OPENING BUSINESS –

Michelle Rodgers called the meeting to order. Attendance is recorded on page 4. Fred Schlutt made a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting held March 10-11, 2016. Jimmy Henning seconded and the motion passed. No items were added to the agenda.

1. UPDATE: Private Resource Mobilization Task Force (p.5) –

Scott Reed, Chair – List of members and the charge is found on p.6. The first meeting is in process. Question by Michelle: Is this a sensible way to proceed? Jennifer Sirangelo – Raised the possibility to interface with National 4-H Council (Jill Bramble), early in the process. Michelle has followed up with Susan Raymond and she has offered to assist as needed. Next report to ECOP will be in July. Mark Latimore expressed approval.

2. ACTION: ECOP National Budget Task Force (pp.6-11) –

Jimmy Henning, Chair – Looking at history as provided by National Office, to categories of reducing costs. 1) Small – unspent budget items, i.e., chair travel and small items, could save ~$10K. 2) Big – Having to do with work with AHS and ESCOP; kglobal and Measuring Excellence in Extension. Fred Schlutt – Western region slightly revised its response last week. A vote was taken with slightly favor of a modest $50K increase. Task Force will be preparing a recommendation with a few scenarios at the July meeting. Afterward, if ECOP proposes an increase, it would go out for a vote by the Section.

3. UPDATE: BAA Public Value Statement (p.12) –

Daryl Buchholz: 11 ECOP members were in favor of the statement as presented but there were concerns for the process and cost associated. All of this was communicated to the Policy Board of Directors (PBD). Clarence Watson delivered the same concern on behalf of ESCOP. The PBD is taking these and other concerns under advisement. No further action
needed at this time until Joint COPs. Goal is to have ready public value statement ready by APLU Annual Meeting. No charge to ECOP; will be paid for by PBD.

4. UPDATE: National System Task Force –

Michelle Rodgers: Significant time, 1 hour, will be devoted to this in July.

Chuck Hibberd: Met on 5.13.16. Identify how we come together or provide leadership. Where we are and future possibilities. Engaging with kglobal to consider messaging that appeals to potential partners and supporters. Will blend with national branding group from 2012-2013. Webinar is 11 ET June 28, 2016 via Zoom. Announcement in EMM on June 6. TF will present with a panel at ESS/CES-NEDA in Wyoming in September. Michelle is interested in the draft document to use the same verbiage in the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation planning grant process.

5. ACTION: Search process – (pp. 13-14) –

Jimmy Henning: Attachment is a starting point based on history. Is the search committee broad enough? Who this should be? Committee determines the process?

Formulation by mid-June. Have conversation about the cost involved. Cannot compare with ESS portfolio. Search committee should take recent ED/A Team survey results under advisement.

Motion: Jimmy Henning – to fill the Executive Director position. Chris Boerboom provided a second. Motion passed. The ECOP Budget Task Force will include look at the budget for the position.

Membership Committee – Keep the size small with regional representative. The following was recommended: ECOP Executive – Fred Schlutt (western); EDA Team (team chooses); PBD – Daryl Buchholz (North Central); BLC – Doug Steele (Southern); immediate past chair – Delbert Foster (1890s), and current chair – Michelle Rodgers (northeast). Fred moved approval; Jimmy seconded; carried. Provide comments to Michelle.

6. Chair Report to ECOP (pp.15-20) –

Michelle Rodgers: 3 announcements – Nominations to POW, refer to FSMA – key points, state plans are due June 1st. Money available for training/Extension. APLU DOL-rule, touch base at July meeting to check in on how institutions are dealing with this.

7. OTHER AGENDA ITEMS:

The meeting was appropriately adjourned.

