OPENING BUSINESS — Fred Schlutt (Chair report — pp. 10)
Fred Schlutt brought the meeting to order by welcoming new members of ECOP and Dr. Qureshi on behalf of Dr. Ramaswamy. The roll was taken and quorum established. Attendance found on (p.6). No items were added to the agenda. Approval of September 2016 Meeting minutes will appear on the next ECOP agenda.

1. UPDATE: National Executive Director Search —
Fred Schlutt: The ECOP Executive Director Search Committee developed a position description, reviewed applications and conducted interviews in 2016. The determination of the committee was to continue searching for an ECOP National Executive Director; will be regrouping to determine a new direction. Fred Schlutt, ECOP Chair, the EDA team along with Sandy Ruble will perform the duties ED. Negotiations are in process with a former Director of Extension to serve as Interim ED for 9 months or until a new National ED is identified (starting 2.6.17). In the meantime, ECOP Chair and the EDA Team will be performing ED the duties. Other members of the Committee are Doug Steele, Texas A&M University; Michelle Rodgers, University of Delaware; Chuck Hibberd, University of Nebraska; Delbert Foster, South Carolina State University; Daryl Buchholz, Kansas State University; Jimmy Henning, University of Kentucky, and Robin Shepard, North Central Region Executive Director. Fred will follow up with the committee to begin the next round of the search process.

Other:
- The ECOP Monday Minute will resume on 1/30/17.
- 2016 Finance report will be presented to ECOP Executive Committee in February 2017. Regarding SNAP-Ed, Cornerstone was approached by the House Ag Appropriations Committee about increasing participation of Cooperative Extension in the SNAP-Ed program. Doug Steel and Fred are going to Washington, DC during the week of January 1.30.17 for that discussion. Fred recommended
reading: 2016 SNAP-Ed Hearing Findings Report

Linda Kirk Fox: Offering the assistance of the Board of Human Sciences as a resource; has a new member, Jo Britt-Rankin who testified to the House Committee last year on this topic.

2. Farm bill update –
Fred Schlutt – Nothing to report at this time.

3. UPDATE/DISCUSSION: APLU BAC Proposed New Approach (p.7) –
L. Washington Lyons – BAA Budget and Advocacy Committee met last week. Nothing to report on the 2017 Budget by Jim Richards, Cornerstone. The “single ask, unified message” was approved in concept. No major concerns from Regions. There is concern about the one-pager. There is a proposal for either $200 or $300 million single ask, no decision yet. 1890s concerns were shared regarding the distribution. Proposing, 4% to be taken of the top of whatever to be divided equally among the 1890 institutions (2% for extension, 2% for research), 96% distributed among the 6 priority lines. Submitted to Cornerstone for review. Next meeting is set for 2.16.17 when final decisions are made.

Fred Schlutt – Encourage use of the terms of this decision as “single ask, unified approach” or “one ask” in all communications.

4. Committees, Task Forces and Partners

a. UPDATE/ACTION: Private Resource Mobilization Task Force status report 1.13.17 (URL) – Bill Hare

Motion by Bill Hare: ECOP approves the four following recommendations which will authorize the Task Force to continue its recommended implementation processes and complete its final report by April 2017 ECOP Meeting; second by Mark Latimore; motion carried.

RECOMMENDATION 1: We believe it is essential that ECOP immediately affirms the value of this work and acts swiftly and decisively to market its unique attributes to potential donors through brand enhancement and creation of an infrastructure needed to receive, manage and steward private gifts.

RECOMMENDATION 2: Beginning in January 2017, the PRM Task Force will solicit and review proposals and recommend to ECOP the establishment of an agreement with the preferred organization as institutional home.

RECOMMENDATION 3: The PRM Task Force recommends ECOP approve up to $50,000 be invested in 2017 to establish an operational infrastructure, managed by a Program Oversight Committee. The Task Force must provide a very detailed budget as to how money will be spent by April with its final report. (see discussion below)
RECOMMENDATION 4: Subsequent to the selection of the institutional home, ECOP will appoint the ECOP PRM Executive Committee, including a Chair and a Vice-Chair, and, as recommended by the Executive Committee, appoint additional committee members in order to advance this effort.

