

MINUTES OF APS FAC/EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Conference Call

September 12, 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attendance..... 2

Call to Order..... 2

1. Constitutional changes..... 2

 a. APS Senior Editor terms 2

 b. CF motion to change student membership definition..... 3

2. APSnet posting of Expanded-Council strategic planning responses from Milwaukee..... 3

3. Ad hoc committee to develop electronic questionnaire on disciplinary sections and representation on Council and survey the membership..... 3

4. EXEC/FAC composition modification (Discussed after item 7b.)..... 4

5. ISPP Proposal and ad hoc Centennial Planning committee (Discussed after item 7b.)..... 4

6. Ad hoc New Products Committee 4

7. Motions from APS members: 4

 a. APS Award for team research (Discussed after item 5 cont.) 4

 b. Return to old way of meeting session planning..... 4

 c. Society name change (Discussed after 7a cont.)..... 4

4 cont. EXEC/FAC composition/modification..... 4

5 cont. ISPP Proposal and ad hoc Centennial Planning committee 4

 a. ISPP proposal 4

 b. ad hoc Centennial Planning Committee 5

7 cont. Motions from APS members: 5

 a. APS Award for team research 5

 c. Society name change 5

8. Meetings – if and who to attend (Discussed after item 9) 6

9. Additional item. Draft of White Paper from ad hoc Bioterrorism Committee..... 6

8. Meetings – if and who to attend	6
a. Midyear Council –dates and who should attend.....	6
b. Fall FAC meeting.....	6
d. Tri-Societies meeting	7
e. ESA meeting.....	7
f. CSSP meeting	7
c. CAST-Kellogg meeting.....	7
Next conference call scheduled for October 10, 2002.....	7
Attachments:.....	7

Attendance

Present: J. Fletcher, G. Bergstrom, C. Ishimaru, J. Sherwood, J. Andrews, J. MacDonald, E. Stromberg

Staff: S. Nelson, M. Smith

Absent: S. Slack, M. Matheron, R. Ploetz

Call to Order

President J. Fletcher called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Central

The agenda was distributed electronically September 5 (see attachment 1).

1. Constitutional changes

a. APS Senior Editor terms

J. Fletcher has not been satisfied with the process for electronic voting on Council issues. Even when input on nominees or motions has been requested, she has received very few comments. She requested that the Executive Committee think about this process and possible alternatives, such as conference calls.

J. Fletcher reviewed that Council approved the constitutional change on APS Senior Editor terms. The next step is for the proposal to go to membership for vote. She asked when and how this would happen. Possibly this item could be grouped with other items that are in the works. G. Schumann wants to see this item resolved so that changes can be instituted by January 2003. Constitutional changes have not been put to electronic vote of membership, however membership did approve electronic voting on constitutional changes. Only a few (<200) letter ballots would need to be mailed, so this would not be an expensive process. The process would take six weeks from the time the ballots are sent out. If ballots were sent out next week, responses could be back by November.

ACTION: M. Smith will send a proof of the motion to J. Fletcher. After it is approved, M. Smith will send it out to membership.

b. CF motion to change student membership definition

M. Bjerkness presented this item to CF for discussion at the annual meeting in Milwaukee. She receives about one or more requests a year from “working students” regarding fees. J. Andrews reviewed the concerns and the information on the issue (see additional information and description in blue below). CF developed a motion on the issue. J. Andrews asked Exec to preview the motion before it is presented to Council.

Motion from CF: Any person enrolled as a degree-seeking student in an accredited college or university is eligible for student membership. The student status must be certified annually by the major professor or department head.

Discussion. Any student involved in a degree program would be eligible regardless of whether their employment status. Current wording says they can't work more than 2/3 time. The motion from CF does not include a term limit, which makes working students eligible indefinitely. Exec suggested adding term limits to the motion. The motion would require approval by Council. J. Fletcher suggested that no action was necessary at this time. Exec discussed the possibility of a Council conference call or taking up the item at Midyear. J. Andrews agreed that the motion should be added to the Midyear agenda, so that the ideas of Exec and CF can be presented to Council. **ACTION.** J. Fletcher will add the CF motion on changing student membership to the midyear meeting agenda.

Additional information copied from agenda: an email from J. Andrews to J. Fletcher.

Dear Jacque: At Milwaukee, Councilors' Forum addressed a recurring concern raised by "working" student members related to fees. The easiest way for me to present this is to copy below the minutes from our CF meeting, which appear below outlining the issue. Basically, this change would strike the penalty for working and the time limitation.

