

Resetting the Conversation: 1994 and 1862 Land Grant Cooperation Progress Report  
Based on the September 22-23, 2016, Meeting in Jackson, Wyoming

### Meeting Context

Native American Land-Grant Institutions, now known as the 1994s, became the newest members of a system of universities and federal partners that had been in place since 1862. The journey since then has seen undeniable progress in building the capacity of the 1994s and the land-grant system to better serve Native American students and communities. Yet that road has not been without its pitfalls and challenges.

To some, in the year 1994 and beyond, tribal colleges and universities were relatively unknown entities that were perceived to be predominantly community colleges and vocational schools. On one hand, that perception led some to set a lower bar in terms of expectations and aspirations for the 1994s. The 1862s controlled 1994 land-grant funding in their early years, checking their invoices and then making payments, and sometimes even charging administrative overhead to the modest amount of 1994 funding. On the other hand, some in the 1994 community may have perceived the 1862s as resource-driven, bottom-line institutions that could not, or would not, acknowledge the historical, social, and cultural contexts of the 1994s and their tribal communities. Congressional mandates, as implemented through NIFA programming, also contributed to these pitfalls and challenges. As a result, 1994/1862 relationships varied state-by-state ranging from collegial to non-existent to sub-optimal to adversarial.

Many opportunities for 1994/1862 collaboration still go unnoticed, and thus the full potential of an integrated, collaborative land-grant system is not fully realized. The September 22-23, 2016 meeting in Jackson Hole, Wyoming represents a chance to reset the conversation, to learn more about each other, and to chart a course into a more collaborative and productive future. The ultimate vision articulated was a candid, honest, respectful, and purposeful engagement between the 1994 and 1862 partners, while respecting sovereignty and service to people and the land.

See Appendix A for the complete version of the context statement provided to participants.

### Meeting Participants

A variety of 1862 and 1994 University Presidents, Cooperative Extension Directors, and other leaders of Indian Country Education and Extension were invited to participate. See Appendix B for a complete list of attendees.

### Meeting Goals

The goals for the September 2016 meeting in Jackson Hole were as follows:

- Building relationships and a peer network of land-grant colleagues working in teaching, extension, and research;
- Gaining understanding and knowledge about best practices in 1862/1994 collaboration;
- Identifying opportunities for amplifying collaboration through the discovery of mutual strengths, priorities, resource needs, and strategic objectives of 1862/1994 institutions;
- Developing an action agenda with specific steps toward identified collaborative opportunities and agreed upon measures of progress;
- Identifying a committed group of 1862/1994 representatives that will serve as a “working group” providing strategic and tactical direction; and
- Creating a shared vision for synergistic partnerships, engagement, and success of 1994 and 1862 programs of relevance to Indian Country.

To this end, participants were asked to come to the conference ready to address the following two questions:

- 1) What current barriers must be overcome in order to fully realize the potential of an integrated, collaborative Land-Grant system?
- 2) What are the successes and best practices we can learn from, leverage, replicate, and/or originate to fully realize this potential?

### Meeting Structure and Recap

The meeting occurred during the afternoon of September 22 and the morning of September 23. To foster an open and frank discussion, the group agreed to “Chatham House Rules” and that the action agenda and associated action commitments, rather than the barriers discussed, would be the primary product of the meeting.

The first afternoon session was devoted to discussing barriers that must be traversed between the 1994s and 1862s. These barriers were discussed and put into the following categories: Practices, Culture, Policies, and Resources. Some successful methods of overcoming these barriers, including “work arounds,” were also discussed during the course of the afternoon.

During an evening activity, participants were encouraged to reference the discussions of the afternoon but also to consider how actions at all levels could be taken to move beyond barriers through successes and best practices.

The morning session was devoted to creating an action agenda with specific steps toward collaborative opportunities. Participants were assigned into three groups, each with different scopes:

- State – What actions should be taken to break down inter-institutional barriers among us to improve institution-to-institution relationships and effectiveness?
- Regional – What actions should be taken to improve multi-state and regional cooperation among 1994s and 1862s, including situations where a single 1994 or tribe is served by more than one 1862?
- National – What nationwide or federal actions should be pursued to help overcome these cultural, policy, and resource challenges?

