

**CLP Questions on the Next Farm Bill
Responses from the Experiment Station Section
June 24, 2020**

In response to the CLP's questions related to the next Farm Bill, the Regional AES Executive Directors (EDs) drafted a survey (attached) and each of the regions shared the survey with their directors. To assist the directors in answering the questions posed by the CLP, the EDs created responses that the experiment station directors could then rank. The survey also provided opportunities for directors to add additional priorities, above and beyond, the priorities that the EDs had identified.

Summary of results: Forty-four stations from across the country responded to the survey. For each of the multiple-choice questions, the two top-ranked responses were clear priorities. The priority areas for each of the questions are identified below.

CLP Survey results:

1.) What region are you from:

- ARD (10)
- North Central (7)
- Northeast (6)
- South (12)
- West (9)

2.) What areas of the current Farm Bill are of most concern or challenge for you and/or your constituency? (Maximum rank order: 1 through 6. Question 3 asks you to provide an additional priority if necessary.)

Ranking:

1. Modify or remove match requirements for non-capacity, USDA competitive grants, particularly SCRI.
2. Identification of and commitment to the funding of infrastructure associated with colleges of agriculture at Land-grant institutions.

ED take: The score sheets that are associated with the rankings (see the attached spreadsheets) clearly indicated that the two areas above were clearly high priority concerns.

3. Limitations on indirect costs for agricultural research, education and Extension programs.
4. Modify Farm Bill language to address LGU reporting requirements to ensure that NIFA asks are truly required and minimize administrative burden. The Extension and Research Working Groups who are currently assisting NIFA's Planning, Accountability and Reporting Staff in developing new reporting modules may also identify these specific items.

5. Lack of clearly defined commitments to regional approaches to national food needs.
 6. Examine Titles in the current Farm Bill other than VII to identify areas where LGUs can be funding recipients. For example, NRCS education grant eligibility for Extension and as a key stakeholder of the USDA ARS NPGS sustainability plan.
- 3.) What other area of the current Farm Bill not identified above is of most concern or challenge for you and/or your constituency? (Open response question)

Responses:

- Additional support for research, teaching, and extension programming specific to minority serving institutions.
- McIntire-Stennis funding. The movement of McIntire-Stennis to 1994's should be accompanied by an increase in total McIntire-Stennis funding.
- State match enforcements and documentation from the state level of such match.
- Re-authorization of : 1890 Capacity Funds (Research & Extension); 1890 Centers of Excellence; and 1890 Scholarship Program
- Increase funding for 1890 LGU Centers of Excellence and make mandatory
- Modification and/or clarity of titles pertaining to inequities and eligibility rules for participating in cost share programs.
- Appropriations for smaller programs that have been authorized but never funded to help smaller institutions enhance capacity
- Increase percentage for SNAP-Education versus SNAP benefits; fully fund AFRI to its congressional authorization limit
- Evidence based nutritional goals with less focus on specific dietary components and shift to a different endpoint such as the role nutrition plays on preventing chronic disease. A wholistic approach to food and nutrition if you will and not a myopic view of food labels that are focused on MDR, calories/vitamins/co-factors/minerals/fats, etc.
- The distribution of Hatch funding to states should be re-evaluated as it needs to be adjusted to support the presence of agriculture in each state.
- Capacity funds are clearly inadequate to maintain a research enterprise at LGUs. Capacity funding should be equal to state funding to AES and AGES.
- Increasing 1890 capacity (Evans Allen and 1890 Extension) funds to authorized level
- Funding non-traditional areas of research
- increasing capacity (Hatch,...) funding levels
- match requirements for capacity funding

ED take: Support for the 1890 institutions is critical and of concern to the system.

- 4.) Where do you see the greatest opportunity for the Board on Agriculture Assembly and affiliated entities to advance the teaching, research, and Extension missions in the next Farm Bill? (Maximum rank order: 1 through 8. Question 5 asks you to provide an additional opportunity if necessary.)

Ranking:

1. Include language to authorize the \$8.4B infrastructure request specifically in the Research Facilities Act along with broad waiver authority for the Secretary.
2. Creation of clear, compelling communications on the contributions by Land-grant institutions and the advancement of the sections of the Farm Bill.

ED take: The score sheets that are associated with the rankings (see the attached spreadsheets) clearly indicated that the two areas above were clearly high priority concerns.

3. Since the Farm Bill is a five-year authorization, develop a coordinated multi-year appropriation and advocacy strategy to align with the language where applicable.
4. Activation of organizations that support the Land-grant mission.
5. Provision of focused advocacy on states with congressional members on agriculture appropriations committees.
6. Cultivation of the LGU relationship with NIFA and the USDA.
7. Ability to engage the sections (e.g., AHS, APS, CES, ESS, etc.) and identify a top priority.
8. Titles in the Farm Bill other than Title VII, "Research, Extension and Related Matters."

- 5.) What other opportunity not mentioned above would advance the teaching, research, and Extension missions in the next Farm Bill?

