

Minutes of NCERA220 Meeting – Cleveland, June 5 2016; 8 – 12 AM.

Present: Brian McCornack (Kansas State University), Matt O’Neal (Iowa State University), Jennifer White (University of Kentucky), Bob Wright (University of Nebraska—Lincoln), Matt Grieshop (Michigan State University), Julie Peterson (University of Nebraska—Lincoln), John Ruberson (Kansas State University), Ben Puttler (University of Missouri)

Main activity – responding to comments of the draft renewal. One comment was about the identity of the NCERA 220 group – who are we and what do we want to accomplish. So – the main discussion for the first half of the 4-hour meeting revolved around this question.

Elements of our identity:

1. Exchange of information. Research and teaching on biological control in the NCB region is diverse and we all benefit from updates on what is going on in other states.
2. Collaboration on research. Some of the members of the group work together on biological control projects or region-wide significance and these meetings have been instrumental in initiating and maintaining collaborations of this kind. An example of this is research on soybean aphid biological control.
3. Education. An important outcome of these meetings in the past has been summer workshops on biological control, which were initiated and organized at these meetings. We would like to transition from this model to one in which our group can serve as a clearinghouse for teaching materials (see below for more on this). Of course anyone in the group is welcome and encouraged to organize summer workshops as well.
4. Symposium at NCB ESA. The group has organized a symposium on biological control at the NCB ESA for many years. These symposia have been very well received and have grown to be a central part of these meetings. They represent a major contribution to the North Central Branch.

We discussed how these elements of our identity could be incorporated into the renewal proposal that B. McCornack is leading. We also worked on some wordsmithing within the proposal that will address other of the reviewer’s comments.

- I. What activities do we want to support/engage in in the future? This is related to the renewal proposal since it includes plans for the next 5 years. Activities discussed included:
 - a. Developing a ‘clearinghouse’ of educational materials for biological control. We envision three classes of such materials:
 - i. Materials to develop entire lectures. M. O’Neal noted that there is a need for PP slide shows with associated written material for use in guiding teaching efforts – particular for people that teach biological control modules as opposed to classes.
 - ii. Shorter – term materials such as groups of just a few slides to make a particular point (summarized case study for example) or short videos.
 - iii. Photos and artwork relevant to biological control that could be used for education. J. White noted that one of her students developed aesthetically

pleasing drawings of aphid biological control agents that can be used to in PP presentations to illustrate interactions etc.

Our vision for these materials is that they would be held within an online platform (kindly supported by B. McCornack) that would be accessible only to members of NCERA 220. We also envision a system by which (i) the use of material in the clearinghouse is properly acknowledged and (ii) the producers of the materials are made aware of the use, including the number of end-users that the materials are used to educate. We will need some kind of a front page in the platform that makes this clear and provides a way to inform providers of this information.

- b. We will continue to organize a biological control Symposium at the NCB ESA meetings.
 - c. We will continue to use the meetings as a means of keeping each other updated about BC developments in the region. There was some discussion of whether oral presentations of the state reports should be continued and while we did not hold a vote on this question, there seemed to support for continuation.
 - d. We will continue to use the meetings as a means of initiating and continuing collaborations. We will try to devise an organized way to express the overlap and potential overlap within the group on particular biological control initiatives. The purpose of this will be to expand collaborations within the group. M. Grieshop gave some examples of types of funding initiatives that could be appropriate for collaboration among members and the idea of collaborative grant-writing was supported.
 - e. We discussed the idea of our group having a presence on Wikipedia based upon some opportunities that M. O'Neal had been made aware of. It was decided that using edits of existing Wikipedia sites or creation of new subject-based ones could be a good way to direct traffic to our current website but that an NCERA 220 Wikipedia page itself may be problematic. Since none of us have much experience with creating/editing Wikipedia pages it was suggested (by M. O'Neal) that we find a person with kind of experience to speak to our group at the next meeting.
- II. Preparation for the next meeting, which will be held in Indianapolis.
- a. Next chair: G. Heimpel
 - b. Next secretary: We will contact Deirdre Prischman and if she is not able to do this we will ask M. O'Neal
 - c. Next Symposium: Interactions between Biological Control and Host Plant Resistance. Symposium conveners M. O'Neal and ????. Julie Peterson agreed to contribute an overview presentation for the symposium and there was some discussion of other potential contributors.