Key is found on next page.
**KEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECOP 2016 Goals:</th>
<th>ECOP Core Themes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Resource Mobilization .........................................................</td>
<td>Build Partnerships and Acquire Resources ...............</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Programming .....................................................................................</td>
<td>Increase Strategic Marketing and Communications ......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation ..................................................................................................</td>
<td>Enhance Leadership and Professional Development ......</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development ............................................................................</td>
<td>Strengthen Organizational Functioning ....................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National System ..........................................................................................</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEXT MEETINGS**

- **Monday, July 18, 1-4:00 p.m. and Tuesday, July 19, 2016, 1:00 – 5:00 p.m.**
  Executive, Program and Personnel Committees meet Monday, July 18, 4-5:00 p.m.
  In conjunction with Joint COPs
  Sheraton Gunter Hotel, 205 East Houston Street, San Antonio, TX 78205
  Registration: [http://www.cvent.com/d/0fqf8b](http://www.cvent.com/d/0fqf8b)

- **Tuesday, Sept. 20, 7 – 8:45 a.m. and Thursday, Sept. 22, 2016, 8:00 a.m. – Noon**
  Executive, Program and Personnel Committees meet Tuesday, Sept. 20, 4-5:00 p.m.
  In conjunction with the ESS-CES/NEDA Joint Meeting, Sept. 19-22, 2016
  Jackson Lake Lodge, Moran, WY
  Registration: [https://conferencereg.colostate.edu/Jackson2016](https://conferencereg.colostate.edu/Jackson2016)

**CONNECT**

- For all ECOP documents see [www.extension.org/ecop](http://www.extension.org/ecop): Meeting minutes (Document Library), calendar, directory, handout, etc.

- For the searchable blog, see [http://ecopmondaymintue.blogspot.com](http://ecopmondaymintue.blogspot.com)

[Back to agenda](#)
**ECOP Membership** Attendance is indicated below with ☑ or ●

**VOTING MEMBERS (8 or more establishes a quorum):**

1890 Region
- ☑ Delbert Foster, South Carolina State University
- ☑ Mark Latimore, Fort Valley State
- ☑ 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, 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
**ECOP Private Resource Mobilization (PRM) Task Force**  
**Background and Charge as of 5.23.16**

**Background**

In January 2016, ECOP voted to support PRM in concept based on the report from Changing Our World, Inc. Pages 11-17 of the report [http://bit.ly/2015ECOP_PRM](http://bit.ly/2015ECOP_PRM) is the basis for the charge set forth for an ECOP Private Resource Mobilization Task Force. When the ECOP PRM and National System Task Forces have progressed appropriately, ECOP could be in a position to engage all directors and administrators in a decision about fundraising capacity to include:

- Job description for chief advancement officer
- Case development
- Prospect research and immediate opportunities
- Prospect cultivation

**Charge to Task Force**

Define national process and approach to consider feasibility of next steps:

1. Develop a draft cost analysis of infrastructure options, including
   - Three-year budget and funding mechanisms
   - Opt-in rates for charter members and tier two considerations for additional commitments (p. 12, 16)
2. Propose a system for prospect research, cultivation and tracking (p. 12, 13)
3. Create a three-year development plan with intermediate goals (p. 14)
4. Suggest a process to identify a Development Coordinating Committee (p. 15)

**Timeframe**

- May 25, 2016 ECOP meeting – announce task force membership
- July 18-19, 2016 ECOP face-to-face meeting – propose timeframe and coordination with ECOP National Systems Task Force

**Related, Simultaneous Effort by ECOP National System Task Force**

- Develop national mission statement-goals/objectives and value proposition for CES to serve as a system wide case for philanthropic support.
- Define national system.
- Launch national brand strategy.

**Potential Membership**

- **CHAIR** – Scott Reed, Oregon State, Western Region
- **MEMBERS** –
  - Roger Rennekamp, Ohio State University
  - Bill Hare, University of the District of Columbia
  - Tony Windham, University of Arkansas
  - Ray McKinnie, Virginia State University
  - Laura Johnson, University of Georgia
- **STAFF** –
  - Jane Schuchardt and Sandy Ruble, ECOP National Office
  - Ron Brown (back-up), Southern Region

[Back to agenda](#)
ECOP Executive Committee – In preparation for our meeting today, May 11th, at 11:00 a.m. ET, attached please find the regional reports related to the ECOP budget. Many thanks to all for engaging in this important discussion and to Jimmy Henning for leading the ECOP Budget Task Force.

As you will see from the regional reports, three regions showed preference for the following:
- only that needed to balance the budget, but maintain current spending, or
- balance the budget and create funds for additional investments by eliminating current expenses.

