

Policy Board of Directors Meeting Summary
April 11, 2019
Portland, OR

- Review current **organizational structure** of the Board on Agriculture Assembly, committees and sections to determine: 1) if this structure is still representative of how the BAA conducts business; 2) determine the process for decision-making, establishing strategic priorities and enhancing collaborations on the national level; and 3) how the BAA provides guidance and leadership to formulating national agendas, advocacy efforts and strengthening relationships with stakeholders.
- Conduct an in-depth evaluation of **assessments** that are currently collected in support of the BAA to analyze: 1) historical background and changes over time in the assessment; 2) formulas used to calculate the assessment; 3) current budget categories and initiatives; and 4) developing a more transparent process for future assessment calculations and decisions.
- NIFA **competitive funding match requirements** was discussed at length and the attached information was provided by NIFA for clarification. The Policy Board is aware of the concerns of the system and the additional burden placed on institutions because of the “cash match” provisions. The Policy Board is working closely with Cornerstone Group and the Budget and Advocacy Committee to address these concerns and work towards removing the cash match requirements in future legislative language.
- **Strategic realignment** update and discussion with committee chair Dr. Ernie Minton Kansas State University. The work of the committee will continue, and the following principles reaffirmed: 1) Do no harm to current NIFA funding lines; 2) Protect lines at current funding levels, even if lines are strategically recommended for realignment; 3) Protect capacity funds; and 4) establish future growth areas that include both capacity and competitive. The committee was asked to continue their work and to begin conversations with NIFA concerning the 2019 and 2020 budget requests, priorities and authorizations. A draft report with recommendations is requested for review at the Joint COPs summer meeting.
- **Communications and Marketing Committee (CMC)** update and report was provided by Dr. Steve Loring, New Mexico State University. After in-depth discussion the following was decided:
 - Upon recommendation from the Policy Board the chair will appoint the CMC as a permanent Ad Hoc committee of the Policy Board;
 - The recommendation by the CMC and AHS/ESCOP/ECOP sections to terminate the contract with K-Global was approved by the Policy Board. Notification of the termination will be provided to kglobal by Doug Steele on behalf of the Policy Board;
 - All materials developed, information collected and social media efforts (i.e. Ag is America) will be retained by the Policy Board;
 - The CMC will be reconstituted with specific focus on national marketing and communication to strengthen the brand promise of LGU’s, reinforce the impact of mission areas, broaden the understanding of research, academics and Extension, and develop a national focus to support advocacy efforts by Cornerstone. A draft plan will be developed for discussion by the new committee;
 - Develop a transition plan that would include the hiring of a position with APLU Office of Vice President for Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources that would provide

leadership and facilitation to the CMC and include the involvement of LGU ag communication and marketing specialists and staff. Evaluate the current assessments paid by the AHS, ESCOP and ECOP and request continued financial support for a national CMC focused effort.

- **Additional Action Items:**

- Provide a letter of support for full funding of Sec. 7201 (7 U.S.C. 3221 et seq.) of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018. This new program, called New Beginnings for Tribal Students, creates a matching competitive grant program for land-grant and 1994 Institutions to support Native American students' higher education. It was added to the Farm Bill with strong bipartisan support for the purpose of increasing the recruitment, retention and graduation rate of tribal students enrolled at the land-grant universities and Tribal Colleges and Universities.
- Approved joint statement between BAA and the Charles Valentine Riley Memorial Foundation (RMF) that expresses mutual interests and goals of increasing federal investments in all segments of an agricultural, food and natural resources research, education, Extension and outreach system and producing the best possible food and agricultural science to meet some of the greatest challenges of the 21st century.
- Develop a process whereby requests for “sign-on” letters, advocacy support and collaborations with APLU BAA can be considered and actions approved in a more deliberate, timely and efficient process to provide direction to the Office of the Vice President for Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Attachment

Competitive Grants Matching Requirements (Provided by NIFA)

For SCRI, the matching requirement is:

(A) In general

An entity receiving a grant under this section shall provide non-Federal matching funds (including funds from an agricultural commodity promotion, research, and information program) equal to not less than the amount of the grant.

(B) In-kind support

Non-Federal matching funds described in subparagraph (A) may include in-kind support.

The NIFA Policy Guide provides a further description of match

(<https://nifa.usda.gov/sites/default/files/resource/NIFA-Federal-Assistance-Policy-Guide-2018-10-05-508.pdf>). The following is an excerpt from the policy guide:

Matching or Cost Sharing

a. Definition

Matching or cost sharing means the portion of project costs not paid by Federal funds (unless otherwise authorized by Federal statute, 2 CFR 200.29). Matching and cost sharing requirements will be identified in the RFA. If matching or cost sharing is required, the applicant must contribute non-Federal funds in support of the project for which they are requesting NIFA funds. If the RFA specifies that matching or cost sharing is required, it also will specify the following:

- The nature of the requirement, e.g., whether it is a fixed percentage or NIFA cannot fund more than a specified percentage of costs;
- Whether match must be cash, or can be cash and/or in-kind

Authorizing legislation governs matching requirements. If there is no matching requirement in the authorizing legislation, a statement will be included in the RFA to convey that there is no matching requirement (i.e., NIFA does not require matching support for this program and matching resources will not be factored into the review process as evaluation criteria). For grants that require matching funds, the RFA will specify, for example, that the Budget Justification must list the overall match amount as well as break out the overall match by the individual sources the identifies the entity that is providing the match and the amount being provided.

Matching requirements are covered in the Uniform Guidance, 2 CFR 200.306. All matching or cost sharing contributions must be:

- Verifiable from the recipient's records;
- Not included as contributions for any other Federally-assisted project or program;
- Necessary and reasonable for proper and efficient accomplishment of project or program objectives;
- Allowable under the applicable costs principles;
- Not paid by the Federal government under another award, except where authorized by Federal statute⁷ to be used for cost sharing or matching;
- Provided for in the approved budget when required; and
- Conform to other provisions of the Uniform Guidance, as applicable.