

Technical Appendix

Survey Research Results for the National Evaluation of Capacity Programs

March 2017

Performed for:

National Institute of Food and Agriculture

Performed by:

TEconomy Partners, LLC.

Project Authors:

**Simon Tripp, Martin Grueber, Dylan Yetter
Joseph Simkins and Alyssa Yetter**



Special Thanks:

The process of distributing these surveys was kindly facilitated by the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU).

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

Full Results of Surveys Completed by:

- I. Dean's and Senior Administration in Agriculture, Forestry and Veterinary Colleges at Land-grant Universities (and other Capacity funded institutions)**
- II. Research and Experiment Station Directors**
- III. Cooperative Extension Service Directors**

Table of Contents

I. Institutional Survey Findings: Dean’s and Senior Administration in Agriculture, Forestry and Veterinary Colleges at Land-grant Universities	6
A. Introduction	6
B. Respondent Profile	6
C. Federal Funding Types Received.....	6
D. How Federal Funds Received are Allocated	7
E. Scale of the Supported Enterprise	7
F. Capacity to Accommodate Increased Funding and Associated Activity Volume	10
G. Stability and Trajectory of Funding Sources	10
H. Capacity Funding Versus Competitive Funding	12
I. NIFA Capacity Funding Use in Expanding Fundamental Capabilities at LGUs	15
J. Hypothetical Impact of an Absence of Capacity Funds at LGUs	15
K. Programs Most and Least Reliant on Capacity Funding.....	18
L. Influence of Capacity Funding Investments on Success in Competitive Awards	18
M. NIFA Capacity Funding Versus NIFA Competitive Funding for Addressing NIFA Challenge Areas ...	20
N. Current Operational Environment Issues and the Importance of Sustaining Capacity Funding.....	21
O. Hypothetical Effects of a Shift to 100% Competitive Funding	22
P. Administrative and Use Characteristics of Key Funding Sources.....	25
Q. Recommendations for Streamlining or Improving NIFA Funding Processes and Reporting.....	31
R. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Capacity Funding System	32
S. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA capacity funding system.....	33
T. Recommendations on Changes to Improve the Capacity Funding System	33
U. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Competitive Funding System.....	34
V. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA competitive funding system	35
W. Recommendations for Changes to Improve the Competitive NIFA (AFRI) Funding System	36
II. Research and Experiment Station Survey Findings.....	38
A. Introduction	38
B. Respondent Profile	38
C. Federal Funding Types Received.....	38
D. How Federal Funds Received are Allocated	39
E. Scale of the Supported Enterprise	40
F. Capacity to Accommodate Increased Funding and Associated Activity Volume	41

G. Capacity Funding Versus Competitive Funding	41
H. Hypothetical Impact of an Absence of Capacity Funds at LGUs.....	43
I. Programs Most and Least Reliant on Capacity Funding.....	44
J. Influence of Capacity Funding Investments on Success in Competitive Awards.....	45
K. NIFA Capacity Funding Versus NIFA Competitive Funding for Addressing NIFA Challenge Areas	46
L. Funding Source Suitability by Area of Output	47
M. Hypothetical Effects of a Shift to 100% Competitive Funding.....	55
N. Funding Sources and Acceptance of Research Risk.....	58
O. Funding Sources and Their Suitability for Funding Basic and Applied Research.....	59
P. Funding Sources and Their Suitability for Addressing Short-term Emergency Needs.....	61
Q. Funding Sources and Their Suitability for Generating Research Products and Output	62
R. Capacity Versus Competitive Funding by Type of Research	68
S. Current Operational Environment Issues and the Importance of Sustaining Capacity Funding	72
T. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Capacity Funding System	73
U. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA capacity funding system	75
V. Recommendations on Changes to Improve the Capacity Funding System	75
W. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Competitive Funding System.....	76
X. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA competitive funding system	76
Y. Recommendations for Changes to Improve the Competitive NIFA (AFRI) Funding System.....	77
III. Cooperative Extension Service Survey Findings.....	79
A. Introduction	79
B. Respondent Profile	79
C. Federal Funding Types Received.....	79
D. How Federal Funds Received are Allocated	80
E. Scale of the Supported Enterprise	81
F. Capacity to Accommodate Increased Funding and Associated Activity Volume	82
G. Capacity Funding Versus Competitive Funding	83
H. Influence of Capacity Funding Investments on Success in Competitive Awards	85
I. NIFA Capacity Funding Versus NIFA Competitive Funding for Addressing NIFA Challenge Areas.....	86
J. Funding Source Suitability by Area of Output	87
K. Funding Source Flexibility	99
L. Hypothetical Impact of an Absence of Capacity Funds at LGUs.....	101
M. Hypothetical Effects of a Shift to 100% Competitive Funding.....	102

N. Funding Sources and Acceptance of Program Risk	104
O. Funding Sources and Their Suitability for Addressing Short-term Emergency Needs	105
P. Funding Sources and Their Suitability for Generating Extension Outputs.....	106
Q. Capacity Versus Competitive Funding by Type of Cooperative Extension Activity.....	111
R. Current Operational Environment Issues and the Importance of Sustaining Capacity Funding	114
S. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Capacity Funding System	115
T. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA capacity funding system.....	116
U. Recommendations on Changes to Improve the Capacity Funding System.....	117
V. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Competitive Funding System.....	118
W. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA competitive funding system	119

I. Institutional Survey Findings: Deans and Senior Administration in Agriculture, Forestry, and Veterinary Colleges at Land-grant Universities

A. Introduction

This survey was distributed to deans and senior administrators in colleges of agriculture, forestry, and veterinary medicine across the 1862 and 1890 land-grant universities as well as other institutions that receive capacity funds. The instrument was designed to assess their perspectives on NIFA capacity funding and AFRI competitive grants. It consisted of quantitative and qualitative measures developed to address the strengths and weaknesses of each system as well as the role these funding sources play in sustaining research and extension programs across each institution. The survey was distributed through SurveyMonkey with the assistance of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

Responses to open-ended questions have been summarized through review by TEconomy Partners, and individual responses de-identified.

B. Respondent Profile

Table 1: NIFA Land-grant Designation of the University

Land-Grant Designation	Number of Institutions	Surveys Returned	Response Rate
1862	59	30	51%
1890	19	17	89%
Non-LGU	15	4	27%

C. Federal Funding Types Received

Question 3: Which of the following federal funding sources are received by your institution?

Table 2: NIFA Types of Federal Funding Received by Institution

	1862	1890	Non-LGU
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	100%	100%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	83%	18%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	90%	76%	100%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	97%	100%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	79%	59%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	90%	94%	0%
NIFA Competitive Funds from AFRI	93%	65%	67%
Competitive/Contract Funds from the USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS)	90%	47%	0%
Other Federal Competitive Funds (e.g., NSF, NIH)	93%	71%	67%

D. How Federal Funds Received are Allocated

Question 4: *In which of the following ways does your institution internally distribute capacity funds?*

Table 3: Ways by Which Institution Allocates Funds

	1862	1890	Non-LGU
Discretionary allocations from College Dean	79%	76%	0%
Discretionary allocations from Research and Cooperative Extension Deans/Directors	76%	65%	0%
Formula distribution among departments	38%	18%	0%
Formula distribution among researchers/principal investigators	21%	35%	0%
Internal competitive grant process	69%	41%	100%
Other	10%	12%	0%

Write-in responses for "Other"

1862 institutions

- *Based on approved projects*
- *Formula goes to departments, but based on projects*

1890 Institutions

- *Formula based on priorities*
- *Funding based on priority needs with flexibility.*

Question 5. *Considering your response to the previous question, please describe the process in which capacity funds are distributed to support programs and projects at your institution. Within your institution is this process different for different colleges, schools, departments, or different funding mechanisms?*

Responses indicated two main ways in which capacity funds are distributed to support projects and programs. One is internal competitive processes with grant writing and peer review. The other is appropriation by senior leadership by need and priority or relevance to NIFA. These methods are not mutually exclusive within institutions. Alternatively, many respondents indicate that some or all of their capacity funds are allocated to salary support outside of the aforementioned processes.

E. Scale of the Supported Enterprise

Questions:

6. *What is the total number of research faculty (including tenure and non-tenure track) within your College, School, or Division?*

8. *What is the total number of non-faculty researchers (including post docs and technicians) within your College, School, or Division?*

10. *What is the total number of cooperative extension employees managed by your College, School, or Division?*

12. *What is the total number of supporting staff (including administrative, financial, marketing, communications, etc.) within your College, School, or Division?*

Table 4: Total number of research faculty (including tenure and non-tenure track), non-faculty researchers, cooperative extension employees, and support staff in respondent college, school, or division?

	Average Number of Research Faculty ¹	Average Number of Non-Faculty Researchers	Average of Cooperative Extension Employees	Average Number of Support Staff
1862	149	179	460	232
1890	18	16	47	17
Non-LGU	11	1	0	3

Question 7. *In the last three years, has the overall number of research faculty at your institution increased, decreased, or remained stable?*

Table 5: Trend in number of research faculty over the last three years

	Increased	Remained Stable	Decreased
1862	31%	28%	41%
1890	41%	35%	24%
Non-LGU	67%	33%	0%
All Institutions	37%	31%	33%

In your opinion, what is the primary reason for this?

Respondents who indicated that faculty levels increased suggested four common ways that these new faculty were funded: 1) increased success in competitive grants, 2) increased state funding, 3) internal reallocation, and 4) increased stakeholder demand.

Respondents who indicated that faculty levels remained stable or decreased suggested that negative or flat growth was due largely to two factors: 1) budgetary constraints at the institution and state levels. and 2) faculty retirement. Some respondents noted that their faculty levels remained stable because retiring faculty were successfully replaced, while other institutions experienced a decrease because of an inability to replace retiring faculty.

Question 9. *In the last three years, has the overall number of non-faculty researchers at your institution increased, decreased, or remained stable?*

Table 6: Trend in number of non-faculty researchers over the last three years

	Increased	Remained Stable	Decreased
1862	21%	41%	38%
1890	29%	41%	29%
Non-LGU	0%	67%	33%
All Institutions	22%	43%	35%

¹ Includes both tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty.

Question: *In your opinion, what is the primary reason for this?*

Respondents who indicated that the number of non-faculty researchers has increased suggest that increases in state and extramural funding have allowed for the hiring of new personnel.

Respondents who indicated stable growth in researchers suggest that stable funding levels have kept personnel levels consistent.

Respondents from institutions with decreases in non-faculty researchers most often attributed negative growth to state budgetary restrictions.

Question 11. In the last three years, has the overall number of cooperative extension employees increased, decreased, or remained stable?

Table 7: Trend in number of cooperative extension employees over the last three years

	Increased	Remained Stable	Decreased
1862	21%	41%	38%
1890	29%	41%	29%
Non-LGU	0%	67%	33%
All Institutions	22%	43%	33%

Question: *In your opinion, what is the primary reason for this?*

As in the responses described above, most respondents suggested that growth in extension employee levels is positively associated with availability of funding, such that increases in state, federal, and extramural funding opportunities have generally led to increases in extension employees, while overall decreases in funding has often led to a decrease in employees.

Question 13. In the last three years, has the overall number of supporting staff at your institution increased, decreased, or remained stable?

Table 8: Trend in number of supporting staff over the last three years

	Increased	Remained Stable	Decreased
1862	21%	41%	38%
1890	29%	41%	29%
Non-LGU	0%	67%	33%
All Institutions	22%	43%	35%

Question: *In your opinion, what is the primary reason for this?*

As in the questions above, decreases in staff employment levels most often appear to be directly related to budget increases or decreases at the state level.

F. Capacity to Accommodate Increased Funding and Associated Activity Volume

Question 14: *If your institution were to receive significantly more capacity or formula-based research funding, what percent increase in funding could be used without increasing your current FTE researcher count? In other words, how much more research funding could be effectively absorbed by your existing research staff?*

Table 9: Estimated capacity at institution to absorb increased capacity funding for research (how much more research funding could be effectively absorbed by existing research staff)

	Average % Increase
1862	76%
1890	33%
Non-LGU	133%
All Institutions	65%

Question 15: *If your institution were to receive significantly more capacity or formula-based cooperative extension funding, what percent increase in funding could be used without increasing your current FTE employment count? In other words, how much more cooperative extension funding could be effectively absorbed by your existing Cooperative Extension staff?*

Table 10: Estimated capacity at institution to absorb increased capacity funding for cooperative extension (how much more research funding could be effectively absorbed by existing cooperative extension staff)

	Average % Increase
1862	63%
1890	30%
Non-LGU	--
All Institutions	51%

G. Stability and Trajectory of Funding Sources

Question 16: *For each of the following sources, please indicate whether the total funding your institution received to support agricultural research and cooperative extension has increased, decreased, or remained stable over the past three years from this source?*

Table 11: Funding change over past three years by funding source/type

NIFA Capacity Funding for Agricultural Research	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	28%	72%	0%	0%
	1890	41%	59%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	31%	63%	0%	6%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	25%	43%	18%	14%
	1890	0%	19%	0%	81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	15%	32%	11%	43%

NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	18%	64%	7%	11%
	1890	29%	35%	6%	29%
	Non-LGU	0%	67%	33%	0%
	All Institutions	21%	54%	8%	17%
NIFA Competitive Funding/Grants for Research (AFRI)	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	41%	41%	10%	7%
	1890	31%	25%	13%	31%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	33%	33%
	All Institutions	35%	35%	13%	17%
Other Federal Funding/Grants for Research	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	66%	24%	10%	0%
	1890	31%	56%	13%	0%
	Non-LGU	33%	33%	0%	33%
	All Institutions	52%	35%	10%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funding for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	14%	71%	14%	0%
	1890	41%	59%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	23%	63%	8%	6%
NIFA Capacity Funding for Forestry Extension	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	7%	57%	7%	29%
	1890	29%	29%	0%	41%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	15%	44%	4%	38%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	4%	82%	11%	4%
	1890	35%	53%	6%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	15%	67%	8%	10%
NIFA Competitive Funding for Extension	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	25%	50%	14%	11%
	1890	35%	41%	12%	12%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	27%	44%	13%	17%
Other Federal Funding/Grants for Extension	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	36%	54%	7%	4%
	1890	19%	50%	13%	19%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	28%	49%	9%	15%
State Funding/Grants for Extension	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	21%	39%	32%	7%
	1890	35%	29%	24%	12%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	25%	33%	27%	15%
State Funding/Grants for Research	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	29%	36%	32%	4%
	1890	35%	29%	29%	6%
	Non-LGU	33%	33%	0%	33%
	All Institutions	31%	33%	29%	6%

Local/County Funding/Grants for Extension	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	25%	32%	21%	21%
	1890	25%	31%	13%	31%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	23%	30%	17%	30%
Local/County Funding/Grants for Research	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	14%	39%	0%	46%
	1890	6%	13%	6%	75%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	0%	67%
	All Institutions	11%	30%	2%	57%
Industry (Company) Funding/Grants for Research	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	45%	45%	3%	7%
	1890	25%	13%	6%	56%
	Non-LGU	33%	67%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	38%	35%	4%	23%
Commodity Group/Association Funding/Grants for Extension	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	18%	43%	7%	32%
	1890	6%	13%	6%	75%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	13%	30%	6%	51%
Commodity Group/Association Funding/Grants for Research	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	28%	48%	3%	21%
	1890	19%	19%	6%	56%
	Non-LGU	0%	67%	0%	33%
	All Institutions	23%	40%	4%	33%
Other Funding/Grants for either Extension or Research	Inst. Type	Increased	Stable	Decreased	Do not receive
	1862	36%	50%	11%	4%
	1890	13%	50%	6%	31%
	Non-LGU	67%	0%	0%	33%
	All Institutions	30%	47%	9%	15%

H. Capacity Funding Versus Competitive Funding

Question 17: For the following set of funding characteristics, indicate whether you think that capacity or competitive funding sources are more suited to funding each.

Table 12: Rating of Capacity Versus Competitive Funding by Application Characteristic and Associated Benefits

Leveraging matching state funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	76%	3%	21%	0%	0%	0%
	1890	94%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	84%	4%	12%	0%	0%	0%
Leveraging matching local and/or county funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	64%	11%	18%	0%	0%	7%
	1890	88%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	73%	8%	15%	0%	0%	4%

Leveraging matching commodity group funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	48%	7%	21%	7%	7%	10%
	1890	53%	12%	18%	0%	6%	12%
	Non-LGU	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	51%	10%	18%	4%	6%	10%
Leveraging matching foundation/non-profit funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	45%	10%	24%	7%	7%	7%
	1890	47%	6%	18%	0%	6%	24%
	Non-LGU	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	47%	10%	20%	4%	6%	12%
Leveraging or generating industry (company) funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	48%	7%	24%	10%	7%	3%
	1890	65%	6%	12%	0%	6%	12%
	Non-LGU	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	55%	6%	20%	6%	6%	6%
Supporting undergraduate engagement	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	31%	10%	48%	3%	0%	7%
	1890	59%	0%	35%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	39%	8%	45%	4%	0%	4%
Supporting graduate students/PhD candidates	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	7%	21%	41%	17%	10%	3%
	1890	35%	0%	41%	12%	0%	12%
	Non-LGU	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	18%	14%	41%	14%	6%	6%
Supporting international students	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	0%	11%	50%	11%	21%	7%
	1890	24%	6%	35%	24%	12%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	8%	8%	48%	15%	17%	4%
Supporting junior faculty	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	52%	28%	7%	7%	3%	3%
	1890	65%	18%	18%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	57%	22%	12%	4%	2%	2%

Supporting tenured/ senior faculty	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	24%	7%	17%	34%	17%	0%
	1890	35%	24%	29%	12%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	27%	13%	25%	25%	10%	0%
Supporting purchases of instruments, tools, and equipment	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	24%	28%	24%	21%	3%	0%
	1890	82%	6%	6%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	43%	22%	18%	14%	2%	0%
Supporting maintenance of instruments, tools, and equipment	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	28%	41%	17%	7%	3%	3%
	1890	6%	82%	12%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	18%	55%	18%	4%	2%	2%
Supporting maintenance of agricultural research fields/ farms and related- infrastructure	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	69%	21%	3%	3%	0%	3%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	33%	0%	67%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	78%	12%	6%	2%	0%	2%
Creating a national research system	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	45%	14%	28%	3%	10%	0%
	1890	76%	0%	24%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	53%	12%	27%	2%	6%	0%
Creating a national cooperative extension system	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	66%	17%	14%	0%	0%	3%
	1890	88%	0%	6%	0%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	33%	0%	0%	67%
	All Institutions	69%	10%	12%	0%	2%	6%
Providing prestige to the University	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Do not currently receive
	1862	7%	7%	21%	10%	52%	3%
	1890	35%	6%	41%	6%	12%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	16%	6%	31%	10%	35%	2%

I. NIFA Capacity Funding Use in Expanding Fundamental Capabilities at LGUs

Question 18. *What fundamental capacities have been recently built within your institution due to NIFA capacity funding?*

Many respondents discussed how capacity funds allowed their institutions to strengthen key program areas, while others noted that capacity funds provided the ability to introduce new program areas. Some respondents indicated that capacity funds provide for programmatic expansion through the hiring of new faculty and staff and support for graduate students. Additionally, several responses indicated that capacity funds provided for new opportunities in partnerships across institutions as well as for better integration of the core activities of research, extension, and education.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *We have attracted some great new faculty members to our experiment station and teaching missions. In part, our capacity funding has helped attract those members. We have also developed a new, effective system of linking producer needs with research activities at our centers through the extension service.*
- *A large percentage of Hatch funds support graduate students and helps meet the need for human capital in the agricultural sciences. Much of our Smith Lever funding supports county-based faculty and staff and programming in priority areas such as community nutrition, sustainable food systems, 4-H STEM programs and sustainable development.*
- *Started new faculty hires to support goals of NIFA, primarily during periods of reduced indirect cost generation at the institution. We have also refocused extension activities through strategic planning and identification of key outreach stakeholders across the spectrum of our communities.*
- *Increased the number of faculty, established integrated program teams, and made significant strategic investments in graduate students.*

1890 institutions

- *The capacity funds have allowed us to expand basic extension programming, new emerging technologies as well as value-added product development.*
- *We have been able to do the following: 1. Keep Extension faculty employed to serve citizens' needs. 2. Keep Research faculty employed to serve and respond to the needs of the citizens. 3. Experiment station is operational. 4. Viable animal herds for research and demonstrations. 5. Partnerships and collaborations have been built with key institutions.*

J. Hypothetical Impact of an Absence of Capacity Funds at LGUs

Question 19. *In what ways, if any, might Cooperative Extension at your institution be negatively affected by the absence of capacity funds?*

Responses suggested two main themes: 1) Without capacity funds, respondents believe there would be a significant reduction in, if not a complete cessation of their Cooperative Extension programs. 2) Without capacity funds, institutions would not have leverage to acquire more competitive funding and would risk the loss of matching state funds as well as funding from other sources. These outcomes would have significant negative impacts for the stakeholders and underserved communities impacted by extension programs.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Capacity funds are critical for supporting the scientific capacity (faculty) essential for success in providing statewide Extension programs. The absence of capacity funds would result in elimination of approximately 50 faculty positions leading to a significant contraction in overall Extension capacity. This level of contraction could only be absorbed by eliminating programs, which are designed and developed by faculty for delivery to stakeholders through a combination of channels. . . Contraction in Extension capacity associated with loss of capacity funds would limit our ability to be competitive for more than just NIFA, but also other federally competitive programs and promotion board funds.*
- *Approximately 20% of our programs and staff would be eliminated. It would likely require re-staffing and negotiation on matching with local government resulting in less funding from local government, further reducing our staff by another 20%. Faculty positions would be reduced causing a combining of responsibilities weakening many programs and reducing positive impact on our citizens and economy, especially our agricultural economy. We may have to eliminate some of our programs that have the least outside support, but that may serve our most vulnerable populations. State and county politics would likely ensure that big agriculture would remain a priority for our remaining funds. In our natural resources programs, the loss of capacity funding would result in the loss of several faculty and staff positions in key areas such as forestry, wood production, and tourism.*
- *Program activity and impact would decrease further. We have downsized in our state and nation greatly since 1980 in spite of the increasing need for Extension in problem solving. Extension capacity is primarily educators and problem solvers and we need more capacity and support funding if we are to successfully deal with the current and growing challenges in agriculture, families, nutrition, youth and communities. In addition, without federal capacity funds, a cohesive national land grant system will become even less of a reality than it is currently and the erosion of consistent regional and national working relationships will continue. Competitive grant funds, while valuable, do not foster long term systems and are not designed to do so, they can foster scientific project groups across regions but these come and go and a resulting silo-based research and extension presence nationwide is not the best model. To improve our overall mission impact nationwide, Extension would benefit from a more rational balance of federal capacity funds with competitive grants. A total reliance on competitive grant funds will not foster an effective system and this is clearly evidenced by the evolution of extension nationwide since the 1980s. Again, there has never been a time when there is a greater need for Extension work in agriculture, families, communities and environment and yet we are clearly in retreat from addressing this need effectively, especially at the Federal level.*
- *We would eliminate agents and faculty if capacity funds were no longer available, which in turn would lead to decreased programs and impacts. This would reduce state and county support for Extension programs, further eroding the budget and decreasing the support provided to farmers, families, youth and communities. With fewer faculty and agents, fewer competitive proposals would be developed and submitted, reducing grant funds and leading to additional reductions in staff and operating expenditures. It is unlikely that state or local funds would be available to replace federal capacity funds.*

1890 institutions

- *It would drastically reduce our capacity to generate and validate appropriate technologies for limited resource and underserved producers; as well as reduce our ability to accelerate the training and transfer of technologies to producers.*

- *All Cooperative Extension programs would cease in the absence of federal capacity funds. Therefore, this will severely diminish our capacity to respond to local issues and problems, particularly in the under-served, minority and small-scale farm communities. Capacity funding is key to sustainability and provide opportunity to respond to critical and emerging issues. Capacity funds provide the basic support to maintain operations.*
- *Cooperative Extension would be completely destroyed. All of the existing and potential partnerships would be disrupted. 2. Expertise needed to seek federal funding would be lost. 3. We would not be able to respond to local, state, regional and national crises. 4. We would not be able to serve the needs of [this state's] citizens in all areas of agriculture, family and consumer sciences or community development. 5. We would not be able to continue the work with at-risk youth. 6. Experiential learning activities for students would be greatly minimized. 7. We would not be able to provide opportunities for faculty / staff development.*

Question 20. *In what ways, if any, might Research at your institution be negatively affected by the absence of capacity funds?*

Responses indicated three main themes: 1) the absence of capacity funds would render institutions unable to support faculty, full-time staff, and graduate students and unable to purchase and maintain equipment and infrastructure (including lab spaces, greenhouses, farms, and fields). 2) Without capacity funds, respondents believe there would be a significant reduction or cessation of research programs. 3) Without capacity funds, institutions would not have leverage to acquire more competitive funding and would risk the loss of matching state funds as well as funding from other sources. These limitations would make it difficult for junior faculty to establish research programs and for all programs to meet important local, regional, and statewide needs of stakeholders.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *In our system, capacity funds are heavily used to support faculty and staff salaries in support of research in both agriculture and natural resources. The elimination of capacity funds would result in a reduction in force, and would eliminate many of our research activities. . . Because capacity funds are heavily invested in salaries, loss of those funds would result in a loss of both research faculty and support staff.*
- *Without capacity funds we would be unable provide seed funding for mission directed research. Seed funding enables preliminary results which makes researchers more competitive for external funding. We would be unable to maintain the facilities and critical staff that our researchers need to perform their research. Finally, some research critical for meeting our mission. . . is not easily supported using competitive grant funds. . .*
- *In short, this would be absolutely devastating to the institution. It would result in layoffs to technical support staff members and a major reduction in essentially all of our research programs including: agriculture, the environment, forestry, food safety and public health. We could not fulfill our statutory responsibilities or core mission in the absence of these funds and it would significantly reduce our ability to compete for extramural grants.*
- *The single largest impact would be a reduction of faculty and staff. Equipment and maintenance funding would also be reduced. Additionally, new faculty success in establishing competitive research programs would be hampered. The continuity of long term research would be impacted as competitive grants don't typically account for these kinds of long term problem based issues.*

1890 institutions

- *Like extension, research would essentially come to a halt. Much of our funding is associated with federal capacity funds. Without these funds we would not be able to support faculty or staff to conduct much needed research. The same faculty also teach, therefore our academic areas would also be affected.*
- *Most of our Research Programs would cease in the absence of federal capacity funds. Therefore, this will severely diminish our capacity to respond to local issues and problems. Capacity funds provide the basic support to maintain operations.*
- *It would be very difficult for our junior faculty to start research programs. They have full teaching loads within 3 years of arrival and need to have sustainable smaller-scale programs than faculty at Land Grant institutions. Without this funding, it is very difficult to obtain early investigator funding in the \$20,000 to \$50,000 per year range in competitive programs. Without research funding, our junior faculty will not be successful in the retention/promotion/tenure process under our "teacher-scholar" model.*

K. Programs Most and Least Reliant on Capacity Funding

Question 23. *What research areas, categories, or programs at your institution currently receiving capacity funding would be least suited to receiving another type of funding? In other words, which projects/programs are most reliant on capacity funding?*

Responses varied substantially. Some respondents discussed broad areas where capacity funding is important. For example, the 1890 institutions largely indicated that all research areas would suffer without capacity funds. Other broad responses included local and regional needs and new and emerging issues. Some respondents provided the names of specific research areas or programs. These included 4-H and youth development, production agriculture (including plant breeding and livestock health), nutrition (including EFNEP and SNAP education), food safety, pest management, and infectious disease.

