**CD Program Leaders’ Meeting Notes**

September 4 and September 6, 2013

NCCEA Annual Meeting – Columbus, OH

**Attending**

Tim Borich (IA), Tom Blewett (WI), Greg Wise (WI), Kathy Tweeten (ND), Michael Wilcox (IN), David Olson (SD), Scott Hutcheson (IN), Anne Silvis (IL), Dan Kahl (KS), Brent Hales (MN), Mary Simon Leuci (MO), Greg Davis (Ohio) and Sept 6 only: Dave Ivan (MI).

**Identification of chair-elect**

Wilcox stepped out momentarily to take a phone call. As a result, his term as chair will begin in June, 2014.

**CDS in Dubuque, IA: July 20 - 23, 2014**

Hosted by Iowa, Illinois and Wisconsin (Tim Borich, Anne Silvis, Greg Wise and Deb Tootle are heading up the local host committee). We could meet as a Program Leaders group before or after the conference. The theme is “renaissance” and will address issues related to redevelopment, with the example of Dubuque moving from something like 28% unemployment to a thriving economy with new sorts of sustainable business, sustainable river development, etc. Because this conference is in our region, we expect many of our Educator colleagues to attend. One of the mobile learning workshops will be led by Robin Sheppard to the national beer museum in Potosi, Wisconsin.

The NC Program Leaders group will meet on Sunday, prior to the conference. Tim will check on finding us a conference room; we will work with Michael Wilcox to confirm the agenda.

**NACDEP in Grand Rapids, MI: June 22 - 25, 2014**

Approximately 9% of NACDEP members are also CDS members (about 30 people). We continue to explore the possibility of a joint conference, whenever and however that might work out. Dave Ivan (MI) and Allison Davis (KY) are co-chairs of the 2014 conference. The theme will include the tenth anniversary of NACDEP, with a focus of looking forward. NACo will be invited and has expressed interest in attending. Brent Elrod from NIFA will be invited to attend, and could give a “D.C. perspective.”

NACDEP offices which are open include the 1890 representative from the North Central Region (may be someone eligible from Missouri); 1994 institutions (their annual conference will occur soon; we should have conversations with someone as we think about involving them, and what they might be seeking through their involvement); president elect; treasurer; and secretary. The formal call for nominations will be sent to all NACDEP members, and the election will be held before the end of this calendar year.

**NACDEP at Galaxy IV in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: September 16-20, 2013**

Reviewed agenda for the national meeting of program leaders and voiced questions about how the agenda would address issues that are important among program leaders; and willingness to participate in the development of the agenda and, especially, identifying issues which are important. Need to provide Scott with more information and priorities that he can use in the national group. What is NIFA’s relationship to CED programming? Entirely through the regional centers? We need to work closely with Brent Elrod to make sure he is invited to program leader meetings, etc. to establish a working relationship. The group discussed the relationship between the national NIFA program leader and the program leaders.

**100 year celebration of the signing of the Smith Lever legislation in D.C.**

Assigned Tim Borich to the national committee. We should use this opportunity to make sure that CD talking points are on the agenda. The anniversary of the signing will be an event in May; Greg Davis will follow up with Suzanne Steel (OH) and Bill Woodrum (WVSU) to confirm the details. CRED represented in all the posts and pictures and celebrations for Smith Lever. Important to be present for key Smith Lever celebrations.

**National CD Program Leaders Meeting - Sept 16/Galaxy – Pittsburgh**

1. Concern was shared about lack of input from state program leaders into the agenda of the national program leaders meeting
2. DIRECT FROM THE NOTES of National Meeting of CRED program leaders in UT, May 2012
   1. **“What’s the venue for meeting?**We should try to meet at NACDEP or some other major conference that most of us attend. Pre-sessions (like this meeting) would be good.
   2. **How often?** FCS program leaders meet annually so maybe we should follow that model.
   3. **Who should be involved beside CRED program leaders?** The 4 RRDC Directors and the NACDEP President
   4. **How should this effort be organized?** Program leader representatives from each region (ideally the Chairs of the regional program leaders groups), the Directors of the 4 RRDCs and the NACDEP President will comprise the core team.”
3. Don Albrecht and Bo (now Rachel) were key to designing 2013 meeting

**Potential candidates for NACDEP officer slate**

* President-elect; Greg will work on someone from OH
* Secretary: Beverly Maltsberger, MO and Greg working on someone in OH; Paul Roback, WI
* 1994—Suggested hold discussion about what 1994 brings and would get with Brian Kowalkowski, Menomonee Nation or Susan Seymour-Givens, FALCON;Gary Halverson, Sitting Bull, VP of FALCON (Not CD)

**Brent Elrod – New CRED NPL at USDA**

How might we best interact with Brent?

