

ARD-SAAESD Joint Meeting

Atlanta Airport Marriott

August 9-10, 2023

Atlanta, GA

Meeting Planning Committee. Greg Goins, Hongwei Xin, Lisa Thompson, Cindy Morley, Alton Thompson, and Gary Thompson.

Welcome by Gary Thompson and Alton Thompson. This meeting grew out of a joint session during the 2022 Southern Mini Land-grant Meeting. At that meeting Louis Whiteside and Paula Agudelo provided a snapshot of their institutional interactions in South Carolina. Most of the institutions within our respective organizations share geography, being co-located in the same state and serving overlapping as well as unique stakeholders. This meeting is a “safe space” for discussion and is about building trust, respect, and relationships. Expect anxiety. To come together, we need to acknowledge why we have been apart. Many of the College of Agricultures at the 1862 institutions are larger than the 1890 colleges combined. Our 1890’s universities cannot do it all, they need to find their niche. We all need to work together.

Welcome by Paula Agudelo and Louis Whiteside (SAAESD and ARD Chairs). It is more critical than ever that we learn from each other and strengthen each other. It all started with a conversation. What separates 1890’s and 1862’s is money. If we can get past that, we can get past anything. In SC, we conduct joint legislative visits where we advocate for each other and ensure that budget hearings are aligned. This has resulted in 40-50% funding increases over the last few years. With regards to joint research projects, the 1890 researchers were asked to join a grant proposal but essentially allocating no funding. They now only join if they have 30% of the budget. Ground rules to participate must be intentionally set. We have recently received a \$70M award and expect another soon. Working together requires us to be intentional and equitable in our interactions.

Attendees: (For full list of registrants and their contact information, see end of notes)

Session 1: Building Relationships with Trust and Mutual Respect

Dr. Donovan L. Segura, Associate Vice Chancellor for Equity, Inclusion, & Title IX, Southern University

Session description: Building relationships based on trust and mutual respect among 1890 and 1862 colleges of agriculture is essential for effective collaboration. By establishing open lines of communication, fostering a culture of cooperation, and recognizing and valuing the expertise of each institution, we can more effectively work together towards common goals. This collaborative approach not only enhances the quality and impact of agricultural research but also strengthens the overall agricultural community, facilitating knowledge exchange and promoting the sustainable development of the agricultural sector.

This meeting is timely - July 2 marked 161 years since 1862 Morrill Act and August 30 will mark 133 years of 1890 Morrill Act.

- In a very open and honest way, the goal of this session is to move us from Awareness to Understanding to Commitment to Action.
- What caused the distrust and what has separated us historically? Federal land-grants. 1862 institutions received a grant of 30,000 acres of land for every Senator and member of the House of Representatives in Congress at that time. Money from the sale of 1862 land-grants supported

and built those institutions. The only 1890 institution to receive federal land outside where the institution sits was Alcorn State University.

- Race has separated our institutions. White middle-class males were the primary benefactors of 1862 Morrill Act. Racial oppression under Jim Crow often relegated black Americans to second class citizenship. Passage of 2nd Morrill act required states to create Land-grant institutions for black Americans. Systemic racism is a fundamental issue that has separated both groups at birth.
- The funding gap between the two institutions is very clear. 100% of 1862 institutions comply with the 1:1 state match for federal capacity funds. Current law allows USDA to waive up to 50% of the matching requirements for 1890 institutions if the state is unlikely to provide sufficient funds. The lack of the 1:1 match significantly reduces research and Extension funding. Should 1890s continue to do more with less?
- Three major factors drive trust. Ability: are they able to perform what they say they can perform? Benevolence: do they care about their institutions? Integrity: If you say you are going to do something you do it.
- Why is this the right time to bring our groups together? Ag is the foundation to human ecology. We must be prepared to feed 10B people soon.

General discussion

- How do we close loopholes that have allowed states to not provide the 1:1 match? The Federal Farm bill will expire soon. How can we work together to ensure the next version reduces disparities?
 - Farm bill is not appropriations it is authorizing language. Making sure the language is as inclusive as possible.
 - Currently, if a state fails to provide enough funding for the federal match the 1890 institution is left to justify why they didn't get the match. Instead, the state should justify/explain why they did not fund the match. The 1890/1862 institutions are supportive of each other, but it remains that the states are not providing adequate funding.
- What can we do in our spheres to drive positive change? Implores everyone to commit to this and will require courage to succeed.
 - Easy win is to contact your counterpart in the other institution. Form a relationship and have the conversations.
- What does Equity look like to you? When comparing funding, is it the size of the institution? The size of the student body? The number of faculty? They don't know how to fund if they don't know what the data should be based on.
 - Providing people with what they need to be successful looks different for each institution.
- Where are you in your interactions?