Two regions preferred to:
- increase the assessment to provide $50,000 for additional investments, or
- increase the assessment to provide $100,000 for additional investments.

During our meeting today, ECOP Executive Committee will determine how to continue the conversation about the budget with the full board during its meeting on May 25th. Thanks very much.

Please note the updated agenda for today (ECOP Exec May 2016.pdf) is attached with a draft of May 25 ECOP meeting (ECOP May 2016.docx). Connection details - Join from PC, Mac, Linux, iOS or Android: https://canr.zoom.us/j/521553456, or by phone: 646-558-8656 or 408-638-0968 | Meeting ID: 521 553 456

Best regards,

Jane
Jane Schuchardt, Ph.D., Executive Director, Cooperative Extension/ECOP
(o) 202.478.6029 (cell) 202.257.9574 jane.schuchardt@extension.org
www.extension.org/ecop http://ecopmondayminute.blogspot.com/
Office Location: APLU, 1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20005-4722

Go to next 5 pages to view attachments from this email message.
Discussion on ECOP Budget Task Force Recommendations

Submission Date: 2016-05-10 16:44:03

Name of person submitting this report: L. Washington Lyons

Your role: Regional ED/A

Please provide your email address: lwlyons@ncat.edu

Select the Cooperative Extension region you represent: 1890 Institutions

Rank the following discussion points in order of your region’s preference for assessments for the following possible budget approaches. You may only enter one answer per row. approaches. You may only enter one answer per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>1 - Most supportive</th>
<th>2 - Moderately supportive</th>
<th>3 - Slightly supportive</th>
<th>4 - Least supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification for ranking provided above:

The 1890 institutions met by conference call and a few of those who could not join the conference call provided their input via e-mail. Approximately 70% of the institutions (13) participated in the process.

It was felt by the administrators that the budget restrictions that they are confronted with along with the difficulties in achieving the state match that they could not afford to commit to an increase in the ECOP assessment. It was the position of the 1890s that ECOP should consider eliminating current expenses before making new investments.
Discussion on ECOP Budget Task Force Recommendations

**Submission Date**: 2016-05-10 14:06:46

**Name of person submitting this report**: Nancy Bull

**Your role**: Regional ED/A

**Please provide your email address**: nancy.bull@uconn.edu

**Select the Cooperative Extension region you represent**: Northeast

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank the following discussion points in order of your region's preference for assessments for the following possible budget approaches. You may only enter one answer per row.</th>
<th>1 - Most supportive</th>
<th>2 - Moderately supportive</th>
<th>3 - Slightly supportive</th>
<th>4 - Least supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) only that needed to balance the budget, but maintain current spending;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) balance the budget and create funds for additional investments by eliminating current expenses;</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) increase the assessment to provide $50,000 for additional investments, or</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) increase the assessment to provide $100,000 for additional investments.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Justification for ranking provided above**: Questioning the return on strategic investments that we now receive. Perception strong to eliminate some current investments. The increase in assessment by two states based on additional NIFA funding strongly influenced the discussion. While the assessment did not increase the amount of payment did increase.

Moved and seconded to balance the budget to create funds for additional investments by eliminating current expenses.
Discussion on ECOP Budget Task Force Recommendations

Submission Date 2016-05-10 12:57:43

Name of person submitting this report Fred Schlutt

Your role: Regional representative to ECOP Executive Committee

Please provide your email address. fschlutt@gmail.com

Select the Cooperative Extension region you represent. Western

Rank the following discussion points in order of your region’s preference for assessments for the following possible budget approaches. You may only enter one answer per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 - Most supportive</th>
<th>2 - Moderately supportive</th>
<th>3 - Slightly supportive</th>
<th>4 - Least supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) only that needed to balance the budget, but maintain current spending;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) balance the budget and create funds for additional investments by eliminating current expenses;</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) increase the assessment to provide $50,000 for additional investments, or</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) increase the assessment to provide $100,000 for additional investments.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion on ECOP Budget Task Force Recommendations

Submission Date 2016-05-09 15:49:38
Name of person submitting this report Robin Shepard
Your role: Regional ED/A
Please provide your email address. robin.shepard@uwex.edu
Select the Cooperative Extension region you represent. North Central

Rank the following discussion points in order of your region’s preference for assessments for the following possible budget approaches. You may only enter one answer per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Most supportive</th>
<th>Moderately supportive</th>
<th>Slightly supportive</th>
<th>Least supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification for ranking provided above.

