



**North Central Regional Association of State Agricultural
Experiment Station Directors**

206th Meeting

Mississippi River Room II, Embassy Suites, Chicago Downtown Magnificent Mile

Tuesday, August 2, 2016; 10 am to 12 noon

Final AGENDA and [MINUTES \(Click here\)](#)

<i>Time</i>	<i>Item #</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Presenter</i>
10:00 am	1.0	Welcome and Call to Order	Archie Clutter for Deb Hamernik, NCRA 2016 Chair
	2.0	Approval of Spring 2016 Minutes, see: http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/April2016.pdf	
	3.0	Adoption of the Agenda	
10:05 am	4.0	Interim Actions of the Chair <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCDC230 • NCRA Contracts 	Jeff Jacobsen for Deb Hamernik Ernie Minton for Deb
10:15 am	5.0	MRC Report	Joe Colletti, Jeff Jacobsen
10:20 am	6.0	NRSP Review Committee Update	Doug Buhler, Jeff Jacobsen
10:30 am	7.0	NC Antibiotic Roundtable Update	Jeff Jacobsen, Ernie Minton, Daniel Scholl
10:45 am	8.0	ESOP Diversity Task Force Discussion	Karen Plaut, Jeff Jacobsen
11:10 am	9.0	Exploring a Collaborative Working Space for Graduate Education in Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Agbiosciences	Shawn Donkin
11:25 am	10.0	NCRA Activities and Plan Update	Jeff Jacobsen
11:45 am	11.0	Implementation of Monthly NCRA All-Director Calls	Jeff Jacobsen, All
11:55 am	12.0	General Announcements	All
		Future Meetings: http://ncra.info/Organization_UpcomingMeetings.php <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2016 Fall ESS/AES/ARD Meeting and Workshop (Joint with CES), September 19-23, 2016, Jackson Lake Lodge, Jackson Hole, WY • 2016 APLU Annual Meeting, November 13-15, 2016, JW Marriott, Austin, Austin, TX • 2017 NCRA Spring Meeting, April 3-5, 2017, Courtyard by Marriott Riverwalk, San Antonio, TX 	
12:00 pm	Adjourn		

Meeting Minutes

Attendees: Joe Colletti (IA), Ernie Minton (KS), George Smith (MI), Karen Plaut (IN), Archie Clutter (NE), Neal Merchen (IL), Marc Linit (MO), Daniel Scholl (SD), Greg Cuomo (MN), Dave Benfield (OH), Doug Buhler (MI; by phone), Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA)

Item #	Notes	Action Taken
1.0	Archie Clutter served as meeting Chair with the explanation that Deb Hamernik was attending to America Society of Animal Science business	
2.0	2016 Spring NCRA Meeting minutes approved; Joe Colletti (motion) and David Benfield (second) for approval	Approved
3.0	Adoption of the August 2, 2016 meeting agenda	Adopted by acclamation
4.0	<p>Archie on Deb's behalf introduced a potential multistate committee on Science Literacy. Marc expressed some interest on behalf of MU College of Journalism and other directors were supportive. Deb also gave Jeff Jacobsen a support letter and said that Tom Bewick would contact Jeff. MSU may provide a second letter of support (tbd).</p> <p>Jeff was appointed as the NC rep to the NCRAC (NC Regional Aquaculture Center).</p> <p>NCRA submitted letter to NIFA voicing on-going concerns with the prior approval of equipment on capacity funds. Directors asked for the NIH FAQ website on their policies. Jeff sent info to the directors via email, see http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/faq_grants_uniformguidance.htm#4487</p> <p>NCDC230 update on progress was reported with submission scheduled per NCRA guidelines for a full, five year proposal.</p> <p>Jeff and Chris Hamilton expressed appreciation for the annual review documentation and increased salary support.</p> <p>Ernie presented an overview of the next 5-year contract for the Executive Director including MSU and NCRA. The question was raised about a need for more formal documentation with the UW Madison office (tbd).</p>	
5.0	MRC overview provided as an agenda brief below. NC7 FY 2017 budget and business plan was unanimously approved (Joe Colletti motion, David Benfield second).	NC7 FY2017 budget and business plan approved. Chris Hamilton shared this information and the standing NC1100 OTT \$25,000 funding with the NIFA budget office on 8/15/2016.
6.0	Doug Buhler (by phone) provided an overview of the NRSP RC findings and an additional call with the PIs of NRSP_temp11. It is not known if	

