are

- Pulled back and held by the central administration
- Pulled back and held by the Experiment Station
- Pulled back but available to departments on request
- Left within department
- Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

9. If made available to departments or left within departments, the funds are allowed to remain within the department

- For 1 year
- 2 or more years
- Indefinitely
- Other (please explain) Not applicable. _____

10. When funds pulled back by the station,
- Funds are used to meet one-time operating/equipment needs
 - Funds are made available for a 1-year competitive award
 - Other (please explain) _____
10. Individual faculty evaluations conducted between dean and/or director and
- Individual faculty members
 - Department head
 - Both individual faculty members and department head
 - Other (please explain) _____
11. Are state matching funds?
- Larger than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
 - Equal to Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
 - Less than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
12. For state matching funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through
- A strictly historical basis
 - An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
 - All on a competitive basis
- How long are the competitive allocations based?
- 1 year
 - 2 years
 - 5 years
 - Other (please explain) _____
- Part historical, part competitive
13. Are state matching funds held?
- Centrally by the station
 - Allocated to departments
 - Part centrally and part allocated to departments
 - Other (please explain) _____

II. MULTISTATE RESEARCH FUNDS

How are MRF used to support personnel and/or operations?

- Yes
- No
- If yes, explain how this is determined _____

If yes, please indicate the approximate % funding for each

- Faculty Small %
- Technicians _____
- Post Docs _____

- Students (graduate, undergraduate) _____
- Operations _____ (Dollar amount or %)
- Travel to committee meetings _____ (Dollar amount or %)

III. INTEGRATED PROJECTS

Do you currently conduct integrated projects with Extension?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please explain how these projects are implemented?

When approving projects, how do you determine which ones are integrated and how do you assure that you will meet the 25% requirement?

IV. LAND USE

Who holds the deeds or titles to AES properties?

- University
 College/Station
 Other (please explain) _____

Who has ultimate authority over AES lands?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
 University President
 Other (please explain) _____

How are station farms/facilities operations funded?

- Centrally from experiment station funds
 Through departments from experiment station allocated funds
 Combination of centrally-held funds and funds allocated to departments
 Other (please explain) _____

How are plot allocations on AES properties determined?

- Centrally in the Directors office
 By the respective station managers
 A combination of the above
 Other (please explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are such decisions made?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
- Central Administration
- In collaboration with the appropriate University officials
- This is a station decision
- Other (explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are funds distributed?

- Central Administration retains funds
- Split between Administration and College/AES
- Other (explain) _____

V. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

What is your university policy on intellectual property, i.e. who owns the IP?

- University
- Faculty
- Other (explain) No patents._____

Does your unit have existing agreements (e.g.CRDA) with private companies?

- Yes
- No

How is the decision to seek a patent made? Please explain.

- Technology Transfer Office make decision after due diligence
- University Committee makes recommendation
- Other (explain) No patents._____

Who negotiates licensing agreements?

- Technology Transfer Office
- Other (explain) Non-applicable_____

If an invention is licensed, how are royalties shared?

- University only
- Faculty only
- Split between University and Faculty

What is a typical royalty share that is received by your university?

- <5%
- 5-10%
- Other (explain) Non-applicable_____

Western Region Teaching Symposium: Assisted with distribution of registration information

NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

ESCOP

Support to the Chair and Organization: With Ron Pardini serving as Chair, our office assumes responsibility for facilitating ESCOP activities. Ron, Harriet and I continue to assure that all matters are attended to in a timely manner. These responsibilities include drafting correspondence, developing agendas, collecting agenda briefs, drafting minutes, facilitating regular conference calls, and maintaining communications with the ESCOP membership. Particular emphasis has been placed the communication and marketing committee activities including developing communications to the section on the marketing plan and the notice of a referendum on an assessment to fund a national marketing effort.

Meeting Support and Logistics: ESS Annual Meeting September 16-19, worked with Ron Pardini, the Chair's Advisory Committee to develop agenda for the annual meeting. Worked with the other EDs to develop the workshop agendas. Coordinated presentations of invited guests.

Science on the Hill: Worked with Alton Thompson to create an electronic survey to assess the impact of the Science on the Hill exhibit.

Committee Activities

- **ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee:** Support Chairman LeRoy Daugherty as the Executive vice Chair on this important committee. Participated in on latest developments with the Farm Bill. Attended BAC meeting in Philadelphia in July. Developed the agenda brief and the plan for the budget priority setting workshop at the section meeting.
- **NRSP Review Committee:** Worked with Lee Sommers to prepare proposed modifications to the committee's rules of operation, agenda brief, committee recommendations and other materials for the section meeting.
- **CREATE-21/Farm Bill Committee:** I serve on the Executive Committee for this activity representing AES directors and the Western Region. Participated in both EC and regular conference calls. Serve as Executive vice Chair of the Farm Bill Committee and as a staff support for the energy title.
- **LEAD²¹:** Represent ESCOP on the Board for this program and serve as the Secretary.
- **Steering Committee - USDA REE Energy Science Strategic Planning Workshop:** At the request of Under Secretary Buchanan, I represent the research interests of the LGU on the steering committee for this workshop that was held

September 5-6 in Washington DC. Participated in a number of conference calls with the committee and facilitators. Assisted with writing the workshop report which was provided to Under Secretary Gale Buchanan in less than a week after the workshop.

NASULGC-DOE/EERE PARTNERSHIP

The BAA-Policy Board of Directors was charged with implementing the activities for this partnership effort. I represent the executive directors (both AES and CE) on the Steering Committee which provides guidance and oversight for the project. I serve as a co-chair on project 1. Specific details:

Project 1: Developing Collaborations between Regional Associations and DOE Regional Offices and EERE Program Managers. The project, Pacific Northwest Extension Energy Initiative, is aimed at informing local government agencies and officials about energy efficiency and renewable energy information. Worked with Lyla Houghlum and extension staff in each state to develop and deploy an on line survey relating renewable energy in each state. Developed the final report for FY 2007 and the plan for FY 2008.

Agrosecurity Survey: Developed survey of current understanding of directors of security issues and practices at respective stations/units.

Presentation:

- **“Agricultural Security Efforts of the State Agricultural Experiments Stations”** September 10, USDA Laboratory Security Workshop Washington DC.

Summary of Travel, July-September, 2006

July 10-13: Western Region Joint Summer Meeting, Jackson Hole, WY

July 24 – 27 Joint COPS, Philadelphia, PA

Policy Board of Directors meeting

Budget and Advocacy Committee meeting

ESCOP meeting

Aug 6-9: W-SARE Administrative Council Meeting, Bozeman MT

Aug 27-30, Western SunGrant Biomass Workshop, Portland, OR

Sept 4-7: Washington DC

REE Biomass Program Planning Workshop

USDA Laboratory Security Workshop

Sept 16-19: Philadelphia, PA

WAAESD fall meeting

ESS Annual Meeting and Workshop

Sept 24-26: NMCC Meeting, Memphis, TN

Action requested: For information

**Western Region
Questionnaire Regarding Hatch/State Fund Allocations**

ARIZONA

This questionnaire deals primarily with Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis (where applicable) funds, but some questions also are directed at state matching funds as required by law. Also, we are primarily interested in *faculty* salary and operating funds.

I. Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis

1. Faculty receiving Experiment Station funding are on

11 or 12-month (fiscal or calendar year) contracts

9-month (academic year) contracts

X Combination of 9- and 12-month

If a combination, what determines what types of contracts incoming faculty receive?

Mostly 9 month but some 12 month particularly if the faculty are located off-campus.

2. Are Hatch/McIntire-Stennis (as applicable) used as part of the 9-month/12-month salaries?

X Yes

No

If *No*, are these funds used to augment 9-month salaries?

Yes

No

3. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause faculty to be released?

Yes

No

Explain Probably but not necessarily—Hatch makes up less than 5% of our budget so we would probably be able to salvage most of our faculty.

4. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause staff to be released?

X Yes

No

Explain Again, this is a maybe.

5. If Hatch funds were lost, would your state funding be affected?

X Yes

No

Explain__ *Our legislature re-appropriates our federal dollars so the total appropriation would probably be reduced by the amount of Hatch dollars—doubt that we would lose the match.* _____

6. With respect to Hatch (formula) funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through

A strictly historical basis

Based on FTE

X An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity

All on a competitive basis

How long are the competitive allocations based?

1-2 year

3 years

3 years

4-5 years

Other (explain) _____

Part historical, part competitive

7. Are the Hatch (and McIntire-Stennis where applicable) funds held

Centrally by the station

X Allocated to departments

Part centrally and part allocated to departments

Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

8. When open positions occur, funds are

X Pulled back and held by the central (**COLLEGE**) administration

Pulled back and held by the Experiment Station

Pulled back but available to departments on request

Left within department

Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

9. If made available to departments or left within departments, the funds are allowed to remain within the department

For 1 year

2 or more years

Indefinitely

Other (please explain) _____

10. When funds pulled back by the station,

Funds are used to meet one-time operating/equipment needs

Funds are made available for a 1-year competitive award

Other (please explain) _____

10. Individual faculty evaluations conducted between dean and/or director and

Individual faculty members

X Department head

Both individual faculty members and department head

Other (please explain) _____

11. Are state matching funds?

X Larger than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations

Equal to Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations

Less than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations

12. For state matching funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through

A strictly historical basis

X An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity

All on a competitive basis

How long are the competitive allocations based?

1 year

2 years

5 years

Other (please explain) _____

Part historical, part competitive

13. Are state matching funds held?

Centrally by the station

X Allocated to departments

Part centrally and part allocated to departments

Other (please explain) _____

II. MULTISTATE RESEARCH FUNDS

How are MRF used to support personnel and/or operations?

X Yes

No

If yes, explain how this is determined _____

If yes, please indicate the approximate % funding for each

• Faculty _____

• Technicians _____

• Post Docs _____

• Students (graduate, undergraduate) _____

• Operations _____ (Dollar amount or %)

• Travel to committee meetings _____ (Dollar amount or %)

III. INTEGRATED PROJECTS

Do you currently conduct integrated projects with Extension?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please explain how these projects are implemented? *_We are fully integrated with Extension so much of what we do is integrated—all of our off-campus and and all Extension Specialists have split appointments.*_____

When approving projects, how do you determine which ones are integrated and how do you assure that you will meet the 25% requirement? _____ *Mostly through the split appointments.*_____

IV. LAND USE

Who holds the deeds or titles to AES properties?

- University
 College/Station
 Other (please explain) _____

Who has ultimate authority over AES lands?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
 University President
 Other (please explain) _____

How are station farms/facilities operations funded?

- Centrally from experiment station funds
 Through departments from experiment station allocated funds
 Combination of centrally-held funds and funds allocated to departments
 Other (please explain) _____

How are plot allocations on AES properties determined?

- Centrally in the Directors office
 By the respective station managers
 A combination of the above
 Other (please explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are such decisions made?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
- Central Administration
- X In collaboration with the appropriate University officials
- This is a station decision
- Other (explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are funds distributed?

- Central Administration retains funds
- Split between Administration and College/AES
- X Other (explain) *_Revert to Ag Endowment Account which is controlled by the College_* _____

V. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

What is your university policy on intellectual property, i.e. who owns the IP?

- X University
- Faculty
- Other (explain) _____

Does your unit have existing agreements (e.g. CRDA) with private companies?

- X Yes
- No

How is the decision to seek a patent made? Please explain.

- X Technology Transfer Office make decision after due diligence
- University Committee makes recommendation
- Other (explain) _____

Who negotiates licensing agreements?

- X Technology Transfer Office
- Other (explain) _____

If an invention is licensed, how are royalties shared?

- University only
- Faculty only
- X Split between University and Faculty

What is a typical royalty share that is received by your university?

- X <5%
- 5-10%
- Other (explain) _____

**Western Region
Questionnaire Regarding Hatch/State Fund Allocations**

CALIFORNIA-RIVERSIDE

This questionnaire deals primarily with Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis (where applicable) funds, but some questions also are directed at state matching funds as required by law. Also, we are primarily interested in *faculty* salary and operating funds.

I. Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis

1. Faculty receiving Experiment Station funding are on

11 or 12-month (fiscal or calendar year) contracts

9-month (academic year) contracts

Combination of 9- and 12-month

If a combination, what determines what types of contracts incoming faculty receive?

All new appointments are 9-month. About 55% of existing faculty are still on 11-month appointments, but we have a proposal in to the campus to offer all AES faculty to convert to 9-month at their same pay level.

2. Are Hatch/McIntire-Stennis (as applicable) used as part of the 9-month/12-month salaries?

Yes

No

If *No*, are these funds used to augment 9-month salaries?

Yes

No

3. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause faculty to be released?

Yes

No

Explain _____

4. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause staff to be released?

Yes

No

Explain__ Temporary staff could be affected, but not permanent staff. _____

5. If Hatch funds were lost, would your state funding be affected?

Yes

No

Explain_ Hopefully not, but I don't want to ask.

6. With respect to Hatch (formula) funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through
- A strictly historical basis
 - Based on FTE
 - An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
 - All on a competitive basis
- How long are the competitive allocations based?
- 1-2 year
 - 3 years
 - 3 years
 - 4-5 years
 - Other (explain) _A funding level for 5 years is determined at the time of renewal of the Hatch project, which is competitively reviewed. All Hatch funds are now allocated directly to faculty in this way (excluding Multistate).

Part historical, part competitive

7. Are the Hatch (and McIntire-Stennis where applicable) funds held
- Centrally by the station
 - Allocated to departments
 - Part centrally and part allocated to departments
 - Other (please explain) _Allocated directly to faculty as explained in #6 above.

Please comment as needed: _____

8. When open positions occur, funds are
- Pulled back and held by the central administration
 - Pulled back and held by the Experiment Station
 - Pulled back but available to departments on request
 - Left within department
 - Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

9. If made available to departments or left within departments, the funds are allowed to remain within the department
- For 1 year
 - 2 or more years
 - Indefinitely
 - Other (please explain) _____

10. When funds pulled back by the station,
- Funds are used to meet one-time operating/equipment needs
 - Funds are made available for a 1-year competitive award
 - Other (please explain) Hatch funds pulled back are made available to the other faculty in

the college through the competitive allocation process explained in #6 above.

10. Individual faculty evaluations conducted between dean and/or director and

- Individual faculty members
- Department head
- Both individual faculty members and department head

Other (please explain) Faculty are evaluated every 2-3 years by all of the faculty of their department, including the chair (who has one vote as a faculty member), and then the Dean evaluates the case but does not interact directly with the individual faculty.

