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Roles and Responsibilities Task Force Report

Task Force members:
Dallas Everhart, Interim Director, CSU Division of Continuing Education
Tony Koski, CSU Extension Turf Specialist
Doug Steele, CSUCE Assistant Director, 4-H/Youth Development
Judy Barth, CSUCE Human Resources Coordinator
Scott Cotton, Extension Agent in Pueblo County
JoAnn Powell, Northern Regional Director for Extension, co-Chair
Elisa Shackelton, CSU Extension Agent in Moffat County, co-Chair

Environment:
Cooperative Extension is an organization based on a proud history of meeting local community and individual needs through the application and extension of information that can be trusted. Local faculty have developed strong partnerships with cooperators and clients alike that have shaped their and our expectations of Extension, as well as what the organization does and how it is done. Cooperative Extension is now operating in a changing environment of decreased resources, fewer staff and increasingly complex social and economic challenges which impact the demand for our services. CSU Cooperative Extension is often being “out competed” in communities as the most significant source of research and field education. Competing corporations and universities are offering increasing levels of customer service with more rapid research response to community issues, while ours becomes more complicated, slower and thinner.

CSUCE must navigate this environment with an eye to a sustainable future in terms of:

- An identifiable market/target audience that can be developed and sustained,
- Relevance of our products in the marketplace,
- Adequate resources to support timely development/delivery of quality products,
- Internal processes that are aligned to support development of appropriate/integrated educational products,
- Use of delivery methods and educational techniques that are appropriate to end users, and
- Recognition as an integral partner/player in the University’s overall outreach strategy.

Recommended Goals

Goal 1 - Cooperative Extension will respond to priority state and local-level needs, with research-based information and educational programming that is supported by the organization’s resources.

Educational programming and information priorities will be determined organizationally and periodically reviewed to ensure they remain on target and are meeting stated objectives. Resources must be aligned with programming priorities such that citizen needs are addressed in a timely and effective manner. It is also important that both planning and resource allocation remain flexible enough to respond to our changing state, emerging issues and emergencies. Because of resource limitations, CE must be strategic in selecting and pursuing programming choices and be willing to access and/or develop the expertise, skills and programs needed to meet citizen and community needs.

Strategies:

- Develop a clear identity for Cooperative Extension that defines our target audiences, determines what these audiences want and need, and identifies what functions CE can provide for them.
  - Review E-Power data/impact reports to identify current recipients of services by demographics, geography, program interests.
- Review needs/audience through active needs assessment that directly drives the work development process.
- Analyze the costs and benefits (as well as potential benefits/revenues) of working with identified audiences/educational areas.

- Meet the educational needs of Colorado residents in ways that are appropriate to their situation while efficiently using the available resources of our organization.
- Identify and develop critical skills and abilities among current employees and for new hires.
- Identify appropriate educational delivery method(s) and develop/access programs to meet recipient needs.
- Contract out/assign/develop Specialist expertise as appropriate to meet programming needs.

**Barriers:***
- Traditional audiences – letting go or delivering differently to
- Staff limited by expertise, time, resources, on-going programs and traditional audiences
- Insufficient resources for program development, distribution, alternative educational methods
- Limited access to appropriate expertise – programmatic and technology

**Other issues:***
- Shifting to a practice of placing a value on product and charging appropriately
- Purposefully identifying clients/needs that are served without charge
- Staff/Specialists continually needing to update/expand expertise to compliment changing client needs – staff development

**Goal 2 - Develop a working relationship with the Department of Continuing Education and other colleges, departments, and agencies in order to take advantage of a broader range of educational methods/delivery techniques to enhance both target audience access to information/educational offerings as well as staff development opportunities.**

**Strategies:**
- Identify educational needs of CO residents that could be served through local Extension offices and DCE. (Teachers, child care providers, safety training requirements, pesticide handlers certification, etc.)
- Offer distance education classes in county offices.
- Promote CSU Distance Education opportunities at the county level that are pertinent—many counties offer employee education benefits that are never utilized.
- Identify other CSU professionals who have expertise/knowledge that communities need and want and facilitate bringing these services/knowledge to local communities through CE offices.