Responses:

- Additional support for research, teaching, and extension programming specific to minority serving institutions.
- State match enforcement.
- Include funding for pandemic driven hybrid course development and conducting effective electronic platforms for conducting research projects and Extension activities.
- More designated funding for integrated grants
- More engagement with the rural community that is not engaged in farming per se.
- Support to 1890 Centers of Excellence and Scholarship funds
- More funds into teaching funding mechanisms. Recognizes the silver tsunami of faculty retirements.
- Include language to authorize funding for infrastructure request for Extension facilities.

- Most stakeholder groups, commodity commissions, and other interests seldom engage in activities outside their immediate interests such as commodity programs, crop insurance, and conservation measures. It should be a priority to reach out to these groups and inform them as to the importance of capacity and competitive grant programs to fund research and extension programs that are of direct benefit to their particular constituency.
- Engaging State Departments of Ag and state organizations in support of funding priorities

ED take: There is breadth in other suggestions to advance the teaching, research, and Extension missions of our LGUs.

6.) What suggestion(s) do you have for strengthening the involvement of our stakeholders in advocacy on legislative priorities? (Maximum rank order: 1 through 7. Question 7 asks you to provide an additional suggestion if necessary.)

Ranking:

1. Clearly identify who the stakeholders are and develop advocacy messaging that compels those stakeholders.
2. Create advocacy strategies for the system that are compatible with institutional wants and needs.

ED take: The score sheets that are associated with the rankings (see the attached spreadsheets) clearly indicated that the two areas above were clearly high priority concerns.

3. Identify the top BAA priority and advocate for that.
4. Create new, or build upon existing, coalitions with relevant USDA agencies and key groups to seek input, inform all, listen to all and refine our short- and long-term priorities. Continue regular contact to further build relationships and, when necessary, request appropriate assistance with legislative and regulatory issues.
5. Unify the efforts within the APLU: align the BAA with the CGA.
6. Secure engagement and buy-in from the sections that pay assessments to the APLU.
7. Utilize the CARET network more effectively and ask them to reach out among their personal networks on behalf of BAA.

7.) What other suggestion not mentioned above would strengthen the involvement of our stakeholders in advocacy on legislative priorities?

Responses:

- Access and Equality.
- Should consider re-organizing APLU into a more modern, dynamic, leaner and more effective organization. Bringing leaders into APLU that think out of the box. Current leadership is outdated and out of touch with society.

- Create or use an existing mechanism to inform stakeholders that their needs and concerns are being heard and actionized (not a word).
- Reach beyond the traditional farm community to gain support.
- Work with stakeholders to better understand importance of NIFA capacity funds to tripartite mission.

CLP Questions Related to Next Farm Bill

The BAA's Committee on Legislation and Policy seeks your reflections on initial issues associated with the upcoming Farm Bill. This brief survey was developed to identify some priorities. We ask for each of the three questions that you rank order the responses, with 1 representing your top priority, 2 representing second priority and so forth. Questions 3, 5, and 7 allow you to provide an alternative "other" response to questions 1, 2, and 3, respectively. Your responses will remain confidential and will assist the beginning preparation for the 2023 Farm Bill reauthorization process. Please submit the survey by 9:00 PM EDT on June 19, 2020.

1. What region are you from?

- ARD
- North Central
- Northeast
- South
- West

2. What areas of the current Farm Bill are of most concern or challenge for you and/or your constituency? (Maximum rank order: 1 through 6. Question 3 asks you to provide an additional priority if necessary.)

- Modify or remove match requirements for non-capacity, USDA competitive grants, particularly SCRI.
- Lack of clearly defined commitments to regional approaches to national food needs.
- Limitations on indirect costs for agricultural research, education and Extension programs.
- Identification of and commitment to the funding of infrastructure associated with colleges of agriculture at Land-grant institutions.
- Examine Titles in the current Farm Bill other than VII to identify areas where LGUs can be funding recipients. For example, NRCS education grant eligibility for Extension and as a key stakeholder of the USDA ARS NPGS sustainability plan.
- Modify Farm Bill language to address LGU reporting requirements to ensure that NIFA asks are truly required and minimize administrative burden. The Extension and Research Working Groups who are currently assisting NIFA's Planning, Accountability and Reporting Staff in developing new reporting modules may also identify these specific items.

3. What other area of the current Farm Bill not identified above is of most concern or challenge for you and/or your constituency?

4. Where do you see the greatest opportunity for the Board on Agriculture Assembly and affiliated entities to advance the teaching, research, and Extension missions in the next Farm Bill? (Maximum rank order: 1 through 8. Question 5 asks you to provide an additional opportunity if necessary.)

- _____ Provision of focused advocacy on states with congressional members on agriculture appropriations committees.
- _____ Creation of clear, compelling communications on the contributions by Land-grant institutions and the advancement of the sections of the Farm Bill.
- _____ Ability to engage the sections (e.g., AHS, APS, CES, ESS, etc.) and identify a top priority.
- _____ Activation of organizations that support the Land-grant mission.
- _____ Cultivation of the LGU relationship with NIFA and the USDA.
- _____ Titles in the Farm Bill other than Title VII, "Research, Extension and Related Matters."
- _____ Since the Farm Bill is a five-year authorization, develop a coordinated multi-year appropriation and advocacy strategy to align with the language where applicable.
- _____ Include language to authorize the \$8.4B infrastructure request specifically in the Research Facilities Act along with broad waiver authority for the Secretary.

