

**DRAFT**  
**ESCOP Meeting Agenda**  
**March 6, 2017**  
**8:00 AM – 12:00 PM**  
**Westin Alexandria Hotel, Alexandria, VA**  
**Room TBA**

- 8:15 1.0 Welcome and call to order – Bret Hess
- 8:20 2.0 Introductions, Approval of Minutes, agenda, interim actions—Bret Hess
- 8:30 3.0 Chair’s Priorities and Goals – Bret Hess
- 8:40 4.0 NIFA update – Parag Chitnis, Jeanette Thurston
- 9:00 5.0 Cornerstone Report, 2017 Budget, 2018 Budget/Single Ask Proposal, Farm Bill, Next steps – Jim Richards/Hunt Shipman/Vernie Hubert
- 9:15 6.0 Budget and Legislative Committee (includes BAC actions) – Bill Brown/Mike Harrington
- 9:30 7.0 Science and Technology Committee – Marikis Alvarez/Jeff Jacobsen
- 9:45 8.0 Communications and Marketing Committee – Beverly Durgan/Rick Rhodes
- 10:00 Break
- 10:30 9.0 PBD – Gary Thompson
- 10:45 10.0 Public/Private Research Forum and Roundtable – Bret Hess
- 11:00 11.0 Diversity Catalyst Committee/Intercultural Development Inventory – Karen Plaut/Jeff Jacobsen
- 11:15 12.0 ESCOP Website revamp – Eric Young/Jeff Jacobson
- 11:30 13.0 2017 ESS Meeting – Gary Thompson/Rick Rhodes
- 11:45 14.0 ESS Budget Status – Mike Harrington
- 11:50 15.0 Other items for the good of the cause
- Noon Adjourn

**Future Meetings**

Joint COPS – July 17-19, 2017 Delta Lodge at Kananaskis, Kananaskis Village, Calgary, Canada  
ESS Annual Meeting –Sept. 25-28, 2017, Philadelphia, PA

**ESCOP Agenda Item 6.0:** ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee Agenda Brief

**Presenters:** Bill Brown and Mike Harrington

**Action:** For information only

**Background:**

The committee holds regular conference calls on the last Tuesday of each month. These calls have generally been well attended. The current B&L Committee membership is shown below.

**Chair:** Bill Brown (UTK)

**Liaisons**

**Delegates:**

Moses Kairo (ARD)

Barry Bequette (ARD)

Karen Plaut (NCRA)

Ernie Minton NCRA

Tim Phipps (NERA)

Jon Wraith (NERA)

George Hopper (SAAESD)

Saied Mostaghimi (SAAESD)

Jim Moyer (WAAESD)

Glenda Humiston (WAAESD)

\*Chair elect

**Executive Vice-Chair**

Mike Harrington (WAAESD)

Doug Steele (ECOP Liaison)

Bob Holland (NIFA)

Paula Geiger (NIFA)

Josh Stull (NIFA)

Vacant (ARS)

Glen Hoffsis (APLU Vet Med)

Eddie Gouge (APLU)

Ian Maw (APLU)

Becky Walth (CARET)

Cheryl Achterberg (APLU - BoHS)

Jim Richards (Cornerstone)

Hunt Shipman (Cornerstone)

Vernie Hubert (Cornerstone)

Jeremy Witte (Cornerstone)

The B&L Committee will be holding a breakfast meeting on March 6 in conjunction with the AHS-CARET meetings. Doug Steel (ECOP B&L Committee chair) will also be in attendance. Discussions will focus on advocacy for this single increase budget request for NIFA, Farm Bill efforts; exploring ways to coordinate the activities of the respective B&L committees; identifying needed “work products” that haven’t already been generated (pre-review documents); and creating broad-based support of major BAA initiatives such as the water security initiative.

ESCOP B&L supports the BAC long-standing policy of “do no harm” to existing efforts. Beyond that overarching goal, here are comments about the proposed budget and requests that relate to research programs. These positions do not detract from any priorities advanced by our Extension colleagues.

**BAC Recommendation:** The BAC met by conference call on Feb 21 to finalize the system’s final details for the top line increase in the NIFA budget. The Committee unanimously passed a recommendation to be forwarded to the Policy Board of Directors: “The BAC supports Option A requesting an increase in \$200 million resulting in approximately a 19% increase in our 6 priority lines. Additional language supporting academic programs and the non-land grant colleges of agriculture to be added.”

All documents related the federal budget are located at the [land-grant.org](http://land-grant.org).

**ESCOP Agenda Item 7.0:** ESCOP Science and Technology Committee

**Presenters:** Marikis Alvarez and Jeff Jacobsen

**Action Requested:** For Information; Accept NIPMCC Report/Revised Rules of Operation

**Background:**

**Committee Members**

Marikis Alvarez (ARD; Chair)

Ken Grace (WAAESD)

Terry Nelsen (ERS)

David Thompson (WAAESD; Chair-elect)

Bob Matteri (ARS)

Joe Colletti (NCRA)

Dwayne Cartmell (SSSc; Social Sci Subc)

Deb Hamernik (NCRA)

Doug Walsh (NIPMCC; Pest Mgmt Subc)

Cameron Faustman (NERA)

Edwin Price (ICOP)

Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA)

Parag Chitnis (NIFA)

Nathan McKinney (SAAESD)

Denise Eblen (NIFA)

Harald Scherm (SAAESD)

John Yang (ARD)

Jeff Jacobsen (Exec Vice-Chair, NCRA ED)

Ed Buckner (ARD)

Chris Hamilton (recorder, NCRA AD)

**General**

The Science and Technology Committee (S&T) has regular monthly calls on the third Monday of each month. All meeting agendas and minutes are posted at: <http://escop.ncsu.edu/ViewCommittees.cfm?comid=5> . Attendance and participation across the directors and liaisons has been consistent and good.