**Barriers:**
- Formal distance education might require higher costs than the clientele is accustomed to paying for continuing education opportunities
- Technology inconsistencies throughout the state and at the local level for distance learning
- Increased time demands on County Extension Agents to assist with distance education
- Travel budget and on-campus time commitment constraints related to Specialists delivering programs at the county level and/or Agents serving multi-county regions
- Low class number enrollments often limit the availability of classes needed by both field personnel and community clients.
Goal 3 - CSUCE is recognized as a viable educational interface/access point for providing K-12 education statewide.

Strategies:
- Identify current outreach efforts.
- Label consistently as CSUCE product.
- Work in partnership with the CSU School of Education to keep abreast of and incorporate best practices into school enrichment programs.
- Align all offerings with Colorado Standards and Guidelines to enhance acceptance by school districts.
- Evaluate and report impacts both internally and externally.
- Share County Agent salaries/benefits with local school districts where Agents are hired to teach a designated course(s) within the school district.

Barriers:
- Convincing local school boards to collaborate with CSUCE—helping them to recognize the “win-win” situation that could exist.
- Deciding whether to offer one standardized CE program throughout the state, or letting each school district figure out what they need (Example: do we target teachers for continuing education credit opportunities or do we target youth?)
- Scheduling Agent time to supplement K-12 education without taking away from classroom time required for CSAP performance.
- Shifting Agent time from locally expected, traditional youth development programming to a different audience.

Goal 4 - Clearly define roles and responsibilities of CSUCE staff at all levels (County Agents, Regional Specialists, State Specialists, State Leaders, etc.) to determine the most productive and cost-effective methods for delivering research-based knowledge to Colorado residents.

Strategies:
- Look at how other states are coordinating outreach at the county/regional/state levels and assess what is working/not working.
- Support program-based state leadership models that assist/identify ways Specialists, Agents, campus faculty, and external partners can work cooperatively together throughout the state.
- Effectively utilize performance assessment tools that measure determined roles and responsibilities of staff as well as program impact.

Barriers:
- State Specialist responsibilities are complex and don’t always lend to them being available when needed.
- There is a dramatic need for consistency in the development and delivery of information and programs to assure that CE is in alignment with CSU/USDA standards.
- Funding sources/materials developed at the state level may not be relevant or timely to Colorado citizens, and may not be producing impact at the county level.
- Extension expectations of an individual Specialist are not always aligned with, recognized or rewarded by the individual departments.
Organizational Structure Task Force Report

The following report was prepared based on information gathered by the committee during three conference calls and one survey. The survey was developed to help committee members collect their ideas prior to the first call. The committee felt that the short time line was a constraint and that to develop more complete ideas would need much more time and effort. Additional ideas or issues that did not get adequate review by the committee have been submitted as appendix to this report. Those documents found in the appendix do not necessarily reflect the group’s view but the individuals you authored them.

Members

Co-Chairs: Kipp Nye and Nathan Moreng, Mark Arndt, Tom Holtzer, Tom McBride, Diana Laughlin, Pat Kendall, Wayne Cooley

Goals and Strategies

Goal 1 - Linkage between applied research conducted by departments, AES, and Cooperative Extension should be tightly linked, well coordinated, and have information flowing in both directions.

Strategies:

a) Input from clientele of university extension faculty is regarded as an important factor in setting applied research priorities.
b) Applied research is conducted by personnel at multiple levels within the system.
c) Applied research is coordinated among multiple levels.
d) Results of applied research are made readily available, by using a structured system, to appropriate people within the university system for their use and to clientele outside the system.
e) Feedback regarding the value of the information is provided to all those involved
f) Feedback serves as input for prioritizing and designing future applied research and extension efforts.
g) A web site might be developed that would bring together departmental information (applied research), to Extension.
h) Faculty who post to this site could get tenure and promotion credit.
i) Extension should have feedback link to specialist evaluation. Annual review of Extension funded specialists should include field staff feedback.

