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Minutes

Monday, July 18, 1-5:00 PM –

Opening Business – Michelle Rodgers

The meeting was brought to order by Michelle Rodgers. Attendance is recorded on p.7. A quorum was established. Following introductions and welcome to guests, Mark Latimore made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 25, 2016 meeting (URL). Chuck Hibberd seconded the motion. Motion carried. Two items were added to the agenda:

- Chris Boerboom: Civic engagement, racism, gun violence, and community trust for discussion
- Rick Klemme and Celvia Stovall: 2016 Budget item from ECOP/ESCOP Health Implementation Team

Michelle Rodgers: The mid-year ECOP finance report prepared by the National Office was presented as information. Several items are not expended until later in the fiscal year. There were no questions.


Chuck Hibberd: Recognized members of the ECOP National System Task Force (NSTF). Feedback from the webinar held on June 28, 2016 is found attached on pp. 9-13. Link to hear recording: https://unl.box.com/v/NationalSystemWebinar. Model being proposed will be an opt-in model. Reconsider our affinity for a better-organized national system in order to respond to funding opportunities and position for funding for key priorities. Reinstate the system-wide program prioritization process as well as a process for identifying rapidly emerging issues. Continue to vigorously pursue opportunities to align our Cooperative Extension system with new partners. Redefine the National Impacts Database to capture progress on national issues. Co-branding with universities in the form of a tagline rather than a logo is under consideration for selected products and programs.

National System Task Force Request: Asking for a limited amount of time at NEDA to present a final report with recommendations. ECOP will vote on talking points.

Jane Schuchardt for Scott Reed: Recognized members of Private Resource Mobilization, p. 14. Overview-Shared boundaries with NSTF, complementary to public funding, not in competition with land-grant institution efforts. Assignments have been made in six areas: cost, prospects, 3-year development plan, Development Coordinating Committee, institutional home (bank), and case statement. Complete work by the end of the year and before the spring 2017 ECOP meeting. Front end-webinar and back-end webinar will be scheduled.

Chris Geith: eXtension Foundation is focusing on developing ways to rapidly respond to initiatives.


Michelle Rodgers: Leadership team is seeking how to proceed as a system and conduct a pilot with RWJF. Strength of the negotiations comes from support by National 4-H Council. “Launch grant” has been undertaken. Tier, goal-oriented systems rather than regionally organized. Work of the ECOP/ESCOP Health Implementation Action Teams is to be a part of this proposal.
Motion by Fred Schlutt - ECOP endorses this process and authorizes the efforts explained above to continue. Motion was seconded by Bill Hare. Approved. Communication is key.

3. USDA-NIFA Report

Louie Tupas filling in for liaison to be determined: In order to provide education about climate change, “Climate Masters” is a program in the design phase. RFA announced last week, AFRI-Agriculture and Natural Resources Science for Climate Variability and Change Challenge Area: https://nifa.usda.gov/funding-opportunity/agriculture-and-food-research-initiative-agriculture-and-natural-resources

Louie Tupas: Written report is attached, pp.16-21.

Bottom line: The National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) is suspending the requirement for all 1862 and 1890 Research and Extension institutions to submit updates to their 5-year Plans of Work (POW) in FY 2017 and FY 2018. This means that the 2018 – 2022 POW will not be due on April 1, 2017 and the 2019-2023 POW will not be due on April 1, 2018.

Please note that an integrated Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results will still be due from each state in FY 2017 and FY 2018. The 2016 Annual Report will still be due April 1, 2017. The 2017 Annual Report will still be due April 1, 2018.]

4. National 4-H Council Board Structure, pp. 65-78

Andy Ferrin – Board Development Goal: Increase fundraising and financial support to grow 4-H youth involvement from 6 to 10 million members by 2025. Less than one half of alumni are connected with 4-H. Strategic recommendation: To change the make-up of Council’s Board of Trustees -- one from Extension system, another from youth, and the rest from representatives of business/organizations that can contribute funding either directly or through partners.

Discussion of this proposal by regions has begun in Northeast and Western, others are gearing up for same. Principles of change: Smaller board from 35 people to a smaller number to shift focus on to fundraising while reducing Council oversight. Council Board will vote in December; implementation by spring 2017. Regions need to be prepared to all come back to NEDA meeting in September for discussions leading to a decision. Feedback is requested on four questions:

Feedback Request

- How do we ensure we maintain alignment and accountability?
- What Extension/4-H priorities do we need to take into consideration?
- What steps will we need to take to maintain strong relationships?
- How can we best create clarity around the overall benefit to 4-H of these changes?

James Trapp: Results of the recent Section survey have been submitted to the BAA Committee on Legislation and Policy where they will be summarized with responses from other BAA sections. The response rate was 50 percent. CES priorities: Protection of lines and prioritize appropriations, while paying attention to other new ideas, capacity fund, line consolidation. 1) Increase Smith Lever, 2) 1890 carryover capability, 3) Crop protection pest management, and 4) Ag risk. About AFRI – do not grow competitive without growing capacity. Further review will take place by Vernie Hubert, Cornerstone.

TUESDAY, JULY 19, 1-5:00 PM

6. ACTION: SNAP-ED Program Development Team (PDT) Assessment

Michelle Rodgers: ECOP is to make a decision to maintain the SNAP-Ed assessment for 2017 and beyond.

Paula Peters, PDT Chair: Survey was performed in spring to self-identify strengths around emerging issues, in order to create an expertise mapping resource for universities to draw upon for mentoring and coaching when faced with similar challenges. PDT is actively in the process of coming up with a map to link states and institutions together to deal with issues across boundaries. The community development aspect (policy system and environment [PSE]) was added recently in order to expand SNAP-Ed beyond direct education. PSE is designed to create an environment/community where healthy food choices can be easily made. PDT engaged with states to help define PSE through webinars; all 50 states and 46 land-grants are involved. Current review is in progress to identify the qualifications of the PDT membership. 1890’s Region is having difficulty acquiring SNAP-Ed funding. There is still some carry over of the requirement for matching funds from before 2010. Still in transition phase. The Association of SNAP-Ed Nutrition Networks and Other Implementing Agencies (ASNNA) is now a membership organization with dues. The historical three-year timeframe for approval of assessments to fund the PDT is flexible. There is no current structure in ASNNA to take over assessment operations.

Tim Cross: Motion-Vote by participating SNAP-Ed institutions to determine their desire to continue payment of the assessment for three more years with a simple majority needed for approval. Second of the motion was made by Chris Boerboom. Motion carried. Paula will provide the budget and 2-3 year summary of expenses and any carryover at SDSU for ECOP’s information. See attachments. The vote will occur at the CES Business Meeting in September.

7. ACTION: ECOP Budget


Jimmy Henning: Survey of the section demonstrates no support to increase the assessment. Presented four scenarios. Note that strategic opportunities has historically cost ECOP $100K per year. Jimmy Henning made a motion for ECOP to adopt Scenario 3 – Strategic opportunities budget line will be established in the amount of $30,000 in 2017 and is designed to support efforts of ECOP in order to advance strategic priorities. Every effort is made to use funds from annual income. If needed, reserves can be used as long as a $200,000 carryover is retained in order to cover approximately six months of ECOP National Office staffing and related costs. Tim Cross seconded the motion. Motion carried.

Jimmy Henning: Motion from Executive Committee action - ECOP will contribute a one-time amount of $7,000, contingent upon ESCOP contributing the same amount or more. Due to the unknown stance of ESCOP, Chuck Hibberd made a motion to table this action until the September meeting. Tim Cross seconded the motion. Motion carried. Great concern was expressed by ECOP members that ECOP budget funds are being committed by the BAA without consideration or action by ECOP. A decision about the best way to communicate this concern will be considered by ECOP Executive Committee.


Jimmy Henning: Motion from Executive Committee action - For 2017 Budget, recommend option #2, to eliminate Measuring Excellence in Extension Implementation Team and database and continue National Impacts Database at $12,500 annual. Motion carried.

8. **UPDATE: Executive Director Search Process (Fred Schlutt)**

Fred Schlutt: Plans are underway to finalize the job description and post the position opening. Time needs to be spent early on with defining ECOP’s relationship with APLU. Hiring to take place by the end of October before the APLU meeting. A draft of the job description will be shared with the entire board to review.

Jane Schuchardt: For the record, membership of search committee is as follows:
- Southern region – Doug Steele
- North Central region – Daryl Buchholz
- Northeast region – Michelle Rodgers
- Western region – Fred Schlutt, chair
- 1890 region – Delbert Foster
- EDA Team – Robin Shepard
- Plus – Rick Klemme, because of the BLC connection

It was recommended that ESCOP have a representative and Michelle Rodgers decided not to do that. Further, Ian Maw has requested that he be part of the search committee.

9. **Committees**

a. **ECOP Executive Committee**
   
i. **EDA Team roles and expectations**, 56-59.

Chuck Hibberd: New document is meant to clarify roles and responsibilities. ECOP Executive Committee recommends that EDA team revise the document, focusing on the role of strategic direction. This document will be shared with the Cooperative Extension Section. A second document, similar to the current EDA Team Directory, will be for internal use only. In the interest of limiting double staffing of work, assignments will be listed as primary and back-up.

b. **ECOP Personnel Committee**

Celvia Stovall: 2016 National Excellence in Extension Award recipient is from Southern Region. Following a review of the process, it was agreed that it worked really well and there is no need to change. All letters to recipients and non-recipients have been delivered. It is recommended that in the future that during the regional process that comments be collected so that these may
be shared constructively. The criteria of this award does not support elevated field agents to the level of receiving a national award.

Members of ECOP request that the Personnel Committee consider a way for field agents/educators to be recognized at the national level within the context of their position.

Panel for the ESS/CES New Director/Administrator Orientation Monday, September 19, 2016, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m. is in place.

Farm bill recommendation: Prioritize new and on-going components of the farm bill, include a new focus on 4-H youth development, and include water conservation within the context Extension as USDA’s educators, especially related to the work of USDA-NRCS.

c. ECOP Program Committee (Mark Latimore) -

Mark Latimore: NUEL update by Chris Boerboom: CLICK HERE. National Extension Diversity Award has been chosen. There were 11 quality nominations. Encouraging more submissions in 2017. Committee has begun to organize a framework to deal with national programmatic issues.

Celvia Stovall and Rick Klemme: Health Implementation update: Continue to meet bi-monthly, over half way through the process. Discussed how this activity aligns with the RWJF and farm bill.

Mark Latimore: Farm bill recommendation: Reauthorize current lines; focus on water conservation, 4-H especially for urban youth, and health. Vernie Hubert will summarize results of farm bill discussions from all BAA sections. Themes to accompany request: include 1994s, do no harm, ask for new money for new programs. Include APLU Deferred Maintenance Committee Report: Strategy Proposal (Draft) as part of the 2018 farm bill discussion.

10. NEDA 2017 location

Michelle Rodgers: Sandy Ruble presented three options based on recommendation from the northeast region, which is the host for 2017. (NEDA will always occur Tuesday-Wednesday noon during the first two weeks of October in the region of the immediate past chair.), Burlington, VT, Philadelphia, PA, and Rochester, NY are under considerations. Hotel proposals come from a process managed by APLU. Based on the presentation, Tony Windham made a motion to have NEDA 2017 in Burlington, VT. Fred Schlutt seconded and the motion carried.


Daryl Buchholz: Plan of Work is for five years and is due for an update. In other action, the PBD is consideration action related to nonpayment of assessments, reviewing the process for advancing new initiatives, and continuing work on public value statements. Darren Katz, kglobal, has offered to help pro-bono. Revision is to be more inclusive of all parts of the BAA. Daryl will take suggestions by ECOP members to include in the plan of work. Linda Kirk Fox: Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People Implementation Team – Draft is available for review and will be presented at the Joint COPs meeting.

12. LIAISON REPORTS: written unless action/discussion required by ECOP-

Chuck Hibberd: Graham Cochran, Ohio State University, is president-elect (2017-2018) of JCEP.

13. OTHER AGENDA ITEMS-

a. Chris Boerboom: Civic engagement, racism, gun violence, and community trust for discussion. Is this a time Extension could engage the nation in a conversation? AEA has
this on their agenda; Gina Eubanks will be leading the discussion. Idea - Consider a similar type of network like EDEN for natural disaster.

Discussion: Prevention rather than response. Public issues education. Youth materials. Connect with the APLU New Engagement initiative. Idea from eXtension, expertise boot camp, with a prize, gather the resources how to quickly compile as a toolkit. The personal development module for 4-H applies.

ACTIONS: Michelle Rodgers is willing to have a conversation with Peter McPherson at the APLU about this idea. Bill Hoffman agreed to engage NIFA after the conversation with Peter McPherson. Ron Brown, Tim Cross, Mark Latimore, Chris Boerboom, and Chris Geith formed a committee to collect programs for national consideration and to do a Design-a-thon through eXtension.

b. 2016 Budget item from ECOP/ESCOP Health Implementation Team: ECOP agreed by consensus to accept the ECOP Executive Committee recommendation to authorize the co-chairs to distribute the remaining balance of the ECOP National Health Implementation budget line for chair travel and committee functions to the five Action Teams.

14. EXECUTIVE SESSION (if needed) – None.

THE MEETING WAS PROPERLY ADJOURNED.

KEY

ECOP 2016 Goals:                                    ECOP Core Themes:
Private Resource Mobilization ....                      Build Partnerships and Acquire Resources ..................
Urban Programming ................................  Increase Strategic Marketing and Communications ....
Innovation.......................................................... Enhance Leadership and Professional Development ....
Professional Development.................................... Strengthen Organizational Functioning ........................
National System .............................................

ECOP Membership (Attendance is indicated with ● or ☑)

VOTING MEMBERS (8 or more establishes a quorum):

1890 Region
☐ Delbert Foster, South Carolina State University
☑ Mark Latimore, Fort Valley State
☑ Celvia Stovall, Alabama Cooperative Extension System

North Central Region
☑ Chris Boerboom, North Dakota State University
☐ Beverly Durgan, University of Minnesota
☑ Chuck Hibberd, University of Nebraska

Northeast Region
☐ Michael O’Neill, University of Connecticut
☑ Michelle Rodgers, University of Delaware
Bill Hare, University of District of Columbia

Southern Region
☑ Tim Cross, University of Tennessee
☑ Jimmy Henning, University of Kentucky
☑ Tony Windham, University of Arkansas

Western Region
☐ Rich Koenig, Washington State University
☑ Scott Reed, Oregon State University
☑ Fred Schlutt, University of Alaska Fairbanks

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:
Ex-Officio Members
☐ Dennis Calvin, Chair, eXtension Board of Directors
☐ Daryl Buchholz, Kansas State University, ECOP Representative to Policy Board of Directors
☐ Chris Geith, CEO, eXtension Board of Directors
☐ Louie Tupas and Bill Hoffman for TBD, USDA-NIFA
☐ Rick Klemme, University of Wisconsin, Chair, ECOP Budget and Legislative Committee
☐ Jane Schuchardt, ECOP Executive Director, Cooperative Extension

Liaisons
☐ Susan Crowell, Council for Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching
☐ Linda Kirk Fox, Board on Human Sciences
☐ Andy Ferrin for Jennifer Sirangelo, National 4-H Council
☐ Clarence Watson, Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy

Executive Director and Administrator Team
☐ Ron Brown, Southern Region
☐ Nancy Bull, Northeast Region
☐ Lyla Houglum, Western Region
☐ L. Washington Lyons, 1890 Region
☐ Sandy Ruble, DC Office
☐ Jane Schuchardt, DC Office
☐ Robin Shepard, North Central Region

Guests
☐ Paula Peters, Kansas State University
☐ Ami Smith, West Virginia State University
☐ Brunetta Gamble-Dillard, West Virginia State University
☐ James Trapp, Oklahoma State University
☐ Darren Katz, kglobal
☐ Hunt Shipman, Cornerstone Government Affairs
☐ Faith Peppers, University of Georgia
☐ Greg Sanders, North Dakota State University

Return to minutes
Cooperative Extension: Opportunities for a National Approach to Funding, Collaboration and Accomplishment
Webinar Overview – June 28, 2016

Our National System study was reported at a Zoom webinar on June 28, 2016 (68 participants, names were not recorded). Links to the recording and the PowerPoint:

   National System Webinar Recording:
   https://unl.box.com/v/NationalSystemWebinar

   National System PowerPoint:
   https://unl.box.com/v/NationalSystemPPT

Poll #1 - How would you describe your role? (42 total respondents)

1. Associate Dean or Program Leader (6 votes, 14%)
2. Communications Specialist (8 votes, 19%)
3. Deputy or Associate administrator (5 votes, 12%)
4. Extension professional (5 votes, 12%)
5. Lead administrator for Extension in your system (18 votes, 43%)

Poll #2 - Which of the following programs or projects are delivered in your system (multiple answers allowed)? (44 total respondents)

1. 4-H (44 votes)
2. Children, Youth and Families at Risk (CYFAR) (32 votes)
3. Master Gardener (40 votes)
4. Office of Juvenile Justice Diversion Program (OJJDP) (22 votes)
5. Producer education funded in the Agriculture Act of 2014 (Farm Bill) (35 votes)
6. Pesticide applicator training (39 votes)

Poll #3 - Which of the following statements do you prefer (multiple answers allowed)? (54 total respondents)

1. Cooperative Extension is relational; we engage communities and organizations in a partnership to co-create opportunities and solve problems. (41 votes)
2. Cooperative Extension operates locally, we listen and focus our work on locally identified needs. (25 votes)
3. Cooperative Extension provides unbiased science-based strategies and solutions. (34 votes)

Poll #4 - Would you be interested in your system working on a national priority if funding was provided? (47 total respondents)

1. Yes (36 votes, 77%)
2. Maybe (11 votes, 23%)
3. No (0 votes, 0%)

Poll #5 - After participating in this webinar, I am: (50 total respondents)

1. More willing to engage in a conversation about national funding for national/local priorities. (43 votes, 86%)
2. Less willing to engage in a conversation about national funding for national/local priorities. (1 vote, 2%)
3. Undecided. (6 votes, 12%)

Chat Text:

1. nslevin : I like a merge of the second two. A national network of 76 state-based programs designed to address national issues.
2. Elizabeth Gregory North, Mississippi : I would add to #3 that we address locally relevant issues in addition to the national ones.
3. fgould: Our view is that science is the umbrella that research functions under. Research is the result of studying a science, social science or communication issue. So research is the validation of science or other needs study that we disseminate to the public.
4. Jimmy Henning : Delivery may be the key word. We can be part of an effort via internet resources when the initiative does not match high enough on priority list to dedicate people to it.
5. Jimmy Henning : I was probably a no on this one because of the difficulty of agreement on a logo and how nutty my institution has become about logos.
6. Elizabeth Gregory North, Mississippi : I would also suggest that we consider a tagline, such as “a member of our nation’s Cooperative Extension System.” That might be easier to deal with, as opposed to a second logo.
7. Jimmy Henning : Nutty in the scientific sense of course
8. Jimmy Henning : agree with the tagline
9. fgould: If there is a national logo then have a tagline of the state LGU
10. Douglas.Steele : We’ve been down the logo road before: I like the idea of a “connecting” tag line.
11. Elizabeth Gregory North, Mississippi : I strongly advise that we stay away from the word “unbiased.” We are biased, towards science.
12. mrodgers: Some of our potential funders appreciate that we work locally but also are a national system...it is the combination that is attractive to some funders I think
13. Roger Rennekamp : Glad to see that we perceive our “method” as involving both “education” and “engagement.” This communicates the notion of mutual benefit and reciprocity and moves us beyond a unidirectional “expert” model.
14. Tim L Cross : Maybe we could consider "objective" instead of "unbiased"
15. Elizabeth Gregory North, Mississippi : Or “science-based”
17. Mike O’Neill : We do not have county government; we deal with 169 independent cities and towns.
18. Nick Place : I prefer "science-based" over "unbiased" as this more truly represents how we do our work of connecting our land grant universites to address societal needs
19. fgould: We may need to say across the US and territories
20. Chris Geith : "national presence, locally relevant" is part of the NEW eXtension - as is engagement with the new Issues, Innovation, Impact model.
21. jschuchardt: The surveys were sent to the Cooperative Extension Section of the APLU Board on Agriculture Assembly. Currently, the 1994s are not a part of the "section."

