OPENING BUSINESS –

Michelle Rodgers called the meeting to order. Attendance is recorded on page 5. A motion was made by Chuck Hibberd to approve the minutes of the meeting held in St. Louis, October 14-15, 2015. Chris Boerboom seconded the motion and the minutes were approved. No items were added to the agenda.

2016 GOALS

1. Innovation
   a. ACTION: ECOP Innovation Task Force (p.4) – Keith Smith

The ECOP Innovation Task Force is a follow-up to the ECOP-sponsored Cooperative Extension Innovation Inventory completed last year by the Ohio State University. Michelle Rodgers thanked Keith Smith for agreeing to continue this work, which is focused on creating a culture of innovation within Cooperative Extension at local, state and national levels. Keith Smith asked for comments on the proposal, especially related to the task force membership. It was recommended that the agriculture and natural resources area be represented. Michelle requested that ideas for additional members be sent directly to Keith. The first meeting of the task force will be in conjunction with the National eXtension Conference, March 22-25, 2016 in San Antonio. All those listed on the proposal (with the exception of Clarence Watson; ESCOP will be represented by Bill Brown) plan to attend the first meeting. Keith has secured $7,000 to support this work and asked ECOP to match this amount. Chuck Hibberd made a motion to adopt the proposal for funding (p.6). Fred Schlutt seconded and the motion passed. The ECOP budget will be amended to include this increase ($7,000).

2. National System/Network
   a. ACTION: Task Force –
Chuck Hibberd, chair of the task force, reported that the initial survey is complete and summarized. Based on the responses of 45 directors/administrators, a second, more comprehensive survey has been developed and will be released in a few days. One of the issues that surfaced was the term “system”. “Network” has been proposed as an alternative or in addition to the term system. Michelle asked Chuck to communicate how much time will be needed at the meeting in March.

b. UPDATE: 4-H Grows – All

Michelle Rodgers asked for updates and comments from each Region.

Southern – Tim Cross: Region is behind the effort. More information is requested on private/public sources.

North Central – Chuck Hibberd: Unanimous support. A document will be provided by Robin Shepard requesting more detail on funding and implementation (enrollment, sharing of funding).

West – Fred Schlutt: Similar to Southern and North Central. WEDA met in December with National 4-H Council and awaits response to questions. Rich Koenig: There are questions of stewardship, and timing of communication with University Foundations.

Northeast – Mike O’Neill: Question about disparity of large and small states on how this will be implemented. What happens if there is no buy-in?

1890 – No report. This item is under review at AEA meeting that is underway.

Jennifer Sirangelo: The level of detail that it is being questioned has been addressed in the application form. This will be released by Ed Jones as co-chair of the National 4-H Leadership Committee within the next few days. A webinar was conducted on 1.20.16 with only a few participants. ACTION: Jennifer Sirangelo will provide a recording of the webinar to include with the release of the application and work with Ed Jones to provide a means for questions to be answered.

3. Private Resource Mobilization
   a. DISCUSSION/ACTION: regional reports and next steps –

Michelle Rodgers asked for reports from each region about the concept.

Northeast – Mike O’Neill: There is consensus to move forward.

Southern – Tim Cross: There is no opposition for more development to take place.

North Central – Chris Boerboom: There is support in concept but there are questions about details.

Western – Fred Schlutt: There is support to move forward to form a Task Force.

1890 – No report. This item is under review at AEA meeting.
Mike O’Neill made a motion to approve the concept as provided by the report by Changing Our World, Inc., Private Resource Mobilization for Cooperative Extension: Pathways to a National Initiative and to move forward to develop more detail. The motion was seconded by Tim Cross. The motion passed. Michelle requested that comments/concerns be shared with the regional representative on ECOP Executive (e.g. Chuck Hibberd, Jimmy Henning, Michelle Rodgers, Delbert Foster, and Fred Schlutt). The ECOP Executive Committee will outline next steps and provide a report at the March ECOP meeting in Delaware.

b. UPDATE: Change in Direction Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) Planning Grant –

Michelle Rodgers reported she and Jennifer Sirangelo met with RWJF leaders, then afterward with the Planning Grant Group, resulting in a positive change. The focus of the planning grant has been broadened from childhood obesity to a broader focus on a culture of health. In addition, Cooperative Extension will use the RWJF-supported County Health Rankings Data in program development. There will be more information released through the ECOP Monday Minute.