Question 24. *What programs at your institution currently receiving capacity funding would be best suited to receiving another type of funding?*

The most common responses to this item generally focused on broad research capabilities. Most frequently, respondents (largely from the 1890 institutions) indicated that no programs currently receiving capacity funding would be suited to receiving another type of funding. The most common response from 1862 institutions was "basic research," and cutting edge research in areas like molecular biology and bioinformatics were also occasionally included.

L. Influence of Capacity Funding Investments on Success in Competitive Awards

Question 25. *For competitively funded research projects, has success with capacity funded projects influenced or impacted success receiving competitive grant awards?*

Table 13: Has success with capacity funds impacted success in receiving competitive funds?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
1862	93%	7%	0%
1890	100%	0%	0%
Non-LGU	67%	0%	33%
All Institutions	94%	4%	2%

Question 26. *For competitively funded research projects, what sort of influence does capacity research funding have in paying for and supporting the infrastructure and resources used to perform the competitively funded research?*

Responses indicate three main themes: 1) Without capacity funding, institutions would not be able to provide the infrastructure necessary to conduct competitively funded research. 2) Capacity funds provide stable support for faculty, full-time staff, and graduate students that competitive funding cannot provide with consistency. 3) Capacity funding provides institutions with the resources and seed funding to complete pilot studies that produce preliminary data necessary to acquire competitive funding.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *We very effectively use capacity funds to maintain and staff much of the infrastructure involving agricultural research, including farms, greenhouses and growth chambers, and this infrastructure is hugely important for our faculty when competing for grants on a national level.*
- *Capacity funds provide the initial funding for developing research projects, generating foundational data, framing questions and building competitive grant proposals. The capacity funds also bring together researchers on a single campus or regionally/nationally and create an environment for synergistic collaboration of diverse disciplines not available in a single location.*
- *It is essential and provides the foundation upon which competitively funded research proposals are built upon. Provides support for preliminary investigations and results which are increasingly essential in obtaining outside funding.*
- *Our capacity funds allow us to have teams in place who can take risks. These teams can then go after targeted competitive funds. Capacity funds can be used with state funds to provide essential start up for new faculty, lab equipment, lab renovation, and support staff. Without these in place, the potential for successfully completing competitively-funded research would be greatly reduced.*

1890 institutions

- *Capacity research funding has had tremendous influence in supporting the development and strengthening of infrastructure; and it has attracted top-level scientists at USDA/ARS to collaborate with scientists at our institution. This partnership has been instrumental in obtaining competitive grant funding. Additionally, it has helped build and equip laboratories for competitive research and training; and strengthened faculty professional development.*
- *Funds help to establish the foundation (i.e., supports personnel and infrastructure) needed to establish these programs. They provide stability and continuity to sustain programs.*

M. NIFA Capacity Funding Versus NIFA Competitive Funding for Addressing NIFA Challenge Areas

Question 27. For each of the six NIFA challenge areas, please indicate which funding source is best suited to meet funding requirements for research and cooperative extension projects/programs.

Table 14: Best Suited Funds for NIFA Designated Challenges

	Institution Type	NIFA Capacity Funds	NIFA Competitive Funds (AFRI)	All Other Competitive Funds	Not a Priority Area for Institution
Bioenergy	1862	18%	39%	25%	18%
	1890	76%	0%	6%	18%
	Non-LGU	67%	33%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	42%	25%	17%	17%
Childhood Obesity	1862	63%	15%	19%	4%
	1890	88%	6%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	33%	67%
	All Institutions	68%	11%	15%	6%
Climate Variability and Change	1862	21%	43%	36%	0%
	1890	65%	18%	12%	6%
	Non-LGU	67%	0%	33%	0%
	All Institutions	40%	31%	27%	2%
Food Safety	1862	66%	34%	0%	0%
	1890	76%	12%	6%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	33%	67%
	All Institutions	65%	24%	4%	6%
Food Security	1862	66%	31%	3%	0%
	1890	76%	12%	6%	6%
	Non-LGU	33%	0%	33%	33%
	All Institutions	67%	22%	6%	4%
Water	1862	50%	29%	21%	0%
	1890	65%	6%	12%	18%
	Non-LGU	67%	33%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	56%	21%	17%	6%

N. Current Operational Environment Issues and the Importance of Sustaining Capacity Funding

Question 28. Please rate the following challenges in terms of their importance and seriousness regarding the continued availability of capacity funds?

Table 15: Rating of challenges in terms of their importance and seriousness regarding the continued availability of capacity funds

	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
Decreases in federal funding	1862	62%	34%	3%	0%	0%
	1890	88%	0%	12%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	71%	22%	6%	0%	0%
State funding budget challenges limiting availability of matching funds	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	38%	28%	17%	14%	3%
	1890	88%	0%	12%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	33%	0%	67%	0%	0%
All Institutions	55%	16%	18%	8%	2%	
Pressure to shift federal resources from capacity funding to competitive funding	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	57%	21%	14%	7%	0%
	1890	88%	6%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%
All Institutions	69%	15%	13%	4%	0%	
Public knowledge and understanding about the importance of agricultural research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	41%	34%	24%	0%	0%
	1890	88%	12%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	33%	0%	33%	33%	0%
All Institutions	57%	24%	16%	2%	0%	
Public knowledge and understanding about the importance of cooperative extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	45%	31%	24%	0%	0%
	1890	76%	24%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	33%	0%	0%	33%	33%
All Institutions	55%	27%	14%	2%	2%	
Public knowledge and understanding about science	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	31%	52%	17%	0%	0%
	1890	71%	18%	12%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%
All Institutions	43%	39%	18%	0%	0%	
Continued shift of political representation toward urban areas	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	17%	52%	17%	14%	0%
	1890	47%	29%	24%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	33%	33%	33%	0%	0%
All Institutions	29%	43%	20%	8%	0%	
Other Critical Challenge	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	82%	9%	9%	0%	0%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
All Institutions	88%	6%	6%	0%	0%	

Write-in responses for “Other Critical Challenge”

1862 institutions

- *Mismatch between undergraduate student interests and the need to renew faculty in agriculture disciplines which creates a budget gap.*
- *Public understanding of food and agriculture*
- *Capacity funds allow new, innovative, but unproven scientific research that would otherwise be difficult to fund.*
- *The understanding of the land grant mission (even on a land grant campus). The need to seek competitive grants for success at the expense of solutions based research. the understanding of the federal state partnership.*
- *Rural states and 1890’s lack of capacity funds to be competitive with larger institutions in the AFRI arena*
- *Dearth of youth going into disciplines associated with food, agriculture, and natural resources*
- *Establish global partnerships to address world food needs*
- *Lack of understanding in the federal offices (other than NIFA) about the need for this program.*

1890 institutions

- *Continued loss of farmland by small and limited resource farmers.*
- *A continued decline in state appropriation is problematic.*
- *Disaster relief and mitigation*
- *Public knowledge of critical drivers such as population and climate change and need for public good science (knowledge generation and application)*
- *Matching requirement for 1890 institutions relative to competitive grant programs. Flexibility in use 1890 program funds to accommodate programming issues that are idiosyncratic to 1890 target audiences.*

O. Hypothetical Effects of a Shift to 100% Competitive Funding

Question 29. How much of your Research program would you say your institution could continue if capacity funds were entirely cut?

Table 16: Amount of Research that Institution Could Continue Without Capacity Funds

	Most of it	Some of it	Almost none of it	None of it
1862	24%	55%	14%	7%
1890	0%	0%	59%	41%
Non-LGU	0%	67%	33%	0%
All Institutions	14%	37%	31%	18%

Question 30. How much of your Cooperative Extension program would you say your institution could continue if capacity funds were entirely cut?

Table 17: Amount of Cooperative Extension Program that Institution Could Continue Without Capacity Funds

	Most of it	Some of it	Almost none of it	None of it
1862	10%	55%	21%	14%
1890	0%	0%	41%	59%
Non-LGU	0%	33%	0%	67%
All Institutions	6%	35%	27%	33%

Question 31. Which of the following best describe your outlook regarding state/local funding under this "all competitive-based funding" scenario? (Check all that apply).

Table 18: Outlook for State Funding Under an "All Competitive-based Funding" Scenario

State/Local Funding Under an "All Competitive" Federal Funding Model	1862	1890	Non-LGU	All Inst.
State/local funding would be very minimally affected, if at all	10%	0%	0%	6%
State/local funding would be impacted some, but not significantly	21%	0%	0%	12%
We would likely have to seek state/local match funding on a proposal-by-proposal basis	14%	18%	33%	16%
It will be difficult to generate the same total level of state/local funding	69%	47%	100%	63%
State/local funds for staffing/operations would be limited	59%	59%	0%	55%
State/local funds for infrastructure would be limited	55%	53%	33%	53%
State/local funding match might be available for some current programmatic activities, but not all	45%	6%	0%	29%
State/local funding might be significantly reduced or eliminated if it did not automatically leverage federal funding	52%	88%	67%	65%
State/local funding would increase, if we generated federal "competitive" funding in excess of our current federal "capacity" funding.	0%	0%	0%	0%

Question 32. For each of the following areas, would your institution struggle to maintain current levels of operations and performance in between competitive grant funding award periods if capacity funds were not available?

Table 19: Would Institution "Struggle" to Maintain Operations and Performance Between Competitive Funding Awards in the Absence of Capacity Funding

Laboratory/Building Infrastructure	Inst. Type	Definitely YES	Probably YES	Probably NOT	Definitely NOT
	1862	55%	10%	28%	7%
	1890	82%	12%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	67%	33%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	65%	12%	16%	6%
Research/Test Fields (Farms) Infrastructure	Inst. Type	Definitely YES	Probably YES	Probably NOT	Definitely NOT
	1862	69%	14%	14%	3%
	1890	88%	0%	0%	12%
	Non-LGU	67%	33%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	76%	10%	8%	6%
Research Personnel	Inst. Type	Definitely YES	Probably YES	Probably NOT	Definitely NOT
	1862	55%	31%	14%	0%
	1890	88%	0%	0%	12%
	Non-LGU	33%	33%	33%	0%
	All Institutions	65%	20%	10%	4%

Extension Personnel	Inst. Type	Definitely YES	Probably YES	Probably NOT	Definitely NOT
	1862	64%	29%	4%	4%
	1890	88%	0%	0%	12%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%
All Institutions	70%	17%	2%	11%	
Support Personnel	Inst. Type	Definitely YES	Probably YES	Probably NOT	Definitely NOT
	1862	55%	41%	0%	3%
	1890	88%	0%	0%	12%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	33%	33%
All Institutions	63%	27%	2%	8%	

Question 33. *What would be the most significant impacts to your institution's research and cooperative extension efforts of such a switch to completely competitive funding?*

Responses align with the themes presented in earlier questions in this survey: all or most research and extension efforts would cease, faculty and staff cuts would be necessary due to a decrease in funding for salaries, leverage to acquire competitive funding would be substantially reduced, and infrastructure enhancement and maintenance would be difficult.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Because a significant portion of capacity funds supporting research are allocated to faculty and staff salaries, we would be required to have a reduction in force to deal with the loss of capacity funds. That in turn would significantly reduce our research activities. In Extension, a shift from capacity funds to competitive funds would also likely result in the need for a reduction in force. Some programs that have capacity funds currently allocated to support program activities would also be impacted. That may be corrected for with competitive funds if they are allocated in appropriate program areas, and if faculty remain who are able to write the grants.*
- *We would bring in more competitive dollars (typically we bring in more than 'our share'). But we would lose some of the stability that comes with the foundational capacity funding and the ability to direct funds (competitive funds are mostly at the discretion of the investigator, capacity funds at the discretion of the directors).*
- *Our capacity funds allow research and extension to address emerging and major problems facing our state constituency. These individuals, commodity groups, and local governments are major agricultural producers and processors and make the case to the legislation for our Research and Extension state budget each year. If we are not responsive to these needs, our budget could be significantly cut. When all faculty and staff are dependent on competitive funding, our programs will most likely be reduced to no more than half and our ability to improve the lives of our citizens will be greatly diminished.*

1890 institutions

- *Switching to completely competitive funding would place us at a much lower competitive advantage in comparison to institutions having broader base support, including facilities and researchers.*
- *All programs would be diminished in the absence of federal capacity funds. Capacity funding helps to pay the infrastructure and resources to perform competitive research and extension programs by supporting the salaries of faculty, support staff, and the operation and maintenance of essential research and extension facilities.*

P. Administrative and Use Characteristics of Key Funding Sources

1. Development and Preparation of Proposals to Access Funds

Question 34. Rate the following funding sources on the level of administrative difficulty (e.g., time, effort, paperwork) involved for your institution in the development and preparation of proposals associated with these funds.

Table 20: Rating of Funding Types by “Level of Administrative Difficulty” for Proposal Development and Submission

	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	1862	3%	24%	28%	41%	3%	0%
	1890	0%	18%	53%	18%	12%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	2%	20%	35%	31%	6%	6%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/ Veterinary Research	1862	3%	7%	34%	34%	3%	17%
	1890	0%	0%	12%	0%	6%	82%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	2%	4%	24%	20%	4%	45%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	1862	3%	17%	24%	41%	3%	10%
	1890	0%	6%	41%	18%	6%	29%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	67%	33%	0%
	All Institutions	2%	12%	29%	35%	6%	16%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	7%	14%	28%	45%	3%	3%
	1890	0%	12%	59%	18%	12%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	4%	12%	37%	33%	6%	8%
Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	3%	14%	10%	41%	3%	28%
	1890	0%	6%	24%	24%	6%	41%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	2%	10%	14%	33%	4%	37%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	3%	24%	38%	31%	0%	3%
	1890	0%	6%	53%	24%	18%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	2%	16%	41%	27%	6%	8%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	1862	14%	38%	31%	10%	7%	0%
	1890	38%	31%	13%	6%	13%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	67%	33%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	21%	38%	25%	8%	8%	0%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	14%	41%	34%	3%	0%	7%
	1890	24%	24%	29%	6%	6%	12%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	16%	33%	31%	4%	2%	14%

All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	21%	31%	45%	3%	0%	21%
	1890	18%	47%	6%	18%	12%	18%
	Non-LGU	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	18%	41%	29%	8%	4%	18%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	14%	45%	28%	7%	0%	7%
	1890	12%	35%	18%	18%	6%	12%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	12%	39%	22%	10%	2%	14%
State/Local Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	3%	17%	34%	38%	3%	3%
	1890	12%	0%	41%	29%	6%	12%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	6%	12%	39%	33%	4%	6%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	3%	17%	41%	28%	3%	7%
	1890	12%	6%	35%	35%	6%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	6%	12%	37%	29%	4%	12%

2. Administration and Reporting Requirements

Question 35. Rate the following funding sources on the level of administrative difficulty (e.g., time, effort, paperwork) involved for your institution in the use, administration, and reporting requirements associated with these funds.

Table 21: Rating of Funding Types by “Level of Administrative Difficulty” for Reporting on Use of Funds

NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	24%	24%	31%	21%	0%	0%
	1890	18%	29%	35%	0%	18%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	20%	24%	31%	12%	6%	6%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/ Veterinary Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	10%	21%	31%	21%	0%	17%
	1890	0%	6%	6%	0%	6%	82%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	6%	14%	20%	12%	2%	45%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	14%	24%	28%	24%	0%	10%
	1890	6%	18%	41%	0%	6%	29%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	0%	33%	33%	0%
	All Institutions	10%	22%	31%	16%	4%	16%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	21%	21%	41%	14%	0%	3%
	1890	12%	29%	35%	0%	18%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	16%	22%	37%	8%	6%	10%
	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	14%	21%	24%	14%	0%	28%

NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1890	6%	18%	24%	0%	6%	47%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	10%	18%	22%	8%	2%	39%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	17%	24%	45%	10%	0%	3%
	1890	0%	35%	41%	0%	18%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	10%	27%	41%	6%	6%	10%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	14%	31%	41%	10%	0%	3%
	1890	6%	35%	18%	6%	12%	24%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	10%	31%	37%	8%	4%	10%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	10%	31%	52%	3%	0%	3%
	1890	6%	35%	35%	0%	18%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	8%	31%	43%	2%	6%	10%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	7%	28%	48%	17%	0%	0%
	1890	18%	24%	24%	18%	6%	12%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	10%	24%	43%	16%	2%	4%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	7%	34%	41%	10%	0%	7%
	1890	12%	29%	12%	24%	12%	12%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	8%	31%	29%	14%	4%	14%
State/Local Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	10%	41%	38%	7%	3%	10%
	1890	18%	41%	18%	6%	18%	18%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	33%	0%	33%	0%
	All Institutions	12%	41%	31%	6%	10%	12%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	7%	45%	31%	7%	10%	7%
	1890	13%	38%	25%	6%	19%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
	All Institutions	8%	40%	27%	6%	19%	8%

3. Recovering Indirect Costs

Question 36. Please rate the following funding sources on the difficulty your institution has in recovering indirect costs from these funds.

Table 22: Rating of Funding Types by “Difficulty in Recovering Indirect Costs”

	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	17%	7%	14%	17%	0%	45%
	1890	6%	0%	12%	0%	6%	76%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	12%	4%	12%	10%	2%	59%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/ Veterinary Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	17%	7%	10%	17%	48%	17%
	1890	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
	All Institutions	10%	4%	6%	10%	69%	10%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	17%	7%	10%	14%	0%	52%
	1890	0%	0%	12%	0%	0%	88%
	Non-LGU	67%	0%	0%	0%	33%	0%
	All Institutions	14%	4%	10%	8%	2%	61%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	21%	7%	10%	17%	0%	45%
	1890	6%	0%	13%	6%	6%	69%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	15%	4%	10%	13%	2%	56%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	21%	7%	7%	7%	0%	59%
	1890	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	94%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	12%	4%	4%	4%	2%	73%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	21%	7%	7%	21%	0%	45%
	1890	6%	0%	6%	6%	12%	71%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	14%	4%	6%	14%	4%	57%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	3%	14%	31%	28%	17%	7%
	1890	0%	18%	24%	29%	6%	24%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	0%	33%	33%	0%
	All Institutions	2%	16%	27%	29%	14%	12%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	3%	14%	34%	38%	3%	7%
	1890	0%	18%	24%	35%	6%	18%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	2%	14%	29%	35%	4%	16%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	3%	3%	31%	41%	21%	0%
	1890	6%	12%	29%	35%	12%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	33%	0%	33%	0%

	All Institutions	4%	8%	31%	37%	18%	2%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	3%	3%	34%	34%	14%	10%
	1890	6%	18%	18%	29%	18%	12%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	4%	8%	27%	31%	14%	16%
State/Local Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	28%	21%	10%	14%	10%	17%
	1890	6%	12%	18%	6%	0%	59%
	Non-LGU	33%	0%	33%	0%	0%	33%
	All Institutions	20%	16%	14%	10%	6%	33%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	25%	20%	15%	15%	25%	25%
	1890	13%	13%	6%	0%	69%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%
	All Institutions	18%	15%	10%	8%	49%	18%

4. Flexibility of Use

Question 37. Please rate the following funding sources in terms of how flexible they are regarding the types of expenditures they can be used for (e.g., labor, equipment, educational materials, program participation scholarship, student wages and stipends, etc.).

Table 23: Rating of Funding Types by “Flexibility of Use”

NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	31%	48%	10%	10%	0%	0%
	1890	35%	35%	6%	12%	12%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	31%	41%	8%	10%	4%	6%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	21%	41%	14%	7%	0%	17%
	1890	12%	0%	0%	0%	6%	82%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	16%	24%	8%	4%	2%	45%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	21%	38%	21%	7%	3%	10%
	1890	12%	35%	6%	6%	12%	29%
	Non-LGU	33%	67%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	18%	39%	14%	6%	6%	16%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	21%	57%	11%	7%	0%	4%
	1890	24%	29%	6%	18%	24%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	21%	44%	8%	10%	8%	8%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	14%	41%	10%	7%	0%	28%
	1890	6%	24%	6%	18%	6%	41%

	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	10%	33%	8%	10%	2%	37%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	21%	31%	17%	24%	3%	3%
	1890	6%	47%	18%	24%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	14%	35%	16%	22%	4%	8%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	7%	28%	21%	41%	3%	0%
	1890	0%	18%	18%	41%	0%	24%
	Non-LGU	0%	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	4%	27%	18%	41%	2%	8%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	7%	21%	24%	34%	7%	7%
	1890	0%	35%	12%	35%	0%	18%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	33%	67%
	All Institutions	4%	24%	18%	33%	6%	14%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	7%	28%	28%	31%	7%	0%
	1890	12%	24%	24%	24%	12%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	33%	33%	0%	0%	33%
	All Institutions	8%	27%	27%	27%	8%	4%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	7%	17%	28%	31%	7%	10%
	1890	6%	29%	18%	18%	18%	12%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	6%	20%	22%	24%	10%	16%
State/Local Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	14%	28%	21%	34%	0%	3%
	1890	6%	47%	12%	12%	6%	18%
	Non-LGU	33%	33%	0%	0%	0%	33%
	All Institutions	12%	35%	16%	24%	2%	10%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
	1862	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	1890	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Question 38. Please provide any relevant recent (i.e., last three years) examples or experiences of the different ways in which the funding sources listed in the previous question are more or less flexible.