Comments received from individual CES Directors:

I question increasing the assessment when there is currently a $400K surplus.

My assessment for ECOP is double the amount my counterpart pays for the research assessment. With capacity flat, what are we getting compared to other COPs. What do I really receive in benefits compared to other COPs now. With flat capacity funds and rising salary costs, I am not in a position for another assessment. I wish I would have had the following option - cut assessments and balance budget. I am most supportive of that strategy.

I hate to be perceived to be non-supportive, but we are getting budget cuts so it is hard to be fully supportive of potential increased support without careful consideration. The MEIE expense is fairly significant on-going expense. Is it truly a special project with an end point? I am interested in the outcomes of the MEIE effort, especially when participation seems limited. I see greater returns from the health Extension investment and one time investments like innovation. I would actually be most supportive of a combination of #2 and #3 – reducing certain existing expenses in combination of a marginal increase in the funding.
Discussion on ECOP Budget Task Force Recommendations

Submission Date: 2016-05-09 11:51:07
Name of person submitting this report: Jimmy Henning
Your role: Regional representative to ECOP Executive Committee
Please provide your email address: jimmy.henning@uky.edu
Select the Cooperative Extension region you represent: Southern

Rank the following discussion points in order of your region’s preference for assessments for the following possible budget approaches. You may only enter one answer per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 - Most supportive</th>
<th>2 - Moderately supportive</th>
<th>3 - Slightly supportive</th>
<th>4 - Least supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) only that needed to balance the budget, but maintain current spending;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) balance the budget and create funds for additional investments by eliminating current expenses;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) increase the assessment to provide $50,000 for additional investments, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) increase the assessment to provide $100,000 for additional investments.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification for ranking provided above.

The Southern Region acknowledged the need for ECOP to be more nimble and to be able to take advantage of targets of opportunity. We did not rank the alternatives as asked above, but clearly no capacity to be strategic was not supported.

There was a significant sentiment to take a look at current expenditures, in particular the CMC/kglobal expenditure for possible reduction. The Southern Region was aware of specific deliverables being part of the current job expectation for kglobal, but were not aware of performance metrics to that end.

There was very strong support for having capacity in the budget for the ability to act strategically, but I chose not to distinguish between the 50 and 100K level, because our conversation did not specifically state a preference.

Back to agenda
Results of ECOP Vote on Public Value Statement 5.5.16

Summary: Thirteen of the 15 ECOP members voted – 11 yes, 2 no. In reviewing the comments provided below without reference to individuals or regions, there is general support for the public value statement, yet significant concern about the process as outlined.

Comments:

- This to me implies a brief statement or document with 30K-foot level data and impact that can be shared with elected and appointed officials nationally. Details later imply a much longer documents and detail, which I think is less useful.
- I would like to see more clearly defined goal(s) of the public value statement (PVS). What is the purpose/intent, how will the statement be used, intended audience, etc.? I do think some value from this exercise is reaching consensus across the system on what we think is our common and collective public value.
- This is very broad – Food, Ag and NR; and R, E and T. Don’t know if we can develop a concise statement(s) that cover these subject matter areas and for all three functions?
- How much data collection is necessary? I think we can articulate many public values. The greater challenge will be reaching consensus across the system on the right focus and/or right “level” of the focus in a PVS.
- What is the purpose of the interviews and are they necessary? I do not believe we need to conduct interviews to determine or measure our public value.
- What data sources? Don’t we have access to the Excellence in Extension database, NIFA reporting portal? Would like a more intentional statement at the front end regarding the audience for the PVS before entering the process. I think this is key to guide a successful process and outcome.
- I suggest that kglobal be asked to provide assistance in developing such a statement, using current resources, given their contract responsibilities related to communicating our public value and gaining support for our mission.
- Our region clearly sees the need for a public values statement, and we absolutely feel that Extension should be included in any such statement. Our group felt that this was an area that we (ECOP, ESCOP, and AHS) are already providing funds to kglobal to support this effort. If that is not possible, we’re supportive of hiring the contractor. Our region just wanted to emphasize that we don’t feel we should pay for the same services twice. And this would be a great opportunity for kglobal to demonstrate value and commitment to our system.
- I realize that this money does not come from the ECOP budget; however, we are all paying for the BAA budget via off the top funding and assessments. I just really feel that we cannot continue to increase assessments and continue to fund projects without a system wide review (BAA, AHS, and all the COPS) of what we are spending our money on.
- I believe there is a degree of uncertainty in the value/ROI of the statement. While the cost of the proposal is being paid by the BAA PBD budget, there is still an opportunity cost of the people who participate in the proposed forums. If there was a more defined benefit of the PVS, I may reconsider.
- What is the relationship to the “systems” articulation work currently underway within ECOP? I am thinking of the National System Task Force and the impending Private Resource Mobilization effort that no doubt could utilize messages from the Public Values effort. Regarding members of the PVT, I suggest that someone from the ECOP National System Task Force would be good.

