



# North Central Regional Association of State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

## 213<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Chancellor Room, Embassy Suites Lincoln, NE  
 Tuesday, October 2, 2018, 8 am to 10 am

### Final AGENDA and Draft [MINUTES](#) (page 2)

<i>Time</i>	<i>Item #</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Presenter</i>
8:00 am	1.0	Welcome and Call to Order	Joe Colletti, 2018 NCRA Chair
	2.0	Approval of <a href="#">July 2018 Minutes</a>	
	3.0	Adoption of the Agenda	
8:05 am	4.0	Interim Actions of the Chair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">NCRA Office Budget Update</a></li> <li>• Other, as needed</li> </ul>	Joe Colletti, Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton
8:20 am	5.0	NRSP Review Committee Update/Vote Prep	Doug Buhler, Jeff Jacobsen
8:30 am	6.0	<a href="#">NAS 2030 Science Breakthroughs Discussion</a>	Archie Clutter
8:50 am	7.0	ESCOP CMC No Confidence Vote Update	Jeff Jacobsen
9:00 am	<a href="#">8.0</a>	Re-imagining Multistate Projects Discussion	Dave, Bill, Deb, Marc, Jeff, Chris
9:35 am	9.0	NIFA Update/Brief Q&A	Jeanette Thurston, NIFA
9:50 am	10.0	Resolutions	Shawn Donkin
9:55 am	11.0	Other Business, as needed	All
		Future Meetings: <a href="https://www.ncra-saes.org/calendar">https://www.ncra-saes.org/calendar</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APLU Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA, November 11-13, 2018.</li> <li>• Spring NCRA Meeting, Scottsdale Marriott Suites Old Town, March 25-27, 2019.</li> </ul>	
10:00 am	<i>Adjourn</i>		

## NCRA Fall 2018 Meeting MINUTES

**Participants:** Joe Colletti (chair), Bill Barker, Greg Cuomo, Marc Linit, Gary Pierzinski, Doug Buhler, Dave Benfield, Greg Lardy, Marty Draper, Deb Hamernik, Shawn Dawkins, George Smith, Archie Clutter, Hector Santiago, Tala Awada, Bill Gibbons, Rebecca Walth, Jeff Jacobsen (recorder)

**Guests:** Jeanette Thurston, Doug Steele

Item #	Topic	Notes and Action(s) Taken
2.0	Approval of <a href="#">July 2018 Minutes</a>	Shawn, Marc motioned, <b>Action: July 2018 minutes approved unanimously</b>
3.0	Adoption of the Agenda	<b>Action: Approved as-is</b>
4.0	Interim Actions of the Chair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">NCRA Office Budget Update</a></li> <li>• Other, as needed</li> </ul>	<p>General review and discussion on the range of potential increases \$30,000 - \$60,000 to be considered at the Spring Meeting. Review of the processes used, increased expenditures (Admin fees, travel, salary and fringe) and Q&amp;A on likely duration of any increase. General sentiment that a \$50,000 increase (approx. 11%) projected to last at least three years. This increase will offset the growing administrative costs at MSU and UW as well as some increased travel costs. <b>ACTION: Shawn, Doug Buhler motioned, Approved Unanimously for \$50,000 assessment increase for FY2020 with the current distribution of 60% equally across 12 states and 40% by three-year rolling average of Multistate Research Fund.</b></p> <p>Deb Hamernik provided an overview of the upcoming ESS/ARD Annual Meeting</p>
5.0	NRSP Review Committee Update/Vote Prep	<p>Doug Buhler provided a NRSP RC recap on midterm reviews: NRSP4 – Positive, referenced the 2016 comprehensive external review, Jerry Baron will visit all regions during their Spring meetings; NRSP6 – Future business plan to diversity funding with a six-month period to provide concrete details, Doug/Bill Barker/Jeff are working to identify alternatives;</p> <p>NRSP9 – Changes were made in response to earlier reviews, positive. No formal actions are needed from ESS at this time on these midterm review projects.</p> <p>NRSP8 – Project renewal that responded positively to questions and requests, discussions included the actions to begin the transition to alternative funding sources and</p>