While respondents typically rate capacity funds as more flexible than competitive funds, some common concerns emerge about both funding sources. Respondents expressed frustration that capacity funds cannot be used for tuition remission and that certain equipment purchases must now be pre-approved.

Capacity funds can, however, be repurposed more easily than competitive funds, which cannot generally be used outside of the specific project they were awarded to.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *In Extension, both capacity and state funds have the flexibility that allows hiring staff who are able to meet the changing needs of stakeholders. They also allow us to shift to support emerging programs or new problems. Competitive funds are tied to specific projects so have less flexibility to support Extension activities. Capacity funds for research are more inflexible due to restrictions on their allocation to salaries tied to specific projects. They are not able to be used to address infrastructure needs. Competitive funds are more flexible as they are dedicated to supporting specific projects developed to address the needs of the state and region.*
- *NIFA Capacity funds, minus new equipment preapproval requirement, have been exceptionally flexible at budgeting and determination of use. Competitive grants are very closely held to budget request, with changes permitted within given ranges with approval.*
- *A significant barrier to the use of these funds is the prohibition of payment of tuition for students provided graduate assistantships to conduct Research and Extension programs. Our institution requires that every student provided an assistantship must include funding for tuition, but many USDA grants prohibit payment of tuition. Training the next generation of scientists, educators, and outreach professionals will be severely constrained with more flexibility in the use of funds to support graduate education.*

1890 institutions

- *1) Capacity funds couldn't be used to support student tuition 2) Pre-requirement for equipment purchase 3) Capacity funds are not allowable for purchasing program promotional items.*
- *Requires prior federal agency approval to purchase equipment. Items are not approved without extensive justification. Extension's inability to hire students with these funds.*

Q. Recommendations for Streamlining or Improving NIFA Funding Processes and Reporting

Question 39. *Provide any recommendations you may have to streamline processes, enhance flexibility of use, or simply/improve reporting requirements associated with NIFA capacity funding for Research and/or Cooperative Extension.*

Many respondents indicated that various aspects of reporting can be streamlined and simplified, particularly Plan of Work and impacts reporting. Responses suggest the amount of time required to meet reporting requirements is overwhelming for many institutions.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Reporting should be based on national data needs, rather than an exhaustive data set for activities, contacts, etc. The days of counting heads should be behind us, what matters is the impacts that have resulted from the Research results and the Extension education provided. National Program Leaders, working cooperatively with a representative group of faculty in appropriate knowledge areas, should establish a small number of metrics by which programs are measured and reported. These metrics should be aggregated from the local level to the state level and finally to the national level. Adoption of the national impacts database as the source of success stories and text-based examples of impacts should be considered. Currently, it is not uncommon to be asked to submit the same financial reports 2, 3 or 4 times, for a single fiscal*

year. Repeated requests for information that has previously been submitted should be eliminated.

- *The improvement of reporting requirements and reporting websites (REEReport, ASAP, Plan of Work) are always in need. The need for more information to be shared between systems and the pre-populating of information is apparent.*
- *Reporting is relatively straightforward and easily accomplished for capacity funds supporting research or Extension. Completing the overall plan of work and progress reports are the most time-consuming components of reporting for these funds. Although the Plan of Work and Progress Reporting are the most time-consuming component related to use of capacity funds, they are valuable tools that allow us to see if funds are being used as planned and what the impact of those funds are.*
- *Reduce time and effort required for POW and Report of Accomplishments - ours is >300 pages and there is little evidence of how it is used. Annual POW and ROA requirements for capacity funding remain voluminous and in some cases, duplicative. A simplified and standardized impact reporting system would be helpful. Simple impact/success stories may be more widely used and helpful.*

1890 institutions

- *The establishment of a common national reporting tool such as the one developed for EFNEP (WebNeers)*
- *1. Electronic report with minor modifications to the current REEReport system. 2. Each institution should be able to submit their individual plan instead of forced reporting between 1890 and 1862 institutions.*
- *1. The reporting E-System must be user friendly. 2. The reporting E-System must be operational at the time reports are requested. There have been occasions when the system would not allow information to be entered and/or submitted to the funding agencies.*

Question 40. *Provide any recommendations you may have to streamline processes, enhance flexibility of use, or simply/improve reporting requirements associated with NIFA competitive funding for Research and/or Cooperative Extension.*

A large number of respondents suggest no recommended changes to the competitive funding system. Again, some respondents suggest reporting can be streamlined. Additionally, some respondents suggested changes to the submission process in the form of pre-proposal submissions, multiple submission dates, or shorter review periods.

R. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Capacity Funding System

Question 41. *List what you believe are the greatest strengths/advantages of the NIFA capacity funding system.*

Common responses included arguments presented in earlier questions. These include stability and consistency in funding levels, enhancement and maintenance of infrastructure, and leverage to acquire competitive funding. The most common response to this question indicates that institutions value the flexibility of capacity funding, as it allows for funds to be reallocated to issues of local or regional importance quickly and effectively.

S. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA capacity funding system

Question 42. List what you believe are the greatest weaknesses/disadvantages of the NIFA capacity funding system.

A substantial number of respondents expressed frustration with the amount of funding available. Respondents share a concern that the amount of capacity funding available has not kept pace with either inflation or increases in the cost of doing research, resulting in an erosion of buying power over time. Some respondents from small states and institutions argued that there is inequity in the funding system that disadvantages their institutions. Additionally, respondents criticized the complexity of the reporting system.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *There is simply not enough money being provided in the capacity funding system. Over time, costs for conducting research have increased while capacity funds have decreased. Additionally, these funds need to be MORE stable in order for us to continue our work and focus on the land-grant mission.*
- *It has been flat or nearly so for years, while costs keep going up, therefore in effect declining. It is also unfairly and inaccurately perceived by a congress and public that are increasingly disconnected from agriculture and natural resources as a handout or unfair competition for federal funds. They do not understand how crucial capacity funds have been to state and local economies, and have transformed our society for the better.*

1890 institutions

- *The formula restrictions for smaller states limits institutions in these states to be competitive.*
- *The 20% carryover of extension funds. Recommend 100% carryover as with Smith-Lever.*
- *The lack of equity in funding in comparison with 1862 institutions. Limited carryover period in comparison to 1862 institutions. Bureaucracy delays the ability to purchase equipment, thereby delaying programming. The lack of significant increase in capacity funding.*
- *There is no mechanism by which the federal government can obligate the states to match their funds at the same funding level, especially for 1890s. The 1890 institutions could benefit from additional funding based on the population they serve and the impact they are making in the communities they are serving.*

T. Recommendations on Changes to Improve the Capacity Funding System

Question 43. Describe what changes you think would be beneficial to improve the impacts of NIFA capacity funding system.

The most common response indicated that respondents would like to see capacity funding increased to maximum allowable levels. Respondents also suggested that further increases in competitive funding should not come at the expense of capacity funding. Some respondents argued that the formulas should be updated to reflect demographic changes to ensure that localized needs are met. Additionally, respondents from small institutions argued that 1) a larger percentage of funding should be provided to rural universities and 1890 institutions, and 2) the carryover rule for 1890 institutions should be changed to allow 100% of funds to be carried over annually as opposed to the current limit of 20%. Another common theme was a desire for simplified reporting requirements, which respondents argued could save large amounts of time and money.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *More timely notification of award amount and allocation to spend. We realize that this depends heavily on Congressional actions. Revert to the former equipment purchase policy. Allow more flexibility in use of capacity funds in research (i.e., allow some portion to be used if needed to address infrastructure needs).*
- *Efforts should be made to inform federal, state and local legislatures on the benefits of the capacity funding in supporting various research endeavors and how this impact the daily lives of our citizens.*
- *Increase funding to the authorized level in the Farm Bill. Elected officials need to recognize that agricultural production in the U.S. is the most efficient sector of U.S. industries producing the lowest cost and highest quality food in the world. This high-value, low-cost industry has been built using capacity funds for research and extension. The U.S. medical system is also recognized as being the best in the world but it is also the most expensive. The medical research has been built largely by competitive funding.*
- *A change in the 1:1 cost match requirement would greatly benefit my state, and allow us to provide a greater amount of funding to address single important problems rather than being concerned with the need to have many faculty involved in capacity programs in order to have sufficient State salaries to meet our cost-match.*

1890 institutions

- *Improve funding equity of 1890 institutions comparable to 1862 institutions. Improve the disparity of funding levels of EFNEP and RREA for 1890s compared to 1862s. The accountability and expectation, however, are the same for all institutions. Retraining and retooling of senior faculty to enhance productivity and effectiveness. Allows for student recruitment and experiential learning.*
The changes we suggest are: 1. Grow capacity funds portfolio versus competitive funding. 2. Revamp the plan of work process 3. Improved awareness of the impact of NIFA capacity funds to the general public. 4. Ensure that regulations and guidelines affecting the use of these fund are clear transparent and practical. 5. Ensure that 1890s have the same carry forward clause that 1862's have relative to capacity funds. 6. Recognize that 1890's and 1862's programs are not exactly alike and the need to acknowledge institutional and operational differences.

U. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Competitive Funding System

Question 44. List what you believe are the greatest strengths/advantages of the NIFA competitive funding system.

Respondents noted two key strengths of competitive funding. The first is the peer review process, which many respondents believe enhances the overall quality of science and rewards the most capable researchers through an open process. In addition to conferring prestige on successful institutions, respondents argue that the peer review process and competitive funding in general encourage innovation by giving preference to cutting-edge research. The second key theme is that competitive funding fosters interdisciplinarity and collaboration, both within and between institutions. Additionally, the competitive funding system allows for targeted, in-depth research, especially projects that focus on issues of national priority.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Allows faculty with strong program ideas to compete for funding to support their program areas. The need to develop strong partnerships with other researchers within a region or across the nation. (Sometimes individual faculty see this as a negative factor)*
- *1) A competitive system directs funding to those institutions and individuals who are best able to articulate the need for a planned activity, have identified the best way of conducting the activity, and have the capacity to complete the planned work. In other words, a competitive system fosters innovation, strategic thinking and planning, and articulation thereof. In contrast, allocating resources strictly on a competitive basis fosters complacency and the status quo. 2) Competitive process is better able to allocate resources to achieve the biggest return on investment.*
- *Peer-review panel process, when administered well, tends to enhance the quality and rigor of science supported by funding.*

1890 institutions

- *Enhances institution's prestige. Opportunity to increase research and extension contributions by 1890s.*
- *Since it's merit based, it strives for research effectiveness by giving funding to the most productive institutions. It helps in addressing national research priorities as set by the RFA. Integrated projects will strengthen the links between all three missions of the land grant goals: academic, research and extension. The peer-review process and objectivity of the competition process, provides valuable feedback to non-funded proposals to help them improve quality over time.*

V. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA competitive funding system

Question 45. *List what you believe are the greatest weaknesses/disadvantages of the NIFA competitive funding system.*

Responses indicate many common criticisms of the competitive funding system, in addition to concerns that there is not enough money available. Respondents from small institutions argued that they are inherently disadvantaged by the competitive system. Researchers from larger, research-focused universities have more time (because of smaller or nonexistent teaching loads), more resources, and more grant writing experience that make it easier for them to submit successful proposals. The matching requirements also limit the ability of smaller institutions in disadvantaged states to compete. Several other key themes emerge which limit the effectiveness of competitive funding, including 1) a low success rate, which discourages researchers from seeking competitive funding; 2) narrow Requests for Application for national priority areas, which are set by bureaucrats; 3) uncertainty from year-to-year, so capacity funds must be used for infrastructure and salaries; 4) inflexibility, which makes reallocation for local and regional or new and emerging needs difficult; and 5) high transaction costs, which also discourages applying for competitive funding and reduced the amount of money and time left for research and extension activities.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *1. Potential disruption of funding for long-term programs. 2. Large amounts of wasted effort when success rates are low. 3. Possibility that "trendy" science will be funded at the expense of more traditional lines of inquiry that better meet the needs of some constituencies. 4. Inability to respond quickly to emerging issues.*

- *1. Short-term, unstable funding is a poor way to support important programs that help ensure a stable food supply, economy, security, health, and youth development. 2. Hiring people on short-term contracts is not a good approach for having the best people working on some of society's most important problems and ensuring a positive future. 3. Many funding groups want to ensure there is a knowledgeable, stable, viable, and well-resourced partner they can depend on for matching funding and for producing great impacts. 4. Programs sometimes change dramatically or disappear from year to year, which makes planning on large interdisciplinary, multi-institution projects difficult. 5. Need more funding in large projects. 6. NIFA competitive funding has moved to support mostly very large collaborative research projects. Funding for medium level collaborative projects is scarce but these projects are often critical to stakeholders in a state or region. 7. The lack of decision making ability on the part of program managers. At times review panels don't have the necessary expertise or information to effectively evaluate and rank proposals.*
- *Transactional costs are very high due to the low success rate. It is very difficult for even the best scientist to stay continuously funded which argues for capacity funds to help close the gap as needed.*
- *It puts smaller states and institutions at a considerable disadvantage for reasons stated above, and the results and application of research and extension from the larger institutions is less relevant and impactful to stakeholders in smaller states. Studies have borne this out.*

1890 institutions

- *Although it is an open process, being compared to aspirational peers and non-peers that have more resources places 1890s at a disadvantage. The RFAs are not published in a timely manner. The requirement of matching funds. Short term funding. High transaction costs. Large research organizations have greater advantage to obtain funds because they have more resources/manpower and stronger infrastructure.*
- *It doesn't support the infrastructure needs because it would fund operation costs and does not have a core budget for salaries and maintenance. Could show bias toward strong research institutions and increase "inequity issues" due to the lack of competitive capacity of smaller institutions. Programming in extension and output in research would vary from year to year based on when funding is secured. Staff hiring would vary from year to year, so no stability would be in place, especially in the counties. We may lack the capacity to write for competitive grants if current staff employed on capacity funds were not in place.*

W. Recommendations for Changes to Improve the Competitive NIFA (AFRI) Funding System

Question 46. In the space below, please describe what changes you think would be beneficial to improve the impacts of the NIFA (AFRI) competitive funding system.

Several key themes have already been addressed in other questions. Recommendations to improve the impacts of the competitive funding system include 1) increasing funding to maximum allowable level while not simultaneously reducing capacity funding; 2) reforming the submission process to allow for shorter review, more submission dates, longer project timelines, and broader calls for projects; 3) make funding more equitable, so smaller institutions (particularly the 1890 universities) do not face clear challenges that larger institutions can avoid, perhaps through tiered competition; and 4) encourage and support more collaboration between institutions and new partnerships with agencies, businesses, and institutions.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Increase the pool of funds to the authorized level of \$700 million. Streamline the panel process and move to more pre-proposal submissions - require more partnerships, i.e., require 1890 and 1862 institutions in the same state or region to partner to apply for major AFRI awards.*
- *Increase AFRI funding to the full authorized level. Require some of the paperwork (e.g., mentoring plan, data management plan) for projects that have been recommended for funding, as opposed to upfront at submission. Reduce allowable page limit for single-function research or extension proposals. Improve the evaluation process to be sure the outreach requirement is fully integrated with the research. Shorten the term and decrease the approved funding for CAP grants, increase effort to evaluate progress during the term of the CAP grants.*

1890 institutions

- *1. Make AFRI funds available in two competitive categories- small to medium sized institutions and large established institutions. 2. Balance the review teams with individuals from small, medium and large institutions. 3. Eliminate the matching requirements for 1890's on certain AFRI grants. 4. Encourage collaborative proposal submissions between larger established and small /medium schools around specific emerging issues. 5. Increase the award amount per grant award and increase the duration of the award period. 6. Raise overall funding for the amount of AFRI to that of NSF and NIH.*

II. Research and Experiment Station Survey Findings

A. Introduction

This survey was distributed to research and experiment station directors across the 1862 and 1890 Land-grant universities as well as other institutions that receive capacity funds. The instrument was designed to assess their perspectives on NIFA capacity funding and AFRI competitive grants. It consisted of quantitative and qualitative measures developed to address the strengths and weaknesses of each system as well as the role these funding sources play in sustaining research across each institution. The survey was distributed through SurveyMonkey with the assistance of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

Responses to open-ended questions have been summarized through review by TEconomy Partners, and individual responses de-identified.

B. Respondent Profile

Table 24: NIFA Land-grant Designation of the University

Land-Grant Designation	# of Institutions	Surveys Returned	Response Rate
1862	59	44	75%
1890	19	16	84%
Non-LGU	15	2	13%

C. Federal Funding Types Received

Question 3. *Which of the following federal funding sources for Research are received by your institution (university or college)?*

Table 25: NIFA Types of Federal Funding Received by Institution

	1862	1890	Non-LGU	All Institutions
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	98%	100%	50%	97%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	90%	19%	0%	70%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	94%	63%	100%	87%
NIFA Competitive Funds from AFRI	88%	88%	50%	87%
Competitive/Contract Funds from the USDA Agricultural Research Service (ARS)	86%	50%	0%	75%
Other Federal Competitive Funds (e.g., NSF, NIH)	96%	75%	0%	88%
Other State Competitive Funds	86%	56%	50%	78%

D. How Federal Funds Received are Allocated

Question 4. *In which of the following ways does your institution internally distribute capacity funds for Research? Please check all that apply.*

Table 26: Ways by Which Institution Allocates Funds

	1862	1890	Non-LGU	All Institutions
Discretionary allocations from leadership (e.g., College Dean, Research Director)	90%	75%	0%	84%
Formula distribution among departments	47%	13%	0%	37%
Formula distribution among researchers/principal investigators	31%	56%	0%	36%
Formula distribution among technical/topical areas	22%	25%	0%	22%
Internal competitive process	71%	38%	50%	63%
Other	8%	13%	50%	10%

Write-in responses for "Other"

1862 institutions

- *All capacity funds support faculty salaries.*
- *Distribution is not necessarily based on formula.*
- *Designation for faculty salary support.*

1890 institutions

- *Peer review process.*
- *Funding based on priority needs, with flexibility.*
- *Formula based on priorities.*

Non-Land-grant institutions

- *Collective decision.*

Question 5. *Considering your response to the previous question, please describe the process in which capacity funds for Research are distributed to support projects at your institution. Within your institution is this process different for different colleges, schools, departments, or different funding mechanisms?*

Responses indicate four main ways in which capacity funds are distributed: 1) by project priority, 2) through internal formulas, 3) through internal competitive processes, and 4) for salary support, which occurs outside of the other methods. Several respondents indicate that this varies by department or college within their institution.

E. Scale of the Supported Enterprise

Question 6. *What is the total number of Research faculty (tenure track and non-tenure track faculty with at least partial research appointments) within your College, School, or Division?*

Table 27: Average Number of Research Faculty by Institutional Designation

	Average Number of Research Faculty
1862	172
1890	17
Non-LGU	5
All Institutions	129

Question 7. *In the last three years, has this number of Research faculty increased, decreased, or remained stable?*

Table 28: Change in Faculty Numbers in Past Three Years

	Increased	Remained Stable	Decreased
1862	35%	29%	37%
1890	38%	44%	19%
Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%
All Institutions	36%	33%	31%

Question. *In your opinion, what is the primary reason for this?*

Responses indicate that increases in faculty employment were due primarily to increases in funding from state and competitive sources outside of the capacity funding system.

Responses indicate that steady faculty employment levels are most often due to stable or declining funding at the state and federal levels.

Responses indicate that decreases in faculty employment were mainly due to decreases in state and/or federal funding as well as more retirements than could be filled.

Question 8. *What is the total number of non-faculty researchers (including post docs and technicians) within your College, School, or Division?*

Table 29: Average Number of Non-faculty Researchers by Institutional Designation

	Average # of Non-faculty Researchers
1862	211
1890	18
Non-LGU	2
All Institutions	157

Question 9. *In the last three years, has this number of non-faculty researchers increased, decreased, or remained stable?*

Table 30: Change in Non-faculty Researcher Numbers in Past Three Years

	Increased	Remained Stable	Decreased
1862	22%	39%	39%
1890	31%	44%	25%
Non-LGU	0%	100%	0%
All Institutions	24%	42%	34%

Question. *In your opinion, what is the primary reason for this?*

The most common responses are identical to those of the previous question.

F. Capacity to Accommodate Increased Funding and Associated Activity Volume

Question 10. *If your institution were to receive significantly more capacity or formula-based research funding, what percent increase in funding could be used without increasing your current FTE researcher count? In other words, how much more research funding could be effectively absorbed by your existing research staff?*

Table 31: Estimated Capacity at Institution (as a %) to Absorb Increased Capacity Funding for Research (how much more research funding could be effectively absorbed by existing research staff)

	Average % Increase
1862	72%
1890	43%
Non-LGU	125%
All Institutions	66%

G. Capacity Funding Versus Competitive Funding

Question 11. *For the following set of research funding characteristics, please indicate whether you think that capacity or competitive funding sources are more suited to funding each.*

Table 32: Rating of Capacity Versus Competitive Funding by Application Characteristic and Associated Benefits

	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
Leveraging matching state funding	1862	70%	9%	19%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	77%	8%	14%	2%	0%	0%
Leveraging matching local and/or county funding	1862	53%	13%	17%	0%	0%	17%
	1890	80%	7%	0%	0%	0%	13%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	59%	13%	13%	0%	0%	16%

Leveraging matching commodity group funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	32%	17%	30%	2%	4%	15%
	1890	44%	6%	19%	6%	6%	19%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	35%	15%	26%	3%	5%	15%
Leveraging matching foundation/non-profit funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	28%	11%	47%	4%	4%	6%
	1890	38%	6%	19%	0%	13%	25%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
	All Inst.	31%	9%	38%	3%	8%	11%
Leveraging or generating industry (company) funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	28%	19%	34%	6%	4%	9%
	1890	44%	6%	19%	0%	19%	13%
	Non-LGU	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	34%	15%	29%	5%	8%	9%
Supporting under-graduate engagement	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	23%	17%	49%	9%	0%	2%
	1890	50%	6%	38%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%
	All Inst.	29%	15%	45%	8%	2%	2%
Supporting graduate students/ PhD candidates	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	9%	23%	49%	13%	4%	2%
	1890	19%	13%	56%	6%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
	All Inst.	12%	20%	49%	11%	6%	2%
Supporting international students	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	2%	15%	43%	21%	19%	0%
	1890	19%	6%	38%	19%	6%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%
	All Inst.	6%	12%	42%	20%	17%	3%
Supporting junior faculty	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	47%	26%	19%	4%	2%	2%
	1890	81%	13%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
	All Inst.	55%	22%	15%	3%	3%	2%

Supporting tenured/ senior faculty	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	9%	4%	43%	30%	15%	9%
	1890	25%	31%	25%	19%	0%	25%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%
	All Inst.	12%	11%	38%	26%	12%	12%
Supporting faculty by buying-out teaching time	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	4%	6%	15%	15%	32%	28%
	1890	31%	19%	19%	6%	19%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%
	All Inst.	11%	9%	17%	12%	29%	22%
Supporting purchases of instruments, tools, and equipment	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	26%	19%	28%	19%	9%	26%
	1890	75%	13%	6%	0%	6%	75%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	37%	18%	23%	14%	8%	37%
Supporting maintenance of instruments, tools, and equipment	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	43%	28%	17%	4%	4%	4%
	1890	81%	6%	6%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	51%	22%	17%	5%	3%	3%
Supporting maintenance of agricultural research fields/ farms and related-infrastructure	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	70%	15%	9%	2%	4%	70%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	75%	11%	9%	2%	3%	75%
Creating a national research system	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	53%	17%	26%	2%	2%	53%
	1890	81%	6%	13%	0%	0%	81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%
	All Inst.	58%	14%	22%	3%	3%	58%

H. Hypothetical Impact of an Absence of Capacity Funds at LGUs

Question 12. *In what ways, if any, might Research at your institution be negatively affected by the absence of federal capacity funds?*

The most common response indicates that the majority of institutions would have to substantially reduce, if not completely cease, all research programs without the support of capacity funds. There would also be a lack of leverage to attain other sources of funding, an inability to address long-term and local and regional needs, a lack of support for faculty and staff salaries, and an inability to purchase and maintain equipment and lab spaces.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *We would lose 20% of our tenure track faculty and would have to close most of our farms. We would also lose state funding because they would no longer be willing to provide match since there would be nothing to match. All in all, we would probably lose about 30% of our faculty counting the cut in state funding. We would lose the ability to match state competitive funding and lose approximately 40% of our start up funding since our state start up must be matched with federal funding. Our capacity funds are critical as match for our start up. With the consequent cut in start up we would no longer be competitive in attracting excellent researchers relative to private institutions.*
- *Support of graduate students, particularly for early career faculty and support of students from competitive grants for early career faculty places tremendous pressure on the budget of smaller (industry) awards. Smaller industry or commodity group grants tend to be the types of grants early career faculty obtain.*
- *Without capacity funds, we would lose our ability to maintain the base level of technical staff, field facilities, animal herds and research equipment required to respond to the critical research needs of our stakeholders. This would reduce our ability to facilitate not only long-term data collection and multidisciplinary investigation needed to address issues such as climate change adaptation from a systems perspective, but also impair our ability to respond to emerging issues with greater urgency than competitive funding would usually allow.*

1890 institutions

- *Creating and maintaining basic infrastructure to conduct research would not be possible without capacity funding. Without basic infrastructure, competitive funding proposals would not get funded and research would cease to exist.*
- *If the Federal Capacity funds are not made available, research in our institution would suffer. The capacity funds enable specialized research faculty and supports the. The regular faculty in our institution are overloaded with teaching. We also have a high percentage of under-prepared students with whom faculty spend a lot of time resulting in no time becoming available to do research.*

I. Programs Most and Least Reliant on Capacity Funding

Question 13. *What Research areas, categories, or programs at your institution currently receiving capacity funding would be least suited to receiving another type of funding? In other words, which area, categories, or programs are most reliant on capacity funding?*

Some respondents addressed broader capacity, while others described specific research topics that would be affected by a loss of capacity funds. Broadly, many respondents (and those from the 1890 institutions in particular) noted that no research programs are suited to other types of funding. Several respondents also addressed the challenges of funding salaries without capacity funding. Specific research topics mentioned included sustainable agriculture, biorenewables, and bioenergy; forestry; pest management; and applied agriculture.