Back to agenda
May 16, 2016

Dear ECOP Board Members:

The ECOP Executive Committee has received advance notice from Jane Schuchardt, Executive Director, regarding her plans to leave the D.C. area later this year and return to Nebraska with her husband Rick. The ECOP Executive Committee is very appreciative of Jane’s five-plus years of service and her willingness to continue to work with us through this transition time until we are able to secure a future ECOP Executive Director. The goal is to hire a new director and have a month overlap with Jane. We desire to complete this process by the November APLU meeting. At that time ECOP will transition to a new ECOP chair, Fred Schlutt, and the new Executive Director. The Executive Committee hopes this timing will facilitate a smooth transition for the leadership and board.

For the May 25 board meeting, the Executive Committee will share with you a proposed search process for your input and discussion as a part of the agenda. If you have any questions or concerns that you would like to discuss, please feel free to give me a call or send an email.

Best regard,

Michelle S. Rodgers
Chair, Extension Committee on Organization and Policy
Associate Dean and Director
University of Delaware

cc ECOP Liaisons, ED/A Team, Ian Maw
ECOP Executive Director Search Process
For Discussion Only on May 25, 2016

Search Committee
Chair of Search
ECOP Executive Committee representation
Executive Director and Administrator Team representation
PBD Liaison
BLC Chair
BAC Chair

Support for Search process-APLU Chief of Staff Jean Middleton-confirmed

Process and Potential Time Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Completed By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish Search Committee</td>
<td>ECOP Board</td>
<td>Mid June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define Position Description</td>
<td>Search Committee</td>
<td>June 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Position</td>
<td>APLU Chief Staff</td>
<td>July 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Posting</td>
<td></td>
<td>July 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Candidates (paper)</td>
<td>Search Committee</td>
<td>Aug 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Interviews/ Select Final Candidates</td>
<td>Search Committee</td>
<td>Aug 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Webinar presentation Candidates</td>
<td>Directors/Admin</td>
<td>Sept 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face to Face Interviews</td>
<td>Search Committee</td>
<td>Oct 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer Position-Complete Hire Process</td>
<td>ECOP Chair/APLU</td>
<td>Oct 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce New ED at APLU</td>
<td>Committee Chair</td>
<td>Nov 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Back to agenda
Chair Report to ECOP
DC Visits 5.3.16

USDA-NIFA communications – Judy Rude, Diane Bell and Lynn Khadiagala

- NIFA impacts database impacts@nifa.usda.gov – NIFA database includes everything from videos, journal articles, and connections to other data bases; will soon launch an impacts spotlight; have been in contact with Scott Cummings to link to www.landgrantimpacts.org; working with Ashley Hawn at kglobal
- **ACTION:** discussion of how to include reference to capacity funds in addition to competitive funds in press releases; NIFA will develop language