		<p>planning for the end of this project following this renewal. Vote will be taken by ESS.</p> <p>NRSP Guidelines will be reviewed by Rick, Jeff and Doug. Any recommendations will be discussed by the NRSP Review Committee for possible ESS action in the future. Bill Barker expressed an interest in participating.</p> <p>Future leadership will rotate to the North Central Region after the upcoming year transitioning after the next ESS/ARD meeting in 2019.</p>
<p>6.0 &amp; 7.0</p>	<p><a href="#">NAS 2030 Science Breakthroughs Discussion</a></p> <p>ESCOP CMC No Confidence Vote Update</p>	<p>Discussion ended up being a combination of items 6 and 7 combined.</p> <p>Archie provided an overview of the report and its key recommendations. General discussion occurred across elements in the report. Similarities to PCAST report. Purdue is referencing the Breakthroughs Report whenever outcomes provided in their news releases connects to relevant recommendations. Several directors stated that it is a report to ourselves in the same manner (a written report) and the contents mimic other past recommendations and efforts. Feeling that this will not move the needle much. Is there going to be a CMC linkage? How is the report going to be communicated in general and, more importantly, what innovative approaches are to be used?</p> <p>NCRA directors initiated a discussion focused on state/regional issues and how we (NC institutions) communicate in new and innovative ways to reach new audiences. Historically, this would mimic the effort to enhance collaborations and (possibly) common measures with IP professionals at NC institutions. Review approaches used by SoAR, Riley Foundation, Fed by Science and other current national efforts that generate publicity. Possibly, in time, consider engaging the NC CES directors and their associated communication professionals.</p> <p><b>ACTION: Interest in facilitating a focused discussion with NC communication professionals to share new and innovative approaches to communicate with existing and new audiences. Subsequent suggestion to have these professionals engage in the near future with a target to have some/all come to the NCRA Spring</b></p>

		<p>meeting to meet with MRC, then NCRA to discuss options (working session) and path forward. Key questions/charges: Identify some regional key messages and (new and innovative) communication strategies. Who is the intended audience? How to communicate effectively, innovatively and cost effectively? What are some desirable outcomes? Doug, Gary, Marty Draper and Greg Cuomo interested in participating in the discussion.</p> <p>Recap also of NCRA position from mini Land-grant meeting in preparation for ESS/ARD Business Meeting.</p>
8.0	Re-imagining Multistate Projects Discussion	<p>Overview of new one-page AA Charge and additional links to resources.</p> <p>Overview of Discussion: NC multistate portfolio should be reviewed for purpose, opportunity gaps and in light of changes in time of LGU resources and project funding, 2030 Report, NIFA focus areas, and value of having scientists/educators getting together. If there are fewer projects, there should be additional funds to support research priorities. Utilize technology when possible. Federal requirement for 25% should be used to support the best of the best projects. Welcome change and simplification. <b>ACTION: Jeff/Chris will brainstorm ideas and engage the named directors in discussion. Provide summary and possibly action items by Spring meeting and possibly for some action by next ESS/ARD meeting.</b></p> <p>Topics to Explore: Nomenclature dated. Need for regional designation may not be needed any longer. Need improved structure across projects. Duration of projects could be more flexible. Need real collaborations (and outputs/impacts). Capture emerging goals and identify new futuristic goals. Set priorities. Reduce the total number of multistate projects. Combine projects with similar objectives and participants, etc.</p>
9.0	NIFA Update/Brief Q&A	Jeanette Thurston provided the NIFA Update with highlights of personnel, Scott Angle starts ~10/29, Strategic Planning, NIFA move, NIFA Listening Sessions and RFAs.
10.0	Resolutions	Shawn read the prepared Marc Linit Resolution, Marc responded with reflections.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

**Item 4.0: NCRA Office Budget Update**

**Presenters: Jeff Jacobsen and Chris Hamilton**

**Action Requested:** For information and to consider for spring NCRA meeting vote/budget approval.

As of 9/12/2018:

