

2016 ESCOP Committee Meeting
Westin Hotel, Alexandria, VA - Bell (Second Floor)
March 7, 2016 (8:00 AM - noon)

In Attendance: Parag Chitnis, Carolyn Brooks, Jane Schuchardt, Rick Rhodes, Eric Young, Cameron Faustman, Gary Thompson, Mike Harrington, Jim Moyer, Bill Brown, Bret Hess, Jeff Jacobsen, Ernie Minton, Saied Mostaghimi, Adel Shirmohammadi, Chris Pritsos, Dan Rossi, Clarence Watson, Lisa Fischer, David Thompson, Bob Shulstad, Hunt Shipman, George Hopper, Bob Godfrey, John Russin, Bill Frost, Becky Walth, Meryl Broussard, Glenda Humiston, Conrad Bonsi, and Shirley Hymon-Parker

Time	Agenda Item	Topic and Presenter(s)
8AM	1	<p>Call to Order - Shirley Hymon-Parker, Chair</p> <p>1.1 Approval of Agenda 1.2 Approval of November 16, 2015 Minutes from ESCOP meeting in Indianapolis, IN 1.3 Approval of Interim Actions</p> <p>The meeting was called to order at 8:02 AM and both the agenda and minutes were approved after making an agenda item time change. Introductions were subsequently done.</p>
8:10AM	2	<p>NIFA Report - Meryl Broussard and Parag Chitnus</p> <p>Meryl's comments on the budget referenced the NIFA brochure that was provided. He informed the group that budget increases in NIFA lines were not at the expense of other NIFA lines but were off-set by cuts to other non-NIFA USDA mandatory programs. The new provisions such as the NIFA Center of Excellence Program and the Commodity Board provisions that bring in matching funds are going well. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the proposed increases to NIFA match the priorities of the BAC.</p>
8:30AM	3	<p>Policy Board of Directors - Clarence Watson and Eric Young</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The PBD met by conference call on Feb 16 and approved the BAC's recommendations for the BAA's FY17 appropriations priorities. The next PBD meeting is March 22 in San Antonio, TX. <p>Clarence Watson reported that there will be more to report after the Policy Board of Directors meets in San Antonio starting on March 22nd. The last PBD call resulted in the approval of the budget requests of the BAC.</p>
8:40AM	4	<p>Cornerstone Report - Hunt Shipman</p> <p>Hunt Shipman reported on the strategy going forward as it relates to advocating for BAA priorities. The Cornerstone Action Alert had gone out earlier and hopefully the call had resulted in quick action as the House has until March 15th to make/support requests and the Senate has until March 17th. If contact with Members has not already been made, the timing to do so may be late as some Members have been using earlier internal deadlines.</p>

8:55AM	5	<p><u>Budget & Legislative Committee</u> - Gary Thompson and Mike Harrington</p> <p>Gary Thompson summarized the BAC recommendations which included the increase to AFRI to get its authorized level of \$700 million but also to request the 2017 requests for the priority lines to be the same as what was requested by both the President and the BAC in 2016. Gary also reported on the Joint B&L meeting of ESCOP and ECOP saying the one voice advocacy is best. Though there are many white papers related to Capacity versus Competitive, it is now agreed that it should not be relegated to 'and/or' but be all about 'and/both'. Rather than more white papers, attempts will be made to get the message format right, to the right people, and out at the right time. Terminology to consider is the use of 'infrastructure' for capacity and to explain that capacity funding is the investment for the long term which provides for foundation needed for competitive funding to address emerging issues.</p>
9:15AM	6	<p>Report from ESS members on the <i>Committee to move forward on the Sightlines Report</i> and subsequent discussion/actions recommended - Clarence Watson</p> <p>A committee has been appointed with the primary charge of determining strategies to be used to get Congress to fund the needs identified in the Sightlines Capital Infrastructure and Deferred Maintenance Study. No committee meeting has been scheduled yet, however Tom Coon has been chosen to chair the committee. Members are: Greg Bohach, Alan Grant, Jay Akridge, Mark Hussey, Walter Hill, Orlando McMeans, Lou Swanson, Greg Weidman, Michele Rodgers, Shirley Hyman-Parker, Susan Sumner, Ronnie Green, Tom Coon, Wendy Wintersteen, Jack Payne and Clarence Watson</p>
9:30AM	7	<p>Assisting with Responsible and Ethical Conduct of Research (RCR) training for NIFA grantees receiving capacity funds - All</p> <p>According to Meryl, NIFA is listening to issues, trying to not be too prescriptive, and seeking to determine how these guidelines should relate to Extension. The issues were these according to the group: The government wants standardization and documentation of training for RFA-related work and campuses seem to be doing fine as it relates to competitive funding. There is training for such provided in general by campuses and certification and documentation are done accordingly. However, some campuses report that they may be lacking in meeting these requirements for initiatives funded with capacity funds and, for example, work done with funding from commodity groups. Must the training include technicians and farm crew....how broad does the net have to be? Some have begun to train Extension Specialists but not Extension agents, so should there be category levels for the training? There is a substantial investment of time for training. NIFA is asked to provide clarification for what 'research staff' means. One cannot just say 'staff funded on a grant must be in compliance' because some administrative/clerical assistants might be staff on a grant. Meryl will take the points made back to NIFA for further discussion and to provide the system with the clarifications it needs.</p>
9:40AM	8	<p><u>Communications and Marketing Committee</u> - Rick Rhodes and Dan Rossi</p> <p>The Plan of Work for the C&M committee was approved on March 5th and now the implementation is guided by 'evaluating, integrating and communicating.' They will also</p>

		do a quarterly report that summarizes the kglobal report and they will use a guiding roadmap for their work going forward. A major challenge is coordinating the messaging, including the B&L messaging.
10:00AM		Break
10:30AM	9	<p><u>Science and Technology Committee</u> - Marikis Alvarez and Jeff Jacobsen</p> <p>Jeff Jacobsen reported and referenced the agenda brief. There is more attention now on the Social Sciences Subcommittee (SSSC) of the S&T Committee. They comfortably find a niche for themselves in the ESCOP priority research interests and will stay attuned to the C&M reports and the national impact database for assistance in doing so. In addition to the SSSC getting more engaged, efforts will be made to strengthen the status of the IPM committee.</p> <p>The S&T committee will work to make sure the Multistate Research and Excellence in Leadership Awards will receive the quality of recognition they deserve at the annual APLU Awards session and costs to elevate the status of the awards in the booklet are expected to be increased in order to do so.</p>
10:40AM	10	<p><u>The ESCOP budget</u> - Bob Shulstad and Jeff Jacobsen</p> <p>The language is there for known expenditures but more transparency is needed for support of one-time expenses/requests. For accountability it was suggested and agreed that each year the ESCOP chair will have a budget approved for the ensuing year and also report on expenditures from the previous year at the annual ESS/SAES/ARD meeting. Bob presented the following motion for approval, which was seconded by Bret Hess and carried.</p> <p>Motion: The chair of ESCOP may authorize the expenditure of assessed funds up to \$5,000 with 2/3 approval of the ESCOP Executive Committee. The ESCOP Executive Committee has authority, through the existing Rules of Operation, to approve annual expenditures from the ESS account at APLU from prior assessments provided the primary intended use has been met or will be met, and the potential expenditure is deemed to be important and beneficial to ESS.</p> <p>This motion will be taken to the fall meeting but will have already been discussed in the ESS regional spring meetings.</p>
10:50AM	11	<p><u>ESCOP Diversity in Leadership Task Force</u> - Karen Plaut and Jeff Jacobsen</p> <p>Jeff reported that the Task Force is moving forward and has been helped with journal articles and examination of data bases. The conversations are around the broader themes and identifying relevant inclusionary efforts that can work across institutions. A report will be ready to share at the Joint Cops meeting in July.</p>
11:00 AM	12	<p>Report on the big Initiatives:</p> <p>Water Security - Mike Harrington</p> <p>Mike Harrington reported that it has become a disappointment to have invested ~two years of work on this to see no final product. He and Robin Sheppard will continue to follow up with NIFA but there has been a suggestion to use NRSP in Hatch for water; but there has not been an enthusiastic acceptance of this plan as long as there is no</p>

		<p>new money. This idea would not result in the desired regional and national levels of initiatives for water. Additionally, this is to be an integrated endeavor, and Smith-Lever does not have language authority for NRSP type funding. Meryl indicated that a problem in moving forward had been the desire to get the funding identified in different lines and NIFA's aim is to consolidate lines, not put funding in several lines. It is also difficult for a federal agency like NIFA to respond to such a large request - \$100M per year for five years. The question from Meryl was – are you asking for this funding for the NIFA budget or trying to get Congress to fund such an initiative. It was also suggested that to get funds for Water Security, consider the <i>Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research</i> which would also include private funding as the match. Same should be considered for the Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People initiative.</p> <p>Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People - Clarence Watson, Shirley Hymon-Parker, Eric Young</p> <p>Clarence Watson referenced the report that was included in the registration packet and had first been sent to Cathy Woteki. The APLU press release on HFSHP can be found at its website. The next step is the funding and a broad-based committee has been established to work on the funding needs and strategies</p>
11:20AM	13	<p>CARET Report - Becky Walth, CARET Liaison to ESCOP</p> <p>Becky Walth, the new CARET liaison to ESCOP was welcomed and she introduced herself by sharing her very special credentials to relate to the land-grant family. She indicated that CARET has developed a scorecard to stay on track with its strategic plan. It was noted that CARET representatives from different states may have different responsibilities. Becky indicated that CARET feels that it would be helpful if the System could do more in providing them with impact reports – what are the impacts being made with the funding the system receives? CARET is supportive of the half million dollar grant received from the Kellogg Foundation, currently called the 2050 Commission.</p>
11:30AM	14	<p>Updates and input on 2016 ESS - NEDA joint meeting - Bret Hess and Mike Harrington</p> <p>The ESS – NEDA joint meeting in Jackson Hole, Wyoming will be Sept. 19 – 22 at the Jackson Lake Lodge and as soon as registration is open the hotel should be reserved quickly as rooming availability will be in demand by vacationers and other groups. Hopefully registration will be available the second week of March. The hotel block goes through August 3rd, has a rate of \$219 +/-night, and on-time registration for the meeting is \$625. Hotel offers shuttle service from and to the airport for \$24 and if driving, there is a park entrance fee. Late registration is \$700 and registrations are non-refundable but transferrable if necessary. Agenda will be on registration site with descriptions of sessions. One facilitated session will have the Farm Bill as the topic of discussion. Panels will be used and there will be capstone initiatives for ending the meeting. Dress – casual.</p>
11:45AM	15	<p><u>ECOP Report</u></p> <p>Jane Schuhardt represented ECOP as Bev Durgan has stepped down as the ECOP liaison to ESCOP. Jane lauded the continuing expansion of ESCOP –ECOP collaborations and listed some examples of working together on joint initiatives.</p>

11:50 AM	16	Other Items
NOON		Adjourn

Item 5.0

ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee Agenda Brief

Presenters: Gary Thompson and Mike Harrington

For information only

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.

<p>Chair: Gary Thompson (NERA)</p> <p>Delegates: Moses Kairo (ARD) Carolyn Brooks (ED-ARD) Karen Plaut (NCRA) Ernie Minton NCRA Tim Phipps (NERA) Jon Wraith (NERA) Bill Brown (SAAESD) Saied Mostaghimi (SAAESD) Jim Moyer (WAAESD) Glenda Humiston (WAAESD)</p> <p>*Chair elect</p> <p>Executive Vice-Chair Mike Harrington (WAAESD)</p>	<p>Liaisons</p> <p>Rick Klemme (ECOP Liaison) Bob Holland (NIFA) Paula Geiger (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)</p>
---	---

The B&L Committee will be holding a breakfast meeting on March 7 with the ECOP BLC in conjunction with the AHS-CARET meetings. Discussions will focus on advocacy for both competitive and capacity funding, identifying and coordinating the roles of the respective B&L committees.; identifying and needed “work products” that haven’t already been generated (pre-review documents); and Creating broad-based support of major initiatives in the context of the water security initiative.

Are we following up on our initiation strategy document for new initiatives?

ESCOP B&L Priorities Statement on the proposed NIFA FY 2017

We support 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.

Crop Protection-Pest Management -- We support the \$3M increase for Crop Protection and also support language that precludes charging indirect costs against Extension Implementation Program Area grant awards.

Efforts of 1890 and 1994 Institutions -- We support all proposed increased funding of 1890s and 1994 institutions.

SARE - We support proposed increases for Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE)

Capacity Funds - Our goal always is to seek an increase in Hatch; however, we support level funding as proposed. Level funding translates into a 3 - 5% annual reduction in available program funds due to increasing costs for salaries, supplies and operations. The Hatch program has been level funded for the past 3 years resulting in a minimum loss of 10% in capacity

AFRI -- We support growth in the AFRI discretionary funding from \$350M (FY 2016) to \$375M (FY 2017). We also support full funding of AFRI at its authorized level of \$700 million through However, we understand that increased mandatory funding requires a reduction in spending elsewhere in the budget. Growth in AFRI must not be at the expense of existing programs or capacity funding.

BAC Priorities: The BAC met by conference call on Feb 16 to finalize the system's response to the President's FY 2017 Budget Proposal The BAC approved appropriations requests for the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA). These include support for AFRI at the full authorized level of \$700 million, support for capacity funding increases for 1962, 1890 institutions and McIntire Stennis programs. With the withdrawal of the 1994s from APLU, the 1994 Research and Extension lines were removed as priorities. The BAC position is to endorse the President's Budget or our 2017 numbers whichever are higher.

All documents related the federal budget are located at the land-grant.org.

Agenda Brief: Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC)

Date: March 7, 2016

Presenter: Richard Rhodes III/Daniel Rossi

Background Information:

1. Committee Membership:

Voting Members:	First Name	Last Name	Region	Term
Chair (ESS)	Richard	Rhodes III	Northeast	2014-
Incoming Chair (AHS)	Beverly	Durgan	North	2015-
Past Chair (CES)	Scott	Reed	West	2014-
AHS Representative	Nancy	Cox	South	2015-
CES Representative	Tony	Windham	South	2014-
ESS Representative	Daniel	Scholl	North	2014-
AHS Chair	Louis	Swanson	West	2015-
ECOP Chair	Michelle	Rodgers	Northeast	2015-
ESCOP Chair	Shirley	Hymon-Parker	1890	2015-
ACOP Representative	Cameron	Faustman	Northeast	2015-
ACE Representative	Faith	Peppers	South	2014-
CARET Representative	Connie	Pelton Kays	North	2014-
APLU CGA Representative	Dustin	Bryant	South	2015-
Nat'l Impacts Database	Sarah	Lupis	West	2014-
Non-Voting Members:				
kglobal Liaison	Darren	Katz	N/A	N/A
Cornerstone Liaison	Hunt	Shipman	N/A	N/A
AHS ED/Admin. Rep	Ian	Maw	N/A	N/A
ECOP ED/Admin. Rep	Jane	Schuchardt	N/A	N/A
ESCOP ED/Admin. Rep	Daniel	Rossi	N/A	N/A

2. Meetings

- The Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC) met by conference call on January 28, 2016
- The CMC met on March 6, 2016 at the CARET/AHS meeting in Alexandria, VA.

3. Updates

- kglobal has released its fourth quarter report (<http://nera.rutgers.edu/cmc/kglobalOct2015Report3rdQ.pdf>). A separate Executive Summary (<http://nera.rutgers.edu/cmc/kglobalQ3ExecSummary.pdf>) is also available for those who just need a broader overview of activities.
- The CMC is focusing on implementing the 2016 Plan of Work (POW). Three working groups were appointed and led discussion at the March meeting on the following general areas of the POW:
 - Message Testing
 - Engaging Communicators
 - Communicating CMC ProgressA series of specific action steps are being developed for each of the strategies associated with these areas as presented in the POW.
- The CMC is also working on a proposal to develop a strategy for reaching out to potential Congressional candidates to explain the value of the LGU's. The proposal will serve a proof of concept for such an effort for future presidential candidates.

Action Requested: For information only.