S&T deliberations to date have focused on:

- SOAR publication on “Retaking the Field: The Case for a Surge in Agricultural Research”;
- C-FARE publication on “Advancing U.S. Agricultural Competitiveness with Big Data and Agricultural Economic Market Information, Analysis and Research”;
- NSF data hubs;
- USDA ARS data practices with Dr. Brian Scheffler; Data Science in Agriculture Summit (10/2016) and;
- Horizon topics from: <https://medium.com/usda-results/ch11-ad478971cba7#.ocpnen1es>), <https://www.oecd.org/sti/inno/oecdreviewsofinnovationpolicy.htm>, and <http://www.ers.usda.gov/amber-waves/2016/november/us-agricultural-rd-in-an-era-offalling-public-funding/>

S&T understands that numerous activities are underway with individual institutions, across institutions, in collaboration with the private sector and throughout federal granting agencies. While much remains in flux, there is interest in formulating a greater presence across ESS/ARD and making more formal recommendation in the near future. For instance, initial discussions regarding a “data” workshop during the 2017 ESS/ARD annual meeting in Philadelphia, PA are being refined and will be adopted by the meeting’s Planning Committee.

Recently, multistate committee members and AAs have asked questions to EDs about the advisability of two multistate projects being submitted as a combined nomination for the 2017 ESS Award for Excellence in Multistate Research. This was referred to S&T for consideration. S&T discussed the question, considered numerous ramifications of a joint project submission and have opted to not promote these types of nominations for 2017, yet would discuss again and evaluate during the formal review of the 2017 regional nominees. S&T would address this specific issue and address it in the 2018 call for regional nominations. This would be brought forward to ESCOP to formally evaluate and take action on.

In addition, S&T has actively engaged with its subcommittees, approving minor modifications to the Rules of Operation for the National Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC), which are posted on

the ESCOP website (attached). The Social Sciences Subcommittee (SSSc) proposed adding a sixth discipline, 'Leadership', to their regional membership (NC, NE, S, W, 1890 ARD, At Large) and disciplinary matrix (Ag Communications, Ag Economics, Ag Education, Human Sciences, and Rural Sociology). S&T also approved this request to create a more diverse and inclusive membership reflective of the social sciences.

#### **National IPM Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC)**

The fall meeting of the NIPMCC occurred during October 18-19, 2016 at APLU. The interactive format elicited ideas, approaches, and priorities focused on IPM. A State of IPM report is part of this S&T submission. It articulates priority issues and opportunities. This will be discussed during a future S&T conference call. In addition, a revised NIPMCC Rules of Operation is attached which has been reviewed and approved by S&T. These revisions reflect operational fine-tuning following the annual meeting. Lastly, three members of NIPMCC (Jan Nyrop, Chris Boerboom, Jeff Jacobsen) participated in a national conversation called by NIFA and the University of Maryland – College Park with the public and private sectors, as well as selected state and federal officials on Tactical Sciences (detection and diagnostics [NPDN, NAHLN], regulatory system support [IR-4, FARAD, MUADP], deployment of technologies and systems [CPPM, IR-4, MUADP, EDEN]). These NIFA funding lines and programs were represented in the Conversation. More information will be available when provided by NIFA.

#### **Social Sciences Subcommittee (SSSc)**

The next SSSc meeting will be in Washington, DC on February 21-22, 2017, focusing on the role and function of the social sciences and related disciplines with Big Data. This session will interface the Committee with APLU, NIFA, C-FARE and AAFA (National Press Club session), Rural Policy Research Institute, and the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA). Discussions and next action steps for SSSc members will be identified and communicated to S&T for consideration.

**State of IPM Report - 2016**  
*Developed by the National IPM Coordinating Committee at its October 18-19, 2016 Meeting*

**State of Programs and Perceptions on Sustainability**

The Programs and Perceptions on Sustainability section of this report was developed from participant questionnaires completed at the close of the October 18-19, 2016 National IPM Coordinating Committee meeting, which was attended by 60 leaders associated with IPM programs in the United States.

Half of those attending (30) filled out the questionnaire at the end of the meeting. Respondents identified their professional affiliations as: Extension 36.6%, IPM Centers 33.3%, Research/Extension 6.7%, Research 6.7%, Research/IPM Centers 6.7%, Extension/IPM Centers 3.3%, NIFA 3.3% and other 3.3%. The table below provides a summary of the responses from all survey participants.

