

Steering Committee Meeting June 25, 2008

Attending: Ames Herbert, Tom Brennan, Pat O'Leary, Ples Spradley, Clayton Hollier, Ryan Kurtz, Henry Fadamiro, Carrie Harmon, John Mayne, Harold Coble, Jim Hudson, Dave Monks, Steve Toth, Jim VanKirk. **Recording:** Rosemary Hallberg

Making Steering Committee part of Advisory Council

There is an issue with having people on the Steering Committee who are not on the Advisory Council. Jim V. suggested that all of the members on the Steering Committee should also be members of the Advisory Council.

Discussion:

- Recruit an Advisory Council member who might later be appointed to the Steering Committee (Ames)
- There should be a separate Steering Committee but not a subset, since the SC makes the rules. (John Mayne)
- Steering Committee members could be ex-officio members of the Advisory Council, since there could be a conflict if someone on the Advisory Council recommends an issue and then votes for it later on.
- Some SC members may not be able to attend both meetings. (Henry) Suggestions were to begin the SC meeting at noon and have a working lunch and define the issues ahead of time.
- The agenda should be more specific as to the issues that need to be discussed. Action items should be labeled, and they should have more information about them.
- Motion: All SC seats will also have a seat on the AC.
- Recommendation: add a seat on the SC for the SPDN. Harold Coble made a motion to add the seat to the SC; it was seconded by Pat O-Leary and approved.

Friends of IPM

Jim suggested adding another award category called "Impact Documentation." The award would recognize people who do evaluation.

Discussion:

- Those people should be recognized by one of the other awards (Ames)
- If you have a situation where someone merits an award but doesn't fit into one of the other categories, perhaps give it a generic award, such as "President's Award.") Jim H.
- The award would be for those who devote their careers to measuring impacts.
- IPM impacts need to be part of the other categories; you can't reward someone for something that has no impacts (Ames)
- Keep the awards as they are, and preserve the IPM Impact award in your pocket (Carrie)
- Rather than making the extra award just for IPM impacts, make it a "Center award" so we can put something in there that doesn't fit (Clayton)

Funding for Working Groups

Current funding structure: critical issues, \$5,000 or less, IPM Enhancement Grant Part 1 (State contacts, IPM Documents), IPM Enhancement Grant Part 2 (Seed, Capstone, workgroups) Crop profiles running about \$5,000; PMSPs, \$10,000, and IPM Elements are \$5,000.

Issue is to add working groups to IPM Enhancement Grant Part 1. The reason is to fund groups such as the School IPM Working Group that need recurring funding but don't need permanent funding.

Discussion:

- Put working groups in between seed and capstone in Part 2 (Harold). Issue: part of the reason to put them in Part 1 is the different panels. The Part 2 panel is looking at scientific design. The part 1 panel looks at Center projects.
- They can be put in Part 1, but they must deliver something that is defined as a deliverable (Ames)
- Working groups should begin with a seed grant. Then perhaps make an allowance for one more year of additional funding but you must show that you will have another deliverable (Carrie)
- We need a motion that a subcommittee will give a recommendation and the SC will accept their recommendation.
- There needs to be a cap on how much we spend (Ames) With the first School IPM meeting, we spent \$15,000 for travel. However, Jim does not want to limit the entire amount to travel (perhaps a small amount, like \$2,000, on salary)
- What matters is that we don't empower a group to have discussions that don't add anything (Tom Brennan)
- Recommendation of a cap of \$15,000 with clear deliverables (Carrie).
- Carrie also made a motion to let Jim and Steve write the RFA. Clayton seconded and the motion was approved.
- The Center can offer the service of conference calls (Jim). The Steering Committee accepted that.
- In the RFA, the core deliverable would be describing the plan and the people who will be involved and what they expect at the end of the year.

Next meeting: December 2-3, 2008.