

Minutes of the CEDA Meeting
December 9, 2006

Robert N. Wiedenmann, Chair-elect

Meeting called to order 3:42 pm
Introductions made by all attendees.
Agenda distributed

Gary Brewer asked for approval of the 2005 meeting minutes. Motion for approval by Ken Grace; seconded. Approved by voice vote.

George Kennedy made a presentation about the Entomological Foundation. He distributed their Annual Report and reviewed the Foundation's programs. The Foundation is an independent, nonprofit education organization formed by the ESA Governing Board. The Foundation was established to be independent, and to be able to solicit and support education programs, in order to build the future for entomology through new entomologists. Through the first ten years, the Foundation has provided a number of awards, but with limited outreach. Since 2000, they have expanded fund raising and programs.

George asked that CEDA support the Foundation in any way we can.

Report by Floyd Shockley, chair of the ESA Membership Committee. For the first time in 4 years, there was a loss in membership. As of the November Governing Board Report, at Sept 30, ESA was down 500 members – due to regular members choosing not to renew or to join initially. The membership Committee was given 8 charges – all were achieved, plus the Committee initiated 6 new ones. One positive note was an increase in emeritus members. However, this is a subsidized category, so there was no gain in income. The Committee suggested creating an emeritus group, formally having a liaison in the Membership Committee. It is difficult for ESA to track emeritus entomologists, so Departments can help to provide addresses of emeritus members. In addition to emeritus members, Departments can help with information about the category termed the “missing middle” – students in transition to employment. On graduating, many of these new graduates decide not to renew, as the rates increase above the amount for students. Even though transition membership stair-steps, the graduates are not renewing membership. Because of the mobility of this group, ESA loses track of their addresses. There were losses in all membership categories, as well as in all branches and sections. The Committee wants to encourage dialogue between CEDA and the Membership Committee that can be pursued next year, both to regain regular members and target the missing middle. The Committee also needs feedback on what works or doesn't. Gary opened up to floor for comments. May Berenbaum – have other societies have similar drop off? Floyd Shockley – most societies have lost members from a few years ago, but ESA may have lost more than others. Most groups (commodity or specialty) also have lost membership.

Gary – CEDA initiated some conversations with Frank Gilstrap in the summer; Gary asked Frank to discuss his views as president and his requests to CEDA.

Frank Gilstrap – over the summer and fall, there were several conference calls with CEDA leaders about issue of leadership. As ESA moves into discussion for renewal of the society, ESA will need more leadership. There will be a new hierarchy with greater need for leaders. Past roles included serving as chair of a Section; Section Chairs provided programming, whereas the new format will require more leadership in the newly revamped sections. Expectations and needs will be greater. CEDA members are, by definition, leaders. How do we encourage leadership among faculty members? ESA struggles to get faculty lined up to be leaders or get commitments from potential leaders. ESA needs support from institutions to faculty for them to be to serve in leadership roles. If we look for leaders, we need to train people appropriately – should we do this as a society? Possibly. ESA Past Presidents could either provide the training or at least provide a template and discuss needs. ESA also needs greater leadership from CEDA, helping to move the Society forward and develop a greater role for CEDA. By virtue of leadership, CEDA members see the bigger picture. Also what does CEDA want from the Society or the Governing Board?

Frank asked if there were any issues or questions from the floor.

Steve Yaninek – CEDA previously criticized the Governing Board for ESA’s absence at the table in discussions on policy-making in Washington, particularly where funds will be distributed. There is still the need for ESA to serve that role, but how do we leverage our disciplinary interests in the changing landscape? Jim Harper added that this was particularly critical where funds are concerned.

Frank asked -- how do we turn around the relationship?

Gary B – increase the dialogue between CEDA and the Governing Board.

Frank – why do we not have a CEDA member on the Governing Board? Carl Jones (section D) is on both CEDA and Governing Board, but he is not formally representing CEDA. Why do we not look to have CEDA clearly represented at the table? Is CEDA willing to do this? Another part of the renewal plan is the idea of a network, which can be organized in either formal or informal ways. Networks will be recognized and be a central part of the renewed ESA. Encourage all of CEDA to think about ideas offered when GB comes back, start dialog about providing leadership and support.

Sonny Ramaswamy – we have discussed this about CEDA being more engaged. ESA is important to all of us. Opportunity to have representation from CEDA makes sense. On another note, Why do emeritus members get subsidized memberships?

Frank – ESA is trying to solicit input from emeritus members, with a luncheon and other meetings. As a society we do not put enough value on the emeritus members. Do we do anything to promote the things they can offer, such as mentoring leaders? How do we involve them in the discussion about change and renewal?

Rob W. – can we use the emeritus members as mentors for new leadership?