	<p>this will be resubmitted next cycle.</p> <p>Jeff introduced the rewrite of NRSP1 given the efforts by Chris and Jeff.</p>	
7.0	<p>An overview was provided of the NC Antibiotic Roundtable by Jeff Jacobsen, Ernie Minton, and Daniel Scholl. Directors acknowledged the importance of the issue and the challenges associated with engagement across individual campuses and vet med, human med, animal health and environmental health programs. Directors requested that the one-pagers be sent to each.</p>	<p>Directors requested that the one-pagers be sent to each (DONE by Jeff Jacobsen).</p>
8.0	<p>The Diversity Task Force overview was provided by Karen Plaut. General discussion ensued. Two action items: 1) Determine when/if the NC 1890 and 1994s were invited to attend the NCRA regional meetings (Chris). Contact John Phillips to discuss future interactions with 1994s (Jeff). 2) Diversity should be a 'standing' best practice topic for NCRA meetings.</p>	<p>Two action items: 1) Determine when/if the NC 1890 and 1994s were invited to attend the NCRA regional meetings (Chris Hamilton will do this for 2017 spring meeting). Contact John Phillips to discuss future interactions with 1994s (Jeff). 2) Diversity should be a 'standing' best practice topic for NCRA meetings.</p>
9.0	<p>Postponed for a future meeting when Shawn Donkin can present.</p>	
10.0	<p>Overview provided by Jeff Jacobsen and directors asked for routine updates at future meetings.</p>	
11.0	<p>Discussed with the result of continuing the monthly Executive Committee calls only. If a topic (e.g. Farm Bill, Infrastructure funding, SOAR and Riley Foundation, Gene Editing) need to be discussed a focused call should be set up for all director participation.</p>	
12.0	<p>General discussion ensued on Mini Land-grant meetings, UAS, and FBI visit to Purdue, administrative position openings.</p>	

ESCOP Written Briefs (for topics not specifically listed above)

- [ESCOP Budget & Legislative Committee](#)
- [ESCOP Science and Technology Committee](#)
- [ESCOP Budget Discussion](#)
- [Communications & Marketing Committee](#)
- [APLU Deferred Maintenance Committee](#)

Item 5.0: MRC Report

Presenters: Joe Colletti, Jeff Jacobsen

Action Requested: Approval of NC7's FY2017 OTT budget and business plan ([below](#))

--

Summary of NCRA New and Renewed Multistate Project Approvals for FY2017

Projects Active 10/1/2016-9/30/2021

NC-type Research Projects

NC1029 (NC_temp1029), Applied Animal Behavior and Welfare: Approved for renewal 6/2016

NC1030 (NC_temp1030), Sustainable Families, Firms and Communities in Times of Change: Approved for renewal 6/2016

NC1034 (NC_temp1034), Impact Analyses and Decision Strategies for Agricultural Research: Approved 6/2016

NC1189 (NC_temp1189), Understanding the Ecological and Social Constraints to Achieving Sustainable Fisheries Resource Policy and Management (pending NIFA approval)

NC1190 (NC_temp1190), Catalysts for Water Resources Protection and Restoration: Applied Social Science Research (pending NIFA approval)

NC1192 (NC_temp1192), An integrated approach to control of bovine respiratory diseases: Approved for renewal 6/2016

NC1193 (NC_temp1193), Assessing and addressing individual and environmental factors that influence eating behavior of young adults: Approved for renewal 7/2016.

NC1194 (NC_temp1194), Nanotechnology and Biosensors: Approved for renewal 6/2016.