USDA-NIFA reporting and accountability – Katelyn Sellers

- The plan IS NOT to move Extension into REEPORT
- Plan of Work upgrade will focus is on impacts – 1) the issue, 2) what was done, and 3) what are the results/public value; new system expected in FY 2019 (2020-2024 Plan of Work)
- **ACTION:** ECOP will provide names for Plan of work subgroups on 1) classification, 2) Extension module, and 3) institutional profile module

USDA-NIFA administration – Sonny Ramaswamy, Robert Holland and Muquarrab Qureshi

- Replacements for NPLs Susan Shockey (family economics) and Marty Draper (pest management, the agency first looks at overall needs and then makes staffing decisions.
- Zika virus – hope to plus-up Smith-Lever, 1890 Extension, multi-state projects; watch for RFA for Extension; Herb Bolton is NPL contact
- Evaluation of capacity funds project – Teconomy (spin-off of Battelle) has the contract. What is the value of capacity funds? What is return on investment and how to measure? What is the connection to the competitive grants? Want complete analysis and report by October 2016, which will be used to make the argument for capacity funds. Contractor has access to USDA-NIFA data; survey will be undertaken through APLU and Executive Directors/Administrators for other information;
- DoL Fair Labor Act – APLU contacted Cathie and Sonny; Cathie and Sonny took action as appropriate for executive branch employees
- Competitive, capacity, and capital – emphasized that the new focus on capital (deferred maintenance) cannot be at the expense of capacity or competitive funds

USDA-NIFA grants and financial management – Cynthia Montgomery

- Equipment purchased with capacity funds – developing guidelines for pre-approvals

USDA- NIFA information technology – Michael Dubois

- Joining with USDA for enterprise IT management; first effort will be in August for capacity funds

USDA-NIFA food safety and nutrition – Denise Eblin

- Next farm bill – update EFNEP language, particularly formula for distribution of funds; will engage Extension in this dialogue
USDA-NIFA budget – Paula Geiger  
- Next farm bill – NIFA will engage stakeholders; working on FY 2018 budget proposal now

USDA-NIFA international programs – Otto Gonzales  
- Focus on aligning international opportunities across all NIFA institutes; hopes to dedicate funding for university capacities on global engagement

USDA-NIFA bioenergy, climate and environment – Louis Tupas  
- Collaborations with other agencies have increased; DoE, EPA, NASA; would be helpful to inform those in the network, need to look at other agencies for funding; robotics, unmanned aerial devices

USDA-NIFA food production and sustainability – Parag Chitnis  
- plant health and water security are focus areas; working with components of the APLU water report in budget requests  
- **ACTION:** How can we get more Extension-led projects in AFRI?

USDA-NIFA NPLs working with climate  
- Suggested development of a National Climate Master Program, Master Gardeners  
- **ACTION:** NPLs will develop paragraph description for possible discussion with ECOP

NASDA RE Food Safety Modernization Act – Barb Glenn and Bob Ehart  
- With appropriate support for capacity, Cooperative Extension can be a strong partner with State Departments of Agriculture to implement provisions of the Food Safety Modernization Act, especially for food safety education related to on-farm readiness.  
- State plans are due June 1st. Directors/administrators are encouraged to contact state department of agriculture to be a partner in the educational component.  
- **ACTION:** NASDA will write a one-pager that summarizes the relevant portions of the law, NASDA’s involvement with State Departments of Agriculture in developing plans, defining how this process is an opportunity for Extension, and recommending follow-up action by Extension Directors/Administrators. Further, NASDA will plan and speak on an ECOP webinar (which could be repeated) that provides more details to the one-pager and allows for participant Q&A.

Continue to next pages to view email communication as part of the ECOP Chair Report.
From: Schuchardt, Jane  
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2016 10:40 AM  
To: 'cesexecutivedirectors@extension.org' <cesexecutivedirectors@extension.org>  
Cc: Rodgers, Michelle S. <mrodgers@udel.edu>; 'Sellers, Katelyn - NIFA' <ksellers@nifa.usda.gov>; Ruble, Sandy <sandy.ruble@extension.org>; Schlutt, Fred <fred.schlutt@alaska.edu>  
Subject: ACTION BY 5.25.16 -- POW Working Groups recommendations  
Importance: High

EDA Team – As we discussed during our meeting last Friday, Michelle requests we provide recommendations to Katelyn Sellers, USDA-NIFA, for the POW working groups. Katelyn and I worked together yesterday to come up with specific guidelines for you as follows:

1) Classification Working Group – Katelyn requests 2-3 people from Extension. As we discussed, please provide **one person per region**. For the 1890s, Ntam Baharanyi, Tuskegee University, has already volunteered.