4. Professional Development Leadership
   a. UPDATE: ED/A Team Review –

Michelle Rodgers: The Executive Committee met last week and agreed to provide more time for each region to discuss the report as presented by the ECOP Personnel Committee. ECOP Executive Committee will have a special meeting to prepare for ECOP action during the March meeting.

5. Urban Programming

Michelle Rodgers: This item will be on the agenda at the March ECOP Meeting. She asked for ideas on recruiting someone from NUEL to come to the meeting. Rich Koenig suggested Brad Gaolach, Washington State University. ACTION: Chris Boerboom suggested asking NUEL Steering Committee or newly formed NUEL Executive Committee to appoint someone. He will check on this and report back to Michelle.

ONGOING PRIORITIES

1. Build partnerships and Acquire Resources
   a. UPDATE: ECOP-ESCOP Chairs DC visit –

Michelle Rodgers: Three pressing items have come up.

Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA): There is a need to pursue a response similar to Risk Management education. There is private funding available to do this. Jane Schuchardt will check with USDA-NIFA on ways to proceed. Regions are asked to provide information on models for food safety Extension education.

Antimicrobial Resistance: Concern was raised by Ian Maw that there was no representation at the summit in Washington last week. Charlie Stoltenow has been named by ECOP to be part of the new implementation task force. Jane Schuchardt will meet with Ian Maw and Chase
Crawford, Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges (AAVMC) to determine strategies for further engagement. There are current programs across the nation, but no new funding available. Although veterinarians are providing leadership for veterinary professionals, there are other audiences involved (consumers, farmers/ranchers, and youth). Jane Schuchardt will provide the antimicrobial resistance report to ECOP.

Differed Maintenance (Sightlines Report): There is a perception that this issue is not directly affecting Cooperative Extension, but rather Experiment Stations/Research. Most Cooperative Extension professionals are housed in county or local government buildings. Bev Durgan indicated Extension needs to be involved. Michelle Rodgers has been asked by Ian Maw to serve on a task force to address next steps. She will follow up as requested.

b. UPDATE: USDA-NIFA – Bob Holland

No report. Did not attend.

c. NIFA-CES Retreat Follow-up – Fred Schlutt

No time at the end of the meeting for a report.

2. Increase strategic marketing and communications (no agenda items this month)

3. Enhance Leadership and Professional Development
   a. ESS/CES-NEDA Planning Committee –

   Jane Schuchardt: The Planning Committee has completed the planning of most all of the joint sessions with ESCOP. There is a need for Cooperative Extension to meet and plan their NEDA session. Work on innovation in Extension appears to be a good topic. Bev Durgan also suggests FSMA, Anitmicrobial Resistance, and Differed Maintenance as topics for consideration.

4. Strengthen Organizational Functioning (no agenda items this month)

OTHER AGENDA ITEMS:

Q&A – Meeting in Delaware - No questions at this time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (if needed)
ECOP Membership (☑ or ● indicated attendance)

VOTING MEMBERS (8 or more establishes a quorum):
1890 Region
☐ Delbert Foster, South Carolina State University
☐ Mark Latimore, Fort Valley State University
☑ Celvia Stovall, Alabama Cooperative Extension System

North Central Region
☑ Chris Boerboom, North Dakota State University
☑ Beverly Durgan, University of Minnesota
☑ Chuck Hibberd, University of Nebraska

Northeast Region
☑ Michael O’Neill, University of Connecticut
☑ Michelle Rodgers, University of Delaware
☐ Bill Hare, University of District of Columbia

Southern Region
☑ Tim Cross, University of Tennessee
☐ Jimmy Henning, University of Kentucky
☑ Tony Windham, University of Arkansas

Western Region
☑ Rich Koenig, Washington State University
☐ Scott Reed, Oregon State University
☑ Fred Schlutt, University of Alaska Fairbanks

NON-VOTING MEMBERS:
Ex-Officio Members
☐ Dennis Calvin, Chair, eXtension Board of Directors
☐ Daryl Buchholz, Kansas State University, ECOP Representative to Policy Board of Directors
● Chris Geith, CEO, eXtension Board of Directors
☐ Robert Holland, USDA-NIFA
● Rick Klemme, University of Wisconsin - Extension, Chair, ECOP Budget and Legislative Committee
● Jane Schuchardt, ECOP Executive Director, Cooperative Extension

