

Multistate Agricultural Literacy Research Committee (W2006) Meeting
April 1, 2015
Virtual Meeting via WebEx

Members Present:

Debra Spielmaker, Utah State University (chair)	debra.spielmaker@usu.edu
Kellie Enns, Colorado State University (vice chair)	kellie.enns@colostate.edu
Denise Stewardson, Utah State University (secretary)	denise.stewardson@usu.edu
Katie Bigness, Cornell University	kse45@cornell.edu
Nancy Irlbeck, Administrative Advisor, Colorado State University	nancy.irlbeck@colostate.edu
Michael Martin, Colorado State University	michael.J.Martin@colostate.edu
Kathryn Stofer, University of Florida	stofer@ufl.edu
Jennifer Melander, Nebraska Cooperative Extension	jmelander7@unl.edu

Members Absent:

Gaea Hock, Mississippi State University	gwimmer@humansci.msstate.edu
Carl Igo, Montana State University,	cigo@montana.edu
Monica Pastor, University of Arizona Extension	mpastor@cals.arizona.edu
Robert Martin, Iowa State University	drmartin@iastate.edu
Kerry Schwartz, University of Arizona	kschwart@ag.arizona.edu
Cary Trexler, University of California, Davis	cjtrexler@ucdavis.edu
Ania Wiczoreli, University of Hawaii	ania@hawaii.edu
Cory Forbes, University of Nebraska-Lincoln	cforbes3@unl.edu

Agenda Items and Minutes

Debra Spielmaker, committee chair, convened the meeting at 3:07 p.m. (MST) via WebEx. She explained that the purpose of this virtual meeting was to prepare for our face-to-face meeting at the National AAAE Meeting in San Antonio, TX, May 19, 2015. Spielmaker referenced three documents that were previously emailed to committee members:

- Final Copy of Current Project Number: W_TEMP2006; Title: Increasing Agricultural Literacy
- Agricultural Literacy Stakeholders concept map
- National Center for Agricultural Literacy Objectives

(Each of these documents is included as an attachment to these minutes.)

Denise Stewardson, secretary, took roll call using the currently posted Participant List from W2006 (NIMSS website). Members present and absent are noted above. Each member gave a brief introduction of their professional positions and research interests. Spielmaker gave brief backgrounds on committee members not present.

Spielmaker reviewed the committee's Plan of Work. The first submission was unsuccessful, but the revised second submission was approved. Spielmaker encouraged members to carefully review the final copy of the project, especially the Statement of Issues and Justification.

A discussion of the project objectives followed (phases and objectives outlined below):

Phase I: Objectives 1. Assess agricultural knowledge 2. Assess attitudes and perceptions concerning agriculture 3. Evaluate existing agricultural literacy programs (identifying programs initiatives that relate to increases in agricultural literacy outlined in the Logic Model outcomes)

Phase II: Objectives 1. Develop new agricultural literacy programs or resources based on research findings 2. Continue to evaluate existing programs (identifying program initiatives that relate to increased agricultural literacy outlined in the Logic Model outcomes)

Phase III: Objective 1. Evaluate New Programs

Objectives

1. Assess agricultural knowledge of diverse segments of the population: a) What are the points of acquisition of agricultural knowledge? b) What decisions are made based upon assessed knowledge?
2. Assess attitudes and perceptions and motivations concerning agriculture of diverse segments of the population. a) How are perceptions, attitudes and motivations developed? b) What decisions are made based upon assessed attitudes, perceptions and motivations?
3. Evaluate agricultural literacy programs to measure the program impact. a) What is effective programming? b) What is the impact of effective programming, both short-term and longitudinal? c) What knowledge, attitudes, and motivations exist for individuals that participate in agricultural literacy initiatives (formal programs, informal programs, voluntary programs)?

When registering for this project, participants selected objectives on which to focus (see Participant List). If there are any changes desired, participants should send an email to Spielmaker, and she will get those updated. Spielmaker encouraged all participants to invite others who may have interests in similar objectives.

Nancy Irlbeck joined the meeting and introduced herself.

Spielmaker asked participants to read the project details and note the outcomes indicated. Follow-through is important when working with others on this committee in order to effectively measure progress and results.

Per Kelli Enns' previous request, Spielmaker gave an overview of agricultural literacy stakeholders (see attachment).

Spielmaker briefly reviewed the objectives for the National Center for Agricultural Literacy (NCAL) (see attachment). It was noted that Objective 1 focused on STEM in secondary education related to agriculture. Funding for agricultural literacy programs may come from NCAL (see Objective 2 and deliverables in second column). There are currently three objectives, but NCAL is focusing on Objectives 1 and 2 at this time.

There was a discussion regarding National Agriculture in the Classroom (NAITC) funding from USDA:

- If USDA removes funding for NAITC, NCAL is working on funding options for NAITC.
- The make-up of state AITC programs is indicated on the Agricultural Literacy Stakeholders concept map. This often determines the funding of particular programs.
- It was noted that the National Program Leader for USDA-NIFA signs on to W2006 project (USDA-NIFA).

Enns asked: Is the stakeholders concept map the vision of the stakeholders who we should be focusing on for participation in this committee? Or, are there other groups who are working extensively in agricultural literacy, e.g., urban farms, that need to be added. Spielmaker replied that these are formal K-12 entities, but there are many, many commodity groups donating to these programs (e.g., state AITC programs).

This will be discussed further in San Antonio and additional potential funders will be added to the concept map.

Irlbeck noted: Agricultural Experiment Station directors have discretion to fund travel to meetings. It is important to thank these directors if they helped fund project participants' attendance to the committee meetings.

Enns noted: Our meeting in San Antonio is in direct conflict with other meetings, which may not facilitate others' participation. Spielmaker agreed that this may always be an issue, but maybe meeting virtually will be the solution. Spielmaker will reach out to state AITC contacts to encourage participation in this project. Stofer will solicit participation from the STEM field. Bigness suggested contacting Leslie Edgar, University of Arkansas, who is working in agricultural communication.

The agenda for San Antonio: Meetings held 10:00 a.m.-12:00 noon on May 19, 2015 (Room TBA).

- Report on current projects
- Discuss the National Agricultural Literacy Outcomes (NALOs)
- Commit to project collaboration for specific objectives
- Revise the Agricultural Literacy Stakeholders concept map

A wiki has been created to post resources for this multistate project: www.W2006.wikispaces.com

Enns suggested inviting any interested participants to SIG meeting and report on their contributions to agricultural literacy.

For our May 19, 2015, meeting, W2006 participants should bring examples of evaluation instruments being used. Melander reported that NCAL is collecting instruments and tools that AITC programs are using for evaluations. The Smithsonian is measuring STEM in agriculture; Spielmaker has instruments for elementary life science. The National Science Foundation has conducted a study on professional development outcomes for science teachers:

<https://www.cfa.harvard.edu/smgphp/mosart/>

Enns will send notice of the San Antonio meeting and resources to possible participants. If they are interested, instructions will then be sent for registering for W2006. Spielmaker will finalize the agenda for the W2006 meeting.

Minutes of this virtual meeting will be posted on the project's wiki and on the NIMSS site (with Irlbeck's help).

Spielmaker thanked Bigness for organizing this meeting via WebEX and also thanked project members for their participation.

Meeting adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Debra Spielmaker".

Debra Spielmaker, Chair

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Denise M. Stewardson".

Denise Stewardson, Secretary

Agricultural Literacy Stakeholders

