## WAASED Spring Meeting Agenda
### March 23-24, 2022
#### Atlantis Executive Boardroom
#### All Times are Pacific Time Zone

### Wednesday, March 23
#### 10:30 AM – 8:00 PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Time (min)</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10:30-10:40</td>
<td>Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions</td>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10:40-10:45</td>
<td>Approval of Business Meeting Agenda</td>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10:45-11:45</td>
<td>Regional Agricultural Innovation Hubs Concept</td>
<td>Bajwa</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11:45-11:50</td>
<td>Approval of 2021 Summer Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>5-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11:50-12:00</td>
<td>Chair’s Interim Actions &amp; Executive Committee Report</td>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12:00-12:15</td>
<td>Blue Ribbon Panel Survey</td>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12:15-12:20</td>
<td>Excellence in Leadership Award Nomination</td>
<td>Davies</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>12:20-12:30</td>
<td>MRC Update</td>
<td>Hess</td>
<td>10-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12:30-1:30</td>
<td>Lunch - Bistro Napa</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1:30-2:45</td>
<td>Writing Impact Statements Workshop</td>
<td>Delheimer</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2:45-3:00</td>
<td>Multistate Impacts Portion of NRSP1</td>
<td>Delheimer</td>
<td>16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3:00-3:30</td>
<td>Break – Emerald/Grand Ballroom Hallway</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3:30-3:45</td>
<td>NRSP1 Proposal</td>
<td>Hess/McGuire</td>
<td>18-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3:45-5:00</td>
<td>Conversation with ESS/ESCOP Chair</td>
<td>Pritsos</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5:00-6:00</td>
<td>Break to Freshen Up Before Dinner</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6:00-8:00</td>
<td>Dinner at Atlantis Steakhouse</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agenda Item</td>
<td>Time (min)</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Presenter(s)</td>
<td>Page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8:15-8:30</td>
<td>ARS Update</td>
<td>Dyer</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8:30-8:40</td>
<td>WAAESD Goals</td>
<td>Hulbert</td>
<td>33-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>8:40-8:50</td>
<td>Treasurer’s Report</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8:50-9:05</td>
<td>2023 Budget Proposal</td>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9:05-9:10</td>
<td>ESCOP Committee Progress Reports and Requests</td>
<td>Donkin, Hess</td>
<td>39-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9:10-9:30</td>
<td>• Budget and Legislative</td>
<td>Hess</td>
<td>55-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9:30-9:45</td>
<td>• Diversity Catalyst Committee</td>
<td>Davies/Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9:45-9:50</td>
<td>• Science and Technology</td>
<td>Hulbert</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9:50-9:55</td>
<td>• National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee</td>
<td>Hess</td>
<td>60-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>9:55-10:00</td>
<td>• Communications and Marketing Committee</td>
<td>Hess</td>
<td>63-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>10:00-10:15</td>
<td>WAAESD Farm Bill Priorities</td>
<td>Donkin</td>
<td>67-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10:15-10:30</td>
<td>Climate Summit Discussion</td>
<td>Hess</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10:30-11:00</td>
<td>Break– Emerald/Grand Ballroom Hallway</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>11:00-12:00</td>
<td>WWN Status Report– Grand Ballroom 3</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Adjourn</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Idea: Agricultural industry is interested in creating more effective partnered pathways with universities to create an agriculture innovation ecosystem in the Rocky Mountain region to spur the economy by bridging the gap between research innovations from university scientists and commercialization of these innovations so that they become useful to agricultural producers and companies. While universities are very successful at conducting cutting-edge research, many of them are less successful at translating agricultural research innovations into commercialized products. **We propose to pilot an agriculture innovation hub with five spokes through public-private partnership to facilitate the incubation and scaling-up of agricultural innovations, coach innovators prior to entering the capital market, and market innovations.** The innovation hub aims to increase the number of agricultural start-up companies, expand business opportunities, create jobs, train and retain talent within the states, and increase the contribution of agricultural sector to the GDP in the region including in underrepresented communities such as American Indian. These innovation hubs will accelerate the commercialization of research innovations to grow the region’s agricultural economy.

**Justification & Benefit to the Region:** Food security is critical to national security. For our region to keep its competitive edge in agriculture in the face of fast changing technology and competition from other parts of the world, investment must be made in bridging the gap between research innovations and commercialization in five critical areas namely, precision agriculture, agricultural production, animal health, crop protection, and value addition. Such an effort combined with the recent investment in agricultural infrastructure will generate more employment opportunities (companies and jobs) and higher wages in agriculture sector. Although farmers and ranchers in many of the rural states produce large quantities of agricultural commodities, the future sustainability of agriculture sector will depend on innovations addressing climate resilience, agriculture input efficiencies, crop/animal health and value addition at the local level that incorporate smart technologies.

The economies of the rural states in the western region (Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, North Dakota and South Dakota) with their vast rangelands and unique croplands depend on their livestock and crop agriculture as a top contributor. These states need federal support to establish this public-private partnership to prepare the regional agriculture sector for climate resilience/mitigation, and long-term international competitiveness. Maintaining the investment in
agricultural infrastructure at the state and regional levels requires bringing locally relevant innovative solutions to the marketplace for producers. The innovation hub will be focused on bringing locally relevant innovations and higher paying jobs to the agricultural sector to strengthen our rural economies.

**Agricultural Innovation Hub Objectives:** The innovation hub cluster is a public-private partnership among the agricultural industry (including agricultural producers and businesses), state governments (Departments of Agriculture & Commerce), and land grant universities of 1862 and 1994. The purpose of the innovation hub is to advance agricultural science and technology innovations by facilitating critical private-public partnerships that will prepare US agriculture for the technology future, generate technology jobs and economic growth in agriculture sector, and allow for commercialization of innovations. The goals of the innovation cluster are to:

1. Create a regional agricultural innovation ecosystem that will link entrepreneurial opportunities with innovative infrastructure and research expertise to create products and services that advance agricultural economy in a transformative manner.
2. Develop creative solutions to more efficiently address production, processing, finance and supply chain issues facing agricultural producers and agricultural businesses;
3. Allow for businesses and entrepreneurs to guide and foster agricultural and technology innovations coming from research community; and,
4. Translate innovations into commercial products and processes that add value and resilience to agriculture and will be adopted by agricultural producers;

**Proposed Hub Structure:** The pilot agriculture innovation hub will be located in Montana with a spoke in each of the five partnering states in the region. The land grant universities in the five-state region will partner with the agricultural industry to establish this hub. Each spoke will address one of the five critical areas in agriculture namely agricultural production, precision agriculture, crop protection, animal health, or value addition (Fig. 1). These innovation hubs are expected to evolve into self-sustaining non-profit enterprises with support from industry, academic and government partners. The hub and each of the spoke will be structured similar to successful models in some states and will include:

1. Each spoke and the hub will have a Board of Directors (BOD) comprised of industry, academic, and government partners as the governing body.
2. A technical advisory committee comprised of innovative researchers to identify and assess innovation opportunities, and to provide technical expertise;
3. An executive director identified by the Board of Directors will manage the hub and solicit financial support from public and private sector sources.

**Request:** We request $10 M to establish the pilot hub with 5 spokes and support its operation.

**Federal Partner:** USDA-NIFA or US Department of Commerce – EDA?.

**Collaborators:** Agricultural Experiment Stations of the Northern Great Plains/Rocky Mountain West, specifically, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Idaho and Wyoming.

**National Need:** The proposed initiative will contribute to all six goals of USDA NIFA by taking research innovations to the hands of agricultural constituencies for the benefit of all people by addressing global food water energy security issues, climate change impacts and sustainability.
WAAESD Agenda Item 4: WAAESD Fall Business Meeting Minutes
Presenter: Leslie Edgar
Action Requested: Discussion/Approval

WAAESD Fall Meeting Minutes
September 28th, 2021

Hybrid: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84675928901  Meeting ID: 846 7592 8901

Attendance: Chris Pritsos, Walter Bowen, Leslie Edgar, Eric Webster, Gene Kelly, Adrian Ares, Mark McGuire, David Gange, Chris Davies, Glenda Humiston, Scot Hulber, Shawn Donkin (virtual), John Talbott (virtual), Nicholas Comerford (virtual), Pete Pinney (virtual), Suzanne. Stluka (virtual), Sarah Lupis (guest speaker), Bret Hess (executive director), Jennifer Tippetts (recording secretary), Carolyn Copenheaver (guest speaker), Saskia van de Gevel (guest speaker). Director Carrie Castille (NIFA), Faith Peppers (NIFA), Bill Hoffman (NIFA).

I. Call to Order- Mark called the meeting to order and welcomed members.

II. Approval of Business Meeting Agenda- Motion approved unanimously.

III. Writing Impact Statements Workshop and more by Sarah Lupis. (start- 1:13)

IV. https://us02web.zoom.us/rec/share/MxsUE0r_GfD9uyGFP9y9AhRUYHNFZ6CfsI1A6oFyrBH24JgChoXVRHPfL7NxDVG2WyMdnZUpY9Qkn?startTime=1632842375000 (Passcode: 52QGt1t#)

V. Reducing the Risk of Sexual Misconduct During Field Research and Laboratories- Copenheaver/van de Gevel (1:13-end) Please use link above for video presentation.

VI. Approval of 2021 Summer Meeting Minutes- Motion to approve minutes made by Chris, motion seconded by Gene. Motion was unanimously approved.

VII. Chair’s Interim Actions & Executive Committee Report- Mark referenced the actions on page 30 of packet. No concerns or comments made. Seconded motion from the executive committee approved unanimously to approve.

VIII. Treasurer’s Report- Gene reviewed the financials. Gene commented on how well it has been working with transitioning the financials away from the university. This is a seconded motion from the executive committee. Motion passed unanimously.

IX. ARS COVID Protocols- This is for USDA facilities that are co-located within universities. To work in a USDA lab, you will be required to complete a form with four questions and show your vaccination card. If you have not been vaccinated, then you will be required to do weekly testing. You will be required to keep the completed form on your person. The ARS encourages practicing appropriate rules of reason. They also encourage reciprocity. If your rules are stricter then they defer to university rule. In Montana it is a protected class, and it is illegal to ask if there is a vaccination. It was noted that technically federal law trumps state laws, however at this time, the rules are not clear.

X. Nominations, New Appointments & Administrative Advisor Openings- Shawn Donkin has agreed to accept a nomination to serve on the BLC committee to replace Chris Pritsos because the chair of ESCOP should not serve on a standing committee. Sreekala also agreed to serve. There were three calls for additional nominations from the floor. It was an uncontested
nomination, and Shawn will serve as the new representative for BLC. Shawn has also agreed to take on a few Administrative Advisor roles.

- There are only two vacancies that need administrative advisors they are W4186-Variability, Adaptation and Management of Nematodes Impacting Crop Production and Trade and WERA 1021-Spotted Wing Drosophila Biology, Ecology, and Management. As a clarification, W4004 the administrative advisor will be Cathy Roheim.

XI. Conversation with NIFA Director- Carrie Castille thanked members for the opportunity to join the meeting. Carrie noted that she had been looking forward to the meeting for several months. Carrie emphasized her commitment to the partnership, as NIFA continues to rebuild the agency, it is essential to have strong partnerships. Carrie emphasized that this is the members’ NIFA organization. They are building back rural communities and the food supply chain. Carrie wants to provide opportunities to have conversations with each region on a more regular basis. Carrie noted that she meets with the executive directors once a month and Bret is a true champion and advocate for the western region. What does this look like in the western region for water, climate changes, and other critical issues? How can we work collectively to best serve our needs and priorities? The Secretary has issued a challenge to bring on 50 people, and that has been done with a very high-level of professionals. Diversity and inclusion are an important piece of the puzzle. Dr. Castille asked for feedback, her objective is to be thoughtful and strategic. The land grant universities and extension offices are a great opportunity to collaborate and share data.

- Scot reviewed the proposed research and funding reconciliations with the budget proposed by the Administration. It looked very reasonable, but there were also big increases in small programs. Dr. Castille noted she is looking for opportunities and having thoughtful conversations. It is not about picking and choosing, but the goal will be to maximize resources that support experiment stations. She would like to have more resources allocated to experiment stations. Bill noted that a lot of the increases are over several years. There are opportunities that are going to be continually reviewed.

b. Geographic innovation- Dr. Castille recommended branding, as it will allow her to amplify and promote on various topics.

c. Glenda noted concerns regarding increased competitiveness for grants. Glenda has mixed emotions about FFAR, in practice it has been very difficult. Great in theory, but the goals keep changing. FFAR is constantly trying to fundraise from the same organizations as some of the universities for the matching funds. Glenda asked what can be done to provide better partnerships. Carrie meets with Sally every quarter and there is new leadership for FFAR in January. Carrie noted the importance of capacity funding and wants to be an advocate on the capacity side and asked for suggestions on how to brand capacity. Competitive funding is a real opportunity, but the funding is not available immediately. Scot noted that capacity funds give the land-grants flexibly to address immediate problems where competitive funds are at least a year out. Nick commented that capacity funds give continuity and focus.

d. Carrie discussed climate change and her conversations with NIFA leaders. She offered land-grant universities as a solution for how to solve climate change. How are we going to communicate and help off-set miscommunications?
XII. **Western Region Communications Initiative**- Faith Peppers asked members to pass along a thank you to communicators for their support over the past year. Faith noted last year media coverage of NIFA and NIFA projects increased by 64%. This was accomplished with communications from land-grant universities. Most comments were positive, the collective audience was over 18 million. There is great dedication to communication. Communications are going both directions, which has helped reinforce positive communications.

XIII. Hopefully in the next month the NIFA staff will double. NIFA is hiring public affairs specialists with experience in 1890, land-grant universities, Hispanic serving institutions, and one representative with Ivy League experience. We will have one communication specialist assigned to each region and living in each region. WAAESD members agreed to share access to university photos for NIFA use.

XIV. **Preparation for ESS Meeting**- Chris Pritsos thanked the members in person and online for their participation. The support from the Western Region has been outstanding; that includes the support over the past four years. We are excited about the program for the next two days. We are hosting the ESS excellence awards normally held at APLU because we have the opportunity to present the awards in person.

a. **Chris reviewed the CY22 ESS Budget.** The total spending was approximately $55,000 due to decreased travel, etc. as affected by the pandemic. There is a new addition for communications and advocacy. We want to create an advocacy tool kit. The idea is to mimic the tool kit that ECOP created. A new website should provide an increased brand awareness with a new online presence, experiment stations need promotion and to generate awareness. The budget also reflects funds for the standing committees to have extra time in Baltimore. The goal is the same as this year, and to allow time to develop a plan that will be presented at the ESCOP meeting held in conjunction with APLU.