**Summary - All Survey Participant Responses (n=30)**

	<b>Federal</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>End-User</b>	<b>Pest Mgmt Industry</b>
<b>Primary funding source for respondent's IPM program</b>	62%	28%	6%	3%
	<b>Increased</b>	<b>Decreased</b>	<b>Same</b>	
<b>IPM Program Funding</b>	48%	30%	22%	
<b>Percentage Change</b>	28%	26%		
	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>		
<b>Sustainability of IPM Programs - current funding and funding model</b>	52%	48%		

A majority of the programs represented were federally funded. Most had seen increased funding during the last 10 years. The average percentage change in funding reported among programs was similar. About half the respondents thought programs were sustainable with current funding and the current funding model. University extension and research respondents were more pessimistic about the sustainability of funding than were IPM Center respondents (data not shown). Responses from programs in which states were the primary funding source were generally more optimistic about program sustainability (data not shown). Funding levels have declined in some IPM programs over the last 10 years. Generally, programs are coping by diversifying sources of funding, but many programs have lost IPM extension/research capacity.

**Key IPM-related Issues of National IPM Coordinating Committee Attendees**

Participants at the 2016 National IPM Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC) Meeting provided input for this section of the State of IPM Report in two sessions; Ideas Informing the Future – the New IPM; and IPM Communication and Accountability. Participants were divided into six small groups. Each participant/group had the opportunity to provide input on 12 questions across several topical areas. Their responses have been summarized in approximate priority order. The information provided was used to develop this report and inform our initial steps toward development of a vision for the “New IPM” - an enhanced IPM future, building on long-accepted IPM principles and integrating new technologies and approaches based on new science and tools. We expect this report to serve as conceptual guideline from which IPM programs are built nationally. The intended outcome is a renaissance in IPM leading to robust and sustainable urban and rural programs, positive stakeholder impacts and the development of a widely recognized and valued IPM culture in America.



### IPM Program Funding

By far, the most common issue described by attendees was the need for federal funding for Extension IPM Programs - supporting, at a minimum, base-level funding for Extension IPM programs in all U.S. states and territories. Under the current funding model, as costs increase and initiatives are needed to address emerging needs, IPM programs will not have adequate resources to meet demands. Full deployment of the “New IPM” concepts and science will require increased funding for IPM research in emerging areas (**phytobiomes, molecular/genetic science, novel pest (insect, weed, disease) monitoring, utilization of big data in support of IPM objectives, IPM research at the ecological/landscape levels, etc.**). Increased funding will be needed to support extension programs in every state in order to move new research-based IPM technology to stakeholders and users.

### Stakeholders and Priorities

Committee responses indicated that stakeholder involvement in IPM programs was critically important. It was deemed important in all kinds of programs; in programs for farmers, urbanites, schools, underserved communities and international communities. The importance of relationship building between IPM practitioners and leaders of these groups was emphasized. Participants at the NIPMCC meeting stressed the importance of developing IPM program priorities at the local level. Currently, most extension programs engage effectively with local stakeholders to develop priorities for local programs. NIPMCC participants felt priorities set at the local level should be aggregated to the state, region and national level. Some of the Regional IPM Centers develop lists of regional priorities, but priority lists are not currently available in all regions. Aggregation of priorities from states to regions, and from regions to the national level is a logical way to proceed, but the process for priority aggregation has not been developed. Since local programs need to be driven by local priorities, regional and national priorities if aggregated such that they address all or a majority of local priorities would be voluminous and of little value. Instead, regional and national priorities should be broad and over-arching. A list of National IPM priorities would be valuable to policy makers, granting agencies and state IPM programs. It would help programs focus on the foremost IPM-related issues. The NIPMCC thorough APLU is an appropriate body to develop and publish (website) a list of National IPM Priorities. A list of national priorities would provide national unity and would contribute positively to our ability to communicate with stakeholders and policy makers with “One Voice” – a concept that was one of the primary themes that emerged at the 2016 NIPMCC meeting. Recapping, the optimum program model should involve significant local stakeholder input and elimination of all federal funding within a state or territory is incompatible with maintaining a strong national IPM program.

### One Voice – National Program Issues Coordination

Communities, states and regions of the U.S. differ in many ways (rural/urban, climate, soils, water availability, culture, ethnicity and attitudes of the people). It is not surprising, therefore, that stakeholder-based IPM programs also differ. Contradictory and mixed messages from programs are not only possible, but likely. There are, however, consistent ideas and themes that are in common with IPM programs across the nation. NIPMCC responses indicated that national IPM research and outreach programs should aggregate program focus and priorities from local stakeholders to the national level. Possible models might involve state IPM Coordinators, USDA Regional Technical Committees, Regional IPM Centers and the NIPMCC. Additional input or approval may be solicited from federal agencies through NIPMCC representation on the Federal IPM Coordinating Committee (FIPMCC). NIPMCC suggested that coordination of focus at the national level could be accomplished by a National IPM Coordinator or by the NIPMCC. Messaging in support of national IPM programs to our advocacy groups should be consistent and of “One Voice”, representing important national interests and stakeholder groups.

### Partnerships, Collaborations and Communication

NIPMCC responses emphasized the importance of partnerships, collaboration and communication in IPM program development, delivery, reporting and outreach. Key partners include: stakeholders (citizens, commodity groups, environmentalists, conservationists, schools, urbanites, etc.), land grant and other universities, Extension, Research,

NIFA, Regional IPM Centers, USDA Regional Technical Committees, IPM working groups, consultants, FIPMCC, IR-4, NPDP, advocacy organizations, the pest management industry (synthetic and biologically-based pesticides, monitoring tools, pest resistant cultivars, etc.) and other IPM-related groups. The committee recognized a need for improved communication among these groups (the “One Voice” concept). Meeting participants recognized the need to communicate effectively despite existing silos (departments/disciplines, states/regional differences, agencies, urban/ag/school IPM, conventional/GMO/organic production, etc.) to develop multistate, transdisciplinary teams to address difficult IPM-related issues.

