

Minutes of the ECOP-SPC and ESCOP-PC Joint Planning Committee
May 18, 2000
Baltimore, Maryland

The meeting was called to order by Eric Young at 8:05 a.m.

Attendance: Myron Johnsrud (NASULGC), Karen Hinton (NV), Nancy Bull (CT), Terry Meisenbach (CSREES), Richard Frahm (CSREES), Gary Anderson (ME), Pat Sobrero (, Ted Alter (PA), Jon Ort (NC), Eric Young (NC), George Cooper (CSREES), P.S. Benepal (VA), Alfred Parks (TX), Mike Chippendale (MO), Bill Trumble (NH), James Wade (MD), Gladys Vaughn (CSREES), Frank Green (ARS) and Richard Heimsch (ID).

A. Land-Grant Studies Report -

Jon Ort provided an overview of the importance of the joint meeting by relating the historical charge to ECOP Strategic Planning Council in engaging in the futuring process and recent reorganization of ESCOP and the formation of the Planning Committee with leadership in planning. Both groups realize their separate and combined roles in identifying separate and joint issues that can be used by both ECOP and ESCOP in the legislative and budget process used by the NASULGC Board on Agriculture. As background for new members the Minutes from the February meeting in Memphis, Tennessee were highlighted. The joint groups were reminded of the need to plan and integrate planning and futuring efforts because at the institutional level this is already a common occurrence and the agreement made to review critical studies of the land-grant university programs and their implications for the future. The charge is how we develop documents and a process that will span the test of time for our institutions and programs.

Myron Johnsrud emphasized the importance of both groups to form recommendations for ECOP and ESCOP that form the basis for a national engagement.

Eric Young suggested that our first order of business would be the examination of studies and reports related to the future of the land grant university system for research and extension. The groups were in agreement with this suggestion and the need to develop a system response and agreed to have this completed for recommendations at the Joint Summer Meetings in Colorado.

The groups will have a letter drafted for signature of the Chairpersons of ECOP and ESCOP that describes what the system is doing and what we plan to do better.

Jon Ort recommended that we respond to the question of how will be operationalize engagement?

Eric Young suggested that we describe in the letter the process used by our groups in the review process and the title of the documents reviewed using the following outline: 1) Issues for prioritization framed around those issues in reports using the criteria impact and urgency; 2) Focus on the issues of engagement and the action item recommendations (six broad areas); and 3) recommendations on the proposed joint initiative process (draft outline developed).

Ted Alter challenged the group to approach our work without an apology for why we have done things the way we have but emphasizing how we do (will do) business in the context of the report and emerging issues.

George Cooper suggested that as we view the flow chart outlining process that we recognize the differences between ECOP and ESCOP and the value of collaborations on issues that value collaborations in the identification, planning, implementation and evaluation of joint initiatives. To the extent possible any new initiatives should relate to or support the NASULGC budget and legislative processes.

Mike Chippendale wanted to know who the reports will be directed to?

Eric Young informed the group that the report will have the following audiences in mind. The primary audience will be the report authors. Other audiences will include land grant presidents and chancellors, land grant administrators, the research and extension communities, key stakeholders, USDA agencies, the NAREEE Advisory Board, etc.

Myron Johnsrud wanted to know why it was important that the report authors be included? Eric Young wanted ECOP and ESCOP to demonstrate a responsive to the most compelling recommendations.

Frank Green suggested that the group would also want to consider presenting the recommendations to the full groups to maximize the impact of our actions and the actions of ESCOP and ECOP. Key will be on how to maximize the moment.

Ted Alter reminded the group of the importance of including key agencies of the Executive Branch, particularly those who impact potential funding for the things that we do (recognize the power of these interactions in influencing and garnering additional support for programs).

