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ABSTRACT
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The national Cooperative Extension and Land Grant University Systems have been struggling with their future direction for a great number of years. This traditional system follows the customary rural, production agriculture focus with an overwhelming percentage of its resources aimed at those efforts. At the State University, like most other traditional land grant institutions, there has been an inner systemic conflict regarding programming to urban areas. This institution was able to establish a metro initiative in one of the state’s major cities. Its outcome can have significant impact on organizational policy, funding, program focus, stakeholder support, public support, and leadership development relative to urban Extension. This dissertation is a qualitative research inquiry using case study methodology to explore these issues using representative bureaucracy theory as the lens from which to assess how it was able to proceed with the effort as well as provide insight into the nature of the system.
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CHAPTER 1 – INTRODUCTION

Background and Historical Context

Cooperative Extension was created through a series of acts by the Federal government that include the 1862 and 1890 Morrill Acts that established Land-Grants and traditionally Black colleges. The land grant movement gave birth to the Cooperative Extension System, “to provide branches of learning with no supervision from the Federal government”, as delineated in the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. With this act, a mechanism was established to diffuse useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture, home economics, and rural energy. A basic intent was as an effort to offer informal educational activities to assist in the preparation for “Professions of Life” to those in the industrial class.

In an effort to boost economic development and raise the quality of life, Cooperative Extension was designated to work with farmers and a variety of related enterprises to improve their production capabilities, thus increasing profitability. As our country moved towards urbanization, the efforts of Cooperative Extension continued to focus on rural and farm-related issues. At the same time, however, it also evolved a presence in urban areas by virtue of having a responsibility to every citizen in each respective state through an Extension office in every county (Panshin, 1992). Up to our current times, our population moved from very agrarian to quite urban (U.S. Census, 2000).

While the system continues to focus on agriculture, today some researchers claim that urban and rural Extension operations have developed beyond this to assist citizens
with many aspects of their lives outside of agriculture. The focus of Extension has expanded from rural service to include significant programming in urban/metropolitan communities. These programs are able to utilize the resources available at the institution to address issues of adults and youth from all backgrounds. The food and fiber system, as currently presented by Extension, includes numerous non-agricultural arenas and has allowed for some states to embrace these non-rural subjects (Kerrigan, 2005).

Statement of the Problem

One would think that if any organization has the opportunity to be a “learning organization” then, large research universities should fall into that designation. For most companies that fail, evidence abounds that the organizational system is failing. All of the evidence goes unheeded even if individual leaders are aware of it. The organization as a system, however, does not recognize the impending threat, understand their implications, or come up with strategies to address them. The organization’s primary threats to survival today didn’t come from specific events but, rather, from slow gradual processes to which they are mostly blind (Senge, 1990). Cooperative Extension and the Land Grant Systems have been experiencing internal stresses regarding their future path due to the lack of programmatic relevance for a great number of metropolitan citizens. With a strong traditional culture, they are beginning to recognize the challenges facing them regarding urban initiatives in their land grant institutions and Cooperative Extension programs. The major claim here is that there is a serious, inner systemic struggle and its outcome can have significant negative impact on organizational policy, funding, program focus, and leadership development. Should the system turn away from directing appreciable focus
on metropolitan areas, its future could be in jeopardy (Panshin, 1992). There is a need to investigate this highly traditional institution that in many ways is unreceptive to metropolitan culture. Such a study may provide methodology and insights into state urban initiatives dealing with challenges confronting them from their internal cultures.

Since the direction of resources follows policies and programming that reflect rural and production agriculture needs, metro areas are at a disadvantage primarily with respect to the level of funding (USDA/CSREES, 1996). When looking at the amount of funding available for metro Extension programs, one barometer to assess that level is to calculate the number of professional staff members who are assigned to a particular office in relation to population. That is, how many state funded, full time, professional staff members are available to a particular county? Almost without exception, metro programs have extremely high professional staff to population ratios. That is, one professional must offer programming to a significantly larger audience. It is not uncommon for rural counties in a particular state to have the same number of staff deployed as in their metro counterparts. The disadvantage, of course, is that the resources are spread out across many, many more residents, effectively handicapping the capabilities of that program (Kerrigan, 2005).