Institutional examples:

- SC State looked at where they were and where they weren't, asking how much money it would take to provide programming to all the counties like Clemson. Then compared Clemson and SC State budgets. Clemson's budget (at the time) was \$100M. SC State determined that they needed to be at \$30M or 30%. They set a target to get there in 8 years and are currently at 18%. Equity for SC State is 30% of what Clemson receives. SC State currently receives their state match.

- NC A&T and NCSU have multiple arrangements. Extension is fully integrated at common stations. Good relationships have been established between leaders who jointly meet with legislators. NC A&T made the 1:1 match last year, and this year are slated for 2:1.
- Georgia has a common plan of work, but they don't have regular meetings among the experiment stations. They do receive their 1:1 match.
- Texas has "a system" that works together for their appropriation requests. This year a priority of the system was to get the match for Prairie View A&M. Having a large system where they all work together has helped.
 - NC, TX, GA, AR, MS, and NC have one system with a common governing board (some also have separate Boards of Trustees).
- Tennessee State and U. of Tennessee have a strong relationship that started with a common Extension office for both institutions in the counties. Counties fund the personnel, contributing an equal percentage to TSU and UT personnel. Research is slower coming but are working to determine if TSU can use the UT network of research stations.

Take aways

- Document what you need. Show how the entire state would benefit from the investment.
- Farmers don't necessarily care about state lines. We do. When we start writing multistate grants together, we need to begin lowering the institutional barriers so that it is easy to work together.
- Share new hire information to help bridge the knowledge gap. Who is doing what? That knowledge needs to get down to the faculty level. Administrators need to build that trust so they can work together and not worry about the dollar flow.
- Build trust at the faculty level. Consider inviting each other to faculty meetings (open college level) so that everyone can see the issues, priorities, and structure within the other institution.
- States with common governing boards for the 1890 and 1862 institution require different tactics and approaches than states with separate governing boards.

Session 2: Getting to One LGU System

Dr. Doug Steele, Vice President of Food, Agriculture, and Natural Resources, Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU)

Session description: Developing collaborative programs in 1890 and 1862 land-grant universities requires recognizing and leveraging the unique strengths and needs of each institution. By understanding our distinct expertise, resources, and regional contexts, leaders can tailor research programs to address specific agricultural challenges effectively. We'll explore examples of formal agreements between 1890 and 1862 institutions, focusing on what is working and ongoing challenges. Included will be the importance of state and federal advocacy partnerships among our institutions for the betterment of the land-grant system.

Visionary leadership focuses on "Where are we and where are we trying to go."

- Being equal requires equality in the system.
- BAA priority to get our capacity funding for 1890 and 1862 where they need to be then focus on growing.
- A unified voice is critical.
- We are the keepers of our history. If we don't share this history no one else will.
 - Many staffers on the Hill don't have an appreciation of LGUs and USDA and their current and historical relationship.

- Our system is unique and could never be replicated again.
- Our language needs to be fresh, modern and reflect what we do.
 - Learning, Discovery, & Engagement instead of Teaching, Research & Extension
- Administration holds the key to large-scale collaborations.
 - Tenured systems don't work well with "partnerships" since no one person gets credit.
 - Incorporate soft skills in student learning: communication, collaboration and working in teams.
 - How do we manage data together? What are the incentive structures?
 - Communication support is vital as the public needs to know what we are doing.
- In the Farm Bill we have a major ask: \$5B (\$1B/yr.) in mandatory funding for infrastructure.
 - In 2020, refresh of the Gordian report (infrastructure) increased 1890s representation.
 - States that have both 1862 and 1890 (and 1994) can take a collaborative approach to establish priorities.
 - We are falling behind: first year US is #3 in the world in ag R&D spending.
 - 60% of ag buildings were built over 45 years old and are beyond their life expectancy.
 - New messaging: "we are doing world-class research however we are going to need upgraded facilities to be able to continue being a world leader".
- Be strategic in how you bring people together.
 - Key elements of a partnership start at the very beginning and not at the end.
 - Our systems must stay separate (laws are built that way), so the strategy is to grow everybody.
 - Many barriers to partnerships are self-imposed (historically, culturally, racially).
- To be successful, APLU can't be the only people in DC advocating for capacity funding.
 - Some good partners who are adding language to THEIR advocacy about LGU's include NCFAR, National Association of State Depts of Agriculture (NASDA), Farm Bureau, Food and Ag Climate Alliance.
 - Missing voices on capacity: national commodity groups, professional associations.
- Take time to look at what partnerships and collaborations make sense.