1. Ask him to be ex-officio member of NACDEP board
2. Participate in NACDEP and national meetings of CRED program leaders
3. Greg will send welcome note and invitation to NC CRD program leader meetings and phone conference along with photo of our group meeting here with identification of our names and indication looking forward to meeting him in Pittsburgh, PA.
4. Concern about perception at NIFA about RD being funneled and only about the four RRDCs as opposed to critical role of state PLs where program is delivered.

**Needed skills of 21st Century of CD educators**

1. What are the characteristics of the 21st Century workforce, and how should we prepare for that?
2. MN has countered offers from Extension staff with offers from other state Extension systems. We expect to see more movement among states in Extension, and more job changes and career changes by employees.
3. Multiple job changes are the norm, not an indication of a problem or of “job-hopping.”
4. We will probably end up hiring people with no experience with Extension; or experience at all. We may need to look for “Extension-like” experience. In practice, we may be “requiring” Extension experience, even though the job description says Extension experience is “preferred.” For people who have been working in Extension a long time, they may over-value Extension experience.
5. Carefully consider the composition of the search committees, to make sure we are not just looking for the traditional or “same-old” skill sets and degree programs.
6. Focus on the coursework and experience, rather than particular degrees.
7. Current employees are not diverse ethnically, so it’s difficult to recruit employees from ethnic groups which are now currently residing in our states. We need to be looking for candidates who are bi-lingual, from various ethnic backgrounds, etc.
8. Could the NCRCRD help develop candidate pools which are more diverse? Well trained? With good experience?
9. How could we improve recruiting?
   1. Work with departments to provide internships.
   2. Share information across the region.
   3. Fund graduate students to work with specialists.
10. There are some success stories about unconventional candidates who have all the attributes, but not the skills for the position. We can train and develop some candidates.
11. Our employment models might have to shift, so that we can test some unconventional hires. We could try limited contracts, for example, or project-based work that allows more flexibility. How do we allow time sufficient for the employee to learn about the community and build a program?
12. How can we identify candidates who are passionate about the work that we do, want to work in communities and with people, who believe in the Extension process and the mission of the land grant university?
13. Who are some groups who might find the value proposition of work in Extension attractive? Returned Peace Corps volunteers, FFA, Americorps, VISTA, Teach for America, planning programs and nonprofit management programs at regional universities and small colleges, . . . other groups?
14. Our Extension culture is difficult for those who are from other cultures. That is one reason why it has been difficult to hire staff that “looks like” the audiences we serve or hope to serve. How can we “grow our own” leaders, and find those from other cultures who will work in Extension long enough to attain a leadership position. Maybe start by hiring graduate assistants who, as a group, match the ethnic demographics of the state.
15. If the generation now entering the workforce is more “color blind” than ever, how do we include their perspective to improve our organization?
16. What are we lacking in Extension (including staff and councils)? Diversity in terms of race, sexual orientation, gender (in leadership roles), etc. How do we gain some measure of diversity?
17. Are we allocating staff equitably across populations? Are we “shorting” urban areas? Are urban areas well-served already, so are CED resources more effectively used in rural areas, which are without the many nonprofits which are serving urban areas? Or should we provide service where the population resides, and where we can reach a multicultural audience, and reach many legislators?

**National Impact Indicators Update**

Mary shared the summary of the work from the national group, and asked if there are changes that we would suggest or additions to capture the social and long term changes that are difficult to capture. Dan Kahl asked for examples of how to collect the data, including questions, systems, etc. that are working and can be replicated or revised to fit. Tom Blewett described the system in Wisconsin, which asks all county staff – across program areas -- to log their contact numbers into a spreadsheet, which is compiled at the state level. This is working well. The list of indicators was developed with evaluation/reporting specialists (including Scott Chazdon from MN). These indicators were created through logic models – does it make sense to plug them back into logic models to identify meaningful outcomes?

The national impact indicators group will report on September 16 at Galaxy, and will collect information and feedback during that conference regarding the use of the indicators; the appropriateness of measures on the list; and “what’s next” information, including the idea of creating a repository of tools made available to all programs in all states.