Bret asked for a follow up on Faith’s presentation. Communication is critical and can lead to increased funding. The request is to develop a strategic communications committee that will focus on writing impacts. Bret is asking for 1-2 directors or members of WAAESD and a minimum of 2 communicators that focus on research impacts. Bret asked for volunteers to help identify communicators. Gene, Glenda, and Leslie volunteered to assist; Bret will communicate with volunteers after WEDA determines whether they would like to join forces.

XV. **Passing the gavel**- Mark thanked members for their contribution, including the executive committee. Mark officially passed the gavel to Chris Davies.

a. Chris thanked members of the executive committee, and Mark for his strong leadership, especially during a pandemic. Chris is looking forward to the next year, and working with Mark as past chair, Scot as chair elect, Gene as treasurer, Leslie as secretary, Sreekala as a new at-large member, and Chris Pritsos who will continue as the other at-large member.

XVI. **Adjourn**
Interim Actions and Executive Committee Report

1. Endorsed the addition of a WAAESD Executive Committee webpage plus webpages for the Western Water Network and Western Region Strategic Communications Steering Committee.

2. Continued efforts to generate regional impacts and success stories by inviting Sara Delheimer to deliver a workshop on writing impact statements at the WAAESD spring business meeting.

3. Nominated two directors (Mark McGuire and Srekala Bajwa) to serve on a committee to offer recommendations for improving relationships between AES and ARS.

4. Signed on to letters from SoAR supporting FY23 Ag Appropriations, from NCFAR supporting FY23 AgARDA, from NCFAR in support of FY22 USDA research programs, and from SoAR to “Support Agricultural Research, Extension, and Facilities Funding.”

5. Supported discussions on the Regional Agricultural Innovation Hub Concept, including making a formal request for the concept to be add to the ESCOP Executive Committee agenda.

6. Signed a proclamation expressing support for the Regional Rural Development Centers and celebrating the 50th Anniversary of legislation that formed the centers.

7. Provided $1,250 to split the cost of a $2,500 Gold-level sponsorship for the Association for Communication Excellence (ACE) Conference with WEDA. This will be an opportunity for the Western Region Strategic Communications Steering Committee to begin implementing the playbook.

8. Transmitted an email to NIFA in response to their listening session to inform development of the agency’s climate adaptation plan.


10. Encouraged creation of opportunities to enhance engagement with national leadership, including regular meetings with APLU, NIFA, and regional research EDs.

11. Endorsed continuing to broaden relationships with regional organizations, such as meeting with WGA about WAAESD’s priorities for the 2023 Farm Bill and involving WGA, CSG-West and NACo-WIR in the assembly of the Western Water Network.

12. Encouraged providing input to the National Academics of Science, Engineering and Medicine’s Blue-Ribbon Panel on collaborative activities.
At the request of the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture, acting on a legislative directive, the National Academies appointed a study committee (Blue Ribbon Panel) to identify actions to enhance the success and impact of inter-institutional activities of the land-grant system. The purpose of the forthcoming preliminary document is to solicit relevant information and ideas from stakeholders. The Panel will evaluate the input of the community to inform virtual workshops, ultimately leading to a brief formal report with recommendations.

By the end of March 2022, the Committee will be posting an initial set of observations on the National Academies’ website related to current collaborations as well as those obstacles that may prevent interinstitutional collaborations. A formal notification will be broadly distributed.

Through a series of questions, the Committee will collect responses and perspectives from a variety of individuals and organizations including ALPU groups such as regional associations, the Policy Board of Directors, COPS, university/college administration; faculty and staff members; state agencies; commodity groups and other stakeholder groups.
Multistate Review Committee Minutes
March 4, 2022
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87154869215?pwd=UE5rT3RJUzBWU1F1NG5XQkVDaU9uQT09; Meeting ID: 871 5486 9215; Passcode: 186579


Welcome and Introductions- An important note. NIMSS performed a system update, and the automatic message from the Western Region System Administrator were not being sent. Bret has been working with programmers to correct the errors. It was also discovered that a proposal entered around December 20th, right before the update, was lost with the system update. Please let Bret know if you encounter any issues.

Important Role of MRC-
The Research Working Group with NIFA Reporting System (NRS) explained the extensive peer review process of multistate committees that occurs on a regional level. Consequently, NIFA has agreed to eliminate their duplicative merit review and elected to make the regional recommendations on multistate research projects final. The MRC role is now even more important to determine if projects submitted for regional review are of sufficient quality to be approved as 5-year projects.

Proposals to Renew ERAs- (Education or Extension & Research, Activities) They are simply evaluated for quality by this committee using the J2 Form. They are not held to the same standards as the multistate research project proposals. Anything with TEMP is in the proposal stage and WDC indicates development stage or a proposal that was sent back for re-write last year. Summary comments for each ERA proposal are included below.

• At the last review, the committee asked for the proposal to be re-written.
• This project was re-written, but the group is not at a collaborative level yet. Their objectives are broad and seem to be focused on gaining collaboration, for example, meeting annually, exchange information, and networking. It is great work, but it is not presented on a collective level yet.
• The proposal was well written. The topic is an area of great importance and justification was well outlined and well established. The objectives were very general. For such a great topic there should be a highly active, broadly based group of participation, but instead the participation was limited.
• The group could succeed with some guidance.
• It is important to note the different expectations for Ws versus WERAs. A “W” project must clearly indicate they are working on the same research objectives across state lines. WERA may be individual projects that are discussed at annual meetings, and in some cases, members only receive money for travel to meetings.
• Recommend accept with major revisions that include more tangible methods to achieve objectives, greater participation, and move beyond individual activities. The revised proposal will go back to the primary and secondary evaluators for re-review. The committee has until September 30th to receive final approval.
• A WDC is given 1 year to revise to MRC satisfaction, if not it automatically terminates September 30th.

• The project was well justified and had clear objectives and a collaborative plan.
• Education plan should be renamed to education/extension plan.
• There are only 8 participants from 5 states, and do not include the largest berry producing states (WA, OR, CA). In 2019 there were 30 participants from almost two dozen states. Poor participation is a concern, especially because of the economic impact of states not participating.
• The committee should also consider local knowledge. What are the local traditional ways of mitigating invasive species, would this add to the program?
• Recommend accept with minor revisions, primarily populate, and specifically include members from Washington, California, and Oregon. Consider including local or indigenous population knowledge.

• This proposal disappeared when NIMSS performed the update at the end of 2021. It will be reviewed at the next meeting.

• This is a new proposal generated from a WDC.
• This was an outgrowth of W507.
• The proposal was well done with clear and well thought out objectives on the public sector, fertility management, youth and outreach, support tools, and economic impacts.
• The education strategy is more information dissemination. An Extension plan would include measurable objectives on impacts.
• There is a strong relationship with youth and federal partners.
• **Recommend approval as submitted.** (One typo- Forester should be Forest)

**Preliminary Assignments:** Discussion ensued about the proposals to renew multistate research projects. Few review forms have been entered in NIMSS. The number of reviews received are indicated immediately after the project title and link. These projects will be evaluated by MRC at a meeting in mid-April.

- **W_TEMP_4008:** Integrated Onion Pest, Disease and Weed Management Onions ([https://www.nimss.org/projects/18926](https://www.nimss.org/projects/18926)). 1 peer review received

- **W_TEMP_5001:** Rural Population Change and Adaptation in the Context of Health, Economic, and Environmental Shocks and Stressors ([https://www.nimss.org/projects/18897](https://www.nimss.org/projects/18897)). 1 peer review received

- **W_TEMP_5122:** Beneficial and Adverse Effects of Natural Chemicals on Human Health and Food Safety ([https://www.nimss.org/projects/18911](https://www.nimss.org/projects/18911)). 1 peer review received

- **W_TEMP_5133:** Economic Valuation and Management of Natural Resources on Public and Private Lands ([https://www.nimss.org/projects/18858](https://www.nimss.org/projects/18858)). 2 peer reviews received

- **W_TEMP_5177:** Enhancing the Competitiveness and Value of U.S. Beef ([https://www.nimss.org/projects/18944](https://www.nimss.org/projects/18944)). 0 peer reviews received

- **W_TEMP_5185:** Biological Control in Pest Management Systems of Plants ([https://www.nimss.org/projects/18930](https://www.nimss.org/projects/18930)). 1 peer review received

**Projects Terminating**

- W519: Rapid Response to Mitigate Impacts of SARS-CoV-2 Across Food and Agricultural Systems
- W3191: Elder Financial Exploitation: Family Risk and Protective Factors
- WERA1023: Watershed Processes and Human Water Systems

**Projects Delayed**

- **W_TEMP_4005:** Developing synergistic approaches to healthy weight in childhood through positive relationships, diet quality and physical activity
Administrative Advisor Vacancies

W2194: Children’s Healthy Living Network (CHLN) in the U.S. Affiliated Pacific Region (formerly Sereana Dresbach)

- Walter volunteered to serve as AA.

Excellence in Multistate Research Award ([https://www.waaesd.org/call-for-nominations-2022-experiment-station-section-award-for-excellence-in-multistate-research](https://www.waaesd.org/call-for-nominations-2022-experiment-station-section-award-for-excellence-in-multistate-research)): There are not any nominations at this time. The submission deadline was February 28th. There was a request to extend the deadline, and Bret is hoping for at least one proposal to review at the next meeting. The West has been the recipient for the last two years. Remember, however, projects are hosted by the region and national in scope.

**Multistate Committee Crosswalk:** This was a request from STC to crosswalk with some emerging priorities from NIFA, specifically climate change. As an addition to climate change, there was a recommendation to crosswalk all NIFA priorities and ESCOP priorities from the Grand Challenges in the Science Roadmap. NIFA wants to be known as a lead agency of climate change. This was originally brought to STC to help determine climate change experts. The committee expanded the scope because climate is important, but other areas are also important.

Natural Resources Management, Preservation, and Conservation may need to be added if it is not covered under Environmental Stewardship. The Wild Horse project would be a great example of how we define ourselves in the West differently from other regions.

A recommendation was made to consider direct or secondary impact instead of direct or loose alignment, but since this is an ESCOP STC request, alignment will be the first step. Impact can then be determined from those that align directly.

ESCOP hired a multistate impact writer. Once we determine direct alignment that writer can take it a step further.

**Next MRC Meeting**- The next meeting will be in April. Jenn will send a doodle poll and schedule the next meeting.

**MRC Membership**- review of terms, listed on WAAESD Website. Volunteers serve a four-year term. One WAAESD representative will need to be named for FY23. Two more will be need in FY24.
THE PARTS OF AN IMPACT STORY:

WHAT IS the ISSUE, WHY WAS IT an ISSUE & FOR WHOM IS IT an ISSUE?
- Connect to hot topics.
- Make people care.

WHAT WAS DONE?
- Describe major research/Extension activities.
- Who was involved?
- Be brief and clear.
- Don't go on and on about methods.
- No jargon.
- Highlight innovation and collaboration.

WHAT WERE the IMPACTS?
- Why do the project/program results and outputs matter?
- What kind of impact?
- How big was the impact?
- Where did the impact occur?
- Who was impacted?

WHAT WAS LEARNED or PRODUCED?
- Share major findings, but don't list a ton of data.
- Share important tools, products, workshops, and other outputs.

MULTISTATE projects:
- Describe the benefits or importance of multistate collaboration.
- Keep activities and impacts organized by type, objective, or other scheme.
- Work together on impact statements.
- Track impacts over time; show progress and return on investment.

IMPACT = condition* + behavior + knowledge
- economic, environmental or social

Still having TROUBLE?
- Think about potential impacts.
- Explain how your research creates a foundation for future impacts.
- Describe the ripple effect of small and/or early impacts over time.
- Show how your work is playing a part in certain impacts.

This guide was developed by the Multistate Research Fund Impacts Program as a supplement to the Impact Writing Workshop “Big Impact: Why Impact! Reporting Matters and How to Do It Better.” You may share this document, but please do not alter or use without attribution. For more information, visit mrfimpacts.org.
IDENTIFY THE PARTS OF YOUR IMPACT STORY.

What issue is being addressed? (e.g., 15% of dairy cow population was lost to disease in 2016)

Who cares about this issue? (e.g., farmers; consumers)

Why do they care about the issue? (e.g., farmers are losing money; consumers want safe, steady dairy supply)

What did the project do to address the issue? (e.g., studied disease, hosted field days)

Did the project use any unique or innovative methods or tools?

Who was involved?

What were the major results or outputs? (e.g., a new vaccine is 10% effective than others)

What kind of impact did the project have or could it have? (e.g., changes in condition, behavior, or knowledge)

Who was impacted? (e.g., farmers, consumers, local businesses)

Where did this impact occur?

How big was this impact?

USE THE INFORMATION ABOVE TO WRITE AN IMPACT STATEMENT.

REVIEW YOUR STATEMENT.

Did you remember to...

☐ talk about all parts of the impact story?
☐ NOT talk too much about methods/theory?
☐ NOT use jargon?
☐ use numbers to show magnitude?
☐ write with an active voice?
☐ only share meaningful info?
☐ be concise?
☐ include a link to more information?

SHARE YOUR STATEMENT.

Think about your audience.

Think about where to share your impact.

- Databases
- Social media
- Department leadership
- Communications team
- Newspapers/magazines
- Speeches
- Interviews
THE MULTISTATE RESEARCH FUND IMPACTS PROGRAM

Administered by U.S. Department of Agriculture’s National Institute of Food and Agriculture (USDA-NIFA), the Hatch Multistate Research Fund (MRF) supports agricultural innovation and sustainability by funding collaborative research projects led by State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES) and land-grant universities. The Multistate Research Fund Impacts Program (MRF Impacts) communicates the importance of these projects to the public through Impact Statements and other materials. We also provide workshops and training materials to help scientists report their impacts. This program is funded through the MRF as a National Research Support Project and is overseen by a Management Committee made up of Regional SAES Association leadership, USDA-NIFA liaisons, and others.