Take aways

- Opportunities for collaboration within and beyond your state:
 - joint publication of peer-reviewed articles and social media.
 - joint student development and graduate programs.
 - joint Impact statements.
- Biggest challenge in GETTING to one land-grant system is funding.
 - NIFA enabling language helps.
 - People relate to storytelling: elicit an emotional response to be successful in funding.
 - We need strategic partnerships enabled by current funding.
 - We too often spread the small investment across too many institutions.
- Consider commissioning a study to show our relationship between LGU and USDA-NIFA and how the loss of federal capacity over time has had a huge detrimental effect on our staffing patterns.
 - Only 2% of people work in Ag today and we need to message beyond that group.
 - Advocate for ourselves and tell our history to the general population, messaging about Land-grants and what does it mean.

Session 3: Communicating Within, Among, and Beyond Our Institutions

Ms. Latasha Ford, Research Communications Specialist, Fort Valley State University

Ms. Cassie Ann Kiggen, Chief Communications Officer, College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences, University of Georgia

Ms. Faith Peppers, Director of Communications, USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture

Session description: Effective communication of agricultural research is vital to the success of our land-grant university research programs in colleges of agriculture. Fostering strong communication channels promotes transparent and accessible communication with external stakeholders, including policymakers, industry leaders, and the public, enhances the dissemination and application of research findings, driving innovation and sustainable practices in the agricultural sector. This panel of communications professionals will discuss our shared communications goals, including giving a voice to the impact of our work at the state, regional and national levels.

Introductory Comments

- We need to put to rest the notion that we don't communicate well about what we do. Last year there were over 26K news stories about our work (that include NIFA) that reached 1.6B people.
- There is more than just pushing the message out the door. How it is used, who is the audience, and what resources are needed to get the story to them.
- It's about impact of the stories, and we must invest in communications to have that impact.

Panel: Tell us about your offices, how you work, and your resources.

Latasha's role as science communicator was created at the time that they hired her.

- They have a total of 9 staff members and are growing with three writers: Latasha is the research writer, the other two focus on Extension and education.
- Reaching out to researchers was the key to develop relationships to the researchers on campus, combining their expertise in research with her expertise in communications.
- Continually looking for new ways to show impacts and reaching new audiences.

Cassie Ann spent 8 years in DC working with the Chamber of Commerce, then the National Venture Capital Association and UN Foundation.

- In early 2021, UGA restructured the communications office focusing on strategic communications with different audiences. She currently has a team of 15.
- Defined roles for university Central Communications vs CAS Communications.
- Public relations and Media relations is unique at UGA, requiring approval from Central Communications. Media Relations team proactively pitches to top tier national outlets.
- Implemented a digital marketing unit for the college and has led UGA.
- Communications team focuses on the middle part of the bell curve of population.

Faith rebuilt the NIFA communications team when NIFA moved to Kansas City and the entire communications team (except one person) quit.

- Spent the last 3 years building NIFA communications to an effective team.
- Used special hire authorities to bring in the best communicators from around the country (Extension, AES, 1890, Ag NGO, stakeholder base).
- Increased media coverage for NIFA programs by 65% by including a communicator on the announcements of NIFA grants. This coverage contributes to collaborations and researcher awareness of work in specific areas.

Panel: Who do you consider to be your audience?

Cassie Ann meets with Campus Communicators (3 campuses and 8 RECs) every month to discuss media stories.

- Internal communications: communicate research and industry partnerships between campuses as well as to the President's Office. Internal weekly newsletter for faculty and staff.
- External communications: prioritizes stakeholders, including state and federal legislators through digital marketing campaigns and direct mail. Communications to legislators is approved by the UGA Office of Government Relations, which can slow the messaging. Make the science digestible to the average Georgia citizen. For example, a campaign focused on "mommy bloggers" in the Atlanta area using Pinterest as way to capture audiences. Looking for new outlets to meet the audience where they are at. Alumni and other donors are another key external audience.
 - Work with a consulting agency to help them understand the average Georgia citizen.
 - Goes beyond press releases to meet the audience "where they are at" such as mobile phone platforms, newswire etc.
 - Not everything can be digital. Some of these audiences need printed material so they developed an annual "Almanac" which focuses on alumni stories.

Latasha's key audiences at Fort Valley State are underserved communities, small-scale farmers, students, alumni, stakeholders, and funding agencies.

- Different ways to reach each audience. Three annual publications are produced that appear in both digital and print versions and are shared on social media. Popular with prospective students (think recruitment).
 - "Engage" research report also showcases student research.
 - "Focus" Extension report.
 - "AgComplish" highlights Ag Alumni activities.
- Leadership allows significant creative freedom and values communications, including communications staff at the early stages.
- Plans to include students in their Ag Communications department soon.

Panel: How can 1862s and 1890s work together to create stronger collaborative impacts that can be shared?

Cassie Ann works with other departments across campus and partners with the Office of External Affairs and Office of Business Engagement to engage industry and different universities.

