



### ***Land Grant Universities – Strategies for Effective Partnerships***

The foundation for public higher education in the United States is established with land grant universities. The Morrill Act of 1862 granted federal land to states and proceeds from the sale of land created the funding for 48 initial *land grant* academic and research institutions, including The Ohio State University (OSU). The Morrill Act of 1890 expanded this process. In 2014 Central State University (CSU) near Wilberforce, Ohio received designation as an 1890 land-grant institution.

Today, over 300 land grant universities across the nation share a common goal - To bring science, technology, and the arts to the American people. Land grant universities provide the catalyst for our nation's public higher education system.

Many states have successful partnerships between 1862 and 1890 land grant institutions. Central State University Extension is co-located alongside and is working in full partnership with Ohio State University Extension in several metropolitan counties. As the two Extension programs continue to work together, additional partnerships will be built, and new community engagement opportunities will be developed. The question is, how will CSU and OSU Extension position themselves to become a model for collaboration and teamwork for the nation?

### **AFBF Policy**

#### **Cooperative Extension Service**

The ultimate beneficiary of the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) is the American consumer, who has been provided a plentiful supply of food and fiber. The CES should remain an agency within USDA and a part of the land grant colleges and universities with federal appropriations expended under cooperative agreements between USDA and each state. Federal and state funds should be used for the implementation of Extension programs as established under the cooperative agreements.

We support:

1. The basic philosophy of CES that programs, and program direction, should be decided by local participants in the program;
2. New programs providing services to non-farm people provided they do not come at the expense of programs for farm and ranch families;
3. CES devoting more time to farmers' needs and to the dissemination of research information to farmers. CES should initiate not only the dissemination of research but also a flow of possible impacts and needs from the farmer-rancher back to the researcher and to the public;
4. Expansion of business management and career guidance programs through CES;
5. An increase in funding and improving services;
6. CES and USDA developing and publicizing a positive food safety program;

7. The streamlining and consolidation of CES while maintaining support for youth; and
8. Maintaining an agricultural focus for our 4-H programs.

We oppose:

1. The federal government dictating direction through the earmarking of funds for specific federally directed non-farm programs;
2. The repeal of the Hatch Act of 1887 and the movement of Hatch Act funds from the current system to a competitive grant system;
3. The repeal of the Cooperative Forestry Research Act of 1962 and the movement of those funds to a competitive grant system. These funds are vital to maintain the infrastructure of ag research stations at land grant universities;
4. Assignment of university extension faculty or staff to regulatory or law enforcement duties of any kind, believing such duties to constitute a conflict of interest, defeating both educational and regulatory purposes;
5. Federal changes in funding mechanisms for nutrition programs used with CES; and
6. Federal budget cuts affecting agricultural research and CES that are in excess of the overall percentage reduction in spending.

## **OFBF Policy**

The Ohio State University

We support the Land Grant Mission and The Ohio State University College of Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and the Ohio Farm Bureau using every economic and political means to assure that The Ohio State University accomplishes its stated mission, which is to promote a sound and prosperous agriculture and rural life as indispensable to national prosperity and security. (The Morrill Act of 1862 established the Land Grant college mission.)

Ohio State University Extension

We support the concept of OSU Extension and its purpose of delivering unbiased research and science-based information to farmers and communities and providing youth development opportunities. However, Extension must undergo a transformation to ensure its long-term sustainability and adherence to this purpose. As part of this transformation, OSU Extension should:

1. Define its purpose and increase its emphasis on agriculture and natural resources, nutrition and 4-H Youth Development.
2. Provide extension services in every county as a first priority, with the exploration of regional/multi-county services to address funding issues and efficiency.
3. Develop a new funding model that is sustainable, equitable and addresses challenges to local funding.
4. Increase collaboration with other agricultural and/or youth organizations with similar missions, which may include collaboration on office space, staffing, administrative functions and/or programming,
5. Improve communication with constituents regarding this transformation.
6. Continue with efforts to promote, encourage and educate regarding urban agriculture.

## **Discussion Questions**

1. List and discuss what Extension programs (4-H, Agriculture, Human Ecology, Community Development, etc.) your council members have relied upon over the years. What program expansion opportunities do you see if two research, education and service institutions were available to the community?
2. As partnerships expand into your area, what public outreach activities do you see needed to help community stakeholders better understand the relationships between land grant institutions and programming?
3. Many communities engage in support activities and fundraising for 4-H and other Extension programs. What policies need to be in place so these efforts continue to run smoothly, as well as incorporate new offerings and challenges?
4. How would you like the Extension “team” built in your county? What leadership should your county Farm Bureau provide in this process?