Question 14. *What Research areas, categories, or programs at your institution currently receiving capacity funding would be best suited to receiving another type of funding?*

Respondents (especially those from the 1890 institutions) indicate that no research programs are best suited to other types of funding. However, many respondents indicate that basic research, research on topics of national importance, and cutting-edge research (particularly fields like bioinformatics, biotechnology, and biomedical sciences) could be successfully funded through other means.

J. Influence of Capacity Funding Investments on Success in Competitive Awards

Question 15. *For competitively funded research projects, has success with capacity funded projects influenced or impacted success receiving competitive grant awards?*

Table 33: Influence of Capacity Funding on Achieving Success in Competitive Awards

	Capacity funding success has had a <u>very significant impact</u> on competitive funding success	Capacity funding success has had a <u>significant impact</u> on competitive funding success	Capacity funding success has had <u>limited impact</u> on competitive funding success	Don't Know	Have not received any competitive-based research funding
1862	68%	23%	2%	4%	2%
1890	63%	13%	13%	6%	6%
Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
All Institutions	65%	22%	6%	5%	3%

Question 16. *If applicable -- Do you believe that the strengths of your institution's capacity-funded Cooperative Extension operations and programs improve your institution's capacity-funded Research activities?*

Table 34: Influence of Cooperative Extension on Improvement of Capacity-funded Research Activity

	Yes	No	Don't Know/Not Applicable
1862	91%	6%	2%
1890	88%	0%	13%
Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%
All Institutions	88%	5%	8%

Question. *If yes, how? If no, why not?*

Respondents who answered “yes” to this question suggest that integration of research and extension activities largely functions through feedback that occurs in both directions. Extension programs provide researchers with ideas for projects that are vital to stakeholders, while researchers rely on extension programs to transfer technology and disseminate findings to their communities. Respondents who answered “no” indicated that research and extension activities are not integrated enough to impact each other.

Question 17. *If applicable -- Do you believe that the strengths of your institution's capacity-funded Cooperative Extension operations and programs improve the competitiveness of your institution's competitively-funded Research activities?*

Table 35: Influence of Cooperative Extension on Achieving Success in Competitive Research Awards

	Yes	No	Don't Know/Not Applicable
1862	89%	4%	6%
1890	81%	0%	19%
Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%
All Institutions	85%	3%	12%

Question. *If yes, how? If no, why not?*

Many respondents who answered “yes” to this question indicated that competitive grants they seek require integration of research and extension programs. Additionally, positive outcomes from extension programs provide leverage to acquire competitive funding.

Question 18. For competitively funded research projects, please describe the influence and impact that capacity research funding has in paying for and supporting the infrastructure and resources used to perform this competitive research?

Respondents generally note that success in competitively funded projects is heavily dependent on the stability of capacity funding. Capacity funding provides the necessary baseline infrastructure and personnel necessary to carry out research activities. Capacity funding also provides continuity over the long-term, as competitive funding timelines are shorter. Additionally, capacity funding is necessary for many institutions as a source of leverage to be more competitively for funding from other sources and to provide preliminary data in pilot studies to make their applications more compelling.

K. NIFA Capacity Funding Versus NIFA Competitive Funding for Addressing NIFA Challenge Areas

Question 19. For each of the six NIFA challenge areas, please indicate which funding source is best suited to meet funding requirements for Research projects.

Table 36: Funding Sources Best Suited for Research to Meet NIFA Priority Challenge Areas

	Institution Type	NIFA Capacity Funds for Research	NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	All Other Federal Competitive Funds	All Other Non-Federal Competitive Funds	Not currently a priority area for our Research activities
Bioenergy	1862	19%	36%	28%	0%	17%
	1890	81%	0%	0%	6%	13%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	35%	28%	20%	2%	15%
Childhood Obesity	1862	36%	26%	28%	0%	11%
	1890	69%	6%	6%	0%	19%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	43%	20%	25%	0%	12%

Climate Variability and Change						
	1862	21%	43%	34%	0%	2%
	1890	75%	13%	6%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
All Institutions	35%	34%	28%	2%	2%	
Food Safety						
	1862	47%	47%	4%	0%	2%
	1890	63%	13%	13%	0%	13%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
All Institutions	51%	37%	8%	0%	5%	
Food Security						
	1862	66%	30%	4%	0%	0%
	1890	88%	0%	6%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
All Institutions	69%	22%	8%	0%	2%	
Water						
	1862	43%	38%	15%	2%	2%
	1890	75%	0%	6%	0%	19%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
All Institutions	51%	28%	14%	2%	6%	

L. Funding Source Suitability by Area of Output

Question 20. Rate the following funding sources on the ability of your institution to translate the research into **publishable research findings**.

Table 37: Funding Source Rating for Research Leading to Publishable Research Findings

NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	55%	34%	6%	4%	0%	0%
	1890	94%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%
All Institutions	65%	26%	5%	3%	0%	2%	
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/ Veterinary Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	30%	38%	15%	6%	2%	9%
	1890	13%	0%	0%	6%	0%	81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
All Institutions	25%	28%	11%	6%	2%	29%	
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	38%	34%	13%	6%	0%	9%
	1890	38%	13%	13%	0%	0%	38%
	Non-LGU	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
All Institutions	40%	28%	12%	5%	0%	15%	
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	74%	17%	2%	0%	0%	6%
	1890	56%	19%	13%	0%	0%	13%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
All Institutions	69%	18%	5%	0%	0%	8%	

All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	70%	21%	4%	0%	0%	4%
	1890	44%	13%	38%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	63%	20%	12%	2%	0%	3%
State/Local Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	23%	26%	30%	13%	0%	9%
	1890	38%	25%	25%	6%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	29%	25%	28%	11%	0%	8%

Question 21. Rate the following funding sources on the ability of your institution to use research findings to prepare **non-formal educational materials** (such as web information, tip/guide sheets, brochures, etc.) for the general public.

Table 38: Funding Source Rating for Research Leading to Non-formal Educational Materials for the General Public

NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	53%	30%	13%	4%	0%	0%
	1890	81%	13%	0%	0%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	60%	25%	9%	3%	2%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/ Veterinary Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	21%	30%	26%	15%	2%	6%
	1890	19%	0%	0%	6%	0%	75%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	20%	22%	18%	12%	2%	26%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	38%	26%	15%	13%	0%	9%
	1890	38%	13%	13%	0%	0%	38%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	38%	22%	15%	9%	0%	15%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	19%	32%	30%	6%	11%	2%
	1890	56%	6%	25%	13%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
	All Institutions	29%	25%	28%	8%	9%	2%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	17%	21%	40%	15%	4%	2%
	1890	44%	13%	38%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	25%	18%	38%	14%	3%	2%
State/Local Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	45%	36%	11%	0%	0%	9%
	1890	50%	25%	6%	13%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	46%	34%	9%	3%	0%	8%

Question 22. Rate the following funding sources on *the volume of research outcomes (e.g., numbers of publications, patents, etc.)* achieved with their funding.

Table 39: Funding Source Rating for Volume of Research Outcomes Achieved (e.g. publications, patents, etc.)

NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	36%	32%	28%	4%		0%
	1890	69%	25%	0%	0%		6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	0%		50%
	All Institutions	43%	29%	22%	3%		3%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/ Veterinary Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	21%	23%	34%	11%		11%
	1890	7%	7%	0%	7%		80%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%		100%
	All Institutions	17%	19%	25%	9%		30%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	21%	34%	26%	11%		9%
	1890	19%	25%	13%	0%		44%
	Non-LGU	100%	0%	0%	0%		0%
	All Institutions	23%	31%	22%	8%		17%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	47%	40%	6%	6%		0%
	1890	44%	25%	13%	13%		6%
	Non-LGU	0%	100%	0%	0%		0%
	All Institutions	45%	38%	8%	8%		2%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	43%	47%	6%	2%		2%
	1890	44%	19%	31%	6%		0%
	Non-LGU	0%	100%	0%	0%		0%
	All Institutions	42%	42%	12%	3%		2%
State/Local Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	17%	28%	36%	9%	2%	9%
	1890	31%	13%	50%	0%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	22%	23%	40%	6%	2%	8%

Question 23. Rate the following funding sources on the ability of your institution to translate the research findings into **new approaches or processes to be deployed into the field**.

Table 40: Funding Source Rating for Generating Research Findings that Translate to New Approaches or Processes in Deployed in the Field

NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	57%	28%	11%	4%		0%
	1890	94%	6%	0%	0%		0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%		50%
	All Institutions	65%	23%	8%	3%		2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/ Veterinary Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	32%	19%	32%	9%		9%
	1890	13%	6%	0%	0%		81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%		100%
	All Institutions	26%	15%	23%	6%		29%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	35%	30%	22%	7%		7%
	1890	44%	13%	6%	0%		38%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%		0%
	All Institutions	38%	27%	17%	5%		14%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	26%	38%	21%	9%		6%
	1890	44%	44%	0%	0%		13%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%		0%
	All Institutions	31%	38%	17%	6%		8%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	19%	40%	28%	9%	2%	2%
	1890	38%	31%	25%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	23%	38%	28%	8%	2%	2%
State/Local Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	47%	28%	15%	0%		11%
	1890	38%	31%	13%	13%		6%
	Non-LGU	0%	100%	0%	0%		0%
	All Institutions	43%	31%	14%	3%		9%

Question 24. Please rate the following funding sources on the amount of **new applied technologies** (e.g., novel crops, new equipment, new approaches) developed with their funding.

Table _41: Funding Source Rating for Research Leading to New Applied Technologies

	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	1862	45%	30%	23%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	94%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	55%	23%	17%	2%	0%	3%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/ Veterinary Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	21%	26%	34%	9%	2%	9%
	1890	13%	6%	0%	0%	0%	81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
All Institutions	18%	20%	25%	6%	2%	29%	
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	30%	26%	21%	13%	2%	9%
	1890	25%	19%	6%	6%	0%	44%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
All Institutions	29%	25%	17%	11%	2%	17%	
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	23%	34%	28%	9%	0%	6%
	1890	38%	31%	6%	6%	0%	19%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%
All Institutions	28%	32%	23%	8%	0%	9%	
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	21%	38%	28%	9%	2%	2%
	1890	25%	31%	31%	13%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
All Institutions	22%	37%	29%	9%	2%	2%	
State/Local Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	30%	21%	30%	9%	0%	11%
	1890	38%	38%	13%	0%	6%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
All Institutions	31%	28%	25%	6%	2%	9%	

Question 25. Please provide recent (i.e., last three years) examples from your institution of particularly strong or meaningful outcomes from capacity funded Research (e.g., publications, reports, patents). Please indicate if the provided examples also include some level of competitive research funding. Feel free to provide links as well as citations.

Respondents generally indicated key research strengths of their institutions, which varied greatly between responses. Plant breeding and infectious disease were named with some frequency as having strong outcomes through capacity funding.

Question 26. Please rate the following funding sources on the *ease with which they can be adapted to the needs of local and state farmers, ranchers, other producers, or consumers.*

Table 42: Funding Source Rating for Ease by Which they can be Adapted to Meet the Needs of Local and State Farmers, Ranchers, Other Producers or Consumers

NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	Inst. Type	Very Difficult	Difficult	Moderate	Easy	Very Easy	N/A
	1862	0%	0%	9%	32%	60%	0%
	1890	0%	0%	0%	13%	88%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	0%	2%	6%	26%	65%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/ Veterinary Research	Inst. Type	Very Difficult	Difficult	Moderate	Easy	Very Easy	N/A
	1862	0%	4%	21%	32%	32%	11%
	1890	0%	0%	6%	6%	6%	81%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	2%	3%	17%	25%	25%	29%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	Inst. Type	Very Difficult	Difficult	Moderate	Easy	Very Easy	N/A
	1862	0%	2%	15%	30%	43%	11%
	1890	0%	0%	6%	19%	38%	38%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	0%	2%	14%	28%	40%	17%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	Inst. Type	Very Difficult	Difficult	Moderate	Easy	Very Easy	N/A
	1862	6%	26%	38%	19%	4%	6%
	1890	6%	25%	6%	25%	25%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	6%	26%	31%	20%	9%	8%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very Difficult	Difficult	Moderate	Easy	Very Easy	N/A
	1862	9%	30%	46%	11%	2%	2%
	1890	13%	19%	25%	31%	13%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	9%	30%	39%	16%	5%	2%
State/Local Funds for Research	Inst. Type	Very Difficult	Difficult	Moderate	Easy	Very Easy	N/A
	1862	0%	0%	13%	30%	51%	6%
	1890	0%	6%	19%	38%	31%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	0%	3%	14%	32%	45%	6%

Question 27. Please rate the following funding sources in terms of **how flexible they are regarding the types of expenditures they can be used for** (e.g., labor, equipment, student wages and stipends, etc.).

Table 43: Funding Source Rating for Flexibility-of-use

	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	1862	34%	47%	13%	4%	2%	0%
	1890	53%	27%	7%	7%	7%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	38%	41%	13%	5%	3%	2%
	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/ Veterinary Research	1862	28%	34%	19%	9%	2%	9%
	1890	6%	19%	0%	0%	0%	75%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	22%	29%	14%	6%	2%	28%
	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	1862	30%	40%	9%	11%	4%	6%
	1890	25%	31%	0%	0%	6%	38%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	28%	38%	8%	8%	5%	14%
	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	1862	26%	21%	36%	9%	9%	26%
	1890	44%	19%	25%	0%	13%	44%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	31%	22%	32%	6%	9%	31%
	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	1862	2%	26%	30%	28%	11%	4%
	1890	0%	27%	33%	33%	7%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	2%	25%	33%	28%	9%	3%
	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
State/Local Funds for Research	1862	30%	28%	21%	13%	0%	9%
	1890	13%	50%	19%	13%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	26%	32%	22%	12%	0%	8%
	Inst. Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A

Question 28. Please provide any relevant recent (i.e., last three years) examples or experiences of the different ways in which the funding sources listed in the previous question are more or less flexible.

In general, capacity funds were rated more flexible than competitive funds. However, respondents note that capacity funds cannot be used to support students, and equipment purchases of a certain size must now be approved.

Question 29. Please provide any recommendations you may have to streamline processes, enhance flexibility of use, or simply/improve reporting requirements associated with NIFA capacity or competitive Research funding.

A large number of responses indicated that reporting requirements are too time-consuming and redundant and should therefore be streamlined.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *For capacity funds, the reporting demands require too large a time component, and translate to substantial slice of total funds, which is inefficient and burdensome. The NIFA online/IT programs and processes are often user unfriendly or/and function poorly; I recognize that this is in substantial part due to insufficient funding, but it takes much time away from our supported faculty and the NHAES support staff that could be used productively. The recent change that mandates prior approval for some equipment purchases is inconvenient and unnecessary, but OMB has decreed that it will be so.*
- *The REEport system is unduly redundant and we are uncertain if the information derived is as useful to NIFA as a more generalized reporting system that would better capture outcomes and less of the outputs. Additionally, not enough emphasis is placed on how state matching funds are used to complement or enhance capacity funds. This leads to a misunderstanding by Congress as to what level of funding is necessary to adequately meet new demands on agricultural research across all areas.*
- *NIFA should follow the recommendations of the Plan of Work panel of experts to eliminate the redundant reporting of research in the annual report of accomplishments for AREERA requirements that are already captured in the annual project reports through REEport. Headings of reporting fields in REEport could be refined to better indicate the required information to the end user and help eliminate the need for NPLs to return reports to PDs for adjustments. Controls on fields that are not applicable to capacity funds could be placed in the system to prevent faculty from making mistakes in their reporting; for example, education is not an allowable activity on Hatch or Multistate funds, but faculty are still able to assign a percentage of the overall effort to a Hatch project during project initiation.*

1890 institutions

- *Enhance the flexibility of use (i.e., 1890s only get one year carryover). Permit 1890s to carry over unlimited funding consistent with the guidelines for 1862s. Remove the requirement for prior approval for equipment purchases. Streamline reporting of annual report.*
- *Reduce redundancy in reporting by incorporating project-specific annual progress reports into the reporting requirements for the NIFA Plan of Work/Annual Report.*

M. Hypothetical Effects of a Shift to 100% Competitive Funding

Question 30. How much of your Research program would you say your institution could continue if federal capacity funds were entirely cut?

Table 44: Amount of Research Program that Could Continue Without Capacity Funds

	Most of it	Half of it	Some of it	Almost none of it	None of it
1862	19%	23%	32%	19%	6%
1890	6%	0%	6%	50%	38%
Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%
All Institutions	15%	18%	25%	28%	14%

Question 31. Which of the following best describe your outlook regarding state/local Research funding under this "all competitive-based funding" scenario? Please check all that apply.

Table 45: Outlook for State/Local Research Funding Under an all Competitive Federal Funding Model

	1862	1890	Non-LGU	All Institutions
State/local funding would be very minimally affected, if at all.	13%	0%	0%	9%
State/local funding would be impacted some, but not significantly.	19%	0%	0%	13%
We would likely have to seek state/local match funding on a proposal-by-proposal basis.	19%	13%	50%	18%
It will be difficult to generate the same total level of state/local funding.	64%	63%	100%	63%
State/local funds for staffing/operations would be limited.	62%	56%	0%	57%
State/local funds for infrastructure would be limited.	55%	50%	0%	51%
State/local funding match might be available for some current programmatic activities, but not all.	36%	0%	50%	27%
State/local funding might be significantly reduced or eliminated if it did not automatically leverage federal funding.	51%	81%	50%	57%
State/local funding would increase, if we generated federal "competitive" funding in excess of our current federal "capacity" funding.	2%	0%	0%	1%

Question 32. For each of the following areas, would your institution struggle to maintain current levels of operations and performance in between competitive grant funding award periods if federal capacity funding for Research was not available?

Table 46: Would Institution “Struggle” to Maintain Current Levels of Operation and Performance In-between Competitive Funding Awards in the Absence of Federal Capacity Funding

	Inst. Type	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably Not	Definitely Not
Laboratory/Building Infrastructure	1862	47%	17%	32%	4%
	1890	94%	0%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	57%	14%	25%	5%
Research/Test Fields (Farms) Infrastructure	Inst. Type				
	1862	66%	17%	13%	4%
	1890	94%	0%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%
All Institutions	71%	14%	11%	5%	
Research Faculty	Inst. Type				
	1862	74%	21%	4%	0%
	1890	94%	0%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	100%	0%	0%	0%
All Institutions	80%	15%	3%	2%	
Non-Faculty Research Personnel	Inst. Type				
	1862	64%	30%	4%	2%
	1890	94%	0%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%
All Institutions	71%	22%	5%	3%	
Other Support Personnel	Inst. Type				
	1862	55%	38%	4%	2%
	1890	88%	0%	6%	6%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%
All Institutions	63%	28%	6%	3%	
Supplies and Materials	Inst. Type				
	1862	60%	28%	11%	2%
	1890	88%	6%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	100%	0%	0%	0%
All Institutions	68%	22%	9%	2%	

Question 33. For the six NIFA challenge areas, how likely is it that your institution would be able to generate competitive Research funding for these areas at the same level as your current capacity Research funding.

Table 47: For the Six NIFA Challenge Areas, How Likely Would Institution be to Generate Competitive Funding Sufficient to Replace Current Capacity Funding

	Institution Type	Very Likely	Likely	Unsure	Unlikely	Very Unlikely	N/A or Not Priority
Bioenergy	1862	2%	26%	11%	28%	17%	17%
	1890	6%	6%	0%	0%	81%	6%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
	All Institutions	5%	20%	8%	20%	34%	14%
Childhood Obesity	1862	2%	19%	21%	28%	17%	13%
	1890	0%	0%	0%	20%	73%	7%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	2%	14%	16%	25%	30%	14%
Climate Variability and Change	1862	2%	32%	17%	23%	26%	0%
	1890	6%	0%	6%	13%	69%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%
	All Institutions	3%	25%	14%	20%	37%	2%
Food Safety	1862	6%	17%	11%	30%	32%	4%
	1890	0%	7%	0%	7%	80%	7%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	5%	14%	8%	23%	42%	8%
Food Security	1862	4%	13%	11%	32%	40%	0%
	1890	6%	0%	6%	6%	75%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	5%	9%	9%	25%	48%	5%
Water	1862	4%	19%	19%	23%	34%	0%
	1890	6%	6%	0%	13%	63%	13%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
	All Institutions	6%	15%	14%	20%	42%	3%

N. Funding Sources and Acceptance of Research Risk

Question 34. Please indicate, by funding source, the amount of risk accepted in proposed research. In other words, do different funding sources allow for more, or less, risky research?

Table 48: Rating of Funding Source by Amount of “Risk Tolerance” in Research

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	1862	34%	45%	15%	6%	0%	0%
	1890	25%	31%	25%	6%	13%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	32%	40%	17%	6%	3%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	1862	26%	32%	23%	11%	2%	6%
	1890	13%	6%	0%	0%	6%	75%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	22%	25%	17%	8%	3%	26%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	1862	30%	30%	19%	11%	2%	9%
	1890	19%	19%	13%	6%	6%	38%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	26%	26%	20%	9%	3%	15%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	1862	4%	15%	47%	17%	11%	6%
	1890	19%	6%	25%	38%	0%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	8%	14%	40%	23%	8%	8%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	1862	11%	21%	32%	23%	9%	4%
	1890	6%	6%	50%	31%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	9%	18%	35%	26%	8%	3%
State/Local Funds for Research	1862	4%	11%	45%	28%	4%	9%
	1890	6%	13%	25%	25%	25%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	5%	12%	40%	26%	9%	8%

O. Funding Sources and Their Suitability for Funding Basic and Applied Research

Question 35. Rate the suitability of the following funding sources for projects in **basic research**.

Table 49: Rating of Funding Source by Suitability for “Basic Research”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	1862	23%	45%	26%	4%	2%	0%
	1890	25%	19%	38%	19%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	23%	38%	28%	8%	2%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	1862	28%	26%	32%	2%	6%	6%
	1890	0%	13%	0%	6%	0%	81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	20%	22%	23%	3%	5%	28%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	1862	20%	24%	37%	4%	4%	11%
	1890	13%	6%	25%	19%	0%	38%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	17%	19%	34%	9%	3%	17%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	1862	51%	36%	6%	2%	0%	4%
	1890	13%	31%	38%	6%	0%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	40%	35%	15%	3%	0%	6%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	1862	64%	30%	2%	2%	0%	2%
	1890	19%	44%	25%	13%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	###	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	51%	35%	8%	5%	0%	2%
State/Local Funds for Research	1862	2%	4%	43%	30%	15%	6%
	1890	13%	19%	13%	44%	6%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	5%	9%	34%	34%	12%	6%

Question 36. Rate the suitability of the following funding sources for projects in **applied research**.