- Participates in organizations such as the SRCC and ACE for regional stories.
- Partners with FV State on the Poultry Science Workforce (Extension) and the Rising Scholars internship program between UGA/FV State.
- Meets monthly with AES Leadership to stay "in the know" and be able to amplify programs.
- Cassie Ann and Latasha coordinate on editorial calendars to determine when to go live with certain stories.
- Not everything is news, but we want to showcase success stories between our institutions so created "Cultivate" an e-newsletter platform.

Latasha and Cassie Ann serve on the SRCC together and work well to share stories.

- Also serve together on the Extension Program Leadership Network.

Panel: What is your approach to collecting impact stories and sharing impact stories? How do you think you could improve that?

Cassie Ann begins with onboarding and training new Extension agents or new faculty members, reminding them who her team is and how to submit stories.

- Project request form/submission portal (uses Asana to track and manage, www.asana.com)
- Quarterly webinars remind personnel about the submission portal.
- Quarterly reminders to faculty that their work, finished or in progress, is newsworthy.
- Reminders from AES director email address asking for 5-10 “Wins” over the last 3-5 years. Were able to get about 13 in-depth story ideas with engaging visuals.
- Every October a formal call from the Dean to submit Impact Statements that come into her office and can be used as story prompts.
- Editorial meeting every Monday with any writers who have anything to do with Ag on the three campuses (about 20 people) to discuss ideas. Use Asana as an editorial calendar for stories and can let administrators know if there is a story coming up with one of their researchers so they can decide the best place to amplify that story.

Latasha uses a similar process to gather stories with a form on the website. This form goes to the Director of Communications who then disseminates it to the appropriate person.

- Does not wait on the researchers to fill out the form. She chases them! She has a great personal relationship with the researchers and will reach out to them often. They will send her photos during conferences or while out in the field for her to promote on social media.
- Serves on the National Impact Land-grant Database committee where she develops summary sheets and stories of all the work in the LGU system.
- Assists the researchers when submitting their Impact Statements
- AEA (Extension) and ARD (Research) monthly newsletters are vehicles for impactful stories at all 1890s institutions.
- For the AEA newsletter, an editorial calendar is created at the beginning of the year that is distributed to all 1890 communicators. Each month there is a deadline to submit content to go to the newsletter. Now turning into an annual publication.

Audience participation: What are large areas that need to be communicated? What is the topic, what other groups are you working with and what about your work needs to be communicated?

- Big Data Science Consortium within the SEC provides training of faculty and collaborative granting.
- Southeastern Row Crop Entomologists write grants together and share graduate students.
- AG-NGINE, the Ag Graduate Student database is workforce development for both 1890 and 1862 students and needs to be communicated to our industry stakeholders. Solving the problems of Industry and stakeholders is a good angle to a story.
- SRDC works on community development issues, collecting Extension indicators and impacts each year, report against information everyone has previously agreed upon. Economic impact stories specific to community development becomes a tool for anyone to use. Published on the website and available to program leads in community development.
- Centers of Excellence involve both 1890 and 1862 partners.

- Multistate Hatch programs provide an opportunity to map what the existing programs are and see where there are natural synergies to broaden 1862 and 1890 participation, including a communicator on some of these projects provides an opportunity for built-in communication support. The 1890 Climate Multistate Project is one such opportunity.
- UT/TSU Biomass work
- Artificial intelligence is an area where many institutions are making investments.
- Irrigation work between OSU, Nebraska, and Kansas.
- Public Breeding Programs rely on each other to share germplasm etc. and have economic impact to the state. Wheat for example is a low hanging fruit.
- Vertical/Indoor Ag
- Strategic branding our universities that incorporates social media, print, websites.
- Climate Change impacts on small growers and policy.
- DEI is an important multi state topic.
- Food security and food safety.
- Colonias: southern border rural communities to be more self-sufficient.
- IR4 Program is a good multistate (NIFA-funded) program that for 60 years provided pest management solutions for specialty crops and had a \$9B contribution to the US GNP.
- Southern SARE project

Take aways

- Common themes: respect, space, and resources. While at different scales programs at UGA and Fort Valley State are successful because they are respected, treated as professionals, and allowed to do what they do best.
- Communication is a specialty. Listen to your communicators as they can help you get what you want.
- Communicating across our universities must be intentional and coordinated with wins for all participating institutions.
- Impact is a big word. Opportunities exist to coordinate impacts from multiple universities and systems through the Land-grant Impact and the Multistate Impact databases.
- Regional newsletters are used to coordinate impactful stories within the 1890 system.
- It takes years to develop true Impact, but annually we are expected to produce impact statements. Develop communication mechanisms that emphasize these collaborations while they are in the process of creating impact.
- More training in science communication is needed for researchers. Recognize that science communication is its own discipline and engage a science communicator when developing grant proposals, as part of the grant.