Liaisons
● Susan Crowell, Council for Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching
☐ Linda Kirk Fox, Board on Human Sciences
● Jennifer Sirangelo, National 4-H Council
☐ Clarence Watson, Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy

Executive Director and Administrator Team
● Ron Brown, Southern Region
☐ Nancy Bull, Northeast Region
● Lyla Houglum, Western Region
☐ L. Washington Lyons, 1890 Region
● Sandy Ruble, DC Office
● Jane Schuchardt, DC Office
● Robin Shepard, North Central Region

Guest
● Keith Smith, The Ohio State University
Innovation Task Force Proposal

Purpose: To form an ECOP sponsored task force on Innovation to address three specific areas of innovation as follows:

1. Learner engagement
2. Innovation environment/criteria for innovation
3. Employment issues for existing and new hires related to innovation.

Objective/Goal – Using the Extension Innovation inventory and other related research and tools, provide a guideline for implementation of innovation strategies in the Extension system.

Discussion

The suggested formation of a task force is a result of recommendations stemming from a study conducted by Ohio State University regarding an inventory of innovation (programming and ideas) within the Extension System across the United States and US territories. Although innovation is at the core of the Cooperative Extension System, national guidelines and subsequent training in tools for stimulating innovation has not been developed for the system at large. Given the study, which when completed, will consist of examples of innovations in the system plus ideas collected from innovators in the system about their innovations and mode of operation, an opportunity would be missed if we did not capitalize on these findings and take seriously the recommendations provided. Subsequently ECOP asked that the results be shared in the national directors meeting in October. Results and recommendations were shared along with a keynote speaker on innovation, Dr. Claudia Fernandez. The discussion at the national directors meeting was robust and positive. These results from the national meeting further invigorated ECOP to review the Executive summary of the study and its recommendations. Upon further review by ECOP, these recommendations have resulted in the committee urging the chair of ECOP to move forward on forming a task force.

Suggested Actions:

After discussion with members of ECOP, including the chair, the Director of eXtension, the immediate past chair of ESCOP, a former Vice President of Agriculture at Ohio State, numerous colleagues in and outside of the system the following individuals are recommended as suggestions for the national task force:

Task Force

1. Chair – Keith L. Smith – Professor Emeritus, Department of Agricultural Communications, Education and Leadership. The Ohio State University
2. Doug Steele – Director of Extension, Texas Agri-life
3. Tom Fox – Vice President, Leadership and Innovation, Partnership for Public Service
4. Jamie Seger – millennial and Program Director, technology innovation, The Ohio State University
5. Chris Geith – CEO - eXtension
6. Clarence Watson – Director, Experiment station, University of Arkansas (subject to approval by the Chair of ESCOP, Brent Hess)
7. Millennials (2) Paul Hill (Utah State), Bradd Anderson (Univ. of Missouri) – subject to more discussion.
8. L. Washington – Executive Director, 1890 institutions
9. Brian Higginbotham – Associate VP and Director, Utah State or if we choose to have Paul Hill from Utah State, we might want to consider having Scott Reed – Associate Provost and Director at Oregon State University
10. Deborah L. Sheely - Director of Extension, University of Rhode Island

Timeline:

1. First face to face meeting of the task force would be at the eXtension annual conference March 22-25. The proposal establishing the committee, other reading material including the results of the Ohio State study would be distributed ahead of the meeting.
2. Michelle Rodgers, along with Keith Smith would deliver the charge to the committee along with the expected results and end date for the committee.
3. Most of the committee work would be via technology through Zoom, teleconferences and the email from March through August.
4. A final face to face meeting is suggested sometime between the middle to the end of August, 2016.
5. Final recommendations of the task force would be delivered to the Chair of ECOP by September 19, 2016 prior to the joint meeting of the National Extension Directors and Experiment Station Directors meeting.