APS Student Member Status: A potential APS student member brought the following concern to the attention of APS headquarters. The requirements for student membership do not address "working" students' needs, such as individuals who are technicians at a university and also students pursuing an advanced degree. This group cannot afford regular membership and journal rates, but because of employment (full-time), do not qualify for student rates. They are not in a post-doc position, and often their compensation is much less than a post-doc, yet they would be required to pay more for membership. It would benefit APS to involve those practitioners through discounted membership rates or more liberal student rates. Current APS constitutional policy concerning student members is that "any person enrolled in an accredited college or university is eligible for student membership, provided that the student is not gainfully employed more than two thirds time. The student and employment status must be certified annually by the major professor or department head. This membership category can only be maintained for 5 years, at which time a Student Member must become either a Post Doctorate Member or a Regular Member. Membership is activated upon receipt of the applicant's dues." After some discussion, Councilors' Forum proposed and passed a motion to modify the current APS definition of student membership to read as follows. "Any person enrolled as a degree-seeking student in an accredited college or university is eligible for student membership. The student status must be certified annually by the major professor or department head.

Membership is activated upon receipt of the applicant's dues." The proposed changes in the APS constitution would have to be approved by the membership. I am not sure the last part about changes having to be approved by the membership is correct, but certainly they would require a vote by Council.

2. APSnet posting of Expanded-Council strategic planning responses from Milwaukee

J. Fletcher asked about the posting on APSnet of responses from Extended Council's strategic planning session. S. Nelson indicated that M. Smith had already posted the responses. Hard copies were sent to those who were unable to attend the discussion at the annual meeting.

3. Ad hoc committee to develop electronic questionnaire on disciplinary sections and representation on Council and survey the membership

J. Fletcher announced that she had developed a list of nominees for the ad hoc committee on developing an electronic questionnaire, as discussed at the annual meeting of Council in Milwaukee: E. Roskopf, J.

Lundquist, F. Nutter, G. Bergstrom, and M. Smith. There was agreement that the committee composition provided adequate coverage of disciplines and was large enough. There was a vote on nominees for chair of the committee. The chair would consult with G. Bergstrom and E. Roszkopf. **ACTION.** J. Fletcher will contact people for membership and ask F. Nutter if he would chair the committee.

4. EXEC/FAC composition modification (Discussed after item 7b.)

5. ISPP Proposal and ad hoc Centennial Planning committee (Discussed after item 7b.)

6. Ad hoc New Products Committee

The idea for this committee came from Staff, especially regarding electronic offerings. J. Fletcher offered suggestions for the committee composition: J. MacDonald, M. Davis (Workshops Chair), E. Stromberg (fiscal considerations), and a graduate student. She also suggested J. MacDonald as Chair and asked for suggestions on additional members. There was general agreement that the committee should be kept small. Suggestions included adding someone from Staff and a young professional from industry or consulting. B. Cobb was mentioned as a possibility. Staff has been meeting about this item. Specifics weren't gone into, but they are looking at things that cross over all programs in APS. S. Rideout was also suggested as a representative from industry. E. Stromberg added that the ad hoc committee could contact people as needed, keeping the actual committee small. J. Fletcher requested additional names be sent to her in the next week. **ACTION.** J. Fletcher will contact J. MacDonald about chairing the committee. **ACTION.** S. Nelson will think about and get back to J. Fletcher on how to best to involve Staff in the committee and how this committee can coordinate its activities with those of OEC.

7. Motions from APS members:

a. APS Award for team research (Discussed after item 5 cont.)

b. Return to old way of meeting session planning.

N. Schaad brought this item to J. Fletcher. He expressed concern that the Bacteriology Committee 's enthusiasm and energy is being suppressed, and fears we are losing members' interest because there aren't enough sessions for them. **Discussion.** How representative is this view? Perhaps additional input should be sought. There was a general feeling that going back to the old way of doing things was not an option. Perhaps there is a problem or a perception of limited opportunities that should be looked at. The Scientific Programs Board is looking at adequate representation in sessions. **ACTION.** J. Fletcher will write to N. Schaad thanking him for his input and ask SPB to look at getting equitable representation. She will also contact the Chair of the Bacteriology Committee for input.

c. Society name change (Discussed after 7a cont.)