22. Elizabeth Gregory North, Mississippi: These statements are all very strong statements about how Extension works and the value we offer to partners. We also need to be aware that these statements are based on internal research. The brand value attributes the Copernicus study are based on research with external audiences and validated by further research with external audiences. We need to be sophisticated in the use of these messages to target audiences appropriately.

23. Paul Brown: An elevator speech is easy when keeping the three R's in mind: research-based, relationships, and relevance.

24. Mike O'Neill: We need to be more inclusive than APLU. 1994 institutions are part of the land grant system. How many times was "land grant" used in this presentation?

25. Elizabeth Gregory North, Mississippi: I like the 3 R's for federal partners. We also have the elevator pitch for clients and local partners: Extension offers practical education you can trust, to help people, businesses, and communities to solve problems, develop skills, and build a better future.

26. mondotech: A follow up with the capacity-priority conversation may be how to share capacity in effective ways.

27. Roger Rennekamp: When we act in accordance with many of the great statements expressed above, we build something incredibly important..."organizational integrity."

28. jschuchardt: Yes, integrity and relevance.

29. Elizabeth Gregory North, Mississippi: I wish we had a "like" button, Roger!

30. Douglas.Steele: No recommendations about national logo or tag line?

31. Chris Geith: These are exciting recommendations. Looking forward to see how eXtension can enable some of these.

32. Elizabeth Gregory North, Mississippi: Just for the record: Thanks so much, Chuck, for the recognition for the national branding work. I would like to point out that the Copernicus National Brand Study and the National Extension Branding Initiative and Tool-Kit were both the work of the ECOP Marketing and Communications Task Force co-chaired by Doug Steele and Ann Bailey Berry.

33. Douglas.Steele: How can you continue to provide feedback after the webinar?

34. Jimmy Henning: Chuck, the future discussion should include what we learned, are learning with the eXtension model, especially what was flawed with the original model, and I think it did develop flaws the longer it went. We should also look that the Farm Bill education effort and what we learned there. Probably obvious to all, but we sure don't want to lose that learning opportunity.

35. Michelle Olgers: Many of the land-grant communicators in the Southern Region will be meeting at SR-PLN in September. We should aim to see how this conversation unfolds until then and add this topic to the agenda.

36. Tim L Cross: Also need to align our national budget/funding model with building new partnerships and funding opportunities?

37. Nick Place: Chuck - appreciate seeing the next step of approaching new partnerships and funding opportunities. For this to have the most traction, we need to ensure that a core number of states are fully behind and supportive of national priorities where we could engage new partners.

38. Elizabeth Gregory North, Mississippi: Also at SRPLN, we will be briefly revisiting the National Extension Branding Initiative and its assets.

39. Latif Lighari: It may also be helpful to consider Extension being future focused.

40. fgould: More strategic training and webinars based on results and next steps of this study.

41. Nick Place: With the current APLU effort on "The New Engagement" this presents an excellent opportunity for Extension to play a proactive leadership role on engagement and these efforts to work with new partners at the national, state and local levels.

42. Chris: We may want to look at strengthening and expanding our relationship with AmeriCorps. It makes sense, given the CE structure.
43. Chris Geith: Yay Jimmy - we are poised to be aligned now!
44. Paul Brown: Opening the door with the Centers for Disease Control on obesity is new for Extension. We need to pull together to open other doors.

Poll participants:

1. nslevin, nas96@cornell.edu
2. Roger Rennekamp, rennekamp.3@osu.edu
3. Douglas.Steele, dsteele@tamu.edu
4. Elizabeth Gregory North, Mississippi, elizabeth.north@msstate.edu
5. nhb02001, nancy.bull@uconn.edu
6. Jon Boren, jboren@nmsu.edu
7. Anne Adrian, aadrian@extension.org
8. mrogers, mrogers@udel.edu
9. mondotech, richard.klemme@ces.uwex.edu
10. glen, glen@uwyo.edu
11. Matt Browning, mbrowning1@wvstateu.edu
12. Terry Meisenbach, terry.meisenbach@extension.org
13. jschuchardt, jane.schuchardt@extension.org
14. Rborger, rborger@ufl.edu
15. robin.shepard, robin.shepard@uwex.edu
16. swansonn, louis.swanson@colostate.edu
17. Kim Fleming, kff2@cornell.edu
18. murphy2a, annmarie.murphy@oregonstate.edu
19. Celeste Carmichael, cjc17@cornell.edu
20. Doug Swanson, dswanson@nifa.usda.gov
21. Bev Durgan, bdurgan@umn.edu
22. Michelle Olgers, molgers@vsu.edu
23. tawe232, timothy.west@uky.edu
24. Tim L Cross, tlcross@utk.edu
25. Thomas Wayne Broyles, tbroyle2@tennessee.edu
26. jacyjohn, jacyjohn@iastate.edu
27. brown, rab2@msstate.edu
28. vjones, vjones@langston.edu
29. Nick Place, nplace@ufl.edu
30. Brian Higginbotham, Brian.H@usu.edu
31. Ken Martin, martin.1540@osu.edu
32. Mike O'Neill, mp.oneill@uconn.edu
33. Chris Boerboom, chris.boerboom@ndsu.edu
34. Chris, ddixon@ag.arizona.edu
35. Wayne Moore, wayne.moore@unl.edu
36. Lucas Frierichs, lfrierichs@ucanr.edu
37. Chris Greer, cagreer@ucanr.edu
38. fgould, fgould@agcenter.lsu.edu
39. Randy Taylor, randy.taylor@okstate.edu
40. Latif Lighari, llighari@tnstate.edu
41. Wendi, williw1@aces.edu
42. Daryl Buchholz, dbuchhol@ksu.edu
43. blm34, blm34@cornell.edu
44. Paul Brown, pwb0001@auburn.edu
45. Tony Windham, twindham@uaex.edu
46. Kathleen Lodl, klodl1@unl.edu
47. scbonanno, scbonanno@mail.wvu.edu
48. Bill Frost, wefrost@ucanr.edu
49. Karla, karla.trautman@sdstate.edu
50. rgrisso, rgrisso@vt.edu
51. mmckinnie, mmckinnie@vsu.edu
52. Kelvin Sewake, sewakek@ctahr.hawaii.edu
53. Edwin Jones, ejones1@vt.edu
54. Jimmy Henning, jimmy.henning@uky.edu

Recommendations

- Reconsider our affinity for a better-organized national system approach to funding opportunities and priorities.
- Reinstitute the system-wide program prioritization process as well as a system for identifying rapidly emerging issues.
- Continue vigorously pursue opportunities to align our Cooperative Extension system with new partners.
- Redefine the National Impacts Database to allow capture of progress on national issues.
- Co-brand selected products and programs.

Return to contents or minutes
ECOP Private Resource Mobilization (PRM) Task Force
Background and Charge 5.23.16

Background
In January 2016, ECOP voted to support PRM in concept based on the report from Changing Our World, Inc. Pages 11-17 of the report [http://bit.ly/2015ECOP_PRM](http://bit.ly/2015ECOP_PRM) is the basis for the charge set forth for an ECOP Private Resource Mobilization Task Force. When the ECOP PRM and National System Task Forces have progressed appropriately, ECOP could be in a position to engage all directors and administrators in a decision about fundraising capacity to include:

- Job description for chief advancement officer
- Case development
- Prospect research and immediate opportunities
- Prospect cultivation

Charge to Task Force
Define national process and approach to consider feasibility of next steps:

1. Develop a draft cost analysis of infrastructure options, including
   - Three-year budget and funding mechanisms
   - Opt-in rates for charter members and tier two considerations for additional commitments (p. 12, 16)
2. Propose a system for prospect research, cultivation and tracking (p. 12, 13)
3. Create a three-year development plan with intermediate goals (p. 14)
4. Suggest a process to identify a Development Coordinating Committee (p. 15)

Timeframe
- May 25, 2016 ECOP meeting – announce task force membership
- July 18-19, 2016 ECOP face-to-face meeting – propose timeframe and coordination with ECOP National Systems Task Force

Related, Simultaneous Effort by ECOP National System Task Force
- Develop national mission statement-goals/objectives and value proposition for CES to serve as a system wide case for philanthropic support.
- Define national system.
- Launch national brand strategy.

Membership
- **CHAIR** -- Scott Reed, Oregon State, Western Region
- **MEMBERS** –
  - Roger Rennekamp, Ohio State University
  - Bill Hare, University of the District of Columbia
  - Tony Windham, University of Arkansas
  - Ray McKinnie, Virginia State University
  - Laura Johnson, University of Georgia
- **STAFF** –
  - Jane Schuchardt and Sandy Ruble, ECOP National Office
  - Ron Brown (back-up), Southern Region
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The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation wants to partner with the Cooperative Extension System to build a nationwide Culture of Health. A National Leadership Advisory Team, comprising representatives across Extension, National 4-H Council, USDA-NIFA and our youth, worked to facilitate this relationship and provided input for initial concept development.

The crux of the concept is grounded in the Cooperative Extension National Health and Wellness Framework created by the ECOP Health Task Force to increase the number of Americans who are healthy at every stage of life and the RWJF Culture of Health Action Framework. Infused in the partnership will be three defining characteristics of Extension: 1) Youth leadership; 2) A volunteer corps; 3) Applied research and assessment.

As we operationalize strategies, we will follow a three-phase approach:

**Start-up, Launch and Sustain**

**START-UP**  
June 2016 – Mid 2017

The start-up phase will be dedicated to designing a systems approach and organization for implementation while testing tools and support systems to begin activating the partnership. As Extension has done for over a century, we will reinforce a national design that allows for local communities to identify and solve problems that matter most to them. States will have the opportunity to determine readiness to participate and opt into the partnership. The work will be steered by a Core Leadership Team and a RWJF representative.

**LAUNCH**  
2017 – 2027

For states that opt in, professionals and counties will be encouraged to conduct self-assessments to determine a state of readiness in one of three tiers. Each will become a cohort to facilitate communication, provide a basis for professional development and allow for sharing of best practices and progress. Some communities may focus on establishing coalitions and engaging community members; others on assessing local challenges, action plans and/or a dashboard measurement to inform and record results. The ECOP Health Task Force Action Teams will be asked to aid in identifying promising practices and proven programs for replication and professional development for each of the tier cohorts.

**SUSTAIN**  
Beyond 2027

A critical element of the first two phases will be ensuring that a sustainable model is developed. The model must allow for our work in health to continue the way our work in agriculture has for more than a century - with programming grounded in research delivered by trusted professionals and volunteers to enable life-changing individual and societal results.

For information and questions contact: Bonnie Braun, bbraun@umd.edu
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USDA-National Institute of Food and Agriculture Update
Louie Tupas, Deputy Director, Institute of Bioenergy, Climate, and Environment

1. **NIFA Budget:**
   a. NIFA’s **FY2017 appropriation bill** has passed the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate. Neither bill has been introduced on the floor for a full vote. If both Chambers do not pass a budget, a continuing resolution or an Omnibus bill will be needed to continue work.

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

2. **Funding Opportunities for the Next Farm Bill and/or Next Appropriation Process**
   a. **Tactical science programs:** NIFA’s current tactical science investments consist of multiple small programs distributed across administrative and disciplinary areas:
      
      i. Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative (FADI)
      ii. National Plant Diagnostic Network (NPDN)
      iii. National Animal Health Laboratory Network (NAHLN)
      iv. Extension Disaster Education Network (EDEN)
      v. Crop Protection and Pest Management (CPPM)
      vi. Minor Crop Pest Management (IR4)
      vii. Food Animal Residue Analysis Database (FARAD)
      viii. Minor Use Animal Drugs Program (MUADP)

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

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

   b. **EFNEP and formula calculations:** Since 1969, EFNEP has employed paraprofessional staff to influence nutrition and physical activity behaviors of targeted populations of low income families and youth. NIFA is undertaking an analysis to update the current EFNEP formula to better reach targeted populations—particularly minorities and
Native American populations—given changes in national demographics, poverty rates, and levels of obesity within these populations since the formula was developed in 1981.

c. **Smith-Lever 3(d):** NIFA is interested in exploring ways that underrepresented groups and institutions can be included in competitive programs under this funding line. NIFA places a high priority on exploring funding opportunities for 1890s, 1994s, Hispanic-serving and other minority serving institutions in research and extension programs, including competitive extension programs under Smith-Lever 3(d).

d. **AFRI Funding:** NIFA will continue to press the case that that AFRI needs, at a minimum, to be fully funded at $700 million, the level Congress authorized when they established the 2008 Farm Bill. Nutritional security is a matter of national security.

e. **Additional Support for Capacity Programs:** Without question, funding support for capacity programs need to be increased at least by five to six percent. Capacity funding has not seen an increase for three years.

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

4. **Capacity Programs Evaluation:**
   a. NIFA’s contract to TEconomy Partners to conduct an evaluation of the agency’s capacity programs is scheduled for completion in late fall. The results of the evaluation will be used to:
      i. Demonstrate the value of the capacity programs to stakeholders and strengthen USDA’s Research, Education and Economics (REE) focus on evidence-based decision-making;
      ii. Identify research gaps and areas of improvement; and
      iii. Leverage the visibility and accountability of capacity programs by this independent review.
   b. A large-scale survey will be sent to our land-grant partners in mid-August. The survey will solicit feedback regarding strengths and weaknesses of capacity programs and collective impacts from research, education, and extension programs.

5. **Infrastructure Task Force:** The October 2015 APLU-funded ‘Sightlines” study of our nation’s schools of agriculture found some $8.4 billion in infrastructure and deferred maintenance at buildings and supporting facilities authorized to receive USDA funding.
   a. NIFA is concerned that the condition of these campus facilities are impacting NIFA-funded research being conducted.
b. An APLU Infrastructure Task Force has identified improved stewardship of facilities through adequate planning and funding of ongoing maintenance need, and investments in major renovations or new construction to replace aging and ineffective or unsafe or inadequate research facilities, and recommended several funding strategies.

c. NIFA supports the overall intent and approach of the Task Force’s proposed strategy. NIFA and ARS will continue to work closely with the committee and the APLU/BAA to develop a balanced and achievable approach through both the Farm Bill and the appropriation process.

Additional topics

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

2. **A need for socio-economic assessment of science and science communication:**
   a. Advances in science offer tremendous potential to address the current and future health and well-being needs of the growing planet. However, considerable uncertainties, risks, and unknowns surround these technologies that raise concerns for the public and policymakers.
   b. Assessing and communicating science requires new research on both the science of science communication and a broader assessment of the benefits of science. Research investigating the relationship between funding investments and publicly valued outcomes is necessary for assessing the socio-economic impacts of science.
   c. NIFA is considering developing a competitive program that would:
      i. Foster teams or forums involving a broad cohort of scientists, legal scholars, bioethicists, social scientists, journalists/communicators and engaging the general public.
      ii. Assess the merits and risks science and technology, and pursue an open and effective means to credibly communicate those issues with the wider public.

3. **Positive Youth Development:**
a. Positive youth development is a proactive, holistic approach to addressing the education, employability, health, and well-being needs of underserved and underrepresented youth by engaging them as empowered members of the community.

b. USDA has a long history with PYD through the Cooperative Extension’s 4-H program. 4-H as a model of PYD translates the sciences of engagement, learning, and change with youth and adults who work to create sustainable community change.

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

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

5. NIFA addresses the substance abuse epidemic in rural communities, with a focus on opioids:
   a. The United States is in the midst of a prescription opioid overdose epidemic. In 2014, more than 28,000 people died from opioid overdose, and at least half of those deaths involved a prescription opioid. Heroin-related deaths have also increased sharply, more than tripling since 2010.
   b. NIFA, the Cooperative Extension Service at Land-Grant Universities, and collaborative partners engage with youth, families, and communities across rural America to connect them to quality evidence-based support, educational programs, and training that increase awareness of and help prevent negative impacts associated with substance use/abuse. These efforts include:
      i. NIFA’s FY 2016 Rural Health Safety Education RFA included language that would provide rural communities the opportunity to use funds for programs that will address the opioid epidemic.
ii. The Community Assessment and Education to Promote Behavioral Planning and Evaluation Project is a collaborative USDA NIFA/HHS SAMHSA project creating a low-cost, replicable community-level monitoring system (CMS) for substance use and mental illness.

iii. The 4-H Healthy Living: Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drugs (ATOD) Prevention efforts include Health Rocks!® uses hands-on activities that educate youth ages 8 to 14 on the consequences of tobacco, alcohol and drug use.

6. Zika Virus:
   a. Through existing programs and in collaboration with our LGU partners, education and outreach on ZIKA virus awareness and prevention is being delivered to rural communities in states and territories.
   b. If additional funding is made available, NIFA will be able to direct a comprehensive and coordinated Zika research and public education and outreach effort across rural and urban communities in the states and territories.
   c. NIFA and CDC are working on an MOU that outlines mutual goals for communication and dissemination of CDC information on current and future emerging disease threats, including ZIKA virus.
   d. NIFA’s 4-H National Headquarters will be delivering Zika virus education and outreach materials for children and families to 4-H Program Leaders and Health Living liaisons for dissemination throughout their respective states.