#### IPM Success Stories and Writers/Marketers of the IPM Message

State IPM Extension programs generate numerous IPM successes and success stories. Success stories are generated by research and extension professionals, State IPM Coordinators, professional writers at LGUs, popular press writers (newspapers, Ag press, specialty crop press, urban pest management press, and others). Professional societies and Regional IPM Centers also employ professional writers that produce IPM success stories. In addition, annual and final reports are written by State IPM Coordinators to comply with USDA NIFA grant and capacity funds requirements (REEport and NIMISS), and other grant requirements. Hiring additional writers/marketers was suggested by some of the NIPMCC participants as a way to improve public awareness of IPM successes. The consensus was, more writers are not needed. What is needed is a process to aggregate, package and disseminate success stories. This information could inform organizations that advocate for IPM and could be used to inform the public about IPM successes. Online training for State IPM Coordinators was recommended to improve their skills in success story writing.

#### Regional IPM Centers

Regional IPM Centers were recognized by the attendees as important in regional organization, promoting collaboration, providing resources (online, funding, program evaluation, etc.), development of success stories, and recognition of programming successes and excellence. Center roles in aggregation of priorities and reports – providing regional “One Voice” messaging to national advocacy groups, and facilitating information flow back from the national level to states was supported by meeting attendees. However, some attendees felt the resources used by the Regional IPM Centers could be better used for IPM program implementation in the states, and priorities/reports could be aggregated from states directly to the national level. Better definition of the roles of IPM Centers was a need expressed by some attendees. Consistent with the “One Voice” concept, the NIPMCC needs to develop consensus on the role of IPM Centers to avoid mixed messages that may distract from our issues-based focus.

#### Supporting Underserved and International IPM Needs

The consensus of committee members on educating traditional U.S. stakeholders, underserved and international stakeholders held that attention to language and cultural differences was necessary to ensure access of all clientele groups to IPM education. Assessment of teaching methods to ensure that they are appropriate for the learning environment and local conditions was also viewed as important. Some committee members recognized that barriers, such as international student access to grant funding, exist and suggested these barriers be removed.

#### Development of the Next Generation of IPM Practitioners and STEM Education

Attendees highlighted the need for programs to develop the IPM practitioners and scientists of the future. Youth/student awareness of careers in IPM, internships, youth/student mentoring, teaching networks and web-enabled communication/education (including social media and YouTube) were identified as important components that would help address this need. Greater emphasis on STEM education to promote interest in science, technology, engineering and math; and 4-H, FFA and other ag-related programming to develop student interest in agriculture are needed.

### Technology and Ag Literacy

Recognizing that the way people access education is changing, the committee highlighted the need to embrace social media, video, infographics and other web-based communication technologies to reach large numbers of people. The committee also recognized that people are using these media resources to support narratives about food production systems and food safety that are not supported by scientific evidence (GMOs, pesticides, organic, etc.). Attendees recognized the need to support Ag Literacy by teaching people the facts about agriculture and that innovative use of modern outreach technologies will be needed to accomplish Ag Literacy goals.

#### Priority Summary:

- Improve national capacity to support Extension IPM programs in all states and territories to deliver the technologies of the “New IPM” to users and practitioners
- Improve funding for IPM research to develop the technologies of the “New IPM”
- Develop a mechanism for aggregating a set of National IPM Priorities: thereby empowering the National IPM Program to communicate with “One Voice” to stakeholders and policy makers
- Improve partnerships and linkages with IPM groups
- Develop an improved process for aggregating reports and developing national IPM messaging (success stories)
- Improve definition of the roles of IPM Centers – aligned with NIPMCC priorities
- Empower programs to effectively impact all U.S. stakeholders – respect, consider and appreciate cultural, language and learning diversity
- Enhance awareness and engagement of students and youth in STEM and agricultural education – to promote development of the next generation of IPM practitioners and scientists
- Effectively engage in educating the public about food (Ag Literacy) to counter misinformation with science-based reports using media appropriate for mass audiences

## **National IPM Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC)** **Rules of Operation**

The National Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Coordinating Committee is a committee of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) and the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) and shall function as a subcommittee of the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee. ESCOP is a committee of the Experiment Station Section of the Board on Agriculture Assembly of the Association of Public Land-grant Universities (APLU).