4 cont. EXEC/FAC composition/modification

J. Sherwood asked if there had been a motion at the Council Meeting in Milwaukee regarding Exec/FAC committee composition. There was uncertainty about whether there had been a motion or just general discussion of the topic. This item will be on the agenda for the next conference call. G. Bergstrom, J. Sherwood and E. Stromberg will continue working on this item.

5 cont. ISPP Proposal and ad hoc Centennial Planning committee

a. ISPP proposal

S. Nelson gave an update on the bid for the ISPP meeting. The letter and proposal is written and ready to submit. C. Delp agreed to send a name for S. Nelson to contact about the final proposal submission. The issue of paying dues to ISPP was revisited. J. Sherwood indicated we could send the dues, but this may not be the best idea. Should we send dues (without having received an audited budget from ISPP) just this time? A concern voiced was that not paying the dues might affect our chances of hosting the meeting. J. Fletcher

suggested we consider pros and cons about paying the dues. **ACTION.** S. Nelson will call Peter Scott and discuss the issue.

b. ad hoc Centennial Planning Committee

E. Stromberg, P. Peterson, R. Ploetz, R. Gergerich, a Councilors' Forum liaison, and a graduate student (to be identified) were received as nominees for membership on the ad hoc Centennial Planning Committee. J. Fletcher added that terms of membership needed to be discussed. Because planning for the Centennial is beginning six years in advance of the meeting, should the same people stay on the committee for that entire period? The graduate student would likely have graduated by then, and the CF member would probably no longer be on CF. There was general agreement that the terms for committee membership would be for three years.

There was a discussion about when the Congress would inform APS of its decision on hosting the ISPP in 2008. S. Nelson did not know when this would happen. It was suggested that committee appointments not be made until after the proposal has been approved.

7 cont. Motions from APS members:

a. APS Award for team research

Exec discussed the proposal by J. Marois, which was sent to J. MacDonald, for a new APS award on team research (see attachment 2). **Discussion.** The Ruth Allen Award can be used for "team research". There might be problems administering this type of an award. Guidelines might be difficult to define. Even defining the term "team" could be problematic. G. Bergstrom suggested there would be benefit in looking into the overall awards coverage via the Awards Committee or possibly an ad hoc committee. J. Fletcher asked if awards are being developed in the context of the strategic plan. Do we want to focus on this as an issue? The Awards Committee, an ad hoc committee, or a membership survey could evaluate this. Are there glaring areas of deficiencies in the context of the strategic plan? **ACTION.** J. Fletcher will contact the chair of the Awards Committee and ask them to look at this issue and provide an analysis of how current and proposed awards address the strategic plan.

c. Society name change

J. Fletcher presented a proposal from A. K. Vidaver regarding a name change for the society. **Discussion.** APS has dealt with this issue several times in the past, and there has been considerable resistance to the idea. It might not be a good idea to present this at the same time membership is considering a governance changes. S. Nelson suggested we could put this out as a motion for membership vote. We could lose some members, but might gain others. It could be included in the electronic questionnaire developed by the ad hoc committee focused on disciplinary sections and representation on Council. However, the committee for the name change should be a different committee and should include representatives of industry, extension, academia, USDA, young professionals, teaching, and at least one representative from Council. Names of possible committee members were A. Paulus, A. K. Vidaver, M. Cline, D. Beadle, S. Miller, P. Lipps, G. Munkvold, R. Belanger, L. Sosnoskie, S. Hurtt, B. Cobb. D. Beadle was nominated as chair. **ACTION.** J. Fletcher will contact appointees and charge the committee to examine the name of the Society with regard to the strategic plan.

If the committee sees benefit in changing the Society's name, it should come up with only one new name so that members only have to decide between "APS" and the "Proposed Name". The process used to change the name of the society was discussed. G. Bergstrom and J. Fletcher offered that the process would be like that used for any other recommendation. An ad hoc committee would make a recommendation to Council. Council would discuss the recommendation and decide what action to take. The question of how much and when to involve membership was raised. It was agreed that it would be up to the ad hoc committee to decide how to get information from the membership on the issue. In summary, J. Fletcher will appoint an ad hoc committee to examine the name of the Society in the context of the strategic plan. If the committee recommends changing the name, they should propose a name. She will advise the committee not to poll

membership at this time. She will also encourage them to involve K. Eversole in their discussions, as A. K. Vidaver suggested.

