NRSP – 8 Leadership Meeting
Sunday, January 15, 2017   7:00 a.m.
Garden Salon 2, Town & Country Resort
San Diego, CA

AGENDA

1. Welcome and Introductions – Eric Young

2. Annual reports – Eric Young
    a. Include at least one impact statement from the project's work since Oct 1, 2015 (can be potential impact).
    b. Include any grants awarded since Oct 1, 2015 (granting agency and amount) that contributed to the objectives of NRSP 8.
    c. Include workshops' attendance numbers and institutions represented (if possible).
    d. Need to get annual reports to Huaijun and Mohamed by mid-February.

3. Project Renewal – Eric Young
    a. Writing Committee chair or co-chairs selection
    b. Accomplishment report and proposal timeline (Jan – Aug, 2017)
    c. External project review and proposal peer review process (Sep – Dec, 2017)
    d. NRSP Review Committee review and approval process (Jan – Sep, 2018)

4. NIFA Representative comments – Parag Chitnis, Deputy Director, Institute of Food Production and Sustainability, USDA-NIFA

5. Project Chair/Secretary and Coordinators comments (focus on new issues or concerns)
    a. Huaijun Zhou, Chair 2016-2017
    b. Mohamed Salem, Chair-elect 2016-2017
    c. Coordinators
        i. Aquaculture – John Lui
        ii. Cattle - Juan Medrano
        iii. Equine - Ernie Bailey
        iv. Pig – Chris Tuggle
        v. Poultry - Mary Delany
        vi. Sheep/Goat – Steven White
        vii. Bioinformatics - James Reecy

6. Other items

[handwritten annotations: "NRSP-8 funds ↓ Past year", "↑ past year", "offset by 7 year 2012 5 dat.", "Impact Outputs → Potential Impact", "DATA ACCESS & ROADMAP"]

V. MIDTERM REVIEW (from NRSP Guidelines, rev 2015)

Effective January 2013, all NRSPs must undergo a progress review in the third year. This review is conducted by the Administrative Advisors of the particular project and then reviewed by the NRSP RC. Pending satisfactory progress as detailed below, the committee will forward its recommendation to the regional associations for informational purposes in time for their respective spring meetings and to the ESS for continued funding at the approved level in years four and five. Should an NRSP fail to meet performance expectations or funding commitments, the committee may recommend that funding approval be altered or termination by the ESS.

The midterm review shall consider the requirements and criteria set forth above for the development/approval of an NRSP in *Section IV. Establishing New NRSPs*.

1. **NRSP Mission**
   Does the project demonstrate consistency with the mission of the NRSP Program?

2. **Relevance to National Issue**
   Is there evidence that the NRSP is continuing to address a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions.
   a. **Relevance to Stakeholders**
      Is there evidence of stakeholder use of project outputs? Are there project outcomes that aide in development of or contribute to the discussion of public policy. If so please describe.

3. **Management and Business Plan**
   The midterm review must reflect progress toward meeting external funding expectations. Failure to meet funding goals may result in alterations to the off the top budget contribution provided by the SAES system.

4. **Progress Toward Objectives and Projected Outcomes**
   In the midterm review the project must demonstrate productivity, progress toward original objectives and the relationship between projected goals, actual accomplishments and any impacts to date. As appropriate, this assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs to date.

5. **Integration**
   As appropriate, the NRSP must indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders. The midterm review the project must demonstrate actual collaborations and any new partnerships built during the project period. The report should address the degree to which the full team is engaged in project planning and implementation. Discuss plans to correct any weaknesses that may have been identified.

6. **Outreach, Communications and Assessment:**
   The midterm review must demonstrate the extent that the NRSP is working to effectively communicate project results to the intended audiences and others who need them.