Discussion: One approach might be to get an idea of total cost of implementation over 3 years. Having a more in-depth conversation about what the relationship with institutional home looks like may influence funding of this implementation. ECOP is likely going to be required to fund years 1, 2 and/or 3 until revenue is generated by the initiative. How up to $50,000 is funded: Strategic Priorities of $30,000. There will be some savings in the budget this year, not having an ECOP Executive Director for a period. Also, a significant amount of carry-over from previous years. ECOP Chair Fred Schlutt is confident that ECOP can support effort in years 1-2, but uncertain beyond this. Would like to see more detailed budget. Criteria for establishing the institutional home is very good. The money is meant for the ECOP PRM Program Oversight Committee to do this work.

b. Personnel Committee Change in Excellence in Extension awards process (p.12) – L. Washington Lyons for Beverly Durgan – Two conference calls have been held to consider ECOP’s wishes to bring in field agents/educator nominations into the award process. The recommendation are highlighted on the attached (p.13). The committee struggled to limit the materials presented to a 5-year window, not part of this recommendation.

Chris Boerboom – If the description could be expanded to “demonstrated high impact of programs relative to the local, state, regional or national responsibilities of the nominee’s Extension appointment. So that evaluators have an understanding of the scope.

Chuck Hibberd – Suggest that someone that launched something innovative, generated resources to support it, with the impact of it. This should be part of how the nominations are reviewed. Also, online resources, learning circles that go beyond listed in #2. Suggesting more modern language in #1 and #2.

Agreement that changes need to be finalized by the Executive Committee meeting, 2.8.17 [Rescheduled to 2.15.17]


Michelle Rodgers – ECOP Executive Committee met with Innovation Task Force Chair Keith Smith, Ohio State University. There are four recommendations being brought forward to full ECOP board for approval for implementation to begin. In all instances Executive Directors and Administrators should be involved and where appropriate involve member of the former Task Force. The following is the motion by Michelle:

i. A major committee/group to focus on ideas on how to change the culture in Extension to support and sustain innovation. – Assigned to ECOP Personnel Committee
ii. A committee to look at how to implement /use the Horizon report. We encourage the use of eXtension to assist in this endeavor or any group/committee that deals with new technology – Assigned to eXtension Foundation to take leadership

iii. Committees /small groups to focus on specific areas to implement training such as Lean Experimentation, Emotional Intelligence etc. – Assigned to ECOP Personnel Committee

iv. The next NEDA meeting should be focused on implementation of the recommendations in priority areas. – Assigned to 2017 NEDA Planning Committee to plan of the 90 min. sessions devoted to accomplishing this.

Chuck Hibberd seconded the motion. Motion carried.

c. Program Committee –

Provided by Chris Boerboom
- Chris Boerboom – new chair, Carolyn Williams – new vice chair. Carolyn, who replaced Mark Latimore, along with Ed Jones, who replaced Tim Cross, are new members of the Program Committee.
- Program committee released a survey on Jan. 13 to CES deans and directors assessing their programming interest in the opioid crisis to determine the potential for a future coordinated response.
- The Civil Discourse Rapid Response team continues to work on their charge. They are working on resources and competencies and expect to have a resource toolkit to share with the system. Training on the competencies is possible. Rachel Welborn, who is leading the effort, made a presentation on the Civil Discourse work at Everyday-Democracy’s National Convening in Baltimore on December 8-10 and will report to ECOP in April.
- NUEL held a biannual meeting from Dec. 5-8 in Denver. They are focusing on the development of regional caucuses, the action teams are working on their projects, and they are assisting the UMN on the administrative track at the National Urban Conference.
- Survey in regard to opioids. Response is not overwhelming. Will look into resending it.
- ECOP/ESCOP Health Implementation – Michelle Rodgers – Michelle is provided leadership and met with chairs of each of the Action Teams. Plan for the next year for meeting is in place. Aligning the work of the committee with the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) Culture of Health. All teams are asked to provide specifically around Chronic Disease Prevention and Management and integrate that work with their committee. Meeting by phone in spring meeting for a day in NHOC through ECOP funding. Related to this, the final phases of completing a grant request to RWJF, with a request for up to $5 million. A webinar for Cooperative Extension institution is being planned for March about the application process. More in ECOP Monday Minute. Selection for pilot institutions will take place in 2 phases. Also, looking at ways to include all institutions in the process through professional development toward readiness in the future.

d. USDA NIFA – Louis Tupas/Denise Eblen/Mike Fitzner
No report at this time due to time constraints.

