

**July 10, 2006**

**NC Land Grant Meeting, Fargo ND**

**CREATE-21 Feedback from Breakout Groups**

**1. Do you have further suggestions to incorporate into the CREATE 21 plan?**

**Group 1 -**

If trying to make CREATE 21 independent, current structure won't allow as is reporting to USDA - won't be independent of politics.

What is selling point - what can it (CREATE 21) do differently to get buy-in. (Structure is confusing vs NIH, etc. Focus on message to help sell.

Intramural + extramural funding efforts working together to complement each other.

Savings - most of support coming from state. Streamlining ability to leave a go-to person.

Way to make clear that CREATE 21 serves needs of total system including action agencies (i.e. within USDA – ERS, ARS etc.). Chance to break down competitive views between agencies. Intramural capacity has a service capacity to other parts of USDA. Expanding goal of expectation - sell as “network organization.” Serves action agencies within USDA that depends on ERS, ARS, etc for research activities.

**Group 2**

We have more questions than further suggestions.

**Group 3**

Youth development activities do not fit fundamental or integrated activities. Dickey says need separate education line along with fundamental (50%)/integrated (40%)/education set aside (10%)

**Group 4**

Look at bigger picture  
in terms of where money is to be spent  
in entire federal/state budgets - e.g. defense, judicial/jails

Extension programs - There is no place currently for enhanced extension research - extension programs may not be fully recognized.

Need to enhance social, community youth - need to have Extension better linked to Ag

Need to keep appropriate focus - need to appeal urban - how to sell entire CREATE 21 (marketing)

## **Group 5**

Clarify & strengthen the descriptions of R & E efforts so that all understand the breadth & depth of R & E in youth/4-H/families/ag/natural resources/forestry/communities

extension positioning

need clearer incentives for ARS/ERS (without great costs to R & E)

If institutions do not support CREATE 21, what can be done to change attitude.

Internet disagreement

Conflict with ear marks

More is better !!!!

How to sell the idea on "new money"

## **Group 6**

Strong marketing plan:

compelling purpose for increased funding solution-based/what are we solving that will ring in ears for public?

Need for greater articulation around higher education:

- partnering with education

- set funding for didactic course improvement in academic programs

- some % of in-direct costs?

## **Group 7**

recognition that the marketing message will need to be adapted to match the varied audiences with:

- impact - based planning

- addresses "who cares"

- address "so what"

CREATE 21 allows AES and CES to be more holistic by reaching out to appropriate non-traditional disciplines

CREATE 21 allows greater integration across research, teaching and extension

CREATE 21 allows greater regional collaboration to address regional issues

the message must maintain the land grant system's strengths, advocacy and identity while reaching out to new audiences

the message must link the funding request to addressing societal needs and the system's ability to adapt

## **2. What are your main concerns regarding moving this initiative forward?**

### **Group 1**

Political environment - losing control of what will happen - election year. Farm Bill - coordination of organizations to support. How do you accomplish? How to find a dialog with these groups for dialog

Concern on timing? What if only approve organization? (Similar structure)

### **Group 2**

Would the tripartite distribution mean sharing the formula funds with the other institutions?

If we adopt this - what is the transition plan?

Would this institute replace REE? What is the plan for the National Agricultural Library? NASS? How is intermural research to merge with the extramural research in terms of placement in the Institute?

How do we link regional, national or state-based programs?

How will the fiscal reporting change?.

### **Group 3**

Buy in from federal agencies. Education of congressional reps, CARETs, etc.

### **Group 4**

Danforth - U of Washington - St. Louis fundings inappropriate \$ public dollars to private institutes (public \$ to well-to-do private institutions)

concerned closeout going to full indirect (IDK)

Think broader - CARET

ARS/ERS will they buy into CREATE 21

Where will the politically neutral independent voice really come from

NSF - What will NSF's response be; will they fight

### **Group 5**

## **Group 6**

Inclusive to ARS & ERS

How do they see themselves in this model?

Will they create advocacy for this Institute?

Maintaining/increasing the agility to respond to emerging issues & crises

## **Group 7**

No comments.

### **3. What suggestions do you have for a name?**

#### **Group 1**

NIFARR - National Institute food Agriculture and Rural Resources

ID a few congressional leaders to start dialog with - already done - they want to see detail.

CREATE 21 - may protect us from future dropping away of our funding.

#### **Group 2**

National Institute Food and Agriculture - Healthy People, Healthy Environments, Healthy Economies. = Healthy Future

#### **Group 3**

Food, natural resources; NIFA, NIFANR, NIFNR

get someone like commissioner to develop an identifiable entity

#### **Group 4**

National Institute for Really Important Stuff - NIFRIS

ask people who have noting to the with LG Ag Extension as to what name should be

Added Comments:

making the case

are we selling our priorities effectively?

repackaging of LG infrastructure in hopes of getting more

have we really done a good job of selling the benefits/impacts of the program

Do we really need to make big change?

#### **Group 5**

National Institute of "American Wellbeing"

Institute for America

Institute for American Progress

#### **Group 6**

Consumer orientation

responsive agriculture

words that resonate: health, energy, environment, food, agriculture. Human well-being, social well-being

## **Group 7**

National Institute of Research, Teaching and Extension  
National Institute of Food and Biorenewable Resources