Table 50: Rating of Funding Source by Suitability for “Applied Research”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	68%	28%	4%	0%	0%	0%
	1890	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	71%	25%	3%	0%	0%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	1862	51%	28%	15%	0%	0%	6%
	1890	13%	0%	6%	0%	0%	81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	40%	20%	12%	0%	0%	28%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	1862	64%	21%	6%	0%	0%	9%
	1890	50%	0%	13%	0%	0%	38%
	Non-LGU	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	62%	15%	8%	0%	0%	15%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	1862	6%	13%	55%	21%	0%	4%
	1890	38%	31%	6%	13%	0%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	14%	18%	43%	18%	0%	6%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	1862	4%	2%	34%	49%	9%	2%
	1890	19%	38%	31%	13%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	8%	12%	32%	40%	6%	2%
State/Local Funds for Research	1862	51%	28%	15%	0%	0%	6%
	1890	44%	38%	6%	6%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	49%	31%	12%	2%	0%	6%

P. Funding Sources and Their Suitability for Addressing Short-term Emergency Needs

Question 37. Rate the suitability of the following funding types for **addressing short-term emergency needs** (e.g., sudden community concern, disease or pest outbreak, natural disaster).

Table 51: Rating of Funding Source by Suitability for “Addressing Short-Term Emergency Needs”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	1862	64%	28%	9%	0%	0%	0%
	1890	50%	38%	6%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	58%	29%	9%	2%	0%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	1862	49%	26%	17%	2%	0%	6%
	1890	13%	0%	6%	0%	0%	81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	38%	18%	14%	2%	0%	28%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	1862	53%	17%	19%	2%	0%	9%
	1890	31%	19%	6%	0%	6%	38%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	46%	17%	17%	3%	2%	15%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	1862	2%	2%	19%	38%	34%	4%
	1890	6%	13%	6%	44%	19%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	3%	5%	17%	40%	29%	6%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	1862	2%	0%	15%	40%	40%	2%
	1890	13%	13%	6%	50%	19%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	5%	3%	14%	43%	34%	2%
State/Local Funds for Research	1862	38%	30%	23%	2%	0%	6%
	1890	31%	31%	13%	13%	6%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	35%	29%	23%	5%	2%	6%

Question 38. Provide up to three recent (last three years) examples of times when capacity funds for research were able to be redirected by your institution to respond to a short-term emergency need.

Respondents provided a variety of specific program and infrastructure areas where capacity funds were redirected. Some of the common responses include infectious disease (e.g. Zika virus and avian influenza), natural and manmade disasters, food safety, climate change, threats to crops (e.g. invasive species, disease, and weeds), pollinator health, equipment purchases, and support for staff and graduate students.

Q. Funding Sources and Their Suitability for Generating Research Products and Output

Question 39. Rate the suitability of the following funding sources for **generating peer reviewed research papers and other academic publications.**

Table 52: Rating of Funding Source by Suitability for “Research Leading to Peer-reviewed Papers and Other Academic Publications”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	1862	36%	49%	15%	0%	0%	0%
	1890	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	49%	38%	11%	0%	0%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	1862	30%	38%	23%	2%	0%	6%
	1890	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	87%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	25%	28%	17%	2%	0%	28%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	1862	28%	49%	11%	4%	0%	9%
	1890	31%	25%	6%	0%	0%	38%
	Non-LGU	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	31%	42%	9%	3%	0%	15%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	1862	74%	19%	0%	0%	0%	6%
	1890	63%	25%	0%	0%	0%	13%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	71%	22%	0%	0%	0%	8%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	1862	79%	19%	0%	0%	0%	2%
	1890	38%	44%	13%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	68%	26%	3%	2%	0%	2%
State/Local Funds for Research	1862	17%	34%	28%	9%	6%	6%
	1890	38%	13%	25%	13%	6%	6%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	23%	29%	26%	9%	6%	6%

Question 40. Rate the suitability of the following funding sources for **generating disclosures, patents, and other intellectual property**.

Table 53: Rating of Funding Source by Suitability for “Generating Intellectual Property”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	1862	34%	28%	30%	9%	0%	0%
	1890	69%	19%	13%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	42%	25%	26%	6%	0%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	1862	23%	26%	34%	11%	0%	6%
	1890	13%	6%	0%	0%	0%	81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	20%	20%	25%	8%	0%	28%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	1862	21%	26%	28%	17%	0%	9%
	1890	38%	19%	6%	0%	0%	38%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	25%	23%	23%	14%	0%	15%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	1862	32%	47%	11%	6%	0%	4%
	1890	63%	25%	6%	0%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	38%	40%	12%	5%	0%	5%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	1862	34%	45%	13%	6%	0%	2%
	1890	33%	47%	13%	7%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	33%	44%	16%	6%	0%	2%
State/Local Funds for Research	1862	17%	15%	30%	28%	4%	6%
	1890	25%	19%	38%	13%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	18%	17%	32%	23%	3%	6%

Question 41. Rate the suitability of the following funding sources for **developing and supporting knowledge-diffusion activities**. Knowledge diffusion includes any method to document and share knowledge, practice recommendations, fact sheets, policy reports, education and training outreach activities, webinars, presentations, and field days, among others.

Table 54: Rating of Funding Source by Suitability for “Knowledge Diffusion Activities”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	1862	57%	26%	15%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	75%	19%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	62%	23%	12%	2%	0%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	1862	40%	30%	23%	0%	0%	6%
	1890	13%	0%	6%	0%	0%	81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	32%	22%	18%	0%	0%	28%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	1862	45%	34%	13%	0%	0%	9%
	1890	44%	13%	6%	0%	0%	38%
	Non-LGU	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	46%	28%	11%	0%	0%	15%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	1862	23%	13%	45%	13%	0%	6%
	1890	38%	31%	13%	6%	0%	13%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	28%	17%	37%	11%	0%	8%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	1862	21%	11%	40%	21%	4%	2%
	1890	31%	31%	25%	13%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	25%	15%	37%	18%	3%	2%
State/Local Funds for Research	1862	45%	32%	17%	0%	0%	6%
	1890	31%	38%	19%	0%	6%	6%
	Non-LGU	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	43%	32%	17%	0%	2%	6%

Question 42. Rate the following funding sources in their ability to **increase the success of faculty in terms of receiving follow-up competitive funding**. In other words, to what degree does proven success from one of these funding sources increase the likelihood of future success in gaining additional competitive funding?

Table 55: Rating of Funding Source by Suitability for “Helping Faculty Increase their Success in Receiving Competitive Funding”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	1862	47%	30%	23%	0%	0%	0%
	1890	94%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	57%	25%	17%	0%	0%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/Veterinary Research	1862	38%	26%	30%	0%	0%	6%
	1890	13%	6%	0%	0%	0%	81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	31%	20%	22%	0%	0%	28%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	1862	40%	21%	28%	2%	0%	9%
	1890	50%	13%	0%	0%	0%	38%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	43%	18%	20%	3%	0%	15%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	1862	45%	36%	11%	2%	0%	6%
	1890	63%	25%	0%	0%	0%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	48%	32%	9%	3%	0%	8%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	1862	51%	34%	9%	4%	0%	2%
	1890	44%	38%	6%	6%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	48%	34%	9%	6%	0%	3%
State/Local Funds for Research	1862	21%	15%	43%	15%	0%	6%
	1890	56%	19%	13%	0%	6%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	29%	15%	37%	11%	2%	6%
Commodity Group, Industry, or Company Funds for Research	1862	11%	23%	43%	13%	2%	9%
	1890	19%	13%	44%	0%	13%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	12%	20%	43%	11%	5%	9%

Question 43. Rate the following funding sources on their ability to **facilitate multi-state or multi-institution collaboration**.

Table 56: Rating of Funding Source by Suitability for “Facilitating Multi-state or Multi-institution Collaboration”

	Institution Type	Very Difficult to Facilitate Collaboration	Difficult to Facilitate Collaboration	Somewhat Easy to Facilitate Collaboration	Easy to Facilitate Collaboration	Very Easy to Facilitate Collaboration	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Agricultural Research	1862	0%	4%	6%	34%	55%	0%
	1890	0%	6%	0%	19%	75%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%
	All Inst.	0%	5%	6%	29%	58%	2%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Animal Health and Disease/ Veterinary Research	1862	2%	9%	32%	26%	23%	9%
	1890	0%	0%	13%	6%	0%	81%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Inst.	2%	6%	26%	20%	17%	29%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Research	1862	0%	6%	26%	23%	34%	11%
	1890	0%	6%	0%	13%	44%	38%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	2%	6%	20%	20%	35%	17%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Research (AFRI)	1862	0%	13%	28%	36%	19%	4%
	1890	0%	6%	6%	19%	56%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	0%	12%	22%	32%	28%	6%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Research	1862	4%	13%	32%	34%	15%	2%
	1890	0%	13%	6%	50%	25%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	3%	14%	26%	37%	17%	3%
State/Local Funds for Research	1862	13%	34%	15%	28%	4%	6%
	1890	13%	31%	19%	0%	31%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	12%	32%	17%	22%	11%	6%

Question 44. What could be done to improve collaboration in research activities above the state level (i.e., across multi-state regions or nationwide)?

Respondents suggest that capacity funding for multi-state projects is working well and would benefit from increases in overall funding levels. Some also suggest that collaboration should be required of a larger number of competitive grants. Finally, there is some support for the idea that regional collaboration could be facilitated by workshops and committees designed to bring researchers together and open the lines of communication.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Supporting a leadership infrastructure that connects researchers and stakeholders around a set of common goals for community-driven setting of research priorities and pursuit of research funding has significant potential to enhance multi-state collaboration. Under this model, an institution may be charged with maintaining community interactions by hosting periodic researcher/stakeholder workshops, orchestrating community self-assembly into research project teams, and fostering continuous interactions through communications platforms. . . Additionally, difficulties popup in collaborations due to differences in infrastructure between institutions. Simply having different equipment can negatively impact the collection of compatible data across institutions.*
- *We believe that NIFA, through its large multi-state interdisciplinary grant programs, is already doing plenty to encourage, support, and improve collaboration in research activities across states, regions, and nationwide. We would like to see more involvement from the states in this area. For example, state support for joint faculty positions across states which would serve both states on important issues of common interest.*
- *Multi-state collaborations require faculty leaders with the skills needed to manage larger, more complex projects. Professional development opportunities targeted to developing that kind of leadership are needed in addition to programs designed to develop department head and deans. Collaborations could also be facilitated by acknowledging the inherent difficulties involved in such projects and adjusting funding programs to accommodate them. Multi-state projects often require larger award amounts and longer project periods to be successful. AFRI programs have started to address this through Coordinated Agricultural Projects, but more funds are needed to sustain this mechanism with sufficient support to meet all requirements for success. Furthermore, the application process and administrative burden associated with multi-institution projects could be streamlined to make leading such efforts more attractive to faculty leaders.*

1890 institutions

- *Establish regional think tank to recommend research projects, prioritize them, and establish funding sources to implement them.*
- *I think a lot of collaboration is already occurring. Some of it is just the willingness of research institutions and other entities to share resources and intellectual capacity to spur results. The other is that it is encouraged and sometimes mandated as stipulations for funding.*

R. Capacity Versus Competitive Funding by Type of Research

Question 45. For the following set of functional characteristics, indicate whether you think that capacity or competitive funding sources are more suited to funding each.

Table 57: Rating of Capacity Versus Competitive Funding for Supporting Various Types of Research and Functional Activities

	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
Supporting agriculture-related research	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	28%	21%	51%	0%	0%	0%
	1890	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	43%	18%	37%	0%	0%	2%
Supporting animal health/veterinary-related research	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	23%	21%	47%	2%	0%	6%
	1890	25%	0%	13%	6%	0%	56%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	23%	15%	37%	3%	0%	22%
Supporting forestry-related research	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	30%	26%	38%	0%	0%	6%
	1890	50%	13%	6%	0%	0%	31%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	35%	22%	31%	0%	0%	12%
Supporting team science	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	13%	11%	53%	21%	2%	0%
	1890	31%	25%	31%	13%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	17%	15%	46%	18%	2%	2%
Supporting transdisciplinary research	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	4%	13%	51%	28%	4%	0%
	1890	25%	25%	44%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
	All Institutions	9%	15%	48%	22%	5%	2%
Supporting integrated research and cooperative extension activities	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	30%	38%	28%	4%	0%	0%
	1890	81%	13%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
	All Institutions	42%	31%	22%	3%	2%	2%

Supporting university research institutes or centers	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	15%	19%	26%	26%	13%	2%
	1890	56%	6%	31%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	0%
	All Institutions	26%	15%	26%	20%	11%	2%
Supporting basic/fundamental research inquiry	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	6%	4%	26%	34%	30%	0%
	1890	38%	6%	13%	31%	13%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	14%	5%	22%	35%	25%	0%
Supporting applied research	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	45%	32%	17%	4%	2%	0%
	1890	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	55%	26%	12%	5%	2%	0%
Supporting international research initiatives	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	4%	6%	26%	32%	28%	4%
	1890	25%	13%	19%	19%	19%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	9%	8%	23%	31%	25%	5%
Supporting knowledge transfer/diffusion activities	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	33%	30%	33%	4%	0%	0%
	1890	53%	20%	13%	13%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	38%	27%	27%	8%	0%	0%
Supporting individuals with gardening issues and questions	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	68%	15%	6%	0%	0%	11%
	1890	69%	13%	13%	0%	0%	6%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	66%	14%	8%	0%	0%	12%
Supporting family-owned farming operations	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	57%	17%	19%	0%	0%	6%
	1890	69%	19%	0%	13%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	50%
	All Institutions	58%	17%	14%	3%	2%	6%

Supporting corporate farming operations	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	23%	23%	32%	11%	2%	9%
	1890	38%	13%	6%	19%	13%	13%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
	All Institutions	26%	20%	25%	12%	5%	12%
Providing prestige to the University	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	4%	2%	21%	21%	51%	0%
	1890	6%	13%	31%	38%	13%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	6%	5%	25%	25%	40%	0%

Question 46. For the following set of topical characteristics, indicate whether you think that capacity or competitive funding sources are more suited to funding each.

Table 58: Rating of Capacity Versus Competitive Funding for Supporting Various Topical Areas

Supporting local and statewide interest in organic foods and farming	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	26%	26%	40%	4%	4%	0%
	1890	81%	13%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	38%	23%	31%	3%	3%	2%
Supporting local and statewide food security efforts	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	36%	23%	36%	4%	0%	0%
	1890	81%	6%	13%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	46%	20%	29%	3%	0%	2%
Supporting "local food" demand-supply (also known as locavore) efforts	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	38%	30%	23%	4%	0%	4%
	1890	75%	13%	6%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	46%	26%	18%	5%	0%	5%
Supporting locality-specific research issues (i.e., findings are geographically limited in their application)	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	57%	37%	7%	0%	0%	0%
	1890	94%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	66%	28%	6%	0%	0%	0%

Supporting urgent research needs (e.g., emerging pathogens, invasive species, natural disaster issues)	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	57%	23%	15%	4%	0%	0%
	1890	56%	25%	13%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	55%	25%	15%	5%	0%	0%
Supporting emerging and frontier areas of agriscience	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	11%	4%	49%	28%	9%	0%
	1890	31%	19%	38%	13%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	15%	8%	46%	25%	6%	0%
Supporting new variety or cultivar development and research	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	43%	36%	19%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	69%	19%	6%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%
	All Institutions	48%	32%	15%	3%	2%	0%
Supporting precision agriculture research and development, including software, sensors, robotics, and drones	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	9%	15%	51%	19%	6%	0%
	1890	38%	25%	13%	19%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	15%	18%	40%	20%	6%	0%
Supporting data analytics and big data processing research	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	4%	4%	45%	28%	19%	0%
	1890	33%	13%	20%	20%	13%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	11%	9%	38%	25%	17%	0%
Supporting research incorporating genetic modification	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	2%	11%	43%	28%	17%	0%
	1890	38%	19%	13%	25%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%
	All Institutions	11%	14%	34%	26%	14%	2%
Supporting plant-microbial symbiosis research	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	4%	6%	53%	26%	11%	0%
	1890	31%	19%	13%	38%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	0%	50%	0%
	All Institutions	11%	11%	42%	28%	9%	0%

Supporting research for bioenergy or industrial biomass applications	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	2%	9%	51%	28%	9%	2%
	1890	50%	31%	13%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	14%	15%	40%	23%	6%	2%
Addressing questions pertaining to global grand challenges	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	4%	2%	36%	36%	19%	2%
	1890	19%	25%	25%	31%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	8%	9%	34%	34%	14%	2%

S. Current Operational Environment Issues and the Importance of Sustaining Capacity Funding

Question 47. Rate the following challenges in terms of their importance and seriousness regarding the continued availability of capacity funds? If there is another critical challenge you face not listed, please include it in the "Other" response option.

Table 59: Rating of Selected Challenge Areas

Decreases in federal funding	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	57%	36%	4%	2%	0%
	1890	81%	13%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	50%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	63%	31%	5%	2%	0%
State budget challenges limiting the availability of matching funds	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	32%	21%	21%	19%	6%
	1890	81%	13%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	43%	20%	18%	14%	5%
Pressure to shift federal resources from capacity funding to competitive funding	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	47%	34%	13%	6%	0%
	1890	81%	13%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	50%	0%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	55%	28%	12%	5%	0%
Public knowledge and understanding about the importance of agricultural research	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	32%	49%	15%	4%	0%
	1890	75%	19%	6%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	42%	43%	12%	3%	0%
Public knowledge and understanding about science	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	38%	36%	21%	4%	0%
	1890	56%	25%	13%	6%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	42%	32%	22%	5%	0%
Continued shift of political representation toward urban areas	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	23%	40%	30%	4%	2%
	1890	44%	25%	31%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	50%	50%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	28%	37%	31%	3%	2%

Other critical challenge	Inst. Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
	1862	57%	7%	29%	0%	7%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	Non-LGU	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	63%	11%	21%	0%	5%

Write-in responses for “Other critical challenge”

1862 institutions

- *Continuity of agricultural research programs*
- *As more competitive grants require 1:1 matching, the ability of institutions to compete with the private sector is being compromised. A lack of funding for infrastructure and instrumentation places LGUs at a competitive disadvantage with private industry and institutions with large endowments that can fund these requirements. As a result, more and more research dollars are going to fewer and fewer institutions.*
- *Small scale farming*
- *Capacity funds allow new, innovative, but unproven scientific research that would otherwise be difficult to fund.*
- *Mismatch between undergraduate student interests and the need to renew faculty in agriculture which creates a budget gap.*
- *Other critical challenge is the growing political pressure to shift traditional capacity funding to a competitive based approach which would seriously impair our ability to deliver discoveries, promote hands-on learning, advance academic excellence and serve our communities in a sustainable manner.*
- *Declining infrastructure.*
- *Lack of politicians understanding the value of capacity funding, especially from urban politicians.*
- *Agricultural research is science!!!*

1890 institutions

- *A reduction in state funds would be problematic.*

Non-Land-grant institutions

- *University support*

T. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Capacity Funding System

Question 48. *List what you believe are the greatest strengths/advantages of the NIFA capacity funding system.*

The most common responses to this question are nearly identical to those of the analogous question in the Institutional Survey: 1) capacity funding provides the base infrastructure, long-term stability, support for faculty and staff, and flexibility necessary to best conduct research programs; 2) capacity funding is ideal for conducting applied research on topics of local, regional, and statewide importance; 3) capacity funding can be leveraged to acquire funding from competitive sources.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Helps supports long term research strengths such as the Plant Breeding program at [this institution]. Helps leverage state funds which also support long term research. Supports applied research so directly benefits stakeholders and helps leverage additional resources from stakeholders. Illustrates the federal government's commitment to advancing agriculture and food system related science and the economic well-being of the agricultural sector. Capacity funding is one of the few sources of funding in applied research in forestry. Many faculty leverage these funds to develop new hypotheses pertaining to basic science concepts that feed back into applied research.*
- *Capacity funding provides a steady source of funds for applied research. This is typically research that benefits our state and our stakeholders. State funding is often predicated on the commitment of federal funds and the outcomes of the research that provides direct benefits to producers and consumers.*
- *Capacity funds provide the basis for developing and sustaining research capacity at land grant universities. In the absence of capacity funds many institutions would not be able to successfully secure nationally competitive funds and the distribution of competitive funds would become even more geographical and institutional disparate with large and non-landgrant institutions sequestering an increasing proportion of NIFA, NSF, and NIH competitive funds. Nationally distributed capacity funding enhances regional-based problem resolution. Capacity funding allows for high risk, high return, but as yet unproven research to take place. Outcomes of preliminary studies done with capacity funds provide the background foundation for competitive proposal developments in these high risk/high return arenas. Capacity funds allow the flexibility to support basic research (critical to new discoveries), unlike competitive funding which is more focused/less flexible. Research funds that come through Cooperative Agreements or Joint ventures are inflexible with regard to use of funds for covering graduate student tuition remission. Capacity funds have greater flexibility with regard to covering tuition remission.*

1890 institutions

- *1. permits flexibility to tackle local challenges not covered by competitive programs in a consistent manner. 2. facilitates partnering and infrastructure development for long-term integrative, multi-region, multi-state research with wide ranging impact and outcomes. 3. facilitates involvement of students and relevant clients (e.g., small farmers, community leaders) at all levels in research and research-Extension activities*
- *1) promote applied research to address regional issues. 2) leverage state match. 3) disseminate research findings to farmers. 4) build capacity for 1890 institutions for competitive funding. 5) promote collaborations. 6) support higher education.*

U. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA capacity funding system

Question 49. List what you believe are the greatest weaknesses/disadvantages of the NIFA capacity funding system.

As is the case with the previous question, some of the common responses to this question are similar to those of the Institutional Survey: capacity funding has not kept pace with inflation and buying power has eroded as a result, and reporting requirements are burdensome and repetitive. Three other concerns were common: 1) funding is provided late in the fiscal year, which is particularly frustrating to the 1890 institutions because they can only carryover 20% of their capacity funding from year to year. 2) Some respondents expressed concern over limitations in funding infrastructural improvements. These limitations include the inability to fund new construction with capacity funds as well as the new rules which require prior approval to purchase equipment. Finally, some respondents were concerned with perceptions of capacity funding. Some argued that the success and importance of capacity funding have not been expressed well to politicians and the American public.

V. Recommendations on Changes to Improve the Capacity Funding System

Question 50. Describe what changes you think would be beneficial to improve the impacts of NIFA capacity funding system.