Resources are allocated through legislative process during federal and state budget deliberations. Interest groups, that include traditional agricultural commodity associations, wield their power through lobbying activities in efforts to influence resource allocations. These stakeholders play an important part in every field. When the leadership in Extension refers to stakeholders, invariably they are referring to agricultural commodity groups and farm related associations. These stakeholder groups are well-
funded and can support lobbying efforts in order to secure funds to support Extension. There is a strong connection between these traditional stakeholder groups and the leadership for Extension across every state (Kerrigan, 2005). There is regular communication among them and it is evident that they hold significant sway with the inner workings of Extension systems. This embedded collegiality and a traditional funding process provides more evidence to support the idea that organizational culture is influencing Extension’s funding, staffing and programming. Stakeholders are not so clearly defined in metro areas due to the many diverse and divergent issues and groups (Schutjer, 1992). This weakens the potential for support to metro Extension programming. There is a significant cultural difference between urban and rural and their perspectives, in many respects are far apart.

Public support for Extension, as a system, may soon encounter its most difficult challenge (Panshin, 1992). While the Extension system is traditionally focused on the rural areas of our state and country, our heavily populated metro areas represent large blocks of voters. In essence, while most people living in rural areas know about Extension, a relatively small percentage of those residing in urban and metro areas recognize Extension as an important public service. This lack of public recognition can negatively impact efforts to gain support for Extension programming (Schutjer, 1992). He further claims that without the metropolitan component and an expanded political base, it is not likely that Extension will survive in the longer term to provide education to any client group. This political base can only be broadened through public awareness.

There are significant potential negative effects with regard to the question of relevance when considering the lack of Extension programming available for urban and
metropolitan citizens. Perhaps the most important is the loss of significance to much of the nation's population which results in reduced funding resources. These funding limitations are easily possible should the system turn away and continue to ignore an emphasis on metropolitan areas. There is a need to illuminate the issue of a metro Extension effort and its challenges so that it can thrive in a system that is highly traditional and in many ways unresponsive to metropolitan cultural differences. Such exploration may provide meaningful insight into the issue of Land Grant Institutions and Cooperative Extension efforts in these areas and provide some direction to advance Extension work in metropolitan regions.

Purpose of This Study

The national Cooperative Extension and Land Grant University Systems have been struggling with their future direction due to the question of relevance for a multitude of urban and metropolitan citizens. This system is quite traditional in that it follows the customary rural, production agriculture focus with an overwhelming percentage of its resources aimed at those issues. At the State University, like all other traditional land grant institutions, there is a serious, inner systemic struggle regarding the integration of an urban agenda and a broader programmatic thrust. Its outcome can have significant impact on organizational policy, funding, program focus, stakeholder support, public support, and leadership development relative to urban Extension.

In regard to college and Extension policies, historically, these policies have always been skewed in the direction of supporting rural clientele and production agriculture (Kerrigan, 2005). These policies tend to give advantages to those who
program in rural areas while handicapping those providing services to urban clients. The issue of policies and their relationship to programming decisions is far-reaching and embedded in the culture of the land grant system. Often, senior leaders in these systems do not recognize the disadvantages they stack against Metro programming. Their focus is so intent in those areas with which they are most familiar and traditionally aligned that the implications of new policies on Metro programs do not integrate into their organizational culture. In this regard Kerrigan (2005) and his work illuminates this issue and presents very strong arguments to support his claims.

In accordance with the federal legislation the land grant institution, The State University, is required to offer problem solving, research based outreach resources to all residents of the commonwealth including those in our urban communities. For my entire career with The State Cooperative Extension system, I have been a passionate internal critic of the overall lack of interest by the system in urban and metro matters. I hope to illuminate the issues related to differing perspectives in rural and urban cultures and also investigate the impact on systemic decision making and leadership of our traditional land grant institution with respect to the development of a metro strategy. Integral to this will be the challenges that the state wide system must overcome in order to provide meaningful educational programming to these urban and metro areas. There has been very little empirical study of this issue and thus there will be heavy reliance on previous work done in urban Extension by only a few researchers such as Dan Panshin; Jack Kerrigan; Morse, Brown, and Warning; Chester Felis, and only a few others. The demonstration of non-traditional leadership activities necessary to establish the metro
initiative will be explored with an emphasis on risk taking, cultural divergence, stakeholder impact, and collaborative strategies.