11. Are state matching funds?

- Larger than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Equal to Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Less than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations

12. For state matching funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through

- A strictly historical basis
- An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
- All on a competitive basis

How long are the competitive allocations based?

- 1 year
- 2 years
- 5 years

Other (please explain) State funds make up about 50% of the pool of resources allocated competitively along with Hatch funds. Other state funds are allocated on historic and formula bases.

Part historical, part competitive

13. Are state matching funds held?

- Centrally by the station
- Allocated to departments
- Part centrally and part allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _____

II. MULTISTATE RESEARCH FUNDS

How are MRF used to support personnel and/or operations?

- Yes
- No

If yes, explain how this is determined_ Determined by department. MRF funds are allocated on a formula basis to department chairs based on the number of faculty in their units who are participants in active Multistate Research projects. Faculty can use these funds for temporary personnel, supplies, and travel to Multistate project meetings. Most departments give some of the funds to those faculty with active projects and hold back some to fund departmental

operations (greenhouses, etc.). The Dean holds back a small amount (~ 4%) to fund faculty travel to Multistate Coordinating Committees on an ad hoc basis as requested and to fund the director's travel to Multistate projects for which he serves as AA.

If yes, please indicate the approximate % funding for each

- Faculty _____
- Technicians _20%_
- Post Docs _10%_
- Students (graduate, undergraduate) _5%_
- Operations _50%_ (Dollar amount or %)
- Travel to committee meetings _15%_ (Dollar amount or %)

III. INTEGRATED PROJECTS

Do you currently conduct integrated projects with Extension?

Yes

No

If yes, please explain how these projects are implemented?

Almost all of our CE Specialists have joint appointments with AES research titles, so we consider their Hatch projects to be integrated. Therefore the competitive research funding that we allocate to them is designated as integrated. A number of our AES faculty without CE titles also have Hatch projects that specifically describe their collaborations with CE Specialists on campus or CE Advisors in counties, so we consider those to be integrated as well.

When approving projects, how do you determine which ones are integrated and how do you assure that you will meet the 25% requirement? As stated above, we consider the projects by our CE Specialists with joint AES appointments to be integrated, as well as those AES faculty who have projects that specifically state their collaborations with either CE Specialists on campus or CE Advisors in counties.

IV. LAND USE

Who holds the deeds or titles to AES properties?

University

College/Station

Other (please explain) _____

Who has ultimate authority over AES lands?

Board of Regents or Trustees

University President

Other (please explain) The Governor, as we found after a recent sale of an AES station at Riverside. It was the Governor's call whether or not any funds would return to the campus. Fortunately, it all did, in the form of a lease revenue bond.

How are station farms/facilities operations funded?

- Centrally from experiment station funds
- Through departments from experiment station allocated funds
- Combination of centrally-held funds and funds allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _Mostly from centrally-held funds, but about 20% of the operational costs are recharged to faculty users, who often use the Hatch/state funds that we allocate to them on a competitive basis.

How are plot allocations on AES properties determined?

- Centrally in the Directors office
- By the respective station managers
- A combination of the above
- Other (please explain) by a faculty advisory committee_____

If lands are to be sold, how are such decisions made?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
- Central Administration
- In collaboration with the appropriate University officials
- This is a station decision
- Other (explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are funds distributed?

- Central Administration retains funds
- Split between Administration and College/AES
- Other (explain) _Reverts to the state, which may or may not give it back.

V. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

What is your university policy on intellectual property, i.e. who owns the IP?

- University
- Faculty
- Other (explain) It is a split (30% to faculty) according to a contract we all sign at appointment.

Does your unit have existing agreements (e.g.CRDA) with private companies?

- Yes
- No

How is the decision to seek a patent made? Please explain.

- Technology Transfer Office make decision after due diligence
- University Committee makes recommendation
- Other (explain) _____

Who negotiates licensing agreements?

Technology Transfer Office

Other (explain) _____

If an invention is licensed, how are royalties shared?

University only

Faculty only

Split between University and Faculty

What is a typical royalty share that is received by your university?

<5%

5-10%

Other (explain) __Faculty receive 30%_____

**Western Region
Questionnaire Regarding Hatch/State Fund Allocations**

COLORADO

This questionnaire deals primarily with Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis (where applicable) funds, but some questions also are directed at state matching funds as required by law. Also, we are primarily interested in *faculty* salary and operating funds.

I. Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis

1. Faculty receiving Experiment Station funding are on
 11 or 12-month (fiscal or calendar year) contracts
x 9-month (academic year) contracts
 Combination of 9- and 12-month

If a combination, what determines what types of contracts incoming faculty receive?

All new faculty position in the College of Ag Sci are 9 month appointments. We still have some 12 month appointments. _____

2. Are Hatch/McIntire-Stennis (as applicable) used as part of the 9-month/12-month salaries?
x Yes
 No
If *No*, are these funds used to augment 9-month salaries?
 Yes
 No

3. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause faculty to be released?
 Yes
x No

Explain_No in the short term. As retirements occur then faculty would not be replaced.

4. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause staff to be released?
x Yes
 No

Explain_Hatch funds are about 20% of appropriated budget so staff would be cut.

5. If Hatch funds were lost, would your state funding be affected?
 Yes
x No

Explain_Not immediately but uncertain about long-term. _____

6. With respect to Hatch (formula) funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty

through

A strictly historical basis

Based on FTE

An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity

All on a competitive basis

How long are the competitive allocations based?

1-2 year

3 years

3 years

4-5 years

Other (please explain) _____

Part historical, part competitive

7. Are the Hatch (and McIntire-Stennis where applicable) funds held

Centrally by the station

Allocated to departments

Part centrally and part allocated to departments

Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

8. When open positions occur, funds are

Pulled back and held by the central administration

Pulled back and held by the Experiment Station

Pulled back but available to departments on request

Left within department

Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

9. If made available to departments or left within departments, the funds are allowed to remain within the department

For 1 year

2 or more years

Indefinitely

Other (please explain) _Proposal is requested on reinvestment of funds in source department of another unit.

10. When funds pulled back by the station,

Funds are used to meet one-time operating/equipment needs

Funds are made available for a 1-year competitive award

Other (please explain) _____

10. Individual faculty evaluations conducted between dean and/or director and

Individual faculty members

Department head

- Both individual faculty members and department head
- Other (please explain) _____

11. Are state matching funds?

- Larger than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Equal to Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Less than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations

12. For state matching funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through

- A strictly historical basis
- An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
- All on a competitive basis
 - How long are the competitive allocations based?
 - 1 year
 - 2 years
 - 5 years
 - Other (please explain) _____
- Part historical, part competitive

13. Are state matching funds held?

- Centrally by the station
- Allocated to departments
- Part centrally and part allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _____

II. MULTISTATE RESEARCH FUNDS

How are MRF used to support personnel and/or operations?

- Yes
- No
- If yes, explain how this is determined _____

If yes, please indicate the approximate % funding for each

- Faculty _____
- Technicians _____
- Post Docs _____
- Students (graduate, undergraduate) _____
- Operations _____ (Dollar amount or %)
- Travel to committee meetings _\$35,000 Dollar amount

III. INTEGRATED PROJECTS

Do you currently conduct integrated projects with Extension?

