**NC CRED Meeting at NCCEA, September 6, 2012**

**Attending:**

Dave Ivan, Scott Loveridge, Greg Wise, Tim Borich, Michael Wilcox, Anne Silvis, Cheryl Burkhardt-Kriesel, Dave Olsen, Shawn Brooke (Native American Liaison, SDSU), Greg Davis, Kathy Tweeten, Scott Hutcheson, Tom Blewett, Mary Leuci, Dan Otto, Scott Chazdon.

**Revenue:**

Nearly all collecting fees.

***Survey:*** Scott L. shared survey developed by Dick Senese. After discussion, realized might need to rework the survey. Really two surveys: page 1 is more about program in aggregate and page 2 is more specific to programs. Page 1 can give us aggregate in terms of region. Might need to include some specific examples. Also would be helpful to know how the process is being framed in each state, principles being used.

Goal: where are we relative to service fees and cost recovery in CRED, what have we learned, where have we had success? Get a summary at the end of the day that can help all of us.

**ACTION:**

* **All: Take two weeks to review and send suggestions to Greg.**
* **Greg Davis will take lead on reworking based on discussion. Question from Anne: for what reason are we collecting fees?**

Concern about differences in structure and focus across states. Some more focused on packaging programs for sale

Michigan: charge $55/hour (ave. cost of staff incl benefits) and flat fee for travel. Large majority will involve a fee for end user. Working on consistency. Will incorporate some aspect of basic amount of service for free. Also some left to educator’s best judgment.

Nebraska: Internally in NE, moving probably toward flat fee per hour but not yet discussed with new director but will be held in next 12-18 mos. Right now not consistency. One of questions is “I am already paying your salary once why I am paying you again?”

Several suggested may approach as expenses and costs.

* + We used to offer this for free but with budget cuts we have had to charge for this.
  + Public good/private good framing.
  + Analogy of state park where state provides basic infrastructure but charge to enter park and greater fee to stay overnight.

Iowa: 1/3 of field specialists are funded on salary/benefits from fees.

Indiana: have looked at industrial manufacturing which provides a certain number of hours per free then goes into consultancy, Do a lot where no cost.

Missouri: In process where principles have been set across Extension and each program area setting the fee structure. In CD, have set fee structure…Doing it for value and especially to support having specialists.

Scott Loveridge: also consider in state and out of state fee. Shared John Leatherman example of increasing demand as added fees. Important to gain perspectives from a survey. Also Laura Kalambokidis’ archived presentation on public/private value at <http://ncrcrd.msu.edu/ncrcrd> under topic are: working differently in extension.

Wisconsin: many different structures and revenue expectations. Do some simple cost recovery by county educators. Have a policy reviewed 7-8 years ago and no recent conversation on fees generation and collection and management.

**Winning Teams Workshops**

***Report***

* Mostly research teams were there.
* Didn’t get much time to work as a team or to apply the pieces and pull them all together.
* Thought the emotional intelligence made sense after time to reflect and dig into it. Read the book *Emotional Intelligence*.

**NCRCRD: Scott Loveridge**

***Post Doc***

* Creating this as new opportunity, will be focusing on programming gaps and creating some teams.
* Will be interviewing all of AES directors and reviewing their reports to determine how they are funding technology and diffusion.
* Currently interviewing for the position.

***Webinars***

* Posted on website.
* New this year: during the previous sound check, will be recording “sneak peak”
* Economic development topics do best. Native American ones haven’t gotten as much uptake but want to do better.
* Might be easier to get folks involved if on a regular schedule. Challenge in scheduling. Not currently tracking degree archived presentations being viewed.
* Opportunity exists to determine and highlight those that would be important for new extension staff/faculty to view. Fundamental for Extension
* Also opportunity for key word search.
* Three series being offered.
  + Standard ongoing webinars: Topics chosen as part of funding for small grants, some Scott noticed as part of a conference, some coming from four RRDCs as key national issues, and Scott takes nominations (including when we bring on a new faculty person who might have a topic). Scott interested in hearing suggestions of presenters from us. Continuous process.
  + Technology and diffusion: New post doc will also provide several on technology and diffusion targeted to actual private industry as new audience in which to tell our story as a system.
  + Policy series as part of the national center with RRDCs

***Small Grants Program***

* Call ready to go out and will be due around early December.
* $150,000 reserved per year.
* Requires at least two different NC states and PI and co-PI have to come from NC LGU.
* Great opportunity for developing a team that can after larger grant.
* Great opportunity for developing multi-state curricula.