**Background:** The National IPM Committee (NIPMC) began in 1985 when the Pest Management Strategies Subcommittee of the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee was charged with providing coordination among the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Programs and USDA, the sponsoring agency. The Subcommittee was expanded to include Extension representation in 1986 to better integrate regional research with activities occurring independently through Smith Lever 3d IPM funds. At that time, the group began referring to itself as the National IPM Coordinating Committee, later shortened to simply the National IPM Committee (NIPMC). Over the years, the NIPMC has functioned to provide advice and communications regarding Integrated Pest Management programs supported by USDA-NIFA (and its predecessors) and Land-grant universities from across the U.S. and its protectorates and territories. Core membership originally consisted of officers of the four ESCOP regional technical committees for IPM (now NCERA 222, NEERA 1004, SERA 3, and WERA 1017), administrative advisers to those committees, and managers of the four regional IPM competitive grants programs (NC-RIPM, NE-RIPM, S-RIPM and W-RIPM), with USDA-NIFA IPM-related National Program Leaders serving as *ex officio* members. Representatives from USDA-ARS-OPMP (1996) and Regional IPM Centers (2000) were added to the committee following their establishment. Key partner organizations, including US EPA, USDA-NRCS, USDA-SARE and IR4 have also participated in its annual meetings. Co-Chairs, one each representing ESCOP and ECOP, and a Regional IPM Center Director organized the annual meeting held each fall in Washington, DC. The ESCOP Co-Chair was a member of the Science and Technology Committee, and represented the committee.

The 2013 President's Budget proposed to combine budget lines for several research and extension programs related to pest management into a new Integrated Crop Protection Program; however, the proposal was met with resistance because highly successful IPM programs would be terminated and funding for the new program would be subject to indirect charges on all of the component programs. An IPM Working Group comprised of more than 40 IPM scientists representing universities, the private sector and government was appointed by the Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC). The Committee charge: "The Working Group is asked to develop a report that provides operational guidelines for fulfilling the goals of the Integrated Crop Protection Program." The working group held a number of conference calls and developed a report that was accepted by the BAC (July 2013). The report was sent to the NIPMC for review and comment, and no formal recommendations were received prior to its 2014 annual meeting. NIPMC composition and governance was discussed at the meeting with further edits suggested. The present (final) version was adopted with the concurrence of the NIPMC at the 2014 meeting and the group formally emerged as the National Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC).

**Charge:** Make recommendations to ESCOP and ECOP on programs, policies, reports, and other matters that affect pest management implementation, and make recommendations on budget matters relating to pest management. Assist in development of reports and strategic plans on pest management issues. Pursue activities that facilitate coordination and collaboration nationally among and between IPM research and extension at the Land-grant universities, and between the Land-grants and Federal agencies involved in IPM.

**National IPM Coordinating Committee Composition:** Committee composition will ensure that IPM input from all U.S. regions and relevant groups is well represented on the committee.

Land Grant affiliates will include:

- Three members as selected by each of the regional technical committees for IPM (NCERA 222, NEERA 1004, SERA 3, and WERA 1017) serving staggered 3-year terms. N=12
- Directors of the four Regional IPM Centers. N=4
- One Experiment Station Director and one Extension Director. N=2
- One representative each from 1890 and 1994 institutions. N=2
- IR4 N=1
- One ESCOP and one ECOP regional Executive Director. N=2

Additional members of the IPM community will be encouraged to participate (ex-officio) including:

- Representatives from non-governmental organizations such as (but not limited to) IPM Voice, IPM Institute of North America, NSF Center for IPM, the National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants (NAICC) and American Association of Pesticide Safety Educators (AASPE).
- Representatives from agencies and program within USDA with IPM emphases including (but not limited to) NIFA, SARE, NRCS, APHIS, ARS (especially OPMP), and ERS.
- Additional Departments of the Federal government including (but not limited to) EPA, HUD, GSA, Interior, and DOD.

The NIPMCC annual meeting is inclusive and open to all interested members of the IPM community, and as such additional Land-grant affiliates, Federal agency representatives, non-governmental organizations, and private sector interests might be expected to participate.

### **National IPM Coordinating Committee Governance**

**Officers:** The officers will include a Past-Chair, Chair and Chair-elect chosen by the Land-grant affiliates of the National IPM Coordinating Committee from among the four regional technical committee representatives, IPM Center Directors, and 1890/1994 institution members. The position of Chair will be rotated among representatives of the five regions (North Central, Northeast, Southern, Western, ARD), ideally ensuring representation by all regions and LGUs over time. The term of appointment as an officer will be three years.

**Executive Committee:** An Executive Committee (EC) will be composed of the National IPM Coordinating Committee officers (N=3), ESCOP- and ECOP-appointed representatives (N=2), and a Regional IPM Center Director (N=1). The Executive Director (from the Science and Technology Committee) or the Extension Executive Director will serve as the Executive Vice-Chair and will provide administrative support to the committee. The NIPMCC Executive Committee will (generally) function by consensus, with a simple majority quorum required.

The Executive Committee will:

- Hold conference calls quarterly as necessary, and organize the annual meeting of the National IPM Coordinating Committee (typically in the fall).
- Annually provide a “State of IPM” report to ESCOP and ECOP.
- Provide updates and reports on its activities and programmatic recommendations to ECOP and ESCOP as requested and deemed appropriate.
- Make any USDA-NIFA budget recommendations via the ECOP- and ESCOP-appointed members for consideration by the respective Budget and Legislative Committees.

**Nominating Committee:** A nominating committee consisting of the past Chair, Chair elect and a NIPMCC member at-large will bring a slate of candidates to the annual meeting for consideration by the NIPMCC. Nominations from the floor are permissible. Following a cessation of nominations, an election will be held through regularly accepted practices and the results announced at the same annual meeting.