- Yes

No

If yes, please explain how these projects are implemented?

_Primarily through faculty having joint AES and CE funding._____

When approving projects, how do you determine which ones are integrated and how do you assure that you will meet the 25% requirement?

_Joint funding of faculty PIs._____

IV. LAND USE

Who holds the deeds or titles to AES properties?

x University

College/Station

Other (please explain) _____

Who has ultimate authority over AES lands?

x Board of Regents or Trustees

University President

Other (please explain) _____

How are station farms/facilities operations funded?

Centrally from experiment station funds

Through departments from experiment station allocated funds

x Combination of centrally-held funds and funds allocated to departments

Other (please explain) _____

How are plot allocations on AES properties determined?

Centrally in the Directors office

By the respective station managers

x A combination of the above

Other (please explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are such decisions made?

Board of Regents or Trustees

Central Administration

x In collaboration with the appropriate University officials

This is a station decision

Other (explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are funds distributed?

Central Administration retains funds

- Split between Administration and College/AES
x Other (explain) _Proposal is presented to Central Admin and approved by Board of Governors.

V. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

What is your university policy on intellectual property, i.e. who owns the IP?

- x University
 Faculty
 Other (explain) _____

Does your unit have existing agreements (e.g. CRDA) with private companies?

- x Yes
 No

How is the decision to seek a patent made? Please explain.

- x Technology Transfer Office make decision after due diligence
 University Committee makes recommendation
 Other (explain) _____

Who negotiates licensing agreements?

- x Technology Transfer Office
 Other (explain) _____

If an invention is licensed, how are royalties shared?

- University only
 Faculty only
x Split between University and Faculty

What is a typical royalty share that is received by your university?

- <5%
 5-10%
x Other (explain) _Negotiated with licensee. _____

**Western Region
Questionnaire Regarding Hatch/State Fund Allocations**

NEVADA

This questionnaire deals primarily with Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis (where applicable) funds, but some questions also are directed at state matching funds as required by law. Also, we are primarily interested in *faculty* salary and operating funds.

I. Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis

1. Faculty receiving Experiment Station funding are on

- 11 or 12-month (fiscal or calendar year) contracts
- 9-month (academic year) contracts
- Combination of 9- and 12-month

If a combination, what determines what types of contracts incoming faculty receive?

2. Are Hatch/McIntire-Stennis (as applicable) used as part of the 9-month/12-month salaries?

- Yes
- No

If *No*, are these funds used to augment 9-month salaries?

- Yes
- No

3. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause faculty to be released?

- Yes
- No

Explain Soft funded faculty would be released. We would try to cover the faculty salary lines from other sources, but the non-tenured faculty would be in jeopardy!

4. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause staff to be released?

- Yes
- No

Explain Support staff paid by Hatch monies could be lost. _____

5. If Hatch funds were lost, would your state funding be affected?

- Yes
- No

Explain It's hard to predict, but we believe the state would increase funding but not cover the entire Hatch amount. This year, we received an increase in Hatch funding and the State lowered their contribution.

6. With respect to Hatch (formula) funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through
- A strictly historical basis
 - Based on FTE
 - An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
 - All on a competitive basis
- How long are the competitive allocations based?
- 1-2 year
 - 3 years
 - 3 years
 - 4-5 years
 - Other (explain) _____
- Part historical, part competitive

7. Are the Hatch (and McIntire-Stennis where applicable) funds held
- Centrally by the station
 - Allocated to departments
 - Part centrally and part allocated to departments
 - Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: The Hatch funds are held by the Station and allocated to faculty by a peer review process.

8. When open positions occur, funds are
- Pulled back and held by the central administration
 - Pulled back and held by the Experiment Station
 - Pulled back but available to departments on request
 - Left within department
 - Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: We often use salary savings for "start up" expenses for hiring new faculty.

9. If made available to departments or left within departments, the funds are allowed to remain within the department
- For 1 year
 - 2 or more years
 - Indefinitely
 - Other (please explain) until the end of the fiscal year.

10. When funds pulled back by the station,

- Funds are used to meet one-time operating/equipment needs
- Funds are made available for a 1-year competitive award
- Other (please explain) _____

10. Individual faculty evaluations conducted between dean and/or director and

- Individual faculty members
- Department head
- Both individual faculty members and department head
- Other (please explain) Chair evaluates faculty and submits recommendations to the Dean who finalizes the College evaluation and forwards it to central administration. _____

11. Are state matching funds?

- Larger than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Equal to Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Less than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations

12. For state matching funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through

- A strictly historical basis
- An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
- All on a competitive basis

How long are the competitive allocations based?

- 1 year
- 2 years
- 5 years
- Other (please explain) Projects are generally approved for three years but funding is allocated on an annual basis. _____

Part historical, part competitive

13. Are state matching funds held?

- Centrally by the station
- Allocated to departments
- Part centrally and part allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _____

II. MULTISTATE RESEARCH FUNDS

How are MRF used to support personnel and/or operations?

- Yes
- No
- If yes, explain how this is determined Based on the FTE assigned to the research project.

If yes, please indicate the approximate % funding for each

- Faculty 67%

- Technicians 3%
- Post Docs 0%
- Students (graduate, undergraduate) 26%
- Operations 4% (Dollar amount or %)
- Travel to committee meetings 0% (Dollar amount or %)

III. INTEGRATED PROJECTS

Do you currently conduct integrated projects with Extension?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please explain how these projects are implemented?

Projects are implemented by the experiment station contributing salary dollars as well as cooperative extension contributing salary dollars to state specialist programs.

When approving projects, how do you determine which ones are integrated and how do you assure that you will meet the 25% requirement?

Priority is given to projects that contain extension FTE's during the competitive allocation process.

IV. LAND USE

Who holds the deeds or titles to AES properties?

- University
 College/Station
 Other (please explain) _____

Who has ultimate authority over AES lands?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
 University President
 Other (please explain) _____

How are station farms/facilities operations funded?

- Centrally from experiment station funds
 Through departments from experiment station allocated funds
 Combination of centrally-held funds and funds allocated to departments
 Other (please explain) _____

How are plot allocations on AES properties determined?

- Centrally in the Directors office
 By the respective station managers
 A combination of the above
 Other (please explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are such decisions made?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
- Central Administration
- In collaboration with the appropriate University officials
- This is a station decision
- Other (explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are funds distributed?

- Central Administration retains funds
- Split between Administration and College/AES
- Other (explain) _____

V. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

What is your university policy on intellectual property, i.e. who owns the IP?

- University
- Faculty
- Other (explain) Both faculty and the university _____

Does your unit have existing agreements (e.g. CRDA) with private companies?

- Yes
- No

How is the decision to seek a patent made? Please explain.

- Technology Transfer Office make decision after due diligence
- University Committee makes recommendation
- Other (explain) _____

Who negotiates licensing agreements?

- Technology Transfer Office
- Other (explain) _____

If an invention is licensed, how are royalties shared?

- University only
- Faculty only
- Split between University and Faculty

What is a typical royalty share that is received by your university?

- <5%
- 5-10%
- Other (explain) The distribution of net income is: 15% Management Fee, 51% to Inventors, 21% to Departments and 13% to the VP or Research _____

**Western Region
Questionnaire Regarding Hatch/State Fund Allocations**

NEW MEXICO

This questionnaire deals primarily with Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis (where applicable) funds, but some questions also are directed at state matching funds as required by law. Also, we are primarily interested in *faculty* salary and operating funds.

I. Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis

1. Faculty receiving Experiment Station funding are on
xx 11 or 12-month (fiscal or calendar year) contracts
 9-month (academic year) contracts
 Combination of 9- and 12-month

If a combination, what determines what types of contracts incoming faculty receive?

2. Are Hatch/McIntire-Stennis (as applicable) used as part of the 9-month/12-month salaries?

xx Yes

No

If **No**, are these funds used to augment 9-month salaries?

Yes

No

3. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause faculty to be released?

xx Yes

No

Explain Few faculty are paid on federal funds. Approximately 3 fte

4. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause staff to be released?

xx Yes

No

Explain _____ Approximately 11 fte _____

5. If Hatch funds were lost, would your state funding be affected?

Yes

xx No

Explain _____

6. With respect to Hatch (formula) funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty

through

A strictly historical basis

Based on FTE

xx An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity

All on a competitive basis

How long are the competitive allocations based?

1-2 year

3 years

3 years

4-5 years

Other (please explain) _____

Part historical, part competitive

7. Are the Hatch (and McIntire-Stennis where applicable) funds held

Centrally by the station

xx Allocated to departments

Part centrally and part allocated to departments

Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

8. When open positions occur, funds are

Pulled back and held by the central administration

xx Pulled back and held by the Experiment Station

Pulled back but available to departments on request

Left within department

Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: All positions are pulled back to the college and must be requested_____

9. If made available to departments or left within departments, the funds are allowed to remain within the department

For 1 year

2 or more years

Indefinitely

Other (please explain) _____

10. When funds pulled back by the station,

Funds are used to meet one-time operating/equipment needs

Funds are made available for a 1-year competitive award

xx Other (please explain) allocated to new position possibly within same department_____

10. Individual faculty evaluations conducted between dean and/or director and

Individual faculty members

- xx Department head
- Both individual faculty members and department head
- Other (please explain) _____

11. Are state matching funds?

- xx Larger than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Equal to Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Less than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations

12. For state matching funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through

- A strictly historical basis
 - xx An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
 - All on a competitive basis
- How long are the competitive allocations based?
- 1 year
 - 2 years
 - 5 years
 - Other (please explain) _____
- Part historical, part competitive

13. Are state matching funds held?

- Centrally by the station
- xx Allocated to departments
- Part centrally and part allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _____

II. MULTISTATE RESEARCH FUNDS

How are MRF used to support personnel and/or operations?

- Yes
- No
- If yes, explain how this is determined _____ must have a regional project _____

If yes, please indicate the approximate % funding for each

- Faculty _____
- Technicians __x__
- Post Docs _____
- Students (graduate, undergraduate) __x__
- Operations __x__ (Dollar amount or %) amount
- Travel to committee meetings __x__ (Dollar amount or %) amount

III. INTEGRATED PROJECTS

Do you currently conduct integrated projects with Extension?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please explain how these projects are implemented? ___ primarily through shared positions _____

When approving projects, how do you determine which ones are integrated and how do you assure that you will meet the 25% requirement? _____ shared positions _____

IV. LAND USE

Who holds the deeds or titles to AES properties?

- University
 College/Station
 Other (please explain) _____

Who has ultimate authority over AES lands?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
 University President
 Other (please explain) _____

How are station farms/facilities operations funded?

- Centrally from experiment station funds
 Through departments from experiment station allocated funds
 Combination of centrally-held funds and funds allocated to departments
 Other (please explain) _____

How are plot allocations on AES properties determined?

- Centrally in the Directors office
 By the respective station managers
 A combination of the above
 Other (please explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are such decisions made?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
 Central Administration
 In collaboration with the appropriate University officials
 This is a station decision
 Other (explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are funds distributed?

- Central Administration retains funds
 Split between Administration and College/AES
 Other (explain) _____ hasn't happened_____

V. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

What is your university policy on intellectual property, i.e. who owns the IP?

- xx University
 Faculty
 Other (explain) _____

Does your unit have existing agreements (e.g. CRDA) with private companies?

- xx Yes
 No

How is the decision to seek a patent made? Please explain.

- xx Technology Transfer Office make decision after due diligence
 University Committee makes recommendation
 Other (explain) _____

Who negotiates licensing agreements?

- xx Technology Transfer Office
 Other (explain) _____

If an invention is licensed, how are royalties shared?

- University only
 Faculty only
xx Split between University and Faculty

What is a typical royalty share that is received by your university?

- <5%
xx 5-10%
 Other (explain) _____

**Western Region
Questionnaire Regarding Hatch/State Fund Allocations**

NORTHERN MARIANAS

This questionnaire deals primarily with Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis (where applicable) funds, but some questions also are directed at state matching funds as required by law. Also, we are primarily interested in *faculty* salary and operating funds.

I. Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis

1. Faculty receiving Experiment Station funding are on

- 11 or 12-month (fiscal or calendar year) contracts
- 9-month (academic year) contracts
- Combination of 9- and 12-month

If a combination, what determines what types of contracts incoming faculty receive?

2. Are Hatch/McIntire-Stennis (as applicable) used as part of the 9-month/12-month salaries?

- Yes
- No

If **No**, are these funds used to augment 9-month salaries?

- Yes
- No

3. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause faculty to be released?

- Yes
- No

Explain _____

4. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause staff to be released?

- Yes
- No

Explain _____

5. If Hatch funds were lost, would your state funding be affected?

- Yes
- No

Explain _____

6. With respect to Hatch (formula) funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty

Explain It's hard to predict, but we believe the state would increase funding but not cover the entire Hatch amount. This year, we received an increase in Hatch funding and the State lowered their contribution.

6. With respect to Hatch (formula) funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through
- A strictly historical basis
 - Based on FTE
 - An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
 - All on a competitive basis
- How long are the competitive allocations based?
- 1-2 year
 - 3 years
 - 3 years
 - 4-5 years
 - Other (explain) _____
- Part historical, part competitive

7. Are the Hatch (and McIntire-Stennis where applicable) funds held
- Centrally by the station
 - Allocated to departments
 - Part centrally and part allocated to departments
 - Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: The Hatch funds are held by the Station and allocated to faculty by a peer review process.

8. When open positions occur, funds are
- Pulled back and held by the central administration
 - Pulled back and held by the Experiment Station
 - Pulled back but available to departments on request
 - Left within department
 - Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: We often use salary savings for "start up" expenses for hiring new faculty.

9. If made available to departments or left within departments, the funds are allowed to remain within the department
- For 1 year
 - 2 or more years
 - Indefinitely
 - Other (please explain) until the end of the fiscal year.

10. When funds pulled back by the station,

- Funds are used to meet one-time operating/equipment needs
- Funds are made available for a 1-year competitive award
- Other (please explain) _____

10. Individual faculty evaluations conducted between dean and/or director and

- Individual faculty members
- Department head
- Both individual faculty members and department head
- Other (please explain) Chair evaluates faculty and submits recommendations to the Dean who finalizes the College evaluation and forwards it to central administration. _____

11. Are state matching funds?

- Larger than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Equal to Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Less than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations

12. For state matching funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through

- A strictly historical basis
- An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
- All on a competitive basis

How long are the competitive allocations based?