2) Extension Module Working Group – Katelyn requests 10 people from Extension, which would be **two per region**. Ntam also volunteered for this group, so he could be on one this group or the classification working group.

3) Institutional Profile Module Working Group – Please provide **one person per region**.

4) ESCOP has provided their recommendations (see attached). [p.19]

5) Katelyn’s guidelines provided to Michelle and others on 5.5.16 are attached for your reference. [p.17]

6) Please provide **all recommendations from your region directly to Katelyn on or before 5.25.16** with a copy to Michelle and me. Katelyn and I agreed that collating the recommendations at the ECOP National Office was not necessary. Please note that these are recommendations and that USDA-NIFA will make the final selections on the composition of the working groups.

7) Please direct questions to Katelyn at 202.578.4141 or ksellers@nifa.usda.gov.

8) Please be mindful of Michelle’s request to include those as appropriate who represented Extension on the original Plan of Work Expert Panel. They were (1st column from ESS; 2nd column from CES):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Northeast</th>
<th>North Central</th>
<th>Southern</th>
<th>Western</th>
<th>1890 LGUs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|              | Cameron Faustman  
|              | cameron.faustman@uconn.edu                     | David Jackson  
|              | Lisa Townson  
|              | Lisa.Townson@unh.edu                            | Deborah Lewis  
|              |                                               | lewis.205@osu.edu                       |                                               | Steve Loring,  
|              |                                               |                                               |                                               | sloring@nmsu.edu                          | Maifan Silitonga  
|              |                                               |                                               |                                               |                                               | Maifan.Silitonga@kysu.edu                 |
|              |                                               |                                               |                                               |                                               | Benjamin Forbes  
|              |                                               |                                               |                                               |                                               | forbesb@ncat.edu                          |

Best regards,

Jane  
Jane Schuchardt, Ph.D., Executive Director, Cooperative Extension/ECOP  
(o) 202.478.6029 (cell) 202.257.9574 jane.schuchardt@extension.org  
www.extension.org/ecop http://ecopmondayminute.blogspot.com/  
Office Location: APLU, 1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20005-4722  

Go to next page to view attachments from this email message.
AREERA Plan of Work Redesign

In order to support the project plan (under development) for the redesign of the Plan of Work system and business process, NIFA will convene various working groups composed of NIFA and LGU representatives. These working groups will provide expertise in certain areas applicable to the POW reporting process and provide a forum for discussion, questions, and analysis of the effects of current, new, and changed policies and business rules in the reporting software.

If you would like to volunteer for one or more of these working groups, please send an email to Katelyn Sellers at ksellers@nifa.usda.gov.

Classification Working Group

| Purpose | To modify and expand NIFA’s classification schema for projects and initiatives that better represent Extension work. The current Knowledge Areas (KA) and Subjects of Investigation (SOI) used for research projects allow NIFA to analyze data at an ideal level of specificity. We would like for Extension to use SOIs (as well as the KAs they are already used to using) in the new POW system. Also, we want this to be an opportunity to expand the KAs to better represent extension. While the focus of this group will be extension, this is also an opportunity to re-examine if any changes need to be made for research as well. |
| Ideal Participant | Extension administrators, agents, or specialists who are familiar with a broad range of extension work/programs. |
| Date Range | May 2016 through August 2016 |
| Time Commitment | 3-4 virtual meetings approximately 1-2 hours in length; in between meetings will require collecting requests for feedback from colleagues, vetting proposed ideas with home institution, answer online polls |
| # of People Needed | 5 (already have 10 committed for a total of 15) |