The extensive urbanization of our nation begged for expansion of the original intent of Cooperative Extension. Indisputably, Extension originated in rural and agricultural America and much of its emphasis has remained there (Kerrigan, 2005). Extension, however, also has existed in cities from the beginning. It has, for the most part, been a token and fragmented existence without significant organizational emphasis or attention. It is likely that Extension will not survive unless its political base is broadened (Schutjer, 1992).

In the face of growing needs for public sector education to address many key societal issues, the ever shrinking farm population cannot politically support federal, state, and local budgets for an Extension program focused solely on farmers and rural communities. Extension’s ability to meet the program needs of its traditional clientele is ultimately linked to relevant public sector education for urban and metropolitan audiences (Schutjer, 1992). The purpose is also to facilitate the questioning of traditionalist actions by individuals in decision making roles and to help them consider their reality from a different vantage point. I will pursue this study in order to illuminate the experience of refocusing to a metro program and the organizational cultural changes necessary. It is my hope to draw attention to a potentially successful metro effort that could enhance local programming resources, increase services to more residents and help strengthen the state wide system. These new customers could potentially serve as advocates in support of the entire Extension system.
Central Theme

Contrary to popular belief, evidence is provided that urban clientele now outnumber rural clientele in Extension programs. According to a national survey, about two thirds of Extension users now reside in metro areas. At one point what was termed as newer Extension programs had been conducted specifically for urban residents (Christenson and Warner, 1985). We must acknowledge here that there exists a philosophical and pragmatic argument between those who favor rural and agricultural emphasis over those who favor an increased urban presence. The implication is that increased attention to urban areas may mean abandoning rural and agricultural America. It appears that an adversarial situation exists with these two cultures: rural and urban. The discussion centers around how vastly different the urban environment is from the rural and that the Extension Service could tear itself into two separate programming systems (Panshin, 1992).

There are two studies that could provide significant support for the concept of supporting a shift in perspective by enhancing programming in metro areas. The first is a study completed in Texas on how to best serve its citizens. Data were collected through a telephone survey of county or district directors in 13 urban locations throughout the country. Texas Extension committed university administration to make programmatic changes based on the results of this state study but allowed adaptation by each county program based on specific local characteristics. It fully realized that the future support for Extension in Texas depended heavily on having visible, effective Extension educational programs in urban areas (Fehlis, 1992).
The second study that can provide significant evidence came out of Ohio State University by Jack Kerrigan (2005). It shows that urban Extension is nested in a traditionally rural and agricultural environment yet serves the urban population by addressing many diverse challenges. This study claims that securing the future of urban Extension is critical to the health of the entire system. The lack of support for the urban effort is at the core of the many challenges Extension faces. There are few if any indicators, benchmarks, or standards in existence that can help address issues of success for urban Extension programs given the rural and agricultural organizational culture of the system (Kerrigan, 2005). In his study, the purpose was to describe an effective, high-impact urban county Extension program. The data were all compiled and ultimately, claims were made on what those findings revealed based on the evidence. In essence, a significant change in perspective is necessary if Extension is to continue to thrive through sustained public support and funding.

Research Question

How did our system become so unequal, i.e. rural and urban? Over the years, Extension evolved into an advocate and ally of rural America. In some ways it serves as a missionary of rural ideals to urban people perhaps in an effort to “convert” their thinking. The Extension stakeholders, rural in nature, continue to exert major influence on the policies and programming of Extension. This is the dominant culture. The perspective would be that those in the majority (e.g. scholars in production agriculture, rural affairs, and institutional leaders) continue to marginalize those engaged in the metro Extension efforts.
It will be argued that in this system almost the entire leadership is made up of non-traditionalists who have come up through the ranks in customary fields and have moved into influential positions. It will be important to investigate the background history of Land Grant and Extension leaders in an attempt to uncover experiences that may have lead them to follow the specific direction and interest in which they are currently engaged.