- 1 year
- 2 years
- 5 years
- Other (please explain) Projects are generally approved for three years but funding is allocated on an annual basis. _____

Part historical, part competitive

13. Are state matching funds held?

- Centrally by the station
- Allocated to departments
- Part centrally and part allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _____

II. MULTISTATE RESEARCH FUNDS

How are MRF used to support personnel and/or operations?

- Yes
- No
- If yes, explain how this is determined Based on the FTE assigned to the research project.

If yes, please indicate the approximate % funding for each

- Faculty 67%

- Technicians 3%
- Post Docs 0%
- Students (graduate, undergraduate) 26%
- Operations 4% (Dollar amount or %)
- Travel to committee meetings 0% (Dollar amount or %)

III. INTEGRATED PROJECTS

Do you currently conduct integrated projects with Extension?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please explain how these projects are implemented?

Projects are implemented by the experiment station contributing salary dollars as well as cooperative extension contributing salary dollars to state specialist programs.

When approving projects, how do you determine which ones are integrated and how do you assure that you will meet the 25% requirement?

Priority is given to projects that contain extension FTE's during the competitive allocation process.

IV. LAND USE

Who holds the deeds or titles to AES properties?

- University
 College/Station
 Other (please explain) _____

Who has ultimate authority over AES lands?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
 University President
 Other (please explain) _____

How are station farms/facilities operations funded?

- Centrally from experiment station funds
 Through departments from experiment station allocated funds
 Combination of centrally-held funds and funds allocated to departments
 Other (please explain) _____

How are plot allocations on AES properties determined?

- Centrally in the Directors office
 By the respective station managers
 A combination of the above
 Other (please explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are such decisions made?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
- Central Administration
- In collaboration with the appropriate University officials
- This is a station decision
- Other (explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are funds distributed?

- Central Administration retains funds
- Split between Administration and College/AES
- Other (explain) _____

V. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

What is your university policy on intellectual property, i.e. who owns the IP?

- University
- Faculty
- Other (explain) Both faculty and the university

Does your unit have existing agreements (e.g. CRDA) with private companies?

- Yes
- No

How is the decision to seek a patent made? Please explain.

- Technology Transfer Office make decision after due diligence
- University Committee makes recommendation
- Other (explain) _____

Who negotiates licensing agreements?

- Technology Transfer Office
- Other (explain) _____

If an invention is licensed, how are royalties shared?

- University only
- Faculty only
- Split between University and Faculty

What is a typical royalty share that is received by your university?

- <5%
- 5-10%
- Other (explain) The distribution of net income is: 15% Management Fee, 51% to Inventors, 21% to Departments and 13% to the VP or Research

**Western Region
Questionnaire Regarding Hatch/State Fund Allocations**

OREGON

This questionnaire deals primarily with Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis (where applicable) funds, but some questions also are directed at state matching funds as required by law. Also, we are primarily interested in *faculty* salary and operating funds.

I. Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis

1. Faculty receiving Experiment Station funding are on

- 11 or 12-month (fiscal or calendar year) contracts
- 9-month (academic year) contracts
- Combination of 9- and 12-month

If a combination, what determines what types of contracts incoming faculty receive?

2. Are Hatch/McIntire-Stennis (as applicable) used as part of the 9-month/12-month salaries?

- Yes
- No

If **No**, are these funds used to augment 9-month salaries?

- Yes
- No

3. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause faculty to be released?

- Yes
- No

Explain _____

4. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause staff to be released?

- Yes
- No

Explain _____

5. If Hatch funds were lost, would your state funding be affected?

- Yes
- No

Explain _____

6. With respect to Hatch (formula) funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty

through

- A strictly historical basis
 - Based on FTE
 - An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
 - All on a competitive basis
- How long are the competitive allocations based?
- 1-2 year
 - 3 years
 - 3 years
 - 4-5 years
 - Other (explain) _____
- Part historical, part competitive

7. Are the Hatch (and McIntire-Stennis where applicable) funds held

- Centrally by the station
- Allocated to departments
- Part centrally and part allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

8. When open positions occur, funds are

- Pulled back and held by the central administration
- Pulled back and held by the Experiment Station
- Pulled back but available to departments on request
- Left within department
- Other (please explain) _professorial positions are pulled back, other positions are left

within the department _____

Please comment as needed: _____

9. If made available to departments or left within departments, the funds are allowed to remain within the department

- For 1 year
- 2 or more years
- Indefinitely
- Other (please explain) _____

10. When funds pulled back by the station,

- Funds are used to meet one-time operating/equipment needs
- Funds are made available for a 1-year competitive award
- Other (please explain) _reallocated through priority staffing_____

10. Individual faculty evaluations conducted between dean and/or director and

- Individual faculty members
- Department head

- Both individual faculty members and department head
- Other (please explain) __individual faculty are evaluated by the department head

11. Are state matching funds?

- Larger than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Equal to Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Less than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations

12. For state matching funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through

- A strictly historical basis
- An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
- All on a competitive basis
How long are the competitive allocations based?
 - 1 year
 - 2 years
 - 5 years
 - Other (please explain) _____
- Part historical, part competitive

13. Are state matching funds held?

- Centrally by the station
- Allocated to departments
- Part centrally and part allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _____

II. MULTISTATE RESEARCH FUNDS

How are MRF used to support personnel and/or operations?

- Yes
- No
- If yes, explain how this is determined _____

If yes, please indicate the approximate % funding for each

- Faculty _____
- Technicians _____
- Post Docs _____
- Students (graduate, undergraduate) _____
- Operations _____ (Dollar amount or %)
- Travel to committee meetings _____ (Dollar amount or %)

III. INTEGRATED PROJECTS

Do you currently conduct integrated projects with Extension?

- Yes

No

If yes, please explain how these projects are implemented?

The faculty are generally split appointments between the Experiment Station and Extension. They have approved annual workplans that reflect the work proposed for the integrated projects. _____

When approving projects, how do you determine which ones are integrated and how do you assure that you will meet the 25% requirement?

The work proposed needs to indicate integrated activities and we also look for Extension or Academic faculty involvement in these types of projects. We assure the 25% requirement through monthly monitoring of spending and unit consultations as needed.

IV. LAND USE

Who holds the deeds or titles to AES properties?

- University
- College/Station
- Other (please explain) __State of Oregon _____

Who has ultimate authority over AES lands?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
- University President
- Other (please explain) _____

How are station farms/facilities operations funded?

- Centrally from experiment station funds
- Through departments from experiment station allocated funds
- Combination of centrally-held funds and funds allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) __funds allocated from central administration directly to station farms/facilities _____

How are plot allocations on AES properties determined?

- Centrally in the Directors office
- By the respective station managers
- A combination of the above
- Other (please explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are such decisions made?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
- Central Administration
- In collaboration with the appropriate University officials
- This is a station decision

Other (explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are funds distributed?

- Central Administration retains funds
 Split between Administration and College/AES
 Other (explain) _case by case review and historical agreements
-

V. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

What is your university policy on intellectual property, i.e. who owns the IP?

- University
 Faculty
 Other (explain) ___shared ownership
-

Does your unit have existing agreements (e.g.CRDA) with private companies?

- Yes
 No

How is the decision to seek a patent made? Please explain.