Agenda 9 ESCOP Science and Technology Committee

Presentors: Marikis Alvarez and Jeff Jacobsen **Acton**

Requested: For Information Only

Committee Members

Marikis Alvarez (Chair, ARD)

Larry Curtis (WAAESD) David

Thompson (WAAESD) Joe

Colletti (NCRA)

Deb Hamernik (NCRA)

Cameron Faustman (NERA)

Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA)

Nathan McKinney (SAAESD)

Harald Scherm (SAAESD) John

Yang (ARD)

Liaisons:

Terry Nelsen (ERS)

tbd (OSTP)

Bob Matteri (ARS)

Charles Allen (Pest Mgmt Subc)

Edwin Price (ICOP)

Jeff Jacobsen (Exec Vice-Chair, NCRA ED)

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>. Membership to S&T is being updated, particularly with the Liaisons to the Committee (e.g. Bob Matteri, Charles Allen, Dwayne Cartmell). In addition, membership to its two subcommittees -- National Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC) and Social Sciences Committee (SSSc) is being identified and will enable fully constituted groups to move forward and develop their agendas and S&T linkages.

SSSc Update – The Social Sciences Subcommittee of ESCOP S&T met on February 3-4, 2016 in Washington, DC. The core of the meeting and the primary discussion areas centered on Environmental Sustainability and Impact Measurements with invited presentations from NIFA, The Council on Food, Agricultural and Resource Economics, Rural Policy Research Institute and the Consortium of Social Science Associations. In an effort to set the stage to better connect and integrate with ESCOP, presentations and discussions were focused on the National Impact Database (Jack Elliot & Scott Cummings), Oregon State’s Impact State Reporting training (Johanna Mitchell) and Creating Impact Stories (Faith Peppers). Topical updates were also provided by Dan Rossi on the Water Security white paper and Diversity Task Force. SSSc is interested in creating an active Executive Committee and to connect in meaningful conversations throughout the year to engage and lead efforts based upon their social sciences expertise and interest.

Report Discussions – Antibiotics are frequently labelled ‘wonder’ drugs for their profound impact on human and animal health. Over the past several decades, bacterial resistance to antimicrobial drugs has increased. A significant number of discussions, actions and reports have and are being developed such as: The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), World Health Organization and Presidential Executive Order “Combatting Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria” followed by the “National Strategy for Combating Antibiotic-Resistant Bacteria. Many have elements that

directly pertain to research and education activities. Most recently, a Task Force with APLU and the AAVMC members published a report “Addressing Antibiotic Resistance in Production Agriculture” that synthesized the issue and provides an active template for additional thought and action. S&T is actively digesting and will respond to this opportunity that spans teaching, training, Extension and research recommendations. The holistic concept of ‘One Health’ provides a framework for work across human, animal and environmental health and antibiotic resistance.

A National Summit Antimicrobial Stewardship: Policy, Education and Economics was held in Washington, DC January 20-21, 2016. In addition, a multistate research committee NCDC230 Antimicrobial Resistance has been recently formed. All are indicative of the need and the substantial and complex challenge that this initiative reflects.

Award Recognitions – The call for the ESS Excellence in Leadership Awardees has been sent from all regional associations. Each regional association at their spring meeting will select their winner and compile summary materials to be submitted to the S&T Executive Vice-Chair. This information and pictures will be refined and submitted to APLU for inclusion in the official booklet ***A Community of Scholars Honoring Excellence*** and the National Awards Program. In addition, the S&T Committee will receive and evaluate the Excellence in Multistate Research Award regional nominees, individually rank and transmit its overall findings to ESCOP for concurrence. These Multistate Awardees will also be included in the official booklet and program. S&T will be responsible for working with APLU to ensure a high quality program for all of these outstanding contributions.

Item 10 The ESCOP Budget

Presenters: Bob Shulstad and Jeff Jacobsen

Action Requested: Discussion and Approval of Motion

A committee consisting of: Bob Shulstad (Chair) and all research EDs were formed to review current guidelines and practices associated with current and future ESS budget practices and decisions. If needed, recommendations were to be provided to ESCOP.

From the Rules of Operation Experiment Station Section (ESS) Board on Agriculture Assembly Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (Amended 2012):

“The Chair of ESCOP may authorize the expenditure of assessed funds up to \$5,000 with 2/3 approval of the ESCOP Executive Committee (page 5).”

APLU has one account where all historical ESS assessments are deposited. In turn, all ESS invoices are expended from this account. Recent assessments for the Communications and Marketing effort has resulted in additional funds that remain as a reserve, since other COPS have joined the C&M effort, thereby reducing the annual ESS expenditure.

Recently, the frequency and need for additional resources to support other ESS activities has increased. Recent examples include: NC-FAR annual membership, NC-FAR Lunch and Learn seminar, APLU Awards recognition brochure and program (specific to ESS), national impact writing effort, and ESS standing committee meetings. A regular ESS account that could be utilized for these diverse purposes and in accordance with existing policies and practices does not technically exist.

Therefore, we propose to conduct an ESS vote at the Fall ESS 2016 meeting which would allow for other ESS uses with this account. Due to various circumstances, there are available funds, yet no formally approved mechanism to utilize without a new ESS- approved written guideline. Each year (Aug-Sept), the ESCOP chair and chair-elect, with EDs' help, will create an annual budget with expected income and expenses for the coming year. This will be presented to the ESS during the business meeting for approval and any specific expenditure (like N-CFAR dues) will not need further approval. Then, at each ESCOP meeting during the year, the Chair will report any expenditure that occurred, including unanticipated ones, since the previous meeting, as part of the Interim Actions agenda item. The ESCOP Chair will communicate to APLU approved expenditures as voted upon by the ESCOP Executive Committee (12 members).

The Motion could be something like:

The ESCOP Executive Committee has authority, through the existing Rules of Operation, to approve annual expenditures from the ESS account at APLU from prior assessments provided the primary intended use has been met or will be met, and the potential expenditure is deemed to be important and beneficial to ESS.

The current account summary for the last three years was provided by APLU.

=====

ESS APLU Account (1/2012 to 12/2015)

Income (dues, meetings, assessment) \$1,200,548

Expenses

Contract Services (consultants, computer services) 786,212

Office Operations 1,560

Travel and Meetings (staff, non-staff, meetings) 9,057

Other (dues, membership, bad debt) 11,730

RESERVE \$ 391,988

=====

Item 11 ESCOP Diversity in Leadership Task Force

Presenters: Karen Plaut and Jeff Jacobsen **Action:** For Information Only

Task Force Members

Karen Plaut (Chair) Purdue University	Sarah Fox Dayton, Cornell University
Charles Boyer, Montana State University	Carolyn Brooks, ARD
Jackie Burns, University of Florida	Dan Rossi, NERA
Ali Fares, Prairie View A&M University	Rubie Mize, 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	

Background

The Diversity Task Force was created by ESCOP to explore the topic of diversity in research leadership across the Land-grant University System, to provide ideas and actions for consideration, and to supplement institutional, regional and national diversity and inclusion efforts. The focus should be primarily on enhancing diversity among the Experiment Station Directors, Research Directors, and their associates and assistants.

Summary of Activities

The 16-member Task Force has worked through teleconferences, literature readings and associated activities, and electronic communications. The group has refined the Task Force charge, created timelines and reached consensus on overall purpose, approaches and desired outcomes. To date we have generally discussed diversity and inclusion issues across the spectrum of LGUs programs – teaching, Extension and research with undergraduate and graduate students, staff, faculty and administrators. Members have reviewed and discussed some information and data associated with the university faculty diversity across all of the 1862 and 1890 institutions. In addition, prior information was collected across dean and department units just in ‘Colleges of Agriculture’ and their respective departmental units. Both data sources were grouped into the regional association groupings. Collectively, this information shows a consistent view of limited diversity with some regional variations.

Most recently, the Task Force has synthesized our discussions into nearly 25 Concepts. The Concepts were grouped to encompass multiple similar ideas for the purpose of forming working groups that could address a specific topic. Their purpose is to create specific actionable ideas applicable to strategic activities to improve ESS. At this point in time the Core Concepts were grouped into five areas: Recruitment and Mentoring, Training, Regular ESS Activities, Integration and Best Practices. These will serve to frame our initial recommendations and will likely evolve as more information is presented and prioritized as key action items. Our next call is March 7, 2016.



Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP)

ECOP Report to ESCOP, 2.26.16

Michelle Rodgers, Chair

ECOP Core Theme -- Build Partnerships and Acquire Resources

- *Private Resource Mobilization* – Considering strategies outlined by Changing Our World, Inc., a philanthropy management consulting firm, for national private fundraising to complement federal funding and not compete with university efforts. Further analysis is underway.
- *Federal Resource Development* – For FY 2017 federal budget advocacy, support the both/and of capacity and competitive funding with an emphasis on water security, and restoring funding at the FY 2016 level for New Technologies in Agriculture Education (NTAE) for eXtension.
- *National System Task Force* – Launching effort to determine how Cooperative Extension can better engage as a national system.
- *ECOP-ESCOP Health Implementation Team* – Continuing work with five action teams (health literacy, health insurance literacy, chronic disease prevention and management, health public policy education, and positive youth development for health) charged with increasing evidence-based educational programs, connecting with appropriate science, and advising on resource development.

ECOP Core Theme -- Increase Strategic Marketing and Communications

- *Strategic Opportunities and Measuring Excellence* – Together with ESCOP, encouraging submission to and use of www.landgrantimpacts.org designed as a one-stop point for program impacts.
- *AES-CES-AHS Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC)* – Together with ESCOP and the BAA Administrative Heads Section (AHS), supporting emphasis areas of water security and health.

ECOP Core Theme -- Enhance Leadership and Professional Development

- *National Extension Directors and Administrators (NEDA)* – The meeting, October 12-14, 2015 in St. Louis, was based on the new *Cooperative Extension Innovation Inventory* and included an innovation showcase, an innovation video produced on-site <https://youtu.be/LqtZTJ3vdZ8>, and concurrent work on innovative leadership models. The 2016 meeting will be in conjunction with the Experiment Station Section September 19-22 in Jackson Lake Lodge in Grand Teton National Park.

- *Celebrating Excellence* – Launched a call for applications www.aplu.org/CESawards due 5.1.16.
- *ECOP-ESCOP Strategic Alliance* – Chairs met in DC in January 2016 and will continue joint work.

ECOP Core Theme -- Strengthen Organizational Functioning

- *eXtension Foundation Board of Directors* – Named a new CEO, changed funding model from assessments to membership, focusing on key issues of health and climate, and, while retaining public-facing communities of high visibility, will focus primary effort on innovative electronic strategies and professional development for state and local Extension excellence.
- *Extension Disaster Education Network (EDEN)* – Advised EDEN leadership on strategic direction for disaster preparation, response, recovery, and mitigation. EDEN has been in existence 20 years.

More Information: www.extension.org/ecop and <http://ecopmondayminute.blogspot.com/>

ECOP is the representative leadership and governing body of Cooperative Extension, the nationwide transformational education system operating through land-grant universities in partnership with federal, state, and local governments.

Located at: Association of Public and Land-grant Universities • 1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 400, Washi

2016 ESCOP Committee Meeting
Sheraton Gunter Hotel (Mahncke), San Antonio, Texas
July 19, 2016 (1:00 PM - 5 PM)

In Attendance: Carolyn Brooks, Rick Rhodes, Jeff Jacobsen, Ernest Minton, Becky Walth, Rachel Leon Guerren, Valerie L. Giddings, George Hopper, Conrad Bonsi, Dyremple Marsh, Ali Fares, Karen Plaut, Louie Tupas, C.Y. Wang, Clarence Watson, Eric Young, John Russin, Bob Godfrey, Bill Brown, Gary Thompson, Mike Harrington, Bret Hess, and Shirley Hymon-Parker

Action Items from the meeting:

- **A letter from Shirley to Ian Maw will be sent to explain that the request of a \$7,000 contribution from ESCOP to fund the continuation of a full time program manager for the AMR initiative will be voted on at the ESS-NEDA meeting in September.**
- **Based on current statutes and appropriations laws, Cornerstone will be asked if the language can be used to provide a legislative fix that would reduce/eliminate the requirements for prior approval for equipment purchases with capacity funds emanating from the OMB Guidance document. The B&L Committee will send a letter to the BAC asking to have this trek considered also.**
- **The CMC asks that we do better at sending stories from our stakeholders or about our work to kglobal, Rick or Bev Durgan.**
- **As soon as possible, proposed Rules of Operation changes/amendments will be sent by the EDs to their respective directors to prepare them for the vote on such at the September meeting.**
- **In the agenda brief that all will receive in advance of the September meeting, the proposed budget for the upcoming year will be provided for approval as will be the process henceforth if the Article VIII amendments are approved. Before sending the proposed budget that was in the current agenda briefs, Jeff will add a statement relating to how expenses that exceed \$5,000 must be approved by ESS.**
- **The APLU Deferred Maintenance Committee Report (draft) will be sent by the EDs to their regions' deans and directors to solicit further input. All were advised to reread the Sightlines Report as well.**
- **Recommendations from the Diversity Task Force were accepted and a permanent Diversity Catalyst Committee will be established to keep the work of the Task Force moving forward.**
- **Louie will get back to ESCOP about who needs to be trained for the requirements for 'Responsible and Ethical Conduct of Research'.**

Time	Agenda Item	Topic and Presenter(s)
1:00 PM	1	<p>Call to Order - Shirley Hymon-Parker, Chair</p> <p>1.1 Approval of Agenda</p> <p>1.2 Approval of March 7, 2016 Notes from ESCOP Meeting in Alexandria, VA - March 7, 2016</p> <p>In meeting report:</p> <p>The meeting was convened by the ESCOP Chair, Shirley Hymon-Parker at 1:30 PM. The agenda was approved, participants introduced themselves and the notes from the March 7, 2016 ESCOP meeting were approved with the correction that the 2016 ESS-NEDA September meeting registration is \$650, not \$625.</p>

		<p>The chair summarized the request from Ian Maw to continue the annual cost to support the full-time program manager, Dr. Chase Crawford, who was hired to lead the charge of the Antimicrobial Resistance Initiative Task Force through various initiatives. Current funding for this position ends in August. To continue to fund this position, ESCOP is requested to contribute \$7,000 as is also requested of ECOP and that has been received from ACOP. It was determined that the ESS Rules of Operation would only allow as much as \$5000 to be spent (with ESCOP Executive Committee approval) from the ESCOP account without ESS approval. Therefore, this request will be taken to ESS for approval in the fall. A letter from Shirley will be sent to Ian explaining this. Additionally, if this request is approved by ESS, ESCOP should have representation on the executive committee of the AMR Task Force. The S&T committee requested that the letter to Ian also include the following recommended actions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Engage APLU/AAVMC with ESCOP to directly participate in pilot projects and the University Research Organization (URO) 2. Create an AR Session at the 2017 ESS Meeting 3. Partner with other groups to create regional/national summits, symposia and /or conferences 4. Support increased funding across NIFA, USDA ARS and other federal agencies 5. Engage the public sector in collaborative efforts 6. Create a central mechanism for enhanced communication efforts (ESCOP website, other collaborative software packages. <p>Finally, in the letter to Ian the question will be asked if AHS will be asked to contribute.</p>
1:10 PM	2	<p>NIFA Report - TBD (To include updates on the evaluation of capacity programs, requirements for 'Responsible and Ethical Conduct of Research', and approvals of equipment purchases with capacity funding)</p> <p>Report Appendix</p>
1:30 PM	3	<p>Cornerstone Report - Hunt Shipman, Vernie Hubert or Jim Richards</p> <p>In meeting report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although there may be a CR put in place once Congress returns this fall, there is hope that an Omnibus appropriations bill could be finalized in December. The Omnibus is preferred because then the NIFA increases would be realized whereas the CR would maintain the same funding levels as the current fiscal year.
1:45 PM	4	<p>Policy Board of Directors - Clarence Watson and Eric Young</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The BAA Policy Board of Directors will meet Wednesday, July 20, 12:00 - 5:00 after the Joint COPS meeting adjourns. One item of discussion will be revision of the current PBD Plan of Work (attached), any suggestions for changes will be appreciated. <p>In meeting report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarence only received three responses about the PBD POW draft. One was editorial, one wanted more specificity and measurability in the PBD's goals, and the third asked why the PBD does not submit to the land-grant family an annual written report. The Board will meet on 7-20-16.
1:55 PM	5	<p>Budget & Legislative Committee - Gary Thompson and Mike Harrington</p> <p>In meeting report:</p>

A response to the B&L letter to NIFA about concerns relating to the policy requiring prior approval for equipment purchases with capacity funds emanating from the OMB Guidance document was sent to Robert Holland and Cynthia Montgomery and a response has been received. In the response the following was stated **“Authorizing statutes and appropriations laws trump all other requirements. In the case of direct conflict between the Uniform Guidance and the authorizing statute, the authorizing statute prevails.”** Consequently, the B&L **recommends that Cornerstone pursue the possibility of having relief on this based on the above which could provide a legislative fix. The B&L Committee will send a letter to the BAC asking to have this trek considered.**

In summary, the B&L committee made the following points/recommendations:

- Issues of concern – *“Delaying Research Projects”*
 - 30-day turnaround at NIFA achievable?
 - Funds from other sources – capacity \$\$ <\$5000
 - POW increases complexity
 - Recommendations:
 - Maintain flexibility in submission timing
 - AES Directors delegated approval authority

The results of the survey on recommendations for the next Farm Bill resulted in the following Overarching priorities:

- Maintain and increase Capacity Funds
- Maintain and increase AFRI to authorized level
- Increase or fully fund all grants programs as authorized
- Reduce the number of lines by combining small grants programs into AFRI
- Seek addition partnerships outside NIFA

New Program Ideas

- 1)Advanced energy technologies, 2) Antibiotic resistance, 3) Global water resources, 4) Big Data and food security, 5) Connect to the public / public education / youth, 6) Extreme events in agricultural production, 7) Aquaculture, 8) Graduate interdisciplinary training grant program, 9) Advanced technologies for precision agriculture, and 10) Regional integrated block grants

NRSP Review Committee Report – Clarence Watson and Eric Young

- Discussion of NRSP's 1 renewal Bill Brown and Jeff Jacobsen

In meeting report:

NRSP_temp11 National Research Data Network for Harmonized Data – rejected by the committee because of many problems and barriers and the project as proposed does not appear to be financially sustainable. The committee agreed that revisions and proposal improvements were needed and will resubmit for consideration next year.

