

**ECOP/ESCOP Joint Planning Committee  
Las Vegas, Nevada, 2-4 February 2000**

## **Studies on the Future of Land Grant Universities and Colleges of Agriculture Introduction**

The Strategic Planning Council (SPC) of ECOP and the Planning Committee (PC) of ESCOP have been charged by their respective Executive Committees to pursue joint planning activities to better integrate how extension and research jointly addresses future national issues. To this end, the ECOP/ESCOP Joint Planning Committee (JPC) held a “planning to plan” meeting in Memphis, TN on October 1, 1999. At this meeting it was agreed that initial joint planning activities would focus on a topic with broad programmatic and operational implications that could lead to more specific topics for future sessions. Thus, the initial topic chosen was to review several recent studies on the future of Land Grant Universities and Colleges of Agriculture; discuss their implications for extension and research; and make recommendations to ECOP and ESCOP on how to address the key issues raised.

The JPC divided itself into subgroups to read and review key documents and to present a summary of main points, implications, and recommendations of their documents. The documents reviewed by each subgroup were:

FSPE Subgroup -

“Food System Professions Education Initiative” W. K. Kellogg Foundation

Engaged Institution Subgroup -

“The Engaged Institution”, W. K. Kellogg Foundation

NRC Subgroup -

“Colleges of Agriculture at the Land Grant Universities - A Profile”, National Research Council, Board on Agriculture

“Colleges of Agriculture at the Land Grant Universities - Public Service and Public Policy”, National Research Council, Board on Agriculture

Chancellor Emeritus Meyer’s Studies Subgroup -

“Rethinking the Outlook of Colleges Whose roots Have Been in Agriculture”, James H. Meyer

“The Stalemate in food and Agricultural Research, Teaching and Extension”, James H. Meyer

“Transforming the Land Grant College of Agriculture for the Twenty-First Century”, James H. Meyer

“Re-Engineering the Land Grant College of Agriculture”, James H. Meyer

“The Historical Trek of the Land Grant College of Agriculture”, James H. Meyer

Summary reports by the various subgroups (attached) were presented to the February JPC meeting and represent the thinking and opinions of the subgroup prior to that meeting.

The JPC met in Las Vegas, NV on February 2-4, 2000 and, with the assistance of a facilitator, integrated the thinking of the four subgroups, examined questions raised by the reports, identified key issues, discussed operationalization of report recommendations, and formulated a process for developing ECOP/ESCOP joint initiatives. These results are described in the following summary report and are offered for review and discussion to ECOP and ESCOP. Specific review and feedback are requested from ECOP’s Program Leadership Committee and ESCOP’s Science and Technology Committee. The JPC will meet again on May 18 in Baltimore, MD to consider all comments and concerns and finalize its recommendations. The JPC also suggests that these recommendations be a topic of discussion at the joint ECOP/ESCOP session in its August meeting.

Respectively submitted to ECOP and ESCOP by:

Jon Ort and George Cooper, Co-Chairs, ECOP-SPC  
Eric Young, Chair, ESCOP-PC

# Studies on the Future of Land Grant Universities and Colleges of Agriculture

## Discussion and Recommendations

The ECOP/ESCOP Joint Planning Committee (JPC) recognizes and appreciates the significant time, effort and thought that was put into the various studies that were reviewed and offer our thanks to the people who have come together to help guide us through this time of change. Any attempt to define critical issues and chart a course for positive change requires input from diverse internal and external stakeholders, these studies represent a significant amount of that type of input. Numerous structural and operational changes for Land Grant Colleges and Universities (LGCU) were suggested throughout these studies, but these changes have been, and will continue to be, very difficult without first realizing the necessary cultural changes. There must be a new shared vision of a culture that embraces the knowledge continuum from discovery to application, including all aspects of research and extension. This culture must foster and appreciate equally the creativity and scholarship of all faculty along the entire breath of this knowledge continuum. In addition, it must facilitate and value the counsel of all stakeholders potentially affected by the use of this knowledge. In order to achieve the magnitude of change required, LGCU's must continue to establish new partnerships with public agencies, private firms and consumer groups that have not been our traditional partners.

The JPC reaffirms that the cultural change prerequisite to any structural and operational changes needed is embodied in the philosophy of engagement, as defined by the W. K. Kellogg report "The Engaged Institution". Most of the discussion and recommendations described below are focused on how the LGCU's, and in particular research and extension, can best achieve engagement in the future.

### Questions Raised by Subgroup Reports

1. What is the focus and starting point for engagement?
2. How do we balance the tension of managing the institution (internal dynamics/values) with being responsive to external stakeholders (external dynamics/values)?
3. How do we know engagement is real and reciprocity is genuine?
4. How do we foster a culture of engagement within LGCU institutions and within the communities and stakeholders they serve?
5. How do we integrate teaching, research and service? Do we have examples of successful new partnerships of engagement and how they are managed effectively?
6. How do we define success of engagement? How do we tie success to measures of productivity and to start the dialogue?
7. What can/should LGCU institutions do to improve access of external stakeholders to research, teaching and service priorities and resource allocation decisions within the institution and with funding sources.
8. How do LGCU institutions balance the need to sustain core competencies and staff with the increasing reliance on competitive grants? How do we provide adequate institutional support for core staff in a competitive grant environment?
9. What methods should we use to guide stakeholder assessments of LGCU activities and decisions and with what results?
10. How do we sustain and balance regional multi-institutional programs and projects of research and education with state level concerns and funding in light of local needs and national priorities?
11. How do we create and sustain integrated, seamless programs of research, teaching and service? What changes must be made to LGCU promotion incentives and reward systems? How will such efforts be recognized and rewarded?
12. How do we balance the need to fill in research gaps with the desire to begin new research, teaching and service institutions?
13. How do we build LGCU capacity for partners and how do we main each partner's identity and worth?