Respondents indicated three key ways capacity funding could be improved. First, they argued for more funding, with a priority for capacity funding over competitive funding. Second, respondents argued that greater flexibility would be helpful, specifically in terms of infrastructure and equipment support. Third, respondents desire simplified proposal and reporting systems that are faster and more accessible. Additionally, respondents again indicated that the inequities between small and large institutions should be decreased, that public awareness of the importance of capacity funding and agriculture research should be strengthened, and multi-state and multi-institution research should be encouraged.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Additional funding provided to research institutions through the system and doing a better job talking about the benefits research brings to society. Currently, there is too much focus on describing the "impact" rather than the benefit of research. Impact reporting fits the Extension model much better than the research one.*
- *New regulatory rules to permit actual building of research capacity at our LGUs. New processes that streamline, including no more financial reporting. Diminishing non-financial reporting requirement, including the program of research for animal health and McIntyre Stennis.*
- *Make the reporting on these funds more user friendly and eliminate redundancies in the reporting process. Allow more flexibility in the use of these funds for smaller institutions that don't have the wide array of financial resources available to them that larger institutions have.*

1890 institutions

- *Improve funding of 1890 institutions to be equitable with 1862 institutions. Have programs for retraining and retooling of senior faculty to enhance productivity and effectiveness. Allows for student recruitment and experiential learning.*
- *Increased funding level to keep up with increased costs and significant increase to grow critical important programs.*
- *An increase in appropriate funds would have a significant impact on the program. Streamline reporting where possible.*

W. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Competitive Funding System

Question 51. *List what you believe are the greatest strengths/advantages of the NIFA competitive funding system.*

The major strengths of competitive funding discussed in these responses mirrors those of the same question in the Institutional Survey: 1) respondents believe the peer review process produces the best science; 2) competitive funding encourages Interdisciplinarity and collaboration; 3) competitive funding allows for more targeted and in-depth research projects that focus on issues of national priority.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *1. Allow individual scientists or teams of experts to focus on fundamental research on a specific problem or issue. This concentrated effort will often create synergistic outcomes that increases our knowledge base. 2. Narrowly defined RFAs for competitive programs have been successful in creating teams across institutions and states for translational research that has the potential to address longer-term challenges to U.S. agriculture that cannot be solved through short-term industry and commodity funding. 3. The well-developed peer review process assures quality control.*
- *Peer-review panel process, when administered well, tends to enhance the quality and rigor of science supported by funding. Provides a funding source for more basic science that would not be supported through commodity boards or other sponsors focused on immediate applied issues/outcomes.*

1890 institutions

- *Since it's merit based, it provides funding to the most productive institutions or research teams. It helps in addressing national research priorities as set by the RFA. Integrated projects will strengthen the links between all three missions of the land grant goals: academic, research and extension. The peer-review process and objectivity of the competition process. It provides valuable feedback to non-funded proposals to help them improve their research quality over time.*
- *Allows to address specific issue in detail. Encourages scientists to develop new innovative solutions to agricultural problems. Support graduate students.*

X. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA competitive funding system

Question 52. *List what you believe are the greatest weaknesses/disadvantages of the NIFA competitive funding system.*

The disadvantages listed in these responses reiterate the arguments made by respondents in the Institutional survey: 1) respondents from small institutions argued that they are inherently disadvantaged by the competitive system, in large part because researchers at smaller universities lack the time and resources to adequately compete; 2) the low success rate discourages researchers from seeking competitive funding; 3) narrow Requests for Application for national priority areas are set by bureaucrats and do not support applied and translational research needed to meet local and regional needs; 4) funding is uncertain from year-to-year, so capacity funds must be used for infrastructure and salaries; 5) inflexibility, which makes reallocation for local and regional or new and emerging needs difficult; and 6) high transaction costs, which also discourages applying for competitive funding and reduced the amount of money and time left for research and extension activities.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *The system tends to make research much more project oriented rather than program oriented. We find that when the funding ends the projects seems to die-off and we don't get the build up and gains we see with a well-funded, long-term research program.*
- *It almost without exception completely eliminates the kinds of regionally replicated applied science that informs current agricultural production and meets the immediate needs of stakeholders.*
- *lack of flexibility to address local issues. Lack of ability to conduct long-term research Not every institution has the infrastructure to be competitive with these funds even though they might have talented faculty*
- *The greatest weakness of NIFA's competitive grant programs is a lack of money and ridiculously low funding rates. It is very discouraging for faculty when innovative and well written proposals receive good reviews but fail to get funded. Furthermore, failure to fund research in a timely fashion significantly delays progress, stymies innovation, and decreases America's competitiveness in world agricultural markets.*
- *Competitive funding does not fit long-term funding of programs. Every 3-5 years there would be risk that a complete turnover of programmatic effort would occur. Thus, it is difficult to sustain a research enterprise with only competitive funding. Further, very limited availability of funding has led to very low success rates which fails to address the broad needs of agricultural research in the United States.*

1890 institutions

- *Not enough funding available and only big/national issues are being funded, not regional or local issues. Big universities receive disproportionately more funding than smaller universities.*
- *Funding system tend to benefit bigger institutions with more resources, making it harder for smaller institutions to participate in major mainstream research that needs major investment. University administration has tendency to increase indirect cost/overhead that reduce available funds for research. High Transaction Costs*
- *Although it's an open process, being compared to aspirational peers and non-peers with greater resources places 1890s at a disadvantage in competing for funds. RFAs are not published in a timely manner. The requirement of matching funds places 1890s at a disadvantage. The funding is short-term. High transaction costs. Large research organizations have greater advantage to obtain funds because they have more resources/manpower and stronger infrastructures.*

Y. Recommendations for Changes to Improve the Competitive NIFA (AFRI) Funding System

Question 53. In the space below, please describe what changes you think would be beneficial to improve the impacts of the NIFA (AFRI) competitive funding system.

Respondents indicate several ways the competitive system could be improved: 1) increase funding to maximum allowable levels while simultaneously not reducing capacity funding levels; 2) make the system more equitable for smaller institutions by eliminating the matching requirement and adding priority areas that meet regional needs; 3) reform the proposal and review processes to increase fairness by further diversifying review panels and having tiered competition; 4) simplify the proposal and review processes to make the process cheaper and faster by adding more submission dates and

instituting pre-proposal screenings; 5) develop more interagency partnerships and encourage collaboration.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Impacts of NIFA competitive funding could be improved through several mechanisms including: full congressional funding of its authorized level as established in the 2008 Farm Bill which would allow for new grant opportunities and a greater number of innovative projects to be funded; maintaining a balance of fundamental and basic research projects as well as short term vs long term fundamental research proposals; greater communication of advance notice for proposals would allow for better preparation by researchers; development of a strategic plan that identifies priorities which will provide program continuity, consistency and predictability for investigators; increased investment of USDA leadership in leading interagency efforts (e.g. NSF, NIH, DOE, FDA) to coordinate and collaborate on food and agricultural research.*
- *1. A short pre-proposal process is needed to very quickly tell scientists if they have a realistic chance at funding. The pre-proposal should be very short (1-2 pages) and the evaluation should be realistic given the prior success rates for the program. This could save a tremendous amount of time for scientists rather having to go to a full blown proposal. 2. More funds are definitely needed to improve success rates and increase the breadth of issues addressed, but not at the expense of capacity funds. 3. A more balanced portfolio relative to basic and applied research 4. More emphasis on technology transfer and Extension outreach*

1890 institutions

- *Level the playing field based on the size of institutions. Have funds available based on the size of the institutions. Eliminate the requirement for matching funds for 1890 institutions.*

III. Cooperative Extension Service Survey Findings

A. Introduction

This survey was distributed to Cooperative Extension Service directors across the 1862 and 1890 Land-grant universities as well as other institutions that receive capacity funds. The instrument was designed to assess their perspectives on NIFA capacity funding and AFRI competitive grants. It consisted of quantitative and qualitative measures developed to address the strengths and weaknesses of each system as well as the role these funding sources play in sustaining extension programs across each institution. The survey was distributed through SurveyMonkey with the assistance of the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities.

Responses to open-ended questions have been summarized through review by TEconomy Partners, and individual responses de-identified.

B. Respondent Profile

Table 60: NIFA Land-grant Designation of the University

Land-Grant Designation	# of Institutions	Surveys Returned	Response Rate
1862	59	52	88%
1890	19	17	89%
Non-LGU	15	0	0%

C. Federal Funding Types Received

Question 3. *Which of the following federal funding sources are received by your institution (university or college)?*

Table 61: NIFA Types of Federal Funding Received by Institution

	1862	1890	All Institutions
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	100%	100%	100%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	75%	59%	71%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	96%	100%	97%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	88%	47%	78%
Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension programs.	81%	65%	77%
State/Local Cooperative Extension Funding Exceeding NIFA Match Requirements	85%	35%	72%

D. How Federal Funds Received are Allocated

Question 4. *In which of the following ways does your institution internally distribute capacity funds?*

Table 62: Ways by Which Institution Allocates Funds

	1862	1890	All Institutions
Discretionary allocations from leadership (e.g., College Dean, Extension Dean, or Extension Director)	94%	94%	94%
Formula distribution among departments	31%	0%	23%
Formula distribution among programs	29%	29%	29%
Formula distribution across the state based on geography/demographics	17%	0%	13%
Internal competitive grant process	31%	18%	28%
Other	21%	29%	23%

Write-in responses for "Other"

1862 institutions

- *PI originated proposals to federal agencies.*
- *Funds are set by priority needs in relationship to Program Team requests (by needs analysis).*
- *Faculty positions are allocated based on College process. Other non-salary Extension allocations are minimal.*
- *Funds are distributed according to local priorities.*
- *Capacity funds are allocated to program areas based upon the percentage of State resources the area receives, with the exception of RREA and EFNEP which are allocated directly to the appropriate program area.*
- *Distribution is based on priority needs determined by program teams.*
- *Used to leverage departmental, program, state and county sources.*
- *Small institutions like [institution name] is dependent on upper management like President and Senior Academic VP to allocate any capacity funds.*
- *The [extension leadership group] makes allocations consistent with program priorities (food system and 4H Youth Development). Allocations support statewide POW and University priorities.*
- *Each unit/department is responsible for seeking its own funding.*
- *Salary lines for targeted programs and positions.*

1890 institutions

- *Extension funds through capacity are competitive. Extension submits four proposal which are determine by program priorities.*
- *Funding based on Extension priority needs of program areas (4-H, FCS, CRD and ANR). Program teams and/or advisory committees are used to internally distribute capacity funds.*
- *Funds are distributed on an as needed basis for projects and programs, plus through grants (competitive and non-competitive). This differs among departments and units as some are internally competitive.*
- *Formula based on program priority.*
- *Priority needs, plans of work, specialized initiatives.*

Question 5. *Considering your answers to the previous question, please describe the process in which capacity funds are distributed to support programs and projects at your institution. Within your institution is this process different for different schools, departments, units, or different funding mechanisms?*

Several respondents noted that capacity funds are largely used to fund salaries. Many respondents also discussed that discretionary allocation by leadership or committee is usually conducted by determining program needs and/or prioritizing key activities.

E. Scale of the Supported Enterprise

Question 6. *What is the total number of Cooperative Extension employees managed by your College, School, or Division?*

Table 63: Average Number of Employees in Cooperative Extension

	Average Number of Employees
1862	483
1890	50
All Institutions	375

Question 7. *What share of the total number employees are located at your main institutional campus locations as opposed to regional or county/parish-located offices?*

Table 64: Percent Distribution of Extension Personnel by Main Campus Versus Regional Locations

	Average Percent on Campus
1862	36%
1890	56%
All Institutions	41%

Question 8. *In the last three years, has the total number of Cooperative Extension employees increased, decreased, or remained stable?*

Table 65: Change in Extension Personnel Numbers Over Past Three Years

	Increased	Remained Stable	Decreased
1862	31%	31%	38%
1890	29%	47%	24%
All Institutions	30%	35%	35%

Question 9. *What share of the total number of employees reported in Question 6 would be considered to be supporting staff (including administrative, financial, marketing, communications, etc.)?*

Table 66: Percent of Cooperative Extension Personnel Comprising “Support Staff”

	Average Percent Support Staff
1862	21%
1890	27%
All Institutions	23%

Question 10. *In the last three years, has the total number of Cooperative Extension supporting staff at your institution increased, decreased, or remained stable?*

Table 67: Change in Extension Support Staff Numbers Over Past Three Years

	Increased	Remained Stable	Decreased
1862	17%	38%	44%
1890	12%	65%	24%
All Institutions	16%	45%	39%

F. Capacity to Accommodate Increased Funding and Associated Activity Volume

Question 11. *If your institution were to receive significantly more capacity or formula-based Cooperative Extension funding, what percent increase in funding could be used without increasing your current FTE employment count? In other words, how much more cooperative extension funding could be effectively absorbed by your existing extension staff?*

Table 68: Estimated Capacity of Cooperative Extension to Absorb Increased Capacity Funding Without Increasing Staffing Levels (how much more capacity funded work could be effectively absorbed by existing extension staff)

	Percent Increase Potential
1862	39%
1890	40%
All Institutions	39%

G. Capacity Funding Versus Competitive Funding

Question 12. For the following set of cooperative extension funding characteristics, indicate whether you think that capacity or competitive funding sources are more suited to funding each.

Table 69: Comparative Rating of Capacity Versus Competitive Funding in Relation to Extension Activities and Receipt of Other Funding

	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
Leveraging matching state funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	81%	8%	10%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	82%	6%	12%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	81%	7%	10%	1%	0%	0%
Leveraging matching local and/or county funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	73%	12%	6%	2%	2%	6%
	1890	59%	0%	18%	0%	0%	24%
	All Institutions	70%	9%	9%	1%	1%	10%
Leveraging matching commodity group funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	40%	8%	25%	4%	10%	13%
	1890	35%	0%	29%	0%	6%	29%
	All Institutions	39%	6%	26%	3%	9%	17%
Leveraging matching foundation/non-profit funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	48%	6%	21%	10%	8%	8%
	1890	47%	6%	12%	0%	6%	29%
	All Institutions	48%	6%	19%	7%	7%	13%
Leveraging or generating industry (company) funding	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	48%	12%	19%	12%	4%	6%
	1890	41%	6%	12%	12%	6%	24%
	All Institutions	46%	10%	17%	12%	4%	10%
Supporting under-graduate service learning	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	40%	15%	31%	6%	2%	6%
	1890	41%	12%	18%	6%	0%	24%
	All Institutions	41%	14%	28%	6%	1%	10%
Supporting graduate students/ PhD candidates service learning and extension activities	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	27%	13%	38%	13%	8%	0%
	1890	29%	6%	18%	18%	0%	29%
	All Institutions	28%	12%	33%	14%	6%	7%
Supporting international students service learning	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	13%	8%	25%	15%	17%	21%
	1890	24%	12%	6%	12%	24%	24%
	All Institutions	16%	9%	20%	14%	19%	22%

Supporting junior faculty extension activities	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	56%	17%	23%	2%	0%	2%
	1890	47%	18%	12%	6%	0%	18%
	All Institutions	54%	17%	20%	3%	0%	6%
Supporting tenured/ senior faculty extension activities	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	31%	15%	33%	12%	10%	0%
	1890	29%	24%	6%	6%	6%	29%
	All Institutions	30%	17%	26%	10%	9%	7%
Supporting extension educator/ agent activities	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	69%	12%	13%	4%	2%	0%
	1890	76%	12%	12%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	71%	12%	13%	3%	1%	0%
Supporting purchases of instruments, tools, and equipment	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	29%	15%	33%	13%	6%	4%
	1890	59%	12%	24%	6%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	36%	14%	30%	12%	4%	3%
Supporting maintenance of instruments, tools, and equipment	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	50%	25%	12%	8%	0%	6%
	1890	65%	24%	12%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	54%	25%	12%	6%	0%	4%
Supporting maintenance of other cooperative extension related facilities, building, camps, etc.	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	62%	15%	6%	6%	2%	10%
	1890	65%	24%	12%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	62%	17%	7%	4%	1%	7%
Creating a national cooperative extension system	Inst. Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	Not Applicable
	1862	71%	13%	6%	2%	4%	4%
	1890	65%	18%	18%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	70%	14%	9%	1%	3%	3%

H. Influence of Capacity Funding Investments on Success in Competitive Awards

Question 16. *If your institution has received any competitive funding for your extension activities, has success with capacity funded programs influenced or impacted success receiving competitive funding?*

Table 70: Influence of Capacity Funding for Extension on Achieving Success from Competitive Funding Sources

	1862	1890	All Institutions
Capacity funding success has had a significant impact on competitive funding success	27%	41%	30%
Capacity funding success has had a very significant impact on competitive funding success	54%	35%	49%
Capacity funding success has had limited impact on competitive funding success	10%	0%	7%
Capacity funding success has had no impact on competitive funding success	2%	0%	1%
Capacity funding success has had very limited impact on competitive funding success	2%	18%	6%
Don't Know	2%	0%	1%
Have not received any competitive-based cooperative extension funding	4%	6%	4%

Question 17. *If applicable -- Do you believe that the strengths of your institution's capacity-funded Cooperative Extension operations and programs improve the competitiveness of your institution's competitively-funded Research activities?*

Table 71: Does Capacity Funded Extension Operations and Programs Improve Institutional Position for Gaining Competitive Funding

	Yes	No	Don't Know/Not applicable
1862	92%	4%	4%
1890	82%	0%	18%
Grand Total	90%	3%	7%

I. NIFA Capacity Funding Versus NIFA Competitive Funding for Addressing NIFA Challenge Areas

Question 18. For each of the six NIFA challenge areas, indicate which funding source is best suited to meet the funding requirements for Cooperative Extension programs.

Table 72: Influence of Capacity Funding for Extension on Achieving Success from Competitive Funding Sources

	Institution Type	NIFA Capacity Funds for Extension	NIFA Competitive Funds for Extension	All Other Federal Funds	All Other Non-Federal Funds	Not a Priority Area for Extension
Bioenergy	1862	13%	42%	15%	2%	27%
	1890	38%	19%	6%	0%	38%
	All Institutions	19%	37%	13%	1%	29%
Childhood Obesity	1862	75%	13%	10%	2%	0%
	1890	88%	6%	6%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	78%	12%	9%	1%	0%
Climate Variability and Change	1862	54%	35%	10%	2%	0%
	1890	56%	19%	19%	0%	6%
	All Institutions	54%	31%	12%	1%	1%
Food Safety	1862	87%	6%	6%	2%	0%
	1890	88%	6%	6%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	87%	6%	6%	1%	0%
Food Security	1862	88%	8%	4%	0%	0%
	1890	81%	19%	0%	0%	0%
	All Institutions	87%	10%	3%	0%	0%
Water	1862	79%	15%	4%	0%	2%
	1890	53%	24%	0%	0%	24%
	All Institutions	72%	17%	3%	0%	7%

J. Funding Source Suitability by Area of Output

Question 19. Rate the following funding sources on the ability of your institution to **translate extension experience and program impacts into academic publications.**

Table 73: Funding Type Influence on Ability to “Translate Extension Experience and Program Impacts into Academic Publications”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	33%	35%	23%	4%	6%	0%
	1890	44%	31%	19%	0%	0%	6%
	All Inst	35%	34%	22%	3%	4%	1%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	23%	29%	17%	6%	4%	21%
	1890	6%	31%	19%	6%	0%	38%
	All Inst	19%	29%	18%	6%	3%	25%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	23%	19%	17%	27%	10%	4%
	1890	38%	13%	31%	13%	0%	6%
	All Inst	26%	18%	21%	24%	7%	4%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	29%	35%	25%	6%	0%	6%
	1890	25%	6%	44%	6%	0%	19%
	All Inst	28%	28%	29%	6%	0%	9%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	27%	29%	29%	4%	2%	10%
	1890	25%	19%	19%	19%	0%	19%
	All Inst	26%	26%	26%	7%	1%	12%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	21%	21%	25%	25%	2%	6%
	1890	25%	31%	25%	0%	13%	6%
	All Inst	22%	24%	25%	19%	4%	6%

Question 20. Rate the following funding sources on the ability of your institution to use research findings to **prepare non-formal educational materials for the general public.**

Table 74: Funding Type Influence on Ability to “Use Research Findings for Non-formal Education Materials for the General Public”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	67%	23%	4%	2%	4%	0%
	1890	75%	19%	0%	6%	0%	0%
	All Inst	69%	22%	3%	3%	3%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	46%	19%	10%	4%	0%	21%
	1890	38%	25%	0%	6%	0%	31%
	All Inst	44%	21%	7%	4%	0%	24%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	60%	27%	4%	8%	0%	2%
	1890	69%	19%	6%	0%	6%	0%
	All Inst	62%	25%	4%	6%	1%	1%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	15%	25%	38%	12%	6%	4%
	1890	38%	13%	31%	6%	0%	13%
	All Inst	21%	22%	37%	10%	4%	6%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	17%	23%	38%	13%	2%	6%
	1890	25%	25%	31%	6%	0%	13%
	All Inst	19%	24%	37%	12%	1%	7%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	46%	29%	12%	6%	2%	6%
	1890	25%	50%	6%	6%	6%	6%
	All Inst	41%	34%	10%	6%	3%	6%

Question 21. Rate the following funding sources on the ability of your institution to translate extension experience and program impacts into **new approaches or processes to be deployed into the field.**

Table 75: Funding Type Influence on Ability to “Translating Extension Experience and Program Impacts into New Approaches and Processes Deployed in the Field”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	73%	23%	2%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	76%	21%	1%	1%	0%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	42%	25%	10%	2%	0%	21%
	1890	56%	6%	6%	0%	0%	31%
	All Inst	46%	21%	9%	1%	0%	24%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	44%	33%	13%	8%	0%	2%
	1890	67%	27%	7%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	49%	31%	12%	6%	0%	1%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	21%	27%	38%	6%	4%	4%
	1890	31%	13%	25%	13%	0%	19%
	All Inst	24%	24%	35%	7%	3%	7%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	17%	27%	38%	8%	2%	8%
	1890	25%	25%	25%	13%	0%	13%
	All Inst	19%	26%	35%	9%	1%	9%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	42%	29%	17%	6%	2%	4%
	1890	44%	31%	19%	0%	0%	6%
	All Inst	43%	29%	18%	4%	1%	4%

Question 22. Rate the following funding sources on the **volume of extension outcomes (e.g., numbers of printed/web publications, demonstrations, tours, contacts, etc.) achieved with their funding.**

Table 76: Funding Type Influence on Ability to “Generate Quantitative Extension Outcomes”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	73%	23%	2%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	81%	13%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	75%	21%	3%	1%	0%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	33%	21%	17%	8%	0%	21%
	1890	38%	19%	13%	0%	0%	31%
	All Inst	34%	21%	16%	6%	0%	24%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	47%	35%	10%	8%	0%	0%
	1890	69%	13%	13%	6%	0%	0%
	All Inst	52%	30%	10%	7%	0%	0%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	19%	35%	31%	12%	2%	2%
	1890	19%	13%	50%	0%	0%	19%
	All Inst	19%	29%	35%	9%	1%	6%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	17%	27%	37%	12%	2%	6%
	1890	19%	19%	38%	13%	0%	13%
	All Inst	18%	25%	37%	12%	1%	7%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	48%	23%	13%	8%	2%	6%
	1890	38%	31%	25%	0%	0%	6%
	All Inst	46%	25%	16%	6%	1%	6%

Question 23. Rate the following funding sources on the ability to **deploy new applied technologies** (e.g., novel crops, new equipment, new approaches) with their funding.

Table 77: Funding Type Influence on Ability to “Deploy New Technologies”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	56%	31%	10%	0%	2%	2%
	1890	88%	6%	0%	6%	0%	0%
	All Inst	63%	25%	7%	1%	1%	1%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	25%	29%	15%	6%	2%	23%
	1890	44%	19%	0%	6%	0%	31%
	All Inst	29%	26%	12%	6%	1%	25%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	23%	27%	33%	10%	2%	6%
	1890	50%	25%	6%	13%	0%	6%
	All Inst	29%	26%	26%	10%	1%	6%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	22%	39%	29%	2%	4%	4%
	1890	38%	19%	25%	6%	0%	13%
	All Inst	25%	34%	28%	3%	3%	6%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	12%	38%	37%	2%	4%	8%
	1890	38%	19%	31%	6%	0%	6%
	All Inst	18%	34%	35%	3%	3%	7%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	33%	29%	15%	13%	4%	6%
	1890	44%	31%	13%	6%	0%	6%
	All Inst	35%	29%	15%	12%	3%	6%

Question 24. Rate the following funding sources on the ability to **apply the results of research to the needs of farmers, ranchers, businesses, consumers, families, or communities.**

Table 78: Funding Type Influence on Ability to “Apply the Results of Research to the Needs of Farmers, Ranchers, Businesses, Consumers, Families, or Communities”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	81%	15%	2%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	81%	6%	13%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	81%	13%	4%	1%	0%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	46%	21%	10%	2%	0%	21%
	1890	44%	6%	19%	0%	0%	31%
	All Inst	46%	18%	12%	1%	0%	24%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	54%	23%	13%	6%	0%	4%
	1890	69%	13%	19%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	57%	21%	15%	4%	0%	3%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	21%	31%	31%	10%	6%	2%
	1890	31%	13%	38%	6%	0%	13%
	All Inst	24%	26%	32%	9%	4%	4%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	17%	31%	33%	10%	6%	4%
	1890	31%	13%	44%	6%	0%	6%
	All Inst	21%	26%	35%	9%	4%	4%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	56%	17%	15%	8%	2%	2%
	1890	56%	19%	19%	0%	0%	6%
	All Inst	56%	18%	16%	6%	1%	3%

Question 25. Rate the following funding sources on the *ease with which they can be adapted to the needs of local and state farmers, ranchers, businesses, consumers, families, or communities.*

Table 79: Rating of Relative Difficulty in “Adapting Funding Type to Meet the Needs of Farmers, Ranchers, Businesses, Consumers, Families, or Communities”

	Institution Type	Very Difficult	Difficult	Moderate	Easy	Very Easy	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	0%	0%	6%	23%	71%	0%
	1890	0%	0%	6%	25%	69%	0%
	All Inst	0%	0%	6%	24%	71%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	0%	0%	12%	24%	43%	22%
	1890	0%	6%	6%	13%	44%	31%
	All Inst	0%	1%	10%	21%	43%	24%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	2%	12%	25%	17%	44%	0%
	1890	0%	0%	19%	25%	56%	0%
	All Inst	1%	9%	24%	19%	47%	0%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	13%	37%	29%	12%	8%	2%
	1890	6%	19%	31%	19%	13%	13%
	All Inst	12%	32%	29%	13%	9%	4%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	12%	40%	25%	13%	6%	4%
	1890	6%	25%	31%	19%	13%	6%
	All Inst	10%	37%	26%	15%	7%	4%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	0%	4%	12%	21%	62%	2%
	1890	0%	0%	25%	31%	38%	6%
	All Inst	0%	3%	15%	24%	56%	3%

Question 26. Rate the following funding sources on the amount of **behavioral change outcomes for farmers, ranchers, or other producers achieved with their funding.**

Table 80: Rating of Funding Type for Funding Work leading to “Behavioral Change Outcomes for Farmers, Ranchers, or Other Producers”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	69%	19%	10%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	63%	31%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	68%	22%	9%	1%	0%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	37%	25%	15%	0%	2%	21%
	1890	31%	25%	0%	13%	0%	31%
	All Inst	35%	25%	12%	3%	1%	24%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	42%	19%	13%	8%	4%	13%
	1890	38%	31%	0%	0%	0%	31%
	All Inst	41%	22%	10%	6%	3%	18%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	13%	15%	44%	19%	4%	4%
	1890	19%	19%	44%	0%	6%	13%
	All Inst	15%	16%	44%	15%	4%	6%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	12%	17%	44%	19%	3.85%	4%
	1890	19%	25%	38%	6%	6.25%	6%
	All Inst	13%	19%	43%	16%	4.41%	4%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	50%	21%	19%	6%	0%	4%
	1890	31%	44%	13%	6%	0%	6%
	All Inst	46%	26%	18%	6%	0%	4%

Question 27. Rate the following funding sources on the amount of **behavioral change outcomes in the area of nutrition, health, and physical activity** achieved with their funding.