OUR IMPACT STATEMENTS

- **SUMMARIES.** In 1-2 pages, Impact Statements highlight a project’s major activities, findings, and IMPACTS on knowledge, behavior, and social, economic, or environmental conditions.
- **NOT TECHNICAL REPORTS.** Impact Statements use everyday language geared towards audiences who aren’t topic experts or scientists.
- **VISUAL.** Impact Statements use images, icons, charts, illustrations, and other visual aids.
- **WRITTEN WHEN A PROJECT ENDS.** Impact Statements are written at the end of a project’s five-year cycle.
- **BASED ON ANNUAL REPORTS.** Information in Impact Statements comes from annual reports submitted by project participants to the National Information Management & Support System (NIMSS; nimss.org).
- **REVIEWED.** Project participants and Administrative Advisors review Impact Statements for accuracy.
- **USEFUL RESOURCES.** Impact Statements can be easily repurposed for different audiences and platforms.
- **IMPORTANT.** Impact Statements demonstrate the public value of collaborative agricultural research and the excellence of the Land-grant University System.

IMPACT WRITING WORKSHOPS

Our Impact Writing Workshops explain the role impact reporting plays in supporting research programs and give participants knowledge and tools for writing, identifying, and leveraging strong impact statements. Contact sara.delheimer@colostate.edu to learn more about hosting a workshop. Download our worksheets for help now: bit.ly/impact-training.

HOW ARE IMPACT STATEMENTS USED?

- **SENT** directly to USDA-NIFA, SAES Directors, university leaders, and others
- **DISCUSSED** with legislators, program leaders, faculty, stakeholders, and others
- **FEATURED** in magazines, newspapers, newsletters, blogs, and other communication pieces
- **INCLUDED** in presentations, grant proposals, legislative briefs, and reports
- **SHARED** on Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, and LinkedIn
- **ARCHIVED** in databases like nimss.org and landgrantimpacts.org
- **UPLOADEd** to websites like MRFimpacts.org

YOU can do these things, too!
Project participants are encouraged to share photos of their team, research activities, outreach events, etc., as well as exciting, interesting, or funny personal stories about their work on the project. The Impact Writer will use stories and photos on social media and in other communication pieces as engaging supplements to the Impact Statement.

Project participants may share or use the Impact Statement—or any part of it—as they see fit. During the review process, the Impact Writer will provide information about how MRFImpacts plans to use the Impact Statement and will suggest ways project participants can share and use the Impact Statement.

Impact Writer makes final revisions and sends final Impact Statement to project participants.

Impact Writer extends revisions Impact Statement and sends revised draft for final review.

Project participants have up to one week to complete a final review and request any further edits.

Review should focus on ensuring the accuracy of the Impact Statement.

Suggested edits should be brief, avoid jargon, focus on impacts, and relate to work done during the five-year project cycle covered by the Impact Statement.

Impact Writer will work with project participants as needed to identify suitable phrasing of edits.

Project participants are encouraged to share photos of their team, research activities, outreach events, etc., as well as exciting, interesting, or funny personal stories about their work on the project. The Impact Writer will use stories and photos on social media and in other communication pieces as engaging supplements to the Impact Statement.

Project participants may share or use the Impact Statement—or any part of it—as they see fit. During the review process, the Impact Writer will provide information about how MRFImpacts plans to use the Impact Statement and will suggest ways project participants can share and use the Impact Statement.

Everyone

SAES DIRECTORS
- Make Administrative Advisors and others aware of MRF Impacts resources
- Share stories in which multistate projects or their members are featured with the Impact Writer

ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISORS
- Make project participants aware of MRF Impacts
- Ensure multistate groups submit thorough reports to NIMSS each year in a timely manner
- Encourage project participants to engage in the Impact Statement review process

IMPACT STATEMENT REVIEW PROCESS

WHAT IS YOUR ROLE?

Impact Writer sends draft Impact Statement PDF to project participants.

Impact Writer has one week to review the Impact Statement and send edits/comments to sara.delheimer@colostate.edu. Reviewers may mark directly on the PDF or list edits in the body of an email.
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Review should focus on ensuring the accuracy of the Impact Statement.

Suggested edits should be brief, avoid jargon, focus on impacts, and relate to work done during the five-year project cycle covered by the Impact Statement.

Impact Writer will work with project participants as needed to identify suitable phrasing of edits.

Project participants are encouraged to share photos of their team, research activities, outreach events, etc., as well as exciting, interesting, or funny personal stories about their work on the project. The Impact Writer will use stories and photos on social media and in other communication pieces as engaging supplements to the Impact Statement.

Project participants may share or use the Impact Statement—or any part of it—as they see fit. During the review process, the Impact Writer will provide information about how MRFImpacts plans to use the Impact Statement and will suggest ways project participants can share and use the Impact Statement.

Share and use Impact Statements
Let us know when you use our Impact Statements or other materials to help us track our reach and impact
Sign up for our newsletter: bit.ly/MRFImpacts-subscribe
Follow @MRFImpacts on social media and engage

Everyone
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Follow @MRFImpacts on social media and engage
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Impact Writer has one week to review the Impact Statement and send edits/comments to sara.delheimer@colostate.edu. Reviewers may mark directly on the PDF or list edits in the body of an email.

Project participants have up to one week to complete a final review and request any further edits.

Review should focus on ensuring the accuracy of the Impact Statement.

Suggested edits should be brief, avoid jargon, focus on impacts, and relate to work done during the five-year project cycle covered by the Impact Statement.

Impact Writer will work with project participants as needed to identify suitable phrasing of edits.

Project participants are encouraged to share photos of their team, research activities, outreach events, etc., as well as exciting, interesting, or funny personal stories about their work on the project. The Impact Writer will use stories and photos on social media and in other communication pieces as engaging supplements to the Impact Statement.
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NRSP1 is a long-term, 1862 Land-grant State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) project that has existed for almost two decades, supporting our regional and national Hatch Multistate research projects and Extension-integrated activities. NIMSS facilitates multistate project management, from proposal conception to project termination. Initially, NRSP1 served as the financial mechanism for the legacy NIMSS (National Information Management Support System), which was developed and housed at the University of Maryland until 2014 when a security breach at the University of Maryland forced the Experiment Station Section (ESS) to migrate NIMSS. A full redesign of the database was implemented with a Clemson University’s ITT contractor. With guidance from an ESS and NIFA-partnered team, Clemson developers created a secure, modern, and agile new NIMSS that went online in 2015.

Following the initial three-year (FFY2014 to 2017) NIMSS redesign period, ESS renewed its contract with Clemson University ITT in 2017 for a full, five-year NRSP, ending on September 30, 2022. That renewal has allowed for continuation of critical multistate research support services, improved system efficiency, continued security enhancement, daily data back-ups, and continued correction of legacy system data integrity. In addition, the Clemson team was able to work closely with US Department of Agriculture (USDA)-National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) to allow for improved data integration and sharing with REEport and as of spring 2021, into the new NIFA Reporting System (NRS). Clemson developers and the regional NIMSS system administrators (RSAs) work together with stakeholders to continue to cooperatively identify and develop new system features.

NIMSS continues to serve ESS as a web-based application allowing: (1) online submission of proposals, peer reviews and progress reports, (2) management of participants, (3) scheduling of annual project meetings, (4) current and past project proposals, and (5) ready access to this information. An automated e-mail notification function prompts users to take action and sends out notifications for meetings and report deadlines, along with instructions for completing required tasks. Researchers, Extension educators, stakeholders, and other cooperators can review and keyword search NIMSS for relevant and timely information related to multistate research projects. In addition, the public has access to research project outlines and impacts without needing to apply for an account. NIMSS is now serving all of the 1862 and many 1890 Land-grant institutions, allowing them to manage, in a paperless environment, our multistate research project portfolios.
Impact reporting is a vital mechanism for project accountability and generating awareness of and support for NIFA-supported research. While NIMSS operates as an internal system for administrating Hatch Multistate projects, it is important to share the impacts of these projects with decision-makers and stakeholders. Project participants submit technical reports and publications throughout each project period, but a professional communications strategy and communicators are needed to develop cohesive messaging, create engaging materials, and reach a wider audience.

Since 2012, NRSP1 has supported the Multistate Research Fund Impacts Program (MRF Impacts), which employs communication professionals who use a variety of strategies to showcase the unique value and successes of Hatch Multistate projects and enhance the visibility of SAES and land-grant universities (LGUs). This is done primarily through Impact Statements (one- to two-page infographics) for terminating projects. Impact Statements are shared directly with Administrative Advisors (AAs), project participants, Regional SAES Associations, and NIFA representatives. They are often shared with leadership and communicators at participating LGUs, partner trade/industry associations, elected officials, regulatory organizations, media, and others. These beneficiaries use Impact Statements to prepare reports, blog posts, press releases, articles, speeches, responses to Congressional inquiries, and more. Secondary beneficiaries include producers and the general public who are impacted by Hatch Multistate research projects.

In addition to being housed on the MRF Impacts website (mrfimpacts.org), Impact Statements are also uploaded to the NIMSS database and the National Land-grant Impacts Database (NIDB; landgrantimpacts.org). Impact Statements are uploaded in multiple locations to reach a variety of audiences and serve different purposes. For example, the NIDB does not display final, formatted Impact Statements (it only supports text), and visitors to NIMSS are largely project participants, so Impact Statements are uploaded to this database for mostly archival purposes. The MRF Impacts website houses Impact Statements and other program information and materials in a public-friendly format. Future work will consider ways to better link the MRF Impacts website, NIMSS, and NIDB for easier access and greater functionality.

Social media continues to be an important space for communicating. Effective social media requires monitoring and networking and a deep understanding of program messaging and resources. In the previous project period, we piloted a social media internship in which a part-time student hourly employee assisted with sharing Impact Statements—along with supplemental information and graphics—on MRF Impacts social media channels (@MRFimpacts on Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram). Participating institutions and researchers, Regional SAES Associations, and NIFA staff frequently engage (e.g., share, retweet, like) these posts.

Continuous increase in the reach and use of MRF Impacts materials provides evidence for continuing with this component of NRSP1. In the previous project period (2017-2022), over 50 Impact Statements were produced. The MRF Impacts website had over 13,500 page views between October 1, 2020, and September 30, 2021. Project participants, Regional SAES Associations, participating researchers and universities, and USDA-NIFA continue to express
appreciation for Impact Statements and use them widely. For example, NIFA’s Director of Communications has used numerous Impact Statements to develop talking points for the NIFA Director and USDA Secretary and Undersecretary. Reach and engagement on social media has continued to rise each year. In federal fiscal year 2021, our tweets had 223,200 impressions; they were retweeted 563 times by NIFA, LGUs, and others. Going forward, we propose to continue strategically sharing Impact Statements and other products using a variety of formats to reach a broad audience.

**Impact Writing Workshops**

Since 2013, MRF Impacts has responded to requests from SAES Directors, AAs, and scientists for impact reporting guidance by delivering in-person and virtual Impact Writing Workshops to a variety of groups, including individual Hatch Multistate projects, faculty at LGUs, NIFA staff, and national conference attendees. Because participants of Hatch Multistate projects actively engage in other research, Extension, and teaching endeavors, even the Impact Writing Workshops that target individual project groups indirectly support better reporting across grants and programs. During the 2017-2022 project period, we delivered over 30 Impact Writing Workshops. Workshop evaluations consistently report satisfaction with presenter knowledge and delivery and indicate improvement in targeted knowledge and skills. Demand for workshops continues to increase and is growing beyond the program capacity. Going forward, we propose to explore a variety of ways to meet this demand more efficiently and effectively.

Proceeding with MRF Impacts will ensure we continue to track and communicate the progress of Hatch Multistate projects and provide project participants with the tools they need to share their impacts. Our activities will continue to support the assembly, storage, and distribution of information and materials about Hatch Multistate research projects. Through these activities, MRF Impacts supports the entire portfolio of Hatch Multistate projects, which address all ESS Science Roadmap national priority areas and needs. Going forward, MRF Impacts will continue to coordinate with NIFA, Regional SAES Associations, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU), the Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC) and others to connect Hatch Multistate projects to broader national campaigns and ensure proposed actions meet stakeholder needs.

Collectively, the NIMSS database system and MRF Impacts provide for open and transparent systems that enhance compliance and accountability for SAES. The success of prior NRSP1 projects and their continuous adaptation of new technologies and approaches reinforce their inherent value and purpose to the Multistate Research portfolio. These two systems reflect ongoing core capacities of ESS.

**IMPLEMENTATION:**

**Objectives and Projected Outcomes**

**Objective 1:** Maintain and enhance the effectiveness, functionality, and utilization of NIMSS.
Objective 2: Effectively document and communicate the impacts of multistate research, enhance the utility of MRF Impacts materials, and improve the capacity of the Hatch Multistate project participants and others to report their impacts.

Objective 1 Projected Outcomes

Routine NIMSS Service and Maintenance:
As we proceed into the next five-year cycle for NRSP1, the NIMSS lead RSAs, currently Christina Hamilton (NCRA) and David Leibovitz (NERA), will continue to solicit system enhancements from our stakeholders, some of whom include federal and state partners, producers, commodity groups, foundations, and foreign scientists. These lead RSAs will work closely with the Clemson ITT developers via email and regular calls to implement these improvements, making NIMSS workflows more efficient, secure, and effective for as many users as possible, basing project and proposal functions consistently on the national SAES Guidelines for Multistate Activities. User requests for system improvements now also include a NIMSS Change Request form, a document sent out to the requester to gather information on whether the requested change will benefit multiple users or stations, ensuring that Clemson developers’ time is used effectively and efficiently.

Separately, Clemson ITT will continue to regularly administer and develop NIMSS at the system level. First, the developers will consistently monitor the NIMSS server to ensure that the applications running NIMSS are kept up-to-date and work well together, allowing the system to operate at peak efficiency and avoid slow page loading. Second, security systems, access, and error logs are continually monitored, and new software installed as it becomes available. Because the NIMSS application has been online for many years, it is subject to hundreds of attempted attacks every day, which renders regular assessment of risks and updates to security systems’ software critical to prevent another breach. Review of error logs helps correct bugs introduced into the system as applications and code are updated. Coupled with security improvements, developers periodically check the accuracy of server and data file locations, while also performing regular backups of NIMSS’ data and code in multiple locations. In the unlikely event of a system crash, NIMSS users can be confident that no data or work will be lost. In addition, modern database administration (DBA) services are employed and updated as new database search techniques are developed, keeping access to NIMSS’ data efficient and system resources low.

Moreover, while most of the legacy NIMSS data issues were corrected during the last NRSP1 iteration, developers continue to monitor and correct errors. Finally, our Clemson developers routinely review and update NIMSS’ code to maintain system efficiency. These changes are documented, and records maintained for the life of the project. All codebase versions are stored in a Git repository, which is a versioning storage system that allows easy access to previous code.