While most in the metro Extension field recognize a cultural disparity, there has been no research from an empirical or scholarly perspective in this area. Given this environment, there are a number of questions I hope to explore. Of central importance, are, “What is Extension’s fundamental identity and how is it conceptualized by the institutional leadership in its effort to establish a metro initiative? How did the traditional College and Extension systems move ahead with the decision to establish an enhanced urban presence? Other secondary questions are also important as exemplified here. How do institutional leaders navigate through issues related to a new metro identity? What types of changes in leadership were needed to re-calibrate the Extension system in order for it to more easily allow metro initiatives? What is necessary for Extension to take root in a metro setting?

I am confident that this study can be significant to the entire Extension field by illuminating the process through which the state Land Grant and Extension systems committed to a more balanced program by engaging the metro areas with significant investment through a Metro Research and Outreach Center concept.
Study Overview

It has become obvious to me that I must investigate how the rural and production agriculture culture impacts organizational decision making and leadership within the Extension system with respect to any strategic metro initiative. The issue here is to see what causes the resistance to shedding traditional, cultural paradigms in order to enhance resources available to all state residents including urban residents. There are a number of issues at work here. When Extension began, farmers were the underclass. The system was designed to assist struggling farmers maximize profitability and accumulate resources. These many years later, they are no longer that underclass, yet they continue to exert significant influence on the Extension system. That the current urban underclass does not deserve similar opportunities for this program is a major incongruence.

This investigation will be carried out using qualitative case study methodology to further explore the manner in which these backgrounds influence leadership’s decision making behavior relative to metropolitan issues. Qualitative studies focus on seeking patterns of relationships both unanticipated and anticipated or expected. This is not to establish cause and effect but rather to behold the world we see and to understand it as deeply as possible experientially (Stake, 1995). Interviews with key leaders within the institution will be conducted to explore the issue of institutional rural/urban cultures and the impacts on leadership decisions as they relate to metropolitan Extension efforts. I will conduct a series of open ended interviews with a number of participants in order to provide balance and variety (Stake, 1995). These initial interviewees will assist me in identifying others who may contribute to the study. The intent is to broaden the overall
interview pool based on explorations that need to take place as a result of emerging ideas and concepts.

Qualitative data analysis seems rarely prescriptive in nature. As such, the analysis I will be employing will be generally thematic. That is, data will be classified and connections will be made among various data in order to find out what the data says (Shank, 2006). An inductive approach will be used. This is loosely defined as the process of moving from the specific to the general. This essentially allows us to look at the suggestions for more general patterns of order (Shank, 2006). Fundamentally, these patterns will provide insights into the nature of core issues and allow a more clearly defined perspective into the nature of the case.

In the course of data analysis, one theoretical perspective will assist me in organization and qualification. This theory is referred to as representative bureaucracy. This theory states that the cross-sections of a population being served should be represented in that bureaucratic organization or political system. That is, the viewpoint that bureaucracies, management hierarchy, and political systems should include racial and ethnic groups, women, and more recently in some circumstances the disabled and the elderly, among others as reflected in the population they serve or represent (Kelly, 1998). Of course, my interest is specifically cultural as defined by rural and urban perspectives.
CHAPTER 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review will explore various aspects of Cooperative Extension that include legislative history, traditional culture, demographics, programmatic trend, leadership, methodology, and theoretical perspectives. The intent is to provide insights and a foundational understanding of the Land Grant and Extension systems as well as the variety of issues plaguing them. The information presented will serve as a guide through the existing literature relevant to this study and provide a glimpse into the institutional effects of culture and the challenges that affect leadership decision making because of it.

The literature cited will support the theoretical arguments and reasoning behind the claims made. It will also supply a broad scope of support data derived from years of study and analysis. While the literature on urban Extension is not as extensive as with many other topics, there is sufficient empirical work to provide a sound foundation for the research being proposed.