Extension Module Working Group

| Purpose | To develop the requirements and clearly define the type of data (think: specific data fields!) NIFA needs to collect for Extension. The data fields collected for each “planned program” in the current POW software as well as the data fields collected for research projects in REEport can serve as a starting point to develop what will work best for Extension. This group will have a large role in redefining what a “program” or “initiative” is for Extension that gets a bit more specific than what is currently entered in the POW (30K foot view) but not as specific with a start and end point as research projects in REEport are (5K foot view). |
| Ideal Participant | Extension administrators who are closely familiar with extension work but who also are familiar with the current POW software and business process. Also ideal is someone who has a strong understanding of where data in their state come from (other software systems, manual process, etc.) |
| Date Range | July 2016 through November 2016; likelihood for extension for additional questions from NIFA through spring of 2017 |
| Time Commitment | 4-5 virtual meetings 1-2 hours in length; in between meetings will require collecting requests for feedback from colleagues, vetting proposed ideas |
Institutional Profile Module Working Group

Purpose
To develop the requirements and clearly define the type of data (think: specific data fields!) that can serve as the general format for a “plan of work.” Per legislation, the institutional profile must contain fields on merit/scientific peer review processes, stakeholder input processes, and information about multi-state and integrated activities. This group will further define how to collect this information and what other fields are needed in order for the system to generate a “plan of work” each year. Along with these fields, this group will also help determine how/when information from the more specific research and extension programs should be rolled up with the institutional profile data to create a “plan of work.”

Ideal Participant
Research and Extension administrators who are familiar with the current AREERA reporting process and who have experience collecting and reporting data related to scientific and peer reviews, stakeholder input, and general executive summaries of institutional highlights/accomplishments.

Date Range
End of June 2016 through October 2016; likelihood for extension for additional question from NIFA through spring of 2017

Time Commitment
4-5 virtual meetings 1-2 hours in length; in between meetings will require collecting requests for feedback from colleagues, vetting proposed ideas with home institution (and others in region if possible/applicable), answer online polls

# of People Needed
15

Note: NIFA recognizes the importance of collecting LGU input on how to report/demonstrate integration between research and extension. Currently, we foresee this discussion topic occurring within the Institutional Profile Module Working Group, but if it needs to become its own working group, we will do that at a later date.

If you would like to volunteer for one or more of these working groups, please send an email to Katelyn Sellers at ksellers@nifa.usda.gov.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group Classification</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Profile Module Working Grp.</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Univ. of Connecticut</td>
<td>Lynn Grabowski</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lynn.grabowski@uconn.edu">lynn.grabowski@uconn.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
<td>Carol Harvey</td>
<td><a href="mailto:harvey@AESOP.Rutgers.edu">harvey@AESOP.Rutgers.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>North Carolina A&amp;T State Univ.</td>
<td>Benjamin Forbes</td>
<td><a href="mailto:forbesb@ncat.edu">forbesb@ncat.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M Univ.</td>
<td>Billy Lawton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bclawton@pvamu.edu">bclawton@pvamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>Lesley Oliver</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lesley.oliver@uky.edu">Lesley.oliver@uky.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>Joel Lown</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jlown@tennessee.edu">jlown@tennessee.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>Casey Hillmer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Casey.hillmer@wisc.edu">Casey.hillmer@wisc.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>Liz Bent</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BentEO@missouri.edu">BentEO@missouri.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>North Dakota State Univ.</td>
<td>Greg Lardy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Gregory.lardy@ndsu.edu">Gregory.lardy@ndsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td>New Mexico State Univ.</td>
<td>Steve Loring</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sloring@ad.nmsu.edu">sloring@ad.nmsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification Working Group</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>Keli Tallman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ktallman@iastate.edu">ktallman@iastate.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>North Dakota State University</td>
<td>Charlie Stoltenow</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Charles.stoltenow@ndsu.edu">Charles.stoltenow@ndsu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>North Carolina A&amp;T State Univ.</td>
<td>Johnnie Westbrook</td>
<td><a href="mailto:irwestbr@ncat.edu">irwestbr@ncat.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Rukeia Draw-Hood</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Rdraw-hood@pvamu.edu">Rdraw-hood@pvamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Ashwani Srivastava</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aksrivastava@pvamu.edu">aksrivastava@pvamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Prairie View A&amp;M University</td>
<td>Carolyn Nobles Williams</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cjwilliams@pvamu.edu">cjwilliams@pvamu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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