The updated NIMSS budget will also allow developers to continually improve user interfaces as technology advances, to provide a more professional and aesthetically pleasing system. Part of this process includes updating the system to provide more responsive layouts, so that users can
effectively use the NIMSS system from any device available, including mobile interfaces. Finally, developers will improve the application program interface (API) to allow for better data transactions (where possible) with NIFA’s Reporting System (NRS), REEpport and REEIS. API improvements allow for better and more data transfer across systems, thus reducing or eliminating staff workload required to share reporting data from SAES offices to NIFA partners.

NIFA is an active participant in the NRSP1 Management Committee and was intimately involved with the NIMSS redesign effort. NIFA liaisons and their IT staff continue to work with NRSP1 members and Clemson ITT developers, since NIMSS is not a system of record for NIFA, in contrast to REEpport and the new NRS. At the time of this proposal preparation, both REEpport and NRS are active, and both are included in this narrative. Eventually, REEpport will go off-line and NRS will completely replace that system, becoming the main requestor of NIMSS data.

NIFA systems have very specific technical guidelines that are dictated by the Research Performance Progress Report (RPPR) set forth by the OSTP and OMB policies. Hence, the rigid reporting format for REEpport and NRS.

At this time, the changes that will be required to make NIMSS interface with NRS are largely unknown. In preparation for upcoming NRS reporting requirement changes, Clemson ITT team developers will create a RESTful API centered around reading data from the NIMSS system. This API will also include creating, updating, and deleting data from the system, but public endpoints will be limited until full specifications for integrations with NRS are completed. Clemson ITT will initially secure this API with OAuth 2.0, but will be available to adjust this security when the technical guidelines become available from NRS. It is likely that data formats will need to be modified to make both systems interface with each other effectively. Initially, all data will be generated to transmit using JSON, however, other formats will be made available as full specifications are delivered. Moreover, reporting in NIMSS is conducted by our multistate umbrella project members, with a focus on multistate collaborative accomplishments and activities, whereas reporting in REEpport and NRS includes only that of individual state participation. NIMSS provides a vital function for the Multistate Research program in which all organization and peer review for the umbrella projects take place at regional and national levels. REEpport and NRS, on the other hand, are strictly a reporting tool at the grant project level for accountability purposes. However, there is some pre-population of REEpport multistate Hatch projects with information from NIMSS including Objectives, Project Title, Multistate Project number, and Collaborating States. Other fields do not have a direct one-to-one relationship that can be imported well at this time, but we are considering ways to include those data in the future, if necessary.

Additional Development Projects/Concepts Proposed for FY23 to FY27

- **Dashboard Redesign:** The action items on the dashboard provide quick access to views of the system that require attention. However, the user has no indication if any action is needed until they click the action item. Instead of listing links, each action item could be contained in a clickable widget. The widgets could provide a minimal view of the information for each item. If the user clicks on a widget, then the full page for that action item would load.
• **Project Breadcrumbs:** The project management interface contains several nested sections. When within multiple levels deep in the interface, it is not clear where a user is in relation to the home page for the project. Depending on the actions of a user, using the web browser’s back button might not perform as intended. As a user navigates into project sections, a “breadcrumb” trail of links could be shown at the top of the interface indicating how they got there. Also, it could be used to quickly navigate to previous sections more accurately.

• **Agile Development:** As technology changes and new software packages become available over the course of this project, the Clemson development team will work directly with NIMSS administrators to design, develop, test, and deploy new features. It is impossible to project specific projects in advance of core technology changes, however, regular meetings between Clemson and NIMSS staff allow for collaboration which will help Clemson development staff understand pain points in the system and aid in the evolution of the NIMSS system.

Overall, we envision NIMSS continuing to serve as an effective communication tool for sharing research data and easing the burden of multistate project management for many more years. An effective and secure database will ease the application of new discoveries and technology transfer supporting and advancing agricultural research. Continual process and development improvements, as described above, are critical as a best practice to maintain an effective national system.

**Objective 2 Projected Outcomes**

During the previous project period, MRF Impacts experienced changes in program leadership and allied partners (e.g., change in Program Director, cancellation of the CMC contract with kglobal, etc.), which led to shifts in MRF Impacts team roles and strategies. Despite these challenges, the previous project met the original objectives and even exceeded expected productivity in some areas (e.g., social media and workshops). We learned important lessons about program flexibility and capacity. We also learned the value of a dedicated social media manager and a direct liaison with NIFA Communications. Moving forward, MRF Impacts will continue to adapt strategies to repair any shortcomings and accommodate changes in capacity and stakeholder needs. We propose that the Program Coordinator continue to participate in select workshops and/or conferences for professional development. Staying up-to-date on best practices and tools for science communication will enable the Program Coordinator to work more efficiently and effectively.

Coordination and networking will be essential to the continued success of the MRF Impacts. The MRF Impacts Program Coordinator will correspond regularly with communicators at the LGUs and federal level, attend key national conferences and meetings, and serve on committees (such as the NIDB). This will increase awareness of the Hatch Multistate program and expand the reach of MRF Impacts materials. In addition, coordination will provide opportunities to synchronize efforts (e.g., social media, impact writing training) for mutual benefit. With the future development of an ESS Advocacy Toolkit, resources and lessons-learned from the MRF Impacts will provide excellent content and will be integrated into the Toolkit. The Program Coordinator will also continue to work closely with the researchers and Extension educators who participate in Hatch Multistate projects during Impact Statement review and during Impact
Writing Workshops. This rapport ensures MRF Impacts materials meet stakeholder needs and are widely used.

**Impact Statement Creation and Distribution**

MRF Impacts will continue to generate high-quality, engaging Impact Statements for at least 10 projects per year, including the annual Excellence in Multistate Research Award winner. These Impact Statements will be shared with a variety of audiences, including project participants, NIFA, and leaders and communicators at LGUs for a variety of uses. Each Impact Statement will be uploaded to the NIDB, NIMSS, and mrfimpacts.org in a timely manner. The Program Coordinator will work directly with NIFA Communications staff to ensure that at least three Impact Statements are featured in federal level communications materials. Additional infographics and other products (e.g., magazine articles, blog posts) will be developed as needed to connect Hatch Multistate research projects to trending conversations and priority topics. The Program Coordinator will share Impact Statements directly with university communicators, magazine editors, and others with the goal of featuring at least two Hatch Multistate projects in publications or other media outlets each year. Printed materials will be distributed as needed or requested (e.g., at national conferences). To measure the success of Impact Statement distribution, we will monitor website traffic (e.g., number of visitors, length of visit, most frequented pages, etc.) and solicit feedback from project members about the quality and utility of Impact Statements. We will also meet regularly with stakeholders for anecdotal feedback about how Impact Statements and other MRF Impacts materials were used.

Our impact communication efforts will continue to include social media. The Program Coordinator will take over management of and content creation for the @MRFimpacts social media channels. Because the Program Coordinator has in-depth knowledge about the Multistate Research Program and works closely with Hatch Multistate research project teams while producing Impact Statements, this will be a cost-effective and time-efficient way to ensure that the program’s social media channels continue to grow. The Program Coordinator will create content for Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram; engage with followers and ongoing conversations; keep track of social media trends and tools; and monitor social media performance. Our goal will be to share at least three social media posts on all platforms per week. These posts will share new Impact Statements and connect trending topics to Hatch Multistate projects and Impact Statements. We expect that continued dedication to social media will further enhance key metrics like impressions and engagement. Social media will not only increase awareness of the Multistate Research Program as a whole, but will also help participating scientists and universities promote their research impacts. Because social media is an evolving platform, shifts in strategy will be evaluated regularly. The Program Coordinator will work closely with other LGU communicators and the NIFA Communications staff to coordinate effective, synchronized social media efforts. To measure progress, we will monitor social metrics (e.g., reach, impressions, likes, retweets/shares, link clicks, mentions, replies, followers, etc.) and gather anecdotal evidence from our peers and followers.

**Impact Writing Workshops**

To efficiently and effectively meet increasing demand for impact reporting training, we propose
for the Program Coordinator to: 1) deliver workshops virtually so that they are more accessible, 2) deliver select in-person workshops that target large, national audiences, 3) coordinate with NIFA, CMC, NIDB and LGUs to develop a cadre of trained presenters who can deliver workshops, and 4) coordinate with NIFA, CMC, NIDB, and LGUs to guide the production of readily available training materials that can be used by and for communicators, scientists, administrators, and others who want to learn about impact reporting.

This path forward will allow us to reach a wider audience, especially as funding and other constraints (e.g., COVID-19) make travel difficult for both trainers and trainees. Regional SAES Associations and NIFA will help select in-person and virtual trainings provided by the Program Coordinator. These workshops and materials will give participants the tools and knowledge they need to craft better reports and produce stronger impact statements that can be parlayed into other communication pieces (e.g., social media posts, press releases). Workshop participants will complete evaluations so that we can gather feedback and measure success.

**Expected Outputs**

- **Impact Statements:**
  - 50 Impact Statements for Hatch Multistate projects (~10 per year)
  - At least three Hatch Multistate projects featured in USDA-NIFA communications each year
  - At least two Hatch Multistate projects featured in trade magazines, university publications, producer websites, or similar each year
  - At least two Hatch Multistate projects featured in materials produced by the NIDB writing team
  - At least four newsletters each year to share Impact Statements and other MRF Impacts materials with university communicators, SAES directors, and other subscribers
  - All Impact Statements uploaded to NIMSS, NIDB, and mrfimpacts.org

- **Social media:**
  - At least three social media posts on all platforms per week
  - At least five social media posts per Impact Statement

- **Impact Writing Workshops:**
  - Virtual workshops for at least four Hatch Multistate research project teams each year
  - At least two in-person workshops or other conference presentations per year to promote MRF Impacts and network with stakeholders
  - Package of materials (e.g., recorded training modules, presentation deck, presenter notes, worksheets) to be used by AAs, LGU communicators, and others to train project participants and faculty on impact reporting
  - Cadre of trained presenters to deliver remote and in-person workshops

**Expected Outcomes**

- Improved communication among MRF Impacts, NIFA, LGUs, CMC, NIBD, and others
- Improved efficiency and reduced duplication of communications efforts
- Greater awareness of the Hatch Multistate Research Program
- Increased visibility of Hatch Multistate project and MRF Impacts materials
• Wider and more frequent use of materials generated by MRF Impacts
• Increased capacity to meet demand for impact reporting training
• Improved knowledge about how to write effective impact statements
• Improved quality of reports submitted by participants of Hatch Multistate projects (and other project types)

Management, Budget, and Business Plan

General oversight, policy development, proposal preparation, and budget recommendations for both components of NRSP1 will be provided by a Management Committee composed of four AAs, representing each of the four SAES regions; the four RSAs; the four regional Executive Directors, and two director's administrative staff members who use NIMSS routinely. NIFA will assign one or more non-voting representatives to the Committee.

Funding for NRSP1 will be provided through an off-the-top allocation from the Hatch Multistate Research Fund. The annual range of NRSP1, combining NIMSS and MRF Impacts, runs from $226,400 to $249,083 (Table 1). The five-year grand total investment is $1,187,891 for NRSP1.

NRSP1 will provide essential administrative and communications services to Hatch Multistate research program administrators and staff, project participants, and other users of NIMSS. Thus, funding for NRSP1 is seen as a core administrative and management expense and alternative sources of funding are not anticipated.

Objective 1:

NIMSS is managed by each of the Regional Associations serving the SAES. The RSAs from NCRA (primary) and NERA (secondary) will serve as the leads with routine interactions with Clemson ITT. All RSAs handle the day-to-day tasks related to updating the system and answer queries from their regional users. Funds for continued development and maintenance of NIMSS will be transferred by NIFA to Clemson University AES, for distribution to the Information Technology Team (ITT) at Clemson’s Youth Learning Institute. The annual budget ranges from $144,750 in FY2023 to $155,941 in FY2027 to reflect cost increases in technology, salary, and fringe rates (Table 2). As a point of reference, the FY2022 budget for NIMSS was $142,730.

To accomplish system administration and development, the NRSP1 budget for NIMSS would accommodate a part of the salary and fringe of multiple technical professionals who would be responsible for maintaining, updating, and developing new features as needed or requested for their programmatic areas. Technical professionals are needed for UI (User Interface)/Front End Development and Administration, Application Development and Administration, Database Administration, System Administration and Security, QA/QC, and Project Management. For those interested, specific job duties and justifications for these positions are found below. Within the software development community, the term ‘development’ is commonly used to reflect the on-going and dynamic nature of a continually changing environment.

Year-to-Year Cost Increases
To account for the inevitable expense increases from year-to-year, projections for technology were increased by 1% per year to cover any potential increases in server costs which are typical when upgrading servers for application maintenance. An increase of 1.9% was factored into all personnel categories to cover cost of living adjustments for development staff over the term of the project.

User Interface/Front End Development and Administration
User Interface (U/I)/Front End Development is the process of designing and developing interfaces that an end user interacts with when they are using the NIMSS system. It is necessary to invest time in User Interface/Front End development not just during the initial development phase, but also regularly in the maintenance phase of the development cycle since web applications do not live in a static environment. Users must access web-based applications through a web browser. There is currently no standard that all web browsers must adhere to and, as such, bugs are introduced from the user/client side on a continual basis. The project’s UI/Front End Developer is responsible for staying informed of the changing web environment and works to ensure that all users can access and interact with the NIMSS system with minimal front-end issues.

Application Development and Administration
Application development, in the case of NIMSS, is the process of developing code utilizing the Laravel framework to gather information collected by the UI/Front End Developers that interfaces and manipulates/stores that information in databases designed and maintained by a database administrator (DBA). These persons are also responsible for creating and maintaining system features as well as adapting the current system to work with new technologies that are currently available as well as to proactively redevelop sections in the NIMSS system to take advantage of these new technologies.

Database Administration
Database administration refers to the tasks in NIMSS that are centered on saving and retrieving information from our relational databases. Server environments must periodically be updated to avoid falling too far behind modern technology and the services provided by a DBA helps to mitigate these issues and ensure that resources that are allocated to the database are being used effective and efficiently. Data backups and recovery are also critically important for system reliability. Both making sure that data is stored in multiple locations and that data stores contain valid and recoverable data are aspects of what must be done to ensure work is not lost due to hardware or software issues. Another critical task for a DBA is database security. Databases are often targets for hackers and must be reasonably protected. In all cases, security measures must be managed proactively to minimize the risks of system access from unwanted agents, who are constantly changing their approaches and finding new exploits to gain access to systems. Database administrators will regularly track system access logs to look for possible injections into the database as well as to review possible slow queries.