Frank – We can try to reach out to those that wish to do this, but some emeritus members will not want to do so.

Jim H – Floyd, how can you get the list to us of those that dropped out? Can we find out names? That would help.

Floyd – will get a list to CEDA after first of the year and before the Feb 15th membership deadline. Even if we don't know where they are, at least letting the Membership Committee know that people are gone allows the committee to try to track them down.

Kevin Heinz – what are concerns about courting students to have greater role in leadership? Given the transitional dropout, are they not seeing enough in the society for themselves? If the students view the society as their own, is there a down side?

Frank – the students don't know how to get into the mechanism of how ESA operates. Looking at the business meeting, there are few students present; those few there are willing to do something. Maybe mentoring those that are there and interested would provide a benefit to ESA. We have proposed a workshop on how the society works, so the students would be more willing to serve. Will take some time; students may not volunteer and provide the time on their own, but maybe we can encourage them.

Kevin H. – on a smaller level, solicit them for how the annual meeting runs, visibility; involvement in symposium development, so they have a greater stake in the meeting. This could be the first step in getting them more involved and help with leading.

Floyd – one thing the society plans to do is a CV posting to provide the connection between the society and students. Some are involved already.

Tom Holtzer – we have to recognize the short time horizon. It may be only one year before they are no longer a student. Is there a way to “fast track” the students into positions?

Frank – don't have to catch only them as students – also as the “missing middle”

Tom – exactly – that is the group we are needing to capture. One way we highlight them is through awards – can that be an entry into what ESA can do for them and what they can do for ESA?

Floyd – PhD students, because of time available during their degree to get involved.

Jon Tollefson – rather than think of them as students, think of them as young professionals, young members, and they will take that status with them in the future as they graduate and get jobs.

Frank – good idea, drop the term “student”.

Gary – leading discussion about CEDA and ESA. CEDA began that discussion a few years ago.

Ray Noblet – what was the challenge?

Gary – Challenge was for CEDA to be more involved in ESA leadership.

Carl J – because we really are active members of CAST and Co-Farm, would it be better to be formal representatives of ESA? If we have formal organization, might be fruitful to have a liaison to GB. Number of Dept Heads on GB has been low, but many issues on GB affect departments.

Gary – challenge is to increase impact of CEDA by some sort of affiliation with the GB; do we want a voice on GB?

Sonny – perhaps *ex officio* membership on Governing Board?

Ray – CEDA members more responsible than any others for welfare of entomology in our own states. Deeper issue in branches. If we want to revitalize entomology, we need to educate entire society. In SEB, leadership is self-perpetuating. Creative faculty members do not get asked.

Jim Capinera – Look at declines, losses. We are tied to Agriculture and Ag has declined. In academia, we survive by reaching out, being creative. The Society has been fixed. If it wants to survive, it will have to reach out and be more creative. Maybe our role is to be “the few and the proud”. But we also do not do well tracking of PhD and PhD wannabees. We overlook those that are not researchers – pest control, beekeepers, etc. Can we reach out better to those folks? Pull in those other societies to represent entomology in the largest sense.

Gary – if we wish to pursue this, may be easier as reps to GB.

Ken Grace – that sounds like the kind of reorganization ESA is trying to do.

Sonny – how do we look – lean and mean? How do we serve as umbrella for these other groups?

Gary – that’s what we have been trying to do.

Rob – idea of network is good, but do we want to have rep (*ex officio*) on GB?

Gary -- Does that remove independence?

ZB – certainly if we operate as a network, there is no issue of control. A network would serve as a place to house groups.

Steve Y – If GB has not had much participation from CEDA members, then an *ex officio* membership could be worthwhile. Logistically, it may be difficult to provide the time.

Carl – will have future changes in the “refreshing” in ESA and CEDA ought to be involved in this.

Mark Ascerno – how do we generate the kind of ideas for ESA to be thinking about? Can’t do this in the short meeting we have. Even the hour with GB is insufficient to influence the process.

Carl – GB is moving toward electronic voting and exchange. Perhaps GB could get input from CEDA.

Mark – CEDA will have to respond to the requests generated.

John O – use regional NCA, AC meetings to have some of these discussions. Do the state reports electronically, then use the meeting to start the discussions of issues.

Sonny – exactly. Instead of the bookkeeping kind of meetings, spend time to discuss issues.

Tom – that meeting is paid by CSREES, so we need to be careful not to use it for ESA, CEDA business.

Gary – perhaps we could have regional CEDA meetings at branch meetings.

Tom – there is enormous dedication needed to be on GB. We as a group need to think about how much we have to give to the society before clamoring to be on the GB. Have to work with all society issues, not just those affecting CEDA. Do we want to take on that kind of challenge? Can we just keep the level of activity and influence now?

