SolCAP Solanaceae Coordinated Agricultural Advisory Board Meeting		
January 15, 2011	10:15AM – 11AM Closed Door	Town and Country Resort, San Diego, CA
Meeting	3rd Annual SolCAP Advisory Board Meeting	
Leader	Dr. Glenn Bryan	
Attendees	Glenn Bryan, SCRI Scotland	
	David B. Neale, UC Davis	
	Deana Namuth Covert, University of Nebraska-Lincoln	
	Deborah Lewis, Ohio State Univ.	
	Michael Coe, Cedar Lake Research Group, SolCAP Assessment	
	Elaine Graham, Monsanto	
	James Giovannoni, Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research	
	Erik Legg, Syngenta	
Not Able to Attend	Caius Rommens, Simplot Company	
	Charles Rivara, California Tomato Research Institute	
	Rene Klein Lankhorst, EuSOL	
SolCAP Advisory Board Discussion with SolCAP Executive Committee and Participants		
11AM (Open Session)	Presenter: Glenn Bryan	
Attendees	Advisory Board (listed above)	
	David Douches, MSU	
	Robin Buell, MSU	
	Allen Van Deynze, UC Davis	
	David Francis, Ohio State Univ.	
	Alexandra Stone, Oregon State Univ.	
	Lukas Mueller, Cornell Univ.	
	Walter De Jong, Cornell Univ.	
	Kelly Zarka, MSU	
	Joyce Van Eck, BTI Cornell University	
	Aliya Momotaz, Frito Lay	
	John McQueen, Oregon State Univ.	
	Roger Leigh, Portland Oregon	
	Heather Merk, Ohio State Univ.	
	Matthew Kinkade, Campbells	

SolCAP Advisory Board Discussion with SolCAP Executive Committee and Participants

Discussion A (Entire SolCAP Project related)

The Advisory Board noted that the SolCAP Team has met and exceeded their objectives in many ways and it has only been 2 years and 3 months into the 4 year project. The project is going very well and SolCAP has developed many tools and resources for the community. The outputs from SolCAP should help to ensure that the Solanaceae research community has a bright future, and these outputs have raised the profile of Solanaceae research in the USA. The Advisory Board is impressed with how well the Executive team works together and how well their expertises complement each other.

Conclusions

The group agreed that the SolCAP Project is going extremely well and the data is of excellent quality. The board does not have any concerns about the science.

Discussion B (Objective 1 –education related)

The Advisory Board stated that SolCAP is doing a commendable job in the area of education and training. They are impressed with the new courses at Cornell and Ohio State University. It looks like it is a fantastic and enviable resource for training new plant breeders.

Conclusions

The group agreed that the education component is proceeding well.

Discussion C (Objective 2 – extension related)

The Advisory board stated that David Francis has done a great job keeping this piece moving forward (from the eXtension paperwork hurdles to content development oversight). Hiring Heather Merk in the content development position has worked out well. Her leadership skills, along with first-hand breeding knowledge and interests in online education have been the perfect fit for the job.

The Advisory Board's suggestion for the last phase of the project is a request that the evaluation/assessment team do some work on measuring the target audience's perception of the extension materials which have been developed. The content team wrestled with issues of writing materials in a formal academic style or a more personal style, as well as trying to decide how difficult/deep to present the wide array of topics. It might be helpful for SolCAP's evaluation/assessment team to survey the target audience to get their feedback in helping the content authors better know how to be writing/developing future materials (or even editing current ones) so that the educational materials have the best possible long term impact. It would be very helpful to have some concrete data from the target audience to know what adjustments would be beneficial.

Conclusions

The group agreed with the comments. It was suggested that we consider implementing on-line surveys. Short user surveys at the end of a module are one possibility. A difficulty would be defining who we would get information from to make it most useful. If a user survey is to be used, the first question to be addressed is how to define the user group and how they can be categorized for analysis.

Once the content on the site builds, the SolCAP group discussed having various portals, e.g. a breeder's portal, a grower's portal, an educator's portal, etc. This would help users find the content that is most appropriate for their education level. SolCAP was funded to focus on professional breeders, therefore currently the content will focus on that area.

The launch of the Plant Breeding and Genomics Community of Practice to eXtension.org which occurred the evening of this meeting was discussed and a personal invitation was extended to all.

Discussion D (Research related Objective 3,4,5)

The trait data which is part of Objective 3 is done very well. The ability of the breeders to access the data is crucial. Usability tests on SGN were suggested, however, the board members familiar with SGN find it easy to use. Objective 4 focuses on developing genomic resources and how to spend the flexible funds. The board is impressed with the money that has been saved and the money that is available. These funds should be focused on in such a way as to provide maximum benefit to U.S. growers and to provide the most useful resources for plant breeders.

Conclusions

The flexible funds should be used to fully exploit the latest technologies that are available. Once the SNP data is complete the SolCAP group can meet to decide what the best strategy will be. This could include more sequencing, genotyping more mapping populations, promoter discovery, etc.

Discussion E (Research related)

Marker trait association analysis. The Advisory Committee have asked a question pertaining to when and how this will be accomplished, and would like to receive more information from the Executive Committee about this aspect of the work when such decisions have been made.

Conclusions

For association analysis in potato, MSU and also Kathy Haynes will be involved. There should be a clear plan developed on how to validate and move forward with any marker associated traits that are identified.

Discussion F (Objective 6)

Small Grants program is well received with the board.

Conclusions

Potato has had one call for mapping populations but the populations were not ready. The cost of genotyping has gone down and more populations can be analyzed. SolCAP wants to meet the needs of the community and select the appropriate populations. The possibility of another call will be assessed.

Discussion G (Objective 7 and SGN)

Long term support for SGN is important. Cornell has a commitment to such support, in the form of the research group of Lukas Mueller. However, priorities can change and it is important to emphasize the importance of SGN to the long term viability of the US and global Solanaceae commuuity.

Conclusions

The importance of long term support for SGN needs to be communicated to the funding agencies at all times. SolCAP team agrees with this.

Discussion H (EuSOL)

There was a discussion on how the collaborative effort with EuSOL is one sided. SolCAP is providing data etc., and there has been very little reciprocity. Glenn Bryan, following further discussion with relevant SolCAP members, will make tactful enquiries with SolCAP management team about why data is not being shared.

Discussion I (SolCAP as a whole)

The advisory board expressed the fact that it is nice to be discussing opportunities rather than discussing meeting objectives. SolCAP has met and exceeded their objectives and the board is pleased with the progress.