7. Training grants
   a. The FY 2017 President’s Budget Proposal includes a new program on training grants that will provide grants to consortiums of universities, agribusiness firms, and federal agencies to recruit, mentor, and train graduate and post-graduate scholars in agriculture-related disciplines.
   b. The new program will expand the competitive fellowships currently available to attract and train graduate students and postdoctoral researchers from diverse fields of basic sciences into the field of agriculture by:
      i. Providing opportunities for hands-on research training in some of the leading government and industrial laboratories
      ii. Offering extension and teaching experiences through peer mentoring and networking among postdoctoral students and other experts in teaching, research and extension in the nation.

Management Initiatives

1. 1890s matching funds
   a. To address the complex questions regarding matching issues for the 1890s LGUs, NIFA undertook an evaluation of the Matching Program.
While much of the data required to perform the analysis could be derived from existing NIFA data repositories, NIFA staff worked with the 1890 universities and the state governments in which the universities reside to determine each entity’s approach to meeting the Federal funds matching requirement.

NIFA is completing a report on its evaluation and is preparing to send it to Congress.

NIFA has committed personnel in its Office of Grants and Financial Management to more closely work with 1890 leadership regarding justifications and use of matching funds.

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

3. **FY16 Capacity RFA Schedule**
   a. In response to feedback from NIFA partners and stakeholders, NIFA released its FY 17 Capacity Grant RFAs earlier than in previous years.
   b. The Animal Health Disease Research capacity RFA is currently pending. All other FY 17 Capacity RFAs were published during June 2016.

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

5. **Grants Modernization**
   a. NIFA is partnering with the USDA OCFO to implement ezFedGrants, a USDA enterprise-wide automated system for managing grants. NIFA will begin using the system for processing FY17 Capacity awards in the fall of 2016.
   b. ezFedGrants will benefit both agencies and their customers. Agency staff will have a paperless system that reduces the time it takes to process awards. External customers will have access to a portal which will provide status updates on their application/award and will allow them to submit required reports, such as the SF-425 Federal Financial Report (previously done through email).
   c. ezFedGrants will be fully integrated with Grants.gov and ASAP. This means applicants will still apply to all NIFA RFAs through Grants.gov, and awardees will still use ASAP to draw down funds.
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## 2018 Farm Bill Recommendations

1. **APLU Component Organization:** [ECOP]

2. **National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) programs to be reauthorized, combined, or eliminated:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Reauthorized? Combined? Eliminated?</th>
<th>FY 2018 Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Recommended Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Language Change? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Justification for Increased Funding and/or Authorization Language Changes (for lengthy justifications, attach separate sheets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Smith-Lever 3(b)&(c)                                      | Reauthorize                         | $300M                | Such sums or $700M (Numerous comments about need for increased appropriations) | Yes                       | • Change such sums to $700M  
• Add auto-inflation clause  
• Change multistate requirement to allow consideration of all funds, not just federal -- to simplify bookkeeping |
| Farm Safety and Youth Farm Safety                         | Reauthorize (no specific authorization; under SL) | $4,610,000 | $10M (based on number of new and beginning farmers) | Yes (program changes) | • Smaller grants for better distribution of funds  
• Administer to all institutions based on formula  
• Roll into a 4-H initiative and use to promote farm/youth safety or into S-L funds |
<p>| New Technologies in Ag Extension                          | Reauthorize (no specific authorization; under SL) | $1,550,000 | $2 to $2.5M | Yes (program changes) | • Use a funding model that addresses regional and national needs that is less cumbersome and more productive |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Reauthorized? Combined? Eliminated?</th>
<th>FY 2018 Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Recommended Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Language Change? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Justification for Increased Funding and/or Authorization Language Changes (for lengthy justifications, attach separate sheets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Children, Youth, and Families at Risk (CYFAR)                               | Reauthorize (no specific authorization; under SL) | $8,395,000          | $10M - $20M              | Yes (program changes)     | • Increase 4-H capacity (more professionals) to grow 4-H enrollment from 6M to 10M members, with a focus on historically underserved or underrepresented  
  • Tie funding to at-risk population                                         
  • Roll into a new national 4-H initiative to reach more youth |
| Federally-Recognized Tribes Extension Program (FRTEP)                        | Reauthorize (no specific authorization; under SL) | $3,039,000          | $5M                      | Yes                       | • Include as part of SL capacity funds  
  • Coordinate with EFNEP, SNAP-ED, health initiative, other programming  
  • Consider safety concerns |
| Home Visits in Remote Areas (proposed new in FY 2017)                       | (no specific authorization; under SL) | $20,000,000 proposed | $10M                     | Yes (program changes)     | • Roll funds into a national 4-H initiative.  
  • Increase funding significantly  
  • Define a relationship or requirement to be integrated with university Ag Ed or other teaching programs |
<p>| Ag in the Classroom (AITC)                                                  | Reauthorize (under section 1417 of NARETPA pertaining to several programs) | $552,000            | $10M                     | Yes (program changes)     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Reauthorized? Combined? Eliminated?</th>
<th>FY 2018 Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Recommended Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Language Change? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Justification for Increased Funding and/or Authorization Language Changes (for lengthy justifications, attach separate sheets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1890 Institutions Extension                      | Reauthorize Change USDA Implementation carryover percentage from 20% to be consistent with carryover provision for Smith-Lever | $60 Million         | Such sums as necessary – a minimum of 20% of Smith Lever 3(b)&(c) (Several comments about need for increased appropriations) | Yes                      | • Change carryover provision for 1890 Extension Capacity Funding from 20% of appropriations for one-year to be consistent with Smith-Lever 3(b)&(c) carryover provision. This would allow the same amount of time for 1890 and 1862 institutions to expend Extension capacity funding for Cooperative Extension.  
• Increase allocation  
• Funding level should the minimum 20% of Smith-Lever (b)&(c) carryover provision.  
• Increase allocation  
• Must accumulate funds over time for facilities projects and this increase costs |
| 1890 Facilities Program                          | Reauthorize                         | $25 Million         | Such sums as necessarily with a minimum $25 million | No                       | • Technology upgrades needed to be efficient and relevant are increasingly costly  
• Must accumulate funds over time for facilities projects and this increase costs |
| 1890 Institution Capacity Building Grants Program | Reauthorize                         | $19.336 Million     | $40 Million under 1417 of the NARETPA pertaining to | No                       | • Increase funding  
• Reduce the amount of match required |
<p>| Outreach and Technical Assistance for Socially Disadvantaged Farmers and Ranchers | Reauthorize                         | $10 Million         | $5M                      | No                       | • Increase funding |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Reauthorized?</th>
<th>FY 2018 Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Recommended Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Language Change? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Justification for Increased Funding and/or Authorization Language Changes (for lengthy justifications, attach separate sheets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI)</td>
<td>Reauthorize</td>
<td>$700,000,000</td>
<td>Increase to more than $350,000,000, No exact amount agreed upon – perhaps 10%</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Language should: 1) Increase funding; 2) Do not allow growth in AFRI when the total NIFA budget does not grow or at the expense of cutting other lines in the NIFA budget; 3) Increase the emphasis on integrated Extension research, and teaching projects; 3) Reduce the support to basic research; 4) provide for more input /direction on the AFRI budget allocations by land-grant representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewable Resource Extension Act</td>
<td>Reauthorize</td>
<td>$30,000,000</td>
<td>Increase from $4,060,000 to $5 million</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Change the requirement for tracking 25% multi-state partnership’s to allow credit for all sources of funding, not just federal. The 5% cap on retirement funds is problematic and requires special book keeping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Health and Safety Extension Act</td>
<td>Reauthorize*</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
<td>Move $1,500,000 to other lines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Support expressed for merging this line with the “Farm Safety” line or Smith-Lever line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Animal Residue Avoidance Database</td>
<td>Reauthorize*</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Mixed opinions. Not a priority. Possibly move to Smith-Lever funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women and Minorities in STEM Fields</td>
<td>Reauthorize</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
<td>Increase $400,000 to $1,000,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Moderate to good support for increased funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Safety Outreach</td>
<td>Reauthorize</td>
<td>As necessary</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Restrict access to Land Grant Colleges and good support for a budget increase.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Methyl Bromide Transition Program                 | Reauthorize   | $2,000,000           | Such sums as Necessary (Section 406 of AREERA) | Yes | • Eliminate program  
<p>|                                                 |               |                      |                          |                                         | • Incorporate into Smith-Lever or Crop Protection / Pest Management (IPM) line |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Reauthorized?</th>
<th>FY 2018 Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Recommended Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Language Change? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Justification for Increased Funding and/or Authorization Language Changes (for lengthy justifications, attach separate sheets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Organic Transition Program           | Reauthorize   | $4,000,000           | Such sums as necessary (Section 406 of AREERA) | Yes                       | • Eliminate program or merge with SARE  
• Re-authorize at a higher level; Increase authorization to $6.0M and/or add cost of living clause  
• Change USDA implementation to ensure participation of all land grant groups (1862s, 1890s and 1994s) emphasizing multi-state collaborative approaches |
| Protection/Pest Management Program   | Reauthorize   | $17,200,000          | Such sums as necessary (Section 406 of AREERA) | Yes                       | • Insert cost of living clause and/or increase authorized level to $25.0M  
• Waive indirect costs charges  
• Change in USDA implementation to ensure stronger collaboration between 1862s and 1890s to address small farm needs |
| Regional Rural Development Centers   | Reauthorize   | $1,000,000           | Such sums as necessary (Section 406 of AREERA) | No                        | • Increase authorized level to 2.5M – 4.0M  
• Eliminate or re-examining program effectiveness  
• Increase funding level with cost of living clause |
| Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative | Reauthorize   | $6,700,000           | Such sums as necessary (Section 1484 of NARETPA) | No                        | • Clearly separate from SNAP-Ed  
• Add auto-inflationary increase clause  
• Change requirements for tacking 25% multi-state partnerships to allow credit for all sources of funding, not just federal  
• 5% cap on retirement funds is problematic and requires special booking  
• Examine formula for funding level |
<p>| EFNEP                                | Reauthorize   | Authorized $90M, has been at $67,934,000 | Raise authorization to $120M | Yes                       |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Reauthorized?</th>
<th>FY 2018 Funding ($M)</th>
<th>FY 2019 and Beyond Funding ($M)*</th>
<th>Recommended Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Language Change? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Justification for Increased Funding and/or Authorization Language Changes (for lengthy justifications, attach separate sheets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag Risk Management Program</td>
<td>Reauthorize</td>
<td>Authorized at $5M</td>
<td>$5M</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The mandatory funding for three of these programs is not included in the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) baseline beyond FY 2018.

3. Current NIFA Programs with Mandatory Funding (Not Subject to Annual Appropriations):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Name</th>
<th>Reauthorized?</th>
<th>FY 2018 Funding ($M)</th>
<th>FY 2019 and Beyond Funding ($M)*</th>
<th>Recommended Funding ($M)</th>
<th>Language Change? (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Justification for Increased Funding and/or Authorization Language Changes (for lengthy justifications, attach separate sheets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative | Reauthorize   | Such sums as necessary |                                  |                          | Yes                      | • Eliminate program entirely  
|                                                   |               |                      |                                 |                          |                          | • Change USDA implementation by merging with SARE  
|                                                   |               |                      |                                 |                          |                          | • Add cost of living clause |
| Specialty Crops Research                         | Reauthorize   | $80M                 | $80M                            | $80M                     |                          | • Scope is limited and does not allow pivot to address emerging needs  
|                                                   |               |                      |                                 |                          |                          | • Reduce match required for program participation |
| Beginning Farmers and Ranchers Program           | Reauthorize   | $20,000,000          |                                 |                          | No                       | • Increase funding  
|                                                   |               |                      |                                 |                          |                          | |
| Biomass R&D                                      | Reauthorize   | $0M                  | $0M                             | $20M                     |                          | • Scope is limited and does not allow pivot to address emerging needs  
|                                                   |               |                      |                                 |                          |                          | • Biofuels component can be cut back until research identifies an economically feasible solution |

*Note: The mandatory funding for three of these programs is not included in the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) baseline beyond FY 2018.
4. Is NIFA working as intended? Are legislative enhancements and/or modifications required?

- **Develop land-grant university panel and national Extension coordinating unit** – Give NIFA less independent authority for program funding. NIFA is not responsive to the need of the population. There is little grassroots contact and the agency is heavily political. A panel and/or coordinating unit could set priorities much more effectively than NIFA. This would be superior to the many advisory groups NIFA has now. Further, Extension directors and administrators could evaluate NIFA and USDA programs annually and provide coordinated consultation.
- **Streamline reporting requirements** – Though efforts are underway, expediency in reducing reporting burden and focusing on outcomes needs to be a priority.
- **Evaluate Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education Program (SARE)** – There have been lots of questions and concerns about SARE, specifically overlap with other USDA programs that support the same efforts. Further, the regional SARE Advisory Boards appear to be acting without national coordination to enhance program efficiency.

5. Is the broader USDA research, education, and extension structure and organization working as intended or are changes needed?

- **Extension as educational arm of USDA** – The mission crepe where USDA agencies hire staff to do education and outreach is not efficient when Extension is well positioned to do this work. Extension needs to be widely known throughout USDA as the educators.
- **Competitive AND Capacity funding** – As USDA appears to be shifting to a more competitive model, it is essential that base capacity funds be increased to sustain the core land-grant mission.
- **Involve Extension in USDA Strike Force** – Strike Force appears to be an unfunded mandate. Establish funding with specific authorization including Extension.
- **Increase understanding to Extension’s portfolio** – There needs to be a greater recognition of the broad base of issues that we work on in Extension, across rural and urban audiences and across diverse interdisciplinary issues. This understanding could open doors for Extension in partnership with USDA agencies.

6. Other matters that the Committee on Legislation and Policy should address in connection with the 2018 Farm Bill:

- **Increase 4-H positive youth development** – The 4-H experience needs to reach more underserved and underrepresented youth. Expand capacity funds specifically dedicated to youth development through 4-H in the farm bill. Increase support for 1890s to reach youth. Position 4-H to be a leader in STEM and youth development. The vison of 4-H Grows: A Promise to America’s Kids calls for increasing 4-H access to 10 million youth, up from 6 million currently by 2025. Funding is needed for 4-H to reflect the population demographics, diverse needs and social conditions of the country. This vision has the elements of inclusion, caring adults, involves at least 1 in 5 youth, and the volunteers and staff reflect the population.
- **Ensure culture of health** – Develop legislation to provide direct funding for Extension education and specified through authorizations in other departments/agencies to address the health in America. In addition to preventative health programs, include emphasis on chronic diseases, obesity, mental health and opioid addiction. Align with agriculture production to assure a safe and affordable food supply.
- **Focus on water security** – Give agriculture is the major user of water and has large impacts on water quality, funding is needed for water research and education.
- **Repeat and expand producer education** – The $6 million provided in the last farm bill for Extension, in partnership with USDA Farm Service Agency, was highly successful. Ten dollars ($10) per farmer could be a reasonable number for support. Previously this appears in Title 1 (Commodity Programs) in the administrative section.
- **Expand urban programming** – Capacity funding is needed to provide for more outreach and engagement in urban and inner city localities.
- **1890 capacity coordination initiative** – Add a new competitive awards program to support the three identified centers.
- **Establish Centers of Excellence** – These could address societal issues such as family violence, disability, civil engagement, obesity and poverty.
- **Other** – How will the farm bill address the current financial crisis in agriculture? How will the farm bill address agricultural workforce development, specifically related to dairies, swine confinement operations, immigrants, and crop laborers?

**Conservation Title**

- NRCS and CES need to work together to provide soil and water conservation education. Extension partners must be a part of planning, implementation and evaluating of programs.
- Clarity of roles is needed, specifically NRCS provides technical assistance and government program benefits and Extension provides education and research results related to best practices. Extension should not develop cost-share programs, and NRCS should not develop educational programs.
- Provide funding specifically for land-grant universities to conduct research and provide education. All conservation practices (e.g., cover crops) should be validated by research before a practice is compensated, and Extension has the educational expertise.

**Rural Development Title**

- Require Extension partners to collaborate with RD to clarify roles. Extension provides education and research results related to best practices.
- Specifically identify funding for Extension’s work in rural development, specifically for the Stronger Economies Together (SET) program. Identify funds for SET instead of using residual funding.
- Invest in the Regional Rural Development Centers for research and Extension education, and establish a coordinating entity.
- Create collaborative programs where Extension provides training, leadership development, grant writing assistance, strategic planning, and program evaluation in order for communities to take advance for RD funds.
- Make it possible for RD funds to flow to land-grant universities for applied research and Extension education.

**Energy Title**
• Strengthen connections with Extension energy programs, specifically for funds to flow to land-grant universities for applied research and education.
• Increased collaboration with 1890s.

**Nutrition Title**

• Extension partners need to be included in program planning, implementation and evaluation and receive appropriate funding for the partnership.
• Reflect the value and impact of Extension programs in the farm bill language.
• Enhance collaboration with K-12 health and wellness education.
• Provide nutrition education funds directly to the university, instead of through the state agency, in order to increase management efficiencies.

**Forestry Title**

• Involve Extension in program planning and implementation and provide funding to Extension for educational programs.
• Advance use and funding for Regional Forestry Centers.
• Increase involvement with 1890s.

Return to contents or minutes
The Land-Grant University SNAP-Ed Program Development Team (PDT) includes Family and Consumer Science Program Leaders and other university administrators, SNAP-Ed Program Coordinators, an office manager, and a NIFA representative who are committed to improving the consistency and effectiveness of SNAP-Ed programming through the LGU System in addressing national health and nutrition-related problems facing low-income populations. This 16-person team, which represents all Extension regions, meets bimonthly by conference calls, subcommittee, and in an annual face-to-face working meeting. The team met recently in Alexandria, Virginia to review progress and plan for the upcoming year.