NRSP-8 is progressing well and thus the committee agreed that no changes are needed.

Bill Brown reported that a draft NRSP-1 is being reviewed and will be discussed by the NRSP-1 Management Committee next week as the current NRSP-1 (NIMSS and Impact Writer) expires in September, 2017.

Communications and Marketing Committee - Rick Rhodes

		<p>A response to the B&L letter to NIFA about concerns relating to the policy requiring prior approval for equipment purchases with capacity funds emanating from the OMB Guidance document was sent to Robert Holland and Cynthia Montgomery and a response has been received. In the response the following was stated “Authorizing statutes and appropriations laws trump all other requirements. In the case of direct conflict between the Uniform Guidance and the authorizing statute, the authorizing statute prevails.” Consequently, the B&L recommends that Cornerstone pursue the possibility of having relief on this based on the above which could provide a legislative fix. The B&L Committee will send a letter to the BAC asking to have this trek considered.</p> <p>In summary, the B&L committee made the following points/recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues of concern – <i>“Delaying Research Projects”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 30-day turnaround at NIFA achievable? ○ Funds from other sources – capacity \$\$ <\$5000 ○ POW increases complexity ○ Recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Maintain flexibility in submission timing ▪ AES Directors delegated approval authority <p>The results of the survey on recommendations for the next Farm Bill resulted in the following Overarching priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain and increase Capacity Funds • Maintain and increase AFRI to authorized level • Increase or fully fund all grants programs as authorized • Reduce the number of lines by combining small grants programs into AFRI • Seek addition partnerships outside NIFA <p>New Program Ideas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1)Advanced energy technologies, 2) Antibiotic resistance, 3) Global water resources, 4) Big Data and food security, 5) Connect to the public / public education / youth, 6) Extreme events in agricultural production, 7) Aquaculture, 8) Graduate interdisciplinary training grant program, 9) Advanced technologies for precision agriculture, and 10) Regional integrated block grants
2:10 PM	6	<p><u>NRSP Review Committee Report</u> – Clarence Watson and Eric Young</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of NRSP's 1 renewal Bill Brown and Jeff Jacobsen <p>In meeting report:</p> <p>NRSP_temp11 National Research Data Network for Harmonized Data – rejected by the committee because of many problems and barriers and the project as proposed does not appear to be financially sustainable. The committee agreed that revisions and proposal improvements were needed and will resubmit for consideration next year.</p> <p>NRSP-8 is progressing well and thus the committee agreed that no changes are needed.</p> <p>Bill Brown reported that a draft NRSP-1 is being reviewed and will be discussed by the NRSP-1 Management Committee next week as the current NRSP-1 (NIMSS and Impact Writer) expires in September, 2017.</p>
2:25 PM	7	<p><u>Communications and Marketing Committee</u> - Rick Rhodes</p>

		<p>In meeting report:</p> <p>As Rick is now the ED for the North East, a new chair must continue in his stead until Bev Durgan takes over as the incoming chair. The agenda brief described the work of the committee. Number of twitter followers is impressive and Darrin Katz asks that we do better at sending stories from our stakeholders or about our work to him, Rick or Bev.</p>
2:40 PM	8	<p><u>Science and Technology Committee</u> - Marikis Alvarez and Jeff Jacobsen</p> <p>In meeting report:</p> <p>The agenda brief provided the status of making sure all is in order for the presentation of the ESS Leadership awards at the APLU Annual Meeting. The document for the call for the award and the information on the Multistate Award process were revised and provided.</p> <p>Discussion about next steps for the Bylaws relating to Assessments and Budgets were discussed. As soon as possible proposed Rules of Operation changes will be sent by the EDs to their respective directors to prepare them for the vote on the proposed changes at the September meeting.</p> <p>In the agenda brief that all will receive in advance of the meeting, the proposed budget for the upcoming year will be provided for approval as will be the process henceforth if the Article VIII amendments are approved. This budget will be presented by Bret as the ESCOP chair-elect as it will be the budget for his term in office.</p> <p>Before sending the proposed budget that was in the current agenda briefs, Jeff will add a statement aboutany expenses that exceed \$5,000 must be approved by ESS.'</p>
2:45 PM	9	<u>ESCOP budget discussion</u> - Bob Shulstad and Jeff Jacobsen
3:00 PM		Break - 3:00 - 3:30 PM in Yellow Rose (Second Floor)
3:30 PM	10	<p><u>Update on Deferred Maintenance Committee Report</u> - Clarence Watson, Mike Harrington and Eric Young</p> <p>In meeting report:</p> <p>Although this report (draft) will be sent to the PBD, it will also be sent by the EDs to their regions' deans and directors to solicit further input. We were advised to reread the Sightlines Report as well. This report will also be sent to the ESCOP CLP and the B&L. One recommendation –“Seek full funding of indirect costs from all granting agencies. This should include USDA funding (AFRI, block grants) as well as private industry funding.” – this may not be too beneficial as the IDC funds we receive now primarily go back to other things, not for deferred maintenance. It was made clear that matching requirement was not specified to be 1:1. When considering where this requested new funding should be placed, the Farm Bill Committee should suggest appropriate options besides creating a grants program within NIFA.</p>
3:40 PM	11	<p><u>ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force</u> - Karen Plaut (with support from Charles Boyer, Ali Fares, Cynda Clary and Jeff Jacobsen)</p> <p>In meeting report:</p> <p>Please see agenda brief for the full report. The Task Force recommended that to respond to results of the information that was gathered and found to be dismal, it is hoped that ESCOP/ESS will want to act to improve upon the diversity in research leadership. In addition, the Task Force provided recommendations for ESS and individual directors that should be considered for implementation opportunities across: Recruitment and Mentoring, System Integration, and Training. An overarching section on Best Practices provides other innovative ideas. The key elements from the report are Priorities I, II, III from the agenda brief. Conclusions – ESS should:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a permanent ESS Diversity Catalyst Committee. • Support training for the Regional Executive Directors and the Assistant Directors. • ESCOP leadership should participate in a diversity training activity followed by a training for ESS. <p>Bret made the following motion which was carried: <u>Create a permanent ESS Diversity Catalyst Committee that establishes goals, metrics, timelines, implementation activities, and continuity of practice with a rolling three-year plan to champion a long-term diversity and inclusion agenda. It should be noted that funding for initiatives would probably be required, some of which could be through grants.</u></p>
4:10 PM	12	<p>Updates on the big Initiatives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Security - Mike Harrington • Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People - Clarence Watson, Shirley Hyman-Parker, Eric Young <p>In meeting report:</p> <p>Mike expressed his dismay at being unable to discern in the NIFA RFAs if there are increasing funding opportunities for water security initiatives. It had been the hope that the majority of the funding could go to regional initiatives with competitive proposals. The frustration mostly however is that when working on big initiatives the transactional costs are very high and still there is the possibility/probability that the efforts do not result in much success.</p> <p>Clarence reminded all that the HFSHP had resulted in a report and the funding piece still had to be presented by a committee. This report will be presented at the PBD meeting on July 20th.</p>
4:25 PM	13	<p>CARET Report - Becky Walth, CARET Liaison to ESCOP</p> <p>In meeting report:</p> <p>The CARET Executive Committee has met with AHS on the strategic plan and they find that meeting with AHS is extremely beneficial. The "T" in CARET is for the teaching mission of land-grant universities and CARET feels this aspect is not as predominant as research and extension and would like more emphasis placed on it. Bill 3856 has been introduced in the House and it proposes that lands that are considered federal surplus be sold and 15% of the proceeds be given to the respective land-grant institution(s). Most active with BLM to do this are campuses in Arizona, Utah and Nevada.</p>
4:35 PM	14	<p>Updates on 2016 ESS - NEDA joint meeting - Bret Hess and Mike Harrington</p> <p>In meeting report:</p> <p>After updates were provided it was asked what the process would be to determine if the joint meeting should be continued after this pilot meeting in 2016. The decision from ESS would be made by ESCOP. The 2017 ESS/SAES/ARD will be held in Pennsylvania as it is the turn of the North East to host the meeting and Gary Thompson will then be ESCOP chair.</p>
4:45 PM	15	<p>ECOP Report - Tony Windham</p>
5:00 PM	16	<p>Other items/Adjourn</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm</p>

Appendix

Report from NIFA - Louie Tupas:

1. **NIFA Budget:**

The FY2017 budget request for NIFA is for \$1.38 billion covering 57 distinct lines. Between the amounts already agreed to by the Appropriations committees, NIFA has a potential funding level of between \$1.32 billion and \$1.36 billion. The FY2017 request represents a \$50 million increase over the FY2016 appropriated amount.

2. **Funding Opportunities for the Next Farm Bill and/or Next Appropriation Process**

- a. **Tactical science programs:** NIFA's current tactical science investments consist of multiple small programs distributed across administrative and disciplinary areas:

- i. Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative (FADI)
- ii. National Plant Diagnostic Network (NPDN)
- iii. National Animal Health Laboratory Network (NAHLN)
- iv. Extension Disaster Education Network (EDEN)
- v. Crop Protection and Pest Management (CPPM)
- vi. Minor Crop Pest Management (IR4)
- vii. Food Animal Residue Analysis Database (FARAD)
- viii. Minor Use Animal Drugs Program (MUADP)

NIFA intends to work with stakeholders to build a much stronger, better funded, and more integrated and coordinated infrastructure that will facilitate enhanced cooperation, leveraging of investments, protection for producers and consumers, and export trade in global markets.

NIFA is in the early stages to engage relevant stakeholders to 1) identify current and anticipated challenges to protect US plant and animal production systems against pests, diseases and other sources of contamination; 2) describe programmatic and infrastructure requirements to effectively address these challenges; and 3) provide input on possible strategies for re-aligning and/or re-inventing the current NIFA scientific tactical sciences framework.

- b. **AFRI Funding:** NIFA will continue to press the case that that AFRI needs, at a minimum, to be fully funded at \$700 million. Nutritional security is a matter of national security.
- c. **Additional Support for Capacity Programs:** Funding increases are still requested to support capacity programs - to be increased at least by five to six percent. Capacity funding has not seen an increase for three years.

3. **Administration Transition:** NIFA is starting to prepare for the transition of the next Administration. A working group has formed to coordinate a range of transition-related activities, including the development of NIFA briefing materials.

4. **Capacity Programs Evaluation:**

- a. NIFA's contract to TEconomy Partners to conduct an evaluation of the agency's capacity programs is scheduled for completion in late fall. The results of the evaluation will be used to:

- i. Demonstrate the value of the capacity programs to stakeholders and strengthen USDA REE’s focus on evidence-based decision-making;
 - ii. Identify research gaps and areas of improvement; and
 - iii. Leverage the visibility and accountability of capacity programs by this independent review.
 - b. A large-scale survey will be sent to our land-grant partners in mid-August. The survey will solicit feedback regarding strengths and weaknesses of capacity programs and collective impacts from research, education, and extension programs.
- 5. Infrastructure Task Force:** The October 2015 APLU-funded ‘Sightlines’ study of our nation’s schools of agriculture found some \$8.4 billion in infrastructure and deferred maintenance at buildings and supporting facilities authorized to receive USDA funding.
- a. An APLU Infrastructure Task Force has identified improved stewardship of facilities through adequate planning and funding of ongoing maintenance need, and investments in major renovations or new construction to replace aging and ineffective or unsafe or inadequate research facilities, and recommended several funding strategies.
 - b. NIFA supports the overall intent and approach of the Task Force’s proposed strategy. NIFA and ARS will continue to work closely with the committee and the APLU/BAA to develop a balanced and achievable approach through both the Farm Bill and the appropriation process.

Additional topics

1. Subcommittee on Food and Agriculture:

- a. NIFA Director Sonny Ramaswamy and Dr. Palmer Orlandi, Acting Chief Science Officer and Research Director of the Office of Foods and Veterinary Medicine, Food and Drug Administration, have been chosen to co-lead the newly established National Science and Technology Council (NSTC) Subcommittee on Food and Agriculture (SFA). The SFA resides in the Committee on Science.
- b. Through extensive engagement with the federal food and agriculture science and technology community, the SFA will identify strategic research needs and resource gaps for the development, implementation, and promotion of sustainable food, fiber, and biofuel production systems.

2. A need for socio-economic assessment of science and science communication:

NIFA is considering developing a competitive program that would:

- a. Foster teams or forums involving a broad cohort of scientists, legal scholars, bioethicists, social scientists, journalists/communicators and engaging the general public.
- b. Assess the merits and risks science and technology, and pursue an open and effective means to credibly communicate those issues with the wider public.

3. Positive Youth Development:

Present funding resources enable 4-H to only reach one in 12 youth through Cooperative Extension programming. Funding must be increased for this important program.

4. Open Data Initiative

- a. The US Government, led by USDA, is a founding partner of the Global Open Data for Agriculture and Nutrition ([GODAN](#)) Initiative. The GODAN partnership is comprised of

- nearly [300 organizations](#) focused on building high-level policy and public and private institutional support for open data.
- b. REE is supporting the Administration's efforts to increase access to the results of federally funded scientific research.
 - c. USDA drafted a public access policy for federally funded scholarly publications as well as for scientific datasets produced with the use of federal funds, and held two listening sessions in December 2015 to solicit views from stakeholders. These views are being incorporated into future planning.
 - d. NIFA is working with NAL, FS, and ARS to outline a more detailed implementation plan to deposit publications and data from extramural research into the PubAg system and Ag Data Commons.
 - e. NIFA is considering requiring data management plans in all competitive grant programs in FY17.

5. NIFA addresses the substance abuse epidemic in rural communities, with a focus on opioids:

- a. NIFA's FY 2016 Rural Health Safety Education RFA included language that would provide rural communities the opportunity to use funds for programs that will address the opioid epidemic.
- b. The Community Assessment and Education to Promote Behavioral Planning and Evaluation Project is a collaborative USDA NIFA/HHS SAMHSA project creating a low-cost, replicable community-level monitoring system (CMS) for substance use and mental illness.
- c. The 4-H Healthy Living: Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs (ATOD) Prevention efforts include Health Rocks!® uses hands-on activities that educate youth ages 8 to 14 on the consequences of tobacco, alcohol and drug use.