The State, Regional, and National groups each reported out to the entire group. Based on these reports a list of six high priority items were agreed upon to form an action agenda.

### High Priority Action Items

#### ACTION ITEM 1:

Pursue stable capacity funding for the 1994 institutions, which is similar to the Hatch/Smith Lever funding utilized by the 1862s and the Evans-Allen/1890 Extension funding utilized by the 1890s. While flexible, this funding could identify, document and utilize, as appropriate, indigenous and sacred knowledge as well as support collections and archives. A priority of this funding would be to allow indigenous knowledge to be blended with western science to the furtherance of both.

#### ACTION ITEM 2:

Instill a more positive tribal orientation in NIFA. This could potentially include NIFA:

- Seeking advice from a “Council of Elders” like group comprised of senior tribal members, which could lead to greater involvement in stakeholder input for priority development;
- Reexamining, and revising as appropriate, NIFA’s requests for grant applications (RFA) language to create opportunities specifically for work related to the development and deployment of indigenous knowledge to address challenges relevant to tribal populations;
- Increasing NIFA participation in Native American Gatherings (e.g. National Congress of American Indians); and
- Improving technical assistance to 1994 institutions at various levels, including pre- and post-award.

#### ACTION ITEM 3:

Pilot a Land Grant University Multi-State/Pan-Jurisdictional Platform that provides a unique regional/multi-state governance structure that provides an equal voice for all member land grant universities. Such a governance platform will offer opportunities for member universities to seek grants based on mutual interests and a blending of indigenous and western science.

**ACTION ITEM 4:**

Given the comparatively quick turnover of 1994 University Presidents, provide training and mentorship early in their tenure regarding the land grant university mission.

**ACTION ITEM 5:**

Develop more opportunities for 1994s and 1862s to gather, plan, and coordinate their work in support of tribal members. This could take the form of a partnership at the multi-state or multi-institutional level.

**ACTION ITEM 6:**

Develop clearinghouse positions and/or duties at the regional or state level to encourage linkages between the 1994s and 1862 positions. In states with many 1994s, this could be a single person at the 1862 institution that serves in a tribal relations role or a joint 1994-1862 appointment. However, some groups of states may want to cooperate on a multi-state effort.

Working Groups

Appendix C contains a list of attendees that expressed an interest in pursuing the high priority action items as a part of a working group. This list also denotes the original break out group that the participant was involved in.

## Appendix A – Meeting Context Statement (written by John Phillips, FALCON Executive Director)

It has been approximately 22 years since the Equity in Education Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 provided land-grant status to tribal colleges and universities. Now known as the 1994s, these Native American-serving institutions became the newest members of a system of universities and federal partners that had been in place since 1862. The journey since then has seen undeniable progress in building the capacity of the 1994s and the land-grant system to better serve Native American students and communities. Yet that road has not been without its pitfalls and challenges. On September 22-23, 2016, a facilitated conversation will take place, which will, in part, seek to create a shared vision for partnerships, engagement, and success of 1994 and 1862 programs of relevance to Indian Country. As we prepare for that meeting, it serves us well to frame our conversations by acknowledging the past, understanding the present, and aspiring to a successful future.

In the early 1990s, as NIFA and the land-grant system prepared to welcome the 1994s, understandably there were many questions and few answers. To some, tribal colleges and universities were relatively unknown entities that were perceived to be predominately community colleges and vocational schools. While there may have been some truth to that perception, it led some to set a lower bar in terms of expectations and aspirations for the 1994s. 1862s controlled 1994 land-grant funding in their early years, checking their invoices and then making payments, and sometimes even charging administrative overhead to the modest amount of 1994 funding. Even today, Congress still mandates that 1994 research grants must be conducted in partnership with an 1862 or 1890 land-grant institution (or most recently with ARS and Forest Service units and schools of Forestry).