Highlights of the meeting and the last year include:

- We offered Policy, Systems, and Environmental (PSE) change development and technical assistance by facilitating LGU involvement in webinars on PSE implementation and coordinating with the SNAP and EFNEP Regional Nutrition Education and Obesity Prevention (RNECE) Centers of Excellence to increase dissemination and utilization of PSE training and other resources that are currently under development. We will continue to facilitate training and learning opportunities and information dissemination that comes through these Centers.
- We hosted a joint webinar with Community Development colleagues and have developed a plan to further strengthen SNAP-Ed and Community Development collaborations.
- We have maintained the Community Nutrition Education Community of Practice in eXtension, through which we have offered information on activities of SNAP-Ed programs, posted stakeholders’ reports, posted webinar recordings, and posted updates from RNECE grantees.
- We developed the template and contracted with TEConomy to produce the fourth LGU SNAP-ED Report. We had a 79% response rate. Past national reports have positioned us well. This report which is nearing completion, will illustrate how the LGUs have adapted to changes resulting from the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act (HHFKA) of 2010, at which time SNAP-Ed transitioned to a competitive grant and the program focus shifted to nutrition education and obesity prevention using comprehensive and multi-level interventions for change. This report is expected to propel Extension, once again, to be seen as effective leaders of SNAP-Ed. We have a plan for dissemination of the report to key stakeholders, and discussing with program colleagues to guide future programming.
- We have identified the need to highlight partnerships, programs, and initiatives where CES and public health have high impact programs (for example, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation winners for Culture of Health). We will share these highlights within the LGU system so that others can learn from them.
- We met with Michele Rodgers, ECOP Chair, and with a representative from Cornerstone, who identified data points that they need to speak accurately and effectively about SNAP-Ed through the LGU System in preparation for legislative discussions. We have developed a survey that will be released shortly to collect the desired information. Concurrently, in this short survey we will ask universities to self-identify strengths around emerging issues, in order to create an expertise mapping resource for universities to draw upon for mentoring and coaching when faced with similar challenges.
- We have committed to providing ECOP examples and to working with the land-grant universities to better reflect SNAP-Ed’s role in Extension’s Health and Wellness Framework.
• We developed a manuscript which has been accepted by the Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior that defines terminology used in SNAP-Ed to help develop common language that is understood across all implementing agencies.

• We presented at the annual national SNAP Directors’ meeting and shared information about SNAP-Ed through LGUs – through a booth and two presentations on the program. We have plans to continue presenting at the SNAP Directors’ meeting again next year.

• We submitted comments to FNS on SNAP-Ed Guidance and the Education and Administrative Reporting System (EARS) as invited, and have worked actively with other entities on the further development of evaluation measures for SNAP-Ed.

• We renewed our commitment to keeping Extension Directors/Administrators informed through monthly contributions to the “Monday Minute”, a presentation at ECOP in July, and ongoing dialogue with FCS Leaders and Program Coordinators through regional meetings.

• We will also continue to encourage and facilitate regional dialogue on SNAP-Ed, for more consistency in programming and resolution of concerns within and across regions.

• We set a new priority for 2017 to facilitate stronger university and state agency SNAP-Ed relationships, which may result in a white paper, mentoring, coaching, or other actions.

In addition to these specific actions that have been accomplished, are underway, or are planned, the PDT continues to play a critical role in advocating for nutrition education for low income families. Members have directly and indirectly communicated importance of federal funding to decision makers, have provided formal or informal mentoring to colleagues in the LGU system and have addressed critical programmatic needs the LGU system faced during changes created by new legislation, regulations, and guidance.

Note: The survey mentioned in a previous bullet has been conducted. Information collected about our system qualifications to deliver SNAP-Ed was shared with Cornerstone and included in recent testimony to the House Committee on Agriculture. The PDT also provided key points from the national report to include in both oral and written testimony to the committee. We continue to prepare an expertise map for mentoring purposes.

Current PDT Members:

North Central Region:
Angie Abbott Program Leader Indiana
Megan Ness Coordinator North Dakota
Pat Bebo Program Leader Ohio

Northeast Region:
Lisa Sullivan-Werner Coordinator Massachusetts
Patsy Ezell Program Leader Maryland
Jamie Dollahite Coordinator New York

Southern Region:
Karla Shelnutt Coordinator Florida
De'Shoin York-Friendship Coordinator Louisiana
Michelle Vineyard Coordinator Tennessee

Western Region:
Sally Bowman Coordinator Oregon
Kathleen Manenica Coordinator Washington
Mindy Meuli Coordinator Wyoming

PDT Executive Committee:
Submitted by the Executive Committee of the SNAP-Ed LGU System (Paula Peters, C.Y. Wang, Helen Chipman, and Sandra Jensen).

**LGU SNAP-Ed PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT TEAM**  
*Past and Current Members - APRIL 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTENSION REGION</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>DESIGNATION</th>
<th>NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Central Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Angie Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Karen Zotz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Virginia Servies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Peggy Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Karen Hudson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Karen Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sue Letourneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Candy Gabel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jo Britt-Rankin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Megan Ness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ana Claudia Zubieta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Joyce McDowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pat Bebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Suzanne Stluka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Laurie Boyce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Ann Ferris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Carol Giesecke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Wanda Lincoln</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lisa Lachenmayr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Patsy Ezell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Lisa Sullivan-Werner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Charlene Baxter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Debbie Luppold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Jan Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kathleen Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jamie Dollahite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Elise Gurgevich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Cindy Fitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Jeff Olson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern Region</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Donnie Love Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Lynn Russell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Karla Shelnutt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kimberly Klinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Elizabeth Buckner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>De’Shoin York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTENSION REGION</td>
<td>STATE</td>
<td>DESIGNATION</td>
<td>NAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Gina Eubanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Deborah Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Debra Garrard-Foster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Hannah Brewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Leslie Speller-Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shirley Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jenna Anding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Jon Perrott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Kathy Volanty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Region</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>David Ginsburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>California</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Virginia Chaidez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Jan Carroll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sarah Morales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cora French-Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mary Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Linda Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Marc Braverman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Sally Bowman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Heidi LeBlanc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Kathleen Manenica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Louise Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cindy Frederick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mary Kay Wardlaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mindy Meuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex Officio</td>
<td>CSREES</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Anna Mae Kobbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSREES</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Cynthia Reeves Tuttle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NASULGC</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Linda Kay Benning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Larry Jones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Paula Peters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Shirley Hastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>C.Y. Wang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Helen Chipman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>Sandra Jensen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Designations:  C – Land-Grant University Program Coordinator;  S – Supervisor Representative;  A - FCS Leader/Administrator;  1890 - 1890 Representative;  L - Leadership Oversight Team;  O - Ex Officio role which was discontinued in 2009.

Go to next page for review of current budget.
Extension on House SNAP-Ed Hearing Panel – At the request of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Agriculture, Jo Britt-Rankin, University of Missouri, was a panelist representing Cooperative Extension/ECOP on a SNAP-Ed hearing at 10 a.m. ET Wednesday, June 13, 2016. Britt-Rankin has worked closely with the ECOP National Office, Cornerstone Government Affairs and the Land-grant University Cooperative Extension Program Development Team to develop the written testimony. The hearing, titled *Past, Present and Future of SNAP: Evaluating Effectiveness and Outcomes in Nutrition Education*, and is documented as follows:


Video archive of hearing: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jkRS_Os65z4](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jkRS_Os65z4)
House Ag Press Release:

Go to Next Page for written testimony by Pat Bebo, Ohio State University. As of 7.8.16, this document was not posted to the House Ag Committee website.
Land-grant University Cooperative Extension
SNAP-Ed Program Development Team

Testimony for the Record

Pat Bebo, MS, RDN
Ohio State University Extension

On Behalf of the
SNAP-Ed Program Development Team

For the hearing on the Past, Present, Future of SNAP:
Evaluating the Effectiveness and Outcomes of Nutrition Education

June 30, 2016
Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Peterson and members of the committee, it is an honor to be invited to submit this written testimony for the record on the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP-Ed). I submit this testimony as a representative of the Land-grant University Cooperative Extension SNAP-Ed Program Development Team (PDT). The SNAP-Ed PDT serves as an ongoing advisory board for national Land-grant University Cooperative Extension Service (CES) Leadership. Team members use their experience, communication, analytical and critical thinking skills to strengthen Land-grant University (LGU) based SNAP-Ed programs and other nutrition networks at the state, regional, and national levels. They also identify linkages that can be forged to support the land-grant university system's broader outreach and engagement, education, and research mission.

I currently serve as a member of PDT, and am the Ohio State University Extension Interim Assistant Director for the Family and Consumers Sciences Program, which includes SNAP-Ed and Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP). I hold a Bachelor’s Degree in Exercise Science from UMASS Boston, a Master’s Degree in Nutrition from Framingham State University and I am a Registered Dietitian/Nutritionist. Previously I served as Regional SNAP-Ed/EFNEP Program Leader with the University of Massachusetts Extension, serving the lower southeast region of Massachusetts.

SNAP-Ed Past

SNAP-Ed as a program has a long history beginning with the 1977 Food Stamp Act in response to bipartisan calls for reform.

- 1977 Act’s language was a requirement for nutrition education based upon the EFNEP model.
  - “USDA to extend the EFNEP to the greatest extent possible to reach FSP participants.”
  - “USDA to develop printed materials specifically designed for persons with low reading comprehension levels on how to buy and prepare more nutritious and economic meals and on the relationship between food and good health.”

- 1981 Food Stamp and Commodity Distribution Amendments of 1981
  - “To encourage the purchase of nutritious foods, the Secretary is authorized to extend food and nutrition education to reach food stamp program participants…”.

- 1988 Hunger Prevention Act
  - Authorized Food Stamp Nutrition Education Program (FSNEP) as an optional administrative expense funded through state/local match that would qualify for Federal Financial Participation.
  - Pilot FSNEP begun through University of Wisconsin Extension

- 1990 Mickey Leland Domestic Hunger Relief Act
  - Authorized the Secretary to assign nutrition education of eligible households to the Cooperative Extension Service.

- 1992 Seven LGUs, via Extension, delivered FSNEP programming

- From 1995 to present FSNEP was expanded to all 50 states and DC, implementers are from a variety of public and private organizations based on state agency decisions; today 33% of all SNAP-Ed programs are implemented by LGUs, the largest single implementer; clearer missions and goals for the program were established; state plans with specific programming and evaluation outlines required; FSNEP was renamed SNAP-Ed after the name of the food stamp program was changed to SNAP. Other programmatic, evaluation and funding changes have been noted in other submitted testimony.

Clearly CES has a long, productive relationship with SNAP-Ed, from the program pilot to its current structure. Since 1914, the core mission of CES has been to improve the lives of people of all ages and from all walks of life through education – taking the university to the people, in rural, urban and suburban communities throughout each state, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories. America’s land-grant universities have the knowledge, expertise and infrastructure needed to help address health and nutrition issues. Through county Extension offices, universities have the community presence and local credibility
needed to influence the social, economic, and environmental determinants of health. Evidence-based interventions, deployed in ways that are respectful of community individual and family norms, beliefs, and current practice have been shown to keep people healthy, and delay or prevent the need for medical care, (Cooperative Extension’s National Framework for Health and Wellness, 2014).

Cooperative Extension works with public, specifically the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA), and private sector partners and the LGU system to integrate research, education, and Extension perspectives to address critical issues. Families at risk, and individuals with limited financial resources, are a key target audience.

SNAP-Ed differs from EFNEP. The EFNEP model, developed in 1969, is a strict direct education model. Trained para-professionals deliver a prescribed series of nutrition education lessons to a prescribed audience – low income families with young children and youth. EFNEP over the years has developed standard outcome measures that have allowed the program to show change across the country with a national online reporting system.

The SNAP-Ed audience first and foremost includes SNAP recipients through the lifespan from birth to seniors. This includes adult individuals and those with families and youth from preschool to high school. SNAP-Ed is a program that works cooperatively in states with oversight from state SNAP agencies and USDA Food and Nutrition Service (FNS). FNS, starting in 1995, began to layer in multi-level activities understanding from research that direct education on its own cannot bring about long-term change. This was evidenced by the development of grants to establish social marketing nutrition networks.

In 2010, the Healthy, Hunger, Free Kids Act (HHFKA) redirected SNAP-Ed to create a new grant program with a focus on interventions that not only included direct nutrition education, but also physical activity, obesity prevention, and community and public health approaches to the SNAP-Ed framework. The act also removed the match component of the program which expanded opportunities for implementing agencies to collaborate with agencies and programs that were prohibited in the past, including state SNAP agencies. In 2007, the cost of the program with match was one half billion dollars. The HHFKA capped the program at $400 million and redistributed funds to states based on a formula that includes state SNAP participation.

Currently SNAP-Ed reporting consists primarily of short term and some medium term outcomes, but strong research evidence, as noted in the Academy of Nutrition Evidence Analysis Library, indicates that effective intervention strategies have been identified to assist food insecure individuals in meeting their nutritional needs that includes multi-level interventions with nutrition education. In addition research shows that direct nutrition education interventions, such as those provided by SNAP-Ed, have been shown to increase food security among low-resource audiences.

SNAP-Ed Present

Starting in 2002, the PDT has periodically published a report on the progress on the provision of nutrition education, evaluation and outcomes as they relate to LGU implementation of the SNAP-Ed program. ([https://nifa.usda.gov/snap-ed-lgu-reports](https://nifa.usda.gov/snap-ed-lgu-reports)) A 2015 report is in final approval phase. Since the first LGU SNAP-Ed national report was completed, FNS has developed an annual data collection system for SNAP-Ed providers called the Education and Administrative Reporting System (EARS). To simplify data collection by states, the second LGU SNAP-Ed national report incorporated selected elements of EARS where feasible for the Community Nutrition Education (CNE) Logic Model framework that was used to collect the data.

While not the only SNAP-Ed implementers, LGU’s bring unique strengths and contributions to SNAP-Ed. LGU SNAP-Ed provides direct access to researchers studying childhood obesity, healthy lifestyles, nutrition education programming and curriculum, and public health approaches to policy, system and
environmental (PSE) change. In addition, LGUs, as part of their mission, are experts at translating current research into educational messages and programs targeted to specific audiences.

The rich history of needs assessment and community engagement, being rooted in communities throughout each state, and engaging community stakeholders and participants through advisory groups, makes LGUs and Extension a unique and impactful partner. The research based education in collaboration with other Extension program areas (Family and Consumer Sciences, 4-H Youth Development, Ag and Natural Resources, and Community Development) and state and community stakeholders creates a synergistic multiplier effect in urban as well as rural environments.


LGU SNAP-Ed is rooted in four primary domains as shown in Figure 1 that form the basis for all program plans.

Figure 1. SNAP-Ed program domains.

The 2015 LGU direct education interventions reached 1.8 million people with 94% of clients participating in SNAP. Direct education is community focused, based on needs assessments and is learner centered and behavior focused for the most impact. SNAP-Ed Federal guidance ensures that the direct education model, based on the Dietary Guidelines for Americans, includes hands-on skill building lessons on basic cooking as well as nutrition.

Massachusetts direct education focused on youth:
UMass Extension SNAP-Ed’s major focus for Direct Education is providing lesson series to youth in schools with community eligibility or >50% eligible for school meals. This focus helps to:
  o reach the greatest number of SNAP families in a cost efficient manner
  o inspire classroom teachers to continue to focus on good nutrition and physical activity with their students
  o create collaborations with schools that foster PSE activities/changes that directly affect SNAP families and amplifies the direct education

35,439 school age youth were reached in FY2014 and 52,879 were reached in FY 2015 with workshop series. Parents of the youth were reached through newsletters that follow up each lesson and engage the entire family. Curricula used included CATCH, Show Me Nutrition, and Team Nutrition.

Evaluation results show that this SNAP-Ed programming resulted in the following statistically significant changes with youth, for both years:
  o Eating vegetables more often
  o Eating fruits more often
  o Being physically active more often
  o Drinking sugar-sweetened beverages less often
  o Choosing whole grains more often

Youth-focused nutrition education has been shown to have positive outcomes and increase the possibility for PSE changes as evidenced by the following University of Massachusetts outcomes.

A sampling of school based PSE Changes include:
  o 96% of classroom teachers where SNAP-Ed is taught have reinforced the nutrition information with their students during other class time.
  o 82% of classroom teachers where SNAP-Ed is taught have made behavior changes such as healthier meal and/or snack choices and become more physically active themselves.

**Indirect Education**
Indirect education is also an important component of communicating with SNAP-Ed target audiences. In 2015, 18,542 indirect activities were carried out by LGU SNAP-Ed programs reaching over 103 million participants.

**Michigan: Michigan Fresh**
Michigan Fresh, a Michigan State University Extension (MSUE) website, offers a range of educational resources to help people experience the state’s locally grown fruits and vegetables, meats, and other locally produced products that can be bought at local farmer’s markets. The website offers fact sheets that cover topics such as preservation techniques and safe storage for different types of vegetables and fruits, gardening tips and recipes. This information is offered in English, as well as Spanish and Arabic. Along with MSUE, Michigan Fresh works to educate minority groups, including tribal communities, the cognitively impaired and the hard of hearing, on the benefits of good nutrition. The program also provides tours of farmer’s markets to help acquaint SNAP eligible individuals with the local, nutritional foods found at the market.

Social marketing through indirect education has been shown to have positive effects when combined with direct education. A study looking at the Iowa Nutrition Network’s social marketing campaign, BASICS Plus, showed that gaining parents’ attention and engaging them in healthy eating practices for their children can be a useful way to increase the effectiveness of school based education programs. (Blitstein, et al. J Acad Nutr Diet. 2016)
Louisiana: Let’s Eat for the Health of It

“Let’s Eat for the Health of It” is a social marketing campaign that was run by the Louisiana State UniversityAgCenter Extension that focuses on increasing the public’s awareness of the many benefits of diet that includes more fruits and vegetables, setting aside time for family meals, and increasing physical activity. Information was disseminated through billboards, posters, outdoor banners, brochures and other handouts. Overall, the goal was that increased exposure to this kind of information would help people select healthier foods and make other healthy behavior choices. A telephone survey of 600 individuals, post campaign, found that half of all survey respondents had been exposed to the campaign materials and that a majority of them expressed a readiness to adopt healthier behavior patterns.

Community Partnerships

As noted earlier LGU SNAP-Ed uses strong community relationships to develop impactful programming and create a forceful multiplier effect.

Washington: Mobile Food Bank Partnership with Second Harvest Food Bank

Second Harvest Food Bank approached Washington State University (WSU) Extension SNAP-Ed in Spokane with a problem: they had too many fresh fruits and vegetables to distribute, and wondered if WSU could help them get the produce to SNAP-eligible individuals. WSU SNAP Ed partnered with Second Harvest and together they helped to increase access to fresh and healthy foods through Family Night events held at local schools, Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) feeding sites and outreach to low income neighborhoods. Second Harvest was able to distribute fresh produce during the Family Night events via its mobile food bank. In 2015 these efforts culminated in reaching 3,000 families through 34 school sites and 500 families through the summer feeding sites. The mobile food bank was able to distribute over 1.3 million pounds of food through school visits, and 2,500 pounds at the summer feeding sites. The partnership with Second Harvest was so successful that Second Harvest dedicated a delivery van to be used exclusively as a mobile food bank by WSU SNAP Ed. The success of this partnership also led to the expansion of the WSU SNAP Ed program to include produce tastings at local libraries, senior low-income housing, and the Police Athletic League Summer Basketball Camps.