6. Training grants

- a. Since FY 2013, NIFA's Education and Literacy Initiative (ELI) has focused on producing more STEM graduates to meet the projected workforce shortage in agriculture related fields.
- b. The FY 2017 President's Budget Proposal includes a new program on training grants that will provide grants to consortiums of universities, agribusiness firms, and federal agencies to recruit, mentor, and train graduate and post-graduate scholars in agriculture-related disciplines.
- c. The new program will expand the competitive fellowships currently available to attract and train graduate students and postdoctoral researchers from diverse fields of basic sciences into the field of agriculture by:

Providing opportunities for hands-on research training in some of the leading government and industrial laboratories

Offering extension and teaching experiences through peer mentoring and networking among postdoctoral students and other experts in teaching, research and extension in the nation.

2014 Farm Bill Update

Commodity Boards

- a. The 2014 Farm Bill allows eligible national and state commodity boards to propose topics for research and outreach that they are willing to equally co-fund with NIFA

through the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative Competitive Grants Program (AFRI).

- b. In FY16, five Commodity boards committed \$1.7 for seven topics that NIFA incorporated into the AFRI food security and foundational program RFAS. The five boards included the Kansas Wheat Commission, the National Pork Board, the Iowa Corn Promotion Board, the Washington State Potato Commission and the National Peanut Board. The topics they proposed are: novel pre-breeding applications for quality enhancement in hard red winter wheat; breeding for genetic resistance to wheat viruses; evaluation of various compounds as alternatives to antibiotics to treat and prevent disease in pork production; environmental influence on phenomics in crop improvement and production; understanding soil ecology to manage potato soil health; drought tolerance and efficient use of water resources in peanuts; and improved peanut and food allergy diagnostic methods.
- c. A Federal Register Notice was published in May that invited topic submissions from eligible commodity boards and marketing orders for the FY17 AFRI RFAs.

2. Veterinary Services Grant Program

- a. The Veterinary Services Grant Program (VSGP) is authorized by the 2014 Farm Bill. Initial funding for the program, \$2.5 million, was appropriated in the FY 2016 budget. The program is intended to relieve veterinarian shortage situations and support veterinary services.
- b. Grants will be made available on a competitive basis to qualified entities to develop, implement, and sustain veterinary services through education, training, recruitment, placement, and retention of veterinarians and veterinary students.
- c. Grants will also be made to establish or expand veterinary practices.
- d. NIFA is actively engaged in developing and implementing this program. Listening sessions were held in mid-February. NIFA released the first Request for Applications for this program in May 2016 with the first grants anticipated to be awarded by Sept. 30, 2016.

1890s matching funds

- a. To address the complex questions regarding matching issues for the 1890s LGUs, NIFA undertook an evaluation of the Matching Program.
- b. While much of the data required to perform the analysis could be derived from existing NIFA data repositories, NIFA staff worked with the 1890 universities and the state governments in which the universities reside to determine each entity's approach to meeting the Federal funds matching requirement.
- c. NIFA is completing a report on its evaluation and is preparing to send it to Congress.
- d. NIFA has committed personnel in its Office of Grants and Financial Management to more closely work with 1890 leadership regarding justifications and use of matching funds.

2. Equipment Prior Approval for Capacity Grantees

- a. In accordance with OMB's Uniform Guidance regulation, NIFA plans to implement equipment prior approval for capacity grantees in FY 2017. OMB defines equipment as tangible personal property having a useful life of more than one year and a per-unit acquisition cost great than or equal to \$5000.

- b. On June 15 and 16, NIFA hosted webinars to review the requirement, definitions, and implementation options. The recorded webinar, PowerPoint, and Q&A transcript are available online on NIFA's website.
- c. NIFA requested feedback and questions from capacity grantees to be submitted by July 30, 2016.

3. FY16 Capacity RFA Schedule

- a. In response to feedback from NIFA partners and stakeholders, NIFA released its FY 17 Capacity Grant RFAs earlier than in previous years.
- b. The Animal Health Disease Research capacity RFA is currently pending. All other FY 17 Capacity RFAs were published during June 2016.

4. Streamlined Process for Continuation Grants

- a. NIFA has recently approved a new streamlined process for continuation grants (approved awards that have annual installments). The new process will be rolled out in fall 2017.
- b. The new process decreases time spent for both NIFA staff and award institutions. It accomplishes this by removing non-essential forms and steps in the process. Removing these steps completely eliminates the involvement of two divisions, which is a major source of time savings.
- c. Two pilots were run to arrive at the streamlined process.

5. Data Gateway

- a. Last year, NIFA debuted a new online data tool on our public website that offers our stakeholders and partners a search capability that allows users to find a variety of funding data such as awards, knowledge areas, grantee type, fields of science, subjects of investigation, states, Congressional districts, and appropriation year. These data go back to 2002.
- b. REEport financial report data are now available in the Data Gateway. Financial information is searchable and can be exported to an Excel file.

6. "Just in Time" Submission Guidelines

- a. NIFA is implementing a new pilot in FY 2017 to allow applicants to submit "Just in Time" (JIT) documentation (supplemental application information, such as Other Support: Current and Pending Information) only if their application has been recommended for an award.
- b. Beginning in FY 2017, the pilot will be run on Beginning Farmers and Ranchers Development Program RFA and Higher Education Challenge (HEC) RFA.
- c. The benefit of Just in Time submission is that it will 1) streamline the application submission process (reducing administrative burden on the grantee); and 2) ensure that the supplemental documentation is up-to-date at the time the award is made.

7. REEport

- a. The REEport Financial Report was released in the fall of 2014 and must now be completed by all new non-Capacity grant projects awarded after October 1, 2014. These were due on Feb. 1, 2016. The requirement to submit a REEport Project Financial Report was written into all terms and conditions for new awards made beginning Oct. 1, 2014.
- b. A new function that allows non-Capacity grantees to change programmatic data in REEport was released late fall of 2015. This function will help grantees and NIFA improve and maintain data quality. Training for this new function will be provided through reporting webinars and guidance posted on the REEport section of the NIFA website.

- c. The next critical deployment (scheduled for fall 2016) will implement a workflow change that will enable easier editing on progress and final reports.

8. Grants Modernization

- a. NIFA is partnering with the USDA OCFO to implement ezFedGrants, a USDA enterprise- wide automated system for managing grants. NIFA will begin using the system for processing FY17 Capacity awards in the fall of 2016. NRCS, APHIS, FAS, FNS, AMS, RD, Forest Service, and others are also implementing or have plans to implement ezFedGrants as part of their grants management operations.
- b. ezFedGrants will benefit both agencies and their customers. Agency staff will have a paperless system that reduces the time it takes to process awards. External customers will have access to a portal which will provide status updates on their application/award and will allow them to submit required reports, such as the SF-425 Federal Financial Report (previously done through email).
- c. ezFedGrants will be fully integrated with Grants.gov and ASAP. This means applicants will still apply to all NIFA RFAs through Grants.gov, and awardees will still use ASAP to draw down funds.

BAA Policy Board of Directors Plan of Work 2011 -- 2016

Preamble – The Policy Board of Directors of A·P·L·U’s Board on Agriculture Assembly (BAA) sets forth the following five-year plan of work to guide its leadership and action in facilitating A·P·L·U- member institutions’ missions of discovery, learning, and engagement for the public good, both domestically and internationally. In implementing this plan of work, the Policy Board of Directors expects many of its actions to advance A·P·L·U’s current and future priority areas. CARET is a closely aligned collaborator.

Note: For purposes of this plan of work, the System is defined as the colleges of agriculture, natural resources, and human sciences of the 1862, 1890, 1994, and Insular/Territorial Land-Grant Universities and Colleges and non-Land-Grant institutions in the 50 states, District of Columbia, Indian Nations, and the U.S. Territories, and their federal and state partners.

Current and Emerging Issues and Future Directions

Goal: Identify current and emerging local, regional, national, and global issues and facilitate strategic discussions and actions that will impact and guide future directions for the System.

Actions:

- Encourage the various Boards and Sections within the Boards to frame strategic approaches to address existing and perceived future challenges in teaching, research, and extension.
- Support the strategic approaches developed through internal and external engagement.
- Provide forums to engage the System and external partners in strategic dialogues to develop recommendations on policy and System-wide approaches for action to address current and emerging issues.

Resource Advocacy

Goal: Seek additional resources for the System through collaborations, partnerships, communication, marketing, budget development, and advocacy.

Actions:

- Support the Budget & Advocacy Committee in their budget development and advocacy efforts, including:
 - Developing the System’s budget request and associated messages with target audiences.
 - Communicating and vetting the Committee’s message throughout the System.
 - Fostering understanding of rationale for budget requests and gaining commitment for them.
 - Effectively using the BAA’s advocacy firm.
 - Identifying and cultivating legislative Congressional champions.
 - Include System members and constituent groups (e.g. CARET, professional societies) in the development and implementation of advocacy strategies.
- Facilitate development of a communication and marketing strategic plan to enhance the public’s understanding of the System’s impacts on social, environmental, and economic issues at both the community and national levels.
- Identify new national-level collaborators and partners and foster mutually beneficial relationships with them.

Farm Bill and Legislative Action

Goal: Develop and support policies and legislative action and subsequent implementation that enhance the System's ability to carry out its missions. – Double the federal investment over the life of the Farm Bill.

Actions:

- Support the Committee on Legislation and Policy in their efforts to guide Farm Bill (and other appropriate) legislation development, passage, and subsequent implementation, including:
 - Positioning the System for new opportunities.
 - Developing appreciation within key federal agencies of the System's capabilities.
 - Identifying and cultivating legislative champions.
 - Forming implementation teams to work with appropriate federal agencies.
 - Monitoring rules as they are developed and published.
 - Keeping the System informed of new opportunities and funding mechanisms presented as new legislation is implemented.
 - Identify federal partners and funding opportunities beyond USDA
- Monitor legislation and policies that may enhance or impede the System's progress and work with decision-makers to make modifications where appropriate.

System Integration

Goal: Enhance integration of goals and activities among BAA members and between the BAA and other groups within A·P·L·U's structure to gain synergy from collaborative actions.

Actions:

- Continue communication among Policy Board of Directors members to find common ground and enhance integration of efforts
- Work with A·P·L·U staff and BAA Executive Directors to ensure appropriate and effective linkages between the BAA and other groups within A·P·L·U.
- Support leadership development within the System, particularly through the Food Systems Leadership Institute and LEAD-21.
- Foster communication with internal and external groups and organizations with common interests in enhancing the federal investment in the System.

Item

ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee Agenda Brief

Presenters: Gary Thompson and Mike Harrington

For information only

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.

<p>Chair: Gary Thompson (NERA)</p> <p>Delegates: Moses Kairo (ARD) Carolyn Brooks (ED-ARD) Karen Plaut (NCRA) Ernie Minton NCRA Tim Phipps (NERA) Jon Wraith (NERA) Bill Brown (SAAESD)* Saied Mostaghimi (SAAESD) Jim Moyer (WAAESD) Glenda Humiston (WAAESD)</p> <p>Executive Vice-Chair Mike Harrington (WAAESD)</p> <p>*Chair elect</p>	<p>Liaisons: Rick Klemme (ECOP Liaison) Paula Geiger (NIFA) Bob Holland (NIFA) Vacant (ARS) Glen Hoffsis (APLU Vet Med) Eddie Gouge (APLU) Ian Maw (APLU) Rebecca Walth (CARET) Cheryl Achterberg (APLU - BoHS)</p> <p>Jim Richards (Cornerstone) Hunt Shipman (Cornerstone) Vernie Hubert (Cornerstone) Jeremy Witte (Cornerstone)</p>
--	--

Bill Brown will assume the chairmanship at the Fall ESS meeting. We look forward to his leadership.

Discussions with the ECOP B&L Committee have focused on joint efforts to provide integrated approaches and leadership for major budget efforts such as the Water Security and the Healthy Food Systems/Healthy People initiatives. Periodic face-to-face joint meetings have been conducted, and a meeting is scheduled for the Joint ESS-NEDA meeting this September in Jackson, WY.

Recent committee discussions focused on the NIFA webinars detailing the requirement for prior approval for equipment purchases using capacity funds. The Committee drafted a memo of concern to Drs. Robert Holland and Cynthia Montgomery (attached).

At the request of Greg Bohach, CLP chair, the committee conducted a detailed survey of all AES Directors seeking input on the 2018 Farm Bill. There was a very good response with 56 Directors completing the survey. Overall, there was strong support for both capacity and competitive programs. Five overarching priorities were derived from the survey.

Overarching priorities:

- Maintain and Increase Capacity Funds
- Maintain and increase AFRI to the authorized level
- Increase or fully fund all grants programs as authorized (e.g. energy, biomass, education programs)
- Reduce the number of lines by combining small grants programs into AFRI
- Seek addition partnerships outside NIFA

**EXPERIMENT STATION COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND
POLICY**

Experiment Station Section

The Board on Agriculture Assembly

Association of Public and Land-grant Universities

June 30, 2016

Memorandum

Subject: Prior approval of equipment purchases

To: Dr. Robert Holland

Associate Director for Operations, NIFA

Dr. Cynthia Montgomery Deputy Director

Office of Grants and Financial Management, NIFA

From: Dr. Gary Thompson

Chairman, ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee Dr. H Michael Harrington

Executive Vice Chair, ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee

The ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee discussed the recent webinars on equipment purchases at its regular meeting on June 28. We are writing to express our concerns about the policy requiring prior approval for equipment purchases with capacity funds which emanates from the OMB Uniform Guidance document. Tangible equipment was defined as an item costing more than \$5000 and having a useful life of more than one year. It is unclear if prior approval would be needed in a case in which the majority of funds were coming from other sources (e.g. cost sharing with other sponsored projects, industry, commodity groups or other internal funds), with capacity funding under the \$5000 threshold.

Our understanding is that these webinars occurred due to the confusing and conflicting information discussed at the NERAOC meeting. The webinars indicated that the policy would be implemented for FY 2017.

In response to numerous questions, OGFM stated that a 30-day turnaround at NIFA would be the timeline for approvals. However, this turnaround time seems unlikely, especially at the start of the fiscal year when many requests would be expected. In addition, our collective experience with the POW approval timeframe and the recent pilot project on prior approval do not provide evidence that this is readily

achievable. This will delay research progress. Thus, there is considerable concern that the approval process will be a protracted and cumbersome. Furthermore, requests for equipment purchases tied to the respective state's Plan of Work are apparently under discussion as an option. The latter suggests that far more detail would be needed in a state POW, contrary to ongoing efforts to simplify reporting.

The submission of "blanket" requests for approvals that would cover several pieces of equipment submitted as a package were encouraged. Requests of this type would likely be handled more efficiently than an individual request. It was recognized that individual requests would come in over a year. Many projects do propose to buy equipment; these projects are approved by the NPL. The NIFA OGF position is that NPLs approve programs, not budgets.

In most cases, our campus procedures involve as many as four steps for approval of equipment purchases: 1) department/unit, 2) AES Director, who approves expenditure of Hatch and Evans-Allen funds, 3) college business office and 4) university procurement. We believe that these steps are sufficient for approval equipment purchases. AES Directors and university financial officers currently have budgetary authority for the responsible administration of capacity funds, and we recommend that the Director or his/her designee be delegated prior approval authority.

The webinar slides were posted today for review by those who were unable to join. A new deadline for comments is now July 15; however, this deadline is too short given the significant impact that implementation of this policy will have on research progress.

We respectfully request posting of the responses to all questions that were asked during the webinars. While we appreciate the extension of the comment period to July 15, we ask that this period be extended to the end of July so that feedback can be collected at regional summer meetings as well at the Joint COPS meeting in San Antonio. This also may call into question the implementation timing beyond FY2017.

We look forward to working with you and your staff to develop procedures that work for NIFA and the universities.

Cc: ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee Dr.

Shirley Hymon-Parker, ESCOP Chair

Dr. Bret Hess, ESCOP Chair-elect

Regional Executive Directors

Agenda Item: NRSP Review Committee

Report Presenter: Clarence Watson

The NRSP Review Committee met at the Hilton Atlanta Airport on May 31, 2016. Attending the meeting were Clarence Watson, Doug Buhler, Bret Hess, Dan Rossi, Don Latham, Tom Bewick, and Eric Young. The committee discussed two primary agenda items; the proposal and budget request for NRSP_temp 11, National Agricultural Research Data Network for Harmonized Data, and the mid-term review of NRSP 8, Animal Genomics.