During discussions it was agreed that we utilize the key issues identified during discussions in Las Vegas, Nevada on February 2-4, 2000. These include the high impact and high urgency issues: **Leadership commitment to engagement; adequacy of vision for engagement; building resources and capacity; sustaining core competencies; rewards, recognition, and incentives and building partnerships**. The group was concerned that for the engagement concept to be fully realized that it will have to be implemented institution by institution.

As a system response is developed, it is important that it be a challenge to the system and take land grant universities to a higher level of responsiveness and effectiveness. The following outline was designed to organize the response by ECOP and ESCOP. The working title of the summary is "Strategies for Enhanced Engagement."

- I. Intent of the document (Introduction). Will be developed by Cooper, Vaughn and Johnsrud to include a shared challenge to stimulate discussion, action and movement towards engagement

and our strategies to influence others to use the system in a collective response.

- II. Statement of Research and Extension Philosophy. Will be developed by Alter, Chippendale and Hinton to include a statement of philosophy and principles for engagement from the joint ECOP/ESCOP committee.
- III. Summary of salient points from the documents reviewed. Will be developed by Ort and Young with assistance from writers at North Carolina State University and lay out a challenge to the components of the land grant university system (key actions needed).
- IV. Examples of current successes at engagement within the land grant research and extension system. Will be developed by Meisenbach, Bull and Heimsch.
- V. Development of objectives and recommendations for each of the six issues with expected action and outcomes. Will be developed by Young and Ort.

The group agreed to the following schedule of activities:

- 1. The initial component drafts from the various groups will be completed by June 16, 2000 and forwarded to Young and Ort.
- 2. The aggregate draft (all components) will be completed by July 7, 2000 and forwarded to the members of the joint committee for review.
- 3. Reactions to the total document will be forwarded to Young and Ort by July 21, 2000.
- 4. A revised draft will be developed between July 21 and 28, 2000.
- 5. A two hour Telephone Conference Call will be arranged between July 24 and 28. CSREES will arrange the details.
- 6. Final draft response document will be mailed to ECOP and ESCOP Executive Committee members on July 31 or Aug 1 for their review prior to the joint meeting on Aug. 9

B. Joint Initiative Development Process

Discussions of the Joint Initiative Development Process (Outline from the Las Vegas, Nevada Meeting)
- A flow chart/diagram was distributed in the meeting minutes.

The purpose of the diagram was to establish a process to be used in the development of joint initiatives between ECOP and ESCOP. A revised diagram will be developed by Eric Young based on discussions at the meeting and will be placed on the agenda for the October 4-6, 2000 meeting to be held in Mystic, CT.

C. Human Resources Session Discussion

Overview of the Human Resources session facilitated by Ron Gunn.

The group felt that the overall presentation was well organized and presented. However there was a need for the group to be pushed harder to reach higher levels of understanding, particularly in painting various scenarios (the so what questions?). There was agreement that the diversity of participants strengthened the group discussions and that the consultant could have challenged the group at the end of the day (around 4:00 p.m.) rather than close-out the session.

In discussions that followed, the group wanted to know if this topic could be used as a plenary session at the NASULGC meetings in San Antonio, Texas? If this could be arranged, having someone who understands the values of 18-24 year old's and their expectations in future employment would be a good topic. Would need to identify someone from the system with research knowledge to help. Another topic could be centered on marketing strategies for the future agriculture work-force to break away from the image that agriculture is so focused on production agriculture that we fail to recognize the consumers of agriculture products (customers). Need to be more concerned about who cares about what we do and how to engage these individuals if we are to be successful in fulfilling our future mission.

The group was also concerned about developing methods to share the results of the facilitated discussions on May 17, 2000. Participants agreed to use regional meetings and other meetings to create an awareness and look for other opportunities. Since the issue is so important to the system and what we do, the group left with the understanding that this will be a recurring theme for continuing discussions. The Chairs of SPC, PODC, PLC and ESCOP Planning were charged with developing appropriate forums for these discussions and identifying ways to engage the leadership of ECOP and ESCOP.