<b>NCRA FY2019 Working Budget (with Final FY2018)</b>				
<b>INCOME</b>				
	<u>FY2018</u>	<u>FY2019</u>		<u>FY2020</u>
Description	Final	Budget	YTD***	Budget
State Assessments	425,763	425,763	425,761	425,763
Account Carryover (MSU)	43,435	42,910	42,910	tbd
<b>TOTAL INCOME</b>	<b>469,198</b>	<b>468,673</b>	<b>468,671</b>	<b>425,763</b>
<b>EXPENSE</b>				
	<u>FY2018</u>	<u>FY2019</u>		<u>FY2020</u>
Description	Final	Budget	YTD	Budget
<b>NCRA</b>				
Regional Initiatives*****	5,000	-		
	(5,000)			
<b>NCRA Subtotal</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	
<b>MICHIGAN STATE</b>				
Executive Director Salary	205,000	213,200	213,200	213,200
Fringe*	48,621	55,219	55,219	55,219
Office Operating	3,242	3,000	42	3,000
Travel	30,510	35,000	4,483	35,000
Training	-	-	-	-
MSU Administrative/Service Fees (2% MSU)****	5,830	6,128	6,128	6,128
<b>MSU Subtotal</b>	<b>293,203</b>	<b>312,547</b>	<b>279,072</b>	<b>312,547</b>
<b>U of WISCONSIN</b>				
Assistant Director Salary	79,480	82,659	82,659	82,659
Fringe**	32,351	33,890	33,890	33,890
Office Operating	2,322	3,000	-	3,000
Travel	6,288	12,000	1,481	12,000
Training	320	500	-	500
Meeting Support	(976)	2,000	-	2,000
UW Administrative/Service Fees (2% CALS, 5% UW)	8,486	9,383	-	9,383
<b>UW Subtotal</b>	<b>128,272</b>	<b>143,433</b>	<b>118,030</b>	<b>143,433</b>
<b>TOTAL EXPENSE</b>	<b>421,475</b>	<b>455,980</b>	<b>397,102</b>	<b>455,980</b>
<b>BALANCE</b>	<b>47,723</b>	<b>12,693</b>	<b>71,569</b>	<b>(30,217)</b>
*MSU FY19 est. fringe: 25.9%.				
**UW FY19 est. fringe: approx 42% (includes est. term leave monthly fee of \$24.80/month).				
***Full FY expenditures for salary + fringe + MSU admin fees, YTD actuals, for other categories.				
****Still awaiting final MSU FY17 and FY18 close-out admin fees to clear.				
*****Bt Corn Video (invoice = expense).				

Proposed assessment increase scenarios for FY2020:

FY2019 NCRA Assessment Distribution by State					Proposed FY2020 Assessment Increase Scenarios			
State	60% State Equal Share Assessments	40% Proportional to State's Share of MRF*	FY19 Assessment	PROPOSED FY20 Assessment Scenario 1 (+\$30,000)	PROPOSED FY20 Assessment Scenario 2 (+\$40,000)	PROPOSED FY20 Assessment Scenario 3 (+\$50,000)	PROPOSED FY20 Assessment Scenario 4 (+\$60,000)	
Illinois	\$21,288	9.88% \$16,826	\$38,114	\$40,800	\$41,695	\$42,590	\$43,485	
Indiana	\$21,288	8.33% \$14,181	\$35,469	\$37,968	\$38,801	\$39,634	\$40,468	
Iowa	\$21,288	10.38% \$17,672	\$38,960	\$41,705	\$42,620	\$43,535	\$44,450	
Kansas	\$21,288	7.66% \$13,038	\$34,326	\$36,744	\$37,551	\$38,357	\$39,163	
Michigan	\$21,288	8.77% \$14,932	\$36,220	\$38,772	\$39,623	\$40,473	\$41,324	
Minnesota	\$21,288	8.74% \$14,881	\$36,169	\$38,717	\$39,567	\$40,416	\$41,266	
Missouri	\$21,288	7.81% \$13,294	\$34,582	\$37,018	\$37,831	\$38,643	\$39,455	
Nebraska	\$21,288	8.86% \$15,085	\$36,374	\$38,936	\$39,791	\$40,645	\$41,499	
North Dakota	\$21,288	5.87% \$10,005	\$31,293	\$33,498	\$34,233	\$34,968	\$35,703	
Ohio	\$21,288	9.47% \$16,126	\$37,414	\$40,051	\$40,930	\$41,808	\$42,687	
South Dakota	\$21,288	5.93% \$10,102	\$31,391	\$33,602	\$34,340	\$35,077	\$35,814	
Wisconsin	\$21,288	8.32% \$14,164	\$35,452	\$37,950	\$38,783	\$39,615	\$40,448	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$255,458</b>	<b>100.00% \$170,305</b>	<b>\$425,763</b>	<b>\$455,763</b>	<b>\$465,763</b>	<b>\$475,763</b>	<b>\$485,763</b>	