1. NRSP_temp11, National Agricultural Research Data Network for Harmonized Data

- It was noted that each 1862 region had a presentation on this proposed new NRSP by either a co-PI or the region's administrative advisor involved with this proposal at their spring meeting.
- This concept created lot of positive interest when first suggested as a potential NRSP, but implementation details as presented in the current proposal appear to have too many problems and barriers, and the project as proposed does not appear to be financially sustainable.
- Comments in common across the regions included the following concerns.
 - General consensus that business plan was not well developed and the non-NRSP funding was mostly dependent on unrecovered indirect costs and in-kind salaries.
 - Concern was expressed over what will happen after ARS & NAL commitment ends and if the project would be sustainable.
 - Lot of concern with ICASA as the core data format standard, focus of this format is on crop simulation and may not be appropriate for other types of data sets, alternative data formats should be considered.
 - Project activity does not appear to be well integrated, only indicates that it would be of interest to Extension, and the outreach and communication plan is not well defined.
 - Private entities, consultants, data analysis companies, etc. should be involved with this project, both through participation and funding.
 - From a USDA/NIFA viewpoint, big data is of great interest, this is similar to the plant database project, lots of data in different formats that need to be brought together for further use.
 - Important for Land Grant Universities to be involved in this area collectively, but the proposed structure may not be the most effective and sustainable mechanism
- NRSP-RC Draft Recommendation
 - Reject proposal as presented. Proposal may be resubmitted provided concerns are addressed, however the committee agreed revisions and new information needed was too substantial to be reconsidered this year.

2. NRSP-8 Midterm Review

- Reviews were all excellent, only criticism was lack of attendance by stakeholder representatives at the annual committee meeting during the Plant and Animal Genomics conference.
However, this conference does not offer much of interest to them. Administrative Advisors will suggest to project leadership that they consider a separate stakeholder meeting/workshop held every 2-3 years.
- NRSP Review Committee agreed project is progressing well and no changes are needed.

Agenda Brief: Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC)

Date: July 19, 2016

Presenter: Rick Rhodes

Background Information:

3. Committee Membership (as of June 1, 2016):

Voting Members	First Name	Last Name	Region	Term	Email
Chair (ESS) ¹	Richard	Rhodes III	Northeast	2014 – 2017	rcrhodes@uri.edu
Incoming Chair (AHS) ¹	Beverly	Durgan	North Centra	2015 – 2018	bdurgan@umn.edu
Past Chair (CES) ¹	Scott	Reed	West	2014 – 2016	scott.reed@oregonstate.edu
AHS Representative ²	Nancy	Cox	South	2015 – 2017	ncox@email.uky.edu
CES Representative ²	Tony	Windham	South	2014 – 2016	twindham@uaex.edu
ESS Representative ²	Daniel	Scholl	North Centra	2014 – 2016	daniel.scholl@sdstate.edu
AHS Chair ¹	Louis	Swanson	West	2015 – 2016	Louis.Swanson@colostate.edu
CES Chair ¹	Michelle	Rodgers	Northeast	2015 – 2016	mrodgers@udel.edu
ESS Chair ¹	Shirley	Hymon-Parker	1890	2015 – 2016	sjhymonp@ncat.edu
ACOP Rep. ²	Cameron	Faustman	Northeast	2015 – 2017	cameron.faustman@uconn.edu
ACE Rep. ²	Faith	Peppers	South	2014 – 2016	pepper@uga.edu
CARET Rep. ²	Connie	Pelton	North Centra	2014 – 2016	ckays@JSC.kscoxmail.com
APLU CGA Rep. ²	Rick	Mertens	South	2015 – 2017	richard.mertens@tamu.edu
Nat'l Impacts Database Rep. ²	Sarah	Lupis	West	2014 – 2016	Sarah.Lupis@colostate.edu
Non-Voting Members:					
kglobal Liaison	Darren	Katz	N/A	N/A	darren.katz@kglobal.com

Cornerstone Liaison	Hunt	Shipman	N/A	N/A	hshipman@cgagroup.com
AHS ED/Admin. Rep	Ian	Maw	N/A	N/A	IMaw@APLU.ORG
ECOP ED/Admin. Rep	Jane	Schuchardt	N/A	N/A	Jane.Schuchardt@extension.org
ESCOP ED/Admin. Rep	Daniel	Rossi	N/A	N/A	rossi@aesop.rutgers.edu

The CMC Operational Guidelines define:

- The officer (Chair, Incoming Chair, and Past Chair) terms as one year in each office for a total of three years.
- Members representing the three sections (AHS, CES and ESS) and other organizations have two year terms and can be reappointed indefinitely.
- The section (AHS, CES and ESS) chairs serve one the CMC during their terms of office, which is one year.

4. Meetings:

- The CMC met face-to-face on March 6, 2016 at the CARET/AHS meeting in Alexandria, VA.
- The CMC Executive Committee met by teleconference on June 6, 2016.
- The CMC met as a full committee by quarterly teleconference on June 7, 2016.

5. Updates:

- kglobal released its first quarter report and an Executive Summary of the first quarter report. The Executive Summary was shared with Deans, Directors, Administrators and their teams. The full report is posted on the NERA website (<http://nera.rutgers.edu/cmc/kglobal2016Q1Report.pdf>). Highlights of the quarterly report include:
 - kglobal recognizes the importance of their work with local communicators and kglobal's accomplishment is enhanced by the engagement with local communicators. kglobal adds value is by taking individual examples from the LGU's and "nationalizing" those to indicate how system is working.
 - Twitter reach is exponential. The greater the engagement with communicators, the more impact we have in marketing the system.
 - Twitter Town Hall: kglobal analysis indicates that a single subject Town Hall is more successful than multiple subjects. The Twitter Town Hall hosted by Virginia Tech was particularly successful and reached members of congress and their staff
 - Traditional media: Press releases promoting the system were successfully placed.
- The chair of the CMC circulated an explanatory note that prefaced the quarterly report and the Executive Summary (the so-called "Executive Summary of the

Executive Summary”). The explanatory note was meant to provide the Deans, Directors and Administrators with a context for the document and for engaged actions that they might take.

- kglobal is doing a complete overhaul of its digital media this quarter and next, updating the *Agriculture is America* site and making it responsive to mobile platforms. The upgrade will also enable prospective users to easily find the site.
- The CMC is currently implementing the approved 2016 Plan of Work. The implementation tasks, the lead person(s) and the timetable are attached below. In short, the CMC is making progress on the implementation tasks.
- A significant focus of the CMC’s implementation plan is to seek feedback from the Deans, Directors and Administrators to assist kglobal in promoting different interests in the system, different/new programs, and impacts and outcomes.
- The CMC will begin drafting the 2017 Plan of Work. That will begin at the end of the summer.
- The leadership of the CMC is evolving. Rick Rhodes, the current chair, has accepted a new position as the Executive Director of NERA and will be vacating the chair’s position. Dan Rossi, the ED that provided administrative support to the CMC has retired (we all thank Dan for his contributions to the CMC!), Rick will be taking on Dan’s role as the ESCOP/Admin Rep.

6. Attachments: CMC 2016 Plan of Work Implementation Tasks

CMC 2016 Plan of Work Implementation Tasks

Number	Task	Lead	Timetable
1	Focus quarterly calls on reviewing quarterly reports and providing specific feedback to kglobal	CMC Chair	Quarterly
2	Provide more specific feedback on impact of communication effort on advocacy	Cornerstone	Quarterly
3	Prepare a one page report when distributing kglobal’s quarterly executive summary that provides a dashboard for specific results and shares other CMC accomplishments	R. Rhodes, D. Katz, F. Peppers (CMC Chair)	Quarterly
4	Quarterly report and executive summary will be forwarded to the AHS, CES and ESS distribution list and all others in the institutional points of contact list	Executive Directors/ Administrators	Quarterly
5	Manage the institutional contacts database	F. Peppers	On-going
6	Investigate a web format so that institutions can directly submit updates	F. Peppers	March-June 2016

7	Develop a one-page summary/roadmap that defines the communications and marketing strategy underlying the goal of increasing the awareness of the value of Land-grant University agricultural and related programs, Agricultural Experiment Stations and Cooperative Extension Services	R. Rhodes, D. Katz, F. Peppers	March -June 2016
8	Present a program on best practices on strategic issue management in Land-grants to help strengthen institutional plans and linking them to national plans at joint CES-ESS meeting	F. Peppers and Chris Sigurdson	9/21/2016
9	Form a communicator's subgroup and work with institutional communications specialists to evaluate metrics used in evaluating communications efforts	F. Peppers and S. Lupis	March -June 2016
10	Encourage deans and directors to engage institutional communicators early in the process	Section Chairs	Periodically
11	Obtain feedback from deans/directors and especially those who have worked more closely with kglobal on specific projects including Twitter town halls	AHS Representatives	September-October annually
12	Schedule training for Deans and Directors during the 2017 CARET/AHS meeting on strategic issue management and importance of engaging institutional communicators in CMC efforts	Executive Directors/ Administrators	March 2017
13	Schedule training for new Deans and Directors orientations sessions	Executive Directors/ Administrators	During orientation program development
14	Develop a sustainable funding strategy for systematic message testing	CMC Executive Committee	Draft prior to next quarterly call
15	Develop a three year agreement with kglobal and Cornerstone with annual contract renewals	R. Rhodes, I. Maw	Fall 2016
16	Conduct a more thorough evaluation prior to establishment of and upon renewal of a three year agreement for the services of kglobal accomplishments	CMC Executive Committee, I. Maw	Fall 2016 & every 3 years thereafter

7. Action Requested: For information only.

Agenda 9 ESCOP Science and Technology Committee

Presentors: Marikis Alvarez and Jeff Jacobsen **Action**

Requested: Discussion and Evaluate Actions

Committee Members Marikis Alvarez (Chair, ARD) Larry Curtis (WAAESD) David Thompson (WAAESD) Joe Colletti (NCRA) Hamernik (NCRA) Cameron Faustman (NERA) Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA) Nathan McKinney (SAAESD) Harald Scherm (SAAESD) John Yang (ARD) Buckner (ARD) Chair Elect (WAAESD)	Members: Larry Nelsen (ERS) tbd (OSTP) Matteri (ARS) Charles Allen (Pest Mgmt Subc) Edwin Price (ICOP) Wayne Cartmell (Social Sci Subc) Parag Chitnis (NIFA) Denise Eblen (NIFA) Jacobsen (Exec Vice-Chair, NCRA ED) 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.

APLU/AAVMC Antibiotic Resistance (AR) Report – Numerous discussions with S&T members and guests (Ian Maw, Chase Crawford) occurred over multiple calls. The interest was consistently strong given the importance of the challenge across animal health, human medicine, veterinary medicine and the environment coupled with the growing investments (faculty, equipment, infrastructure) that Land-grant Institutions and others are making. S&T acknowledges that on individual campuses and across institutions existing and new collaborations need to be cultivated and grown as this is a long-term challenge. Specific ideas created by S&T to ESCOP are presented below for discussion and consideration for subsequent actions.

ACTION – 1) Engage APLU/AAVMC with ESCOP to directly participate in pilot projects and the University Research Organization (URO), 2) Create an AR Session at the 2017 ESS Meeting, 3) Partner with other groups to create regional/national summits, symposiums and/or conferences, 4) Support increased funding across NIFA, USDA ARS and other federal agencies, 5) Engage the public sector in collaborative efforts, and 6) Create a central mechanism for enhanced communication efforts (ESCOP website, other collaborative software packages).

Awards – The five regional associations submitted their ESS Leadership Awardees with supporting materials for future use. The Executive Vice-Chair ordered recognition gifts to be presented at the APLU Annual Meeting. In addition, the APLU Program and script were created based upon the materials submitted. Four regional multistate projects were submitted for review, discussion and a recommendation was submitted to the ESCOP Executive Committee for ratification. The rankings and summary comments from S&T Committee were provided to the ESCOP Executive Committee and, ultimately, to the regional associations as a communication back to the project nominees. The APLU Program and script were created based upon these nomination and final results. Lastly, a subgroup of S&T will intensively review the 2017 call for the Multistate Awards and provide suggestions to be reviewed and accepted by ESCOP. In addition, the 2017 call for the Leadership Awards will be reviewed by the Executive Directors and provide recommendations for any substantive changes to ESCOP for approval.

ACTIONS – Finalize the 2017 call for the Leadership (following page) and informational on the Multistate Awards (under review by S&T).

NIPMCC – The Executive Committee (EC) has begun regular phone calls discussing the goals, activities and future activities for the EC and the NIPMCC. The EC has agreed to conduct a fly-in meeting to more fully discuss and develop an overall agenda for the future. This will be in Minneapolis, MN on August 25-26, 2016. In addition, the fall meeting of the NIPMCC has been scheduled for October 18-19, 2016 at APLU.

2017 Experiment Station Section Awards for Excellence in Leadership (July 2016)

Purpose

To recognize those who have served the Regional Associations, the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP), the Experiment Station Section (ESS) and/or the national Land-grant System with exemplary distinction. Through this person's leadership, he/she shall have personified the highest level of excellence by enhancing the cause and performance of the Regional Associations and ESS in achieving their missions and the Land-grant ideal. The Excellence in Leadership is a national award.

Award and Presentation

Up to five awards, one from each ESS region will be presented each year. The awards shall be signified by the creation of a suitably inscribed piece and presented to the recipient or his/her proxy at the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) Annual Meeting and will be further memorialized by a resolution to be read during the fall ESS meeting. The home institution shall be made aware of the recognition by formal letter from the ESCOP Chair to the Administrative Head with other upper administration officials copied as appropriate. The expense of the actual inscribed award will be borne by the Regional Association, while the expenses associated with travel of the winners to the APLU Annual Meeting will be borne by the respective Regional Associations and/or home institutions.

Eligibility

Individuals eligible for this award are former or current State Agricultural Experiment/Research Station (SAES or ARD) leaders who have provided service as assistant director, associate director, director, administrator or as chief operating officers with equivalent, but variant titles (e.g. vice chancellor, associate vice chancellor, associate vice president, dean for research) and/or as a regional executive director. This award is distinctive in its expectations and not necessarily coincident with retirement, election to specific office or any other specific professional benchmark.

Nominations

The formal call initiating the annual process will reside with the ESCOP Chair. Each region will establish its own nomination and review process, while adhering to the below elements, leading to the national award recognitions. Nominations shall address the contributions of the nominee to the Land-grant ideal through service to include offices held, committee assignments, and other service and, in particular, special and extraordinary service activities. Such service should include for example: active participation in the affairs of the Regional Association and/or ESCOP; regional, national and/or international special assignments with distinctive performance that has advanced the mission of the ESS and the Land-grant ideal; systemic efforts to enhance diversity and inclusion; and a record of significant accomplishments in the agricultural sciences. Specific examples of contributions may include: the enhancement of cooperation across institutions, creation of model administrative systems useable by other institutions, and development of new strategic directions for the Regional Associations or the ESS.

Submission and Review

Nominations for the recognition should be submitted to the Regional Associations by February 1 each year. The Regional Associations will review the nominations and will select their winner, then send their names and titles, bio (paragraph) for script (200-250 words), and a B&W photograph (at least 2x3" and 300 dpi, jpg or tiff) to the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee Executive Vice-Chair (lead regional ED to S&T) no later than June 1. This ED will secure the inscribed Awards, transmit the recognition materials to APLU and will create the ESS resolution. The winners will be announced at the fall ESS meeting and the awards will be presented at the APLU Annual Meeting. Regional Associations may also choose to recognize the Awardee in addition to the above venues.

**2017 Experiment Station Section Award
for Excellence in Multistate Research (updated
July 2016)**

Purpose

The fundamental mandate of the Multistate Research authority compels State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES) to *interdependently* collaborate in projects that two or more states share as a priority, but for which no one state station could address singularly. Demonstration of interdependence is a high standard, and has become a hallmark of the Multistate Research Program's management objectives.