Budget

1. The chair of the task force has $7,000.00 from a foundation that he is willing to match 1:1 with ECOP for this national effort. This budget would help with expenses including:
   a. Travel for the chair and expenses associated with two face to face meetings
   b. Faculty/graduate student assistance with further study/research, writing.
   c. Final paper printing
   d. Teleconference, ZOOM meetings
   e. Consultant/outside participants travel and expenses
   f. Misc. expenses

Back to agenda
Extension Committee on Policy (ECOP)
Personnel Committee Report
Executive Director/Administrator Review
November 12, 2015

Background:
The Personnel Committee of ECOP (hereafter referred to as the Committee) was charged with conducting a review of the structure and function of the Executive Director/Administrator (ED/A) Team. The ED/A Team consists of a Regional Executive Director from each region (1890, NC, NE, S, W – [0.25 FTE each]), the Extension Executive Director, and an Administrative Assistant. The review was intended to address only the Structure and Function of the ED/A Team. The review was not intended to address individual performance of members of the ED/A Team.

The Committee deliberated about how to conduct the review. Ultimately, it was decided that a survey of Extension Directors and Administrators would be used to assess the structure and function of the ED/A Team.

Survey:
A Qualtrix survey was developed and sent to Extension Directors and Administrators at 1862 and 1890 Land Grant Universities (76 institutions in total). The survey instrument consisted of four open-ended questions (see Table 1). The survey was anonymous – no identifying information was collected from survey respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Survey Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All questions relate only to the structure and function, and not the individuals serving in these roles. Consider the structure and function of the ED/A Team. What do you think is working well?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What do you think needs improvement in the ED/A Team structure and function?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the structure and function of the team appropriate to achieve maximum return on investment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What comments, concerns, and suggestions do you have to improve the structure and function of the ED/A Team?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 48 responses were submitted by Directors and Administrators yielding a response rate of 63 percent.

Written Responses by Question:
Q1: Consider the structure and function of the ED/A Team. What do you think is working well?
The overwhelming response to Question 1 is that the current model provides improved communication and coordination among the regions. Of the 24 written responses to this
question, 10 specifically noted the improved communication that resulted from the current structure. Improved coordination was noted in nine of the 24 written responses. Other notes indicated the importance and value of assigning ED/A Team members to ECOP Committees, workgroups, and other roles.

Q2: What do you think needs improvement in the ED/A Team structure and function?
Two themes were evident in response to Question 2. The first theme focused on an apparent disparity among the commitment from the regions. In particular, it was noted that the Northeast Region and the Western Region appeared to have a lesser commitment to the ED/A Team (The NE and W Regions have 0.5 FTE Executive Directors, NC S, and 1890 Regions have 1.0 FTE Executive Directors). Of the 23 total responses, seven noted a concern about equal responsibility among the regions.
The second theme focused on the need for clear annual goals for the ED/A Team. Evaluation of the team was a strong thread throughout these responses. Seven respondents indicated a need for clear goals and/or evaluation of the ED/A team. A final subset of responses focused on a need for stronger leadership at the national level. Some concern was expressed regarding the need for a national Executive Director. The Experiment Station Committee on Policy (ESCOP) model was cited as an alternative.

Q3: Is the structure and function of the team appropriate to achieve maximum return on investment?
Question 3 focused on achieving maximum return on investment using the current structure and function. A total of 24 written responses were provided for this question. Nine responses indicated that the structure and function was appropriate. By contrast, 15 responses were unsure or did not think that the structure and function were appropriate. Specific comments and recommendations focused on the lack of data to evaluate the effectiveness of the structure and function of the ED/A Team. Some comments indicated that information sharing is not sufficient as an outcome for the level of administrative staffing involved.

Q4: What comments, concerns, and suggestions do you have to improve the structure and function of the ED/A Team?
The final survey question provided an opportunity for comments and suggestions. There were 21 written responses for Question 4. No overriding themes were apparent from the responses. Some specific comments include:
- Need for full-time commitment from all regions;
- Need for goals and measurable outcomes;
- Concern that APLU has too great an influence on ECOP due to co-location;
- Need for updates from the ED/A Team; and
- An expectation that more partnerships would be forged through national leadership.

Summary of Written Responses:
Overall, it is clear that communication and coordination have improved as a result of the current ED/A Team structure and function.
Secondly, respondents identified a need for clarification of the roles of the Regional ED’s relative to the ED/A Team structure and function. Likewise, there is a need for clear goals created for (or by) the ED/A Team. Respondents identified a need to define a process for evaluating the effectiveness of the ED/A Team. Respondents indicated a desire to have additional partnerships developed at the national level. The ED/A Team was expected to provide leadership in forming these partnerships.