- Technology Transfer Office make decision after due diligence
 University Committee makes recommendation
 Other (explain) _____
-

Who negotiates licensing agreements?

- Technology Transfer Office
 Other (explain) _____
-

If an invention is licensed, how are royalties shared?

- University only
 Faculty only
 Split between University and Faculty

What is a typical royalty share that is received by your university?

- <5%
 5-10%
 Other (explain) _____
-

**Western Region
Questionnaire Regarding Hatch/State Fund Allocations**

UTAH

This questionnaire deals primarily with Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis (where applicable) funds, but some questions also are directed at state matching funds as required by law. Also, we are primarily interested in *faculty* salary and operating funds.

I. Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis

1. Faculty receiving Experiment Station funding are on
 11 or 12-month (fiscal or calendar year) contracts
 9-month (academic year) contracts
 Combination of 9- and 12-month

If a combination, what determines what types of contracts incoming faculty receive?

This differs by the department the funds are allocated to (i.e., Economics is primarily 9 months whereas Animal, Dairy, and Veterinary Sciences is primarily 12 months).

2. Are Hatch/McIntire-Stennis (as applicable) used as part of the 9-month/12-month salaries?

Yes
 No

If *No*, are these funds used to augment 9-month salaries?

Yes
 No

3. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause faculty to be released?

Yes
 No

Explain: Approximately 18 Faculty FTE would have to be terminated.

4. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause staff to be released?

Yes
 No

Explain: This depends on whether state funds were cut in addition to the Hatch/McIntire-Stennis funds.

5. If Hatch funds were lost, would your state funding be affected?

Yes
 No

Explain: At this point, we are not certain what would happen to the state funds, though we suspect some would stay.

6. With respect to Hatch (formula) funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through
- A strictly historical basis
 - Based on FTE
 - An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
 - All on a competitive basis
- How long are the competitive allocations based?
- 1-2 year
 - 3 years
 - 3 years
 - 4-5 years
 - Other (explain) _____
- Part historical, part competitive

7. Are the Hatch (and McIntire-Stennis where applicable) funds held
- Centrally by the station
 - Allocated to departments
 - Part centrally and part allocated to departments
 - Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

8. When open positions occur, funds are
- Pulled back and held by the central administration
 - Pulled back and held by the Experiment Station
 - Pulled back but available to departments on request
 - Left within department
 - Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

9. If made available to departments or left within departments, the funds are allowed to remain within the department
- For 1 year
 - 2 or more years
 - Indefinitely
 - Other (please explain) _____

10. When funds are pulled back by the station,
- Funds are used to meet one-time operating/equipment needs
 - Funds are made available for a 1-year competitive award
 - Other (please explain) _____

10. Individual faculty evaluations conducted between dean and/or director and
- Individual faculty members

- Department head
- Both individual faculty members and department head
- Other (please explain) _____

11. Are state matching funds?

- Larger than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Equal to Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
- Less than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations

12. For state matching funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through

- A strictly historical basis
- An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
- All on a competitive basis
 - How long are the competitive allocations based?
 - 1 year
 - 2 years
 - 5 years
 - Other (please explain) _____
- Part historical, part competitive

13. Are state matching funds held?

- Centrally by the station
- Allocated to departments
- Part centrally and part allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _____

II. MULTISTATE RESEARCH FUNDS

How are MRF used to support personnel and/or operations?

- Yes
- No
- If yes, explain how this is determined _____

If yes, please indicate the approximate % funding for each

- Faculty: 75%
- Technicians: 5%
- Post Docs: 5%
- Students (graduate, undergraduate): 5%
- Operations: ~0% (Dollar amount or %)
- Travel to committee meetings 10% (Dollar amount or %)

III. INTEGRATED PROJECTS

Do you currently conduct integrated projects with Extension?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please explain how these projects are implemented?

These projects have been developed as part of the Plan of Work jointly by the Experiment Station and Extension.

When approving projects, how do you determine which ones are integrated and how do you assure that you will meet the 25% requirement?

We examined the faculty members that were involved in both Extension and Experiment Station (i.e., joint assignments) to determine if the Experiment Station and Extension goals/POW were consistent with each other. We have no problem meeting the 25% requirement (at least under normal circumstances). Extension has a much larger problem meeting the requirement.

IV. LAND USE

Who holds the deeds or titles to AES properties?

- University
 College/Station
 Other (please explain) **The university holds title to some properties but most are held by the Experiment Station.**

Who has ultimate authority over AES lands?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
 University President
 Other (please explain) _____

How are station farms/facilities operations funded?

- Centrally from experiment station funds
 Through departments from experiment station allocated funds
 Combination of centrally-held funds and funds allocated to departments
 Other (please explain) _____

How are plot allocations on AES properties determined?

- Centrally in the Directors office
 By the respective station managers
 A combination of the above
 Other (please explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are such decisions made?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
 Central Administration
 In collaboration with the appropriate University officials
 This is a station decision

Other (explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are funds distributed?

Central Administration retains funds

Split between Administration and College/AES

Other (explain) More recently, the Central Administration has taken a stronger position with how the funds are used with less going to the Experiment Station.

V. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

What is your university policy on intellectual property, i.e. who owns the IP?

University

Faculty

Other (explain) _____

Does your unit have existing agreements (e.g. CRDA) with private companies?

Yes

No

How is the decision to seek a patent made? Please explain.

Technology Transfer Office make decision after due diligence

University Committee makes recommendation

Other (explain) _____

Who negotiates licensing agreements?

Technology Transfer Office

Other (explain) _____

If an invention is licensed, how are royalties shared?

University only

Faculty only

Split between University and Faculty

What is a typical royalty share that is received by your university?

<5%

5-10%

Other (explain): 25%

**Western Region
Questionnaire Regarding Hatch/State Fund Allocations**

WYOMING

This questionnaire deals primarily with Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis (where applicable) funds, but some questions also are directed at state matching funds as required by law. Also, we are primarily interested in *faculty* salary and operating funds.

I. Hatch (formula) and McIntire-Stennis

1. Faculty receiving Experiment Station funding are on

- 11 or 12-month (fiscal or calendar year) contracts
- 9-month (academic year) contracts
- Combination of 9- and 12-month

If a combination, what determines what types of contracts incoming faculty receive?

2. Are Hatch/McIntire-Stennis (as applicable) used as part of the 9-month/12-month salaries?

- Yes
- No

If **No**, are these funds used to augment 9-month salaries?

- Yes
- No

3. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause faculty to be released?