Table 81: Rating of Funding Type for Funding Extension Work leading to “Behavioral Change Outcomes in Nutrition, health and Physical Activity”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	54%	31%	13%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	63%	25%	13%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	56%	29%	13%	1%	0%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	10%	4%	12%	10%	13%	52%
	1890	19%	0%	6%	0%	6%	69%
	All Inst	12%	3%	10%	7%	12%	56%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	69%	21%	10%	0%	0%	0%
	1890	75%	19%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	71%	21%	9%	0%	0%	0%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	10%	29%	40%	13%	6%	2%
	1890	19%	6%	56%	6%	0%	13%
	All Inst	12%	24%	44%	12%	4%	4%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	15%	10%	46%	17%	8%	4%
	1890	19%	6%	50%	13%	0%	13%
	All Inst	16%	9%	47%	16%	6%	6%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	38%	29%	19%	4%	2%	8%
	1890	31%	31%	31%	0%	0%	6%
	All Inst	37%	29%	22%	3%	1%	7%

Question 28. Rate the following funding sources on the amount of **behavioral change outcomes for children and youth** achieved with their funding.

Table 82: Rating of Funding Type for Funding Extension Work leading to “Behavioral Change Outcomes for Children and Youth”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	69%	21%	8%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	71%	22%	6%	1%	0%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	12%	6%	15%	12%	13%	42%
	1890	25%	0%	6%	6%	6%	56%
	All Inst	15%	4%	13%	10%	12%	46%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	46%	21%	25%	8%	0%	0%
	1890	81%	13%	0%	0%	0%	6%
	All Inst	54%	19%	19%	6%	0%	1%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	15%	13%	38%	17%	6%	10%
	1890	19%	25%	38%	6%	0%	13%
	All Inst	16%	16%	38%	15%	4%	10%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	15%	13%	40%	25%	2%	4%
	1890	19%	19%	50%	6%	0%	6%
	All Inst	16%	15%	43%	21%	1%	4%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	54%	21%	15%	4%	0%	6%
	1890	38%	31%	25%	0%	0%	6%
	All Inst	50%	24%	18%	3%	0%	6%

Question 29. Rate the following funding sources on the amount of **behavioral change outcomes in the area of parent and family skills development** achieved with their funding.

Table 83: Rating of Funding Type for Funding Work leading to “Behavioral Change Outcomes in Patenting and Family Skills Development”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	52%	19%	21%	0%	0%	8%
	1890	75%	19%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	57%	19%	18%	0%	0%	6%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	8%	0%	4%	2%	22%	65%
	1890	19%	0%	6%	6%	6%	63%
	All Inst	10%	0%	4%	3%	18%	64%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	37%	19%	31%	4%	2%	8%
	1890	69%	25%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	44%	21%	25%	3%	1%	6%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	10%	12%	35%	21%	10%	13%
	1890	25%	19%	38%	6%	0%	13%
	All Inst	13%	13%	35%	18%	7%	13%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	12%	15%	33%	21%	12%	8%
	1890	19%	19%	50%	6%	0%	6%
	All Inst	13%	16%	37%	18%	9%	7%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	31%	37%	17%	4%	2%	10%
	1890	38%	38%	19%	0%	0%	6%
	All Inst	32%	37%	18%	3%	1%	9%

Question 30. Rate the following funding sources on the amount of **behavioral change outcomes in the area of leadership and civic/community engagement** achieved with their funding.

Table 84: Rating of Funding Type for Funding Work leading to “Behavioral Change Outcomes in Leadership and Civic/Community Engagement”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	62%	19%	15%	2%	0%	2%
	1890	81%	13%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	66%	18%	13%	1%	0%	1%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	15%	4%	13%	13%	10%	44%
	1890	25%	6%	19%	6%	0%	44%
	All Inst	18%	4%	15%	12%	7%	44%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	15%	6%	21%	19%	8%	31%
	1890	19%	19%	38%	6%	6%	13%
	All Inst	16%	9%	25%	16%	7%	26%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	10%	12%	31%	27%	12%	10%
	1890	19%	19%	44%	6%	0%	13%
	All Inst	12%	13%	34%	22%	9%	10%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	8%	10%	35%	22%	16%	10%
	1890	19%	13%	56%	6%	0%	6%
	All Inst	10%	10%	40%	18%	12%	9%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	38%	35%	17%	2%	0%	8%
	1890	31%	31%	31%	0%	0%	6%
	All Inst	37%	34%	21%	1%	0%	7%

Question 31. Provide recent (last three years) examples from your institution of particularly strong or meaningful outcomes from capacity funded Cooperative Extension programs (e.g., education programs, farmer or consumer assistance, youth development, assistance publications, etc.).

Of the varied responses provided, four occurred with some frequency: youth development and 4-H, natural disaster response, crop well-being, and farmer outreach.

K. Funding Source Flexibility

Question 32. Rate the following funding sources in terms of **how flexible they are regarding the types of expenditures they can be used for** (e.g., labor, equipment, educational materials, program participation scholarships, student wages and stipends, etc.).

Table 85: Rating of Funding Type in Terms of Flexibility-of-use

	Institution Type	Very Flexible	Somewhat Flexible	Neutral	Somewhat Inflexible	Very Inflexible	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	42%	40%	4%	13%	0%	0%
	1890	44%	31%	0%	19%	6%	0%
	All Inst	43%	38%	3%	15%	1%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	17%	33%	10%	13%	2%	25%
	1890	19%	25%	0%	13%	6%	38%
	All Inst	18%	31%	7%	13%	3%	28%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	8%	31%	12%	38%	10%	2%
	1890	13%	25%	19%	19%	25%	0%
	All Inst	9%	29%	13%	34%	13%	1%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	8%	13%	19%	42%	12%	6%
	1890	6%	13%	6%	50%	6%	19%
	All Inst	7%	13%	16%	44%	10%	9%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	8%	15%	17%	40%	12%	8%
	1890	6%	19%	6%	56%	6%	6%
	All Inst	7%	16%	15%	44%	10%	7%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	50%	29%	10%	4%	2%	6%
	1890	19%	38%	6%	31%	0%	6%
	All Inst	43%	31%	9%	10%	1%	6%

Question 33. Provide any relevant recent (i.e., last three years) examples or experiences of the different ways in which the funding sources listed in the previous question are more or less flexible.

Because capacity funds can be used to fund salaries and infrastructure, their use is more flexible in addressing new and emerging issues over the long-term. However, there is disagreement among respondents regarding just how flexible capacity funding is – that seems to be a reflection of the specific needs of institutions and what they wish to use capacity funding for. Competitive grant funding is much more difficult to reallocate based on the way it is acquired. However, respondents note that capacity funding has become less flexible due to limitations on purchasing equipment without approval.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Difficult to adjust post award budgets. Excessive annual POW and annual reporting by NIFA due to combining all institutions into a single state report. Recent annual report was in excess of 700 pages*
- *Examples of greater flexibility have been the leveraging of these dollars to develop more regional sharing, especially educators in extension agriculture teams. The flexibility of these dollars has*

also allowed for the identification and support of innovative programs, and rapid response to time sensitive and emerging issues. Examples of less flexibility are integrating student opportunities for student learning in extension and support of summer internships.

- *We use NIFA capacity funds for salaries so we have not sought greater flexibility in types of expenditures for these funds. However, the requirement that 25% of Smith Lever funds are used on multi-state and integrated activities can make it challenging to fund salaries when many of the pressing needs are driven by local and state needs. We have found the other federal funding sources to have adequate flexibility to fund salaries, operating, printing, travel, and small equipment.*
- *Capacity funding can be used for personnel and/or operational needs. We have used funding to help develop a new on-line infrastructure in support of extension programming. Competitive funding provides flexibility by providing resources to address specific aspects of a major issue. Capacity funding allows the states to address local and state level problems that are not supported by competitive funds that tend to focus on national issues.*

1890 institutions

- *Limits in terms of actual use of funds has restricted program implementation, equipment purchase/usage and new project development.*
- *Capacity funds can be re-purposed much easier than competitive funds to address local or emerging issues. However, some capacity funds (ex. EFNEP) are somewhat inflexible in support of student experiential learning that can assist with program delivery. Competitive funds have very little flexibility beyond the scope of work of the project.*

Question 34. Provide any recommendations you may have to streamline processes, enhance flexibility of use, or simplify/improve reporting requirements associated with NIFA capacity or competitive Cooperative Extension funding.

Several respondents recommend removing the recent requirement of approval for large equipment purchases. Many respondents addressed the reporting system, which was generally seen as repetitive and time-consuming. Respondents would like to see the process streamlined. They specifically recommend standardizing reports for capacity and competitively funded projects, increasing accessibility of reporting data after submission, creating a system that would more easily link reporting from different institutions and allow for aggregation across regions and states, and making the reporting system more user-friendly to facilitate more speed up the process.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Ideally LGUs should be able to share with NIFA our successes in a format that is useful for NIFA and not onerous for LGUs to input and edit. The process could be streamlined if there was specific criteria/rubric for reporting and the ability for LGUs to upload a document. The onerous part of reporting is the reporting tool. Often the questions are related and the answers must be replicated. If one document was developed by the LGU and uploaded to NIFA – NIFA could then use/showcase the annual reports. The annual reports would be more thoughtfully crafted so as to also be used by the LGUs as an annual report of accomplishments. The current annual report is really not of use to the LGUs as it is all text. Realizing that an upload would not allow for comparative data – there may be specific data for use in a reporting tool – perhaps indirects, outputs, outcomes and success stories around a handful of NIFA priority areas.*

- *The previous administrative handbook for Cooperative Extension work was much easier to follow and comply with than the new combined guidance. Each capacity program has unique needs and legislative mandates that are very difficult to address in one combined document.*
- *Award funds at the beginning of the budget year not the end of the budget year. Allow carryover at end of the year. Significantly reduce the multi-state requirement. Streamline annual reports. Increase capacity funding.*
- *There is currently an ongoing process to streamline the reporting process regarding the use of capacity funds. I am in hopes that it will provide a new and improved reporting system. The general impression is that the material provided to NIFA in the current system is not widely utilized by NIFA. It is clear that at the local level it is not in a beneficial format for promotion of our program within the state. Local promotions of programs must utilize short and concise presentation of programs in one page infographics and brochures that utilize numbers, photos, and graphics. Federal reporting is to full of text, classifications, jargon, etc. to be useful for program promotion to legislators and private funding sources.*

1890 institutions

- *Capacity funds, particularly 1890 Extension funds, have a 20% limitation on carryover funds. There needs to be language consistent with Smith-Lever funds that allow for 100% carryover of funds.*
- *Rather than requiring 1890 Institutions to return funds when not properly matched, the state government should be penalized for refusing to provide a dollar-to-dollar match to the federal allocation of funds. Approvals to change program deliverables or direction should be handled more expeditiously.*
- *Our recommendations would be to: 1. Ensure that regulations and guidelines affecting the use of these fund are clear transparent and practical. 2. Continue the effective use of webinars to inform institutions of guidelines and regulations for use of governing funds. 3. To allow some flexibility as to extension specialists being able to support classroom support and experiential learning.*

L. Hypothetical Impact of an Absence of Capacity Funds at LGUs

Question 35. How much of your Cooperative Extension program would you say your institution could continue if federal capacity funds were entirely cut?

Table 86: Expectation Regarding Percent of Current Cooperative Extension Activities that could be Maintained in the Absence of Federal Capacity Funding

	Most of it	Half of it	Some of it	Almost none of it	None of it
1862	4%	27%	38%	27%	4%
1890	0%	6%	6%	38%	50%
All Institutions	3%	22%	31%	29%	15%

M. Hypothetical Effects of a Shift to 100% Competitive Funding

Question 36. Which of the following best describe your outlook regarding state/local Cooperative Extension funding under this "all competitive-based funding" scenario? Check all that apply.

Table 87: Expectation Regarding Ability to Achieve/Leverage State or Local Funding Under an All Federal Competitive Funding Model

	1862	1890	All Institutions
State/local funding would be very minimally affected, if at all.	6%	6%	6%
State/local funding would be impacted some, but not significantly.	10%	0%	7%
We would likely have to seek state/local match funding on a proposal-by-proposal basis.	37%	44%	38%
It will be difficult to generate the same total level of state/local funding.	81%	63%	76%
State/local funds for staffing/operations would be limited.	62%	56%	60%
State/local funds for infrastructure would be limited.	56%	69%	59%
State/local funding match might be available for some current programmatic activities, but not all.	48%	25%	43%
State/local funding might be significantly reduced or eliminated if it did not automatically leverage federal funding.	73%	94%	78%
State/local funding would increase, if we generated federal "competitive" funding in excess of our current federal "capacity" funding.	0%	0%	0%

Question 37. For each of the following areas, would your institution struggle to maintain current levels of operations and performance in between competitive grant funding award periods if federal capacity funding for Cooperative Extension was not available?

Table 88: Would Cooperative Extension "Struggle" to Maintain Operations and Performance Between Competitive Funding Awards in the Absence of Federal Capacity Funding

Campus Facility/Building Infrastructure	Institution Type	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably Not	Definitely Not
	1862	52%	12%	27%	10%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	63%	9%	21%	7%
Demonstration Fields (Farms) Infrastructure	1862	63%	19%	15%	2%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	72%	15%	12%	1%
Extension/Youth Camps	1862	61%	20%	16%	4%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	70%	15%	12%	3%
Travel Funding/Support	1862	67%	15%	12%	6%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	75%	12%	9%	4%

Program Delivery Funds					
	1862	77%	15%	2%	6%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	82%	12%	1%	4%
Supplies and Materials					
	1862	58%	25%	10%	8%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	68%	19%	7%	6%
Extension Personnel					
	1862	87%	8%	2%	4%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	90%	6%	1%	3%
Support Personnel					
	1862	75%	17%	2%	6%
	1890	100%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst	81%	13%	1%	4%

Question 38. For the six NIFA challenge areas, how likely is it that your institution would be able to generate competitive Cooperative Extension funding for these areas at the same level as your current capacity funding for Cooperative Extension.

Table 89: Perceived Ability of Institution to Generate Competitive Funding for Cooperative Extension Equivalent to Prior Capacity Funding Levels in an “Absence of Capacity Funding” Environment

	Institution Type	Very Likely	Likely	Unsure	Unlikely	Very Unlikely	Not a Priority Area for Extension
Bioenergy							
	1862	0%	8%	27%	15%	21%	29%
	1890	0%	0%	0%	0%	56%	44%
	All Inst.	0%	6%	21%	12%	29%	32%
Childhood Obesity							
	1862	0%	12%	12%	35%	42%	0%
	1890	0%	19%	6%	13%	63%	0%
	All Inst.	0%	13%	10%	29%	47%	0%
Climate Variability and Change							
	1862	0%	15%	21%	27%	37%	0%
	1890	0%	0%	0%	6%	75%	19%
	All Inst.	0%	12%	16%	22%	46%	4%
Food Safety							
	1862	4%	10%	17%	35%	35%	0%
	1890	0%	0%	13%	6%	81%	0%
	All Inst.	3%	7%	16%	28%	46%	0%
Food Security							
	1862	4%	10%	13%	31%	42%	0%
	1890	0%	0%	13%	0%	88%	0%
	All Inst.	3%	7%	13%	24%	53%	0%
Water							
	1862	2%	13%	25%	29%	29%	2%
	1890	0%	6%	6%	6%	63%	19%
	All Inst.	1%	12%	21%	24%	37%	6%

N. Funding Sources and Acceptance of Program Risk

Question 39. Indicate, by funding source, the amount of risk accepted in proposed programmatic activities. In other words, do different funding sources allow for more or less risky or "out of the box" thinking regarding program development?

Table 90: Rating of Risk Tolerance in Cooperative Extension Activities by Funding Source

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	45%	24%	22%	6%	0%	4%
	1890	25%	44%	19%	6%	6%	0%
	All Inst.	40%	28%	21%	6%	1%	3%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	22%	18%	25%	4%	4%	27%
	1890	6%	25%	31%	0%	6%	31%
	All Inst.	18%	19%	27%	3%	4%	28%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	6%	12%	39%	31%	8%	4%
	1890	13%	6%	44%	19%	19%	0%
	All Inst.	7%	10%	40%	28%	10%	3%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	12%	29%	24%	14%	14%	8%
	1890	13%	13%	25%	25%	13%	13%
	All Inst.	12%	25%	24%	16%	13%	9%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	6%	35%	14%	20%	14%	12%
	1890	6%	25%	19%	25%	19%	6%
	All Inst.	6%	33%	15%	21%	15%	10%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	26%	24%	24%	6%	10%	10%
	1890	13%	31%	25%	19%	6%	6%
	All Inst.	23%	26%	24%	9%	9%	9%

O. Funding Sources and Their Suitability for Addressing Short-term Emergency Needs

Question 40. Rate the suitability of the following funding types for addressing short-term emergency needs (e.g., sudden community concern, disease or pest outbreak, natural disaster).

Table 91: Rating of Suitability of Funding Source to Address Extension Work for “Short-Term Emergency Needs”

NIFA Capacity Funds for	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
Cooperative Extension	1862	78%	14%	6%	2%	0%	0%
	1890	63%	13%	13%	0%	13%	0%
	All Inst.	75%	13%	7%	1%	3%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	39%	25%	8%	6%	2%	20%
	1890	31%	13%	19%	0%	13%	25%
	All Inst.	37%	22%	10%	4%	4%	21%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	20%	14%	16%	37%	10%	4%
	1890	19%	13%	31%	25%	13%	0%
	All Inst.	19%	13%	19%	34%	10%	3%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	0%	2%	12%	37%	47%	2%
	1890	0%	6%	25%	19%	38%	13%
	All Inst.	0%	3%	15%	33%	45%	4%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	0%	2%	8%	43%	43%	4%
	1890	0%	13%	19%	19%	44%	6%
	All Inst.	0%	4%	10%	37%	43%	4%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	57%	18%	14%	8%	2%	2%
	1890	25%	25%	31%	6%	6%	6%
	All Inst.	49%	19%	18%	7%	3%	3%

Question 41. Provide up to three recent (last three years) examples of times when capacity funds for Cooperative Extension were able to be redirected by your institution to respond to a sudden and severe need.

The most common responses to this question are programs addressing natural and manmade disasters, invasive species, and infectious disease.

P. Funding Sources and Their Suitability for Generating Extension Outputs

Question 42. Rate the suitability of the following funding sources for **generating peer reviewed papers and other academic publications**.

Table 92: Rating of Suitability of Funding Source to Address Extension Work in “Generating Academic Publications”

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	22%	37%	27%	10%	4%	0%
	1890	44%	31%	6%	6%	6%	6%
	All Inst.	27%	36%	22%	9%	4%	1%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	20%	33%	22%	6%	0%	20%
	1890	25%	13%	13%	13%	6%	31%
	All Inst.	21%	28%	19%	7%	1%	22%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	16%	18%	27%	25%	12%	2%
	1890	25%	19%	25%	6%	19%	6%
	All Inst.	18%	18%	27%	21%	13%	3%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	37%	49%	8%	4%	0%	2%
	1890	6%	44%	25%	6%	0%	19%
	All Inst.	30%	48%	12%	4%	0%	6%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	35%	45%	10%	6%	0%	4%
	1890	13%	25%	50%	0%	0%	13%
	All Inst.	30%	40%	19%	4%	0%	6%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	20%	20%	36%	18%	4%	2%
	1890	19%	25%	31%	6%	6%	13%
	All Inst.	20%	21%	35%	15%	5%	5%

Question 43. Rate the suitability of the following funding sources for **generating extension-specific publications, web information/modules, web-based decision tools, and other programs leading to behavioral change.**

Table 93: Rating of Suitability of Funding Source to Address Extension Work in Generating Publications Leading to “Behavioral Change”

NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
	1862	71%	22%	6%	0%	2%	0%
	1890	94%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	76%	16%	6%	0%	1%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension							
	1862	51%	25%	2%	0%	0%	22%
	1890	38%	19%	13%	0%	0%	31%
	All Inst.	48%	24%	4%	0%	0%	24%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)							
	1862	45%	22%	27%	4%	2%	0%
	1890	50%	25%	19%	0%	6%	0%
	All Inst.	46%	22%	25%	3%	3%	0%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension							
	1862	24%	33%	29%	10%	2%	2%
	1890	13%	38%	31%	6%	0%	13%
	All Inst.	21%	34%	30%	9%	1%	4%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension							
	1862	22%	27%	24%	20%	2%	6%
	1890	19%	19%	50%	6%	0%	6%
	All Inst.	21%	25%	30%	16%	1%	6%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension							
	1862	47%	25%	18%	8%	0%	2%
	1890	31%	38%	19%	0%	6%	6%
	All Inst.	43%	28%	18%	6%	1%	3%

Question 44. Rate the suitability of the following funding sources **for broad knowledge-diffusion activities**. Knowledge diffusion includes any method to document and share knowledge, practice recommendations, fact sheets, policy reports, education and training outreach activities, webinars, presentations, and field days, among others.

Table 94: Rating of Suitability of Funding Source to Address Extension Work in “Knowledge Diffusion”

NIFA Capacity Funds for	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
Cooperative Extension	1862	82%	16%	2%	0%	0%	0%
	1890	88%	6%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	84%	13%	3%	0%	0%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	49%	27%	4%	0%	0%	20%
	1890	50%	6%	19%	0%	0%	25%
	All Inst.	49%	22%	7%	0%	0%	21%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	57%	22%	10%	12%	0%	0%
	1890	53%	27%	13%	0%	7%	0%
	All Inst.	56%	23%	11%	9%	2%	0%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	12%	37%	22%	18%	10%	2%
	1890	31%	13%	38%	6%	0%	13%
	All Inst.	16%	31%	25%	15%	7%	4%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	16%	24%	31%	18%	10%	2%
	1890	31%	0%	56%	6%	0%	6%
	All Inst.	19%	18%	37%	15%	7%	3%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	57%	20%	16%	4%	2%	2%
	1890	38%	25%	25%	0%	6%	6%
	All Inst.	52%	21%	18%	3%	3%	3%

Question 45. Rate the following funding sources in their **ability to increase future funding success in terms of receiving follow-up competitive funding**. In other words, to what degree does proven success from one of these funding sources increase the likelihood of future success in gaining additional competitive funding?