The purpose of the Experiment Station Section Excellence in Multistate Research Award program is to annually recognize those station scientists who are conducting exemplary multistate activities and enhance the visibility of the multistate program. A recipient Multistate Project will be selected from the pool of nominees submitted by the five regional research associations (NCRA, NERA, SAAESD, WAAESD, and ARD), and judged by the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee to exhibit sustained, meritorious and exceptional multistate research activities. The ESCOP Executive Committee will provide final approval.

Award

The Experiment Station Directors have approved a monetary recognition of \$15,000 of Hatch Multistate Research Fund (MRF) for the Excellence in Multistate Research Award winner. Up to \$5,000 has been available to cover travel for up to two members of the recipient project (the Administrative Advisor and Chair or their designees) to attend the awards ceremony at the APLU Annual Meeting. The remaining \$10,000, and any unused travel funds, has been available to support activities which enhance and contribute to the research and/or outreach objectives of that multistate project, consistent with the appropriate use of Hatch MRF. Use of these funds is a project committee decision made in conjunction with its Administrative Advisor.

Eligibility

Any current Multistate Project (research, ERA, CC) listed in NIMSS (www.nimss.org) is eligible for consideration for an Excellence in Multistate Research Award. The nomination is predominantly based upon the five-year project period.

The Multistate Research authority allows other non-SAES partners to join in these project-based collaborations. Thus, many multistate projects include extension specialists as members as well as Agricultural Research Service or Forest Service research scientists. In addition, many projects have private sector and non-Land-grant participants. Moreover, the majority of multistate projects have participants from more than a single region, with many having representation from all regions such that they are national in scope.

Basis for Nomination

Each of the five regional research associations may nominate one Multistate Project chosen from the entire national portfolio of active projects. Nominations shall be made to the Chair of the respective regional Multistate Review Committee (MRC) via the regional Executive Director's office. The documentation for

this type of nomination should be sufficient to allow the review committee members to evaluate the Project according to the criteria listed below.

Criteria and Evaluation

Successful selections from regional nominations and advanced to the competition for the national ESS Excellence in Multistate Research Award will demonstrate high standards of scientific quality, research relevance to a regional priority, multistate collaboration on the problem's solution, and professional leadership in the conduct of the project.

All nominated projects, in the required format, shall be evaluated using the same criteria (with weights shown) based on the Project's:

1. Issue, problem or situation addressed (5%)
2. Objectives (5%)
3. Accomplishments as outputs, outcomes and impacts (40%)
4. Added-value and synergistic advantages from interdependence across mission areas (30%)
5. Evidence of multi-institutional and leveraged funding with examples of sources (15%)
6. List of participating institutions (5%)

Selection Process

The ESCOP Science and Technology (S&T) Committee will serve as the review panel. The review will select from the annual group of regional nominees a national winner in time for public announcement and award presentation at the APLU Annual Meeting each year. All nominated projects will be evaluated using the same criteria.

Award and Presentation

The national winning project will be recognized by the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) Chair and USDA NIFA Administrator during the Awards Program held at the APLU Annual Meeting. Each of the regional award winning projects will be included in the APLU Awards Program by project number and title, technical committee chair, administrative advisor and participating institutions. This National Awardee narrative will be created by the Impact Writer and submitted to S&T Executive Vice-Chair. The title of the national winning project will be added to a plaque located at the USDA Waterfront Center.

Timeline

- October – Announcement sent to Directors, Administrative Advisors and NIMSS participants by ESCOP Chair
- February 28 – Nominations due at Offices of the Executive Directors
- March – Nominations reviewed by regional multistate research review or multistate research collaboration committees and recommendations submitted to regional associations
- March/April – Regional associations approve regional nominations at Spring meetings
- May - Regional associations review, edit and finalize their nomination prior to the final submission
- May 30 – Associations submit final regional nominations to ESCOP Science and Technology Committee (pdf and word document)
- June – ESCOP Science and Technology Committee reviews regional nominations and submits recommendation for national winner to ESCOP Executive Committee
- June/July – ESCOP Executive Committee selects national winner
- July – National winner submitted to APLU
- September – National winner announced at ESS meeting
- November – Award made at APLU Meeting

Nomination Format

(The nomination should be a very concise summary and must be in this format.)

Nominating Region: _____

Nominator: _____ **E-mail:** _____

Project or Committee Number and Title: _____

Technical Committee Chair: _____ **E-mail:** _____

Administrative Advisor: _____ **E-mail:** _____

Project Summary (noting the following):

- The issue, problem or situation addressed (5%)
- Objectives (5%)
- Accomplishments (40%)
 - Outputs
 - Outcomes
 - Impacts (actual or anticipated)

- Added-value and synergistic advantages from interdependencies (30%)
 - Multi-disciplinary activities
 - Multi-functional integrated activities
 - Additional partnerships, associations or collaborations
- Evidence of multi-institutional and leveraged funding with examples of sources (15%); and
- Participating institutions (5%) (**page 4 only**).

Nominations will be **no more than 3 single spaced pages** (Times Roman 12 point and one inch margins) plus a 1 page list of Participating institutions and units (alphabetized) for a **total of 4 pages**. Regions may utilize other information in selecting their nominee. The final regional nomination should be submitted by email to the Office of the regional Executive Director, by **c.o.b. February 28, 2017**:

Chris Hamilton, North Central <christina.hamilton@wisc.edu>

Rubie Mize, Northeast <rgmize@aesop.rutgers.edu>

Donna Pearce, South <donna_pearce@ncsu.edu>

Sarah Lupis, West

<Sarah.Lupis@colostate.edu>

Dr. Alton Thompson, ARD-1890s <athompson@umes.edu>

Agenda 10 ESCOP budget discussion

Presentors: Bob Shulstad and Jeff Jacobsen **Action Requested:**
Discussion and Approval Action

Currently, ESS does not have a defined budget process to directly consider items that support ESS activities. The proposed Rules of Operation changes (green) would be put forward to ESS for a vote in Fall 2016 at the ESS Annual Meeting.

ARTICLE VIII – ASSESSMENTS and BUDGETS

Move the following item below on page 5 lines 8-9 to this revised section with the addition of the Budgets section “The Chair of ESCOP may authorize the expenditure of assessed funds up to \$5000 with 2/3 approval of the ESCOP Executive Committee.”.

===== ARTICLE VIII – ASSESSMENTS

AND BUDGETS

Assessments

Assessments that are invoiced through APLU shall be a single annual request and conducted in an orderly process in accordance with the following schedule:

1. Referendum development shall be discussed at the Spring ESCOP meeting, or at the Summer ESCOP meeting.
2. Written or electronic announcement of the intent to conduct a referendum shall be made to all Section members in August, once it is decided to proceed.
3. Referendum voting shall be by written or electronic balloting conducted in September and/or October.
4. Invoicing by APLU of member institutions shall be initiated in November, following the APLU annual meeting, if the referendum passes. A two-thirds (2/3) majority of those voting is required for adoption of an assessment referendum. All member institutions will be assessed, if the question passes.
5. Assessment payments are due by June 30 of the next year.

Budgets

In August of each year, the ESCOP chair and chair-elect, with Executive Director’s assistance, will create an annual budget for the upcoming year. This budget will be presented to the ESS during the annual business meeting for approval. At each subsequent ESCOP meeting during the year, the Chair will provide budget updates as a regular component of the Interim Actions Agenda.

In the circumstance that expenditures for the specified purpose of the assessment(s) is met, any additional expenditure deemed to be important and beneficial to ESS may be considered by the ESCOP Executive Committee.

The Chair of ESCOP may authorize the expenditure of assessed funds up to \$5000 with 2/3 approval of the ESCOP Executive Committee.

APLU Deferred Maintenance Committee report Strategy

Proposal

25 May 2016

The group's charge is to develop a strategic framework for addressing the deferred maintenance challenge for U.S. public universities and agencies involved in research in food, agriculture and natural resources.

There is a compelling need for a major investment in the infrastructure that supports public research in food, agriculture and natural resources. Research spending by private industry has surpassed the public investment manifold, yet private industry still depends on publicly funded research for new advances in fundamental science and in preparing the scientists of the future. While the private investments are critical for ongoing advancements in food and agricultural production, they are limited in scope and are too closely tied to profit generation in the short term to help advance breakthroughs needed in fundamentals of food, plant, animal and environmental sciences.

The recent Sightlines study (Kadamus, et al. 2015) documented a critical need to address aging infrastructure for agriculture, food and natural resource research at public universities. Of 15,596 buildings included in their assessment, containing 87 million gross square feet of space, 52% was built between 1951 and 1990, the period when buildings were built quickly and with lower quality standards and materials. Research facilities built in this time period accounts for 68% of the deferred maintenance costs across the system, which totals \$8.4 billion. The replacement cost of all research space in the system is estimated at \$29 billion.

Failure to address this challenge aggressively and systematically puts the entire public reliance on public research in food, agriculture and natural resources at risk. This will lead to a reduction in the number of institutions involved in conducting this research, a reduction in the sophistication of the research that is undertaken, and a risk to private enterprise in not having access to fundamental research findings that can fuel their innovation and translation of research into commercial application.

The private sector will be more dependent on their own innovations, which will be more protected than information generated in the public domain, and will put the

- agriculture, food and natural resource industries at competitive disadvantage at the time that other developing and developed economies are increasing their public investment in food, agriculture and natural resource research.

One of the unique features of the research enterprises that undergird the tremendous success of the U.S. food, agriculture and natural resource industries is the partnership between private industry, ranging from individual farming and ranching operations to large corporate agribusiness and food marketing entities, the federal government through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Drug

Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, and Department of Interior, state governments, through their state agriculture commissions and investments in public universities, and those public universities. Non-government organizations such as commodity groups and professional and farming organizations have an interest in this as well.

Two key objectives have been identified for strategic action: 1) improving stewardship of facilities through adequate planning and funding of ongoing maintenance needs, and 2) investing in major renovations or new construction to replace aging and ineffective or unsafe or inadequate research facilities.

In order to address the improved stewardship, we recommend the following actions:

- Development and communication of facility stewardship best practices and standards for facility managers to use.
- Seek full funding of Indirect Costs from all granting agencies. This should include U.S. Department of Agriculture funding (AFRI, block grants) as well as private industry funding.
- Greater leeway in use of NIFA Capacity Funds for facility operating expenses

In order to address funding for major renovations or new construction of research facilities, we recommend the following actions:

- Create a grants program within NIFA to assist in funding major renovations or new construction to replace facilities created prior to 1990. The program should be designed so as to replace at least half of the facilities built prior to 1990 within the next 10 years. This represents approximately \$10 billion over 10 years.
 - The program should require documented matching funds from other partners, either state government, university, or private sector matching funds.
 - The program should include two tiers, e.g. projects under \$5 million and projects greater than \$5 million in total costs, with different matching requirements for each category
 - Proposals should be evaluated on their ability to address regional needs, to accommodate collaborations with other universities and states, and to enhance collaborations with USDA-ARS
 - Proposals will be required to include a stewardship plan for ongoing maintenance of the new facility.

These two elements should be incorporated into planning for the 2018 Farm Bill.

Agenda Item 12 ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force

Presentors: Karen Plaut (and Task Force members in attendance) Action

Requested: Discussion and Approval

TASK FORCE CHARGE

Bob Shulstad, then ESCOP Chair, communicated the following in the charge to the newly appointed Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force members:

Conversations about all facets of diversity and inclusion are increasingly common in higher education institutions with frequent initiatives directed at undergraduate students, and to a lesser extent, graduate students. Faculty activities are also targeted to enhance the diversity in academic departments and programs. These efforts are beginning to assist with the complex and challenging goal to enhance diversity and inclusion. At the ESCOP meeting this past July, it was decided that a focused study and discussion on diversity in research administration and leadership across the Land-grant universities may facilitate progress with this effort in that realm.

This task force is charged to explore the topic of diversity in research leadership across the Land-grant university system, to provide ideas and actions for consideration, and to supplement institutional, regional and national diversity and inclusion efforts. The focus should be primarily on enhancing diversity among the Experiment Station Directors, Research Directors, and their associates and assistants.

Answers to the following questions may be helpful in completing your task:

- ☐ Where are we positioned currently within the land-grant university system in terms of research leadership diversity and its potential pipeline?*
- ☐ Are there actions and programmatic activities that might contribute to increasing this diversity?*
- ☐ What best practices can be identified and shared throughout our regional and national associations that would complement on-going efforts?*

BACKGROUND

The world population is projected to steadily increase from 7.3B in 2015 to 8.5B in 2030 and 9.7B in 2050 (United Nations report). The U.S. population was 321.4M in 2015 and is projected to reach nearly 400M in 2050. At the same time, the percentage of people identifying as Hispanic/Latino and Black is expected to increase (Table 1; U.S. Census Bureau). Gender distribution in the U.S. is projected to remain virtually the same from 2015 to 2050, at 49.6% male and 50.4% female. By 2050 timeframe, the U.S. share of the world population is projected to decline from 6.2% to 4.0%. Demographics continually change.

Table 1. Estimates and Projections (percentage) in the U.S. population across male and female (no shading) and females only (gray shading) from 2015 to 2050.

Year	White (non-Hispanic)	Hispanic or Latino	Black	Asian
2015	62.4	17.7	5.8	13.8
2050	46.3	30.3	9.2	15
2015	61.7	17.1	12.7	5.7
2050	47.5	25.8	13.1	8.7

As a microcosm of U.S. society, we evaluated the diversity of full-time faculty at 1862 and 1890 institutions based upon the fall 2013 information published in the Chronicle of Higher Education (October 23, 2015, pp. B30-B47). This data set includes information on 4,457 faculty at 19 1890 institutions and 76,016 faculty at 53 1862 institutions. This information is self-reported at each institution and submitted to the Department of Education. Regional and institution-type differences in gender and race are apparent (Table 2). Several observations to note: 1) the type and quality of data needed to benchmark progress does not routinely exist, 2) the specificity to a given demographic and geographic area identifies other deficiencies, and 3) while additional and quality data would be useful, the diversity gaps are self-evident and should not limit innovation through implementation of relevant change practices and processes over the long-term.

Table 2. Summary of Diversity (percentage) for Full-time Faculty at 1862 and 1890 Land-grant Institutions by Region.

Faculty Diversity	ARD (1890)	Average (1862)	North Central (1862)	Northeast (1862)	South (1862)	West (1862)
Female	42.9	37.9	36.5	40.5	35.9	38.8
Male	57.1	62.1	63.5	59.5	64.1	61.2
Total Non-white	67.0	21.0	22.1	21.3	20.4	20.3
White	30.7	74.6	76.9	71.5	77.8	72.8
Race Unknown	1.4	3.4	0.9	6.4	0.8	5.3

We evaluated the participant demographics from two well-known leadership development programs: Leadership for the 21st Century (LEAD21, www.lead-21.org) and Food Systems Leadership Institute (FSLI, www.fsli.org). These programs are extensively supported and used by Land-grant institutions. LEAD21 was not able to provide any demographic information about participants, while FSLI retroactively identified all participants (participants did not self-identify). Both LEAD21 and FSLI have begun to collect this information from participants going forward.

FSLI program participants were predominately male and white (Table 3). Participants in FSLI tend to be those with prior leadership experience (e.g. deans, department chairs/heads) and not members of the faculty. For this reason, we do not compare the results with the previously described data on faculty diversity. The finding that the FSLI dataset has a higher percentage of whites than the faculty dataset suggests that whites dominate leadership positions. Diversity is specifically mentioned as a “Secondary Competency” in the LEAD21 program, while the ability to “serve broader and more diverse constituencies” is listed as a goal for those who complete the FSLI program.

Our final evaluation of diversity under the ESS-focused umbrella involved reviewing and classifying individuals in leadership positions in college administrative units (Table 4). The five Executive Directors collected (2015) this information without distinguishing between the many different structures and naming conventions across the core “College of Agriculture” units or the core “department” units that reside in the core college. Gender and race were estimated based on names and photos of individuals (supplemented with phone queries) and then summarized in broad categories (e.g. female/male and white/non-white). Data was then aggregated by region and within a region. For the purposes of this exercise, “Dean” units will include the highest ranking administrative head of the college, the highest ranking CES administrator, the highest ranking academic administrator, and all research administrators (dean, associate dean, assistant dean). We grouped department heads/chairs under “Department” units. Individuals in an “acting” or “interim” position

were counted in the same way as the department group which only includes core departments to a College of Agriculture as head/chair not associate head/chair.