5. What other opportunity not mentioned above would advance the teaching, research, and Extension missions in the next Farm Bill?

6. What suggestion(s) do you have for strengthening the involvement of our stakeholders in advocacy on legislative priorities? (Maximum rank order: 1 through 7. Question 7 asks you to provide an additional suggestion if necessary.)

- _____ Identify the top BAA priority and advocate for that.
- _____ Create advocacy strategies for the system that are compatible with institutional wants and needs.
- _____ Unify the efforts within the APLU: align the BAA with the CGA.
- _____ Secure engagement and buy-in from the sections that pay assessments to the APLU.
- _____ Clearly identify who the stakeholders are and develop advocacy messaging that compels those stakeholders.
- _____ Create new, or build upon existing, coalitions with relevant USDA agencies and key groups to seek input, inform all, listen to all and refine our short- and long-term priorities. Continue regular contact to further build relationships and, when necessary, request appropriate assistance with legislative and regulatory issues.
- _____ Utilize the CARET network more effectively and ask them to reach out among their personal networks on behalf of BAA.

7. What other suggestion not mentioned above would strengthen the involvement of our stakeholders in advocacy on legislative priorities?

Question 2. What areas of the current Farm Bill are of most concern or challenge for you and/or your constituency? (Maximum rank order: 1 through 6. Question 3 asks you to provide an additional priority if necessary.)

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	TOTAL RESPONSES	SCORE
Modify or remove match requirements for non-capacity, USDA competitive grants, particularly SCRI.	15	16	8	3	1	1	44	4.86
Identification of and commitment to the funding of infrastructure associated with colleges of	18	10	9	4	1	2	44	4.77
Limitations on indirect costs for agricultural research, education and Extension programs.	6	11	12	9	4	2	44	4.00
Modify Farm Bill language to address LGU reporting requirements to ensure that NIFA asks are truly	1	4	6	14	9	10	44	2.73
Lack of clearly defined commitments to regional approaches to national food needs.	3	1	7	6	11	16	44	2.43
Examine Titles in the current Farm Bill other than VII to identify areas where LGUs can be funding	1	2	2	8	18	13	44	2.20

Question 4. Where do you see the greatest opportunity for the Board on Agriculture Assembly and affiliated entities to advance the teaching, research, and Extension missions in the next Farm Bill? (Maximum rank order: 1 through 8. Question 5 asks you to provide an additional opportunity if necessary.)

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8	TOTAL RESPONSES	SCORE
Include language to authorize the \$8.4B infrastructure request specifically in the Research Facilities Act along with broad waiver authority for the Secretary.	21	4	5	5	2	3	3	1	44	6.25
Creation of clear, compelling communications on the contributions by Land-grant institutions and the advancement of the sections of the Farm Bill.	5	9	11	6	7	1	2	3	44	5.39
Since the Farm Bill is a five-year authorization, develop a coordinated multi-year appropriation and advocacy strategy to align with the language where applicable.	4	12	5	2	7	7	3	4	44	4.89
Activation of organizations that support the Land-grant mission.	6	4	5	10	7	6	4	2	44	4.82
Provision of focused advocacy on states with congressional members on agriculture appropriations committees.	3	8	7	6	3	7	6	4	44	4.57
Cultivation of the LGU relationship with NIFA and the USDA.	3	6	3	6	8	5	9	4	44	4.16
Ability to engage the sections (e.g., AHS, APS, CES, ESS, etc.) and identify a top priority.	1	1	5	5	4	6	10	12	44	3.09
Titles in the Farm Bill other than Title VII, "Research, Extension and Related Matters."	1	0	3	4	6	9	7	14	44	2.84

Question 6. What suggestion(s) do you have for strengthening the involvement of our stakeholders in advocacy on legislative priorities? (Maximum rank order: 1 through 7. Question 7 asks you to provide an additional suggestion if necessary.)

	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	TOTAL RESPONSES	SCORE
Clearly identify who the stakeholders are and develop advocacy messaging that compels those stakeholders.	11	8	6	9	6	3	1	44	4.91
Create advocacy strategies for the system that are compatible with institutional wants and needs.	8	9	10	7	4	4	2	44	4.77
Identify the top BAA priority and advocate for that.	6	8	7	5	6	5	7	44	4.09
Create new, or build upon existing, coalitions with relevant USDA agencies and key groups to seek input, inform all, listen to all and refine our short- and long-term priorities. Continue regular contact to further build relationships and, when necessary, request appropriate assistance with legislative and regulatory issues.	7	5	3	7	6	11	5	44	3.80
Unify the efforts within the APLU: align the BAA with the CGA.	7	3	5	10	3	6	10	44	3.70
Secure engagement and buy-in from the sections that pay assessments to the APLU.	4	5	6	2	9	9	9	44	3.41
Utilize the CARET network more effectively and ask them to reach out among their personal networks on behalf of BAA.	1	6	7	4	10	6	10	44	3.32