Thursday - August 10

Session 4: Justice 40 and Environmental Justice

Dr. Kevin Kephart, Deputy Director, Institute of Bioenergy, Climate, and Environment, USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture

Session Description: Two executive orders will have an ongoing impact on how NIFA-supported programs will be developed and delivered to stakeholders. The Justice 40 Initiative (J40) was issued in January 2021 through EO 14008. This instructs agencies to identify J40 covered programs and determine benefits derived with a goal of 40% of the benefits realized in underserved communities. NIFA identified 14 programs that are authorized to benefit minority-serving institutions. More recently, EO 14096 was

issued in April 2023 on Environmental Justice (EJ). Each agency will need to develop an EJ strategic plan by October 2024 and partner input and involvement will be important for NIFA. The goal of this presentation will be to begin NIFA's outreach to the Land-grant partner community, explain what has been done so far, and begin an important conversation for moving forward.

Two recent executive orders: EO 14008 (January 2021) Tackling the climate crisis at home and abroad and EO 14096 (April 2023) Revitalizing our nations commitment to environmental justice for all.

- EO 14008 is a Biden-Harris administration priority.
 - A government-wide approach.
 - Net zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 (Reducing by 50% by 2030).
 - Equity will be vital consideration in all we do on climate change at USDA.
 - NIFA has formed Justice 40 (J40) Task Force (Catherine Doyle-Capitman is the Department Coordinator)
 - REE has a J40 working group.
- Justice 40, what is it?
 - Combines environmental justice and equity frameworks to deliver 40% of benefits from qualified federal investments to underserved communities.
 - What has been done?
 - Task force formed.
 - Strategic planning and coordination with REE.
 - Listening Sessions with NAREE Board members
 - Case study underway- Methane case study - How does this generate benefits in underserved communities?
 - Increases in appropriations in covered programs.
 - Included in NIFA Climate Adaption Plan
 - Covered programs- 15 total including:
 - NIFA workforce development
 - Climate Science Extension
 - Climate Science Research
 - Evans-Allen Program
 - 1890 Facilities Grants
 - Centers for Excellence for 1890s
 - Tribal Colleges Research Grants
 - 1890 Institution Teaching, Research and Extension Capacity Building Grants
 - Covered priority areas- benefits including these topics:
 - Climate change
 - Clean energy and energy efficiency
 - Clean transportation
 - Affordable and sustainable housing
 - Training and workforce development
 - Remediation and reduction legacy pollution
 - Critical clean water and waste infrastructure
 - Underserved communities:
 - Historically marginalized and or overburdened by pollution and underinvestment in housing, etc.
 - Challenges

- How do science agencies determine community benefits from federal investments? They need help in articulating the benefits.
 - How to emphasize J40 Priority topic areas?
 - Congressional authorizations are broader than the priority topics listed in the J40 initiatives.
 - Priorities are determined by the states, 1890 Institutions, and the Tribal nations.
- Environmental Justice (EO 14096)
 - Objectives
 - Meaningful involvement of underserved and overburdened communities.
 - Deepen whole government commitment to environmental justice.
 - How do we expand EJ?
 - Ensure the public has adequate access to information.
 - Improve collaboration and communication with state, tribal territorial, and local governments on programs.
 - Encourage and ensure that government-owned contractor facilities take steps to implement the directives of this order.
 - Ensure federal activities do not have the effect of excluding persons, denying benefits, and subjecting persons to discrimination.
 - New White House environmental justice interagency council.
 - Within 18 months and every 4 years afterwards agencies must submit strategic plans on environmental justice.
 - 2 years after the submission of the EJ strategic plan each agency shall submit a report.
 - Annual EJ scorecard.
 - Section 5 of EO: Research, Data Collection and Analysis to advance EJ (has Land-grant written all over it).
 - Geospatial tools (see Kevin’s slides for links)
 - OSTP will form an EJ subcommittee. Will be a sounding board on how NIFA and LGUs move forward.
 - Will need to identify opportunities for agencies to coordinate with State, tribal etc. (Think Extension for this).
 - Each agency will take steps to consider the recommendations of the environmental justice subcommittee to promote development of research and data.
 - EJ and NIFA
 - Consider ways to ensure that recipients of federal funds advance EJ (creating performance metrics, dedicating resources, and professional development).
 - Identify and address gaps in science, data, and research.
 - NIFA has investments underway (5 AFRI projects and 9 Hatch, 2 from Evans Allen listed in slides).
 - A1461 pilot program in its inaugural year (\$1M currently).