Table 3. Estimates of Diversity (percentage) in FSLI Program Participants (n=217).

Diversity Groups	Number	Participant Distribution
Total Female	63	29
Total Male	154	71
White Female	48	22
Non-white Female	15	7
White Male	122	56
Non-white Male	32	15
Total Non-white	47	22
White	170	78

The leadership in “Colleges of Agriculture” units is predominantly male and white. These trends are similar to those noted above for FSLI participants. White male and non-white male representations across FSLI and dean units were similar. However, with the department unit, white males predominant. Racial diversity in the dean unit appears to be substantially more than the department units; this may be problematic if one considers that departments are the likely source of the next generation of leadership.

FSLI participants and dean units have similar racial diversity. In-depth review of the administrative diversity reveal regional differences, 1862 and 1890 differences, specific gender and minority issues, and pipeline issues (data not presented).

Table 4. Estimates of Administrative* Diversity (percentage) in Dean (n=318) and Department (n=551) Offices in 1862 and 1890 Land-grants.

Diversity Groups	Dean	Department
Total Female	23	23
Total Male	77	77
White Female	17	18
Non-white Female	6	5
White Male	59	68
Non-white Male	18	9
Total Non-white	25	15
White	75	85

*The Dean grouping includes one top administrative head, one top CES administrator, one top academic administrator, and all research administrators (dean, associate dean, assistant dean). The Department group includes core departments to a College of Agriculture as head/chair not associate head/chair. Acting/interim administrators

were counted in both.

These packages of data attempt to depict, in a semi-quantitative manner, the significant challenge universities face to train, attract, and retain diverse administrative leadership groups for a resilient research enterprise. Trends are reported to elevate awareness and start a conversation about diversity and inclusiveness. ***Collectively, the quantitative and qualitative information reinforces a need to evolve with a keen sense of urgency to a more diverse and inclusive organization. Failure to do so may lead some to question the connection between our mission and our relevance to society.***

TASK FORCE DELIBERATIONS

To the best of our knowledge the ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force is the first group to be charged with assisting in the creation of a recommendation for a more diverse and inclusive community for our body. The Task Force uses “diversity” to reflect a diverse, equitable, and inclusive ESS organization. The members of the Task Force brought their backgrounds, experiences, and perspectives to bear on discussions creating a rich environment to communicate and share ideas, listen to experts, review literature, and synthesize information. In addition, the Task Force worked to prioritize innovative activities and best practices that will start our long-term efforts. The Task Force recognizes that diversity and inclusion, in general, is absolutely intertwined and fundamental to success with diversity in research leadership. In addition, we agreed to enhance the initial charge to reflect these questions:

- ❓ How do we create diversity in ESCOP leadership and its pipeline?
- ❓ Where are we now? Where do we want to go? What does success look like?
- ❓ Are there actions and programmatic activities that might contribute to advancing this critical issue?
- ❓ What best practices could we adopt in our regional and national associations that would complement on-going efforts?

We acknowledge that many higher education institutions have existing programs, activities, experiences, practices, personnel, and mandates that are connected to the culture and climate in the state and specific institutions, and, to some extent, professions. These diversity efforts may engage undergraduate students, graduate students, post-docs, faculty, staff, and/or administrators. In addition, there are high quality programs and conferences/forums and other venues that provide new insights in defining, assessing, and increasing diversity (e.g. NSF Advance <http://www.portal.advance.vt.edu/index.php/categories/initiatives>; Women in Agribusiness <http://www.womeninag.com>, ACE – Inclusive Excellence Group, <http://www.acenet.edu/leadership/Pages/default.aspx> and Latinos in Agriculture <http://www.latinosinagriculture.com/>).

We discussed how ESS conducts its business and activities through its governing body (ESCOP) and standing committees, task forces, working groups, and other short-term assignments. At the national level, leadership is selected through a regional rotation and nomination process based upon prior engagements with ESS and the ability to engage over a multiple year period. With ESCOP standing committees and other ad hoc appointments, interest, expertise, and time in the committee generally determines leadership. Committee support is through Executive Directors and Assistant Directors. Personnel in the regional offices provide continuity and support throughout the ESS. A combination of written policies and guidelines/practices govern the activities of ESS. However, there are none that pertain to diversity, inclusiveness, or personal behavior.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

While we recognize the continuum and strong connections to the aforementioned diversity and inclusion programs, our task was to focus on research leadership by identifying the need for and developing ideas for our implementation to address diversity and inclusion. The Task Force has collectively worked to create and propose initial ideas for implementation and fully recognizes that this effort is dynamic and may require a long-term commitment for success. We have highlighted some key areas – **Recruitment and Mentoring**, **System Integration**, and **Training** that provide key action elements for adoption and implementation over the next several years (I, II, III). It offers positive actions for all executives in research leadership positions to evaluate, modify, and integrate into their operations. Collectively, the **Best Practices** section provides numerous additional ideas. We believe that diversity and inclusion within ESS will help catalyze progress towards diversity in research leadership.

Recruitment and Mentoring

To broaden the diversity of individuals holding research administrative positions, we must increase awareness and mentor faculty as they explore their interest in administrative positions. In order to accomplish long-term change, we must move from a compliance mentality (we have to do it) to an inclusive mindset (we embrace these opportunities). The recommendations we present below are not standalone actions, but instead will support the concept of integrated recommendations. There is a balance between mandatory and voluntary actions that will likely give variable results and require further refinement.

Individuals will make a choice to value diversity, in all of its forms, rather than compliance mechanisms.

Create awareness of administrative positions and encourage individuals to apply for these positions to enhance recruitment

- ☐ In administrative searches build a broader pool and a larger final candidate group by following best practices for inclusive searches and include diversity culture/issues questions in interview processes. We recommend that each institution provides an update on this item at their regional meeting and then contributes one success story as part of the ESS meeting each year in a best practice session. (II, III)
- Create a mentoring committee or similar group to provide a regular sounding board as a new career of a ‘diverse’ hire is being launched. In addition, administrators must stay engaged and provide an on-going connection and supportive environment that takes into account cultural, academic, and work environment needs of a diverse workforce.
- ☐ Conduct institutional workshops/discussion panels on administrative careers - discussion of skill sets, different career paths, and general differences between faculty and administrative positions, and diversity issues and needs. Each institution should hold at least one workshop/seminar on this topic or incorporate this topic into an existing program (for example, mid-career workshop series). (II)
- ☐ Encourage and support (through sponsoring) professional societies to provide workshops focused on administrative career paths diverse or underserved groups. Suggest that current AES administrators serve as workshop organizers and/or speakers. (II, III)

Provide faculty with development activities/programs that increase leadership capacity and administrative experience through mentoring activities

- ☐ Identify underserved groups (not just individuals) for development opportunities including leadership programs, shadowing activities, and short-term projects that will provide learning experiences related to administrative careers. (II)

- Develop and promote institutional mentoring programs that offer an opportunity for the mentee to undertake an administrative role – recommend release time for these programs. (II, III)
- ☐ Sponsor faculty participation in leadership workshops and trainings through their professional societies. (II, III, \$\$)

System Integration

The Land-grant system is a complex national organization of institutions (1862, 1890, and 1994) that has had far-reaching impacts in the U.S. and beyond and across its teaching, research, and outreach missions. In that, our focus is on research leadership, we have focused on the 1862s and 1890s. There may be opportunities to more fully utilize the spirit of the Land-grant mission to increase diversity in research leadership. The Task Force recognizes the need to consciously increase our efforts to engage across the institution’s leadership. First, Task Force members recognize that we need to be more deliberate in engaging a diverse team of individuals for leadership tasks. Second, diversity discussions must become a regular part of future meetings. Lastly, we must fully engage individuals and leaders across 1862 and 1890 institutions. Groups would discuss and hopefully develop strong ideas and plans to explore collaborative and futuristic paths that will collectively enhance research programs and research leadership.

While our specific focus is to enhance diversity in leadership across experiment stations, we know that a broader vision requires a multi-faceted approach which starts with enhancing diversity in PreK-12, 4H, and undergraduate and graduate students. Where feasible and going beyond the 1862s and 1890s research focus, we could partner with other divisions such as the Academic Program and Cooperative Extension Sections in order to achieve the broader goals while focusing our efforts on diversity and integration in research leadership and university environments as a whole.

Build relationships and programs leading to enhanced integration across research leadership and key institutions

- ☐ Participate in diversity discussions with other Sections and integrate plans for future training sessions at APLU meetings and Joint COPs. Routinely engage with other institutions and regions at meetings. (I, II, \$)
- ☐ Create regular opportunities for active and interactive discussions (e.g. topics of diversity and inclusion) with research leadership across institution types (1862s, 1890s, and possibly others (e.g. non-land grants, minority serving)) in joint discussions that serve to enhance all research programs. (II)
- ☐ Convene an executive group(s) across 1862 and 1890 institutions to fully explore opportunities for meaningful and long-lasting collaborations across institutions with a goal of building research programs and research leadership. (II)

Review and suggest modifications to the ESS Rules of Operation and any associated guidelines/practices that incorporate diversity

- ☐ Create a small group to review and make recommendations on the Rules of Operation; Multistate Guidelines; general practices; expected behaviors; websites, and any other documents affiliated with ESS assignments to ensure open and inclusive processes, procedures and appointments. (I)
- ☐ Engage with some experts (e.g., The Social Justice Training Institute <http://www.sjti.org/>, Hackman Consulting Group <http://www.hackmanconsultinggroup.org/>, Dr. Bailey Jackson at UMASS <https://www.umass.edu/education/faculty-staff-listings/BaileyJackson>, Dr. Kathy Obear <https://drkathyobear.com/>) to target future programs to serve ESS. (I, \$\$)

- ☐ Add a diversity statement to all websites, publications, meeting agendas, and minutes throughout ESS functions. (I)
- ☐ Identify and work to resolve gaps between current mission/values statements, and policies/reporting procedures (i.e. non-discrimination policy, behaviors, sexual harassment, personal grievances). (I)

Recognize excellence through regional and national diversity and inclusion awards

- ☐ Enhance the Multistate Research Award to acknowledge contributions to diverse stakeholders. (II)
- ☐ Enhance the Leadership Award to include diversity and inclusion efforts as an element of the award criteria. (II)
- ☐ Create criteria for regional and/or national awards that recognize excellence in diversity and inclusion in ESS. (II, \$)

Training

Life-long learning is a core professional development practice for professionals such as faculty and administrators at Land-grant Universities. Informed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities Breakthrough Advances in Faculty Diversity report, Damon Williams' Achieving Inclusive Excellence: Strategies for Creating Real and Sustainable Change in Quality and Diversity, and Creating Multicultural Change on Campus by Pope, Reynolds, and Mueller, the ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force believes in creating a long-term strategic agenda of topics and activities to be implemented with ESCOP leadership and ESS that builds a shared understanding of current practices and behaviors and creates future successes.

Engage diversity professionals in the benchmarking assessment, training, and planning activities

- ☐ Use the Multicultural Organizational Development (MCOB) Model as an assessment tool to benchmark efforts and monitor progress (<https://www.pdx.edu/sites/www.pdx.edu.studentaffairs/files/MCOB%20Best%20Practice%20s.pdf>). (I, \$\$)
- ☐ Use the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) to assess the cultural competence of our organization <https://idiinventory.com/>. (I, \$)
- ☐ Engage institutional diversity professionals, preferably from the college level, in the planning process and regularly thereafter. (I or II)

Create regular activities, training, readings and other for directors at regional and/or national meetings

- ☐ Institutionalize diversity and inclusion training and best practices including sessions at annual ESS meetings (e.g. 2017 meeting) and through periodic webinars. The periodic webinars would be open to all levels of leadership in Experiment Stations. Engage key leaders at 1862 and 1890 campuses to create an enhanced discussion on best practices that aligns with various campus climates (II, \$\$\$)
- ☐ Communicate expectations for key leadership development programs to contain, and possibly expand, their programmatic emphasis on diversity and inclusion. (II)
- ☐ Increase participation from underrepresented groups through expansion of scholarship opportunities for key leadership programs. (III, \$\$)

- ☐ Apply for a National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) conference grant to bring in diversity and inclusion experts to meetings important to ESS functions (e.g. NERAOC). (II)
- ☐ Gather good practices and other resources from peer institutions and make these available in a digital library, including on-line tools for ESS members to increase awareness and competency. (I)

Best Practices

A critical element in achieving research preeminence through innovation and impact is through intellectual contributions from a diverse academic populace. Paramount to this on-going effort is the ability of research leadership to nurture, understand, work, transform, and build a diverse and inclusive environment that continually strives for excellence. Identification of best practices (below) for inclusive excellence, adapted and implemented throughout the System over the long-term, is essential for premier organizations in the future. We must reflect a complex society at large and provide solutions to complex and vexing challenges that require diverse thinking and actions to resolve.

- ☐ Successfully achieving a diverse workforce must include programs or individuals whose responsibilities are to focus on recruiting, hiring, mentoring, professional development, and retaining professionals from diverse communities. An empowered diversity infrastructure such as a chief diversity officer committed to college-, AES-, and department-level diversity efforts can help establish long-term priorities, action plans, and evaluation of outcomes.
- ☐ Civil Rights audits are a requirement for organizations with federally-funded research. This comprehensive evaluation creates an opportunity to critically review processes, procedures, and outcomes to ensure that the principles of diversity and inclusion are reflected throughout the mission. Outcomes of these audits are opportunities to improve diversity programs and/or celebrate successes. This element is currently a component of the federal audit process.
- ☐ Resources should be allocated to enhance diversity through targeted investments in graduate assistantships, fellowships, faculty sponsorships, summer support, professional development (e.g. LEAD21, FSLI, NELD, ACE), and other unique advancement opportunities to build additional leadership capacity focused on diversity.
- ☐ Create regular training and other interactive opportunities (summits, conferences, panel discussions, seminars, courses) with college and department leadership, and professional societies to elevate the knowledge and conversation of diversity and inclusion to a routine and supportive level that could also be expanded to faculty, staff, and students.
- ☐ Create an intellectual community that focuses on ways to enhance diversity and respond to the recommendations of the community.
- ☐ Incorporate accountability for diversity and inclusion activities into the annual review process for all administrators and their academic units. Ensure that the accountability measures are meaningful and encourage forward thinking. Reward innovative thinking and actions. Through confidential surveys or other means ensure that the diversity beneficiaries and all other groups have an opportunity to contribute their voice with these accountability measures.
- ☐ Create endowed professorships targeting underrepresented groups, enhance cluster hires, build cohorts for common leadership exploration experiences, and support diverse visiting scholars, and faculty/administrative fellows programs.
- ☐ Always encourage diversity in any hiring process.