Obstacles:

1. Coordination of departmental sharing.
2. Communication with staff that have applied research responsibilities but little or no understanding of Extension will require a higher level of two-way communication.
3. Contributors will need to provide more time and effort.

Goal 2 – Develop a more formal communication structure between all University departments and Cooperative Extension that promotes open communication and exchange of information about community needs throughout the state and current department programs that may have application to Colorado communities.
Strategies:

This structure may have a common staff person who functions as a focal point for connecting the campus staff with the CE staff for programming needs. This person may be thought of as to function as a router that connects staff to ideas. Reformattin of job responsibilities, either at regional, cluster, or campus level to make this workable was discussed. It is possible that increased number of people within the system, who have this specific role, might enhance the effectiveness of a small region/cluster approach in the future. The more formal the structure, the more sustained communication will become and the better connected the staff. This structure promises to be a great education mechanism to inform campus departments about CE.

Obstacles:
1. Traditional communication systems that are currently impeding effective two-way communication between department faculties.
2. Development of a rapport between Extension and all targeted departments that demonstrates a win/win relationship for all involved.
3. Requires faculty to take outreach seriously.
4. Would require additional funding for travel.
5. Department Head and Deans need to be in favor of a closer relationship between state and field staff.

Goal 3 - Development of a stronger and more direct relationship between Cooperative Extension and Continuing Education that is mutually beneficial.

Strategies:

This is needed but the linkage is one that requires a delicate hand. This relationship has been accomplished in other states and their models need to be reviewed. A more formal structure linking the two programs seems on the surface to have a win/win potential. The direct contact that CE has in the community can be used to enhance the program develop and delivery for Continuing Ed. Continuing Ed. being more directly linked with each extension office can benefit CE by connecting clientele with credit course work that people are requesting.

Obstacles:
1. Must be more flexible with academic expectations.
2. Who gets credit?
3. Credit vs. non-credit

Goal 4 - Develop a restructuring plan at the local level that incorporates some variation of either “county clusters” or “issue areas” and promotes better use of resources, enhanced ability to provide high quality programs and greater flexibility in addressing current and emerging issues.

Strategies:

The specifics of such a model will need thought and analysis in order to address all the concerns and obstacles therefore; this group recommends that a separate committee be convened to develop such models. The clusters or areas could be centered around 3-6 counties or developed based on the predominate issues that are common ground for certain areas without the use of county boundaries.

Obstacles:
1. BOCC buy in to sharing money and faculty.
2. Matching current staff expertise with needs of new cluster or area.
3. Agents may not want to travel outside their counties.
4. May require additional travel funding.
5. Risk of each cluster doing their own thing without common vision of what is to be achieved.

Appendix A –

Nathan T. Moreng

Organizational Structure: Thoughts on Form and Function

Once upon a time there was a frog. By some strange twist of fate, the frog found himself in a comfortable pot of water, where he spent his days doing what frogs do best. As luck would have it, this pot of water happened to be on top of a stove. One day, the heat level on the stove was gradually turned up, thereby warming the once comfortable water that the frog had always enjoyed. The frog stayed in the pot too long, and well after the water had reached the boiling point. Since the temperature had changed so slowly, some felt that the frog never sensed his impending doom. Others speculated that the frog knew things were not right, but expected the water temperature to return to normal if he just waited long enough.

Such was the life of the frog.

The combination of Tabor, Gallagher, and Amendment 23 has been described as the “perfect fiscal storm”. Like many public institutions across Colorado, Higher Education recently faced significant budget cuts. Some have predicted that Higher Education’s financial future will continue to be challenged, even with an economic recovery. As we evaluate the organizational structure of Cooperative Extension (our form), it is also essential that we evaluate the future environment in which Extension will operate, and then ask how we can be most effective in this environment (our function). What we might discover are new opportunities that allow for positive changes and create a viable and sustainable Cooperative Extension educational delivery model.

