*Questions for all groups to discuss:*

**1. During the past five years, what trends have been observed in the funding for extension activities?**

 --Increased evaluation work is created by grants. . . .funders are requiring more rigor in evaluation.

 --Going to increased competitive bidding.

 --Federal grants prefer multistate approach.

**2. What are key funding challenges?**

 --Getting them to build logic models/plans that they will follow/know how to use (sustain funding)

 --How do they cost out inputs?

 --Effectively evaluating the impact of social media (i.e., evaluation of webinars, electronic offerings)

--Evaluation is not “at the table” when “deals are made.” There’s little understanding of the real cost of evaluation.

**3. Where have the most notable funding declines or increases occurred?**

Multistate (increases)

Competitive (increases)

Decreases in state funds

**5. What are 3-5 key challenges for extension?**

 --Enhancing use of technology-based delivery and determining the impact of such

 --Greater expectations for evaluation, but not funded

--No real consideration for building staff evaluation capacity

**6. What are 3-5 key opportunities/trends for extension?**

 --Evaluation needs to be forethought, not afterthought

 --Opportunity to integrate evaluation/create better scholarship

~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

Our group had a conference call with Katelyn Sellers & Bart Hewitt, NIFA Accountability Office--

to discuss strengthening state POW and Annual Report

1. They recommended we highlight programs/successes in the Annual Report Executive Summary that will be in the report—helps reviewers
2. They recommended FTEs be appropriate to the intended work in the POW.
3. They are using plans and reports for budget documentation.

Past performance is showing why funds are so important and answering what is going on in each state.

1. When asked about the process for indicating plans/results of the State’s choice among the long list of indicators for the five Federal initiatives, Bart said he’s had to report outcomes for a specific issue in each State for an Ag. Committee. Also, that they are currently being audited by the govt. accountability office.

After engaging in conversations with the various program leader groups, we discussed whether banner outcomes can be interpreted differently . . . not always economic outcome as some banner outcomes are currently written—to focus on other important outcomes, e.g. environmental conditions.

**Those in evaluation group want to take active role in working w/program leaders and administrators in selecting from national outcomes. We believe there’s potential for using the banner outcomes to prioritize among national outcomes and indicators so each state in North Central can report against common measures.**