

AES Advisory Team
Minutes – July 26, 2018

Present: Bruce Davis, Clint Loest, Jerry Sims, Stephanie Walker, Dave Lowry, Shengrui Yao, Jane Pierce, Steve Loring, Natalie Goldberg, Aaron Scott, Shad Cox, Steve Guldan

On phone: Roland Sanchez

Absent: Blake Curtis, Dina Chacon-Reitzel, Dino Cervantes, Craig Ogden

1. Review of the Committee Assignment (Steve and Natalie)
 - a. Charge to the committee – conduct an objective and comprehensive review of the Agricultural Experiment Station and the off-campus ASCs. Are we doing the type of research that is needed to meet the needs of our stakeholders? What additional research is necessary to meet the needs of our stakeholders in the future? How do we ensure that we can continue to meet stakeholder needs with limited resources? What are the options for increased funding?
 - b. The final report from this committee is due to Dr. Flores by **Dec. 1, 2018**. The report needs to be concise (up to 5 pages). It was decided that the report should address the AES as a whole (all ASCs together) without discussing each ASC in detail, however examples from ASCs can be used to illustrate specific points. It was also decided that supplemental material for each center would be provided that will provide more details.
2. Review of the ASC Questionnaires (group discussion)
 - a. We need to look at how and why each station was established and determine if they are fulfilling their mission. Are they meeting the needs of their stakeholders? Are they able to adjust research efforts to fit the changing needs of their stakeholders?
 - b. What is gained from closing each center and what is the cost?
 - c. Shad recommended that we use the ASC profiles as part of the supplemental material.
 - d. Bruce Davis mentioned that every business needs to assess their business and cut out the deadwood pretty regularly or the deadwood just builds up. He thought this committee was a good and needed exercise. He believes none of the centers needs to be closed – but we need to cut out the deadwood.
 - i. He recommended another committee after this one should meet with each center and the advisory boards to see where we go from here.
 - ii. He also noted that the Extension network is a powerful mechanism for disseminating information. He also suggested that the ASCs should seek help from the stakeholders in disseminating information (producers talk to and respect the opinions of other producers – they can let each other know what works and doesn't work for their industries).
 - e. There was a discussion on the importance of stakeholder input and the need for some ASCs to more effectively use their advisory boards. There was also a discussion on the desire to have advisory boards communicating with each other and, potentially, the development of a state-wide advisory board (make-up could include members from each centers advisory board).
 - f. Did we get the information we needed on what the future research efforts could be? The answers to this question were varied. Some centers did a good job of identifying

potential areas for growth while other focused more on continuing the type of work they are already doing.

- g. A weakness in the questionnaire was identified in that we did not ask about current collaborative efforts among the ASCs, with campus faculty, with CES and with external partners (agencies, university, NGOs, etc.). We also didn't ask about what opportunities there might be to increase these types of collaborative efforts. **Natalie will send an email to the ASC Superintendents to get answers to these questions (deadline August 2).**
 - h. In the questionnaire, we also did not ask about the ASCs contribution to the teaching mission of the college. Many grad students conduct part or all of their research at off-campus ASCs, but this was still identified as an area for improvement by the LFC. The distance from NMSU main campus and the need for housing at the ASCs were noted as challenges. In addition to distance education classes and housing, good course scheduling is necessary to avoid adding too much time to a degree program.
 - i. The ASCs are inadequately funded in both personnel and operations. Yet, they continue to function and conduct impactful research. What opportunities exist to increase funding?
 - i. Endowed Chairs?
 - ii. Producers/Industry – donations, contracts, cooperative/commodity assessments?
 - iii. IDC for grants conducted at the ASCs should be returned to the ASCs. These unrestricted funds can be used to help purchase equipment and supplies, pay for personnel, and help with maintenance of improvements to facilities.
 - iv. Sales
 - v. Land-use fees
 - vi. Leases
 - vii. The university needs to allow the ASCs to use their local advisory boards and legislators to seek state support for Capital Outlay at the centers. The view of the legislators is that if we don't ask for money, then we don't need it. Stakeholder support has been the key to increased funding at the better funded stations. It should not be overlooked, however that this effort for state funding is still taking a piece of the state legislature's pie, which is limited.
 - viii. The question was asked about GO Bonds and whether or not there is an opportunity for a future GO Bond to support infrastructure and deferred maintenance for off-campus facilities.
3. What should be included in the report?
- a. An introductory paragraph on the mission of the AES and the history of the Experiment Station and the ASCs in New Mexico. This paragraph should include a discussion of the two types of facilities that we have: facilities without faculty that serve as 'research support labs' for campus-based faculty (Fabian Garcia, Leyendecker, CDRRC and Corona) and off-campus centers with faculty stationed at the center. **Steve Loring will write this paragraph.**
 - b. A paragraph on how well the ASCs are helping to meet the AES mission. What is the overall impact of the stations - economic impacts, community impacts, other impacts