***Approved October 12, 2014***

***Amended November 1, 2016***

***Approved by NIPMCC EC and S&T, January 2017***

**Agenda Brief:** Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC)

**Date:** March 6, 2017

**Presenter:** Bev Durgan/Rick Rhodes

**Background Information:**

1. **Committee Membership** (as of February 22, 2017) :

<b>Voting Members:</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Term</b>	<b>Email</b>
Chair (AHS) <sup>1</sup>	Beverly	Durgan	North Central	2015 – 2018	<a href="mailto:bdurgan@umn.edu">bdurgan@umn.edu</a>
Incoming Chair (CES) <sup>1</sup>	Mark	Latimore	1890	2016 – 2019	<a href="mailto:latimorm@fvsu.edu">latimorm@fvsu.edu</a>
Past Chair (CES) <sup>1,4</sup>	Scott	Reed	West	2014 – 2017	<a href="mailto:scott.reed@oregonstate.edu">scott.reed@oregonstate.edu</a>
AHS Representative <sup>2</sup>	Nancy	Cox	South	2015 – 2017	<a href="mailto:ncox@email.uky.edu">ncox@email.uky.edu</a>
CES Representative <sup>2</sup>	Bonanno	Steve	Northeast	2016 – 2018	<a href="mailto:SCBonanno@mail.wvu.edu">SCBonanno@mail.wvu.edu</a>
ESS Representative <sup>2</sup>	Daniel	Scholl	North Central	2016 – 2018	<a href="mailto:daniel.scholl@sdstate.edu">daniel.scholl@sdstate.edu</a>
AHS Chair <sup>3</sup>	Cathann	Kress	North Central	2016 – 2017	<a href="mailto:cathann@iastate.edu">cathann@iastate.edu</a>
CES Chair <sup>3</sup>	Fred	Schlutt	West	2016 – 2017	<a href="mailto:fred.schlutt@alaska.edu">fred.schlutt@alaska.edu</a>
ESS Chair <sup>3</sup>	Brett	Hess	West	2016 – 2017	<a href="mailto:BretHess@uwyo.edu">BretHess@uwyo.edu</a>
ACOP Rep. <sup>2</sup>	Cynda	Clary	South	2016 – 2018	<a href="mailto:cynda.clary@okstate.edu">cynda.clary@okstate.edu</a>
ACE Rep. <sup>2</sup>	Faith	Peppers	South	2016 – 2018	<a href="mailto:pepper@uga.edu">pepper@uga.edu</a>
CARET Rep. <sup>2</sup>	Becky	Walth	North Central	2016 – 2018	<a href="mailto:walth@valleytel.net">walth@valleytel.net</a>
APLU CGA Rep. <sup>2</sup>	Rick	Mertens	South	2015 – 2017	<a href="mailto:richard.mertens@tamu.edu">richard.mertens@tamu.edu</a>
Nat'l Impacts Database Rep. <sup>2</sup>	Sarah	Lupis	West	2016 – 2018	<a href="mailto:Sarah.Lupis@colostate.edu">Sarah.Lupis@colostate.edu</a>
<b>Non-Voting Members:</b>					
kglobal Liaison	Jenny	Nuber	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:jenny.nuber@kglobal.com">jenny.nuber@kglobal.com</a>
Cornerstone Liaison	Hunt	Shipman	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:hshipman@cgagroup.com">hshipman@cgagroup.com</a>

AHS ED/Admin. Rep	Ian	Maw	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:IMaw@APLU.ORG">IMaw@APLU.ORG</a>
ECOP ED/Admin. Rep	Rick	Klemme	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:rickklemme@extension.org">rickklemme@extension.org</a>
ESCOPE ED/Admin. Rep	Rick	Rhodes	N/A	N/A	<a href="mailto:rcr3@uri.edu">rcr3@uri.edu</a>

The CMC Operational Guidelines define:

1. The officer (Chair, Incoming Chair, and Past Chair) terms are one year in each office for a total of three years.
2. Members representing the three sections (AHS, CES and ESS) and other organizations have two year terms and can be reappointed indefinitely.
3. The section (AHS, CES and ESS) chairs serve on the CMC during their terms of office, which is one year.
4. Scott Reed is completing the final year of Rick Rhodes' term as outgoing chair.

## 2. Meetings:

- The CMC Plan of Work Development Committee met by teleconference on December 9, 2016.
- The CMC Executive Committee met by teleconference on December 13, 2016.
- The CMC met as a full committee by quarterly teleconference on December 19, 2016.

## 3. Updates:

- Jenny Nuber assumed responsibility as the principal point of contact for kglobal and released the Q3 report in November (attached). kglobal continues to have the exclusive responsibility of providing services to the CMC and the execution of the Communications and Marketing Plan (CMP).
- The Plan of Work Development Committee of the CMC (chaired by Bev Durgan) adopted the recommendations of kglobal (previously reported in September) in the drafting of the 2017 CMC Plan of Work.
- The CMC will meet during the annual AHS/CARET meeting on March 5, 2017 in Alexandria, VA. At that meeting, the CMC expects to approve the 2017 CMC Plan of Work and Plan of Work Implementation Steps as well as amend the CMC operating guidelines to improve committee efficiency and operations. As the CMC previously reported in September, kglobal and the CMP are pivoting and concentrating on engagement. Further, the CMP will focus upon the BAA initiative areas (water, healthy food systems and people, infrastructure and “top-line funding request”). The targeted educational efforts of kglobal will strategically mirror the work of Cornerstone.