- ❑ Host leadership opportunities (administrative fellows) for all faculty with upper administrative offices (Associate Dean and above), so that the fellows can evaluate their interest and aptitude for administration.
- ❑ Help all leaders see their role in building, mentoring, evaluating, and encouraging a diverse faculty and staff by reflecting on the organization, identifying challenges, and creating opportunities for positive change with attitudes, behaviors, and actions. Consider the use of a climate survey to assess the breadth of issues and opportunities spanning organization environment, culture and resistance defined by values, practices, systems, traditions, and behaviors.
- ❑ Develop meaningful recognition and rewards for individuals and groups that successfully incorporate diversity and inclusion into their programs and demonstrate broad impacts.
- ❑ Provide mentoring and shadowing to key individuals and create a broader community to enhance their sense of place, a critical mass of people, and an overall positive cultural experience. Consider mentoring efforts that span multiple institutions of varied size and scope.
- ❑ Comprehensively review processes, policies, procedures, written and electronic materials, and activities to ensure a positive climate, openness, inclusivity, and a multicultural environment with contemporary communications and actions.
- ❑ Participate in groups that have different diverse perspectives, experiences, and views to enhance your knowledge and abilities.
- ❑ Create partnerships and relationships with 1862 and 1890 Land-grant institutions, non Land-grants, minority-serving institutions, community colleges, and the private sector.
- Create an environment where diversity practitioners within and outside Land-grant institutions can actively network and share best practices. Consider developing an online database that can be accessed under a secure web environment, so that data can be updated and shared by institutions. An immediate course of action is to work closely with NADOHE – National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education. NADOHE serves as the preeminent voice for diversity officers in higher education. Its vision is to lead higher education towards inclusive excellence through institutional transformation. NADOHE has more than 600 institutional and individual members. (www.nadohe.org)

TASK FORCE CONCLUSIONS

As a collective of individuals associated with many premier institutions, the ESS organization has had a rich history and significant impact on state, regional, national, and international research enterprises. A key facet of this success is looking into the future, engaging colleagues, conceiving innovative concepts and strategies, and, most importantly, deftly executing these plans. As an organization, ESS encourages efforts to mirror all aspects of a diverse, inclusive, and futuristic community. Many of our best practices will require specific external and trained expertise, while others require a change from compliance to enthusiastic acceptance. We acknowledge that there are many tools, training firms, and institutional expertise that can be utilized to ensure success. Several examples are provided throughout to illustrate the choices, but we recognize that others should be fully explored. We have identified the need, offered options and strongly encourage action. ***The ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force fully embraces the above recommendations and encourages their adoption and implementation.***

Our highest priority actions for ESCOP are:

Create a permanent ESS Diversity Catalyst Committee that establishes goals, metrics, timelines, implementation activities, and continuity of practice with a rolling three-year plan to champion a long-term diversity and inclusion agenda (I)

Support training for Regional Executive Directors and Assistant Directors to enhance skills and build capacity. This training could be a day long workshop conducted by Dr. Kathy Obear (<http://drkathyobear.com/>) and Dr. Jamie Washington (<http://washingtonconsultinggroup.net/>) focused on Multicultural Organization Development (I, \$\$\$)

ESCOP leadership should collectively participate in a diversity training activity to help to ensure that we are modeling best behaviors and practices as members of the leadership team followed by training for ESS attendees (I or II, \$\$)

ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force Members

Karen Plaut (Task Force Chair), Senior Associate Dean for Research and Faculty Affairs, Purdue University

Shannon Archibeque-Engle, Director of Diversity and Retention, Colorado State University

Charles Boyer, Vice President, Dean and Director, Montana State University
Carolyn Brooks, Executive Director, Association of 1890 Research Directors
Jackie Burns, Dean for Research and Director, University of Florida

Doze Butler, Associate Dean College of Sciences and Agriculture, Southern University and A&M College

Cynda Clary, Associate Dean Academic Programs, Oklahoma State University

Sarah Dayton, Assistant Director, Organizational Development and Accountability, Extension Administration, Cornell University

Ali Fares, Associate Director for Research, Prairie View A&M University

Christina Hamilton, Assistant Director, North Central Regional Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Jeff Jacobsen (Task Force Support), Executive Director, North Central Regional Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Rubie Mize, Assistant to the Executive Director, Northeast Regional Association of State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Sarah Lupis, Assistant Director, Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors
Tim Phipps, Associate Dean for Research and Outreach and Associate Director, West Virginia University
Dan Rossi, Executive Director, Northeast Regional Association of State Agricultural Experiment
Station Directors
Soyeon Shim, Dean, School of Human Ecology, University of Wisconsin-Madi



Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP)

ECOP Report to ESCOP July 2016 Tony Windham, Liaison

- 8. *Private Resource Mobilization*** – An ECOP task force, Scott Reed, Chair, is charged with considering selected strategies outlined by Changing Our World, Inc., a philanthropy management consulting firm, for national private fundraising to complement federal funding and not compete with university efforts. The work will include close alignment with the *ECOP National System Task Force*.
- 9. *National System*** – An ECOP task force, Chuck Hibberd, Chair, is considering ways Cooperative Extension can better engage as a national system. Two surveys and a webinar have been conducted.
- 10. *Innovation*** – ECOP and the eXtension Foundation named an *Innovation Task Force*, Keith Smith, chair, to provide thought leadership on innovative strategies on learner engagement, environmental factors that support innovation, and Extension employment considerations.
- 11. *Federal Resource Development*** – The *Extension Farm Bill Coordinating Committee*, James Trapp and Albert Essel, Co-chairs, is guiding a national Cooperative Extension effort to outline new ideas and key issues for consideration in the next farm bill, scheduled for 2018. Efforts related to the FY 2017 federal budget resulted in House and Senate recommendation for flat Smith-Lever 3(b)&(c) and 1890 Extension funding, restoration of New Technologies in Agriculture Education (NTAE) for eXtension, and a \$25 million increase for AFRI, among other actions. Congressional deliberations continue.
- 12. *Health Programming*** – The *ECOP-ESCOP Health Implementation Team*, Rick Klemme and Celia Stovall, co-chairs, is midway through a three-year assignment related to health and health insurance literacy, chronic disease prevention and management, health and all policies education, and positive youth development for health. The team is charged with increasing evidence-based educational programs, connecting with appropriate science, and advising about resource development.

13. **Urban Programming** – ECOP is aligning with the *National Urban Extension Leaders (NUEL)* to call attention to urban programming while maintaining Extension focus education in rural America.
14. **Marketing and Communications** – ECOP continues support of impact reporting through www.agisamerica.org, focusing on water security and health, and www.landgrantimpacts.org.
15. **Professional Development for Directors and Administrators** – ECOP and the eXtension Foundation is sponsoring a session at the 2016 Cooperative Extension Section meeting on trust as a core business practice www.trustedge.com. Extension meets in conjunction with the Experiment Station Section September 19-22 in Jackson Lake Lodge in Grand Teton National Park.
16. **Celebrating Excellence** – Applications are under review for the 2016 National Excellence in Extension and National Extension Diversity awards to be presented as part of the APLU Annual Meeting November 13-15 in Austin, TX.
17. **ECOP Leadership and Staffing** – Fred Schlutt, University of Alaska, becomes ECOP chair in November 2016 following Michelle Rodgers, University of Delaware. ECOP is searching for an executive director following the resignation of Jane Schuchardt who has served since January 2011.
18. **More Information** -- www.extension.org/ecop and <http://ecopmondayminute.blogspot.com/>

ECOP is the representative leadership and governing body of Cooperative Extension, the nationwide transformational education system operating through land-grant universities in partnership with federal, state, and local governments.

Located at: Association of Public and Land-grant Universities • 1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC

2016 ESS Business Meeting
Jackson Lake Lodge (Osprey/Grizzly), Grand Teton National Park, Wyoming
September 21, 2016 (8:30 AM – 12:00 PM)
MINUTES

Time	Agenda Item	Topic and Presenter(s)	Notes and Decisions
8:30 AM	1.0	<p>Call to Order - Shirley Hyman-Parker, Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.1 Approval of Agenda • 1.2 Approval of September 30, 2015 Notes from ESS Meeting in Charlotte, NC • 1.3 Approval of Interim Actions • 1.4 Experiment Station Section Awards for Excellence in Leadership 	<p>The agenda was unanimously approved as presented.</p> <p>The minutes were unanimously approved as presented.</p> <p>There were no interim actions</p> <p>ESS Leadership Award Winners were announced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walter Hill, Tuskegee University • Steve Slack, The Ohio State University (retired) • Daniel Rossi, Northeast Region AES (retired) • William (Bill) Brown, University of Tennessee • Barbara Allen Diaz, University of California (retired)
8:40 AM	2.0	<p>NIFA Report - Parag Chitnis and Bill Hoffman</p>	
9:00 AM	3.0	<p>Proposed Changes to the ESS Rules of Operation - Bob Shulstad and Jeff Jacobsen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Rules of Operations changes • Current Rules of Operations, 2012 • ESS Budget Presentation 	<p>Changes to the Rules of Operation were unanimously approved.</p>
9:15 AM	4.0	<p>Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) Initiative – Ian Maw</p>	
9:20 AM	5.0	<p>Budget & Legislative Committee - Gary Thompson and Mike Harrington</p>	
9:30 AM	6.0	<p>NRSP Discussion and Vote – Clarence Watson and Eric Young</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NRSP Review Committee Agenda Brief • NRSP Review Committee 	

		<p><u>Presentation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>NRSP TEMP11, National Agricultural Research Data Network for Harmonized Data proposal</u> • <u>NRSP TEMP11 Writing Committee response to review and recommendations</u> • <u>NRSP 2017 Budget Summary</u> • <u>NRSP1 Preview</u> – Bill Brown and Jeff Jacobsen 	
9:50 AM	7.0	ESS Budget Discussion - Bret Hess and Mike Harrington	<p>APLU Awards Booklet/Program - \$5,000 Diversity Task Force ESCOP Training - \$5,000 ESS 2017 MTG - \$10,000 APLU/AAVMC Antibiotic Resistance Task Force Manager - \$7,000 ESCOP Website - \$10,000 Impact Database - \$10,000 Impact Communications - \$5,000 <i>(Nat'l Impact Database)</i></p> <p><i>The proposed ESCOP budget was unanimously approved.</i></p>
10:00 AM		BREAK	
10:30 AM	8.0	NRSP Voting Results – Shirley Hymon-Parker	With 35 stations reporting, the NRSP RC recommendation passed unanimously.
10:45 AM	9.0	BAA - Policy Board of Directors - Clarence Watson and Eric Young	
11:00 AM	10.0	Communications and Marketing Committee - Rick Rhodes	
11:10 AM	11.0	Science and Technology Committee - Marikis Alvarez and Jeff Jacobsen	
11:20 AM	12.0	NIMSS Update – Jeff Jacobsen and Chris Hamilton	<p>NIMSS Update Note for Fall ESS 2016</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Initial release in December <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Many fundamental database management practices in the old NIMSS were overlooked or violated and resulted in the need for the developers to manually correct issues in order to provide a consistent experience to NIMSS users. b. Most have been corrected, but a few come up time to time and

			<p>are corrected immediately.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">c. Current system follows relational DBA normalization and logic rules, so we won't experience these data issues going forward. <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. Sarah Lupis and Chris Hamilton held several NIMSS training webinars. NIMSS administration has now returned to the regional offices. Sarah and Chris continue to monitor issues and work with users and Clemson to make improvements, as needed and whenever possible to the benefit of the majority of users.3. NIMSS manual is online and link can be found in NIMSS, under the Directory tab.4. We communicate with our Clemson developers on average once a week, usually just for minor formatting fixes or efficiency improvements identified by us or users in your stations. Current NIMSS management and development follows an agile management format. Agile software management is an iterative approach to planning and guiding project processes. Updates to the system are completed in small, iterative sections, which means we'll don't have to wait for different versions. Fixes are completely very quickly, sometimes within minutes of our reporting them to Clemson. We are very pleased with this system, a vast improvement over the previous system .5. Overall:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. the new NIMSS has greatly improved security, which protects Clemson and other user institutions,b. increased data integrity, for a better picture of multistate participation nationally and at individual institutions,c. improved the ability to communicate the impact of multistate programs to decision makers and stakeholders by
--	--	--	--

			<p>validating and improving the reporting process</p> <p>d. Increased the efficiency of Hatch allocations for stations by automating NIFA participant approved and adding new participant search capabilities</p> <p>6. Going forward, we will continue to support and help users with questions and further automate the system as much as we can. We're looking forward to the renewal of the NIMSS portion of NRSP1, which will include not only continued security and efficiency improvements, but also work towards more mobile capabilities, allowing for NIMSS access on smaller devices such as tablets and smart phones.</p>
11:25 AM	13.0	<u>Update on Deferred Maintenance Committee Report</u> - Clarence Watson, Mike Harrington and Eric Young	
11:30 AM	14.0	Update on Prior Approval for Equipment Requirement Implementation – Alton Thompson	Initially, NIFA/OMB required prior approval for equipment purchases of \$5,000 or more. Regional associations and sections responded to this requirement with written letters expressing concern about the practical implementation of this. NIFA/OMB position is that internal controls at our institutions is insufficient. NIFA is investigating “special purpose equipment” exemptions (similar to NIH, NSF) and blanket approvals (all equipment approved in one request). At the Joint COPS meeting in July, concern was expressed about NIFAs ability to respond to requests within 30 days. Because this is an OMB mandate, ESCOP has requested that the BAA pursue a legislative fix to this issue. During the August 25 th webinar, we learned that for general use equipment the \$5,000 limit would apply. For “general” use equipment, the new limit is \$150,000. This will begin with FY17 dollars.
11:35 AM	15.0	Updates on the “Big Initiatives”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Security - Mike Harrington • Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People - Clarence Watson, Shirley 	NIFA has formed a coordinating committee to look into the Water Initiative. Mike Harrington and Robin Shepard will be involved in this

		Hymon-Parker, Eric Young	committee.
11:50 AM	16.0	Election of Chair-Elect – Shirley Hymon-Parker	Dr. Gary Thompson from Penn State University was unanimously elected Chair-Elect of ESS.
11:55 AM	17.0	Resolutions Committee Report – Shirley Hymon-Parker	
12:10 PM	18.0	Changing of the Guard – Shirley Hymon-Parker Final Remarks and Adjourn – Brett Hess	
		Agenda Briefs Only	
	19.0	ECOP Liaison Report to ESCOP – Bev Durgan Diversity Report – Jeff Jacobsen	
		Joint Sessions	
		Joint Session I – National Updates	<p>USDA – REE & NIFA Update <i>Parag Chitnis, Deputy Director, Institute of Food Production and Sustainability, USDA-NIFA</i></p> <p>Federal Budget and the New Administration/Congress <i>Jim Richards, Hunt Shipman & Vernie Hubert, Cornerstone Government Affairs</i></p> <p>Communication & Marketing Report <i>Jenny Nuber, Partner, kglobal & Hunt Shipman, Cornerstone Government Affairs</i></p> <p>APLU/BAA National Initiatives Updates <i>Ian Maw, Vice President of Food, Agriculture & Natural Resources, APLU</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antibiotic Resistance in Production Agriculture • Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People Funding Strategies • The Challenge of Change: Engaging Public Universities to Feed the World <p>Written-only Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact Database Update and Factsheet • BAA Policy Board of Directors Report • Deferred Maintenance Strategy Proposal • ECOP-ESCOP Health Implementation Team Report
		Joint Session II – Lessons Learned from Successful Regional AES/CES Partnerships	<p>Integrated Approach to Sustainable Control of Internal Parasites in Small Ruminants <i>Thomas H. Terrill, Associate Professor, Fort Valley State University</i></p> <p>EFNEP Related Research, Program Evaluation and</p>

			<p>Outreach (NC 2172) <i>Deb Hamernik, Associate Dean of Agricultural Research & Associate Director of the Agricultural Research Division, University of Nebraska- Lincoln</i></p> <p>Value of Northeast Extension Directors-Northeast Regional Association Planning Grants in Leveraging Substantial External Funds <i>Dan Lerner, Associate Dean & Director for Faculty and Programs, University of Vermont</i></p> <p>Framework for Nutrient Reduction Strategy Collaboration: The Role for Land-grant Universities (SERA 46) <i>Loren W. (Wes) Burger, Associate Director, Mississippi Agricultural & Forestry Experiment Station & Forest and Wildlife Research Center of Mississippi State</i></p> <p>The Western Perspective & Western Agenda <i>Bret Hess, University of Wyoming, & Fred Schlutt, Vice Provost, Extension & Outreach, Director of the Cooperative Extension Service, University of Alaska</i></p>
		Joint Session III--	<p>New Ideas and Key Changes for Federal Authorization: Farm Bill Work Session</p>
		Joint Session IV	<p>Many Voices, One Message</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elizabeth Stulberg, Agricultural Science Fellow, Office of the Chief Scientist, U.S. Department of Agriculture • <i>Ian Maw, APLU</i> • <i>Greg Bohoch, Mississippi State University</i> • <i>Gary Thompson, Pennsylvania State University</i> • <i>Richard Klemme, University of Wisconsin Extension</i> • <i>Ami Smith, Acting Associate Vice President for Research and Associate Research Director, Associate Vice President for Public Service, and Director of Extension, West Virginia State University</i>
		Joint Session V	<p>Simmer it Down: Strategic Issues Management for Land-grant Universities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Faith Peppers, Director of Public Affairs, University of Georgia</i> • <i>Chris Sigurdson, Vice President for Communications, Office of University Relations, University of Arizona</i>
		Joint Session VI	<p>Recap/Next Steps/Follow-up <i>Bret Hess, University of Wyoming & Fred Schlutt, University of Alaska</i></p>