History and Demographic Evolution

Cooperative Extension was created through a series of acts by the Federal government beginning with the first Morrill Act of 1862 that established Land Grant College system. This was followed by the Morrill Act of 1890 that added the traditionally Black Colleges. The land grant movement gave birth to the Cooperative Extension System “to provide branches of learning with no supervision from the Federal government” as established by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. With this act, an initial
mechanism was established to disseminate useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture, home economics, and rural energy (Smith-Lever Act of 1914).

Since the country had a massive segment of the population involved in agrarian activities, an economic development model addressing this industry seemed wise at that time. According to Wilkie (1978), when the first Morrill Act was passed, census data was quite inaccurate. During the 1930s, statistical processes were used to better approximate the population and its demographic breakdowns. According to the U.S. Census Bureau (1990) in 1860 during the time of the first Morrill Act, 19.8 percent of the U.S. population was considered urban with the remainder, 80.2 percent counted as rural. In 1910, circa the passage of the Smith-Lever Act, 45.6 percent of the population was urban and 54.4 percent was rural. Again, according to the 2000 census, 79 percent of our population is urban. Today, 1.6% of our population is counted as farmers (U.S. Census, 2000). Well known and documented evidence also shows that throughout the 20th Century, our national population migrated towards urban centers (U.S. Census, 2000). During this time, Extension’s programming followed.

In this effort to boost economic development and raise the quality of life, Cooperative Extension was designated to work with farmers and a variety of related enterprises to improve their production capabilities, thus increasing profitability. A basic intent was to offer preparation for “professions of life” to those in the industrial class. This was a very logical response since our country was quite agrarian during that time. As our nation moved towards urbanization, the greater efforts of Cooperative Extension continued to focus on rural and farm-related issues (USDA, 1996). While the nation changed to industrial, then to post-industrial and beyond, our land grant system walked
away from the responsibilities it holds for its urban population. It was blinded by traditional production agriculture and those rural based stakeholders who insisted that the resources be focused on their particular needs, and challenges. Ultimately, most of Extension resources were focused on these issues. These arguments are all clearly established by Schutjer (1992).

Topical Overview

With a lack of large volumes of empirical literature related specifically to urban Extension, the number of articles published is a disadvantage for the pursuit of content or literary analysis research in this specific aspect of Extension. Due to the history and focus of Extension, the vast majority of research presented to the scholarly community is from a rural perspective and includes rural audiences in their studies. There are countless studies that address issues from many programmatic perspectives. These studies, however, in almost all cases are rural in their settings and foci. Since my effort is directed specifically at the premise that urban Extension holds a minor position within the system, these studies have little relevance to the claims being asserted.

It will be necessary that this study follow its own course. I am driven to do what I feel is right regarding the lack of resources available to urban residents. While the system continues to focus heavily on production agriculture and rural issues, today many researchers claim that some urban and rural Extension operations have autonomously developed beyond this to assist citizens with many aspects of their lives. In some urban areas, where there is local programmatic independence, the focus of Extension has expanded from traditional service into significant, creative programming that fully
addresses urban/metropolitan challenges (Kerrigan, 2005). These programs are able to tackle issues of adults and youth from all backgrounds. The true food and agriculture system, as currently presented by Extension at the national level, includes numerous non-agricultural arenas and has allowed for some states to embrace these non-rural subjects. The question being asked in some quarters now is, “Can a program delivery model, designed for specific rural needs, address the needs of an urban or metropolitan audience”? Some evidence on effective components of such a model is presented through the assessment of a high impact urban program and the data collected through a Delphi study (Kerrigan, 2005). My research will incorporate the discovery of foundational perspectives of truth in the historical, economic, and social infrastructures (Lincoln & Guba, 2000) within Extension on behalf of those millions of urban residents who cannot access the same educational resources as their rural counterparts because, simply these are not available in the same ratio as they are in rural areas.