System Administration and Security
Much of what is accomplished by system administration is similar to database security in technique and purpose. The main difference between these two areas is that system administration refers to securing the server, whether physical or virtual, from unwanted access.
This is done by keeping track of trends in security and intrusion techniques and patching them as soon as is possible.

**QA/QC**
This refers to quality control and assurance of the NIMSS product. It is a best practice to employ a non-developer to review and test the system and write test cases for automated testing. It is this person’s responsibility to make every effort to eliminate bugs or other issues from the system before it is made available to our end users. This person also coordinates larger alpha and beta testing groups and serves as a bridge between the various developers and the stakeholders.

**Project Management**
A person is assigned to coordinate the resources available in order to execute the project. This person would review newly developed code to make sure it meets the standards set forth by the initial development. They monitor the timeline of the project to make sure all areas of development and administration are working together effectively. They oversee documentation of the project and provide reports to stakeholders and partners to ensure all parties are satisfied with the process. The NIMSS technology costs in the budget would cover the server expenses, ownership of the domain name, hosting, SSL (secure sockets layer; a technology that maintains system security by encrypting the connection between the user and the NIMSS site), email systems server, and all data backups.

**Objective 2:**

MRF Impacts is managed by the Program Coordinator under the guidance of the NRSP1 Management Committee. Funding for MRF Impacts will be transferred by NIFA to Colorado State University (CSU) AES for distribution in their annual Hatch allocation. The overall proposed budget for MRF Impacts ranges from $81,650 in FY2023 to $93,142 in FY2027 (Table 3). As a point of reference, the FY2022 budget for MRF Impacts was $100,967.

This budget will support one full-time Program Coordinator and the travel, materials, and technology needed to meet objectives successfully and efficiently.

**Program Coordinator**

The proposed budget includes salary and fringe for a full-time Program Coordinator. Salary for the Program Coordinator is set to meet market standards for positions with similar responsibilities and levels of education and experience. Annual increases of 3% are built in across the 5-year project. Fringe is budgeted according to CSU’s FY22 rate of 28.1% and predictions for 1% annual increases resulting in rates of 29.1% in FY23 to 33.1% in FY27.

The Program Coordinator provides overall strategic vision for MRF Impacts, including coordination of activities with NIFA, the NRSP1 Management Committee, ESCOP, CMC, NIDB, and others. The Program Coordinator is also responsible for writing, designing, and disseminating Impact Statements; managing social media; developing and conducting Impact Writing Workshops; and maintaining mrfimpacts.org. The Program Coordinator also attends to administrative tasks such as budgeting and purchasing.
Operating Expenses

Operating Expenses includes computer hardware and software, and printing/copying of materials. The proposed budget for hardware and software includes annual subscriptions to essential software and services, such as Adobe Creative Cloud, iStock, Buffer, and Zoom, and anticipates replacing the Program Coordinator’s laptop. The budget also includes funds for technology and/or software that may help record impact training or conduct virtual Impact Writing Workshops in an efficient and engaging way.

Under special circumstances (e.g., conferences, Congressional visits), printed materials may be needed to support the overall communications strategy. Creation of printed material will be done in consultation with the NRSP1 Management Committee and NIFA, so that these products are available when most beneficial to overall national efforts and priorities. Handouts and promotional materials may also be printed to support in-person Impact Writing Workshops.

Travel

Though we plan to transition most Impact Writing Workshops to virtual platforms, we propose a travel budget that accommodates three trips per year to provide impact training to larger, national groups in person or to attend important meetings and conferences (e.g., Association for Communications Excellence conference, Ag Media Summit) that provide promotional, networking, and professional development opportunities.

Integration and Documentation of Research Support

NRSP1 was developed to facilitate the management and communication of the impacts of integrated research activities supported by the Hatch Multistate Research Fund. It supports all 1862 and many 1890 researchers and some Cooperative Extension participants. The program can also accommodate integrated education activities as the need arises.

Outreach, Communications and Assessment

Objective 1:

Input from SAES administrators and scientists on issues of policy, planning, and management of NRSP1 is an essential element in sustaining it as an effective support system. The approval of this NRSP provides the mechanism to support the representation of user interests and provide a forum to assess the effectiveness of the outreach of the NRSP1 programs.

The four NIMSS RSAs will serve as the primary contacts and source of information and training for university administrators, program managers, investigators, business officers, and station staff using NIMSS. The primary RSA will provide quarterly updates from Clemson developers on new NIMSS developments during NRSP1 meetings and will collect feedback from AAs and NIFA on user comments/experiences, as available. Lead RSAs may also send out short surveys to the user community and/or conduct ad hoc interviews during conferences to gain improved understanding of user needs.
Objective 2:

The Program Coordinator will serve as the primary contact and source of information on the impact communications component of NRSP1. The Program Coordinator will provide quarterly and annual reports to the NRSP1 Management Committee and NIMSS. The Program Coordinator will collect feedback on the quality and utility of Impact Statements from researchers, Extension educators, and NIFA. The NRSP1 Management Committee will be responsible for collecting information from the institutions in their respective regions to reflect the effectiveness of MRF Impacts in meeting their needs and objectives. Post-workshop surveys will be conducted to assess the success of Impact Writing Workshops.

PROJECT PARTICIPATION: All 1862 and many 1890 Land-grant Institutions, and NIFA.

LITERATURE CITED: N/A

BUDGET:

Table 1. Cumulative NRSP1 Five-Year Project Budget FY23-27.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NIMSS</td>
<td>$144,750</td>
<td>$147,449</td>
<td>$150,225</td>
<td>$153,057</td>
<td>$155,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRF Impacts</td>
<td>$81,650</td>
<td>$84,372</td>
<td>$87,192</td>
<td>$90,113</td>
<td>$93,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Totals</td>
<td>$226,400</td>
<td>$231,821</td>
<td>$237,417</td>
<td>$243,170</td>
<td>$249,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. NRSP1 Objective 1: NIMSS System Administration and Development Budget FY23-27.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servers</td>
<td>$2,750</td>
<td>$2,770</td>
<td>$2,817</td>
<td>$2,865</td>
<td>$2,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosting, SSL, Email, and Back-ups</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Administration and Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Server Maintenance</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,171</td>
<td>$9,345</td>
<td>$9,523</td>
<td>$9,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Development</td>
<td>$106,000</td>
<td>$108,014</td>
<td>$110,066</td>
<td>$112,158</td>
<td>$114,289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U/I Development</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,171</td>
<td>$9,345</td>
<td>$9,523</td>
<td>$9,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>$17,000</td>
<td>$17,323</td>
<td>$17,652</td>
<td>$17,988</td>
<td>$18,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Totals</td>
<td>$144,750</td>
<td>$147,449</td>
<td>$150,225</td>
<td>$153,057</td>
<td>$155,941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In the event of a reduction in the NIFA Hatch funding line, the NRSP1 budget lines that fund the NIMSS contract with Clemson ITT are not subject to reduction and will not be included in any overall reduction calculation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
<th>FY26</th>
<th>FY27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator salary</td>
<td>$55,500</td>
<td>$57,165</td>
<td>$58,880</td>
<td>$60,646</td>
<td>$62,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator fringe</td>
<td>$16,150</td>
<td>$17,207</td>
<td>$18,312</td>
<td>$19,467</td>
<td>$20,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yearly Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>$81,650</strong></td>
<td><strong>$84,372</strong></td>
<td><strong>$87,192</strong></td>
<td><strong>$90,113</strong></td>
<td><strong>$93,142</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WAAESD Goals for FY23

Strategic Direction 1. Strengthen functional relationships with regional and national partners.
  ➢ Pursue opportunities to work better or differently with WGA.
    o Engage WAAESD in discussion with WGA staff on the 2023 Farm Bill.
    o Include WGA staff in the Western Water Network.
    o Assist with recruiting young leaders to the WGA Leadership Institute.
    o Contribute to the Western Policy Network.
  ➢ Collaborate with the Council on State Governments- West.
    o Hold regular meetings with CSG-West staff to coordinate activities.
    o Engage CSG-West in the Western Water Network.
    o Contribute to the CSG-West electronic newsletter.
  ➢ Re-engage with the National Association of Counties Western Interstate Region.
    o Engage NACo-WIR in the Western Water Network.
  ➢ Coordinate with fellow research EDs and APLU to maintain the functional relationship with NIFA.
    o Participate in regular meetings with NIFA leadership.
    o Support the Western Region’s contributions to a Climate Summit.
  ➢ Assist with the development of a Western Region Strategic Communications Playbook.
  ➢ Engage in national discussions about the 2023 Farm Bill.

Strategic Direction 2. Foster multistate collaborations.
  ➢ Convene water experts to build out the Western Water Network.
  ➢ Facilitate the development of a vision paper with members of the Western Water Network that will serve as the basis for development of an audacious proposal.
  ➢ Crosswalk the region’s multistate committees with national priorities to identify potential for future collaborations.
  ➢ Conduct site visits at member institutions to gain a better understanding of the region.

Strategic Direction 3. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion.
  ➢ Create opportunities to engage with the 1994 institutions, FRTEP, and the communities they serve.
    o Collaborate with Steve Gavazzi and others on “Cultivating Food Security and Food Sovereignty for Native American Peoples Through 1994-1862 Land-Grant Partnerships.”
    o Collaborate with Maureen McCarthy and the region’s climate hubs on “Cultivating Food Security and Food Sovereignty for Native American Peoples.”
    o Assist with recruiting and selection of young tribal leaders to participate in the WGA Leadership Institute.
Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Sta
Reconciliation Summary
Western Assoc. Agric. Expt. Sta, Period Ending 12/31/2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dec 31, 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>237,047.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleared Transactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks and Payments - 5 items</td>
<td>-9,108.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits and Credits - 4 items</td>
<td>26,612.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cleared Transactions</td>
<td>17,504.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleared Balance</td>
<td>254,551.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register Balance as of 12/31/2021</td>
<td>254,551.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>254,551.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WAAESD Agenda Item 19: Treasurer's Report
Presenter: Gene Kelly
Action Requested: Discussion/Approval
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>1 - 30</th>
<th>31 - 60</th>
<th>61 - 90</th>
<th>&gt; 90</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1,183.88</td>
<td>-1,183.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1,183.91</td>
<td>-1,183.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ordinary Income/Expense

#### Income
- **Annual Assessments**
  - Membership Dues: $95,042.65
- **Total Annual Assessments**: $95,042.65

#### Event Income
- **Event and Meeting Registrations**: $42,489.35
- **Event Reimbursements**: $24,713.03
- **Event Income - Other**: $1,290.00
- **Total Event Income**: $68,492.38

#### Other Types of Income
- **Miscellaneous Revenue**: $101,506.17
- **Total Other Types of Income**: $101,506.17
- **Total Income**: $265,041.20

#### Gross Profit
- **Gross Profit**: $265,041.20

#### Expense
- **Business Expenses**
  - Business Registration Fees: $12.00
  - Business Expenses - Other: $113.70
  - **Total Business Expenses**: $125.70

- **Contract Services**
  - Accounting Fees: $450.00
  - Event Coordination: $23,119.60
  - Outside Contract Services: $13,165.46
  - Recording Secretary: $12,563.50
  - Web Management: $3,427.50
  - **Total Contract Services**: $52,726.06

- **Operations**
  - Books and Reference Materials: $1,748.75
  - Office Equipment: $1,500.64
  - Postage, Mailing Service: $403.50
  - Printing and Copying: $540.19
  - Software and Software Subscript: $682.74
  - Supplies: $126.18
  - **Total Operations**: $5,002.00

- **Other Types of Expenses**
  - Other Costs: $641.92
  - **Total Other Types of Expenses**: $641.92

#### Program Expenses
- **Association Meetings**: $4,410.00
- **ESS Meetings**: $36,677.49
- **Total Program Expenses**: $41,087.49

#### Reconciliation Discrepancies
- **Reconciliation Discrepancies**: $-0.02
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan - Dec 21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference, Convention, Meeting</td>
<td>935.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>2,371.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Travel and Meetings</td>
<td>3,306.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expense</td>
<td>102,889.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Ordinary Income</td>
<td>162,151.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Income</td>
<td>162,151.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Feb 28, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Balance</td>
<td>248,750.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleared Transactions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks and Payments - 6 items</td>
<td>-13,805.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Cleared Transactions</strong></td>
<td><strong>-13,805.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleared Balance</td>
<td><strong>234,945.47</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Register Balance as of 02/28/2022</td>
<td>234,945.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Balance</td>
<td>234,945.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors FY23 Budget

## Expense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY21 Budget</th>
<th>Actuals</th>
<th>FY22 Budget</th>
<th>Projections</th>
<th>FY23 Proposed Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Coordinator</td>
<td>$9,720</td>
<td>$9,720</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$38,840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Secretary</td>
<td>$25,200</td>
<td>$6,941</td>
<td>$32,271</td>
<td>$18,160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webmanager</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$2,228</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
<td>$4,800</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$1,104</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g., facilitation)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$20,980</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractors Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$52,320</td>
<td>$28,992</td>
<td>$99,321</td>
<td>$90,230</td>
<td>$82,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$237</td>
<td>$250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy/Print</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,191</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Videoconference</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,501</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage &amp; Mailing</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$19</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$903</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer hardware/software</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$630</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$298</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer support</td>
<td>$455</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,283</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$512</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$512</td>
<td>$512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidentals</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$33,129</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$1,749</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$6,780</td>
<td>$35,581</td>
<td>$8,650</td>
<td>$9,491</td>
<td>$13,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED travel</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$330</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$22,121</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor travel</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$433</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$11,116</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership awardee</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
<td>$2,206</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Travel Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>$763</td>
<td>$60,500</td>
<td>$35,443</td>
<td>$95,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$141,600</td>
<td>$65,337</td>
<td>$168,471</td>
<td>$135,164</td>
<td>$191,812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected FY21 carryover $75,025
Actual FY21 carryover $76,263
Projected FY22 carryover $33,307

ED salary is paid in full with Off-The-Top funds

Projected expenses $40,973
Expected balance Jun 30 $193,972
Account balance Feb 28 $234,945
End FY23 balance $95,605

proposed assessments $93,445
proposed deficit $98,367
less FY22 carryover $65,060

Expected balance Jun 30 $193,972
Account balance Feb 28 $234,945
End FY23 balance $95,605
Diversity Catalyst Committee (DCC)

Call to Action 2021

Land-grant institutions and the Experiment Station Section have a duty to understand how they have benefitted from racial injustice and to ensure their programs and services do not perpetuate systems of oppression and injustice. We challenge ourselves to not simply strive to become non-racist but commit to an active anti-racist agenda in all aspects of our work.