Consider the following:

** County clusters could be designated “Cooperative Extension Educational Delivery Units” (CE-EDU) where success is measured, in part, on how well they sustain themselves financially and where innovation and customer satisfaction become a primary focus.

** CE-EDU may need to become 501-C (3) non-profits, or Enterprises (CU is exploring this option). Will 501-C, or Enterprise designation create improved opportunities for bringing in grants, or generating revenue through workshops, seminars, or other educational programs?

** What would happen if every county had a 4-H para-professional (instead of an Extension Agent), and the 4-H Extension Agent served a new role within the CE-EDU, such as reaching new audiences, training leaders, and developing youth reaching partnerships?
**What would happen if every CE-EDU had one person designated with grant responsibility?** Perhaps this person also facilitated (“routed”) the development of partnerships (within and outside of the University)? Would this fit within the concept of University Engagement in the 21st Century?

**Would an CE-EDU model improve our ability to collaborate with Continuing Education to deliver their brand of education (“fun to Ph.D.”) throughout the state? Would this create new opportunities for the CE-EDU to revenue share?**

**What other staff shifts might be needed to improve upon how we are conducting the Cooperative Extension “business” today, and how we might better conduct this in the future? Are their opportunities to shift toward para-professional staff, while strengthening the level of field specialists across all discipline areas?**

**Would there be any value in developing a two tier Cooperative Extension system?** For example should we retain a Cooperative Extension “traditional or classic” system, and also develop a CE-EDU system (entrepreneurial). Would a traditional/classic system appeal to some County partners, and CE-EDU appeal to others? Could a combination of both the traditional/classic system, and the CE-EDU system, allow us to serve priority need areas in Colorado using limited tax resources (serving low income families for example), and also allow us to explore other market driven alternatives with the ability to pay (nutrition for the athlete for example)?

---

**Appendix B –**

Tom McBride

**Small District Design**

Since the budget cuts became serious this past year and we began to lose field staff, I have thought that we should consider forming smaller management units, which would permit us to adapt under tight budget constraints. Listed below are my ideas and possibly a place to start.

I have studied the map of Colorado Cooperative Extension and my recommendation is to go to 11 districts, five of these would be on the west side and six on the east side of the mountains. The districts would be divided somewhat programmatically so clientele will still be served. A County Director from each of the districts would commit a small portion of their time (10-20%) to serve as District Director (coordinator).

Listed below are the 11 districts. I have listed the counties when appropriate and have listed the number of counties in each district in parenthesis. There are a few more counties in the east district but this works best from a program management viewpoint.

District Director (coordinator) responsibilities will include:
1. Evaluate other County Directors within the district and review staff PASA's for raises, etc.
2. Liaison between Regional Director and County staff.
3. Review any vacancy openings with Regional Director.
4. Coordinate hiring process of all positions within the smaller districts.
Fifty-nine (59) Counties
1. South East Area (7)
2. Golden Plains Area plus Sedgwick (5)
4. Metro North - Adams, Denver, Arapahoe, Jefferson, and Broomfield (5)
5. Metro South - Douglas, El Paso, Elbert, Lincoln, and Teller (5)
6. San Luis Valley Area (6)
7. Tri-River Area (4)
8. Southwest - San Miguel, Dolores, Montezuma, LaPlata, and Archuleta (5)
10. Mountain Central - Eagle, Summit, Park, Pitkin, Gunnison, and Chaffee (6)
11. South Central - Fremont, Custer, Pueblo, Huerfano, and Las Animas (5)
Diversity of Funding Task Force Report