4. **Action Requested:** For information only.

## 5. Attachments:

- a. kglobal Q3 report.

## Association of Public and Land-grant Universities 2016 Q3 Insights Report

July 1 – September 30, 2016

### Overview

The goal of the Ag Is America project is to be a public, unified voice that communicates the value of the land-grant system in order to protect and grow its federal funding sources. Over the last four-plus years, the Ag Is America brand has become an established and trusted source of information for influencers, stakeholders, the media and the general public.

In mid-Q3, kglobal conducted a strategic planning session to reflect on what we have accomplished over the last several years, which tactics have worked and which are ready to be discarded, and where we should focus our resources going forward. As a result, we presented the CMC with recommendations to strategically shift the focus of the Ag Is America project from “building” to “engagement” through a new content-creation strategy focusing on the BAA priority areas, streamlined internal communications and an emphasis on robust interactions within our digital communities.

With the approval of the CMC, and with support from the Joint Meeting of the Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Sections in Jackson Hole in late September, our team has been working diligently to implement the recommended changes to the Ag Is America project. We’ve expanded the internal project team to better support our new direction and we finished out Q3 creating some of the foundational documents that will support our efforts moving forward. We are excited to share the initial analysis and results with the CMC in our Q4 report.



## Content Creation

Compelling content is important to position Ag Is America as an active, engaged, and creative brand. Unique, visually interesting content is the most important mechanism we utilize to communicate meaningful information to our audiences.

In Q3, we continued to research, solicit, and categorize case studies, impact statements, and feature stories from land-grant universities to be repurposed and disseminated over Ag Is America digital platforms. This included **45 blog posts** and nearly **200 social media posts**.

Towards the end of the quarter, kglobal began to shift content ratios to focus on the BAA priority areas: water, healthy food systems, infrastructure and ongoing funding. By the end of 2016, we plan to have completely transitioned our content strategy to focus on these priority areas.

## Digital + Social

During Q3, Ag Is America hosted **two Twitter Town Halls** on the Master Gardeners program and the Zika virus. During our weeks-long preparations for each Town Hall, the kglobal team actively targeted local and national media, various stakeholders, faculty and alumni at target schools, and key legislators.

During this quarter, we also conducted **outreach to high-impact bloggers**. This allowed us to use the innovative Twitter Town Hall format to expand the Ag Is America universe. Several well-known and high-impact blogs participated in our Twitter Town Halls by retweeting our tweets and replying to questions from people around the United States. Many of the blogs are now following our Twitter account. kglobal will continue to update and create blogger media lists as appropriate to encourage additional engagement.

The foundation of our social media content is our AgIsAmerica.org website. Every article links back to the website for more information and provides a visitor with the opportunity to return to the original article on the school's website. This quarter, we published **45 new blog posts**, generating thousands of new and recurring page views. We also tweaked the format of our blogs to make them more concise, predictably structured, and appealing to someone clicking on the link. This allowed visitors to more effectively understand how the land-grant system is solving the problems facing the United States.

### Website

- Researched and drafted 45 blog posts highlighting the land-grant system's achievements and news, with six longer-form features, including four press releases and two interviews with land-grant experts, garnering over 2,000 quarterly page views

### Social

- **Facebook:** 58 daily posts garnered over 50,000 views and 1,000 engagements
- **Twitter:** 112 tweets garnered over 185,000 views



## Media Relations

We know that the media can be a powerful ally for the land-grant system. In addition to educating the general public, Ag Is America platforms provide reporters with a trusted place to find information on the land-grant system, its impacts, and its available resources. Ag Is America offers both traditional reporters and online thought leaders and bloggers a steady stream of proactive information via social media, press releases, and story pitches.

### Press Releases

Press Release	Total online pickup	Total social pickup	Total potential audience	Social media impressions
LGUs bolster the US Potato Genebank impact	196 outlets	4	87.5 M	10,206
21 LGUs create animal feed database	213	5	88.3M	8,896

- Drafted and submitted two press releases on land-grant universities' impact on the US Potato Genebank (September 13) and the animal feed database created by twenty-one land-grant universities (August 9).
- *Chicago Business Journal, Arizona Republic, The Olympian, Yahoo!*, and local news outlets in New York, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, and Florida all picked up the release.

## Community Activation

Ag Is America leverages the power of traditional grassroots and grassroots activists, as directed by Cornerstone, to reach new audiences and to amplify our education efforts. As we plan ahead for 2017, a large component of our digital engagement efforts are focused on priming our digital communities for calls to action. kglobal remains in close conversation with Cornerstone on this issue.

## Internal Communications

Our team attended the 2016 Joint Meeting of the Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Sections in Jackson Hole, Wyoming in September. There, we presented on AgIsAmerica's 2016-2017 communications plan, and participated in additional relevant communication sessions.

In an effort to make our communications with internal audiences more effective and efficient, in Q3 kglobal combined the monthly "news hooks" email into the monthly "Why Ag Matters" newsletter. This streamlined approach ensures our university contacts are receiving not just our requests for specific project support, but are also able to concurrently view real examples of how we will use those stories and shared resources on the Ag Is America platforms.



In addition, we updated the newsletter template to a cleaner and more visually impactful format. This format allows us to organize content based on priorities, and showcase specific news and updates to communicators.