Information inserted from agenda:

8/2/02 email from Anne Vidaver

As promised, here's my request to have the society consider a name change for the 21st century. As those in attendance at the annual meeting heard, even from a 'friend', we have an unwieldy and difficult to understand name. Assuming you ask an ad-hoc committee for advice, please be reminded that one of our most successful (i.e. generating monetary support) sister societies, the Am. Soc. Physiology changed its name to the Am. Soc. For Plant Biology (I think that's the right title). And physiology is easier to understand than pathology. Thus, a key resource person would be Brain Hays from that society and Jim Cook, a member. You might also seek the advice of Kellye, one of the most pragmatic and realistic people I know.

We need all the good will and understanding of what we do that we can get: making it difficult to do so is not wise. Our logos can be of assistance here, but really need to be considered up front.

8. Meetings – if and who to attend (Discussed after item 9)

9. Additional item. Draft of White Paper from ad hoc Bioterrorism Committee.

J. Fletcher asked for input on the draft of the 2nd white paper from the bioterrorism committee. The first white paper was very useful. J. Cook is already using the draft of the 2nd white paper with permission from J. Fletcher. She asked for input on the draft. Minor editorial changes were mentioned. As for contextual issues, J. Sherwood suggested adding a wind up paragraph and a set of recommendations. J. Andrew agreed: a brief synopsis or bulleted list would be helpful. A summary page should be added, since the draft is quite long and heavy reading.

As for contextual issues, J. Andrews raised three points. He questioned the statement that the “official list should be limited to exotic pathogens”. The need for centers for plant disease control was also questioned, as there are already institutes involved or should be involved in disease diagnosis, i.e. NAPIS, CAPS, some APS committees and others. He also asked if anyone had approached the CDC for input on what could be done for plant diseases.

J. Fletcher advised that if there was strong reservation against the draft of the 2nd white paper, it should go back to the committee. E. Stromberg also raised points on the 3rd page of the document, regarding the proposal for diagnostic networks. He emphasized there would be a need for continued support for building and sustaining the centers. J. Fletcher commented that a statement on publishing materials on sensitive issues was taken out of the original draft. This is a major contextual issue. ASM is looking at this same issue.

ACTION. J. Fletcher will ask the Pub Board to look into the issue of an APS stand on publication of sensitive materials. **ACTION.** J. Fletcher will contact J. Cook and let him know that Exec supports online publication of the 2nd white paper, but has some reservations on content.

8. Meetings – if and who to attend

a. Midyear Council –dates and who should attend

Discussion of item postponed until next conference call.

b. Fall FAC meeting

The Fall FAC meeting is scheduled for Dec 5-6, 2002 (noon to noon). In addition to the sessions on Thursday afternoon and Friday morning, there will be a dinner discussion on Thursday night. This will be a combined meeting of Exec and FAC. FAC issues will be the focus. If time allows, Exec items will be handled.

ACTION. J. Sherwood will work with M. Smith to develop a FAC meeting agenda.

d. Tri-Societies meeting

ACTION. J. Fletcher will write a letter of regret that she will not be in attendance.

e. ESA meeting

J. Fletcher has written to the President of ESA, but hasn't heard back yet.

f. CSSP meeting

The next CSSP meeting is on Dec 7th. **ACTION.** J. Fletcher will contact S. Slack about attending. She may also be able to go.

c. CAST-Kellogg meeting

See description and additional information in agenda. **ACTION.** S. Nelson will contact T. Gruber about the invitation to attend the "Cultivating Leadership for a Changing Agriculture: Shared Leadership I" in Colorado Springs. He will let J. Fletcher what he finds out.

Next conference call scheduled for October 10, 2002

The conference call ended at 10:55 a.m. Central

Respectfully submitted,

Carol A. Ishimaru

Secretary, APS

Attachments:

1. Agenda 9-12-2002
2. APS-20TEAM-20AWARD.wpd

Attachment 1:

AGENDA

Executive Committee Conference Call, September 12, 2002

1. Constitutional changes

a. APS Senior Editors terms - Constitutional change approved by Council – now goes to membership vote

b. CF motion to change student membership definition – not yet brought to full Council - *see description, below, Additional Information (blue)*

2. APSnet posting of Expanded-Council strategic planning responses from Milwaukee?

3. Ad hoc committee to develop electronic questionnaire on disciplinary sections and representation on Council and survey the mbrship. (Erin, John Lundquist, Forrest Nutter, Gary Bergstrom, Marci?)