Background

The Diversity of Funding Task Force was one of several committees established as a follow up to the July 2003 Colorado State University Cooperative Extension Futuring Conference. The following Diversity of Funding Task Force Members were named at the 2003 Extension Forum: Co-Chairs: Doug Hall and Jacque Miller, Members: Richard Connell, Dan Fernandez, Luis Garcia, Mike Geile, Michael Roll. This task force was assigned the task of establishing organizational goals, objectives, strategies, and identifying concerns in relation to the following:

1. User fees
2. Grant and foundation support
3. Mill levy funding/block grants/line item status

Overview of Committee Discussion

Support for CSUCE programs and services is provided from a variety of sources, including tax funds, grants and contracts, user fees, gifts, sponsorships, partnering, etc. No single funding source provides an ultimate answer to our current funding dilemma. It will require a multi-faceted approach to funding programs, with numerous existing and potential sources promoted and supported within the organization. It has become crucial for the Extension program planning process (needs identification, planning, implementation and evaluation) to include identification of funding source.

The current environment of negative voter response to tax increases provides little incentive to focus attention on the option of mill levies. Given the current economic situation of the state, being a separate line item in the state budget would leave CSUCE vulnerable and we would not recommend pursuit of this option. The current status of CSUCE within the university budget seems appropriate at this time.

The current economic and political environment will continue to threaten levels of fiscal support from our federal, state and county funding sources. It is important that we not neglect these partnerships and, in fact, we need to improve communications with our state legislators and county commissioners in order to maintain current levels of funding. It is a reality that, even with the best relationships with government representatives, funding from county, state and federal partners may very well continue to decrease.

At this time the most viable sources of funding are increased utilization of user fees and grants/foundation support. Neither are new concepts; however, challenges exist in actualizing the full potential of these sources.

User Fees

It has long been the organizational culture to provide education programs and services at no cost or on a cost recovery basis only. As other funding sources become scarce or increasingly more competitive, the need to make a cultural shift toward implementing revenue-generating activities is evident. New strategies are needed that include the fiscal management, administrative coordination and implementation into the program planning process.

The CSUCE handbook, Cost Recovery and Fee Guidelines, is available to provide specific guidance on cost recovery and program fees. In the 1990’s a great deal of dialogue went into the assembling of this document. This document is an excellent starting point for providing guidance in cost recovery and establishing user fees for program efforts. Some revisions may be needed to reflect organizational changes. Currently, the USDA is reviewing its legal ruling and administrative guidelines in relation to user fees. These changes will need to be implemented as well.
Two additional recommended resources related to user fees would be *The Implications of Increased Alternative Revenue in the Cooperative Extension System: Present and Future Strategies for Success* located at [http://nasulgc.org/publications/Agriculture/CESAltRev.htm](http://nasulgc.org/publications/Agriculture/CESAltRev.htm) and the Iowa State University User Fee Committee Report at [http://www.extension.iastate.edu/admin/reports.html](http://www.extension.iastate.edu/admin/reports.html).

Currently there is not a system in place to track which counties, areas, or state programs have included user fees or cost recovery in their program planning process. It is apparent that some staff charge fees for programs and services while others elect not to.

Concerns related to implementing a more fee-based system include:

**CE is already tax supported.**
Response: Other tax supported entities charge fees for services. For example, our state and national park systems require a fee for admittance to parks or for the use of facilities, even though they, too, are supported (in part) by taxes.

**Charging for our product will result in reduction in participation.**
Response: Participants will have a higher expectation of product/services that require a fee. Their expectation will be met with high quality programs that meet high priority needs, resulting in more satisfied customers.

**Limits access to programs for some audiences.**
Response: Other funding strategies, such as grant or foundation support, can be secured for targeted audiences. It is imperative that we continue to provide some method (scholarships, etc.) so that limited resource audiences have full access to our programs.

