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Gaea Hock, conducted the meeting as Michael Marten (chair) was not able to attend. The meeting was called to order at 4:45 PM.

Members and guests of the committee introduced themselves.

Warnick discussed the need for the group to complete the W2006 report on time and provided report examples. He also addressed questions about how to join the Agricultural Literacy W3006 through AES contacts. Spielmaker added that she would update the list serve with the W3006 information.

As this was the last meeting of the W2006, and several guests in attendance were interested in joining this research committee, the committee decided to discuss the objectives of the new agricultural literacy committee, the W3006, beginning on October 1, 2019, and then discuss the W2006 final report accomplishments with the W2006 committee members the next day (September 18th).

Hock reviewed the objectives and Spielmaker discussed how members select the objectives that fit with their research interests to add to the AES NIMSS reporting system.

* 1. Assess the agricultural knowledge of diverse population segments related to agriculture, including consumers, students, and producers. Specifically, explore and/or measure:
     1. points of acquisition of agricultural knowledge;
     2. decisions made based on assessed knowledge.
  2. Assess attitudes, perceptions, and motivations of diverse population segments related to agriculture, such as consumers, students, and producers. Specifically, explore and/or measure:
     1. how perceptions, attitudes and motivations are developed;
     2. decisions made based on assessed attitudes, perceptions, and motivations;
     3. behavior changes that have occurred due to changes in attitude, perceptions, and/or motivation.
  3. Evaluate agricultural literacy programs to measure program impact. Specifically:
     1. measure impacts of agricultural literacy programs related to critical thinking and problem solving;
     2. explore and evaluate peer and participant-centered agricultural literacy programming methods to determine their effectiveness in addressing defined agricultural literacy outcomes.

Spielmaker discussed the need for a more “multistate” approach to the research citing that this is the purpose of the group, to work together when possible in collaborative ways to leverage resources. She mentioned that historically, we have worked as individual researchers working on common objectives, but that more states working with the same instrumentation could perhaps do more in a true multistate effort. Stofer asked if all previous instruments used to measure agricultural literacy were available so that we could all use the same instrument to collect data and analyze the results to address the objectives. Spielmaker said yes, however most of the instruments that had been developed were for very specific interventions and she suggested the use of the recently published National Agricultural Literacy Outcome (NALO) assessments developed by faculty at Utah State University, building of previous research by Liesing & Igo. Stofer suggested that one way to leverage resources and gather a larger dataset would be for us to all use the NALO assessment. Igo suggested that the group use this instrument in the coming year to assess the incoming freshman at each institution with the grade 9-12 NALO assessment (Judd-Murray Agricultural Literacy Instrument, JMALI) as a way to develop a baseline and further evaluate the reliability of the instrument.

Members discussed this option and as Judd-Murray about the parameters for use of the instrument. Spielmaker noted that the instrument is available on agliteracy.org, under research resources, but that rather than everyone doing their own download of the instrument we all share the same survey as a “common-measure” in Qualtrics to keep the data set together. She mentioned that this would still allow for use to use skip logic to address institutional differences and the addition of attitudinal/perception questions. The JMALI is a knowledge-based instrument. Spielmaker suggested that the group consider a blanket IRB for use with youth and adult audiences using the NALO assessments as common measures. Narine provided an explanation about how this is handled at Utah State University. Judd-Murray added that all of the IRB documents have already been developed and could be easily adapted for a common-measure IRB proposal.

Warnick mentioned this assessment would help with the objectives by measuring multiple populations and Kellie added in that most institutions do have a general ag literacy course and that the large dataset would provide valuable insight for the institution and nationally.

Igo moved, and Stofer seconded that Spielmaker and Judd-Murray pursue the approval of a blanket, common-measure IRB at Utah State University that could be referenced by other universities. The motion passed unanimously. Spielmaker said this could be in place this spring for use in the fall. Members from Utah, Montana, Colorado, Kansas, Florida, and Washington all said they would be able to assess using the JMALI next fall.

Hock asked about the groups’ next meeting and if we would continue to meet twice a year at Western AAAE and AAAE (American Association for Agriculture Education). Warnick said he would prefer for the group to meet just once per year to demonstrate a more unified commitment. The group discussed the pros and cons of meeting in at each meeting and the option of webinars. A consensus was reached that the AAAE meeting was already packed with meetings that members needed to attend and that the Western meeting, with fewer competing meetings, would be a better choice.

Enns moved, and Igo seconded that the W3006 meet annually at the Western Region AAAE meeting. The motion passed unanimously. Enns also suggested that committee members prepare an accomplishment/impact document prior to the conference that can be reviewed by others and used to shape the annual meeting’s agenda. This would also allow for more time to be spent on professional development or collaboration at this face-to-face meeting. Enns moved and Spielmaker seconded that the committee members submit a progress report one month prior to the annual W3006 face-to-face meeting. The motion passed. It was further discussed that the group needed to hold a webinar after the common measure IRB is approved at Utah State University. Judd-Murray and Spielmaker said they would take the lead on this effort.

To facilitate the work of the W3006 a discussion about the need designating a chair emerged. Judd-Murray was nominated but Spielmaker, but with her new role as an assistant professor she declined. Spielmaker offered to chair until the next formal meeting of the W3006, September 2020, where an election can be held with new members recognized by their intuitions. There was unanimous support. Spielmaker nominated Denise Stewardson as secretary. Stewardson was elected by acclamation.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 PM with the acknowledgement that members would meet at 5:00 PM the next day (September 18th) to address remaining agenda items.

**W2006, September 18th, 5:00 PM**

Hock reconvened the meeting by reviewing the agenda items of unfinished business:

1. Discussion of accomplishments and impacts from previous multi-state project
   1. How can we write these for the end of program report (due soon)?
   2. How can we think about impact statements as framing our work in the future?

As we were short on time, and members would be reporting on their accomplishments and impacts from the W2006 in the final report, it was agreed that the group should focus on the organization and content of the final report. The committee discussed the report examples provided by Warnick. Spielmaker suggested a Google Doc might be the best way to capture everyone’s accomplishments and impacts. She offered to create the file with the essential report headings organized by objective (objectives noted below) and then share the file with all the committee members. Members will report under each objective with a brief summary statement, list of publications, presentations, impacts, ongoing research, and planned research. The report is due to Warnick on November 17th. Committee members will need to complete their reporting using the shared document by November 10th so that Spielmaker and Stewardson can edit the document for submission by the deadline.

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

Igo moved to adjourn, Stofer seconded, the motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 PM