On the other hand, some in the 1994 community may have perceived the 1862s as resource-driven, bottom-line institutions that could not, or would not, acknowledge the historical, social, and cultural contexts of the 1994s and their tribal communities. 1994/1862 relationships varied state-by-state, proving that perception to be both true and untrue. Some 1994s and 1862s have had long-standing productive collaborative relationships while others have not. In some cases, collegial faculty-to-faculty relationships developed into effective 1994/1862 collaborative programming in teaching, extension and research. In other instances, relationships were nonexistent or even adversarial, where competition for limited federal and state resources defined the playing field. We still see this dichotomy today in some states, albeit in less sharp features.

USDA (specifically NIFA), and by extension, Congress, has also played a major role in shaping the architecture of the 1994/1862 relationship. Funding for 1994 teaching, extension and research were first appropriated in separate fiscal years (teaching in 1996, extension in 1997, research in 2000), so 1994 land-grant programming was established piecemeal and often lacked the benefit of strategic and institutional

planning. Thus, 1994/1862 relationships were often borne out of short-term necessity and project-by-project—and not with institutional leadership, particularly, the deans and presidents, who could help promote more strategic thinking.

Today, we see how that 22-year history has shaped the current situation. The 1994s were, and still are, a diverse mix of institutions, representing different histories, cultural orientations, and organizational structures. Each 1994's journey has led them to their own unique place within the land-grant system, and they have developed widely varying degrees of institutional capacity to deliver on their land-grant mission and to collaborate productively with their 1862 counterparts. There are still some perceptions among the 1994s and the 1862s that are based on incomplete information, and those can lead to policies or positions that are counterproductive. Structural issues such as legislative mandates and congressional funding line-items serve to separate rather than integrate the land-grant system. Yet, many 1862/1994 relationships, new and old, continue to be productive and mutually beneficial.

There is much more work to do. Many opportunities for 1994/1862 collaboration still go unnoticed, and thus the full potential of an integrated, collaborative land-grant system is not fully realized. Ultimately, the people and communities that these land-grant institutions serve do not receive the full benefits of the land-grant system. The September 22-23, 2016 meeting represents a chance to reset the conversation, to learn more about each other, and to chart a course into a more collaborative and productive future. Your participation will be critical to discovering what that future can be, as well as acknowledging and learning from the past and the present. By such candid, honest, respectful, and purposeful engagement between the 1994 and 1862 partners while respecting sovereignty, we hope all of us succeed in our efforts to serve the people and the land.

## Appendix B – Meeting Participants

First	Last	Institution
Larry	Anderson	Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College
Pat	Aune	United Tribes Technical College
Jeff	Bader	Montana State University
Chris	Boerboom	North Dakota State University
Jon	Boren	New Mexico State University
Daryl	Buchholz	Kansas State University
Charlene	Charr	Institute of American Indian Arts
Thomas	Coon	Oklahoma State University
Carrie Ann	Duafala	Cankdeska Cikana Community College
Barry	Dunn	South Dakota State University
Virgil	Dupuis	Salish Kootenai College
Bev	Durgan	University of Minnesota
Nancy	Garcia	Southwestern Indian Polytechnic Institute
Timothy	Grosser	NIFA
James	Hafer	Chief Dull Knife College
Gary	Halvorson	Sitting Bull College
Mike	Harrington	Western Agriculture Experiment Station Directors
Chuck	Hibberd	University of Nebraska
William	Hoffman	NIFA
Dan	Kinsey	Aaniiih Nakoda College
Brian	Kowalkowski	College of the Menominee Nation
Tara	Kuipers	University of Wyoming
Benita	Litson	Dine' College
Amber	Marlow	Lac Courte Oreilles Ojibwa Community College
Kelly	Nipp	Leech Lake Tribal College
Oltrogge	Mike	Nebraska Indian Community College
Barbara	Petty	University of Idaho
John	Phillips	FALCON
Sonny	Ramaswamy	National Institute of Food and Agriculture
Kathay	Rennels	Colorado State University
Fred	Schlutt	University of Alaska
Amanda	Sialofi	Ilisagvik College
Craig	Smith	Fort Peck Community College
Randy	Smith	Sisseton Wahpeton College
Char	Spruce	Keweenaw Bay Ojibwa Community College
Nate	St. Pierre	Stone Child College
Lou	Swanson	Colorado State University
Teegerstrom	Trent	University of Arizona
Henry	Thompson	Chief Dull Knife College
Glen	Whipple	University of Wyoming
Janyce	Woodard	Little Priest Tribal College