**ACTION: PLs encourage participation among educators and faculty.**

***State visits***

* Two formats:
  + Go and talk with people or attend a staff/faculty meeting and rotate to catch all states every few years.
  + Can coordinate a program review in the state (not been used).

**National Leaders Meeting pre-NACDEP**

* Tim and Mary highlighted. Review of four regions was shared. NC by comparison has more director support and programming and staffing than other regions. NE starting to meet together more regionally. South does this already and West working a little on this.
* Two major issues:
  + need a voice
  + need to demonstrate impact
* Next Steps:
  + Need to meet at annual meeting. Begin planning for next annual meeting – Don Albrecht, working with Bo Beaulieu, will take the lead on this. Because the next NACDEP meeting will be part of Galaxy, we need to look at another venue this year – perhaps Charleston in July. They will also start looking at the possibility of dues.
  + The core team will meet with NIFA and educate (as opposed to advocate) them about CED/CRED and ask NIFA to do a better job of including CED/CRED in Family, Youth and Community. This group will get together and develop some talking points and share back with this group. Bo Beaulieu will coordinate.

**Nov. 15. Scott L. and Dave Ivan participating. NACDEP president going (Mike Wilcox)**

* + Create revised listserve of CRED program leaders. Rachel Welborn will work on this.

**national-crd@lists.msstate.edu**

* + Identify collaborative accomplishments over past years – tell stories and impacts Mary Simon Leuci, Deb Tootle, and Tom Blewett will take the lead on this step.
  + Work on logo. Tim Borich will be responsible.

**NOTED NEED: Be clear about who is championing.**

* Opportunity to involve and engage with the Washington State CRED Program Leader with NC; might want to involve him in a online meeting with us around revenue generation.
* ACTION: Dave will visit with Rob McDaniel to determine option for him presenting during a NC CRED PL meeting re: fees and his interests and programs
* ACTION: Share Rachel Welborn’s email for adding to national listserv of program leaders/state contact person for CRD and make sure we share in NC when a list comes out.

**DC Meeting of NC CRED PLs**

* March-April for us to connect with NIFA, NACo
* Key priorities for us, what aligns with their interests and passions
* Ask our regional liaison, Susan Shockey, and Robin Shepard along with Jane Schuhardt to assist in setting up the meeting.
* Structure for best use of time.
* Our region represents region with one of strongest CRED programs and larger number of public land grant universities. Who might we attract if we have specific issues in mind?

**ACTION:**

* **Greg will have conversation with Susan as former colleague to create opportunity to connect with folks in NIFA, etc.**
* **Also will develop key sense of what we can do/our capacity so we are prepared to talk. Need to identify and work on what that value proposition is that we bring to the table (last bullet)**

**Indicators:**

* Eliminate: Increase in number of minorities participating from previous year
* Percentage of participants who are racial minorities:
  + racial minorities
  + total
* Percentage of participants who are in order to do regional average need to have absolute number for minorities and the total
* Change volunteer hours leveraged to deliver the program (program generated)
* Delete no. programs implemented/initiated
* Delete value of programs implemented/initiated
* Delete ave. hourly wage for jobs created.

Importance of attribution reaffirmed.

***ACTION: NEED TO SEND OUT THE DEFINITIONS EACH YEAR WHEN WE SEND OUT THE SPREADSHEET***

***Executive Summary:***

* Vignettes: Discussed whether to have a sample from all of the states
* Decision: bullets shorter with one from each state and link to fuller vignette in full report