- Yes
- No

Explain _____

4. If Hatch funds were lost, would it cause staff to be released?

- Yes
- No

Explain _____

5. If Hatch funds were lost, would your state funding be affected?

- Yes
- No

Explain _____

6. With respect to Hatch (formula) funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty

through

- A strictly historical basis
 - Based on FTE
 - An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
 - All on a competitive basis
- How long are the competitive allocations based?
- 1-2 year
 - 3 years
 - 3 years
 - 4-5 years
 - Other (explain) _____
- Part historical, part competitive

7. Are the Hatch (and McIntire-Stennis where applicable) funds held

- Centrally by the station
- Allocated to departments
- Part centrally and part allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

8. When open positions occur, funds are

- Pulled back and held by the central administration
- Pulled back and held by the Experiment Station
- Pulled back but available to departments on request
- Left within department
- Other (please explain) _____

Please comment as needed: _____

9. If made available to departments or left within departments, the funds are allowed to remain within the department

- For 1 year
- 2 or more years
- Indefinitely
- Other (please explain) _____

10. When funds pulled back by the station,

- Funds are used to meet one-time operating/equipment needs
- Funds are made available for a 1-year competitive award
- Other (please explain) _____

10. Individual faculty evaluations conducted between dean and/or director and

- Individual faculty members
- Department head
- Both individual faculty members and department head

Other (please explain) _____

11. Are state matching funds?

- Larger than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
 Equal to Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations
 Less than Hatch/McIntire-Stennis allocations

12. For state matching funds, the funds are allocated to departments and faculty through

- A strictly historical basis
 An historical basis with changes made at the margin between departments as a function of productivity
 All on a competitive basis
How long are the competitive allocations based?
 1 year
 2 years
 5 years
 Other (please explain) _____

Part historical, part competitive

13. Are state matching funds held?

- Centrally by the station
 Allocated to departments
 Part centrally and part allocated to departments
 Other (please explain) _____

II. MULTISTATE RESEARCH FUNDS

How are MRF used to support personnel and/or operations?

- Yes
 No
 If yes, explain how this is determined _____

If yes, please indicate the approximate % funding for each

- Faculty _15%__
- Technicians ____
- Post Docs ____
- Students (graduate, undergraduate) _25%__
- Operations _40%__ (Dollar amount or %)
- Travel to committee meetings _20%__ (Dollar amount or %)

III. INTEGRATED PROJECTS

Do you currently conduct integrated projects with Extension?

- Yes
 No

If yes, please explain how these projects are implemented?

When approving projects, how do you determine which ones are integrated and how do you assure that you will meet the 25% requirement?

IV. LAND USE

Who holds the deeds or titles to AES properties?

- University
- College/Station
- Other (please explain) _____

Who has ultimate authority over AES lands?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
- University President
- Other (please explain) _____

How are station farms/facilities operations funded?

- Centrally from experiment station funds
- Through departments from experiment station allocated funds
- Combination of centrally-held funds and funds allocated to departments
- Other (please explain) _____

How are plot allocations on AES properties determined?

- Centrally in the Directors office
- By the respective station managers
- A combination of the above
- Other (please explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are such decisions made?

- Board of Regents or Trustees
- Central Administration
- In collaboration with the appropriate University officials
- This is a station decision
- Other (explain) _____

If lands are to be sold, how are funds distributed?

- Central Administration retains funds
- Split between Administration and College/AES

Other (explain) _____

V. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY POLICY

What is your university policy on intellectual property, i.e. who owns the IP?

University

Faculty

Other (explain) _____

Does your unit have existing agreements (e.g. CRDA) with private companies?

Yes

No

How is the decision to seek a patent made? Please explain.

Technology Transfer Office make decision after due diligence

University Committee makes recommendation

Other (explain) _____

Who negotiates licensing agreements?

Technology Transfer Office

Other (explain) _____

If an invention is licensed, how are royalties shared?

University only

Faculty only

Split between University and Faculty

What is a typical royalty share that is received by your university?

<5%

5-10%

Other (explain) _____

Agenda Item 10.0: Resolutions

Presenter: G. Bohach

Background:

Resolution #1:

WHEREAS Associate Dean Dr. Bruce McPheron, Ms. Mary Seaton, Ms. Mary Wirth, Ms. Rachel Unger, and their colleagues from Pennsylvania State University were organizers and hosts for the Experiment Station Section, State Agricultural Experiment Stations, and Association of Research Directors Annual Meetings, and the Fall meeting of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, at the Sheraton Society Hill, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, September 16-19, 2007; and

WHEREAS Dr. McPheron, Ms. Seaton, Ms. Wirth, Ms. Unger, and their colleagues provided such hospitable surroundings in which to meet and were also outstanding hosts; and

WHEREAS Dr. McPheron, Ms. Seaton, Ms. Wirth, Ms. Unger, and their colleagues arranged excellent joint meetings, presentations, workshops, and social activities; be it

RESOLVED, That the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors during its meeting at the Sheraton Society Hill, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, on this day of September 17, 2007, expresses its sincere and heartfelt appreciation to Dr. McPheron, Ms. Seaton, Ms. Wirth, Ms. Unger, and their colleagues for their significant contributions to successful individual and joint meetings; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the original of this resolution will be provided to Dr. McPheron, and a copy be filed as part of the official minutes of this meeting.

Action Requested: Approval of Resolution

Action Taken: Unanimously approved resolution to meeting organizers

Agenda Item 11.1: ESCOP Communications and Marketing Subcommittee

Presenter: R. Pardini

Background:

Pardini reported that a recommendation from the ESCOP Communications and Marketing Subcommittee would be made to the ESS meeting. The recommendation is to fund a marketing effort that would have a targeted approach on specific areas. The program would be for funded the first year from residual ESCOP funds retained at NASULGC (leaving \$25,000 to cover emergency requests). The final two years would be funded at \$300,000 per year, supported by a special assessment. The assessment for the marketing effort would be sent with the BOA assessments due in June 2008. Of the yearly assessments, \$240,000 would fund Podesta (the selected marketing firm) and \$60,000 would be paid to Cornerstone to coordinate their efforts with Podesta.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 11.2: One Solution

Presenter: Pardini

Background:

CSREES has been developing the One Solution and is asking for a group of stakeholders (one or two representatives from each region) to be appointed to serve on the One Solution Study Group.

Action Requested: Appointment of members to One Solution Study Group

Action Taken: C. Kaltenbach and L. Daugherty, representatives to the NIMSS Oversight Committee are to serve on the group.

Agenda Item 12.1: Spring Meeting 2008

Presenter: C. Kaltenbach

Background:

Joint WAAESD/WEDA Meetings

March 17 — 20, 2008

RCIC Meeting	March 17	8am – 4pm
WAAESD Executive Committee Meeting	March 17	4pm – 5:30pm
WRPLC Meeting	March 17 March 18 March 19	9pm – 5pm 8am – 5pm 8am – 12pm
WAAESD Meeting	March 18 March 19 March 20	8am - 5pm 8am - 5pm 8am - 12pm
WEDA Meeting	March 18 March 19 March 20	8am - 5pm 8am - 5pm 8am - 12pm

WAAESD (Western Assoc. Ag Exp Station Directors)

WEDA (Western Extension Directors Assoc.)

RCIC (Research Coordination and Implementation Committee)

WRPLC (Western Regional Program Leadership Committee)

Tentative Meeting location:

Westward Look Resort

245 E. Ina Rd.

Tucson, AZ 85704

Tentative Registration Fee: \$350

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 12.2: Joint Summer Meeting 2008

Presenter: C. Lewis

Background:

Lewis reported that the 2008 Western Region Joint Summer Meetings would be held at the University of Alaska on July 6-9, 2008.

Lodging will be available at three hotels in the Fairbanks area. The meetings coincide with the peak of the Fairbanks summer tourist season. To ensure accommodation, blocks of rooms have been reserved for this conference. Further information will be made available soon.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 13.0: Changing of the Guard

Presenter: CY Hu

Background:

CY Hu presented G. Bohach with a gavel and turned the meeting over to Bohach.

Bohach adjourned the meeting.

Action Requested: For information