## Key Issues Identified

### High Impact and High Urgency

1. Leadership commitment to engagement
2. Adequacy of vision for engagement
3. Building resources and capacity
4. Sustaining core competencies
5. Rewards, recognition, and incentives
6. Building partnerships
7. Operationalizing engagement

### High Impact and Low Urgency

1. Expansion of LGCU mission beyond agriculture
2. Establishing a common vision for agricultural research, application, education, and service
3. Communications with stakeholders
4. Advisory role for stakeholders and partners
5. Accountability to all partners (internal and external)
6. Measures of success

### Low Impact and High Urgency

1. Restructuring and reorganizing for an inclusive environment
2. Defining engagement
3. Responding to studies and reports on LGCU system
4. Advocacy roles for stakeholders and partners

## Operationalizing Engagement

1. Commitment to engagement
  - ? Determine who benefits
  - ? Determine ethical issues
  - ? Obtain agreement from partners on respective roles and expectations
  - ? Identify optimum points of leadership (engagement) in the partnership
  - ? Make an assessment and an investment of resources among partners
2. Build leadership
  - ? Institutional leadership has “world-views” or “mental models” of engagement that are commonly understood and generally coherent.
  - ? Institutions are properly aligned with a shared “world-view” or “mental models” among LGCU’s and ECOP/ESCOP leadership.
  - ? LCGU and ECOP/ESCOP leadership understands roles and rules of engagement.
3. Establish/refine rewards and recognition
  - ? Leadership from Deans and Provosts to reward engagement activities.
  - ? assure appropriate recognition for “contributions”
  - ? Develop reward/recognition criteria based on effective engagement
  - ? Examine and improve existing reward and recognition system where appropriate
  - ? Explore alternative models for rewards and recognition (e.g., ownership of intellectual property, profit sharing, etc.)
4. Increase/revise physical presence
  - ? Active participation of diverse representation from key stakeholders, constituencies, and the public
  - ? Involve them in strategic planning & resource allocation decisions.
  - ? LGCU institutional representatives actively engaged in “community” decisions as an advisor or resource to community (note: role shift of LGCU representative to listen and advise, rather than to actively plan and decide).
  - ? Craft processes/mechanisms to bring back and share lessons learned with LGCU institution and community.
  - ? Be willing, able, and prepared to engage in constructive dialogue with a wide range of partners.

5. Design/redesign organizational structure
  - ? Correct administrative and programmatic structures and processes in place within LGCU institutions and in ESCOP/ECOP to meet the challenges of engagement.
  - ? Invent new or refine old processes as needed.
6. Develop resources
  - ? More diverse resource base beyond public funds from state and federal governments.

### **Key Assumption Behind Joint Initiative Development Process**

The focus of the Land Grant University enterprise and related policy support systems (e.g., ESCOP/ECOP) is to foster the discovery, dissemination, and application of knowledge (for inquiry and action) as represented by the knowledge continuum from discovery to application.

### **Process of Joint ECOP/ESCOP Initiative Development**

1. Identify Emerging Issues
  - ? Scan the system to identify emerging research and extension issues
  - ? Host system issue forums and attend industry forums
  - ? Identify and define issues for potential initiatives
2. Proposal for New Joint Initiative
  - ? Brought to ECOP and ESCOP Executive Committees from any sector
  - ? Assess need and merit (relevance) as potential joint initiative
3. Review by ECOP-PLC, ESCOP-S&T and ECOP/ESCOP Joint Planning Committee (JPC)
  - ? Sent to committees if accepted by Executive Committees as having potential as a joint initiative
  - ? Merit review by key stakeholders coordinated by ECOP/ESCOP-JPC
  - ? Recommendation from each committee to Executive Committees
4. ECOP and ESCOP Executive Committees operationalize new joint initiative
  - ? Establish joint ECOP/ESCOP implementation team with member recommendations from ECOP-PLC and ESCOP-S&T
    - ? Further define initiative
    - ? Assess current capacity / expertise of system
    - ? Identify existing models similar to proposed initiative
    - ? Link communication on initiative across the whole system
    - ? Initiate national dialogue including international scientists, stakeholders and consumers
    - ? Host system forum on initiative
    - ? Assess how resources are marshaled (for rapid response, long term response, solid science, and public interest)
  - ? ECOP and ESCOP budget committees develop joint funding proposal for new initiative
    - ? Seek new resources from traditional and non-traditional sources
  - ? ECOP and ESCOP develop appropriate partnerships outside LGCU system and improve on existing partnerships
    - ? Explore possibility of joint funding proposals and other forms of resource sharing with key public and private partners
5. ESCOP and ECOP Executive Committees
  - ? Develop continuous assessment process to monitor progress and impact of joint initiative

## Joint ECOP/ESCOP Initiative Development