**Administrator Dialogue: Tom Coon and Karla Trautman**

* Tom Coon’s term as administrative liaison ending and Karla taking on this in November.
* Reiterated concerns about representation in NIFA.
* NACo discussion. Daryl Bucholtz will be chair of ECOP next year and spoke with NACo nationally and is leading the followup.
  + Directors have discussed who is the followup and lead with each of state organizations. Therefore take a more local approach.
  + Likely what happened nationally was the dumping of a few county officials who used it as an opportunity to vent their agendas.
* Joint discussion with ANR PLs on water on heels of WQ regions organized around EPA regions that provided funding for organizing and supporting of national infrastructure. Discussion will be new development of a new model that is based on NC region that is based on extension regions. Similar discussion occurring in West and in Southern Region (checking with NE too). Some sensitivity to fact that host institutions in older regions got larger amount of money. Like to create a system where all institutions will be at the table to create collaboration and funding opportunity with NIFA and EPA. Tom indicated directors are looking to CRED and ANR PLs to work this out, esp. if other regions moving in similar direction.
* Banner outcomes: Directors hope that what is being developed in NC will be valuable for national adoption. South and NE starting to look.
* ECOP discussing next week developing a system nationally that allows entry of impact statements like CRED vignettes that will be searchable database. If approved will become part of Excellence in Extension. This new part will be part of what public an access as opposed to other parts of Excellence in Extension. Option that we could put our vignettes in on behalf of the region.
* Key program areas for cross-program collaboration that directors are priority to move forward in NC:
  + water issues
  + metropolitan food systems
  + financial literacy

**The Future of Multi-state Water Research and Extension Education (Joint discussion with ANR)**

* Similar discussions occurring in Southern and Western Regions.
* Paper coming out in Advancing Water Resource Management in Agricultural and ….addressing role of land grant universities coming out in Journal of soil and Water Conservation (Lois Wright Morton)

***Summary of the ask:***

* + - Extension directors and program leaders consider and bless a 6 month planning process for concept plan with 2 program leader liaisons
    - Want 2-3 from each state, one from ANR, one from CRED and other.
    - PLs select a liaison from the group
    - Ext directors and PLs provide input on linkages
    - State based discussion also to occur
    - Work with WQ team after August 2013 after funding ends for supporting infrastructure for Heartland and Great Lakes. Great Plains (Dakotas also finished funding)

DISCUSSION:

* + - * Room for broadening discussion of water to include economic development and broad array of resource interests. Broadening beyond AFRI will require this.
      * Historically AFRI limited the issues that could be addressed.

***How can we best capture multi-state and multi-program synergies?***

* + - Don’t go down the path of past with Farm Safety assuming funding will be available.
    - Important to know what we will measure in terms of impact to be able to indicate what impacts are as a result.
    - Put a dollar value to it to discuss return on investment.
    - Work with what we have already done and also develop specifics that include qualitative and quantitative aspects.
    - Important to have a good “business model” that includes how the program will be sustained.
    - Consider funding ask from directors to be a request for “seed money.”
    - NOT intent to fund water research agenda but an extension program. Research is in title for integrated funding opportunities. Might need to say extension first or extension-led.
    - Also National Great Rivers Research and Education Center /Institute housed in Alton, Illinois that hosted meeting last year. Interest was expressed in linkage with LGU. Is there opportunity to look at this linkage again in partnership with them?
    - Might be time to bring in experiment station/researchers upfront.
    - Is this the time to reprioritize water needs and priorities and where are the natural fits for potential subregions. Not likely programming all 12 states on an issue.
    - How are sea grants involved? Could be another partner.
    - Is there a regional research committee on this topic that could be engaged?

***What might planning process look like?***

Time line:

* + - The two liaison names by Sept. 7
    - Need to determine who will contact the Ag Exp Station directors and when
    - Names from states submitted and selected by Oct. 10.
    - By early Nov. committee determined
    - Early face to face meeting to determine key operation, expanse of effort, work teams (still to be determined if sufficient funding exists to support all of travel)
    - Feedback from us
    - Early concept piece in early Jan for feedback
    - Early Feb shared with PLs for feedback
    - March proposed concept plan to extension directors

Discussion: little update along the way to directors so no surprises

***Other ideas for institutional and program engagement***

* Having someone with background in industrial engineering because water quality and quantity is critical to manufacturing.
* Might be good to have listing of people so can balance for developing whole team. Share 4-5 names and tell what areas they represent.
* Think about folks who have linkages and ability to link back to base back in each state. Desire to play a leadership role.
* Selection process then will be a negotiated process.
* Consider tiered levels to present as a result.

***What is the message to Extension directors on Friday?***

* General consensus of the combined ANR-CRED groups was to proceed with planning.