4. EXEC/FAC composition modification – approved by Council; add to MOO (JLS?).

5. ISPP Proposal and ad hoc Centennial Planning Committee

(suggestions received for committee: Eric Stromberg, Paul Peterson, Randy Ploetz, Rose Gergerich, Councilors' Forum liaison, graduate student. Question: would the same people stay on the committee for six years? The grad student would likely no longer be a grad student, nor would the CF member still be on CF.)

6. Ad hoc New Products Committee (suggestions: Jim MacDonald, Mike Davis (Workshops Chair), Eric Stromberg (fiscal considerations), grad student; who else?)

7. Motions from APS members:

a. APS Award for team research – *see attached file below, Additional Information, green*

b. Return to "old" way of meeting session planning - Norm Schaad brought this to JF. He feels that the Bacteriology Committee's enthusiasm and energy is being suppressed and fears we are losing members' interest because there aren't enough sessions for them.

c. Society name change - *see message, below, Additional Information, red.*

8. Meetings - if and who to attend

a. Midyear Council – dates and who should attend (send out clarification to everyone)

b. Fall FAC meeting - when? who?

- c. CAST-Kellogg meeting - *see description below, Additional Information, teal.*
- d. Tri-Societies meeting
- e. ESA meeting
- f. CSSP meeting

Additional Information on above items:

#1.b. CF motion from John Andrews.

Dear Jacque: At Milwaukee, Councilors' Forum addressed a recurring concern raised by "working" student members related to fees. The easiest way for me to present this is to copy below the minutes from our CF meeting, which appear below outlining the issue. Basically, this change would strike the penalty for working and the time limitation. APS Student Member Status: A potential APS student member brought the following concern to the attention of APS headquarters. The requirements for student membership do not address "working" students' needs, such as individuals who are technicians at a university and also students pursuing an advanced degree. This group cannot afford regular membership and journal rates, but because of employment (full-time), do not qualify for student rates. They are not in a post-doc position, and often their compensation is much less than a post-doc, yet they would be required to pay more for membership. It would benefit APS to involve those practitioners through discounted membership rates or more liberal student rates. Current APS constitutional policy concerning student members is that "any person enrolled in an accredited college or university is eligible for student membership, provided that the student is not gainfully employed more than two-thirds time. The student and employment status must be certified annually by the major professor or department head. This membership category can only be maintained for 5 years, at which time a Student Member must become either a Post Doctorate Member or a Regular Member. Membership is activated upon receipt of the applicant's dues." After some discussion, Councilors' Forum proposed and passed a motion to modify the current APS definition of student membership to read as follows. "Any person enrolled as a degree-seeking student in an accredited college or university is eligible for student membership. The student status must be certified annually by the major professor or department head. Membership is activated upon receipt of the applicant's dues." The proposed changes in the APS constitution would have to be approved by the membership. I am not sure the last part about changes having to be approved by the membership is correct, but certainly they would require a vote by Council.

#7.a. APS Award for team research - 8/1/02 email to Jim MacDonald from Jim Marois

#7.c. Society Name Change - 8/2/02 email from Anne Vidaver

As promised, here's my request to have the society consider a name change for the 21st century. As those in attendance at the annual meeting heard, even from a 'friend', we have an unwieldy and difficult to understand name. Assuming you ask an ad-hoc committee for advice, please be reminded that one of our most successful (i.e. generating monetary support) sister societies, the Am. Soc. Physiology changed its name to the Am. Soc. For Plant Biology (I think that's the right title). And physiology is easier to understand than pathology. Thus, a key resource person would be Brain Hyps from that society and Jim Cook, a member. You might also seek the advice of Kellye, one of the most pragmatic and realistic people I know.

We need all the good will and understanding of what we do that we can get: making it difficult to do so is not wise. Our logos can be of assistance here, but really need to be considered up front.

#8.c. CAST-Kellogg meeting - info from Theresa Gruber, CAST

You may recall that in May 2001, CAST partnered with the Institute for Conservation Leadership (ICL) in holding a leadership workshop for scientific societies and sustainable agricultural organizations, which was funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Farm Foundation, and USDA-CSREES. Following the success of that workshop, CAST and ICL submitted a proposal for a multi-year leadership program to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, which was recently funded!

We are now on a very fast track to implement the "**Cultivating Leadership for a Changing Agriculture**" program. Our first workshop will be October 19-22, 2002 and will be very similar to the pilot workshop, dubbed "Shared Leadership I." We are inviting scientific societies, sustainable agriculture organizations, and university-based sustainable agriculture related institutes.