Tom – We need to be realistic. Do we have people power to do this?

Gary – what do we want CEDA to do?

Steve – The Society is important to us. Students and post-docs get visibility. It is important to us to have the society there. What should our role be? Where do we find the extra time to engage the GB in the way they may want our involvement? What can we contribute that would make a difference? Engaging without clear objectives will not get us far.

Grant Kinzer – what do we have to do? We don’t have membership from those other (non-PhD) entomologists working in the field. If we had a CEDA member on the GB 40 years ago, would we have included those other groups (e.g., beekeepers)?

Ray – how can we provide the best input to society. Use officers of CEDA and past chair to form a committee to provide input. Review and support electronically.

Sonny – we're all busy. We have to step up and make it happen.

Gary - CEDA has some value to each of us, but we have never decided what we want the group to do.

Ken Grace – CEDA has value as the only association of academic heads. Over past few years we have discussed declining programs, amalgamation of departments. We see CEDA as separate from ESA, with separate issues. CEDA serves the purpose to as a forum to discuss those issues that affect academic units. We took on Co-Farm because ESA couldn't. As a small group, we could do so. Gave entomology some representation at a national level. We still represent a variety of different units at a national level.

Gary – This is a good time to have the CAST and Co-Farm reports.

ZB Mayo – brief report about what CAST is and does. Issue papers and publications are being used and considered at national level. CEDA dues that we pay are \$629 and that is the amount made available to CEDA members to go to two meetings per year. CAST wants representation from as many groups as possible. Issue paper and commentaries will be an important part of CAST. Commentaries are to get out in front of the scientific studies to address emerging issues. Need some background and know where gaps are. We (CEDA) need to propose some issues; they have good reception when in Washington. Desire by legislators to get info from CAST to get unbiased info. Need to get input on entomology issues.

Tom – important for us to help pick projects to get ideas and topics into the process. Give ideas to our rep (ZB). ZB is willing to be CEDA rep for one more year.

ZB – CEDA ought to come up with a new round of the white papers as was done before.

Rick Meyer – CEDA pays \$500 a year to Co-Farm. Focus is lobbying for increasing funding for agriculture. Rick's representing CEDA is limited by being a federal employee. We should look at Create-21. CEDA ought to have different Co-Farm rep to be able to have a voice. They have monthly meetings in DC. Usually 7-9 societies are present, others call in. Co-Farm cosponsoring a lunch and learn series for staffers. Most Co-Farm reps are former staffers.

Carl - ESA doesn't have scientists on site. Haven't looked at emeritus members. Can do some by phone, but must be on site when dealing with congressional aides, and we would have more credibility after attending a few times. CEDA ought to lobby ESA about doing this. Opportunity for ESA to join office with tri-societies (crop sci, agronomy, soil science).

Tim Schowalter – can we support congressional internships to represent us?

Carl – if we could afford it, we should (\$50-60K). Get emeritus members (local) to do this.

Ken – be value in ESA being there, even if someone could not always go.

Jim – For ESA, CAST is \$6500, but Co-Farm is \$500.

Gary – we had a member go to congressional visit day. John Brown went, found it of limited value. Just showed up in congressional offices. As follow up, should we join Biological Environmental Science Coalition.

Sonny – we already did so

Gary – maybe we dropped it. Do we want to join?

Moved, seconded and approved to join.

Rob – propose that CEDA be a network of ESA.

Moved, seconded, approve to have CEDA be a network.

Rob – CEDA mission, goals, principles to have electronic discussion in coming year.

Bob Davis – BCE report. Opportunity to have certification help profession as a whole through specialty exams serve departments as practice exams (qualifiers) or other uses. BCE could provide some of that info to provide a service.

Gary – put together a brief outline recapping, provide contact info, and it will be distributed to CEDA members.

Dennis Kopp distributed the CSREES report.

Rick Meyer distributed another set of CSREES handouts.

Monte Johnson and Herb Bolton – nothing to add.

Steve – Grants.gov – problems getting proposals submitted. What is status of electronic submission?

Rick – anticipating all programs will use that. Will still be some problems, especially with Mac users.

Herb – there is a tremendous rush trying to submit the last two hours – don't wait until the last minute. Time stamp really does matter.

Dennis – there will be glitches, but it will happen this year.

Gary – two items needing addressed. How do we evaluate extension? We will have to address electronically.

Susan Fisher – OSU budgets will be determined by metrics, including one based on documenting extension impacts.

Mark A – This has been an issue for 30 years. Put extension in the context of education. Most people think of outreach and public engagement, but if we call extension “education” then we can evaluate in the same way.

Gary -- This will need follow-up electronically.

Gary – voting for chair-elect. Mark the ballot and return.