(change in behavior, increased knowledge, etc.). Key station impacts could be used as examples here with more impacts being included in the supplemental material. **Jerry Sims, Jane Pierce and Dave Lowry will write this section.**

- c. A paragraph on the future research possibilities and the potential to increase collaborations: Among ASCs, with main campus (including increasing collaboration with graduate students), with CES, and with external entities (industry, NGO's, other universities, etc.). **Steve Guldán, Stephanie Walker and Aaron Scott will write this section.**
- d. Paragraph on the potential for ASC faculty to support the teaching mission of the college: teaching distance education classes, mentoring undergraduate and graduate students, hosting student tours (this could help with recruiting graduate students who would be interested in working with station faculty). **Jerry Sims and Clint Loest will write this section.**
- e. A paragraph on the need for effective use of Advisory Boards, the potential need for a state-wide advisory board, and better communication between existing boards. **Shad Cox and Clint Loest will write this section.**
- f. A paragraph on the need for effective and increased communication/dissemination of the impact of the work conducted at the stations – marketing and PR. Effective use of the Extension network of agents and specialists, and effective use of stakeholders in delivering our message. **Stephanie Walker and Shengrui Yao will write this section.**
- g. A paragraph on resource needs and funding options. **Steve Loring, Shad Cox and Dave Lowry will write this section.**
- h. Uniqueness of centers (research questions, soils, geographic and climatic variability, etc). **Natalie will write this section.**
- i. The Consequences of closing centers. Cost to the community, stakeholders, employees, etc.? (Perhaps include a sentence on the need for this type of decision to be made above the level of this committee). **Jane Pierce and Steve Guldán will write this section.**

4. Timeline

Action Items	Deadline	Responsible Party
First Draft of report sections (all writing teams submit first draft of the sections to Steve Loring)	September 7	All writing team members
Compilation of sections into a draft report and sent to ALL committee members for review	Sept 7 - Sept 14	Steve Loring
Review of draft report completed and returned to Steve Loring	Sept 14 - Oct 1	All committee members
Review edits incorporated into 2 nd draft and sent to ALL committee members and ASC Superintendents for review	Oct 1 - Oct 5	Steve Loring
Supplement material completed and sent to ALL committee members and Superintendents for review	Oct 5	Natalie Goldberg
Review of 2 nd draft and supplemental material completed and returned to Steve Loring and Natalie Goldberg	Oct 5 - Oct 19	All committee members and Superintendents
Review edits of report and create 3 rd draft and sent to ALL committee members for review	Oct 19 - Oct 26	Steve Loring
Committee members review 3 rd draft	Oct 26 - Oct 30	All committee members
Review edits and create final draft to go to Frank Sholedice and Ana Henke (MarComm) for editing, incorporation of images and/or graphics and branding	Oct 30 - Nov 1	Steve Loring and Natalie Goldberg
Editing and branding	Nov 1 – Nov 31	Frank Sholedice and Ana Henke
Submit report to Dean Flores	December 1	Natalie Goldberg and Steve Loring