**Grant and Foundation Support**

In the 2002 – 2003 budget year for CSUCE, 7.8% or roughly $2.0 million of the budget came from “other” grants. Over the past five years, funding from grants has varied only slightly from this amount. Grant funding continues to be from only a few sources with a majority of proposals written and managed by campus specialists. In an effort to provide more support to all CSUCE staff in identifying grant and foundation sources, writing proposals and providing related assistance, a full time Resource Development Specialist was hired in 2000. However, as a result of budget cuts in 2003, this position was reduced to a half time position. Even with this assistance it has been a challenging process to shift the paradigm of our system to actively seek grant and foundation support for program funding.

Challenges include:

- Schedules allow little time to write proposals and build relationships with potential funding sources.
- Proposal writing viewed as a frustration with complicated procedures required by the funding source and/or the University.
- Rewards are limited when the grant is reduced by excessive administrative costs, when the management of the grant adds complexity to the position or when it results in a negative experience with a collaborator.
- Professionals are hired primarily for their technical skills in a subject matter and much lack expertise in grant writing and management.
- Lack of overall coordination/management of the grant and foundation sources between administration, specialists and field staff.
Recommended Goals and Objectives

Goal: Increase revenue available for program and professional development through state and local program/services user fees.

Objective 1: Establish an organizational committee to develop strategies for fiscal management, administrative coordination, and implementation of state and local user fees. In addition this committee will be responsible for initiating the next two objectives. Composition of this committee should be representative of the fiscal office, Regional Directors, County/Area Directors, Specialists, and field professionals. The duration of this committee could range from one to two years depending on additional strategies identified to accomplish the overall goal.

Objective 2: Incorporate training related to user fees into New Agent Orientation, County/Area Director Meetings and Regional Meetings/Extension Forum.

Objective 3: Conduct a review of the current status (a baseline) of the organization related to user fees.

Goal: Improve the skill level of CSUCE professionals in securing revenue from grant and foundation funding sources by providing support and training.

Objective 1: Hire a full time pre-awards professional and a full-time post-award professional to assist CSUCE professionals in writing proposal and managing grants.

Objective 2: Identify a simple administration and communication process for CSUCE proposal writing process.

Objective 3: Identify core competencies required to successfully receiving grant and foundation awards. Introduce these core competencies to CSUCE professionals through training during New Agent Orientation, County/Area Director Meetings, and Regional Meetings/Extension Forum.

Additional Thoughts

- Require that the program planning process include the additional element of identifying the funding source.
- Allow CSUCE professionals to identify a variety of sources, such as user fees, grants, donations or any combination thereof to fund their programs.
- Utilize additional revenue generated through user fees and administrative costs to re-establish the professional development funds and program initiative grants.
- Identify three to five statewide initiatives that teams of CSUCE professionals will prioritize their efforts on to generate larger dollar amounts.
Milan,

This is a preliminary report -- a work in progress.
• The decision on what the image or message to marketed actually is cannot be made by one task force in isolation.
• Other decisions, or agreements, also must be made before more work can be done.
• Joel and I compiled the report matrix based on notes from the two conference calls that we conducted. Others have not yet had an opportunity to comment on it.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this process. Please let us know what steps are next, and what additional information you need from us.