Jim Harper. Treasurer’s report not ready; roughly \$4000 roughly starting balance; expenses of \$2312; took in \$1300 from 23 institutions. OK for now. Will email the report as it is finished.

Jim – CEDA salary report in new format. Better database. New program will allow better reports. Table with information by sex, by region, rank. Please look at data closely.

Susan Fisher elected as chair-elect.

Break while GB joins us.

Gary – Charge from Frank for CEDA to be more involved in ESA. CEDA agreed to be a network; representation on GB is up in the air.

Frank – GB is finishing business for ‘refreshing’. Discussed some of the issues placed before CEDA. Perception that there is no reward for serving society. CEDA is the group that makes decisions about rewarding faculty for performing those activities. CEDA is an enormous resource for the Society and can influence the direction of the Society.

Carl – There was mention that we are losing early-career members. The need for new scientists to get programs up and running takes away much of their time, so many heads are not advising new people to be fully engaged.

Frank – if one is too busy to give back, why should we do anything for that person? Do we value the service activities our faculty members provide?

Mark – I give credit for service, but only up to 10% of total. Funding for attending meetings makes it difficult to have flexibility. Flexible funds of the past are no longer there to support participation.

Steve – historically, CEDA was better represented on GB. CEDA is ready and willing to step up if we are asked or if there are logical places for us to step up. My opinion is that it doesn’t make sense to be another member of GB, but if there are issues for which we can take the lead or be visible, we could do so. A subset of GB and CEDA members are to look at identifying interactions.

Frank – Every member of CEDA has a vision, share that with GB and offer it to the Society. ESA ought to be writing letters of recognition when someone is serving the Society in a significant role. Would that help?

Kevin – We need to encourage participation by faculty in many ways, especially if one is already at the meeting. If one is already there, judge papers, go to business meetings.

Frank – CEDA members should be serving as judges. What do YOU bring to the table to add value to our society? Step up and find a way to contribute back. An expectation, especially in mixed departments, is that every faculty member should participate in a professional society.

Jon T – with the low level of FTEs in a department, if we give up a faculty member for service to ESA, how do we cover that loss of time for that expertise?

Frank – offer whatever support you can. Clerical staff could be offered to help that person in support of their service. There are a number of things we need to do collectively to help the society.

Jonathan E – we all serve as individuals, but I am not sure what we can do as a group to work in some formal way?

Frank – maybe CEDA adopts a firm position that all members stay the whole meeting. Do we recognize faculty that stay at the entire meeting? Can those faculty members provide leadership back to the Department?

Tom – this time of the year is difficult for student and faculty participation. Finals and other requirements make it difficult.

Frank – we have to give up something in order to prioritize our activities.

John Heraty – Can Departments offer incentives for students to become more involved in participating beyond giving papers?

Gail – lot of options for students to be involved – offer symposia, be on committees (even lead them), this is a wonderful time for them to be visible and form contacts. Need to get that message out to all students.

Steve Clement – why don't we offer more program enhancement funds for students to offer symposia?

Mike I – why aren't we supporting more nominations for good teachers?

Frank – some of the award committees are faced with very good nominations – a nice problem to have if we have all excellent candidates among whom to choose. But other

categories are having few nominees. Dept heads should be putting faculty forward for awards.

Marvin – most of us have seen the Society grow tremendously, then wane. We have seen departments coalesce. Looking at the role of ESA, we award degrees from universities, when the student gets a job, how does the student continue to grow? The Society is the premier place for post-graduate education. Our new faculty and students are the ones who will benefit the most by their continuing education. Professional growth occurs at the meeting.

Mike Culy – GB discussed that ESA is suffering from leadership deficit; going to need more leaders for new structure. Could CEDA hold multiple-year symposium for younger professionals on how they can provide leadership? Use this as chance to provide leadership. Some younger faculty do not know how to break into the service/leadership roles. Something for CEDA to do each year as something we can do to give back to students and faculty.

Scott – everyone has been aware of renewal. CEDA is an example of a network. Encourage students and faculty to become their own networks, sponsor symposia or other activity. CEDA lives and dies on science and public policy. Sections need that expertise that we can provide. We can provide that perspective and opportunity.

Frank – help GB find the way to bring the value of CEDA to the table. ESA needs perspective, insightful leadership, and to look at big picture. I hope ESA and CEDA can build as actions from the discussion today.

Follow-up items:

1. Choose some issues for CEDA to take a lead on
2. Share the leadership and ethics in courses taught by Steve Yaninek & Rob W.
3. What the CEDA mission and leadership role should be
4. Do we want to propose symposia for the 07 meeting?
5. Do we want to propose longer discussion on a targeted issue (e.g., evaluating extension) at the 07 CEDA meeting?

Meeting adjourned (I did not get the time).