Suggestions for improving the NC Indicators report:

1. Change logo of each state outline on the NCRCRD report to the University Extension logo. Need to highlight the contribution of the Extension work in each state.
2. Add a tagline that highlights the states’ contributions, to bring focus to the individual contributions of the states.
3. Edit the first line to add something like “the states, collectively, . . .” to make sure that the report reflects the work of the states.
4. From the actual report, the “NCRCRD programs” should more accurately say, “programs from states in the North Central region.”
5. Pay attention to the attribution of the work and/or publishing. Reflect the status and credibility of the NCRCRD as compiler and publisher of impact across the region.
6. How could distribution be used to share our story with appropriate audiences? With embedded hyperlinks to each institution? Need to share the links with Scott and Rosa, because they might change each year.

**Report from the Extension Directors**

1. The Directors viewed the “Excellent in Extension” database which should be ready for use in March 2014. Ultimately, the impact reports will be available to the public. The database is sortable on a number of fields, which will make it useful for a variety of purposes. The indicators we have been developed as a region for CED will be used in this database.
2. Look at what other regions doing & revisit our indicators
3. Look at beta system at ISU

**NC CRED PL Plan for FY14**

1. Impact Indicators:
   1. Revisit and also develop pool and sharing of tools and methods
2. Build Relationship with Brent Elrod:
   1. Bring him to NC: preconference CDS (might have to help pay for it)
   2. Share NC impacts from each state—cred
3. Candidate Resource Pool:
   1. How do we generate information about CRED Extension as a career?
   2. Post NC positions in CRED on NCRCRD website—NCRCRD as aggregator, facilitator
   3. Analyze: where to people we want to work for us look for their jobs? i.e., focusing on our applicant pool may be wrong place to discern this. Partner with Monster.com. Look at LinkedIn.
   4. Some states also have positions getting posted on AAEA Free Net. (Ag Econ)
   5. Identify programs out there to market to and develop a piece to market what CRED Extension does (what we do and who we are and impact) Brent—CDS put together a list of degree granting programs a few years ago—maybe opportunity for grad student updating a central repository so we can send our descriptions to a set list. Also opportunity for next NCRCRD fellow.
   6. Get active in promotion on our own campus; consider other methods of communication like YouTube.
4. Professional development across states: how do we collectively provide training?
   1. Have the infrastructure for webinars but the current webinars are NCRCRD sponsored (while good they are not what we are collectively indicating important; they do provide added value)
   2. Opportunities other than virtual training
   3. Use what we have started to learn from our revenue generation conversation
5. Advance collaboration: Also each of talk about what we want to do but don’t have resources to do as basis to engage in discussions about opportunities for collaboration (relates to revenue generation, professional development but not same as)
6. Revenue Generation Guidelines:
   1. Finalize protocol
   2. Begin actually working with this across states
   3. Encourage use of the ‘Take Out Menu’

**NCCEA Homework Question**

What interview strategies might elicit key personal attributes of a 21st Century Extension employee?

Discussion points:

1. Visits to the county/location where the person will be working, so he/she will not be surprised, and so the local leaders can work on the “sell” of the community so as to help create a welcoming environment. This might reduce employee turnover.
2. Efforts to discern how the candidate might respond in a difficult situation. Example question: Tell us about a time when you worked with a difficult person or persons. How did you work with that person? Or: how did you employ community development practices in that situation? Followed by: would you change your approach if you had a “do over”? Note if the candidate dodges the question, which is an indication that he/she is not learning and adjusting to a changing environment. We are seeking people who are able to reflect and learn, to adjust to changing situations, rather than following a prescribed process.
3. Create a situation to gauge the candidate’s reaction. For example, a scenario where the county board asks for something (with a slightly inappropriate request or a request that asks for something outside of what we should be doing as Extension, and the candidate would know that this is not within the job description) and see how the person problem-solves, and manages the relationship with the person who has asked. This could be based on a written scenario, and allow the candidate to respond, in writing, due before the interview. Evaluate according to Scott Hutchinson’s rubric.
4. Set up “auditions” rather than interviews.
5. In-box exercises, with time during interview for the candidate to respond, maybe in writing, to assess written communication skills.
6. Involve clientele in interview? Need to brief the non-university participants before the interview to assure fairness and legal compliance. Should they attend only the presentation? Questions limited to the presentation?
7. We should be able to screen candidate qualifications via their applications, so those questions are probably not going to be addressed in the interview.
8. MARY, please share Missouri’s questions with us!