Some Extension literature presents the issue that extensive urbanization of our nation begged for expansion of the original intent of Cooperative Extension and its Land Grant mission. These researchers are correct in establishing that Extension originated in rural and agricultural America and much of its emphasis has remained there. In the face of growing needs for public sector education, the ever smaller farm population cannot politically support federal, state, and local budgets for an Extension program focused solely on farmers and their rural communities. Extension’s ability to meet the program needs of its traditional clientele is ultimately linked to relevant public sector education for urban and metropolitan audiences (Schutjer, 1992).
Cooperative Extension and the land grant university system continue to struggle with their future due to the question of relevance for all of their urban and metropolitan citizens. This system is quite traditional in that it follows the conventional rural, production agriculture focus with an overwhelming percentage of its resources aimed at those issues. Currently, at traditional land grant institutions, there is a serious, inner systemic struggle. Its outcome can have significant impact on organizational policy, funding, program focus, stakeholder support, public support, and leadership development relative to urban Extension. In this regard, Fehlis (1992) seems to be quite accurate in his presentation that Extension must serve the educational needs of all the people.

Policy and Funding

In regard to organizational policy, historically, policies have always been skewed in the direction of supporting rural clientele and production agriculture. Kerrigan (2005) and his research clearly delineate these issues. Further, he indicates that these policies tend to give advantages to those who program in rural areas while handicapping those providing services to metro areas. The issue of policies and their relationship to programming decisions is far-reaching and embedded in the culture of the land grant system. Often, leaders in these systems do not recognize the disadvantages to metro programming. Their focus has such intensity in those areas with which they are most familiar and traditionally aligned that the implications of new policies on metro programs and their clients is simply, not perceived.

In this Extension system, the state leadership has authority for deploying staff across the state. Specifically, his authority lies with the dean of the College of
Agriculture. Here, rural counties have very similar staff deployments as in their metro counterpart. There is little consideration for per capita service provision. When staff is more evenly deployed across the state, there is a metro disadvantage that the resources are spread out across many, many more residents in a populous county. This effectively handicaps the capabilities of metro programs to provide comparable services to their residents. This issue is exemplified quite well by Kerrigan (2005). Consider the following statistical breakdown in Tables 1 and 2 (Extension, 2007).
Table 1

*State Demographic Breakdown using 2000 Census*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of state</td>
<td>12,500,000 approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of the target county</td>
<td>1,350,000 approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of the state’s largest city</td>
<td>1,600,000 approx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population of smallest county</td>
<td>4,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of counties</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median county population</td>
<td>89,856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Professional Extension Paid Staff to Population ratio*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Ratio (including CED)</th>
<th>Ratio (without CED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For the Target County</td>
<td>1:186,000</td>
<td>1:217,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including CED (CED)</td>
<td>without CED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the largest city in the state</td>
<td>1:470,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including CED (CED)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the Median County</td>
<td>1:22,000</td>
<td>1:30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including CED (CED)</td>
<td>without CED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This data provides a clear perspective on the issue of available state and federal funding to support staffing to metro programs. The Extension model is such that the states (through federal and state sources) provide professional subject matter staffing, technical support from Extension appointed faculty located at University Park, publications and written material along with some other minor miscellaneous items. The local county government provides all of the other support such as: clerical, supplies, equipment, space, telephones, printing, travel reimbursement, printing, etc. Additional local resource generation efforts are able to supplement these primary sources but are rarely sustainable in nature.

Programmatic Relevance

Program focus becomes another issue. In order for quality programs to exist in metro areas, it is necessary that the system include a cadre of professorial expertise on campus. Essentially, this Extension faculty provides the research and basis from which county programs are developed. Further this faculty provides: ongoing professional development to county educators in that field of studies, technical assistance, assistance with the workshops and seminars to the public, and fact sheets on their area of expertise. Since much of the focus is on rural and production agriculture issues, the makeup of Extension faculty will reflect this; meaning that faculty who explore issues more relevant to metro audiences are few in comparison. Once again, Kerrigan (2005) clearly presents the deployment of resources slanted to rural and production agriculture.