Your society is invited to a unique opportunity to strengthen its effectiveness and its individuals' leadership abilities. We hope you can join us! Details are below, and I am attaching the application form. We are also mailing hard copies of the application to your society president and executive. We will have additional workshops and other capacity-building opportunities over the next three years, but some will be available only to those who have participated in the Shared Leadership I workshop.

Please give me a call if you have any questions, at 202-675-8333 ext. 11, or call Kathy Buhman at 515-292-2125 ext. 25.

Best regards,

Teresa Gruber
Executive Vice President

Cultivating Leadership for a Changing Agriculture: Shared Leadership I

Date: October 19-22, 2002

Location: The Nature Place (a beautiful resort outside Colorado Springs, CO)

Application due: September 13, 2002

This program will help leaders build effective organizations in a changing world, engage new people with diverse perspectives and create successful partnerships. This program will support participating board members and executive staff in developing the abilities they need to effectively lead and govern their groups.

Participating organizations in this three-day Shared Leadership I Workshop will

- receive on-going coaching and consulting assistance
- be eligible to participate in the Shared Leadership II Workshop
- be eligible to apply for small grants to develop collaborative projects

This workshop is part of Cultivating Leadership for a Changing Agriculture, a three-year program funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation to strengthen the capacity of sustainable agriculture organizations and institutes in universities and agriculturally-based scientific societies. Over the next three years, four Shared Leadership I workshops and three Shared Leadership II workshops will be offered.

Who should participate? Eight organizations will be selected from sustainable agriculture organizations, university-based institutes of sustainable agriculture, and agriculturally based scientific societies to participate in this first workshop. A team of three leaders from each organization is required. Your team would consist of the executive director, a current strong leader or board member, and an emerging leader.

How much will it cost? The cost for each organization will be \$800, which includes workshop participation and follow-up coaching and consultation, shuttle from CO Springs to the Nature Place, lodging and meals. Limited

scholarships may also be available.

How can I apply or learn more about the program? Please reply to Barbara Rusmore Barbara@icl.org, Brian Lewis Brian@icl.org or Kathy Buhman kbuhman@cast-science.org to request a packet containing more detailed information and an application.

Sponsoring Organizations

The Institute for Conservation Leadership (ICL) empowers leaders and strengthens groups that protect and conserve the Earth's environment. They do this by helping leaders improve their leadership skills, by building connections between groups with similar goals, and by supporting these groups' progress with training, consulting and facilitation. Further information is available at their website: www.icl.org.

The Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST) is an international consortium of 37 scientific and professional societies in agriculture, food, and related sciences. Its mission is to identify food and fiber, environmental and other agricultural issues and to interpret related scientific research information for legislators, regulators, and the media for use in public policy decision-making. More information is available at their website: www.cast-science.org.

Attachment 2:

APS Team Award

Present APS awards are to individuals to recognize their accomplishments during their careers.

In contrast:

- 1) Most of the research being published is under multiple authorship funded by grants to many individuals across several disciplines, organizations, and locations.
- 2) More problems are being addressed at a systems level to find viable solutions. The old model of a graduate student working in one lab with one professor is being replaced by thesis efforts that involve several labs and disciplines.
- 3) A major challenge for universities, private industry, and government agencies is to determine how to appropriately recognize a particular individual's contribution to a group effort. This especially affects tenure and promotion actions.

Proposal

APS develops an award that recognizes the efforts of a team to address a particular question in plant pathology. Things that could be considered are: complexity of the problem, contributions to plant pathology and other disciplines, degree of success, and level of interaction among investigators. As quantifiers could consider number of grants, number of students involved, and number of publications. Also could use citation index, other awards by team members based on the project, and extent of adaption by stakeholders as indicators of success.

Challenges:

Many of the team efforts, by definition, go beyond contributions to Phytopathology. They may make significant contributions to entomology, genetics, microbiology, agronomy, etc. Do we recognize non-plant pathologists/APS members on the team? I think we have to.

Do we involve other societies in the award decision process? I expect we have enough expertise in most areas already in the society, but I think the Awards Committee should be encouraged to go outside of the society if they feel it is necessary.

What will the award be? Trip to Hawaii for everyone and their families would be nice, but probably not feasible. Maybe a certificate to each team member with special recognition to the team leader - if one is identified.