Members
Jan Carroll & Joel Plath, co-chairs
Wendy Douglass, Khadija Haynes, Dell Rae Moellenberg, Kathay Rennels, Jim Smith, Deb Weitzel
### Marketing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Price, Place</th>
<th>Position &amp; Promotion (Branding)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal 1</td>
<td>Goal 2</td>
<td>Goal 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Message</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Focus on Cooperative Extension</td>
<td>• Target to various audiences</td>
<td>• Show up!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Putting Knowledge to Work Tag Line -- everywhere</td>
<td>• First priority is funders including legislators, county commissioners, donors (such as 4-H alumni), etc.</td>
<td>• Our own staff will be marketers for the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include history, progress, and spirit (heart) of CE</td>
<td>• What’s In It For Me must be answered for each constituency</td>
<td>• “Enhancing our Advocates” training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content and process of our work</td>
<td>• Build on system’s strengths</td>
<td>• Put a face on CE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keep “cooperative” in message (it is a marketable concept; how we’re funded and how we work)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tool kit, CD’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Our good work is our best marketing tool</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Links to Web sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Clothing items for CE identification beyond nametag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 4-H T-shirts for participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barriers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the image or message to be marketed or portrayed?</td>
<td>• Maintain current constituency</td>
<td>• Ag stereotype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independence is our strength and weakness</td>
<td>• Local presence is a must</td>
<td>• “Animal required” for 4-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact reports must be increased in quantity and quality</td>
<td>• Need input from field faculty to identify target audiences at their level (county, area, etc.)</td>
<td>• Funding for marketing campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Uniformity vs. independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Client input is missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Issues</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multiple plans of work</td>
<td>Other priorities include:</td>
<td>• Existing resources are available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other task forces will have important direction for marketing</td>
<td>• Colorado State University administration, faculty and staff [students later]</td>
<td>• Additional resources must be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cooperative Extension professionals</td>
<td>• Outside expertise may be appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “General public”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• K-12 including 4-H participants and their parents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Other states have marketing materials (Nebraska, Kansas, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1: There is an urgent need to market CSUCE for sustainability of the organization and adequate funding.</td>
<td>No. 2: Targeted audiences are: funders, CSU faculty and administrators, and CSUCE.</td>
<td>No. 3: Local participation is required to effectively market CE.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Introduction

The Technology Subcommittee of the Futuring Taskforce conducted several conference calls. We discussed the task placed before us and selected goals we felt would have the most impact on technology and Colorado Cooperative Extension.

A request for input from Cooperative Extension was distributed via the admin bulletin board and responses received were discussed and considered. We appreciate the input we received.

Our task was to develop 3-5 measurable goals, the strategies to achieve goals, and determine the obstacles to remove or deal with in order to achieve those goals.

Several goals (#3 & #4) relate to specialists. The results of the recent Specialist Evaluation meeting held at CSU will be considered when implementing these goals.

Recommended Goals

Goal #1 – Find out what each county has for technology and what they are dealing with regarding access and support.

Strategy:
1. A Web survey (Technical Capability Survey) will be conducted (see attached) of every Cooperative Extension agent, specialist, and support staff to help identify problem areas throughout the state and on campus related to:
   a. high speed access
   b. technical equipment
   c. software
   d. support
   e. technical comfort level
   f. training issues
   g. other areas lacking for technology.
2. The database will use the same information as the Personnel Directory, Specialist expertise, and county support staff ethnicity. The form used will have name and location data already input - the survey should not burden the system.
3. All Extension personnel will be surveyed.
4. Extension Administration will require this form to be filled out by all individuals with an Extension responsibility. Other goals identified by the technology task force are based on this information.
5. This survey (will) (is expected to) be on-line and operational by January 2004.

**Obstacles:**
1. Completion of survey by all with Extension Responsibilities
2. Accuracy of the information provided by those responding

------------------------

Goal # 2 – Achieve standardized reporting process for indicators under program areas in ePOWER.

**Strategies:**
1) Improve communication between program team leaders and database administrators (Joy and Wendy) to implement specific “Help Screens” related to each Program Area indicator within ePOWER.
2) Communicate mechanism between counties so consistent reporting is achieved.  
   a) Develop more training for ePOWER users (agents, specialists, and volunteers) on how to accurately report into and use the ePOWER system.
   b) Enhance the communication to all CE system on benefits and uses of ePOWER.

**Obstacles:**
1) Obtaining help topics/information from Program Team Leaders in a timely fashion
2) Keeping communication alive between all parties involved
3) Locating and identifying time for adequate training facilities
4) Willingness (or lack of willingness) of staff to put together complete ePower reports that will be meaningful to entire organization.

------------------------

Goal # 3 – Increase specialist use of technology and enhance specialist participation in the digital arena.