Teaching children where their food comes from and multiplies the impact of Extension program areas by combining nutrition education with agriculture and youth development. Community garden projects are especially strong around the country and research has shown they can increase fruit and vegetable consumption among children. (Heim, et al. JADA, 2009)

Ohio: How Does Your Garden Grow?

A unique multi-organizational partnership has come together in Southern Ohio using gardening to provide a valuable learning opportunity for underserved children in a 10-week summer program. The collaboration, involving Ohio State University Extension Ag and Natural Resources, 4-H Youth Development, SNAP, Scioto County Soil and Water Conservation District, Findlay Manor retirement center and the 14th Street Community Center, has established a community garden where youth learn about community service, gardening, and nutrition in an intergenerational program. Professionals met with the children at the garden three times per week where the children planted, weeded, watered, raked, and tended to their garden every Monday. On these “Measuring Mondays,” each child would measure the height, number of leaves, blooms, and fruit of their own plant.

Not only did the children learn how to plant a garden but they also learned the importance of growing their own food, the cost effectiveness of planting a garden, working together, team building, nutrition, responsibility, confidence, the benefits of physical activity and following directions. Among several goals of the program was to teach children about nutrition and eating.
Children love to try new foods, when they have grown the food themselves and this can have a positive impact on lifelong eating habits.

**Food Resource Management**

Managing a food budget is especially important for SNAP recipients to make the most of their food dollars.

**Texas: Better Living for Texans**

“Better Living for Texans” (BLT) is a statewide program serving 217 out of 254 counties in Texas, and is aimed at helping educate both children and adults on how to eat healthier while saving money on their grocery bills. BLT offers educational classes, newsletters and other services at no cost to the participants in order to provide up-to-date nutritional advice, particularly to SNAP recipients, so that consumers can make healthier food choices. The program has documented positive behavioral changes in its participants in many areas, including better food shopping and food budgeting practices, better food safety and the ability to prepare nutritious family meals.

**Physical Activity**

In addition to creating better eating behaviors, SNAP-Ed also focuses on physical education whether it is incorporated into nutrition education classes, part of a larger collaborative effort or a stand-alone program.

**Alabama: Body Quest**

The child obesity program “Body Quest” was first implemented in 1999, and since then has become a 15-week, multi-level program aimed at reducing childhood obesity in third-graders. In FY 2015, the initiative was implemented with a treatment and control group of students and their parents. The treatment or intervention included social marketing, community coalitions, and parent and child engagement, among other things. The curriculum included materials and iPad applications with anime-style cartoon characters representing different healthy habits to help make the curriculum relatable to children. By the end of the 15-week period, treatment students reported eating more fruits and vegetables offered through the School Lunch Program compared to the control group. Parents of treatment group children were given easy to make, inexpensive recipes that incorporated more vegetables, and were given information and tips through a texting initiative. A post-survey texting poll found that 100% of parents who received the texts enjoyed them, and as a result treatment parents found that their third-graders ate an increased amount of vegetables per day compared to the control group.

SNAP-Ed is an accountable program. SNAP-Ed implementing agencies have regularly scheduled state management evaluations and audits and federally scheduled management evaluations and audits every two years. LGU SNAP-Ed distribution of funds for programming is focused in the community with 84% of all funding going to educational delivery staff, 7% devoted to administration and budget, 6% to program leadership and accountability and 3% curriculum development and support staff.

In 2010, SNAP-Ed that was delivered through LGU Extension used fewer federal dollars per participant than that delivered through other providers. This was an average, and was not necessarily the case for specific providers. There are often important aspects of SNAP-Ed delivery that underlie these figures, such as the challenging nature, and associated higher costs, of reaching particular constituencies with nutrition education. The table below shows SNAP-Ed delivery metrics for LGU Extension providers and the overall national average cost per participant. Since 2010 was the last year this number was officially calculated, the SNAP-Ed focus has expanded from mainly direct education to direct education plus multi-level interventions. Therefore a new analysis will have to be undertaken to update the calculation based on these changes.
Through sound government accounting practices of the LGUs, SNAP-ED is a well-managed, reviewed, audited and impactful program.

**Partnerships with other Federal Nutrition Programs**

Working with other federal nutrition programs SNAP-Ed reinforces and enhances opportunities for success.

**Florida: Alachua County Food Hub**

The Alachua County Food Hub, also known locally as the “Farm to School to Work Hub,” has become a teaching facility for students, a meeting space for school garden champions wanting to connect their gardens to the lunchroom, a place for kitchen managers learning to use farm fresh produce, and a learning opportunity for districts around the state desiring to incorporate more fresh produce into school menus for children most in need. The hub is a true representation of collective impact, which includes a partnership between the Family Nutrition Program (Florida SNAP-Ed), the Alachua County School Board, the Growing Educational Training program, and numerous community organizations. Students were instrumental in helping to develop the food hub where they received and aggregated produce from local farmers and learned to weigh, measure, package and distribute to district schools. Nineteen SNAP-Ed-eligible schools received produce from local farms as well as from onsite gardens and greenhouses through the food hub. Nearly 13,000 pounds of produce from local farms and the hub gardens were processed through the food hub. Additional outcomes and impacts of the program include student participation in gardening classes; training in food packing, food safety procedures; more than 150 heads of lettuce produced for the school lunch program; students cared for over 3,000 plants for school gardens; five local farms provided more than 9,000 pounds of produce for 15 SNAP-Ed eligible schools; and students assisted in developing standard operating procedures for the food hub based on industry standards.

**Oregon: Food Hero and Smarter Lunchrooms**

Oregon State University SNAP-Ed program has a partnership with the Oregon State Department of Education- ODE (Child Nutrition Programs, School Food Service, and the broader school environment) includes three training efforts that include Oregon SNAP-Ed faculty and staff.

- Five regional culinary workshops designed for Food Service managers and food preparation cooks in schools are scheduled for fall of 2016. SNAP-Ed Food Hero recipes will be highlighted, and Oregon SNAP-Ed faculty/staff can attend.
- Smarter Lunchroom: There will be 10 regional trainings over 18 months, starting in the Fall. Four will focus on the National School Lunch Program; 4 on the Child and Adult Care Food Program; and 2 on SFSP sites. These are train the trainer workshops for Oregon SNAP-Ed faculty/staff members and Food Service staff.
- Cycle menu training. There will be 4 locations for these regional trainings for school food service employees, and SNAP-Ed faculty can attend.

Incorporation of SNAP-Ed Food Hero recipes into Child Nutrition Programs: ODE Child Nutrition Program is continuing to test, quantify, and credit SNAP-Ed Food Hero recipes for use in school lunch programs, CACFP sites, and summer feeding sites. These recipes are quantified at

---

### SNAP-Ed cost and reach – Extension and other providers nationally, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LGU Extension</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of participants</td>
<td>4.5 million (74%)</td>
<td>6.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal funding level</td>
<td>$161 million (43%)</td>
<td>$375 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal cost per participant</td>
<td>$36 per person</td>
<td>$63 per person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sexton, J. FY 2010: A retrospective review (Note: The data in this table are from 2010. The funding formula for SNAP-Ed was modified immediately after 2010 data were gathered, and a current analysis may produce different figures.)
approximately 12, 24, 50 and 100 serving sizes. By the end of 2017, 72 recipes will be completed and listed on the SNAP-Ed Food Hero website. These recipes are part of a larger effort that includes ODE, DHS, Oregon Department of Agriculture, and Oregon SNAP-Ed. Large posters of showcased fruits and vegetables align with the quantity recipes as part of Food Hero and Oregon Harvest for Schools.

SNAP-Ed future

The FY 2017 SNAP-Ed Federal Guidance requires states to adopt a new National SNAP-Ed Evaluation Framework which includes short, medium and long term outcomes and indicators. This Evaluation Framework is accompanied by an interpretive guide to help implementing agencies understand how to best utilize and report on outcomes and indicators. This will move the nationwide program into an even higher level of standardized outcomes and accountability and help stakeholders see the impact of ongoing activities. In addition, implementing agencies are guided by a national toolkit of best practices. Development of these new evidence based tools guides practitioners to select an intervention with the greatest chance of success for their community and provides researchers with tools to document evidenced based outcomes for multi-level community based interventions. The goal is to impact SNAP recipients where they live, learn, work, play and pray. As we collaborate, cooperate and network with partners the force multiplier will create much needed change to our future health outcomes with SNAP-Ed as one of the most innovative programs implemented at a community level.

Thanks to Chairman Conaway, Ranking Member Peterson and all of the committee members for your acceptance and careful review of this testimony.
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Final Report and Scenarios – ECOP Budget Task Force

July 14, 2016

Daryl Buchholz, Tim Cross, Ray McKinnie, Doug Steele and Jimmy Henning, Chair

1. Pending long-term budget-related decisions:
   ECOP must make long term decisions on priorities for the use of assessments at the national level that include:
   
   
b. ECOP Operations – Represents spending categories seen as longer term in support of functioning committees appointed by ECOP. Proposed to combine ECOP Executive Committee, 4-H National Leadership Committee, Measuring Excellence in Extension Implementation, National Impacts Database Committee, Personnel Committee, Program Committee, Budget and Legislative Committee.
   
c. Strategic Initiatives and Opportunities - Appointment by ECOP of national task force or committee to address current or emerging issues of concern or opportunity and short term investments in targeted areas.
   
d. Allocation of funds in direct support of emerging national program support or incentives.

2. The task force developed a survey for input by each region and the results were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>1 - Most supportive</th>
<th>2 - Moderately supportive</th>
<th>3 - Slightly supportive</th>
<th>4 - Least supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) only that needed to balance the budget, but maintain current spending;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) balance the budget and create funds for additional investments by eliminating current expenses;</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) increase the assessment to provide $50,000 for additional investments, or</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) increase the assessment to provide $100,000 for additional investments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results of the survey the task force acknowledges that there is not national support to increase the assessment and therefore decisions need to be made based on current levels of revenue and expenses.

3. The ECOP Budget Task Force proposes the following budget scenarios for ECOP discussion:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Funding for Strategic Opportunities (SO)</th>
<th>Increase needed (assuming 75 LGU)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do nothing, take on no projects except those for which you have budget savings or reserves</td>
<td>From current budget savings or reserves</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Even without a new budget category for SO, project, ECOP must be prepared to increase their annual spending by an estimated $10K or more depending on the salary demands of the next ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic opportunities budget of $30,000</td>
<td>From non-balanced budget</td>
<td>Zero now, up to $30,000 when reserves fall below a critical amount ($300,000?). (5% or average of $400 per institution)</td>
<td>Allows for faster action. Does not require an assessment vote now Non-sustainable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic opportunities budget of $30,000</td>
<td>From balanced budget with prior reallocation of funds</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Allows for faster action. Budget must be reallocated. Biggest areas for savings are Measuring Excellence in Extension ($0 to $32,000) and kGlobal (up to $132,132). Both will require ECOP action, but not a full section vote.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic opportunities Budget of $30,000</td>
<td>From balanced budget</td>
<td>$30,000 (5% or avg of $400 per institution)</td>
<td>Requires an increase in assessments and a full section vote.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Maw, Ian  
Sent: Wednesday, June 15, 2016 10:50 AM  
To: jschuchardt@extension.org  
Subject: Support of AMR work.

Jane,  
This has been on the back burner as I have been distracted by other items.
Attached is the funding request going to both ECOP and ESCOP. We want to move this forward ASAP/
Thanks,

Ian
Ian L. Maw, PhD
Vice President -- Food, Agriculture & Natural Resources
Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU)
1307 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005
imaw@aplu.org
202-478-6031 (Office)
202-441-9474 (Cell)

APLU/AAVMC
Antimicrobial Resistance Initiative (AMR)

June 1, 2016

APLU and AAVMC formed a Task Force in December 2014 on the use of antibiotics in animal agriculture and the issues of antimicrobial resistance. Composed of experts from the fields of veterinary medicine and animal agriculture the Task Force was charged to develop recommendations that would support the government’s endeavors to combat antimicrobial resistance through programs of research, education, and outreach.

The Task Force framed its report with a robust agenda for future work on the part of the respective institutional members of AAVMC and APLU in collaboration with government departments such as HHS, USDA, etc. and the producer and pharma industries.

As the APLU/AAVMC Task Force completed its work with the publication of the task force report, Addressing Antibiotic Resistance – a report on antibiotic resistance in production agriculture it was determined that to facilitate the implementation of the recommendations on education, research, and outreach a full-time program manager would be needed. Dr. Chase Crawford (DVM), was hired to fulfill that role on a one-year contract commencing on September 1, 2015 and reported to an executive committee comprised of the two Task Force Co-chairs, Dr. Lonnie King and Dr. Robert Easter, Peter McPherson, Ian Maw, and Eddie Gouge. The costs associated with his employment and operating expenses are equally shared between AAVMC and APLU with the APLU portion of the costs equally shared between APLU and the BAA. Chase is housed at the headquarters of AAVMC and is provided some staff support at that venue.

Much of Chase’s work has been focused on cultivating existing relationships or fostering new partnerships with agencies, commodity groups, and industry sectors to publicize the work and recommendations of the Task Force through a series of on-going workshops and educational leadership forums such as the USDA-ERS, Farm Foundation, APLU/AAVMC events this past year, the USDA-NIFA Webinar conducted in April, the formation and work of a curriculum design group (due to report this July) and most recently the North Central Regional Roundtable held at The Ohio State University in late May; these among many other ongoing activities. Attached is a more complete summary of activities through April of this year as well as planned activities moving forward.
As the effort continues to be ramped up through our collective work, there will be increased engagement with each of our individual sections – academic programs, experiment station, and Cooperative Extension as the recommendations are considered and implemented.

In the opinion of the AMR executive committee, good progress has been made, but much more is needed and given that Chase continues to diligently pursue the implementation of the recommendations we asked him to consider the extension of his contractual involvement for another year (September 1, 2016- August 31, 2017) with a similar funding arrangement, but also with the expectation that funding external to our two organizations be realized and substituted for that of our groups. He has agreed to do so.

The annual costs for the position are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>$102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (pension, health, etc.)</td>
<td>16,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Operations</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$124,778</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This breaks down to $62,389 for both AAVMC and APLU (with the APLU portion split equally for $31,195 each for APLU and the BAA). To date, we have commitments from ACOP for $7,000 toward the costs, and up to $17,000 from the PBD. What is requested is a commitment from ECOP and ESCOP to match that of ACOP ($7,000 each). This would bring a total of $38,000 some of which will meet current commitments for the position and allow a small portion to be carried forward into 2017 to fund the position.

The expectation would be that external funding would secured to offset further funding requests made to the BAA family.

More on next page.
a joint project on ANTIBIOTIC RESISTANCE IN PRODUCTION AGRICULTURE

Interim Report (April 2016)

Introduction
On September 1st, 2015, a program director was hired to guide the implementation of the AAVMC | APLU Task Force on Antibiotic Resistance in Production Agriculture’s recommendations and goals. This report outlines the progress made towards achieving each goal in relation to target completion dates. Additionally, challenges and successes of the initiative will be discussed.

Priority 1 – Target Completion Date: December 31, 2015
In cooperation with the communications teams from AAVMC and APLU, a strategy was developed to ensure that the Task Force report, Addressing Antibiotic Resistance, was distributed to a wide audience. This included the development of press releases, op-eds and direct communications with key stakeholder groups. While the report was disseminated broadly, one of the challenges we continue to face is having our op-eds published. In looking at op-eds that have been published on this subject, most either pointing blame toward the agriculture sector or, they are written by high-ranking Administration officials such as Tom Frieden, Director of the CDC. The One Health message we are advancing has yet to gain momentum in the popular press – even after the Presidential Advisory Council’s recent report emphasized a One Health approach, journalists gave little more than a passing mention of this aspect of the Council’s work. We do not want to move away from our message simply to appeal to op-ed editors, rather we should continue to raise the level of this approach within the administration and various stakeholder groups.

By cultivating existing relationships and developing new partnerships, AAVMC and APLU have established themselves as key players in the antibiotic resistance discussion. One example is how the associations’ partnership with CDC during its World Antibiotic Awareness Week efforts led to the involvement of CDC staff in the AAVMC/APLU Curriculum Working Group and CDC mentioning our associations by name in meetings with national and international stakeholders – including, a recent meeting with the Ambassador of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. In addition to human health partnerships, AAVMC and APLU have both utilized existing partnerships and developed new ones in the agriculture and animal health sectors. Two focus areas moving forward include the human medical associations (AAMC, AMA) and the retail food companies. Opportunities to engage these constituencies are currently being pursued – including a NCRA Regional roundtable, potential PCAST meeting and plans to hold a One Health meeting in partnership with the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

In the fall, an informal survey of the AMR educational landscape was conducted. Currently available resources include the Antimicrobial Resistance Learning Site for Veterinarians and the USDA’s National Veterinary Accreditation Program’s Module 23: Use of Antibiotics in Animals. These resources are currently underutilized and in need of content updates. AAVMC and APLU are working to assist efforts to enhance both of these resources. In addition, a Curriculum Working Group was formed to develop desired learning outcomes for students of various education levels at colleges of agriculture and veterinary medicine as well as youth groups.

From the beginning of the AMR Initiative, planning for a summit with the Farm Foundation was underway. While a target date of December, 2015 was set, the event was delayed until January of 2016. Despite the delay of one month, the event was regarded as a highly successful event and
showcased AAVMC/APLU’s ability to bring in new meeting participants that previous AMR-related events could not. Many of our speakers have been utilized in subsequent events and thus, we have been able to enhance our member institutions’ status as both AMR subject matter experts and engaging speakers.