**Sept 6 Discussion Notes**

1. **Face to face in-service examples from states:**

Purdue: Annual 1 ½ day retreat (with a topical theme, e.g., entrepreneurial communities) involves both educators and specialist. The site has differed based on topic, including meeting at a community hospital, to include an experiential learning opportunity. The training includes “fun” events, such as learning about Latino dancing/music with a dance instructor was an Extension employee. Staff were required to produce an academic paper (poster) to provide experience in producing this type of product. Prizes were provided. Other elements included discussions on evaluation, establishing measurable goals, etc.). Staff were also asked to reflect on the previous year’s activities, and linked the reflection to the training retreat. Next year’s theme is sustainability and it will be held in Columbus Indiana. Topics include placemaking, local foods, arts, and diversity. The goal is to bring expertise from across the NCR region, foster bridging social-capital. Approximately 40 participants, but includes specialists, USDA RD guests. Communications: bi-weekly newsletter pointing out different trainings opportunities.

Missouri: Extends current statewide Extension gatherings a day (1/year) and the topic vary depending on the needs. Topics have included strategic direction setting (extra days added for this topic with an outside facilitator), Strategic Doing, guidance/principles of revenue generation, etc.. Sometimes it is more of an administrative focus versus a competency focus. Also use adobe connect for trainings on a regular basis.

South Dakota: Two annual conferences (fall & spring). The goal is to build the new culture and included in the gatherings is some staff development. Topics have included dressing for the corporate image. ripple-effect mapping, etc. Funding comes from the travel/budget office. About 2 hours of these gatherings have been devoted to the ECED program team.

Michigan: Two annual conferences (fall & spring). Professional development topics vary depending on programmatic needs. Topics have included dealing with contentious audiences, strategic planning, gathering impact data and sustainability. Often topics are more administratively focuses versus competency focused.

North Dakota: Facilitation training, evaluation training, emotional intelligence training. Meet monthly on conference calls for general announcements. Trying to connect with new audiences in North Dakota (given changes that are occurring within ND communities). Using new media outlets (e.g., newspapers for oil workers) to distribute information. Also have done work on cultural tourism.

Minnesota: 4 trainings per year (1 statewide Extension gathering in which 1 day is devoted to ECED).

All teams have bi-weekly conference calls to discuss staff issues. Spring conference is a 3-day conference focusing on community vitality. This past spring it was in MSP, next year is in Bemidji. Focus on staff development, hot issues, strategic planning for differing audiences. Day 1 all staff together, day 2, split off into individual groups, day 3 entire group reconvenes. Other topics have included Extension scholarship, and how you can produce various scholarly outputs. Each team (e.g. Leadership, Civic Engagement, Community Economics) has two separate meetings that are two-day trainings with competency trainings. It was asked if there were too many meetings, but staff said no.

Illinois: Gatherings are designed to build competencies, and involve others for outsider perspectives.

Iowa: Meet quarterly and has an in-service planning committee. Annual gathering is two day with day one with a structured agenda and day two with no agenda to have informal discussions/reflection on day one presentations.

Kansas: Program focus teams (12 across KSU Extension) used to be top-down, now more grassroots in effort to identify your programmatic focus area. Many agents in Kansas are hired by the county, so disconnect. Central administration has asked state program leaders to allow focus teams to self-develop. Teams to gather, spring retreat, annual conference, typically led by 2-3 county-based extension folks. Discussion has been focused on what administrative expectations are versus programmatic updates.

Ohio: Once per week newsletter update with information/upcoming events/grant opportunities versus forwarding emails as the feedback received from staff was that their in-box was too full of information. 4 meetings/year with 1 overnight. The summer retreat is across the state, focusing on professional development. Small portion on administrative updates. Examples included social media, web-based tools, google analytics, reporting system, OSP process. The goal is to identify areas that can enhance their ability to achieve success. Feedback is that 4 meetings/year work well.

1. **Reporting Systems examples:**

Ohio State:

Thomson-Reuters owns the system which was initially developed by the OSU Medical Center. It is designed to report what you do and also identify potential collaborators for your work. Staff don’t need to choose key words, but it is reflected on the work you have reported on. The system captures staff outcomes, which are used in annual performance evaluations. The system includes elements of the logic models and program details which are used for the federal report.

Iowa State: New system. Staying away from the statewide system given the uniqueness of ECED programming. Looking at the community as the unit of analysis as well as the individual. Allows you to record “community progress” over a series of years to demonstrate impact. Hope to be able to enter data via smart phone. You can also search activities by community. Captures audience, hours invested, number of individuals trained, institutional change, and other impacts. One of the unique aspects is the ability to go back to events/trainings and update the impacts (cause/effect).