Background:
During the annual 2020 Experiment Station Section meeting, the opening session was dedicated to “inclusive excellence.” From that session, the attached summary report was written¹. During the opening work session, the Experiment Station Section directors identified four diversity challenge areas and discussed potential actions to address those challenges. These are listed in the report. Prior to and coincident with the ESS meeting, the United States was in the midst of civil unrest boiling over from years of racial injustice and the need for all Americans to acknowledge and address racial inequities. During his leadership term, ESCOP Chair, Moses Kairo declared that the first of the Chair’s Initiatives was: Fully integrate Diversity, Equity and Inclusion as an essential component of all our programs. Last, the Diversity in Research Leadership Task Force, the predecessor to the DCC, recommended strategies to broaden the diversity of leaders holding research administrative positions. Many of the suggestions made by that task force are reiterated here. It is to these ends that the DCC shares the following reflections and recommendations.

Diversity and Inclusion Challenge Areas:
The Experiment Station Section Directors identified four diversity and inclusion challenge areas. These included:
- Recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce: developing a pipeline to support inclusive excellence.
- Strengthening partnerships among the 1862/1890/1994 institutions.
- Addressing funding challenges/disparities across the three LGU systems.
- Reaching/working with underserved populations.

Call to Action:
The DCC issues a Call to Action to engage all directors. Of the challenge areas listed above, the DCC asks you to identify a challenge that you intend to address in the upcoming year and use the following questions to guide your action steps.
- What actions do you intend to take?
- What is the timeline on your actions and what resources will you deploy?
- What gaps will you address and what obstacles do you anticipate?

¹ The summary report was written by Woody Hughes, Jr., Brian Raison and Rachel Welborn.
• What goals do you expect to reach?
• What will diversity and inclusion look like on your campus or station?
• How does your response to this Call to Action fit into the long-term diversity and inclusion strategies of the station, the college and university?

DCC Actions:
The DCC will periodically ask each director what they’ve undertaken. The DCC will work with NIFA to profile exemplary actions of the directors. The DCC will seek directors to share what they’ve done in a series of best practice sessions. The DCC will encourage submission of nominations for Diversity and Inclusion Award winners and celebrate your accomplishments.
Inclusive Excellence: Systematic Approaches to System Change

September 28, 2020 Opening Session to the 2020 ESS/AES/ARD Annual Meeting Summary Report

Session Objectives – Participants will:

- Explore how inclusive excellence can strengthen existing Experiment Station efforts.
- Engage in a series of conversations that will identify obstacles to affect inclusive excellence and strategies to overcome the obstacles.
- Be challenged to implement at least three actionable steps that lead to inclusive excellence at their home institutions.

Survey Highlights

In a survey to ESS members prior to this session, several assets as well as challenges to inclusive excellence were identified. During this session, participants explored potential strategies to leverage assets to address the four top challenges identified. The section that follows documents potential strategies to address these issues:

1. Recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce; developing a pipeline to support inclusive excellence
2. Strengthening partnerships among 1862/1890/1994 institutions
3. Addressing funding challenges/disparities across the three LGU systems
4. Reaching/working with underserved populations

Call to Action

This report serves as a summary of thoughtful input on what ESS could do in order to vastly impact Inclusive Excellence. The charge to the reader is this:

*How will this input be translated into CONCRETE ACTION that will have the greatest positive impact in Inclusive Excellence in 5-10 years?*

~Session Participant

If we do wonders with one set of eyes, imagine seeing the world from various other set of eyes.

~Session Participant

In a changing world, a diversity of ideas will better help us find solutions to new problems that are not predictable with past understanding.

~Session Participant
 Strategies for Addressing Top Challenges

Recruiting and Retaining a Diverse Workforce; Developing a Pipeline to Support Inclusive Excellence

• Internships
  o Targeted internships
  o Internships leading to permanent positions at slightly better the entry-level salaries (e.g., incentive)
  o Reserve internships for minority serving inst.
• Mentorships - strong peer-to-peer mentorship for underrepresented groups
• Pipeline development
  o Industry pipeline program (industry scholarships/internship opportunities)
  o Grow the diverse workforce that you want to see by grooming students from freshman through graduate school for those w/ graduate programs
  o Use capacity funds to recruit diverse graduate students (will end up as faculty hopefully)
  o Postdoctoral programs to bridge to faculty
  o Work with your institutions MANRRS groups as a pipeline for employees
    https://www.manrrs.org/
  o Develop a program from diversity scholarships in undergrad and grad.
• Training
  o Training own diversity PhD students
  o Identifying unconscious or systematic biases currently causing attrition within the pipeline
• Start with youth development
  o Start early with 4H in creating the foundation for a diverse workforce
  o Change the perspective of high school students about what Agriculture is, most of the best talent is going to a pre-med pathway
  o Campus experiences for 3rd graders from URMs
  o Target students in 7-12 for scholarships in Ag programs to build the pipeline
• Exchange programs/shared programs/cross training/collaboration
  o Graduate student swap between 1862s, 1890s, 1994, like a clinical rotation, for a semester research project.
  o Develop summer experiential exchanges for students between the LGU system
  o Student opportunities to exchange across campus
  o Create regional research exchange programs to provide greater experience for grad students and post docs
  o Station scientists from other organizations at our experiment stations
o Cross training of students from diverse institutions - summer internships at diverse locations - all institutions involved
o Dual degrees from more than one institution/program
o Providing learning opportunities to each other’s students within a region.
o Multiyear faculty exchanges across institutions
o Develop bridge research programs with 3 LG types

- Incentivize - Incentives for minority faculty and students
- Identify successful examples
- Examine/reshape recruitment and hiring practices
  o Aggressive search locally and internationally
  o Reduce the number of non-essential required qualifications in job ads
  o Improve recruitment strategies.
  o Strengthen hiring practices
  o Strong start up packages
  o Reactive and proactive work environment- vetting in hiring for sensitivity
  o Train all personnel involved in any aspect of hiring training in recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce
  o Dedicated funding to assist in hiring diverse faculty.

- Collaboration
  o Shadow AES/ARD Directors and get them to regional/national meetings
  o Encourage and build through regular monthly/weekly meetings with Admin
  o Build Regional strategic relationships with 1890s and 1994’s to do target hires at faculty or staff
  o Joint travel to relevant sites
  o Change the climate so that different people with different life experiences can feel at home
Strengthening Partnerships among 1862/1890/1994 Institutions

- **Building relationships**
  - Physically visit other institutions
  - Faculty exchanges across the three LGU family members.
  - More face to face get-togethers with faculty working in related areas and administrators across these institutions.
  - Effective partnerships begin with building strong relationships!
  - Regular collaborative sessions
  - Faculty "internships" or mini sabbaticals at institutions of different land grant groups
  - Virtual exchanges
  - University alliance formation among 2-3 other university partners
  - Reach out to one of each institution type different from your own and invite to 1) a meeting, 2) a research proposal.
  - Specialty listing
  - Names of 1862/1890/1994s into a hat and matchmake to outcomes and/or speed dating.
  - Partnership building grantsmanship workshops
  - Create shared appointments within and across states that have scientists from both institutions at each of the universities
  - Hold meetings at more affordable locations for larger participation or meet at an 1890 or 1994 institution's campus for major meetings.

- **Target collaboration on issues**
  - Targeted meetings focused on joint challenges or common stakeholders
  - Link common interests at grass roots level, not admin.
  - Organize mixed research teams around a given area and provide funds
  - Targeted special collaborative initiatives
  - Think tanks that will connect researchers/expertise with targeted outcomes
  - Identify common goals.
  - Develop statewide or regional joint research programs to include all types of institutions
  - Collaborative projects

- **Funding/grants**
  - Dedicated competitive funding
  - Seed grants to form or strengthen teams between 1862/1890/1994 institutions and facilitation of these partnerships
  - Fund cooperative projects with faculty at other LGU types
  - Create grants in AFRI, NSF, NIH, etc. that requires partnerships with 90 and 94
  - RFAs that require or at least favor collaborations among LGUs
Funding that not only rewards diverse granting participants, but also highlights different cultural perspectives in presenting research results

- Expand Hatch Multistate type funding to 1890 and 1994 institutions
- National funding programs requiring programs that include all partners
- Dedicated funding for collaborative projects for mixed research teams
- Require collaborations across institutions for more grant sources.
- Shared grants requiring multiple diverse land grant institutions.
- USDA-funded graduate student and post-doc exchange programs
- Financial Benefit should go primarily to the 1890 and 1994 partners, 1862 faculty should be rewarded internally from the effort and time.
- Dedicated competitive 1890 funding for the 1890 LGUs, and dedicated competitive 1994 funding for the 1994 LGUs that is separate from new and existing dedicated competitive funding for all LGUs

**Expand leadership opportunities**

- Invite 1890's and 1994's to lead on projects and not just follow
- Provide funding to 1890s & 1994s to lead the strengthening partnership efforts
- Allow 1890's to lead programs with 1862s as participants
- 1890/1994 lead interdisciplinary proposals
- Due to external funding having a long history of moving extraordinarily slow at some 1890 LGUs, in some instances, take that into consideration when determining which institution will be responsible for managing external financial resources as it relates to 1890/1994/1862 collaborative partnerships

**Strengthen multi-state opportunities**

- Create a program that allows for more participation from the 1890s and 1994s in Multistate projects
- Take better advantage of multistate opportunities
- Collaborations are personal - invest in more involvement of 1890/1994 in multistate research projects
- Multistate research projects / research teams
- Joint multi-disciplinary research initiatives
- Joint research and extension programming
- Encourage faculty to include project partners from these universities

**Cross institution pipeline development**

- Joint degree programs and grant program collaborations
- Automatic adjunct faculty appointments with institutions within each state
- Building partnerships around recruitment of faculty and staff for 1862, 1890 and 1994
- Share facilities, human and other resources
- Co-advise students
Addressing Funding Challenges/Disparities across the Three LGU Systems

- **Join together/ collaborate (3) for significant request for all ag research**
  - Joint programs/research projects
  - Collective pipeline directed to UG and MS programs at 1890/1994 institutions leading to PhD program at 1862 so all institutions benefit at their strengths.
  - Collaborate to be unified and make a concerted effort on behalf of all.
  - Merge the different institution types to reduce segregation in higher education
  - True long-term partnerships. Not one-time funding that encourages last minutes request.

- **Collaborative grant development**
  - Public private partnerships
  - Grant and project cooperation across 1890/1862/1994
  - Shared grants across diverse institutions with equal sharing of resources.
  - Designated pools of funding (collaborations)
  - Develop funding opportunities targeted specifically to joint submissions from the 3 LGU systems focused on developing solutions to meet global challenges
  - Commit to submitting a proposal with at least one other institution AND commit to allowing the minority-serving institution to be the host of the project.
  - Set asides in OREI, SCRI and other competitive funding opportunities
  - Partnerships between institutions strengthen research grant applications!
  - Funding opportunities that require meaningful roles/budgets for all 3 LGU
  - National initiative stimulating ag research to the level of NIH; all LGU benefit
  - Collaboratively developed research proposals
  - Partner across LGU systems to find grants together and foundation support
  - Joint projects/grant programs that require participants from more than one land-grant category: 1862 + 1890 + 1994
  - Develop joint grantsmanship workshops and proposal development activities, preferably with accompanying seed funding committed from the institutions
  - Build extra power in grants including commodities for partnerships
  - Grant subcontracting
  - Meaningful participation of 1890s and 1994s with the 1862s, not as add-ons
  - Collaborative grants with dedicated funding and long-term partnerships

- **United approach to funding/advocacy**
  - Joint advocacy for more funding
  - All land-grant Universities advocate for equitable funding at the federal level
  - 1890's and 1994's need to have the fully funded match just as the 1862's do.
  - Do the state-based work to ensure equitable match availability
  - Focus on increasing 1890 and 1994 $ BEFORE 1862 after IDing the goal that works.
  - Joint lobbying to minimize competition amongst institutions
- work with state legislatures and Congress to highlight the benefits of leveraging resources across systems
- Better aligned requests to Congress
- Joint efforts in seeking state matching funding.
- Join forces for advocacy as ONE
- Advocacy for funding increases of underfunded programs
- Willingness of 1862 institutions to equitably share increases in funding (based on need) with 1890 and 1994 institutions
- Expand advocacy efforts
- Expand Capacity Funds - and have student and faculty demographics as part of the formula for allocating dollars
- Local and state representation, federal reps in the corner as well- part of this also means a diverse representation to represent a diverse constituency

**Share resources**
- Share AES research stations which some lack.
- Willingness to share resources
- Share resources
- Pooling internal funding across different institutions
- Create opportunities for leveraging
• **Listen and identify needs first; develop true long-term partnerships**
  
  o Include multiple members of those populations in advisory groups to set priorities.
  o Collaborate on research projects addressing underserved populations to include a needs assessment.
  o Intentional outreach and inclusion in advisory groups
  o Match making process to identify underserved populations and their needs, then facilitation process to make connections with LGU that have resources and want to assist
  o Use/revise/enhance/change frameworks to engage underserved populations
  o Firstly, define and identify the populations
  o Working with advocacy groups for underserved populations to identify needs
  o Engage the stakeholders directly in setting the research and outreach agenda
  o Get out more and find stakeholders and address their concerns
  o ID some problems and then sign up to do
  o Listen first and be there for long haul.
  o Show genuine interest
  o Listen to needs, and create intentional collaborations with clear measures of accountability
  o Underserved populations aren't always overlooked, but not considered in the plan. Be interesting and try hard. Nobody wants to partner with you if you are boring and not in tune with culture!
  o Listen carefully to what your target population says is important to them.
  o Identify shared issues (e.g., use of public lands)
  o Shared stakeholder communication activities - both to gather input into our programs and delivery of results
  o Include underserved perspectives in interpretation of research results and sharing those perspectives as a way to enhance conversations and include diverse audiences.
  o Targeted programs in the poorest counties in each state/long-term and intentional

• **Understand, respect and build on the strengths of each other**
  
  o Working with underserved populations with limited resources is what 1890’s and 1994’s do well. This is a case where 1890s/1994’s could lead the conversation
  o Partner with the experts, Extension, especially 1890 Extension
  o Partner with 1862s, 1890s, and 1994s to deliver instructional and research programs in underserved areas/populations
  o Increased collaborations
  o Use Extension partners to reach out across state/region/nation
  o Build on linkages that have already been established
• collaboration with institutions that focus on underserved populations
  o identify the best communicators - then build the team who has the scientific expertise to solve issues

• **Strengthen understanding/training around working with underserved audiences**
  o Special training for reaching the underserved
  o Build a greater understanding to learn how to become more effective.
  o reach out to NGOs and other non-university entities (e.g. advocacy groups) to learn best practices in how they engage underserved populations

• **Grow the pipeline of students and faculty from underserved groups**
  o Dual and joint graduate degrees across all LGUs
  o Provide internships for underserved populations.
  o scholarships
  o Summer camps/interns/faculty sabbaticals for underserved groups
  o recruiting employees/students from the targeted underserved population
  o Create shared internships to focus on this area
  o Create programs and funding for teachers in target schools to develop familiarity. Match the faculty to the population
  o Student exchanges/mentoring across diverse institutions.
  o scholarships/ internships - multi-year commitments
  o Hire faculty with this as a major job expectation and hold them to this through T&P process. or create an endowed chair with this expectation
  o Student internships that target underrepresented groups within the state and region - do this as a regional/joint activity rotating across universities or joint effort
  o employing a diverse faculty and staff

• **Purposeful inclusion/ prioritization**
  o Make it a priority, rather than an afterthought.
  o Field days that facilitate bringing in underserved populations
  o Increase the focus on urban populations, food islands, linkage of food with health outcomes.
  o Community service/open classes and community events, schools
  o Better funding for these types of programs
Addendum: Participants provided other rich content to the session through a series of related discussion prompts. These are included below for reference.