\*Proportion of State share of MRF based upon rolling 3-year actual average (FFY15-17) as provided by NIFA. NRSP and NC off-the-top allocations (IL, IA, MI, NE, WI) not included.

**Information on other regional assessments:**

NCCEA – Individual state share based upon their percentage of total regional Smith-Lever funding. They also make a uniform assessment across the 12-states for their annual grant programs with the amount dependent upon the themes and desired outcomes.

NCRA – NCRA creates the total annual (estimated) budget and 60% of that total is evenly distributed across the 12 and the remaining 40% is based upon percentage share of the 3-year rolling average of the NC MRF.

NERA – Requested budget billed as percentage share of the individual station (numerator) to the regional MRF allocation. They also have a built in 23% carryover.

SAAESD – The total approved budget is based upon the individual state percentage of the regional total allocation for Hatch regular and MRF. They also have assessments for cotton nursery and a database that are calculated differently and are over and above the base.

WAAESD -- Approximately 66% of our budget is covered by a regional multistate management project W106 taken off the top from the Western Region MRF. This corresponds to the effort that the office puts into the multistate program. The remaining balance is assessed as follows: Territories pay \$1000 except Guam, then 20% across the board and remaining amounts on a pro rata share of each state's MRF to the total western MRF.

APLU -- based 60% on NIFA capacity funds and 40% NIFA AFRI

[Back to Top](#)





## Quick Guide: Expectations for Administrative Advisors (AAs) and Multistate Projects

- Is the project relevant to regional and national priorities? Make sure it's aligned well with at least the [ESCOP Science Roadmap](#) topics and the [NIFA Strategic Plan](#). If not, encourage the committee to develop goals that align with these key resources at their next renewal or consider re-organizing/allowing the project to expire as scheduled.
- Is your committee active, meeting annually, and submitting good quality, timely reports? Reports are crucial for accountability and to show impacts from our multistate program to NIFA, legislators, and other important stakeholders. Without quality documentation in NIMSS, we don't know if committee is indeed functioning. AAs should attend meetings either in person or remotely, whenever possible, to share relevant information on funding, priorities, and other critical announcements from the NCRA.
- Are the committee reports showcasing **multistate efforts**, collaborations, impacts, and linkages above and beyond individual station activities? This information has become critical for the continuation of our multistate research program and its funding. Please communicate this need to committee members at each meeting and do not approve annual reports or future meetings until they meet this goal. Going forward, committees may not be approved for renewal, if they are not clearly articulating their collaborative efforts. **We strongly discourage lists of individual station reports.**
- Tips for developing excellent multistate reports for NIMSS:
  - Send a template out to all members in advance of the meeting. They can use this form to list partnership and other multistate efforts, impacts, publications, etc. from the past year, then committee chairs can use the completed forms to quickly and easily create the annual report and submit it to NIMSS
  - Keep reports short, no more than 3-5 pages
  - AAs should review the report prior to approval and not hesitate to reach out to the committee for any revisions prior to approval
  - See item #7 here for tips, an example, and how to submit an annual report to NIMSS: <https://www.ncra-saes.org/multistate-handbook>
- At year 3, AAs are assigned a project review form in NIMSS. They should evaluate the project's activities and progress against the reports available in NIMSS. Again, the focus should mainly be on the committee's multistate activities and collaborations.

For more detailed information on the role of an AA on a multistate committee, please check out our "AA Checklist and Recipe for Success" under item #6 here: <https://www.ncra-saes.org/multistate-handbook>.