**ADJOURNED**

**KEY**

**ECOP 2017 Emphasis Areas:**
- Private Resource Mobilization
- Urban Programming
- Innovation
- National System
- Capacity Funding

**ECOP Core Themes:**
- Build Partnerships and Acquire Resources
- Increase Strategic Marketing and Communications
- Enhance Leadership and Professional Development
- Strengthen Organizational Functioning
**ECOP Membership** – Attendance is indicated with ✓ and ❌

**Voting Members**
- ✓ Fred Schlutt, *Chair*, University of Alaska
- ✓ Chuck Hibberd, *Chair-elect*, University of Nebraska
- ✓ Michelle Rodgers, *Past-chair & 2017 NEDA Planning Committee Chair*, University of Delaware
- ✓ Chris M. Boerboom, *Program Committee Chair*, North Dakota State University
- ✓ Tom Dobbins, *Personnel Committee*, Clemson
- ✗ Beverly Durgan, *Personnel Committee Chair*, University of Minnesota Extension
- ✓ Bill Hare, *Program & Private Resource Mobilization Committee*, University of District of Columbia
- ✓ Jimmy Henning, *Executive Committee*, University of Kentucky
- ✓ Ed Jones, *4-H Leadership Committee Co-chair*, Virginia Tech
- ✓ Mark Latimore, *Executive Committee*, Fort Valley State University
- ✗ Scott Reed, *Private Resource Mobilization Task Force Chair & Program Committee*, Oregon State University
- ✓ Vonda Richardson, *Personnel Committee*, Florida A&M University
- ✓ Louis Swanson, *Personnel Committee*, Colorado State University
- ✓ Chris Watkins, *Personnel Committee*, Cornell University
- ✗ Carolyn Williams, *Program Committee Vice-Chair*, Prairie View A&M University

**Ex-officio/Non-voting members**
- o Daryl Buchholz, *ECOP Representative to Policy Board of Directors*
- ❌ Denise Eblen, **Mike Fitzner, Muquarrab Qureshi**, Louie Tupas USDA-NIFA
- o Doug Steele, *Chair, ECOP Budget and Legislative Committee*
- o To be determined, Executive Director, Cooperative Extension/ECOP

**Liaisons to ECOP**
- ✗ Vernon Jones, eXtension Foundation Board Chair, Langston University
- ✗ Susan Crowell, Council for Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching
- ✗ Linda Kirk Fox, Board on Human Sciences (indefinite)
- ✗ Chris Geith, CEO, eXtension Foundation (indefinite)
  - o Jennifer Sirangelo, National 4-H Council (indefinite)
- ✗ Clarence Watson, Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (indefinite)

**Executive Director and Administrator Team**
- ✗ Ron Brown, Southern Region
- ✗ Lyla Houglum, Western Region
- ✗ L. Washington Lyons, 1890 Region
- ✗ Sandy Ruble, DC Office
- ✗ Robin Shepard, North Central Region
  - o To be determined, Northeast Region
  - o To be determined, DC Office

**Guests**
- ✗ Mike Gaffney, Washington State University

[Return to Agenda]
APLU BAC Proposed New Approach FAQ

- **Question**
- **Answer**

- What would the process entail if we moved to this single ‘ask’ model, in regards to allocation of funding to individual report lines?
  The proposed allocation would be part of the ask. The mockup of the one-pager, and the Option A-B spreadsheet should go a long ways in helping to address the question.

- If appropriations to NIFA are greater than the sum of the requests for the six priority lines, then where are the additional funds allocated (do we have any control of this)?
  I hope we have this problem. As has always been the case, the only control we have is by virtue of the strength of our advocacy effort. Ideally they would add additional $’s to our core priorities.

- If the budget is cut, then how does this translate to individual lines?
  Previous answer applies on control. I would note that, other than the sequester year, any reductions in NIFA lines have occurred outside of our core priorities.