Discussion Prompt: How would we (ESS) be better if we truly worked under a banner of Inclusive Excellence?

- Then we will value the opinion of others who train of thought is not of the same cannon (our view), from a traditional way
- ESS would produce more innovative programs and products and of more practical value to a larger number of people in our communities
- We will be able to more freely share our resources and truly bring 1862, 1890, and 1894 institutions together.
- Working under a banner of Inclusive Excellence would yield broader perspectives on existing issues.
- We would be better equipped to approach problems (both internal to the university and external) in more meaningful ways, and ultimately provide solutions that are more robust.
- We need to ask our advisory groups, stakeholder groups, and commodity support groups to better embrace DEI as a relevant system of increasing market share and consumer support.
- build more trust and confidence among ourselves
- Bring a broader set of experiences that would challenge our assumptions of “the way” to solve or approach issues
- also a better set of outcomes for our students and adult learners
- Fresh, more efficient processes across the board that don't follow, "We do it this way because it's how we've always done it."
- It would help to enhance inter-institutional cooperativity
- If we embrace inclusive excellence, we would expand both the diversity of ideas in addressing research questions while also expanding our potential impact.
- reach more people more effectively
- Inclusion of different viewpoints and experiences can spark innovation.
- All voices would be heard and valued, leading to a better working climate, increased productivity, and innovation.
- Examples of best practices or new programs that work at other institutions that could be modeled at our institutions
- Through IE, we would be able to more effectively engage stakeholders whose
- Research questions and answers that address the needs - limitations of all those who live in our borders to ensure safe, food, feed, and fiber
- If we do wonders with one set of eyes, imagine seeing the world from various other set of eyes.
- Reach a broader audience
- It would change the perspectives we all harbor, to open minds to see problems more broadly.
• Chance to hear perspectives you might not consider, or might have misconstrued, and learn issues that are outside your normal thinking.
• Richer experience for all involved.
• Diverse world experiences bring very different ideas on how to approach a problem — both research challenges and institutional challenges.
• We will be able to more freely share our resources and truly bring 1862, 1890, and 1994 institutions together.
• Broadened perspectives and horizons.
• In a changing world, a diversity of ideas will better help us find solutions to new problems that are not predictable with past understanding.
• Provide more role models and motivation to strive for leadership positions for marginalized people.
• Problems which ESS aims to address and respond to impact a diverse group, answering these challenges will require a diverse team
• Inclusive Excellence would provide for stronger, more meaningful and impactful multi-disciplinary and multi-institutional collaborations: leveraging of resources.
• Empowering and welcoming a diverse community of scholars will improve the quality of everything we do, from teaching to the quality of our research questions and solutions.
• Being inclusive doesn't just make us better, it makes us relevant to more people.

Discussion Prompt: What is ONE THING I could change or do this year that would have the greatest positive impact in Inclusive Excellence in 5-10 years?

• Reach out to other institutions that we have not connected with as yet.
• Work on regional strategies with Alton Thompson and ARD Directors
• I will reach out to 1890s and 1994s to recruit my graduate students.
• Network with people who are not just like me. Build my circle with people outside my box.
• Intentional communication and engagement.
• support shared internships
• Focus on audience when developing materials to report data
• be proactive in reaching out to other groups
• Hire faculty members of color and support them with quality start-up packages.
• Incentivize my faculty to collaborate with 1890 universities on research projects
• Be strategic and intentional about inclusivity
• Recruit faculty from 1890 and 1994
• collaborate with 1890s on internships in agriculture fields
• Try to carve out seed funding for new collaborative efforts between our faculty (1862) with 1890 or 1994 partners
• Try to institutionalize the concept of inclusive excellence with faculty and administration and establish a pilot program to foster interactions between ESS 1862 and 1890s.
• I think my "one new idea" is also the answer for this one: Building an advisory committee that will better connect communicators from 1862, 1890 and 1994 institutions so we can benefit from their input and they can benefit from learning about each other, their audiences and their cultures.
• Establish meaningful relationships with other institutional members of the LGU family.
• Reach out to build trust with 1994 institutions
• Helping others (students, high school teachers, Madea, etc.) to understand all that "Agriculture" is. That is the best way to recruit and will lead to positive change in the years to come. [Madea--the person who is raising those students who should major in agriculture, but because of the view of agriculture, these students are majoring in other areas.]
• Facilitate meaningful conversations among minority and majority students for deeper understanding of challenges and opportunities of DEI
• This has been an amazing thinking and reflecting time. THANK YOU!
• Our 1862 HSI has some of the same challenges that our 1890 and 1994 institutions are facing, so I will seek ways to collaborate at a higher level.

Discussion Prompt: What are 2-3 action steps I could take in the next 30 days to advance toward this ONE THING?

• Identify funding opportunities to enable these interactions and collaborations to become a reality.
• I sure would love to think through how the SRDC could help with these ideas.
• Agriculture can be so much more than its historical image, data sciences, gene editing, innovation and entrepreneurship, we need to embrace those traits
• Plan for seed funding for collaboration with 1890 universities
• Talking to everyone I meet about agriculture:
• Flip the narrative that education is the pathway away from Agriculture.
• Pick up the phone and start networking!
• Establish a regular monthly meeting with my counterparts in 1890 and 1994 universities.
• Target faculty from 1890 and 1994 to participate in AFRI grants
• I love the emphasis on conversation...that's where it starts!
• As was mentioned earlier, I will work with Gary Thompson to plan and implement joint programs, proposals with ARD and the Southern region

Respectfully submitted by:
• Woody Hughes, Jr., Fort Valley State University
• Brian Raison, The Ohio State University
• Rachel Welborn, Southern Rural Development Center
“Inclusive Excellence” Call to Action 2021 Report
Submitted by Anna Katharine Mansfield, Associate Director

What challenge area you are addressing?
Since August 2020, the Cornell AgriTech DEI Council (formerly Committee) has begun to address two of the four D&I Challenge Areas:
• Recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce: developing a pipeline to support inclusive excellence.
• Reaching/working with underserved populations.

What actions have you taken?
• Created, completed, and analyzed data from internal climate survey
• Initiated integrated Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Council
• Drafted and initiated three-year DEI plan:
  Yr 1. Internal climate
  Yr 2. External climate
  Yr 3. Metrics and accountability
• Initiated informal monthly meetings of principal DEI leaders at Cornell AgriTech, Cornell Cooperative Extension, and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
• Hosted, or have secured speakers for, station-wide talks or workshops on:
  • The history of indigenous peoples at Cornell AgriTech
  • Anti-racism initiatives in Cornell Cooperative Extension
  • Microaggressions in the workplace
  • Gender and sexuality
• Drafted agenda and programming for an AgriTech employee onboarding program to include community expectations and cultural norms for international employees (to be completed in May 2022)
• Encouraged and supported formation of Employee Affiliate Groups (EAGs) for Minority Genders in STEM and LGBTQ employees
• Initiated planning for student assistantships and internships for underrepresented minority candidates
• Two faculty searches were conducted with emphasis on diversifying candidate pools; both were filled with diversity hires
• With the help of Cornell’s American Indian and Indigenous Studies program, land acknowledgement language was drafted and is under review for consideration by the historically dispossessed Seneca Nations

What resources have you deployed?
• Associate Director effort reapportioned to include DEI initiatives
• Discretionary funds used for professional training in DEI programming for DEI Council co-chairs
• DEI training and programming available from Cornell
• Commitment to invest discretionary funds in student assistantships and internships for underrepresented minority candidates

What gaps will you address?
• Cornell AgriTech community is largely white, male, and cishet; training on the realities of normative culture and privilege and its implications for recruiting and retaining diverse candidates
• Critically assessing current demographics and cultural norms to improve inclusivity for underrepresented groups within the AgriTech community
• Critically assessing stakeholder reach to determine what groups are being overlooked and how extension and outreach programming can be more accessible and welcoming
• Support and encouragement of individual growth for all community members
• Acknowledgment and ‘credit’ for DEI work in annual reviews

What goals are you seeking?
• To provide baseline education about normative culture to all community members
• To support critical, open discussion about the strengths and weaknesses of current culture, and create a common vision for change
• To identify and empower leaders within the community to advocate for equity for minority segments
• To create a self-aware, accessible culture where individuals can bring their full, authentic self to work

What does diversity and inclusion look like on your campus or station?
• Majority white
• Age-stratified such that white, cishet men still hold most leadership positions, but younger leaders and more diverse
• Diversity largely consists of women and international academics
• Student and staff population is more diverse in almost all parameters than faculty

How does this CTA fit into your station, college, or university DEI strategic plan?
• Cornell AgriTech made a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in late 2019; the social upheaval in 2020 prompted rapid action in the development of a DEI Committee. In 2021, this committee was transformed into an integrated DEI Council, and charged with the development of a DEI strategic plan.
• In the spring of 2021, DEI strategic plans were requested from the College for all units, including AgriTech; so the still-developing strategic planning document was reformatted to fit the college template.
GRAND CHALLENGES BRIEFS FOR LOCAL/REGIONAL ADAPTATION

USAGE GUIDELINES

The Grand Challenges templates are intended for use by local/regional institutions who want to show the work they are doing to address the Grand Challenges. Each template is designed to provide consistent messaging about the Challenge Area and the response of the LGU/AES system, local/regional branding and identity, and local/regional success stories related to the Challenge Area.

The templates can be downloaded and edited using Adobe InDesign. Please refer to the notes below as well as those provided in the InDesign file and in the example PDF.

STYLE GUIDE

Layout

- View InDesign template in “Normal” (not “Preview) to view rulers, guide lines, and spacers
- Extend Page 1 background photo to bleed line
- Use 0.25” document margins
- Leave all spacers intact
- Do not alter text box width; only adjust height to accommodate more text

Text Formatting

- Fonts used: Lucida Sans (title, headings, success stories, captions) and Garamond (body text)
- Bold institution and place names (e.g., University of Illinois, Illinois, Midwest)
- Underline hyperlinks
- Bold and italicize numbers reported in success stories

Graphics

- Use high-resolution, relevant photos or other visual aids
- Attribute visual aids as needed
- Follow institution guidelines for choosing, sizing, and spacing logos
SUSTAINABILITY, COMPETITIVENESS & PROFITABILITY OF FOOD & AGRICULTURE

Rising energy costs, frequent extremes in weather, and social changes affect agricultural productivity, food security, and economic viability. Even in the absence of these factors, a business-as-usual approach to agriculture will continue to degrade soil, water, air, and other natural resources. Now more than ever, we must enhance the sustainability, competitiveness, and profitability of our food and agricultural systems.

As part of the Land-Grant University System, the University of Illinois is poised to address this challenge area. Doing so will require investment in interdisciplinary systems-level research and development of comprehensive datasets and holistic analytical tools.

RESEARCH PRIORITIES

- Reduce agriculture’s carbon footprint
- Improve the energy efficiency of agricultural systems
- Enhance crop and livestock productivity
- Improve soil health
- Find new ways to conserve water
- Develop non-chemical pest and weed control
- Improve producer profitability

CAPACITY & RESOURCES

As part of the Land-Grant University System, the University of Illinois has access to:

- Research sites representing diverse ecosystems, communities, and food production systems
- State-of-the-art laboratories, greenhouses, computational centers, and tools
- Skilled scientists, educators, students, and staff
- Impartial, peer-reviewed science, technology, and recommendations
- Far-reaching Extension networks to work with and inform communities across the state and beyond
- Strong relationships with government agencies, farm and commodity groups, and the private sector
SUCCESS STORIES

Research-based approaches can make agricultural systems more resilient to change, protect natural resources and ecosystem services, and keep agriculture and the economy at the frontier of global competitiveness. Over the years, the University of Illinois has shown how investments in research can have major impacts.

95% of Illinois swine producers and transporters have received training through University of Illinois research and Extension programs that ensure pig welfare and food safety. Certification gives producers access to more markets and allows them to sell products at a premium.

Small Farm Program trainings on running livestock enterprises helped 32,538 small farms in the Midwest increase net farm income by an average of $4,500 per year.

Growers using a new wireless soil moisture sensor system have seen less disease, better plant quality, and large water savings. One user reduced irrigation by 50% and saved 43 millions gallons of water.

95% of Illinois swine producers and transporters have received training through University of Illinois research and Extension programs that ensure pig welfare and food safety. Certification gives producers access to more markets and allows them to sell products at a premium.

Small Farm Program trainings on running livestock enterprises helped 32,538 small farms in the Midwest increase net farm income by an average of $4,500 per year.

Growers using a new wireless soil moisture sensor system have seen less disease, better plant quality, and large water savings. One user reduced irrigation by 50% and saved 43 millions gallons of water.

95% of Illinois swine producers and transporters have received training through University of Illinois research and Extension programs that ensure pig welfare and food safety. Certification gives producers access to more markets and allows them to sell products at a premium.

Land-grant University researchers are making advances that protect livestock health. For example, Virginia Tech researchers developed a quick, easy-to-use tool to detect bacteria that cause bovine respiratory disease. A new vaccine could save beef producers $10-15 million each year by preventing epizootic bovine abortion, a disease that causes loss of pregnancy or unhealthy calves. iStock photo.