NC1195 (NC_temp1195), Enhancing nitrogen utilization in corn based cropping systems to increase yield, improve profitability and minimize environmental impacts: Approved for renewal 6/2016

NC1196 (NC_temp1196), Food systems, health, and well-being: understanding complex relationships and dynamics of change. (pending NIFA approval)

NC1197 (NC_temp1197), Practical Management of Nematodes on Corn, Soybeans and Other Crops of Regional Importance (pending NIFA approval)

NC1203, Lipids In Plants: Improving and Developing Sustainability of Crops ("LIPIDS of Crops"): New NC project approved 4/2016

NC1204 (NC_temp1204), Advancement of Brassica carinata (pending NIFA approval)

NCCC Projects

NCCC167 (NCCC_temp167), Corn Breeding Research: Approved for renewal 5/2016

NCCC170 (NCCC_temp170), Research Advances in Agricultural Statistics: Approved for renewal 6/2016

NCCC212 (NCCC_temp212), Small Fruit and Viticulture Research: Approved for renewal 6/2016

NCCC65 (NCCC_temp65), Indicators of Social Change in the Marketplace: Producers, Retailers and Consumers: Approved for renewal 5/2016.

NCCC216 (was NC1191), Understanding weed biology and ecology to address emerging weed management challenges: Approved 5/2016.

NCERA Projects

NCERA101 (NCERA_temp101), Controlled Environment Technology and Use: Approved for renewal 4/2016

NCERA13 (NCERA_temp13), Soil Testing and Plant Analysis: Approved for renewal 4/2016

NCERA180 (NCERA_temp180), Precision Agriculture Technologies for Food, Fiber, and Energy Production; Approved for renewal 7/2016.

NCERA219 (NCERA_temp219), Swine Production Management to Enhance Animal Welfare: Approved for renewal 4/2016

NCERA220 (NCERA_temp220), Biological Control of Arthropods and Weeds: Approved for renewal 6/2016

NCERA221 (NCERA_temp221), Turfgrass and the Environment: Approved for renewal 5/2016

NCERA222 (NCERA_temp222), Integrated Pest Management : Approved for renewal 5/2016

NCERA59 (NCERA_temp59), Soil Organic Matter: Formation, Function and Management: Approved for renewal 6/2016

[Back to Top](#)

FY17 NC7 Budget Request and FY15 Budget Narrative

NC-7 Budget Narrative: The Agricultural Experiment Directors of the North Central Regional provide substantial Hatch funding to Multi-State Project NC-7 (\$522,980 annually for the past decade), and Iowa State University provides additional, substantial in-kind and direct support. In these difficult financial times, we especially appreciate the commitment of the NCR SAES Directors.

Personnel: NC-7 Hatch funds provide a substantial portion of the personnel and operating expenses of the North Central Regional Plant Introduction Station, responsible for plant genetic resource and information management. Nine Iowa State University Agronomy Department personnel are dedicated to the NCRPIS and supported by Hatch and ISU resources, and account for 97% of Hatch fund expenditures. They are: Larry Lockhart, Program Manager II (retires July 1, 2016, position to be filled by Fred Engstrom); Kathleen Reitsma and Laura Marek, Curator III; David Brenner, Curator II; Cindy Clark, Sam Flomo, and David Zimmerman, Agricultural Research Specialists; Brian Buzzell, Farm Equipment Mechanic; Lloyd Crim, Farm Equipment Operator III (recently retired, position will be a Professional & Scientific Ag Specialist); and three months' effort from John Reinhart, Farm Equipment Operator II. Iowa State University College of Agriculture & Life Sciences provides the benefits for these staff members, retired ISU/NCRPIS personnel, and an additional Assistant Scientist III, Grace Welke. Hatch resources are also support short-term student hires. Since 2006, vacant ISU positions have not been refilled, and two support positions were eliminated due to fiscal constraints.

In FY2017, NC-7 funds will substantially provide for additional student labor to accomplish curatorial objectives.

Travel: Each Curator and the Program Manager are allocated travel funds for at least one professional meeting annually. Additional travel expenditures are related to plant germplasm collection and regeneration plot care or data collection.

Equipment and Supplies: Expenditures that cannot be covered using ARS funds.