### Newsletters

- In Quarter 3, Ag Is America sent out **three newsletter communications** to internal audiences on July 6 (July newsletter), July 26 (August newsletter), and September 7 (September newsletter).

Month	Opens	Open rate	Click rate
July newsletter	145	31.52%	19.31%
August newsletter	127	33.16%	12.6%
September newsletter	141	31.06%	11.35%

- AgIsAmerica's open and click rates remains extremely high, compared to the industry average of 24.07% and 3.12%, respectively.
- AgIsAmerica's original content, typically the press releases, are consistently the most clicked link in the newsletter.



**ESCOPE Agenda Item 11.0:** Diversity Catalyst Committee (DCC)

**Presenters:** Karen Plaut and Jeff Jacobsen

**Action:** For Information Only

**Background:**

The Diversity Catalyst Committee (formerly the ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force) is being reconstituted with existing and new members. Additional members from CES and ARD are being solicited. Our tasks will be to create goals, metrics, timelines, implementation activities and leadership for the previously identified high priority items from the original report. Four working groups (Recruitment and Mentoring, System Integration, Training, Best Practices) have been formed to work on the action items, Work will be completed electronically and submitted to ESCOP when complete.

**Committee Members**

Karen Plaut (Chair) Purdue University	Wes Burger, Mississippi State U
Charles Boyer, Montana State University	Alton Thompson, ARD
Jackie Burns, University of Florida	Rick Rhodes, NERA
Ali Fares, Prairie View A&M University	David Leibovitz, NERA
Tim Phipps, West Virginia University	Sarah Lupis, WAAESD
Soyeon Shim, University of Wisconsin-Madison	Chris Hamilton, NCRA
Cynda Clary, Oklahoma State University	Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA
Doze Butler, Southern University and A&M College	
Shannon Archibeque-Engle, Colorado State University	CES tbd; ARD tbd

As a highlight of these high priority training items, a number of activities will occur at the CARET/AHS meeting March 6-8, 2017. These trainings were made possible through the ESS/ARD approval of a training budget focused on programs and activities recommended by the initial Diversity Task Force.

Per PBD discussions from the last meeting at the APLU Annual Meeting, Elaine Turner (APS Chair from UFL) and Jeff Jacobsen have been in communication regarding future program and training activities across APLU Sections. In addition, initial Planning Committee discussions for the ESS/ARD annual meeting in Philadelphia, PA include a session on diversity and inclusion.

The three trainings that are occurring during the CARET/AHS meeting are:

**Session I Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) – Banneker Room**

(ESCOPE and other colleagues),

Dr. Pamala Morris, Assistant Dean, Office of Multicultural Programs, College of Agriculture, Purdue University

The IDI assessment (<https://idiinventory.com>) will form the basis for a group discussion focusing on cultural differences and commonality from this leadership group. Group and individual perspectives will provide comparative evaluation to established profiles with action steps identified for future advancement an intercultural mindset.

**Session II Applying the Multicultural Organization Development Model (MCO) – Bell Room**

(Leadership, regional research and Extension associations, NIFA)

Dr. Shannon Archibeque-Engle, Director of Diversity and Retention, College of Agricultural Sciences, Colorado State University

How do you create, maintain, and lead a multicultural organization? This session categorize an organization, including an educational or research organization. This interactive session will introduce the MCOB model, provide participants with specific criteria to categorize your organization, and supply a step-by-step process to lead your organization toward its goals with specific next steps.

**Session III Diversity and Inclusive Excellence – Curie Room**

(Leadership, regional research and Extension associations, NIFA)

Dr. Shannon Archibeque-Engle, Director of Diversity and Retention, College of Agricultural Sciences, Colorado State University

This highly interactive session will create diversity and inclusion practitioners who feel competent and confident and who are prepared to impact the climate and culture of their organization towards Inclusive Excellence (Williams, 2007). Outcomes of this session: Develop awareness, knowledge, and skills to understand and enhance multicultural competency, Integrate Inclusive Excellence in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs and services, Equip participants with skills to proactively affirm and promote diversity and inclusion, Develop diversity and inclusion practitioners who feel empowered to advocate for diversity and inclusion, and Practice intervention skills to support diversity and inclusion.

## **ESCOP Agenda Brief 12.0: ESCOP Web Site Update**

**Presenters:** Jeff Jacobsen and Eric Young

**Action:** For information only

### **Background:**

The ESCOP website currently resides on the NCSU system managed by the IPM Center. NCSU has notified ESCOP that this website must be moved to a non-NCSU location due to the IPM Center no longer hosting sites for non-NCSU entities. Clemson University through its YLI – ITT unit (our NIMSS vendor) is in the process of working with NCSU to migrate the system to a Coldfusion server and maintaining it for a period of six months. The cost for this service is \$2,858.88, which has been approved by the ESCOP Executive Committee. All functionality will remain live during this period. Concurrently, a new ESCOP website is being designed and operationalized with input from all regional associations. When complete, the new ESCOP website will become active and the old ESCOP website will be retired.

Clemson ITT is currently working on mock-up templates for the homepage and a standard committee page. The new ESCOP website will have a look and feel similar to the new NIMSS site to give both a visual link to ESCOP operations. Content of the current web site is being documented for broken links, file naming consistency, and appropriate location on the new web site.