General Discussion

- Can these efforts be Incorporated into the Plan of Work?
 - Must incorporate Extension involvement as well as research.
 - As a Focus and not a “mandate”.
 - Could be for EJ, but not necessarily for J40.

- J40 there are several metrics that are used. PoW could incorporate improvements for communities.
 - This is an area that is difficult to address. Local voices are the best voices for this with communities reporting how they are impacted.
- EJ: just treatment and water. Water is the number 1 issue with some cities (in Texas) required to have a 100-year water plan. Small rural communities are being impacted by urban usage.
- Low hanging fruit could incorporate participatory research that is currently taking place engaging community partners (i.e., co-authorship with community members).
- Where are the research gaps in EJ and how do you translate the results to communities so they can make decisions? Involve social scientists from the beginning.
- Researchers and Extension from 1890 are very familiar with EJ. Scale and impact would be better with including our 1890's. Joint Plans of Work to show this.
- EJ is more straight forward than J40. How to take EJ and integrate it into J40 to make IT more straight forward? Can be addressed in reporting by incorporating J40 in EJ.
- Simplify the language and make it broad to create unique opportunities for the LGU communities.

Session 5: Building Interdisciplinary Research Teams

Dr. Amy Grunden, Assistant Director of the North Carolina Agricultural Research Service, North Carolina State University

Dr. Greg Goins, Interim Associate Dean for Research, North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University

Session description: Creating interdisciplinary research teams and fostering collaboration between 1890 and 1862 land-grant colleges of agriculture is a powerful approach to tackle complex agricultural challenges. By leveraging the diverse expertise and resources of our institutions, researchers can combine scientific knowledge, technological advancements, and practical experience to develop holistic solutions. This collaborative effort promotes innovation, enhances the efficiency of agricultural practices, and contributes to the overall advancement of the agricultural sector, benefiting both rural communities and the broader society.

Interdisciplinary solutions are needed to solve food security and climate change problems. Trust must be built at the beginning and requires developing relationships to make successful interdisciplinary teams.

- Often the 1890 gets tacked on at the end and is not included at the beginning. How to change that dynamic?
- RATS- Rewards, Accountability, Trust, and Silos
 - Be transparent in what the real needs are.
 - Determine what resources are needed to act on the outcomes.
 - Be aware of limitations on both sides.
 - Silos in our university structures can inhibit interactions.
- Levels of interaction and integration:
 - Low: Investigator initiated research (individual fruit).
 - Medium: Research collaboration (fruit salad).
 - High: Integrated research team (smoothie).
- Examples of best practices

- NCE2008-0451 Enhancing Collaboration between 1890 and 1862 Institutions in the Area of Food Safety (NC State and NC A&T, 2008-2010).
 - CEFS- Center for Environmental Farming systems (focused on food safety)
 - Play to your strengths: pre-harvest 1862, post-harvest 1890.
 - Share space (co location) one uses during pre- and one during post-harvest activities.
 - Once they started talking, trust came naturally with mutual respect.
- North Carolina Agromedicine Institute (<https://www.ncagromedicine.org/>)
 - Created in 1999, focuses on the health and safety of rural populations.
 - Synergistic area of collaboration.
- SERA 49 Heirs' Property: Impacts at Family, Community, and Regional Levels
 - Partners with SRDC, connecting research and Extension on heirs' property issues.
 - Research informed Extension curriculum is being developed.
- Soft Infrastructure needs (HR, Grants and Contracts, etc.)
 - 2022 NAS Report enhancing coordination and collaboration across the LGU.
 - Report says: Congress should facilitate participation of historically black and tribal colleges and universities.
 - How to make sure that the 1890's have the support they need to put proposals together and work on impacts.
 - You lose competitiveness with slowing down.
 - Need Cross-training.
 - NSF has a program called "Granted" and USDA may want to look at this model.
 - What is tech transfer like in the 1890 communities? Invention from federally sponsored research is required to be reported. There should be some coming out of the 1890 communities, but there aren't any in the reporting system.
 - Faculty need to be incentivized to apply for patents.
 - Subcontract with an 1862 to assist with this if there are no offices of tech transfer/patent office in 1890s.
- Money disputes can cause problems.
 - NAS report also said money needs to be allocated for upfront costs so everyone can participate fully.
 - To be able to go from R2 and R1, the *infrastructure level* is where the 1890's need funding not at the *researcher level*.
 - Grants that require matching funds from the institutions
 - What happens when an institution can't make the match? That cost should be negotiated up front.
 - Until we get the state match, this isn't going to happen.
 - Younger faculty don't often realize these limitations when going after grants.
- Incentive structures need to be in place for faculty to participate.
 - It takes time for faculty to engage in these activities, especially younger faculty.
 - Upper administration needs to give this message to department Heads so they can pass that along.
 - Can we leverage new technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) to develop a dynamic expertise database among our institutions?
 - Use AI to identify best practices to design interdisciplinary teams.
 - AI can skip over areas of our country if left unchecked, so 1890's must be involved.