Contract Services: FY 2017 will include metering costs for irrigation water, refuse and other services.

Repair and Maintenance: In FY17, primary NC7 funded expenses will be used to repair irrigation water lines on Agricultural Experiment Station land. No major R&M NC7 expenses are planned for FY17. NC7 staff have worked to improve drainage in problem areas to reduce loss of plantings due to excessive rains, and generally improve the quality of the fields for research, but additional investments need to be made.

In FY16, ARS funds are used to cover R&M needs for facilities covered by lease agreements and ARS equipment. ARS funding supported installation of a three-phased backup generator system, recently completed and fully operational. The roof of the HQ building and the GEM cold storage building were coated in FY16 to extend their lifetimes. If FY16 ARS resources allow,

additional mobile shelving will be purchased and installed in one of the cold seed storage building rooms.

ARS Resources: FY2016 resources are approximately those of FY2010. FY2017 is unknown.

FY16: Any funding reductions will impact projected expenditures, which would significantly impact our ability to accomplish the mission of the North Central Regional Plant Introduction Station, conservation and utilization of plant genetic resources and information management. We request funding to remain stable at \$522,980 for FY17, but ask that consideration be made for future increases to ensure stability.

NC7 Budget Summary – July 1, 2016

Basic Budget	NC7 FY06	NC7 FY15 Actual	NC7 FY16 Budget	NC7 FY16 Projection	NC7 FY17 Projection
Personnel: salaried	434,000	485,200	488,400	497,035	500,995
Personnel: hourly	10,000	33,240	11,580	4,500	3,000
Utilities & Telecom	0	4,500	4,500	4,500	15,000
Travel	24,000	11,760	7,500	16,500	4,500
Equipment & Supplies	55,762	46,100	6,000	4,600	5,000
Research Support Agreement	0	0	0	0	0
Specific Coop Agreements	0	0	0	0	0
Contracts & other Services	4,500	7,500	0	0	0
Repair & Maintenance	0	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000
Indirect Research Costs	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	640	0	0	0
Leveraged funds- other sources	0	0	0	0	0
Total Expenditures	528,262	593,940	522,980	532,135	533,495
Base NC7 Funds	528,262	522,980	522,980	522,980	522,980
Prior FY Carryover	0	81,503	80,847	80,847	72,692
Total Funds	528,262	604,483	603,827	594,672	585,157

Iowa State University Contributions to NCRPIS											
Items	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
Salaries	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Benefits ¹	156,720	161,421	166,264	180,220	194,306	186,101	205,066	192,213	201,159	210,767	222,819
Facilities off-campus ²	83,933	86,451	89,045	91,716	94,467	97,301	100,220	103,227	106,323	109,513	112,798
Facilities on-campus ²	118,391	121,943	125,601	129,369	133,250	137,248	141,365	145,606	149,974	154,473	159,108
Farm Residence ²	14,008	14,428	14,861	15,307	15,766	16,239	16,726	17,228	17,745	18,277	18,825
Totals	373,052	384,243	395,771	416,612	437,789	436,889	463,377	458,273	475,201	493,030	513,550

¹ Actual benefits may vary from annual estimate depending on personnel changes, benefit cost increases, and personal choices from cafeteria benefit plan.
 FY16 benefit contributions are reduced due to retirements and staffing changes.

² Incremented 3% annually.

[Back to Top](#)

Agenda Item 6: NRSP Review Committee Report

Presenter: Doug Buhler

From Joint COPs; for information only.

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 Item 8: ESCOP Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force
Presenters: Karen Plaut and Jeff Jacobsen

For information only.

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.fсли.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/.](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%20Practices.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://drkathvobear.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-Madison

[Back to Top](#)

Item 10: NCRA Activities and Plan Update

Presenter: Jeff Jacobsen

For information only.