Priority 2 – Target Completion Date: March 30, 2016
A series on on-going workshops and educational leadership forums has been established. Below is a list of events that AAVMC and APLU have had a hand in:

- **USDA-ERS, Farm Foundation** (January and March)
- **Pew, Farm Foundation** – Metrics Survey (In process)
- **USDA-NIFA Webinar** (April 19)
- Washington DC Chapter of **American Registry of Professional Animal Scientists** (April 27)
- **NCRA, Ohio State University** – Regional Roundtable (May 19-20)
- **NIAA** – Program Planning Committee for Metrics Workshop (June)
- **FAO, Netherlands** – One Health approaches to AMR (*early planning process*)
- **Alliance to End Hunger** – AMR as a food security/sustainability issue (*early planning process*)
- **PCAST** – Summer Stakeholder Meeting (*tentative*)
- **Biotechnology Innovation Organization (BIO)** – Program Planning Committee for Animal Biotech Summit (September 21-23, 2016)
- **Elanco** – Summit (September 2016 - *more information to follow*)
- **FAO** – Roundtable during World Antibiotic Awareness Week (November 14-20, 2016 - *tentative*)
- **Cancelled** – Congressional Briefing with FAO and Alliance to End Hunger (May 13, 2016)

AAVMC and APLU convened a Curriculum Working Group for an in-person meeting that took place in Washington, DC in February. The working group developed a draft set of learning outcomes for students of various educational levels. This document is now being revised and completed virtually. The group has consulted with stakeholder groups including 4-H, FDA and USDA. Opportunities to collaborate with the USDA’s National Veterinary Accreditation Program and the FDA’s Center for Veterinary Medicine to develop learning modules were an additional outcome of this in-person meeting. Once completed, the Working Group’s learning outcomes will be made available online.

Opportunities to assist in the creation and development of several university-based pilot projects are beginning to take shape on several fronts:

- **Pew/Farm Foundation** – focus area of metrics
- **NCRA Regional Roundtable** – four thematic focus areas
- **Kingdom of the Netherlands** – focus area of One Health Surveillance
- **CDC’s forthcoming RFP** – focus area of antimicrobial stewardship in companion animals
- **CDC Broad Agency Announcement** – focus area of potential impact on human health of large antibiotic and other discharges (e.g. agriculture, human or animal sewage) on the development and spread of resistance in the natural environment

AAVMC and APLU assisted in the dissemination of public education and communication materials. A series of VFD-related brochures created for veterinary students by the FDA have already been distributed and additional opportunities to leverage the associations’ existing networks are being pursued.

Priority 3 – Target Completion Date: June 30, 2016
One of the long-range projects of addressing the lack of access to veterinary care has seen substantial progress. The USDA-NIFA’s Veterinary Services Grant Program received funding for the first time in the FY16 spending bill and has been appropriated $2.5m in the FY17 House agriculture appropriations bill. AAVMC and APLU will work to ensure that Senate appropriators include funding for this priority program as well.
The ultimate goal of the AAVMC | APLU Task Force on Antibiotic Resistance in Production Agriculture was to create and institute a university research organization (URO) that would continue to carry out the Task Force’s recommendations independently. Discussions with key stakeholders including FFAR, the Pork Board, PCAST, the Noble Foundation’s Soil Health Institute and others are ongoing. Additionally, efforts to develop national One Health Centers of Excellence that would have the ability to focus on antibiotic resistance are also being made – the One Health Act of 2016 was introduced in March and a coalition of AMR stakeholders is being developed to support this legislation. The current challenge is finding an early adopter. FFAR staff recommended against pursuing a broad-based center of excellence pitch and suggested a more targeted approach – focusing on antibiotic alternatives or some other area that might be easier to measure programmatic success. Unfortunately, it is still very early in the process of the Noble Foundation’s Soil Health Institute to be suggesting that their model is a successful one. AAVMC and APLU need to make the case that if this issue is a priority of this administration, a URO is needed to ensure that significant progress is made in the agriculture sector.

Measuring Excellence in Extension
Assessment Report

Submitted by the Measuring Excellence in Extension Committee

June, 2016

Background
The Measuring Excellence in Extension (MEiE) database was launched in 2008. During this 8-year period, support for the database has trended downward. As a result of this, the MEiE committee recommended an assessment be conducted to determine the current use and value of the database. This assessment was approved by ECOP and initiated in the Spring of 2016. This report contains a summary of the overall results of the assessment and recommendations for continued database operations.

MEiE Assessment Results

MEiE Assessment and Population
The MEiE Assessment was initiated on April 11, 2016 and closed on May 4, 2016. A total of 277 participants were targeted for the assessment. This included individuals with data entry access and directors/administrators. Eighty-eight responses were received for a response rate of 33%. Of the respondents, 55% (36) were directors/administrators and the remaining 45% represented areas such as fiscal, human resources, program and staff development, or communications.

The data provided represented 42 states and 3 territories. Regional participation was as follows:
  South – 32 responses
  West – 18 responses
Assessment Results
Based on the results, there was not general consensus on the value or future direction of the database. Of the 88 respondents, 73% had accessed or provided data to the MEIE database. Of these, 58% were directors/administrators and the remaining 42% fell into the categories described above.

Of the 22% that had not accessed or provided data, the main reasons for not using the database are listed below. This list is consistent whether the respondent was a director/administrator or from another group such as fiscal, HR, or program and staff development.

Reasons for not Using System
Position had changed
Data are difficult to access
Data are not available from all institutions

Suggestions for making the database more useful are provided below. Directors and administrators tended to focus on full participation, purpose and use of the system, and more comparable data.

Suggested Value-added Improvements to System
Better understanding of the purpose and use of the database
Full participation by all institutions
Compatibility and comparability with NIFA and state systems

For those who had accessed or provided data for the database, there was consistent results for how they used the data. Directors/administrators tend to use the system for internal analytics and benchmarking. The full list of system uses is provided below.

How system is Used
Institutional analytics for internal purposes – 37%
Institutional analytics for external purposes – 35%
Benchmarking data for my institution – 45%
Provide data when requested by LGU administration – 41%

When asked about the value of the database to an institution, a number of responses were provided. The results of this area are consistent among all respondents. However, fewer directors/administrators responded that the data was of little or no value. The responses have been categorized and are provided below.

System Value Results
Source for salary/personnel information – 15 responses
Data are not of much use or value – 14 responses
Benchmarking of data to other institutions – 9 responses
Internal reporting – 2 responses

**Recommendations**

Given the lack of consensus with the responses and the low response rate, the committee is providing three possible actions with regard to the future of the MEiE effort.

Modify MEiE Database to focus on salary and personnel data – The committee was in complete consensus that this should be the future of the effort. There were numerous responses in the assessment that support the need for a system to collect salary and personnel data. This data has not been collected systematically and system-wide since CSREES discontinued the annual salary survey. If this option is accepted, the committee would focus on determining the most appropriate data to collect, and the best method to collect and provide this data to institutions. Funding to implement this option would be $15,000 for the first year and $10,000 annually thereafter. This would enable a budget reduction of $6,000 in year one and $11,000 after year one.

Eliminate the MEiE Database – Some data suggests that current users and contributors to the MEiE database see little value in the database and, therefore, it should cease to exist. This is also supported by the downward trend in participation over the past few years. This option would eliminate the current $21,000 of funding dedicated to the MEiE effort.

Continue with the current MEiE Database - There is limited data to suggest that some institutions use the database and it is of value. Funding for this option would remain at $21,000 annually.

**Added by Jane Schuchardt after approval by Scott Cummings, 6.6.16**

**Option 1: Collect salary and personnel data only, plus continue impact database.**

- Operation/maintenance of website and database: $15,000 in 2017 saving $6,000
- Impact statement collection and reporting: $12,500
- Face-to-face team meeting: $8,000 in 2017 and 2018
- Chair travel and committee functions: $3,000 in 2017 and 2018

**Option 2: Eliminate MEiE and continue impact database**

- Operation/maintenance of website and database: zero saving $21,000
- Impact statement collection and reporting: $12,500
- Face-to-face team meeting: zero saving $8,000
- Chair travel and committee functions: zero saving $3,000

**Option 3: Maintain MEiE and impacts database as in 2016.**

- Operation/maintenance of website and database: $21,000
- Impact statement collection and reporting: $12,500
- Face-to-face team meeting: $8,000
- Chair travel and committee functions: $3,000
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National Responsibilities as of 6.1.16
Executive Director and Administrator Team

Operating Principles: The Executive Director and Administrator Team (EDA Team) works in support of ECOP goals and ongoing priorities [http://www.aplu.org/CESGoals](http://www.aplu.org/CESGoals). The seven-person team is made up of the full-time Executive Director and Staff Associate in the ECOP National Office at APLU in Washington, DC, plus 25 percent FTE of each of the five regional executive directors and administrator, including travel costs and other support.

In the table beginning on page 2, a primary and secondary EDA Team member is listed. Unless otherwise noted, the primary person will serve as the main contact for the effort and will be backed up by the secondary person as needed. Due to the intensity of responsibility for some efforts, some work as noted requires two individuals until such time as an appropriate transition can be made to the primary/secondary approach.

In general, the EDA Team members provide staff support for those leading the effort and, specifically:
- Offer strategic guidance for priority work, promoting national coordination.
- Draft or review and provide advice on agendas for approval by the chair or lead for the
- Work with the chair to see that meeting arrangements (via phone, video, or face-to-face) are accomplished in a timely and cost-effective manner.
- Work with the chair to arrange for recording of notes and, as required in some cases, official minutes. Review and edit meeting notes as needed.
- Advise other EDA members of the progress of effort so that all regions are appropriately engaged.
- Develop reports of accomplishments as requested.
- Attend to other responsibilities as outlined by the chair or lead for the effort.

This directory will be revised at least annually and as needs change related to ECOP’s goals and ongoing priorities. It can be found at www.extension.org/ecop.

Contact Information:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ron Brown</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rab2@msstate.edu">rab2@msstate.edu</a></td>
<td>662-325-0644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Bull</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nancy.bull@uconn.edu">nancy.bull@uconn.edu</a></td>
<td>860-486-6092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyla Hougum</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lyla.hougum@oregonstate.edu">lyla.hougum@oregonstate.edu</a></td>
<td>541-737-9920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Washington Lyons</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lwlyons@ncat.edu">lwlyons@ncat.edu</a></td>
<td>336-340-6465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Ruble</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sandy.ruble@extension.org">sandy.ruble@extension.org</a></td>
<td>202-478-6088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Schuchardt</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jane.schuchardt@extension.org">jane.schuchardt@extension.org</a></td>
<td>202-478-6029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robin Shepard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robin.shepard@uwex.edu">robin.shepard@uwex.edu</a></td>
<td>608-890-2688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description - Chair</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Executive Committee – Rodgers</strong></td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications &amp; Marketing Committee – Rodgers, Reed, Windham</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Excellence in Extension – Cummings (interim)</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Impacts Database Committee – Cross with ESCOP</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National System Task Force – Hibberd</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Task Force – Smith</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>Bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOP Budget Task Force – Henning</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Director Search Committee – TBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOP Private Resource Mobilization Task Force – Reed</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOP Orientation</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Committee – Stovall/O’Neill</strong></td>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Directors and Administrators Orientation</td>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellence in Extension National and Regional Awards</td>
<td>Ruble/Lyons</td>
<td>Bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Note – Ruble point of contact for Awards Process. Lyons point of contact for nominations review.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Committee – Latimore</strong></td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Hougulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Implementation Team – Klemme/Stovall</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Award</td>
<td>Ruble/Brown</td>
<td>Hougulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Note – Ruble point of contact for Awards Process. Brown point of contact for nominations review.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUEL – Boerboom</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Hougulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget and Legislative Committee</strong></td>
<td>Klemme/Steele</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Shepard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eXtension Foundation Board of Directors</strong></td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-H National Leadership Committee</strong></td>
<td>Jones/McKee/Hibberd</td>
<td>Hougulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Farm Bill Coordinating Committee</strong></td>
<td>Trapp/Essel</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown/Lyons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description - Chair</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination with Liaisons to ECOP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA-NIFA - TBD</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Shepard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board on Human Sciences – Linda Kirk Fox</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCOP – Clarence Watson</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARET – Susan Crowell</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>Shepard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National 4-H Council – Jennifer Sirangelo</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination with ECOP Liaisons to Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Maintenance Strategy Committee – Foster</td>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCOP – Windham</td>
<td>Shepard</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Research Support Projects</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSP-NIMSS Management Committee</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Council on Extension Professionals - Hibberd</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
<td>Hougulum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Issues Leadership Development</td>
<td>Hougulum</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Disaster Education Network - Place</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD 21 – Durgan/Place</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Journal of Extension</em> – Ami Smith</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC-FAR Board – Cross</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC-FAR Research and Outreach Committee</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee - Boerboom</td>
<td>Shepard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APLU</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly staff meetings</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag staff meetings</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APLU Annual Meeting</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APLU Board of Agriculture Assembly (BAA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Multi-State Coordinating Committee</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description - Chair</strong></td>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Board of Directors (PBD) - Buchholz</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC) - Klemme, Essel</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Shepard/Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Legislation and Policy (CLP) - Trapp, Essel</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Brown/Lyons/Shepard/Bull/Hougum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Partnerships</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USDA REE and NIFA - Rodgers</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Lyons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIFA/CES Retreat Follow-up – Hibberd/Schlutt</td>
<td>Shepard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Nutrition Service/SNAP-Ed</td>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Department of Energy (SEEP)</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Shepard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACo - Rodgers</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Hougum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDA Climate Hubs</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>National Office Coordination</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDA meetings</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications toolkit</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website maintenance</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial tracking and reporting</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting arrangements (ECOP Exec, ECOP, BLC, task forces)</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOP Reports (PBD, JCEP, EDEN, CARET, ESCOP, FCS)</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECOP Monday Minute</strong></td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOP handout, annual report, letters and other communications</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOP incoming chair planning (calendar, goals)</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble and appropriate regional EDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOP archive</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOP surveys</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOP meetings</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOP webinars</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOP Chair presentations</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reports as requested</td>
<td>Schuchardt</td>
<td>Ruble</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Folks,

The message below is sent on behalf of Jay Akridge our chair. Please take appropriate action as suggested so that we can have an informed discussion at the Joint COPs meeting next month.

Dear Board Members,

You may recall that at our last PBD meeting (March), we discussed the importance of updating the Plan of Work (POW) for the next five-year period; the plan currently in place was for the period 2011-2016.

We agreed that to initiate this process, it would be important to engage our various board constituencies in the effort to get feedback on the POW and propose revisions, new items, etc. prior to our PBD at the Joint COPs meeting in late July. At this meeting we would be able to discuss these proposals and assign a team to integrate them into a new POW with the intent of vetting the POW with BAA constituents prior to the PBD meeting in November.

Attached is the current POW and your assignment is, using whatever mechanisms you desire, to please share the POW with your constituent members and solicit their input to our work and bring these to our July meeting.

Many thanks for your work on this important objective.

Jay.

Thank you all for your attention to this important effort. Best regards,

Ian

Ian L. Maw, PhD
Vice President -- Food, Agriculture & Natural Resources Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU)
1307 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20005
imaw@aplu.org
202-478-6031 (Office)
202-441-9474 (Cell)
BAA Policy Board of Directors Plan of Work (Draft 3/5/11)
2011 -- 2016

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Monitor legislation and policies that may enhance or impede the System’s progress and work with decision-makers to make modifications where appropriate.

**System Integration**

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

**Actions:**

- Continue communication among Policy Board of Directors members to find common ground and enhance integration of efforts
- Work with A·P·L·U staff and BAA Executive Directors to ensure appropriate and effective linkages between the BAA and other groups within A·P·L·U.
- Support leadership development within the System, particularly through the Food Systems Leadership Institute and LEAD-21.
- Foster communication with internal and external groups and organizations with common interests in enhancing the federal investment in the System.
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Private Resource Mobilization – An ECOP task force, Scott Reed, Chair, is charged with considering selected strategies outlined by Changing Our World, Inc., a philanthropy management consulting firm, for national private fundraising to complement federal funding and not compete with university efforts. The work will include close alignment with the ECOP National System Task Force.

National System – An ECOP task force, Chuck Hibberd, Chair, is considering ways Cooperative Extension can better engage as a national system. Two surveys and a webinar have been conducted.

Innovation – ECOP and the eXtension Foundation named an Innovation Task Force, Keith Smith, chair, to provide thought leadership on innovative strategies on learner engagement, environmental factors that support innovation, and Extension employment considerations.

Federal Resource Development – The Extension Farm Bill Coordinating Committee, James Trapp and Albert Essel, Co-chairs, is guiding a national Cooperative Extension effort to outline new ideas and key issues for consideration in the next farm bill, scheduled for 2018. Efforts related to the FY 2017 federal budget resulted in House and Senate recommendation for flat Smith-Lever 3(b)&(c) and 1890 Extension funding, restoration of New Technologies in Agriculture Education (NTAE) for eXtension, and a $25 million increase for AFRI, among other actions. Congressional deliberations continue.

Health Programming – The ECOP-ESCOP Health Implementation Team, Rick Klemme and Celvia Stovall, co-chairs, is midway through a three-year assignment related to health and health insurance literacy, chronic disease prevention and management, health and all policies education, and positive youth development for health. The team is charged with increasing evidence-based educational programs, connecting with appropriate science, and advising about resource development.

Urban Programming – ECOP is aligning with the National Urban Extension Leaders (NUEL) to call attention to urban programming while maintaining Extension focus education in rural America.

Marketing and Communications – ECOP continues support of impact reporting through www.agisamerica.org, focusing on water security and health, and www.landgrantimpacts.org.

Professional Development for Directors and Administrators – ECOP and the eXtension Foundation is sponsoring a session at the 2016 Cooperative Extension Section meeting on trust as a core business practice www.trustedge.com. Extension meets in conjunction with the Experiment Station Section September 19-22 in Jackson Lake Lodge in Grand Teton National Park.

Celebrating Excellence – Applications are under review for the 2016 National Excellence in Extension and National Extension Diversity awards to be presented as part of the APLU Annual Meeting November 13-15 in Austin, TX.

ECOP Leadership and Staffing – Fred Schlutt, University of Alaska, becomes ECOP chair in November 2016 following Michelle Rodgers, University of Delaware. ECOP is searching for an executive director following the resignation of Jane Schuchardt who has served since January 2011.

The ECOP 4-H National Leadership Committee met virtually on June 2, 2016. The planned face-to-face meeting for Dallas, TX was canceled due to weather considerations. All members except Glen Whipple and Woody Hughes were able to join for all or part of the conference call.

Information outcomes:

- Arch Smith, chair of the National Program Leadership Group (NPLG) reported on their progress in becoming organized and the items they are working on:
  - Governance structure
  - Survey to system on: 4-H participation by age, age to show livestock, and state resolutions to the tax issue
  - Clarifying the committees and their roles at the national level
  - Developing the transition of responsibilities of National 4-H Congress Board

- ECOP 4-H National Leadership Committee and National 4-H Council Board of Trustees were represented by Ed Jones and Cathann Kress at APLU President’s Council meeting of June 21, 2016 to discuss 4-H and access to higher education.