- How do we ensure that all sections (ESCOP, ACOP, ECOP, 1890s, etc) feel represented in the budget request?
  The entire process described above should help to illustrate that a rising tide floats all boats. ACOP is the most challenging on those as they are not directly reflected in the core six lines, rather they benefit from each. The challenge will be, similar to the CREATE21 process, sections arguing for a bigger portion of an increase that has yet to be realized. The competitive and capacity lines are important across all sections and would significantly increase in the OPTIONS presented.

**Timeline**

- December 13: BAC Call – Approps strategy discussion
- December 13 – January: BAC reps and EDs lead discussions throughout the system
- January: finalize discussions and answer questions
- January 19: BAC Call – discuss options, feedback, fix anything
- February 16: BAC Call – approve new strategy
- February PBD Meeting: Ratify BAC decision
- March 5 – 8: CARET/AHS
Innovation Task Force

Zoom meeting Dec. 15, 2016

I) Keith gave an overview of the request from ECOP concerning the implementation of the Task Force recommendations
   a. Training for Director’s/Administrators
   b. Training in priority areas such as Lean Experimentation, New Technologies, Creativity, Critical Thinking, Emotional Intelligence, and Diverse Teams were the high ranking areas from the director/administrator survey

II) Also shared that a Journal of Extension (JOE) Special edition dedicated to innovation was on the horizon
   a. Challenged the, especially non-tenured, members of the task force to respond regarding this opportunity

III) Recommendations from the task force resulting from open discussion – 10 of the 13 members of the task force were on the call/ZOOM meeting
   a. Recommend a clean break from the current task force.
   b. Recommend a new task force or multiple task forces/subdividing groups to focus on specific types and areas of training. We want to make sure that the main focus for each group isn’t too large so that the focus can be thoroughly explored and implemented.
      i. A major committee/group to focus on ideas on how to change the culture in Extension to support and sustain innovation.
      ii. A committee to look at how to implement /use the Horizon report. We encourage the use of eXtension to assist in this endeavor or any group/committee that deals with new technology
      iii. Committees /small groups to focus on specific areas to implement training such as Lean Experimentation, Emotional Intelligence etc.
      iv. The next NEDA meeting should be focused on implementation of the recommendations in priority areas.
      v. Directors/Administrators need to be actively involved as a group.

IV) Further recommendations on how to implement
   a. Immersive learning experiences
   b. Pre-Training webinars
   c. Pre-Conference workshops/training
d. Encourage participation in innovative events within and outside Extension – Example = Innovate conferences being held across the country 

e. Pilot testing Adobe Kickbox with a number of Directors/Administrators (Harvard Business Review article available – Feb. 23, 2015 (Burkus) 

f. Innovation Task Force members could be asked to serve (divided up) on these subgroups/committees for continuity

Return to Agenda
ECOP Chair Report

1. ECOP National Office, day-to-day operations in place of Executive Director
   a. EDA Team participation
   b. Staff Associate supervision
   c. NC-FAR Research Outreach Committee participation
   d. *ECOP Monday Minute* composition

2. Partner follow-up in process with support by Executive Committee
   a. SOAR - Breakthroughs 2030 project
   b. NSDA-FSNA, pollinators
   c. USDA-FSA, producer education program
   d. NC-FAR Research and Education Committee
      i. Capitol Hill Lunch/Learn (February 13, 2017)
      ii. Unified message/farm bill convening at APLU
   e. USDA-NIFA, capacity funds study
   f. FFAR
   g. NACo
   h. National Academy of Sciences – roundtables

3. NIFA-Cooperative Extension Relations (Retreat follow-up) – Next meeting 1.27.17

4. 2016 ECOP Finance Report – In process, expected to be available for ECOP Executive Committee review on 2.8.17.

5. ECOP-ESCOP Strategic Alliance DC Meetings – February 27 – March 3 (other Federal agencies and NGOs and NIFA, March 8-10, 2017)

6. *Horizons Report* follow-up – (URL) ECOP Executive Committee has assigned implementation to [eXtension Foundation, based on a recommendation made by Innovation Task Force]. Former ECOP Innovation Task Force members and eXtension are willing to assist.

7. Executive Director Search Committee – Chair

8. SNAP-Ed and EFNEP Discussion – Assigned to ECOP Budget & Legislative Committee by ECOP Executive Committee, next meeting 2.14.17.