—

Pre-approval Equipment Purchase with Capacity Funds: <https://nifa.usda.gov/resource/nifa-webinar-equipment-prior-approval-capacity-grantees>

Memo sent to Robert Holland and Cynthia Montgomery on 6/30/2016:

June 30, 2016

TO: Bob Holland
Associate Director

Cynthia Montgomery
Deputy Director

FR: Jeff Jacobsen on behalf of NCRA Directors



RE: Pre-approval Equipment Purchase with Capacity Funds

Through a combination of events (NERAOC, webinars and summaries, state discussion and ESS Committee interactions), it has become increasingly clear that the ‘as proposed’ pre-approval of equipment purchase with capacity funds is problematic on many fronts. I am building upon the available information with this communication.

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 and that they would be posted for further review to enable additional comments. The webinars were to be posted so that initial attendees and others who were not able to join could provide additional insight. This did not occur as stated, until two weeks after on June 29. While we appreciate the extension of the comment period to July 15, we ask that this period be extended to the end of July to better allow NCRA directors time to review the slides and respond appropriately.

In response to questions, OGFm stated that a 30 day turnaround at NIFA would be the timeline for approvals. However, this turnaround time seems highly unlikely. 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 and other programs. Thus, there is considerable concern that the approval process will be protracted and cumbersome regardless of the various options proposed (bulk, bulk within 90 days, throughout the year, emergency and at fiscal yearend). 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 simplification efforts. Approval by both the NPL and the OGFm will add significant burden to NIFA and again calls into question the 30 day turnaround.

Campus procedures involve as many as five steps for approval of equipment purchases: 1) faculty, 2) department/unit, 3) AES Director, who approves expenditure of Hatch or Evans-Allen funds, 4) college business office and 5) university procurement. These are auditable by state and federal agencies. We believe that these steps are sufficient for approval of 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 definitions at the federal level and at the state level appear to be highly consistent on what constitutes 'equipment' versus supplies further suggesting the use of state level authorities. Multiple sources of non-capacity funds with capacity funds are typically leveraged to purchase equipment. How is this to be handled?

NCRA respectfully asks that the webinars be posted as soon as possible, with responses to all questions, and that the comment period be extended so that feedback can be collected at regional summer meetings as well at the Joint COPs meeting in San Antonio. In addition, the very fluid nature of the proposals strongly suggests that more strategic communications and discussions should take place with all impacted partners before implementation. This also may call into question the implementation timing beyond FFY2017.

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

--

Update on [APLU Deferred Maintenance Committee Report](#)

Recorded NIFA webinar: <http://nifa-connect.nifa.usda.gov/p17yd09czm8/>

[Back to Top](#)

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 OGFm 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

[Back to Top](#)

ESCOP Science and Technology Committee

Presenters: 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)

Deb Hamernik (NCRA)

Cameron Faustman (NERA)

Adel Shirmohammadi (NERA)

Nathan McKinney (SAAESD)

Harald Scherm (SAAESD)

John Yang (ARD)

Ed Buckner (ARD)

Chair Elect (WAAESD)

Liaisons:

Terry Nelsen (ERS)

tbd (OSTP)

Bob Matteri (ARS)

Charles Allen (Pest Mgmt Subc)

Edwin Price (ICOP)

Dwayne Cartmell (Social Sci Subc)

Parag Chitnis (NIFA)

Denise Eblen (NIFA)

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> . 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 ESOCF 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:

- Issue, problem or situation addressed (5%)
- Objectives (5%)
- Accomplishments as outputs, outcomes and impacts (40%)
- Added-value and synergistic advantages from interdependence across mission areas (30%)
- Evidence of multi-institutional and leveraged funding with examples of sources (15%)
- 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>

ESCOP budget discussion

Presenters: 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.

Agenda Brief: Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC)

Date: July 19, 2016

Presenter: Rick Rhodes

Background Information:

1. **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 Central	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 Central	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	mroddgers@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 Kays	North Central	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:

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

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. 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	F. Peppers	March-June

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

5. Action Requested: For information only.

[Back to Top](#)

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 U.S. 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:

- a. Development and communication of facility stewardship best practices and standards for facility managers to use.
- b. 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.
- c. 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:

- a. 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.
 - i. The program should require documented matching funds from other partners, either state government, university, or private sector matching funds.
 - ii. 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
 - iii. 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
 - iv. 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.

[Back to Top](#)