- Clarification on how agenda items are brought to the Committee. Director/Administrator and State Program Leaders are the conduit for the system and representatives are responsible for communicating to the bodies they represent. A form has been developed for representatives to use to submit to co-chairs.

- ES237 Working Group. This group is addressing the broad aspects of reporting as it relates to 4-H. This is an on-going conversation to address what is needed, what is relevant and what is feasible.

- International Efforts. Developing process to handle international related inquiries, how to share interest, and how to engage internationally. Discussion on-going.

- NIFA is providing leadership for 4-H strategic plan for 2025. Expectation is that it could be used as a framework for 4-H nationally. Will be developed through NPLG to be endorsed by ECOP committee.

- Field Marketing Update. Twenty-seven LGU’s have invested, providing sufficient resources to proceed. The plan will be put into action over the coming months.

- National 4-H Council Board Changes. National 4-H Council is evaluating the current board structure in light of their mission and expectations. Process and discussions to proceed with the Cooperative Extension System over the coming months.

**Action/Discussion**

No request for discussion at this time.
ECOP Budget and Legislative Committee Report

Submitted by Rick Klemme
Dean and Director, Cooperative Extension, University of Wisconsin
Committee Chair

Summary of Accomplishments

1) Developed one-pager on Smith-Lever 3(b)&(c) for the FY 2017 budget deliberations (see www.land-grant.org).
2) Developed response to President's FY 2017 proposed budget and worked with the BAA Budget and Advocacy committee to request $304M for Smith-Lever (up $3M), support increased for 1890 Extension, concur with the recommendation for crop protection/pest management, agree with increases for EFNEP, and retain funding for NTAE (eXtension).
3) Increased efforts to work collaboratively with the ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee including support for the Water Security budget request. Completed joint meeting in March and have another scheduled in September.
4) Finalized a side-by-side comparison document of EFNEP and SNAP-ED programs as requested by Cornerstone.
5) Planned and facilitated a session at PILD for Cooperative Extension Directors/Administrators on the FY 2017 federal budget and efforts of the ECOP National System Task Force.
6) Began planning for the next farm bill with support from the Extension Farm Bill Coordinating Committee.

Upcoming Plans

1) Continue engagement with ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee.
2) Monitor FY 2017 appropriations.
3) Continue support of Water Security proposal.
4) Begin support of Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People proposal.
5) Identify top line new ideas and key changes to propose to the BAA Committee on Legislation and Policy for the next farm bill.

Action/Discussion

Support recommendations for new ideas and key issues to be considered by the BAA Committee on Legislation and Policy for the next farm bill, expected in 2018.
Communications and Marketing Committee Report

Submitted by Scott Reed
Vice Provost-University Outreach & Engagement, Director-Extension Service, Oregon State University
Immediate Past Chair

Summary of Accomplishments

BACKGROUND: The Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC) is an enterprise of the Cooperative Extension, Experiment Station and Administrative Heads Sections of the APLU Board on Agriculture Assembly. Scott Reed, immediate past chair; Tony Windham, and Michelle Rodgers represent ECOP on the CMC. See membership list attached. The purpose of CMC is to provide oversight for contracts with kglobal and Cornerstone Government Affairs to provide education and advocacy, respectively, to targeted decision-makers in Congress. The education is designed to promote the research, Extension and academic program priorities of land-grant universities through www.agisamerica.org, social media, earned media and other venues. The effort is funded by a three-way split of the $400,000 annual investment amongst ESCOP, ECOP and the Administrative Heads Section (AHS). With Rick Rhodes transitioning to the Executive Director of the northeast Experiment Stations, he steps down as chair, and will move into a support role for the CMC working closely with Jane Schuchardt, ECOP Executive Director. The transition plan is in process to name a chair for the remainder of this year. Bev Durgan takes over as chair in 2017 representing AHS.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS:

1) Developed a plan of work which has three sub-groups -- message testing, engaging communicators, and communicating CMC progress.
2) Determined distribution of quarterly kglobal report which carries a cover letter by the CMC chair. The distribution will be regional through the Executive Directors and Administrators. The reports are not for broad distribution, only to top administration in the APLU Board on Agriculture institutions and those whom administrators designate, such as communicators and program leaders.
3) Continued work to engage university communicators and set up a web site to update the communicator contact list.
4) Continued implementation of the 2016 plan of work tasks (see attached).
5) Identified water security and nutrition/human health as priorities.

Upcoming Plans: The current plan of work entails 1) additional message testing, 2) engaging university communicators in the most effective ways, and 3) communicating CMC progress to stakeholders. Chief activities include social media, Twitter town halls, digital and traditional media, and targeted contacts. All communication is geared toward improving understanding and support of university research, outreach and engagement. In addition, the CMC will:

1) Develop plan of work for 2017. This effort is being led by Bev Durgan, CMC chair for 2017.
2) Engage communicators in the 2016 joint ESS-CES/NEDA meeting in September in Wyoming to speak on "Simmer It Down: Strategic Issues Management for LGUs."
3) Identify ways to articulate effectiveness of communications efforts. Hunt Shipman, Cornerstone, reported at the June 7th quarterly meeting: "... interplays with other advocacy efforts. It's a constant struggle and challenge to quantify impact of these efforts. Using dollar metrics is tricky. Not all results translate to dollars; there also is value in recognizing the system's capacity. For example Extension was recognized as the lead agency for producer education. These are all real results of CMC."

**Action/Discussion:** CMC intends to develop a sustainable funding strategy that will assist in committing to a plan and evaluation strategy beyond current annual contract cycles. Importantly, ECOP must decide the level of support for this project, including identification of financial resources.

**Attachments:**
2016 Plan of Work and Membership List—

---

**Extension Farm Bill Coordinating Committee Report**

Submitted by James Trapp  
Associate Director, Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service  
Committee Chair

**Summary of Accomplishments**
1) Organized Extension Farm Bill Coordinating Committee -- Albert Essel, James Trapp, Ron Brown, L. Washington Lyons, Jane Schuchardt, Sandy Ruble.
2) Developed, launched and analyzed farm bill survey as requested by the BAA Committee on Legislation and Policy (attachment). Half of the 76 institutions in the Cooperative Extension Section (1890 & 1862) responded. The committee felt this was a good return rate, since many directors/administrators are new in their positions and may be more familiar with appropriations than authorizations as outlined in the farm bill.
3) Developed a one-pager (link below) describing the Extension director/administrator role.
4) Engaged the ECOP Budget and Legislative Committee (BLC) in a discussion about top line new ideas and key issues.

**Upcoming Plans**
1) Continue engagement with ECOP, ECOP BLC and all Extension directors/administrators on priorities for the next farm bill.
2) Fully participate with other BAA sections through the Committee on Legislation and Policy in preparing advocacy for the next farm bill.
3) Keep ECOP advised of actions.
**ECOP Innovation Task Force**

*Submitted by Keith L. Smith*

Professor Emeritus, Gist Chair in Extension Education and Leadership, Ohio State University

**Chair**

**By way of update:**

1. The task force has met via teleconference approximately every other week since our first face-to-face meeting in March in San Antonio, Texas. There have been side conversations with others outside the task force via email and through other media such as Twitter, Instagram and Chat box.
2. Participation from the task force has been 100%. Everyone has contributed to the Box interaction or been present for the teleconference calls. Most of the time members have participated in both. Teleconference participation has been averaging 70-80% participation.
3. Our millennial group has been very involved and they are eager contributors. Be warned we will try to hire them away to Ohio!
4. We have addressed the charge from ECOP to focus our report on suggestions for how to promote innovation in Extension. All of the following topics have resulted in candid, fruitful dialogue. Per our charge, we have discussed:
   a. the definition of innovation
   b. how to nourish innovative leadership in Extension
   c. how to change the Extension culture to one of nourishing change and innovation,
   d. hiring new people with innovation skills
   e. Learner involvement in innovation.
5. The report is being drafted and will be going to the task force in July for reaction/additions/changes.
6. We plan on continuing our teleconference calls with the task force in July and August to finalize the report.
7. We are on schedule to have the report ready before the September NEDA meeting.
ECOP Personnel Committee Report

Submitted by Celvia Stovall
Associate Director, Urban Affairs and New Nontraditional Programs, Alabama Cooperative Extension System, Alabama A&M University
Committee Co-chair

Summary of Accomplishments:

The Excellence in Extension Award Program is in process. Candidates for the National award, nominees from each of the five regions, were reported a little ahead of schedule. The committee is on course to select a recipient by July 14, 2016. Letters will be delivered to all recipients, non-recipients and their nominators.

The co-chairs Celvia Stovall and Mike O’Neill have collaborated with ESCOP colleagues to plan the ESS/CES New Director/Administrator Orientation with Monday, September 19, 2016, 3:30 – 5:00 p.m. preceding the joint ESS/CES-NEDA meeting at Jackson Lake Lodge, Wyoming.

Upcoming Plans:
ESS/CES-NEDA New Director/Administrator Orientation

Purpose:
This session is designed for directors and administrators with three years of experience or less. There will be opportunity to hear from a panel of Extension and Research directors and administrators. The focus of the discussion will be on tips and talents needed to create a rewarding work environment.

Moderator: Celvia Stovall, Associate Director, Alabama Extension, Alabama A&M University

Additional Panelists:
1. Bob Shulstad, Associate Dean for Research, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, University of Georgia
2. David Thompson, Research Associate Dean and Director, Agricultural Experiment Station, New Mexico State University
3. Bill Hare, Associate Dean for Land-grant Programs, University of the District of Columbia
4. Bev Durgan, Extension Dean and Director, University of Minnesota
5. Edmund Buckner, Interim Dean and Administrator, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff

Format: Moderator asks the following questions with response by panelists. Not all panelists need to respond to all questions. Time will be set aside at the end for participant Q&A.

Action/Discussion
No request for discussion at this time.
ECOP Program Committee

ECOP/ESCOP Health Implementation Team Report

Submitted by Celvia Stovall
Alabama Cooperative Extension System, Alabama A&M University
Health Implementation Co-chair

Summary of Accomplishments

BACKGROUND: The Health Implementation Team meets bi-monthly to help guide the work of implementing 5 areas of the *Cooperative Extension’s National Framework for Health and Wellness*, March 2014.

**Chronic Disease Prevention and Management (CDPM)** – Completed Environmental Scan to assess which CDPM programs are currently being delivered by Extension throughout the Nation. 195 responses were received and data is under current analysis. Team met at the NHOC 2016 meeting in Roanoke and completed a logic model to drive the rest of our efforts.

**Health Insurance Literacy** – Extension Health Insurance Literacy @hilteam Face Book page is place to find relevant updates related to health insurance literacy nationwide
Beginning development of a health insurance literacy toolkit for educators

**Health Literacy** – Oral presentation, New Mexico Border Health. June 1, Las Cruces. *Cooperative Extension’s National Focus on Health Literacy*.

**Health Issues in All Policies Education (HiaPE)** – Interviewed Extension Program Leaders about current and prospective health policy efforts, produced a Readiness Assessment, and developed a logic model that will serve to guide the team’s efforts. For more information, including obtain the report, contact Roberta Riportella, action team chair, Oregon State University, at roberta.riportella@oregonstate.edu.

**Positive Youth Development for Health (PYDH)** – PYDH predicts that building capacity within Cooperative Extension to promote health and prevent illness among youth will require identifying diverse revenue streams to both support the good work that is already being done and stimulate the development of new program and professional development opportunities.

**Upcoming Plans:**

**CDPM** – In addition to identifying programs that represent ‘best practices’ in CDPM and the needs and gaps, we recognize a need to focus more on the role of Extension in addressing policy, systems, and environmental (PSE) changes that affect CDPM.
Health Insurance Literacy –
The team would will:
- explore ways that we can bring health care to hard to reach communities, possibly through use of rural extension offices for preventive services or other related partners.
- adopt a Smart choice outcome variable (I have the confidence and capability to make a smart choice health insurance decision) as the [national] consistent evaluation measure for all health insurance literacy programs in Extension.
- propose a text message campaign to encourage people to use their health insurance - will cost to pilot and then sustain.

Health Literacy –
Resource Development: The HL Action team members are exploring a toolkit to benefit educators and community health workers who are looking to revise existing and/or develop new health-related messaging documents. The idea has been met with much enthusiasm by CDC and the Institute for Health Advancement who have resources designed for those working in the medical profession.

HiaPE –
Identify “CHAMPIONS” that would be able to assist with and promote a paradigm shift in thinking within Extension that involves the inclusion of health in all policies.

PYDH –
PYDH will continue to identify and catalog sources of funding for programs that build capacity within Cooperative Extension to promote health and prevent illness among youth. Those identified to date are described at https://www.dropbox.com/s/xjgpkk0zl2it51m/PYD%20Health%20Action%20Team%20Report%20Three%20Due%20May%2031%2C%202016.docx?dl=0.

Action/Discussion
No request for discussion at this time.

National Extension Diversity Award
Presented on behalf of
Dr. Mark Latimore, Chair
Diversity Review Committee and ECOP Program Committee

The 2016 National Extension Diversity Award is offered in partnership by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) and the USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA). This award is presented annually to either an individual or team who has accomplished excellence in diversity in Extension educational programming.

For 2016 there were 11 nominees, all with good quality, and representing all five regions of the Extension system. The review committee was impressed with the quality of nominations and with the winning nominee’s intentional intercultural competency development as a part of a
systematic professional development approach. The review team also noted a very strong state impact, with potential for replication in other states.

A trophy will be presented to the selected nominee at the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU) Annual Meeting. The nominee will be honored at a reception scheduled for Saturday, November 12, and will accept the trophy on Sunday, November 13.

The review committee was impressed with the organization of review materials provided by ECOP staff and found the online system useful during the review process.

Board on Human Sciences Report

Submitted by Linda Fox
Dean, College of Family & Consumer Sciences, University of Georgia
Liaison to ECOP

Summary of Accomplishments
The Board on Human Sciences (BOHS) www.thebohs.org annual conference was March 8-11, 2016, in Alexandria, VA, Impact and Advocacy: Expanding our reach, shaping the future was the theme.

The Board on Human Sciences nominated Board member Cheryl Achterberg of the Ohio State University as a candidate for the Department of Health and Human Services Secretary's Advisory Committee on National Health Promotion and Disease Prevention Objectives for 2030. This nomination continues the BoHS commitment to advocacy for the Human Sciences and provides new opportunities for collaboration.

As BOHS Liaison to ECOP, I continue to be active on the CES Robert Wood Johnson Foundation national leadership and core team and on the BAA/BOHS Healthy Food Systems Healthy People Implementation Team. Along with Bonnie Braun, Professor Emerita, University of Maryland School of Public Health Extension Consultant, University of Maryland Extension, we will present reports on both group’s activities to the state program leaders attending American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS) on Saturday, June 25th in Bellevue WA. This will be part of the agenda of a two-hour meeting of USDA/NIFA and state program leaders convened by Caroline Crocoll, Director, Division of FCS, USDA NIFA.

Upcoming Plans
BoHS Board will hold a "Retreat to Advance" with the theme Transitions for Excellence and Sustainability on Monday, July 18th prior to Joint COPS meeting. New and very active Task Forces (ad hoc) of BOHS are: Strategic Plan TF (to update the 2013-2016 Plan); Impact Statement TF; and Marketing/Social Media TF. The draft of the Strategic Plan (with Action Plan) for 2016 - 2021 has been completed. Discussion and voting on the plan will take place at
the Retreat and the plan will be voted by the membership at the November 2016 BoHS business meeting. The draft of the Impact Statement (currently in brochure format) has been completed and is in final editing. It will be presented for review and approval also at the Retreat.

The search for an Executive Director, who will replace Carol Kellett by January 1, 2017, is in progress. The search process will be reviewed and approved at the July "Retreat to Advance."

Action/Discussion
No request for discussion at this time.

Back to contents

BAA - Policy Board of Directors Report

Submitted by Daryl Buchholz
Associate Director of Extension and Applied Research, Kansas State University
ECOP Representative to Other Organization

Summary of Accomplishments
1) Assessments – Payment by institutions is ahead of previous years. The 1994s have withdrawn from APLU. In hopes of engaging them in 2017, no change has been made to the PBD bylaws to date.
2) What is a land-grant? -- The short statement was approved with minor changes. The statement, which emphasizes the maturity of the Land-grant University System, can be used to discourage additional institutions from requesting land-grant status.
3) FSLI and LEAD21 -- Both programs are well managed and on track as professional development opportunities.
4) Water Security -- Mike Harrington and Robin Shepard met with NIFA colleagues in April in an effort to elevate this issue in the next federal budget request.
5) New APLU Commission -- The Challenge of Change: Engaging Public Universities to Feed the World is the new APLU commission funded by the Kellogg Foundation. The commission will make recommendations on what public higher education should contribute to meeting the global food needs by 2050. The recommendation will be in the context of water, energy and environment consideration and involves both land grant and non-land grant universities. William “Randy” Woodson, Chancellor, North Carolina State University, chairs the effort.
6) Antimicrobial Resistance Task Force -- A report was released in May 2016. Funds will be sought from the Noble Foundation and the Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research to Fund to fund research and education with the expectation of 3-5 years of sustainability for the project. APLU and AAMVC is paying for a staff person and funding will be requested from ECOP and ESCOP.
7) Deferred maintenance -- Working with NIFA and ARS, a committee has been formed chaired by Tom Coon, Oklahoma State University, to address the issue at institutional, state and federal levels. The need is about $10 billion.
8) PBD election – Experiment Station, International Agriculture and Insular/Territorial will need to provide replacements. Electronic voting will be used through Balloteer Vote Online.

9) Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People – Rick Mertens, Texas A&M, will chair the team to put together the budget request. The expectation is to get this completed in sufficient time to be considered for FY 2018 federal budget proposals to the President.

10) Healthy Forests – Board on Natural Resources at APLU and National Association of University Forest Resources Programs was given the okay to make a request at the 2016 Joint COPs meeting.

Upcoming Plans
1) Discuss how to handle nonpayment of assessments by University of Arizona.
2) Determine what needs to be included in the next five-year plan of work to be finalized by November 2016 meeting.

Action/Discussion
Recommend actions for the PBD to include in the next five-year plan of work.