9. ECOP Executive Committee has asked the National System Task Force to develop the best approach to implementing #2 and #3 a. and b. (next page).
Cooperative Extension: Opportunities for a National Approach to Funding, Collaboration and Accomplishment

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Two surveys conducted in early 2016 followed by reports and conversations at ECOP, a national webinar (June 28, 2016) and a presentation at the National Extension Directors and Administrators (NEDA) meeting (September 21, 2016) generated a framework for our definition of a ‘national system’. Most compelling were the results of the following questions:

- At the June 28, 2016 webinar, 86% of respondents agreed with this statement “More willing to engage in a conversation about national funding for national/local priorities.”
- At NEDA (September 21, 2016), 98% of respondents voted ‘yes’ to this query: “Assuming appropriate funding for a national initiative consistent with your system priorities, well-defined parameters and minimal barriers, would you consider participating?”

These responses demonstrate a willingness to consider a national system approach to funding and collaboration for Cooperative Extension.

This study identified the following themes to describe Cooperative Extension:

1. Cooperative Extension operates locally in our counties, parishes and boroughs across the US. We listen to local stakeholders and focus our work on locally identified needs.
2. Cooperative Extension provides unbiased, science-based strategies and solutions to local, national and global issues. We transform scientific results into educational forms and formats that benefit people, communities and organizations.
3. Cooperative Extension is relational: we engage people, communities and organizations in a partnership mode to co-create opportunities and solve problems.

Recommendations:

1. Actively engage Extension Directors and Administrators in considering opportunities created with a better-organized, systems approach to Congressional funding, collaboration with USDA-NIFA and resourcing from new partners.
   a. Frame our interaction with Congress, USDA-NIFA and external partners in the context of the Cooperative Extension Thomos (see above).

2. Develop marketing materials and use a national ‘logo’ for Cooperative Extension to build brand recognition and communicate the breadth and reach of Cooperative Extension across the United States.

3. Establish a better-organized, system-oriented approach to addressing and funding national opportunities and priorities.
   a. Re-institute the system-wide program prioritization process to identify candidate initiatives for national funding.
   b. Pursue system-wide agreement on national goals and indicators. Utilize the National Impacts Database to compile individual LGU-based Extension System accomplishments to demonstrate national impact.
   c. Vigorously pursue funding opportunities with partners interested in our priorities.
   d. Establish a procedure to discern LGU-based Extension System’s interest in participating in nationally-funded initiatives.

4. Review and evaluate Cooperative Extension Section assessments to determine the return on investment and strategic use of these funds to advance a national agenda.
5. Use these findings to inform the Private Resource Mobilization Task Force as they work to develop a model for this effort.

ECOP Personnel Committee Report

Members: Beverly Durgan, Co-chair, Vonda Richardson, Thomas Dobbins, Chris Watkins, Lou Swanson

The ECOP personnel committee held two conference calls to discuss how to increase participation from field agents and educators in the ECOP National Award for Excellence in Extension. The committee agreed to submit the following recommendations to ECOP:

1. Revise the evaluation award criteria to make it more applicable for field agents and educators and place more emphasis on innovation (See revised criteria below)

2. Encourage each region to provide some coaching to assist field agents and educators with the award process.

3. Encourage JCEP to nominate some of their award winners for consideration for the ECOP National Award for Excellence in Extension.

National ECOP Excellence in Extension Award

Evaluation Criteria

500 words or less for each criterion

- Demonstrated high impact of programs. Please describe the following:
  - The formal process by which needs that impact the public good were identified (10)
  - How the educational program was established to meet these needs (15%)
  - Assessment of the program, specifically how the public good indicated by economic, social and/or environmental impact was evaluated (10)
  - How innovation was used (5%) **Weight - 40%**

- Recognized excellence in one’s field of expertise as demonstrated by sustained external funding, awards, recognition, and request for regional/state/national addresses and speaking engagements; and appropriate, publication of scholarly work, including journal articles, fact sheets, and newsletters. **Weight - 20%**

- Demonstrated innovation through impact data in regards to partnerships, funding, and educational program delivery. **Weight - 20%**

- Ability to engage university colleagues in Extension programming with evidence of teamwork both within and outside of Extension. **Weight - 10%**

- Demonstrated conveyance of cultural sensitivity and appreciation for diversity. **Weight - 10%**