Table 95: Rating of Suitability of Funding Source in Terms of Increasing Success in Gaining Follow-up Competitive Funding

	Institution Type	Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	53%	29%	18%	0%	0%	0%
	1890	63%	31%	6%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	55%	30%	15%	0%	0%	0%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	29%	24%	20%	2%	2%	24%
	1890	44%	13%	6%	0%	6%	31%
	All Inst.	33%	21%	16%	1%	3%	25%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	16%	41%	27%	12%	2%	2%
	1890	44%	38%	6%	6%	6%	0%
	All Inst.	22%	40%	22%	10%	3%	1%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	33%	37%	18%	4%	2%	6%
	1890	38%	31%	19%	0%	0%	13%
	All Inst.	34%	36%	18%	3%	1%	7%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	25%	47%	18%	2%	0%	8%
	1890	38%	31%	25%	0%	0%	6%
	All Inst.	28%	43%	19%	1%	0%	7%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	26%	38%	30%	2%	0%	4%
	1890	19%	44%	19%	6%	6%	6%
	All Inst.	24%	39%	27%	3%	2%	5%

Question 46. Please rate the following funding sources on their ability to **facilitate multi-state or multi-institution collaboration**.

Table 96: Rating of Suitability of Funding Source to Facilitate Extension Work in “Multi-state or Multi-institution Collaborations”

	Institution Type	Very Difficult to Facilitate Collaboration	Difficult to Facilitate Collaboration	Somewhat Easy to Facilitate Collaboration	Easy to Facilitate Collaboration	Very Easy to Facilitate Collaboration	N/A
NIFA Capacity Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	0%	4%	16%	25%	55%	0%
	1890	6%	6%	25%	13%	44%	6%
	All Inst.	1%	4%	18%	22%	52%	1%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Forestry Extension	1862	0%	6%	14%	27%	29%	24%
	1890	6%	6%	19%	6%	25%	38%
	All Inst.	1%	6%	15%	22%	28%	27%
NIFA Capacity Funds for Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	1862	6%	20%	22%	26%	24%	2%
	1890	13%	19%	19%	25%	13%	13%
	All Inst.	8%	20%	21%	26%	21%	5%
NIFA Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	2%	12%	39%	29%	16%	2%
	1890	0%	6%	44%	19%	13%	19%
	All Inst.	1%	10%	40%	27%	15%	6%
All Other Federal Competitive Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	2%	18%	31%	37%	6%	6%
	1890	0%	6%	50%	25%	6%	13%
	All Inst.	1%	15%	36%	34%	6%	7%
State/Local Funds for Cooperative Extension	1862	16%	18%	27%	20%	18%	2%
	1890	13%	38%	25%	0%	13%	13%
	All Inst.	15%	22%	27%	15%	16%	4%

Question 47. Provide your thoughts on what could be done to improve collaboration in Cooperative Extension activities above the state level (i.e., across multi-state regions or nationwide)?

Respondents recommend several strategies to facilitate collaboration across states and regions, including 1) priority funding for collaborative projects, 2) regional committees, forums, and/or training to discuss broad issues and increase communication, and 3) incentives for collaboration.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Create a bucket of money that can be used to incentivize or match projects that target multi-state activities. Provide travel funds at the regional level or make it a requirement that a certain dollar amount of each state's capacity funds be used to fund Extension travel to collaborate*

across regions - encourage Extension Agent involvement rather than just Specialists. Extension Directors have to all see this as a priority.

- Provide greater funding to states for faculty to collaborate. In forestry, regional funding has helped create the Southern Regional Extension Forestry Program. In Horticulture we have created a multistate Small Fruit Consortium. These are largely faculty groups that work together across state lines. However, requiring current funding to be redirected to multi-state does not help, especially when capacity funds are used for county agent salaries, who rarely are available for multi-state work. New funding, even as competitive, for multistate collaboration is needed.
- I believe improved multi-state collaboration in Extension is best funded by competitive grants. I believe it is the roll of national level funding to facilitate the synergy that can come from states sharing their expertise and learning from each other. For political/funding reasons state funds must show state impacts. Hence the use of state funds for the benefit of other states can be difficult to justify even if reciprocal benefits are present. Use of federal funds for multistate activity avoids this potential negative political state level conflict.

1890 institutions

- More incentives to encourage collaboration, the current environment promotes competitiveness and everybody out to get numbers, make impact and secure placing.
- Increased funding/increased access to funding to facilitate enhanced collaboration across multi-state regions. Support for convening around common issues among institutions, agencies and other entities. More public/private partnerships opportunities.
- Organize a database of projects/programs being delivered through Extension. The database should be accessed easily by Extension program people and linked to the NIFA landing page under each of the NIFA categories of interest. Develop intentional use of social media fora for gathering and chatting around program ideas and collaborations.

Q. Capacity Versus Competitive Funding by Type of Cooperative Extension Activity

Question 48. For the following set of functional characteristics, indicate whether you think that capacity or competitive funding sources are more suited to funding each.

Table 97: Comparative Rating of Capacity Versus Competitive Funding for Support of Functional Extension Activities

Supporting agriculture-related extension activities	Institution Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
	1862	67%	22%	8%	0%	2%	2%
	1890	88%	6%	0%	0%	0%	6%
	All Inst.	72%	18%	6%	0%	1%	3%
Supporting animal health/veterinary-related extension activities							
	1862	57%	20%	12%	2%	2%	8%
	1890	63%	13%	6%	0%	0%	19%
	All Inst.	58%	18%	10%	1%	1%	10%
Supporting forestry-related extension activities							
	1862	62%	12%	12%	2%	2%	10%
	1890	56%	0%	13%	6%	0%	25%
	All Inst.	61%	9%	12%	3%	2%	14%

Supporting multidisciplinary problem solving								
	1862	37%	16%	37%	6%	2%	2%	
	1890	50%	31%	13%	6%	0%	0%	
	All Inst.	40%	19%	31%	6%	1%	1%	
Supporting university extension-related units, centers, or institutes								
	1862	59%	16%	20%	2%	2%	2%	
	1890	56%	31%	6%	0%	6%	0%	
	All Inst.	58%	19%	16%	1%	3%	1%	
Supporting integrated research and cooperative extension activities								
	1862	33%	24%	25%	8%	8%	2%	
	1890	56%	13%	25%	6%	0%	0%	
	All Inst.	39%	21%	25%	7%	6%	1%	
Supporting knowledge transfer/diffusion activities								
	1862	59%	22%	18%	0%	0%	2%	
	1890	81%	13%	6%	0%	0%	0%	
	All Inst.	64%	19%	15%	0%	0%	1%	
Supporting educational engagement programs								
	1862	51%	29%	10%	8%	0%	2%	
	1890	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	All Inst.	60%	25%	7%	6%	0%	1%	
Support and programming for children and youth								
	1862	76%	12%	6%	4%	0%	2%	
	1890	81%	13%	6%	0%	0%	0%	
	All Inst.	78%	12%	6%	3%	0%	1%	
Supporting entrepreneurial programming and development								
	1862	37%	14%	31%	12%	4%	2%	
	1890	50%	25%	19%	6%	0%	0%	
	All Inst.	40%	16%	28%	10%	3%	1%	
Supporting individuals with gardening issues and questions								
	1862	76%	22%	0%	0%	0%	2%	
	1890	75%	13%	13%	0%	0%	0%	
	All Inst.	76%	19%	3%	0%	0%	1%	
Supporting family-owned farming operations								
	1862	75%	20%	2%	0%		4%	
	1890	75%	13%	6%	6%		0%	
	All Inst.	75%	18%	3%	1%		3%	
Supporting corporate farming operations								
	1862	35%	20%	25%	10%	4%	6%	
	1890	25%	19%	19%	19%	6%	13%	
	All Inst.	33%	19%	24%	12%	4%	7%	
Support and programming for nutrition, health, and physical activity								
	1862	61%	10%	27%			2%	
	1890	80%	7%	13%			0%	
	All Inst.	65%	9%	24%			2%	
Support and programming for parent and family skills development								
	1862	59%	18%	18%	2%	0%	4%	
	1890	88%	13%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
	All Inst.	66%	16%	13%	1%	0%	3%	

Support and programming for leadership and civic/community engagement							
	1862	57%	25%	10%	0%	2%	6%
	1890	73%	13%	13%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	61%	23%	11%	0%	2%	5%
Providing prestige to the University							
	1862	12%	8%	41%	12%	24%	4%
	1890	25%	19%	31%	13%	13%	0%
	All Inst.	15%	10%	39%	12%	21%	3%

Question 49. For the following set of topical characteristics, indicate whether you think that capacity or competitive funding sources are more suited to funding each.

Table 98: Comparative Rating of Capacity Versus Competitive Funding for Support of Functional Extension Activities

	Institution Type	Capacity Much Better	Capacity Moderately Better	Both Equally Suited	Competitive Moderately Better	Competitive Much Better	N/A
Supporting local and statewide interest in organic foods and farming							
	1862	43%	18%	25%	10%	2%	2%
	1890	50%	19%	25%	6%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	45%	18%	25%	9%	1%	1%
Supporting local and statewide food security efforts							
	1862	49%	29%	16%	4%	0%	2%
	1890	69%	13%	19%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	54%	25%	16%	3%	0%	1%
Supporting "local food" demand-supply (also known as locavore) efforts							
	1862	47%	29%	14%	8%	0%	2%
	1890	63%	25%	13%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	51%	28%	13%	6%	0%	1%
Supporting locality-specific issues (i.e., programs are geographically limited in their application)							
	1862	65%	24%	8%	0%	2%	2%
	1890	69%	25%	0%	6%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	66%	24%	6%	1%	1%	1%
Supporting urgent extension support needs (e.g., emerging pathogens, invasive species, natural disaster issues)							
	1862	84%	4%	8%	2%	0%	2%
	1890	56%	19%	25%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	78%	7%	12%	1%	0%	1%
Supporting emerging and frontier areas of agriscience							
	1862	25%	10%	25%	20%	18%	2%
	1890	25%	13%	38%	25%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	25%	10%	28%	21%	13%	1%
Supporting new variety or cultivar development							
	1862	35%	14%	20%	22%	8%	2%
	1890	38%	19%	38%	6%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	36%	15%	24%	18%	6%	1%

Supporting precision agriculture development and programming, including software, sensors, robotics, and drones.	1862	16%	12%	41%	22%	8%	2%
	1890	31%	25%	38%	6%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	19%	15%	40%	18%	6%	1%
Supporting farmer and public education regarding GMOs	1862	45%	25%	25%	2%	0%	2%
	1890	56%	19%	25%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	48%	24%	25%	1%	0%	1%
Supporting bioenergy or industrial biomass development	1862	6%	16%	27%	24%	16%	12%
	1890	25%	25%	19%	25%	0%	6%
	All Inst.	10%	18%	25%	24%	12%	10%

R. Current Operational Environment Issues and the Importance of Sustaining Capacity Funding

Question 50. Rate the following challenges regarding their impact on the continued availability of capacity funds? If there is another critical challenge you face not listed, please include it in the "Other" response option.

Table 99: Perception of the Impact of Challenges on Continued Availability of Capacity funds

Decreases in federal funding	Institution Type	Very High	High	Moderate	Low	Very Low
Decreases in federal funding	1862	55%	31%	12%	0%	2%
	1890	81%	19%	0%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	61%	28%	9%	0%	1%
State budget challenges limiting the availability of matching funds	1862	39%	16%	16%	20%	10%
	1890	75%	19%	6%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	48%	16%	13%	15%	7%
Pressure to shift federal resources from capacity funding to competitive funding	1862	69%	24%	8%	0%	0%
	1890	75%	19%	6%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	70%	22%	7%	0%	0%
Public knowledge and understanding about the importance of agricultural research	1862	27%	35%	25%	10%	2%
	1890	56%	31%	13%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	34%	34%	22%	7%	1%
Public knowledge and understanding about the importance of cooperative extension	1862	51%	33%	8%	8%	0%
	1890	75%	19%	6%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	57%	30%	7%	6%	0%
Public knowledge and understanding about science	1862	29%	45%	18%	8%	0%
	1890	44%	25%	31%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	33%	40%	21%	6%	0%
Continued shift of political representation toward urban areas	1862	24%	41%	22%	10%	4%
	1890	31%	44%	13%	13%	0%
	All Inst.	25%	42%	19%	10%	3%
Other critical challenge	1862	53%	24%	12%	6%	6%
	1890	80%	0%	20%	0%	0%
	All Inst.	59%	18%	14%	5%	5%

Write-in responses for "Other critical challenge"

1862 institutions

- *University Administration not understanding capacity funding and wanting to use the funds in other ways.*
- *Primary challenge is possible shift from NIFA capacity funding to competitive funding for [extension in this state]. Have political and stakeholder support for state and local funding.*
- *Academic demands on faculty time and on non-instructional funding lines. 25% multi-state requirement is very challenging and difficult to document. Does not increase efficiency.*
- *The ability for small LGUs to compete with large LGUs for funding.*
- *Decreases in county government funding -- it is "Cooperative" Extension with 3 legislation for 3 levels of public funding.*
- *Public leaders not effective in addressing long term national, state and local funding challenges.*
- *Expanding programming through distance education models.*
- *Increasing competition by many organizations for grant dollars and confusion between belief and marketing-driven solutions versus science-based solutions.*
- *Perception by many that Cooperative Extension is just about programming for agriculture and rural areas; whereas Extension is responsible for addressing needs of our diverse populations*
- *Children growing up with little understanding and appreciation of science.*
- *University understanding of cooperative extension and desire to harmonize faculty positions across the institution.*
- *Aging workforce - willingness to support needs outside their demographic.*
- *Finding other funding sources to be ultra responsive to rapidly emerging issues.*
- *The effects of climate change to maintain farm production.*

1890 institutions

- *Lack of continued educational awareness via Extension.*
- *The continual decline in state revenue from gas and oil place extreme challenge for higher education.*
- *Matching requirement for 1890 institutions relative to competitive grant programs. Flexibility in use 1890 program funds to accommodate programming issues that are idiosyncratic to 1890 target audiences.*

S. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Capacity Funding System

Question 51. In the space below, list what you believe are the greatest strengths/advantages of the NIFA capacity funding system.

These responses resemble responses to the same questions from the other surveys: 1) capacity funding provides leverage to acquire funding from other sources; 2) they provide stability and continuity over the long-term; 3) they help pay for infrastructural needs and provide a base level of funding; 4) they are flexible and can be easily reallocated; 5) they provide support to address local, regional, and statewide needs; 6) they provide salary support for staff.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Flexibility to strategically allocate funds among program areas; Importance to demonstrate federal commitment to Extension partnership to state legislators and county commissions;*

Provide salary funds to maintain faculty critical mass necessary to be nationally competitive while meeting local priorities.

- *Some of the greatest strengths of NIFA capacity funding are the stability, flexibility, and ease of use of the funding. Capacity funding allows each state the ability to respond to the local, county, regional, and statewide issues immediately, thus allowing Land-Grant Institutions with a mechanism to directly fulfill the land grant mission. Due to the process of Competitive funding, the mechanism could not accomplish this.*
- *Provides for infrastructure to distribute knowledge and education on vital issues and needs in local communities throughout [the state]. Provides ability to respond to crises and unanticipated needs. Provides capacity for 4-H youth development in every community throughout the state.*
- *Provides a greater opportunity to address local needs/problems, driven by the grassroots advisory councils. Salary and fringe support for Extension faculty and field agents for states that do not have adequate funding to support Extension personnel at the local and/or state levels. Provides highly specialized faculty to conduct in-service for field agents at the local level. In some cases, capacity funds provide for only one specialist in a specific discipline for the entire state. Provides operating funds for support of non-formal educational programming. Provides funding stability to address long-term problems/needs of the citizens.*

1890 institutions

- *Consistent and reliable source of funds to address local and emerging issues and problems. Capacity funding systems provide the base operations and improve the success of competitive funded activities. Capability to re-purpose resources to address local or emerging issues Provides resources for sustaining base Extension operations. Supports a national extension system, and allows capacity to reach underserved clientele (i.e. 1890, 1994 resources). Leveraging of matching resources.*
- *1. Provides opportunity to address all phases of Cooperative Extension including: youth development, family and consumer sciences, agriculture, community development and other activities. 2. Does not severely restrict Extension funds allowing for a diversity of activities that meet the needs of the population. 3. Allows for a broad-based targeting of disadvantaged groups: women, minority, limited resource, those with disabilities and others.*
- *Capacity funds provide a minimum assurance of educational opportunities to the least and most difficult to serve people living in American communities. Capacity funds provide a minimum level of funding to institutions. Critically under-resourced institutions are able to use the funds to leverage competitive and other extramural funding.*

T. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA capacity funding system

Question 52. In the space below, list what you believe are the greatest weaknesses/disadvantages of the NIFA capacity funding system.

The main weakness noted among the responses is the stagnation of funding. Respondents also indicated frustration with the number of reporting requirements and noted that smaller institutions are at a disadvantage (due to outdated formulas and carryover restrictions noted in other responses above).

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *The consistent/shrinking funding of funds, because of their static nature in a time of increasing societal issues, results in challenges of trying to do too much with too little.*
- *1. The weaknesses are often misperceptions regarding capacity funding. Assuming that the capacity funds are equitably distributed based on need, performance, and priorities, it's difficult to identify real weaknesses. 2. A perceived weakness may include a lower level of productivity or drive to achieve goals and develop real impact. This simply is not the case in today's climate of increasing high expectations for faculty and staff who must produce at high levels for merit pay, to maintain use of office, lab, greenhouse, and field resources and for promotion and tenure. 3. Another perceived weakness is that the funding agency gets less return on their funding dollar. This view is often short-sighted, again looking at a conglomeration of the outputs of many short projects/programs that may never result in real outcomes or impacts. Capacity funds allow for longer, more meaningful programs and projects to develop that really change behaviors and improve the lives of citizens. 4. Less direct overhead spent at universities and less overhead administering programs because there is no need for all the grant panel costs, both time and dollars.*
- *Capacity funds have not received a significant increase in allocation over the past decade. As a result, level funding allocations over time mean we lose ground in the ability to keep pace with programming demands, emerging issues and societal grand challenges at the state, regional and national level. This means we hire fewer faculty and staff or consolidate expertise in order to be financially accountable while struggling to meet the real demand of constituent needs.*

1890 institutions

- *Insufficient funds to address all critical problems faced by clientele and communities. There has been no significant increase in capacity funding. The timing of the appropriation and accessibility of funds not synchronize with fiscal year. The appropriations are available typically later in the fiscal year, thereby causing issues with the University with pre-award accessibility of funds.*
- *No significant increase in funding over the last several years. The greatest weakness is the lack of adequate resources to address the needs that we have. There is not a great weakness in capacity funding system because it is the backbone of all of our programs. Our program would not exist without capacity funding.*

U. Recommendations on Changes to Improve the Capacity Funding System

Question 53. *In the space below, describe what changes you think would be beneficial to improve the impacts of NIFA capacity funding programs.*

Similar to the other surveys, respondents indicated that capacity funding programs would be improved through simplified reporting processes, increases in capacity funding (rather than being replaced by competitive funding), and more equitable funding and policies for 1890 institutions.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *-Proper program planning requirements: Revise the current reporting system; Identify new reporting metrics to be used by all institutions and states; Issue statements that NIFA fully supports capacity funds.*
- *Building a culture in extension that can take risks without being concerned about the tax payers and policy makers seeing failed attempts at innovation as their tax dollars being wasted. A*

national investment in competitive funds that encourage innovation ,but don't expect all projects to lead to new extension applications, would help assure that capacity funds continue to support people and infrastructure but help keep extension relevant and at the cutting edge.

- *Addressing and adjusting the formula to make it more fair from the current formula which is very much outdated. There have been many changes and advancements made in each state which are not reflected in the current formula for distribution of capacity funds. Increasing the funding levels available which would expand and strengthen programming opportunities Enable flexibility in use of the funds to meet state and local needs.*

1890 institutions

- *Improve funding equity of 1890 institutions comparable to 1862 institutions. Improve the disparity of funding levels of EFNEP and RREA for 1890s compared to 1862s. The accountability and expectation, however, are the same for all institutions.*
- *Release capacity funds early in the fiscal year would greatly improve the efficiency of the program. It would be helpful to increase the amount of carryover of funds and the amount to be compatible with other programs.*
- *The changes we suggest are: 1. Grow capacity funds portfolio versus competitive funding. 2.Revamp the plan of work process. 3. Improved awareness of the impact of NIFA capacity funds to the general public. 4. Ensure that regulations and guidelines affecting the use of these fund are clear transparent and practical. 5. Ensure that 1890s have the same carry forward clause that 1862's have relative to capacity funds.*

V. Greatest Strengths and Advantages of the NIFA Competitive Funding System

Question 54. *In the space below, list what you believe are the greatest strengths/advantages of the NIFA competitive funding system.*

Responses mirror those of the same questions in the other surveys. Capacity funding 1) encourages collaboration across institutions, departments, and states; 2) can be used to address targeted and specific problems, especially those of national importance; 3) fosters innovation and produces the best science through peer review; and 4) supplements capacity funding.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Appropriately focused opportunities to support targeted regional and national needs and priorities for cooperative extension. Innovations in programming methods that can be shared across the system.*
- *Funds National level priorities driven from the top down. Addresses more specific problems. Provides more opportunity for collaboration across institutions.*
- *1) Competitive funding has an advantage in funding innovative research or integrated research/Extension projects. However, integrated projects sometimes force collaboration, which may be a disadvantage because the Extension component is not well developed. 2) Competitive funding has clearly defined priorities. 3) Competitive funding fits well when there is there is a need for a single national or regional leader on a project. 4) Competitive funds may be well suited for a pilot project or when a narrow issue or commodity is being targeted*

1890 institutions

- *Prestige associated with receiving an award and as a merit bases approach, it strives for overall effectiveness by giving funding to the most productive institutions or units. Peer review process stresses objectivity. Helps address national priorities as set by the RFA.*
- *Greatest strengths and advantages: 1. Allows to address specific issues in great detail. 2. Allows for larger block of funds to be directed to a specific issue. 3. Competitive funds can support further enhancements and support of program issues that have been previously identified via capacity funds. 4. Competition encourages and fosters competitive innovative solutions for agricultural problems. 5. Support graduate /Ph.D. students*

W. Greatest weaknesses and disadvantages of the NIFA competitive funding system

Question 55. *In the space below, list what you believe are the greatest weaknesses/disadvantages of the NIFA competitive funding system.*

Similar to the questions in the other surveys, competitive funding: 1) disadvantages small states and institutions due to barriers of entry to successful proposals; 2) rewards a small number of projects proposed, which is discouraging to those who are trying to establish themselves early in their careers; 3) has high transaction costs; 4) is time-consuming and requires expertise to be successful; 5) is inflexible and specific in scope, and cannot be used to easily respond to urgent needs; and 6) is uncertain with short timelines that often prohibits continuity beyond the initial grant for a project.

Select open-ended responses

1862 institutions

- *Focuses on big science. Focuses on politically driven science agendas. Few Extension proposals are funded. Large time commitment to prepare a quality proposal. Low funding rate serves as a disincentive to faculty.*
- *It's good, but the programs and activities that are outlined in the research proposals takes away the flexibility to quickly shift funds to address urgent issues as they arise or they are made known.*
- *High level of cost in review panels, grant management, writing proposals, oversight and limited impact. Continuity often lacking once the project ends - nothing more continues.*
- *1. Short-term, unstable funding is a poor way to support important programs that help ensure a stable food supply, economy, security, health, and youth development. 2. Hiring people on short-term contracts is not a good approach for having the best people working on some of societies' most important problems and ensuring a positive future. 3. Many funding groups want to ensure there is a knowledgeable, stable, viable, and well-resourced partner they can depend on for matching funding and for producing great impacts.*

1890 institutions

- *1. 1890's are at a competitive disadvantage when applying for comp funds. 2. Competitive funding tends to favor larger more established institutions 3. Competitive funding does not allow for sustained prolonged support of program initiatives and /or program development. 4. Competitive funding does not allow flexibility in redirecting funds to emerging issues. 5. Matching requirement for competitive funding grants put the smaller minority serving institutions at a disadvantage. 6. Difficult to maintain and sustain a viable workforce readiness.*

- 7. Create a certain level of uncertainty because an institution does not know if it will be funded from one year to the next.*
- *Personnel will have to allocate their time to develop a competitive proposal that may or may not be funded. The time spent can be diverted in implementing, advancing, and expanding current projects and activities to reach out to our stakeholders. There is a high transaction cost (overhead cost) in competitive funding and does not fit into on-going projects/programs. At smaller institutions, manpower is limited and there may not be enough personnel to seek competitive funds and implement the project. The potential of securing external and competitive funding is not certain, thus it is unstable. The amount of funds will fluctuate and creates instability in extension programming. Without capacity extension funds, it will be more difficult to see external competitive funds and many programs if not all will be jeopardized.*