BAA - Committee on Legislation and Policy Report
Submitted by James Trapp
Associate Director, Extension, Oklahoma State University
ECOP Representative to Other Organization

Summary of Accomplishments
1) Provided Extension report of farm bill recommendations to the BAA Committee on Legislation and Policy (CLP) by the July 1, 2016 deadline. This is the first of many opportunities for Extension to be engaged.
2) Reviewed schedule of CLP activities through February 2017 and made a commitment to engage in all sessions, including a face-to-face meeting in DC.

Upcoming Plans
1) Together with Albert Essel, representing the 1890s on the CLP, continue to provide national leadership for Extension farm bill discussions and articulation of priorities.

Action/Discussion
None.
Summary of Accomplishments
1) Preparation for and implementation of expansive advocacy related to the APLU top-line requests for the FY 2017 USDA-NIFA budget.
2) Advocacy for retention of the $1.55M funding for the New Technologies in Agriculture Extension (NTAE) line.
3) Continued work in support of the Water Security priority.

Upcoming Plans
Once the Healthy Food Systems, Health People budget request is received, follow the PBD guidelines for bringing this to the attention of USDA-NIFA and other federal partners for consideration in the FY 2018 budget.

Action/Discussion
None.

Extension Disaster Education Network (EDEN) Report
Submitted by Nick Place
Dean and Director, University of Florida/IFAS Extension
Liaison to ECOP

Summary of Accomplishments
Many people have done much to move EDEN forward, and 2015 and 2016 have been two very good years where we’ve seen great progress. We have an excellent EDEN Executive Committee doing more work than ever before. In March of this year, Steve Cain was able to visit with several people in DC while attending a conference. The FEMA Community Planning and Capacity Building team now understands that EDEN has a community development work group, and they are committed to working with us. The FEMA CPCB liaison to foundations has offered to work with us to find foundation funding. We are engaged with the National Security Council on resilience. Joshua Barnes now understands what EDEN has to offer. Just two weeks ago he and Steve Cain worked together to put an EDEN person on a panel for a White House level water summit. That person was Bev Malsberger, who talked about a major project affecting both too much and too little water. The Foundation on Food and Agriculture approached EDEN to help them with their abilities to improve research on disasters. Their goal is to reduce disasters’ effects on food and Ag production. And they tell us they are bringing money to that table. The Emergency Management Institution has engaged EDEN and made us a staple for developing national agricultural exercises. The President’s budget that will start on September 1, 2017 has
a 50% increase for Food and Ag Defense Initiative, which is our EDEN Homeland Security Project funds. Of course, Congress may not approve them at that level. We will see.

The Extension Disaster Education Network (EDEN) held an ECOP focused strategic planning session in Indianapolis in September of 2015. ECOP chose the Extension Directors, one from each region, to participate in that meeting. To prepare for the meeting, EDEN conducted surveys of Extension Directors and EDEN delegates. Survey results indicated that 87% of Extension Directors expect EDEN to be active in their state. A large, 91%, of delegates, have used resources provided by EDEN in their state activities. And, 73% said resources used in their state were more robust because of EDEN. Eighty three percent of delegates stated that EDEN resources saved them time. A key take-a-way from the meeting was the development of a white paper on how to better brand EDEN with Extension.

EDEN, in collaboration with 20 national and state agencies, developed a Community Capacity Building Guide for Drought Response and piloted the program in Socorro County, New Mexico in the fall of 2015. The guide was found to be very useful, helping the community develop mitigation and action plans for drought conditions. It is of note that this pilot involved tribal nation participants. The International Association of Emergency Managers featured the Guide in a webinar. And as of February 2016, FEMA’s Community Planning and Capacity Building program is promoting it to states facing drought. EDEN is also going to provide a webinar for the National Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster on this guide. The goal is to get volunteer organizations more involved in drought response.

In December of 2015, the USDA published a new disaster resource page usda.gov/disaster. The foundation for this page rests in EDEN’s work with the FEMA/USDA resource matrix, noted in EDEN’s last report to ECOP. This website, which has an Ask the Expert system, is a result of that effort. The USDA did a soft launch of the site to EDEN specialists who are currently reviewing it.

**Upcoming Plans**

In late 2015, EDEN was asked by the Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Coordination, USDA, to help develop educational programs in food and agriculture cybersecurity. EDEN immediately set up a team to identify existing resources and/or develop new resources. EDEN will likely develop a novel educational program.

Also late in 2015, EDEN was approached by members of the President’s National Security Council to address issues in national disaster resilience. EDEN formed a Disaster Resilience Team and developed a proposal for a “Resilience Summit” to be held in Washington, DC. The proposal is under consideration and, as a result, EDEN is now involved in the national debate on resilience. Resilience is a new buzzword in the disaster arena. While a lot of work is being done in this area it is uncoordinated. EDEN hopes to help bring all resiliency efforts together to help the nation be better prepared for a growing number of disaster and climate resilience issues.

**Action/Discussion**

None.
Joint Council of Extension Professionals (JCEP) Report

Submitted by Kimberly Gressley
Extension Agent, 4-H Youth Development, University of Arizona
Liaison to ECOP

Summary of Accomplishments
Attachment

Upcoming Plans
Attachment

Action/Discussion
None.
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National Coalition for Food and Agriculture Research (NC-FAR) Report

Submitted by Tim Cross
Extension Dean and Professor, University of Tennessee
ECOP Representative to Other Organization

Summary of Accomplishments
1) Tim Cross accepted a renewed appointment to the NC-FAR Board of Directors. Jane Schuchardt represents ECOP on the NC-FAR Research and Outreach Committee.
2) Together with ESCOP, planned and sponsored a Capitol Hill Lunch and Learn session on February 6, 2016 called "More Crop for the Drop."
3) As a result of Extension engagement, NC-FAR has changed its strategy related to advocacy to reflect the both/and of competitive and capacity funding.
4) Attended the NC-FAR board meeting and review ECOP's goals.
5) Recommended session at NC-FAR annual meeting focusing on priorities of the Board on Agriculture Assembly which was delivered by Wendy Fink, APLU.
6) Worked with APLU to provide a response to the SOAR report calling for more competitive funds. The response emphasized the need for both competitive AND capacity funds.
Upcoming Plans

1) Continue to fully engage with NC-FAR members through board meetings, annual meeting, and Research and Outreach Committee meetings.

2) Recommend a NC-FAR Lunch/Learn for 2017, together with ESCOP, on "healthy Food Systems, Healthy People."

Action/Discussion
None

National Urban Extension Leaders (NUEL) Report

Submitted by Chris Boerboom
Director, NDSU Extension Service
ECOP Representative to Other Organization

Summary of Accomplishments
NUEL: Highlights of May 23-26 bi-annual meeting in Columbus, Ohio (41 people attending)
NUEL accomplishments compiled to include:
- Developed “A National Framework for Urban Extension”
- Developed a website for NUEL (NUELaction.org)
- Delivered NUEL 101 seminar
- Recognized by ECOP
- Established executive and steering committees
- Collaborated with the WCMER webinar series- 5 webinars
- NUEL presentation to PILD in spring 2016

NUEL’s focus is shifting from advocacy for urban Extension programming to implementation with the recent endorsement of NUEL by ECOP and with urban Extension as an ECOP priority.

The primary focus at the meeting was to establish goals/plans for the five action teams for next six months which includes:

1. Communication Team – enlisted to develop marketing materials for meetings with NIFA, NaCO, LUCC, etc.; also to recruit new members; continue to build system to collect/publish urban success stories.

2. Partnership Team – to establish strategic linkages by meeting with 2-3 federal partners at fall meeting (with assistance by Ahlishia Shipley); begin to develop linkages with LUCC/NACO.

3. Research Team – to identify emerging issues; determine best practices for a structure to respond such as a pool of applied researchers (Hot Shots) that can be quickly tapped; explore the potential to offer contract research through WCMER.

4. Professional Development Team – survey professional development needs; provide training to fulfill needs; review procedures from other associations to develop a
conference selection procedure – likely to include a rotation among regions; discussions of biennial vs annual Urban Extension Conference seemed to be favoring a biennial approach initially.

5. Strategic Alignment and Urban Policy Team – will advance urban issues guide, which is supported by the Kettering Foundation, promote multi-state projects by getting an inventory of projects; explore connection of NUEL website with eXtension site; review operations recommendations for NUEL such as requesting a minimum of 1 year service on action teams for continuity.

Upcoming Plans
Next meeting scheduled in early December. Location either D.C. possibly hosted by NIFA or New Jersey if a D.C. meeting cannot be arranged.
2017 Urban Extension Conference: May 8-11, 2017 Radisson Blu, Bloomington, MN.

Action/Discussion
None.


To: ECOP
From: Susan Crowell, CARET liaison
Date: July 19, 2016

The volunteer delegates on the Council for Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching (CARET) work with an integrated advocacy approach to increase support for the land-grant system, its national priorities and funding for research, extension and teaching. The CARET Strategic Plan and Scope of Work for executive committee members and officers are located on the APLU website.

The CARET executive committee, chaired by Dina Chacon-Reitzel, New Mexico, met July 18, 2016, prior to the Joint COPS meeting in San Antonio.

- The board heard updates from the following liaisons
  - ACOP – Gary A. Blair, Mississippi: CARET delegates discussed at length how better to advocate for the “T” (Teaching) in CARET.
  - ESCOP – Rebecca Walth, South Dakota
  - National Association of Counties – Robert Kidd, Wyoming: CARET has participated in monthly conference calls, and attended May 25-27 regional NACo meeting and was included on the Agriculture and Rural Affairs Steering Committee and also made connections with the Large Urban Counties Steering Committee;
invited to participate in December NACo Rural Action Caucus.
  - **Committee on Legislation and Policy** – Jean-Marie Peltier, *California*
  - **Agriculture Heads Section** – Orlando McMeans

- Members received information on H.R. 5836, introduced recently by U.S. Rep. Paul Gosar, which creates a process for the sale of federal lands, with land grants (in the state where the disposal takes place) to share in the sale revenues (15%).

- Received update on planning for the 2017 CARET-AHS joint meeting in March. Invited keynote speaker is **Dr. Christine O’Connell**, Associate Director of the Alan Alda Center for Communicating Science at Stony Brook University. Also invited to speak is **Chris Policinski**, president and CEO of Land O’Lakes Inc.

- During the afternoon of July 18, while I was meeting with ECOP, the CARET executive committee met with AHS representatives to review and possibly update the CARET strategic plan to align it with AHS goals or priorities, beyond the budget.

- Through its executive director, Eddie Gouge, CARET provided information on land-grant advocacy to various groups; monitored related legislative activity (pertinent and timely updates are communicated to delegates); and attended various meetings related to food and agriculture in D.C.

- The nominating committee, chaired by past chair Jim Shirk, recommended the slate of current officers to continue their terms:
  - Chair: Dina Chacon-Reitzel, New Mexico
  - Vice Chair: Louise Beaman, Indiana
  - Secretary: J. Nolan Ramsey, North Carolina

**Upcoming meetings:**
- July 31-Aug. 2, 2016: North Central Region’s Mini Land-Grant Meeting, Chicago, IL
- Nov. 9-10, 2016: CARET executive committee meeting, APLU, Austin, Texas
- March 5-8, 2017: Joint CARET-AHS meeting, Alexandria, Va.
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Campaign Launch Results

OVERALL REACH:

685M

MEDIA VALUE:

$9.4M
Early Campaign Wins

- $1.5 million in donated media
- $9.4 million in overall media value
- 15,000 new alumni addresses
- New corporate prospects in the pipeline
- Local alignment creates national relevance
- Extension investment in 27 states

Campaign Expanded through Local Engagement: LGUs Investing $800K Annually

West: 8 institutions
North Central: 7 institutions
South: 7 institutions
Northeast: 5 institutions
4-H System: What’s Ahead

- 4-H Marketing Assets in Spanish
- Grow True Leaders Campaign resources: Fair season alumni engagement toolkit
- Alumni contact info from 4-H.org
- National 4-H Week and NYSD webinars and resources
- Annual marketing and promotions calendar
- National 4-H Week and NYSD nationwide promotion
- Campaign resources: Digital Clover Promotion

Investor LGUs: What’s Ahead

- Exclusive training to accompany fair season alumni toolkit
- Alumni contact info plus engagement tips and strategies
- Dedicated national marketing staff support
- Annual marketing promotions calendar: National Marketing Training Series
- Engagement with your field marketing liaisons
- Pro-bono media priority
- Strategy support for making the most of Digital Clover
- State marketing plans and dashboards aligned with national training
- Marketing Bootcamp at NAE4-HA
- End of year giving e-templates aligned with national branding
- Refresh of online fund development toolkit for launch in Q3 FY17
- Regular investor communications
Fundraising Wins Tied to Trustee Influence

Trustees Personal Giving

**TRUE LEADERS CIRCLE**

**2020 GOAL:**

10M

**PLEDGE TO DATE:**

$933K

Corporate Supporters:

- Martha Bernadett
- Joseph Dzielo
- David Epstein
- Landel Hobbs
- Alison Lewis
- Teresa Paulsen
- Jennifer Whitlow
Board Development Objective:

Increase Council's fundraising power to maximize financial support of Extension's goal to reach 10 million 4-H youth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role:</th>
<th>80 percent focused on fundraising</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size:</td>
<td>20 Trustees or less to improve effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria:</td>
<td>Trustees required to meet personal giving and fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition:</td>
<td>C-Suite execs across key industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure:</td>
<td>Stakeholder advisory groups for Extension, Youth, Agri-business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Board Structure:

- **Public**: 23 seats
- **Cooperative Extension & Land-Grant Institution Class**: 8 seats
- **Youth**: 4 seats
- **Federal Government Liaisons**: 3 seats

**4-H Program Leaders**
- Chris Bolick, Texas A&M
- Jeff Goodwin, Colorado State

**LGU President**: Gordon Gee, West Virginia University

**Regional Dir/Adm**
- NF: Michelle Rodger, University of Delaware
- South: Nick Place, University of Florida
- 1890: Dalbert Foster, South Carolina State
- NC: Cathann Kress, Iowa State
- West: Fred Schlitt, University of Alaska
Proposed Board Structure:

Stakeholder Advisory Groups

- ECOP National 4-H Leadership Committee Representative(s)
- Youth Committee Representative(s)
- USDA/NIFA Liaison(s)

Board of Trustees (20 seats)
- Fundraising
- Council Operation Oversight

Key Principles

- National 4-H Council Board ensures fundraising efforts are informed by Cooperative Extension priorities.
- Changes will further clarify the roles and responsibilities of the three partners (Extension, USDA and Council) as outlined in the MOU.
- Extension and Youth have a voice in Council strategy. Each advisory group will have full voting seat.
- Timeline:
  - Summer ‘16 Gather input
  - December ‘16 Board vote
  - Spring ‘17 Implementation
Feedback Request

- How do we ensure we maintain alignment and accountability?
- What Extension/4-H priorities do we need to take into consideration?
- What steps will we need to take to maintain strong relationships?
- How can we best create clarity around the overall benefit to 4-H of these changes?

Thank You!
# Board Development Initiative

**Primary Objective:** Increase Council’s fundraising power to maximize financial support of Cooperative Extension’s goal to reach 10M 4-H youth by 2025.

**Rationale:** Council’s Board of Trustees is contemplating changes to its own composition and construction in order to attract additional “heavy hitters” with access to significant resources that will support the growth of Extension 4-H programs.

**Changes Contemplated:** Council Trustees met in March and April 2016 to discuss how the Board can more effectively fulfill its mission to increase investment and participation in 4-H—specifically, to maximize its ability to bring additional resources to Extension and execute its unique role. Trustees were supported by Russell Reynolds & Associates, a national board development specialist and executive recruiter. The following recommendations were a result of those discussions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Preliminary Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarify the Board’s Role</td>
<td>• Focus 80% of the Board’s time &amp; resources on fundraising, remaining time on overseeing Council operations; Council’s Board is NOT involved in 4-H programmatic policy or implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>• Reduce the size of the Board to 20 Trustees or less to improve effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Criteria</td>
<td>• Each Trustee will be required to meet personal giving as well as separate fundraising goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Composition</td>
<td>• C-Suite executives across key industries; philanthropists; media decision makers; digital marketing experts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>• Establish Stakeholder Advisory groups (or connect to existing groups) for Extension, Youth and Agri-business that support and inform the National 4-H Council Board with representatives from each group having voting seats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stakeholder Feedback Request:** Council’s Board of Trustees is proactively seeking input from Extension leadership as it contemplates changes:

- How do we ensure we maintain alignment and accountability?
- What system priorities do we need to take into consideration?
- What steps will we need to take to maintain strong relationships?
- How can we best create clarity around the overall benefit to 4-H of these changes?

*June 1, 2016*
FAQs:

How will National 4-H Council ensure that its fundraising efforts are informed by Cooperative Extension priorities?

Council will continue to coordinate and align its long term strategic direction with Extension through engagement with the ECOP 4-H National Leadership Committee. Currently, the CEO sits as an ex-officio liaison on the Committee, but it is envisioned that a closer and more formal relationship, including a seat or seats on the Council Board for representatives of that policy-making group, be institutionalized.

For example, Council could seek input from the Committee to inform its annual fundraising plan. Relationships with Extension leadership groups—and any mutual accountability—would be written into Council by-laws and voted on by the present Board of Trustees.

How will these changes impact the roles and responsibilities of the three partners (Extension, USDA and Council) as outlined in the MOU?

The changes envisioned will strengthen Council’s focus on its unique responsibilities in the MOU: providing resources to Extension (marketing, fundraising) as well as operating the Conference Center and the Supply Service. The expected outcomes of the changes are consistent with the MOU signed by ECOP, USDA/NIFA and Council on May 8, 2014, as well as National 4-H Council’s 2015-2018 strategic plan.

How will Council’s relationship with USDA/NIFA be affected?

No change to the current relationship between USDA and the Board of Trustees is envisioned. USDA/NIFA currently has 2, non-voting, liaisons to the Board. Council will continue to invest in a strong and collaborative relationship with USDA leadership.

Will Extension and Youth have a voice in Council strategy if these changes are implemented?

Each advisory group will have a voting seat on the full Board. Current Extension and Youth Trustees will be actively involved in planning and implementing changes to Board construction, as well as the design and operating norms for new groups.

When will changes to the Board’s composition and construction take place?

Potentially, in the first six months of 2017. Council’s Board will ensure appropriate time to make changes to the Board Development Initiative based on stakeholder feedback. Council Trustees and staff will be engaging Extension leadership at regional and national meetings to gather input, ideas and concerns from June through November 2016. The extent and nature of the feedback will determine the timing of a transition plan. Any changes to Council’s by-laws will be voted on by the Board in either December 2016 or March 2017 and implementation will follow soon after.

June 1, 2016