- Everyone wants the “anchor” researcher on the team, but they are often over committed to other projects.

Take-aways

- Plan strategically: If possible, look for co-located buildings in “neutral” territory and work out money issues at the beginning.
- Spend time promoting the success of others on the team as much as yourself.
- Enable joint projects and research initiatives that capitalize on the strengths and resources of both types of institutions.
- Encourage interdisciplinary collaboration by bringing together experts from various fields within both institutions.
- Explore opportunities for sharing resources that can reduce duplication of efforts and enhance the overall capabilities of both types of institutions.
- Develop incentive and reward structures for participation: P&T does NOT support interdisciplinary contributions.

Session 6: Engaging stakeholders in the Southern Region

Dr. Olga Bolden-Tiller, Dean, College of Agriculture, Environment and Nutritional Sciences, Tuskegee University

Session description: Engaging stakeholders in the southern region is crucial for the success of agricultural research. By actively involving farmers, local communities, industry representatives, and government agencies, researchers can better understand the unique challenges and opportunities specific to the southern agricultural landscape. This collaborative approach promotes knowledge sharing, innovation, and the development of sustainable solutions that address the region's agricultural needs while supporting economic growth and environmental stewardship. This session will focus on best practices to engage the broad spectrum of our stakeholders across the region.

Stakeholder engagement is a process that organizations can follow to listen to, collaborate with or inform their existing stakeholders.

- Requirements: identifying, mapping and prioritizing stakeholders to determine the best tactics for effective communication.
- Proactively consider the needs and desire of anyone who has a stake in our organizations.
 - Mitigates potential risks and conflicts with stakeholder groups.
- Authenticity and trust are the most important aspects of stakeholder engagement.
- Communicate and involve individuals early and often.
 - Relationships are key. Go forth in a simplistic manner but it doesn't have to be easy.
 - Compromise is key. We AND our stakeholders need to understand what success looks like. Everyone is responsible.
- Engagement is different with different stakeholders.
 - Farmers - Local communities - Industry representatives - Government agencies
- Stakeholder *potential* is critical. Important to identify stakeholders for their potential rather than just their current predisposition.
- What did stakeholders think about the “Enhancing Coordination and Collaboration Across the LGU system (2022) document?
 - 78 responses: 1862 (43) and 1890 (9)
- Best Practices to engage stakeholders across the region?
 - Among 1862 - Virtual listening sessions to engage outside our traditional base.

- Among 1890 - Appointment to Advisory councils/advisory boards and community events
- Among all LGUs - Coordinated/collaborative field days (producer round tables), coordinated messaging, and engagement in strategic planning for the organization.

Take-aways

- We often think we know what stakeholders want but we are not always right. Ask what can we do better? Communicate with stakeholders and involve CARET.
- Learn how to politic by developing convincing elevator speeches, unified messaging, and have frequent joint meetings.
- Publish a shared field day calendar in advance (regionally, not just statewide).
- Try common scheduling when meeting with stakeholder groups and conduct shared listening sessions.

Wrap-up and next steps

- A post-survey will be sent to all participants.
- Consider have an annual meeting.
- Measure our progress over time.
- What institution wants to host next year?
- What is next? What are epiphanies from this meeting?
 - Share resources. Don't reinvent the wheel.
 - As soon as possible, engage new faculty. Younger faculty are open to this while the older faculty may not be.
 - We need to develop an expertise database.
 - Incentivize/reward faculty who participate in collaborations.
 - Continue the energy from this meeting.
 - Communicate the messages from this meeting to those who didn't make it (share the notes),
- Every state needs to schedule an in-state meeting between 1890 and 1862. Put down objectives to move forward. Report back to the associations.
 - Consider including your communication teams at these meetings.
- 1890 Research Symposium: Nashville, TN, April 6-9, 2025 (registration released in October 2023).
- As you are putting together your ARERA Plans of Work, it is often evident that the institutions show a lack of collaborative report (even though it is a joint report). How do you capitalize on the submission of this report to capture collaborations?