Extension specialists share information with beekeepers, farmers, home gardeners, regulatory agencies, and others. Beekeepers following research-based recommendations saved 10,500 honey bee colonies, worth over $5,750,000 each year. iStock photo.

The Grand Challenges are part of the Science Roadmap for Food and Agriculture developed by the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) to guide food and agricultural research. A unit of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities, ESCOP governs the research activities of Land-grant Universities and Agricultural Experiment Stations. Borne out of the Hatch Act of 1887 and the Evans-Allen Act of 1977, these premier institutions are supported by USDA NIFA and by collaborations across federal, regional, state, nonprofits, and private institutions. For more information: escop.info.

Learn more about University of Illinois research: aces.illinois.edu

The University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign
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### Regional Multistate Project Portfolio
### Alignment with USDA and ESCOP Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>USDA Priorities (Direct=D, Loose=L)</th>
<th>ESCOP Priorities (Direct=D, Loose=L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>DEIA</td>
<td>Climate</td>
<td>Energy Security &amp; Bioecon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Opps</td>
<td>Workforce Develop</td>
<td>Safe, Secure &amp; Abundant Food Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>Food &amp; Nutrition Security</td>
<td>Human Health, Nutrition &amp; Wellness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sustain, Comp, &amp; Profitability of Food &amp; Ag</td>
<td>Environ Steward &amp; Sustain Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indiv, Fam &amp; Comm Resilience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agricultural Experiment Stations and Branch Stations
in the United States
FROM: Douglas L. Steele  
Vice President for Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources  

TO: Voting Members of the Board on Agriculture Assembly (BAA)  

DATE: February 10, 2022  

SUBJECT: Policy Board of Directors NOTICE of Amendment to BAA "Rules of Operation"  

**************************************************************************************************************  

WAAESD Agenda Item 21.5: CMC Report  
Presenter: Bret Hess  
Action Requested: Discussion/Cast Votes  

From: Robinson, Suzette <SRobinson@APLU.ORG>  
Sent: Tuesday, February 15, 2022 9:04 AM  
To: Robinson, Suzette <SRobinson@APLU.ORG>  
Subject: FW: Board on Agriculture Assembly Policy Board of Directors "Rules of Operation" Amendment NOTICE  

Board on Agriculture Assembly  
Policy Board of Directors  
NOTICE of Amendment to "Rules of Operations"  
(February 10, 2022)  

The SAMPLE ballot is at the end of this document.  

BACKGROUND
Over the past decade, the Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC), a committee appointed by the Policy Board of Directors, has managed external contracts and served as the communications lead for the Experiment Station Section (ESS), Cooperative Extension System (CES), and Administrative Heads Section (AHS). In 2019, the CMC discontinued its contract with k-global and began an 18-month process (with a new consulting contract with Forbes Tate Partners) to assist in conducting an internal needs assessment that led to the development of a strategic communications and marketing roadmap. Additionally, upon advice from FTP and internal stakeholders, the CMC recommended the hiring of a new position, Assistant Vice President for Communications and Partnerships, within the Office of Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources (FANR) to lead the daily efforts for the continued development and implementation of the strategic communications and marketing roadmap.

**RATIONALE FOR TRANSITIONING THE CMC TO A STANDING COMMITTEE**

The CMC is currently an ad-hoc committee of the Board on Agriculture Assembly (BAA). The designation of the CMC as a standing committee would provide a preferred committee structure to facilitate the continued growth and long-term support of communications and marketing efforts across all BAA councils, sections, and committees.

The designation as a standing committee would:

**Elevate the stature of Communications and Marketing in support of the BAA**

The Policy Board of Directors currently has two standing committees: (1) Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC) and (2) Committee on Legislation and Policy (CLP). The CMC as a standing committee would enable the committee to be equal partners with the BAC and CLP. The CMC would be in a stronger position to align with and support the BAC and CLP as well as provide expertise to the BAA overall.

**Increase continuity**

Because of the CMC’s ad hoc status, the committee works on an annual basis. The change of status to a standing committee would facilitate long-term continuity as well as enable the CMC to appoint agricultural communicators to the committee in support of the BAA.

**Support BAA’s advocacy**

The CMC feels that it is essential to develop and disseminate compelling and targeted stories that spotlight the value of land-grant universities’ research, education, and Extension in order to successfully move legislation. Elevating the CMC to a standing committee would provide the necessary framework to develop key communications strategies and tactics on the annual authorizations and the reauthorization of the Farm Bill to fortify the BAA’s advocacy throughout the entire year.

**PROPOSED AMENDMENT**
The Policy Board of Directors recommends that the Communications and Marketing Committee become a Standing Committee of the Board on Agriculture Assembly.

**Overall Changes to the "Rules of Operation"**

- Article IV – Assembly Committees, Section 1: Adds the Communications and Marketing Committee as an Assembly committee.
- Article IV – Assembly Committees, Section 6: This is a new section and provides a description of the purpose of the CMC and the membership of the CMC. This description is consistent with those of the current BAA standing committees.
- Article IV – Assembly Committees, Section 7: Only the numbering of the section has changed, a result of the addition of a new Section 6.
- Article IV – Assembly Committees, Section 8: Only the numbering of the section has changed, a result of the addition of a new Section 6 and the renumbering of section 7.

**Per "Rules of Operation"**

Article VI-Amendments

Section I: These "Rules of Operation" may be amended by a two-thirds majority of the voting representatives to the Assembly, provided the proposed changes have been presented to the Assembly at least thirty (30) days prior to the voting.

Thirty (30) day listening period ends March 15, 2022

Voting Period March 15-April 1, 2022

**SAMPLE BALLOT**

Amendment to the Board on Agriculture Assembly "Rules of Operation" to add the Communication and Marketing Committee as a Standing Committee of the Policy Board of Directors

_____ Yes

_____ No

Comments or questions need to be sent to Doug Steele, Vice President, Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources, APLU in writing by email (dsteele@aplu.org) by **Close of Business on March 15, 2022**.

**Click here to view "Rules of Operation": KM_C658-20180130101036 (aplu.org)**
On February 11-12, 2022, a group of writers and editors from across the nation worked collaboratively to write impact stories and fact sheets to support the work we do in land-grant research, teaching and extension. Over the course of two days, they wrote, edited, designed and illustrated 61 web stories, 27 fact sheets and one video for publication on the National Impact Database. Please take a moment to review the work of this team. You can view these products at the National Impact Database website: https://landgrantimpacts.org

Entries in NIDB as of March 8

2021 (Final Numbers)
380 - statements public
212 - Extension Statements
168 - Research Statements
82 - marked as Covid
50 - marked as Diversity and Inclusion

2022
18 - statements public
0 - statements in queue to review
18 - Extension Statements
0 - Research Statements
7 - marked as Covid
1 - marked as Diversity and Inclusion

Programming TAGS currently available in the National Impact Database

Agricultural Systems:
- Alternative Agriculture
- Food Systems
- Fiber Systems
- Profitability & Competitiveness
- Climate Change
- Sustainability
- Crop Management
- Livestock Management
- Integrated Pest Management
- Economics
- Modeling
- Irrigation
- Local Foods
- COVID-19
- Diversity & Inclusion

Energy & Bioproducts:
- Bioproducts
• Biofuels
• Biomass
• Biofuel Incentives
• Energy Technologies
• Energy Efficiency & Conservation
• Climate Change
• COVID-19
• Diversity & Inclusion

**Environmental Stewardship:**
• Ecosystem Services
• Pest Control
• Stewardship
• Energy Conservation
• Water Quality
• Water Availability
• Water Conservation
• Waste Management
• Soil Conservation
• Climate Change
• COVID-19
• Diversity & Inclusion

**Food Security:**
• Productivity
• Plant and Animal Improvement (breeding & genomics)
• Reduced Chemical Use
• Nutritional Value
• Food Availability
• Food Affordability
• Plant and Animal Food Products
• Chronic Disease Prevention and Management
• Food Safety
• Food Preservation
• Food Supply Systems
• Climate Change
• COVID-19
• Diversity & Inclusion

**Nutrition & Health:**
• Human Health
• Genomics
• Nutrient Delivery Systems
• Physical Activity
• Wellness
• Human Nutrition
• Chronic Disease Processes
• Functional Foods
• Climate Change
• COVID-19
• Diversity & Inclusion

Youth, Family & Communities:
• Economic Development
• Community Development
• Leadership
• Technology Use
• Financial Management
• Entrepreneurship
• STEM
• Youth Development & 4-H
• Home Safety
• Child and Family Resilience
• Economic Value
• Jobs Created/Retained
• Workforce Preparedness
• Community Engagement in Public Issues
• Community Decision Making
• Emergency Management
• Emergency Preparedness
• Emergency Response
• Emergency Recovery
• Climate Change
• COVID-19
• Diversity & Inclusion

Writing Team Recommendations and NIDB Actions

• Tags:
  o Issue: Can’t access a wide range of tags except for those under the area of focus you have selected when submitting an Impact Statement.
  o Challenge: Number of tags offered??
  o Outcome: Desire to select Focus Area(s) and then access separate list of tags (see entire list and be able to select appropriate tags.
  o Working Committee: Steve Loring (Chair), Sara Delheimer, Scott Cummings

• Communication/Training:
  o Issue: States don’t know who has the ability to submit Impact Statements OR lack of consistency in updating the state team when turnover occurs.
  o Challenge: Educating/Communicating with Deans & Directors and then that information being shared with their Communications team
  o Outcome: Create a communication/training plan. Sharing messages with Deans/Directors about the NIDB, the roles for their institution, what is needed by those
roles AND then creating training components on those roles (how to perform them) and how to use the Data Base.

- **Working Committee:** Frankie Gould (Chair), Sara Delheimer, Faith Peppers

**Editorial Review Board/Quality Control Checkpoints:**

- **Issue:** Lack of formalized review process; confidence in quality of statements as a result.
- **Challenge:** Obtaining and sustaining Reviewers who participate in a timely manner
- **Questions:**
  - How would reviewers be selected
  - Must address training for reviewers
  - Ability for reviewers to make minor changes to statements without re-routing everything back through the system
- **Outcome:** Create protocols for implementing an Editorial Review Board concept
- **Working Committee:** Karla Trautman (Chr), Debby Lewis, Rick Rhodes, Ron Brown
Summary of ESS Recommendation for the 2023 Farm Bill

General

- Add LGUs as recognized research collaborators where other entities (e.g. Extension, USDA ARS) are acknowledged or added in other Titles in the Farm Bill (e.g. NRCS and the Conservation Title) and with pertinent research thrusts (e.g. climate, soil health, sustainability, conservation).
- Remove barriers to collaboration with USDA ARS and LGUs.
- Encourage regional food systems as components of national food security in competitive grant programs. In addition, encourage investment in big data applications in agriculture.
- Elevate specialty crops to the status of commodity crops.
- Provide authorization and funding for plant breeding programs with new crop development.
- Shift the focus on specific dietary components to roles that nutrition plays on preventing chronic disease.
- 2018 Farm Bill directed USDA ARS to develop and implement a National Strategic Germplasm and Cultivar Collection Assessment and Utilization Plan (SEC. 7205) that “takes into consideration the resources and research necessary to... as a self-study internal evaluation activity.” Several of these National Plant Germplasm Station gene banks are on LGU campuses and have other affiliations. Consequently, significant consultations on the human and physical infrastructure necessary to improve these joint programs should include resources and research needs by USDA ARS and relevant LGUs as part of any action agenda in the 2023 Farm Bill.
- Based upon the research Grand Challenges and the expansive capacity/interest in climate change research agenda, increase Hatch funding.
- Re-enforce, strengthen and stipulate that 1862 and 1890 research directors are the only administrative officials responsible for capacity research programs at state-certified institutions eligible to participate in capacity-funded programs.
- Increase F&A IDC rate only if new money is appropriated to NIFA competitive grant programs.

Infrastructure

- Engage with any opportunity to do singularly or as a collaborator and partner (e.g. USDA ARS, NRCS) on new and deferred maintenance and agricultural infrastructure at LGUs and non-LGUs with agricultural programs.

Matching

- Specialty Crop Research Initiative (SCRI) – Remove or modify with waiver authority for Secretary. Continue funding at current level.
- Research Facilities Act – Remove or modify with broad waiver authority for Secretary.
- Evans-Allen to ensure that it is new funds (not redirected) and greater than current matching levels.
- Remove or modify the current 100% match requirement with New Beginning for Tribal Student (NBTS) grants.
Reauthorization and Authorization Levels

- **1890 Scholarship Program, 1890 Capacity Building Grants Program, 1890 Facilities Improvement Program – Do and increase.**
- Modify and/or provide clarity in titles to address the inequities and eligibility rules for participating in cost-share programs.
- FFAR had mixed support from several respondents in its reauthorization – from no to something less than current level.
- Increase the authorization levels of the Multicultural Scholars, Graduate Fellowships and Institution Challenge Grants.
- Change the authorization and restrictions on tuition remission (e.g., allow use of Hatch funds to pay tuition and allow use of tuition paid by an institution to support a graduate student stipend paid by capacity funds as non-Federal match) and indirect costs from (capacity) funds 7 U.S. Code § 3319.
- Within AFRI awards for new investigators, the stated criteria is too restrictive and counterproductive for the future workforce. Currently serves as 5-year, career track experience which does not allow for pandemics, family leave options, publication limit needs to change. Modify the language to be less restrictive and to reflect modern realities.
- Reauthorize the Sun Grant program at $75,000,000. The regional center concept has established value for regionally relevant bioeconomic research and development. Broadening the emphasis beyond bioenergy and allowing the recovery of real costs of administration by the performing institutions will strengthen the potential for economic impact through the regions of the United States.
- Support for research and Extension activities with Titles VIII (Forestry), IX (Energy), X (Horticulture) and XII (Miscellaneous) for McIntire-Stennis; growing and processing crops for biofuel, C sequestration, climate mitigation and adaptation, renewable energy systems; expanding farmers markets, local food programs with research and infrastructure; grow and expand beginning, socially disadvantaged workforce, respectively.

### 1890 Institutions

- Increase funding for the Evans-Allen Program from the 30% percentage share of Hatch funding to 40%.
- Increase the 1890 Centers of Excellence from six to twelve.

### 1994 Institutions

- Eliminate the mandate that requires 1994 collaborations on research grants with 1862 LGUs, 1890 LGUs, USDA ARS, Institutions with approved forestry programs.
- Concurrent with expanding the eligibility of 1994s with McIntire-Stennis funds increase the total allocation.