**Recommendations:**
The Personnel Committee has the following four recommendations regarding the structure and function of the ED/A Team:

**Recommendation 1:** Coordination and communication among the ED/A Team should continue. Regular updates should be provided to ECOP and the larger audience of Directors and Administrators regarding activities and outcomes from the ED/A Team. These updates should be driven by a specific work plan (see Recommendation 2).

**Recommendation 2:** The ED/A Team should develop an annual work plan that clearly identifies deliverables and outcomes from the Team. This work plan can be in the form of a Logic Model. Alternatively, the ED/A Team can develop a simple document that articulates deliverables and outcomes. The work plan should clearly identify how each of the Regional ED’s contribute to the national plan. These roles should be balanced across the five regional ED’s. The work plan should be provided to ECOP for discussion and approval.

**Recommendation 3:** The ED/A Team should expand efforts to build appropriate partnerships at the national level. The location of the office of the National Executive Director (co-located in Washington, DC with APLU) seemingly was expected to increase the number and quality of partnerships at the national level. An alternative (ESCOP-style) model could be explored as an alternative structure.

**Recommendation 4:** The Committee will use the Delphi method to initiate a new round of questions to further explore responses to Question 3 in the original survey. The goal of this follow-up effort is to refine the responses to Question 3 and to identify changes in the structure and function of the ED/A Team that would achieve the desired goals of ECOP and Extension.
ECOP/ESCOP Chair DC Meetings  
January 20-21, 2016  
Michelle Rodgers and Shirley Hymon-Parker, Chairs  
Assisted by Jane Schuchardt and Carolyn Brooks

Jane contact information  
Cell 202.257.9574  
jane.schuchardt@extension.org

Carolyn contact information  
Cell 410.200.4566  
cbbrooks@umes.edu

Wednesday, January 20, 2016 ECOP Meetings  
9:00 – 10:00 a.m.  
NACo, 25 Massachusetts Ave., NW (easy walk from Union Station)  
Contact: Jamie Richards, assistant to Matt Chase, 202.942.4258  
Dr. Paul Beddoe, Associate Legislative Director (Urban Caucus)  
Arthur Scott, Associate Legislative Directors (Ag & Rural Affairs)

10:15 – 10:45 a.m.  
Shari Garmise, APLU VP, Office of Urban Initiatives, Jane’s office

11:00 a.m. – Noon  
ECOP Meeting via Zoom, Jane’s office at APLU

Wednesday, January 20, 2016 Joint Meetings  
12:15 – 1:15 p.m.  
APLU Kellogg Room, 4th floor -- prep for meetings  
Lunch compliments of ECOP

1:15 – 1:30 p.m.  
Cab to Cornerstone

1:30 – 2:30 p.m. –  
Cornerstone Government Affairs and kglobal  
300 Independence Ave SE, 202.448.9500  
Jim Richards, Vernie Hubert, Hunt Shipman, Jeremy Witte, Alice Gomez, Darren Katz

2:30 – 3:00 p.m.  
Cab to Whitten

3:00 – 4:00 p.m.  
USDA-REE, 214W USDA Whitten Building  
Contact: Michele Simmons, 202.720.1542  
Cathie Woteki, Ann Bartuska, Kim Green, Bill Hoffman

Wednesday, January 20, 2016 ECOP Meeting  
4:15 – 5:00 p.m.  
USDA Food, Nutrition and Consumer Service  
216E Whitten, 202.720.7711  
Jerry Mande, Senior Advisor
Thursday January 21, 2016 – all meetings in Waterfront Center (WFC)
Contact: Jeanette Thurston, 202.720.7166

8:00 a.m. Jane pick up at Hilton Garden Inn, 815 14th Street, NW
8:15 a.m. Arrive WFC
8:30 - 9:30 a.m. Drs. Ramaswamy, Broussard and Holland, Room 4329
9:30 -10:30 a.m. Directors and Deputies, Room 4103
NIFA Institutes
Center for International Programs
Office of Grants and Financial Management
Office of Information Technology
11:00 – Noon Communication and PARS Directors, Room 1341
Noon - 12:45 p.m. Lunch (order from Potbelly, delivered to WFC, need cash), Room 1341
12:45 -1:15 p.m. Climate Change NPLs, discussion of concept paper, Room 1341
1:15 - 1:30 p.m. Prep for seminar
1:30 – 2:30 p.m. NIFA Staff Seminar, Room 1410 A & B
3:00 p.m. Jane drop off at Union Station (or other destinations)
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