Registrant Name (First)	Registrant Name (Last)	Email	Institution	Address (State)
Arthur	Appel	appelag@auburn.edu	Auburn University	NA
Olga	Bolden-Tiller	oboldentiller@tuskegee.edu	Tuskegee University	AL
Conrad	Bonsi	cbonsi@tuskegee.edu	Tuskegee University	AL
James	Brown Jr.	JBrow02507@comcast.net	Tennessee State University	TN
Desmond	Mortley	dmortley@tuskegee.edu	Tuskegee University	AL
Paul	Patterson	paul.patterson@auburn.edu	Auburn University,	AL
Lloyd	Walker	Lloyd.walker@aamu.edu	Alabama A&M University	AL
Christopher C.	Mathis, Jr.	mathisc@uapb.edu	University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff	AR
Jean-Francois	Meullenet	jfmeull@uark.edu	University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture	AR
Cindy	Morley	cmorley@uark.edu	SAAESD	AR
Gary	Thompson	gat009@uark.edu	SAAESD	AR
Manjit	Misra	Manjit.Misra@usda.gov	USDA-NIFA	DC
Michelle	Samuel-Foo	Michelle.Samuel-Foo@usda.gov	USDA-NIFA	DC
Doug	Steele	dstele@aplu.org	APLU	DC
John	Davis	jmdavis@ufl.edu	University of Florida/IFAS	FL
Tommeron	Timmons	tommeron.timmons@famou.edu	Florida A&M University	FL
G. Dale	Wesson	garlen.wesson@famou.edu	Florida A&M University	FL
Jeffrey	Dean	jeffdean@uga.edu	University of Georgia	GA
Latasha	Ford	fordl@fvsu.edu	Fort Valley State University	GA
Cassie Ann	Kiggen	cakiggen@uga.edu	University of Georgia	GA
Brou	Kouakou	kouakoub@fvsu.edu	Fort Valley State University	GA
Harshavardhan "Harsha"	Thippareddi	agresch@uga.edu	University of Georgia	GA
Michael	Toews	mtows@uga.edu	University of Georgia	GA
Jamie	Matthews	james.matthews@uky.edu	University of Kentucky	KY
Marlin	Ford	marlin_ford@suagcenter.com	Southern University and A&M College	LA
Harold	Mellieon	harold.mellieon@subr.edu	Southern University A&M College / S.U. Ag Center	LA
Donovan	Segura	donovan_segura@suagcenter.com	Southern University AgCenter	LA
Janana	Snowden	chianti_primus@suagcenter.com	Southern University AgCenter	LA
Michael	Stout	mstout@agcenter.lsu.edu	LSU AgCenter	LA

De'Shoin	York, Ph.D.	deshoin_york@suagcenter.com	Southern University Ag Center	LA
Moses	Kairo	ceharris@umes.edu	University of Maryland Eastern Shore	MD
Lisa	Baxter	lisa.baxter@usda.gov	National Institute of Food and Agriculture	MO
Kevin	Kephart	kevin.kephart@usda.gov	NIFA - Institute of Bioenergy, Climate, and Environment	MO
Douglas	LaVergne	lavergned@lincolnu.edu	Lincoln University-Missouri	MO
John	Yang	yangj@lincolnu.edu	Lincoln University of Missouri	MO
Scott	Willard	stw4@msstate.edu	Mississippi State University	MS
Mohamed	Ahmedna	ahmedna@ncat.edu	NC A&T State University	NC
Gregory	Goins	gdgoins@ncat.edu	North Carolina A&T State University	NC
Amy	Grunden	amgrunde@ncsu.edu	NC State University	NC
Alton	Thompson	athompson1@ncat.edu	Association of 1890 Research Directors	NC
Lisa	Williamson	lmwilliamson1@ncat.edu	Association of 1890 Research Directors	NC
Sakthi	Kumaran	ssubburayalu@centralstate.edu	Central State University	OH
Morakinyo	Kuti	mkuti@centralstate.edu	Central State University	OH
Vernon L.	Jones	vernon.l.jones@langston.edu	Langston University	OK
Scott	Senseman	jennifer.catoe@okstate.edu	Oklahoma State University	OK
Paula	Agudelo	pagudel@clemson.edu	Clemson University	SC
Ralph	Noble	pirons@scsu.edu	South Carolina State University	SC
Louis	Whitesides	lwhitesides@scsu.edu	South Carolina State University	SC
Chandra	Reddy	creddy@tnstate.edu	Tennessee State University	TN
Tim	Rials	trials@utk.edu	University of Tennessee Institute of Agriculture	TN
Cliff	Lamb	cliff.lamb@ag.tamu.edu	Texas A&M AgriLife Research	TX
Erdogan	Memili	ermemili@pvamu.edu	Prairie View A&M University	TX
Leland	Pierson	leland.pierson@ag.tamu.edu	Texas A&M AgriLife Research	TX
Stafford	Crossman	scrossm@uvi.edu	University of the Virgin Islands	VI

Thomas	Zimmerman	tzimmer@uvi.edu	University of the Virgin Islands	VI
Ami	Smith	smitham@wvstateu.edu	West Virginia State University	WV
John	Green	john.green@msstate.edu	Southern Rural Development Center	
Faith	Peppers	faith.peppers@usda.gov	USDA-NIFA	