**Strategies:**
1) A specialist survey will be developed and distributed.
   a) This survey will request information on what training requirements are needed:
      i) To become more involved with:
         (1) Answer Link
(2) Web Site development
(3) Etc.
   ii) To be more effective in responding to emails and phone calls by agents.
   iii) To be more effective with PowerPoint and other presentation programs/methods.
2) Department heads and other supervisors of specialists will receive advance notice of the need to survey specialists and be asked to support/encourage response to the survey.
3) Survey instrument will be distributed by Extension Administration. This will be done via an email submittal form.
4) Several specialists and at least one department head will assist in the development of this survey instrument.
5) The notice of this on-line survey will be sent to specialists after the Technical Capability Survey is on-line.

Obstacles:
1) Lack of response by specialists
   a) Support of the survey by Extension Administration and Department Heads should overcome this perceived obstacle
2) Lack of use of information generated by this survey

Goal #4 - Improve access and resources to campus.

Note: A lot of discussion centered on the responsiveness of campus as well as field staff. The committee felt that there should be some type of written policy regarding expectations when responding to questions or inquiries in a timely fashion.

Strategies:
1) Develop a written policy regarding Extension's expectations on responsiveness
2) Develop a Web instrument to provide feedback on how well requests are responded to internally. This instrument will determine how often the field contacts campus and vice versa and how responsive those individuals are
   a) This systematic approach will:
      i) provide reports to individual supervisors, regional directors, department heads, and CE administration. Reports would be run and distributed quarterly to the appropriate individuals
      ii) will allow the capture of this data from both agents and specialists
      iii) will allow concerns to be voiced as well as accolades when appropriate.
   b) This instrument can be used for PASA performance evaluations as well as specialists evaluations within departments.
   c) This survey will be developed and distributed after the Technical Capability Survey is complete
   d) Tentative date for instrument to be available is July, 2004
3) Access to resources will continue to be developed through the technical resources such as the Web.
4) The Cooperative Extension Website will be redesigned and the new look updated and completed no later than December 2004.

**Obstacles:**
Note: The concept of a method to provide feedback on specialists and agents will likely not be well received by some. In order for this to be effective in improving the responsiveness of agents and specialists alike, Cooperative Extension administrative support as well as Department Head support will be needed. One way to indicate the importance of this information is including information received in PASA and Specialist Evaluations.

---------------------------------

Goal #5 - Update the Technology Strategic Plan by December 31, 2003.

**Strategies:**
1) Ruth Willson and Howard Schwartz will head up the development of the plan with input from many individuals as the plan is developed.
2) The Cooperative Extension Technology Strategic Plan will be updated by December 31, 2003 and submitted to the Director’s Administrative Council for final review.
3) After review and edits, the final Technology Strategic Plan will be shared with the system and posted on the CE Website by March 31, 2004.

**Obstacles:** Other priorities taking precedence.
Technical Capability Survey:

Survey of all Extension personnel

How many computers are in your office?

How many agents/staff are in your office?

Do you have a computer on your desk?
   If not, where do you access a computer?

Do you have Internet access on the computer on your desk?
   If not, where do you access the Internet?

What type of Internet access do you have?
   Hardwire/Ethernet (T1, DSL, Satellite)
   Modem
   Other: Please specify

Is the access provided by the county?

If there is no high-speed access in your office, does the county have high-speed access?
   If yes, how far away is this access located?

Do you know if the county is part of the Multi Use Network (MNT)?

If your access is through a modem:
   How many phone lines does your office have?
   How many agents/staff share the access to the Internet?
   Is there high-speed access available in your area?
   If yes, what are the options and price?

Are the computers in your office networked?

Who provides the main troubleshooting support for your office?

What Browser do you normally use? What version? (will instruct on how to check for version number)

What e-mail program do you use? What version?

What version of Windows are you currently using?

What is your comfort level with the computer and associated programs:
   1 - low; 5 - high;
File management;
Office (what version)
  PowerPoint;
  Word;
  Excel;
  Access;
  Publisher;
What Web publishing software do you use?