First	Last	Institution
Steve	Yanni	Bay Mills Community College

Appendix C – Follow up commitments

Follow-Up Commitments

National Scope Group

<b>Name and Institution</b>	<b>Specific Project Area</b>
<b>Mike Harrington</b> , WAAESD	Farm Bill
<b>Mike Oltrogge</b> , Nebraska Indian CC	Farm Bill Tribal Orientation of NIFA
<b>Barry Dunn</b> , South Dakota State University	Willing to help with any of the priority areas
<b>Chuck Hibberd</b> , University of Nebraska	Farm Bill Pilot Project for Land Grant Platform Joint 1862-1994 appointments
<b>Nate St. Pierre</b> , Stone Child	Willing to help with any of the priority areas
<b>Steve Yanni</b> , Bay Mills CC	Farm Bill Partnership Conference
<b>Pat Aune</b> , United Tribes Technical College	Joint 1862-1994 appointments Training Opportunities
<b>Tom Coon</b> , Oklahoma State University	Pilot Project for Land Grant Platform Tribal Orientation of NIFA Training Opportunities / “Linker” position
<b>Benita Litson</b> , Dine` College	Tribal Orientation of NIFA Pilot Project for Land Grant Platform Partnership conference (regional OR national)
<b>Virgil Dupuis</b> , Salish Kootenai College	Farm Bill Reviewing RFA processes Partnership conference (regional OR national)
<b>Trent Teegerstrom</b> , University of Arizona	Pilot Project for Land Grant Platform Farm Bill Joint Appointments Training Opportunities / “Linker” position

Regional Scope Group

<b>Name and Institution</b>	<b>Specific Project Area</b>
<b>Bev Durgan</b> , University of Minnesota	Opportunities for regional training, conferences, etc.
<b>James Hafer</b> , Chief Dull Knife College	Willing to help with any of the priority areas

<b>Name and Institution</b>	<b>Specific Project Area</b>
<b>Chris Boerboom</b> , North Dakota State University	Partnership conference (regional OR national)
<b>Brian Kowalkowski</b> , College of the Menominee Nation	Joint 1862-1994 appointments Willing to help with any of the priority areas

State Scope Group

<b>Name and Institution</b>	<b>Specific Project Area</b>
<b>Glen Whipple</b> , University of Wyoming	State issues (particularly relationships with FRTEP)
<b>CarrieAnn Duafala</b> , Cankdeska Cikana CC	Willing to help with any of the priority areas
<b>Charlene Carr</b> , Inst. of American Indian Arts	State collaboration & Training Increase capacity funding
<b>Henry Thompson</b> , Chief Dull Knife College	Willing to help with any of the priority areas
<b>Amanda Sialofi</b> , Illisagvik College	Willing to help with any of the priority areas
<b>Char Spruce</b> , Keweenaw Bay Ojibawa CC	Willing to help with any of the priority areas
<b>Dan Kinsey</b> , Aaniiih Nakoda College	Willing to help with any of the priority areas
<b>Jeff Bader</b> , Montana State University	Willing to help with any of the priority areas
<b>Craig Smith</b> , Fort Peck CC	Willing to help with any of the priority areas
<b>Kelly Nipp</b> , Leech Lake Tribal College	Training Opportunities (state or regional)
<b>Janyce Woodard</b> , Little Priest Tribal College	Training Opportunities / “Linker” position