Public support is the area in which Extension, as a system, may encounter its most difficult challenge. While the Extension system is traditionally focused on the rural areas
of our state and country, the heavily populated metro areas represent large blocks of voters. In essence, while most people living in rural areas know about Extension, a relatively small percentage of those residing in urban and metro areas recognize Extension and the resources available. This lack of public recognition can negatively impact numerous avenues for gaining support for Extension programming. Schutjer (1992) correctly claimed that without the metropolitan component it is not likely that Extension will survive to provide education to any client group unless the political base is broadened. He continues that this political base can only be broadened through public awareness brought about by enhanced programming in metro areas.

There are significant potential negative effects with regard to the question of relevance for urban and metropolitan citizens. One of the most serious is the loss of significance to much of the population which can result in reduced funding resources. This is easily possible should the system turn away from directing appreciable focus on metropolitan areas. It is easy to see why Panshin (1992) stated that Extension’s future could be in jeopardy. There is a need to illuminate the issue of urban Extension so that it can thrive in a system that is highly traditional and in many ways unreceptive to metropolitan culture. Such exploration may provide meaningful insight into the issue of our Land Grant Institution and Extension efforts in urban areas.

A study that provides support for the notion of developing an urban Extension effort was completed in Texas (Fehlis, 1992). There, they collected programmatic and organizational data through a telephone survey of county or district directors in 13 urban locations. These locations included the counties and urban areas around Arlington, Virginia; Atlanta, Georgia; Baltimore, Maryland; Kansas City, Missouri; Minneapolis
and St. Paul, Minnesota; Nassau County, New York; Jacksonville, Tampa, and St. Petersburg, Florida; Portland, Oregon; Phoenix, Arizona; and Seattle, Washington.

Results of the study revealed a wide variety of approaches being used in working with urban audience and indicated common problems and frustrations among urban faculties. They expressed concern about: their effectiveness in programming, demands on their time, and lack of clear direction and expectations from administrators. Respondents emphasized the need for better communications and nationwide networking among urban county faculty and for urban Extension conferences to discuss successful programming.

Texas Extension committed university administration to make programmatic changes based on the results of this state study but allowed adaptation by each county program based on specific local characteristics. As Texas urban areas continued to grow, the initiative was an effort to position Extension by serving the educational needs of all the people across the state regardless of whether they lived in rural or urban areas. It fully realized that the future support for all of Extension in Texas depended heavily on having visible, effective Extension educational programs in urban areas (Fehlis, 1992).

While the state system continues to focus on agriculture, today many researchers claim that urban and rural Extension programs have expanded beyond this limited perspective to assist citizens with many aspects of their lives. The focus of Extension has been extended from rural service into meaningful programming in urban/metropolitan communities (Kerrigan, 2005). These programs are able to address issues of adults and youth from all backgrounds. The interesting issue here is that many of these initiatives are not funded by core Extension dollars but rather, are supported using grant funds and budget enhancements initiated by local county leadership as well as efforts by local
county governments. The question Kerrigan (2005) raises is, “Can a program delivery model, with limited resources and designed for specific rural needs, address the needs of an urban or metropolitan audience?” Further, what would it take for an organization with this history to turn its attention to the metro areas of the state? Again, Kerrigan (2005) illuminates this issue clearly in his dissertation work out of the Ohio State University.

**Leadership**

For this study, leadership will be examined relative to the sources of authority for leadership. There are innumerable aspects to leadership; however, this concept is directly aligned with the issues on which this study will focus. Leaders in this study are in unique situations that can be examined using this aspect for leading organizations.

As the discussion of stakeholders and their affect on leaders is explored, the investigation on sources of authority for leadership becomes paramount. Sergiovanni (1992) talks about a new kind of leadership. It is one that focuses on attitudes and values, leadership belonging to everyone, and content and substance over process and skill. He also contends that leadership must be looked at from the follower’s perspective. In essence, it is the follower who determines the leader. The questions are who, what, and why should someone follow a particular individual. In the end, many leaders prefer that the led not ask why questions because this leads to discussions in which many leaders are not well armed to engage. There are five types of authority: bureaucratic, psychological, technical-rational, professional, and moral. Primary authority for current leadership rests in a combination of bureaucratic, psychological and technical-rational. He argues that
bureaucratic, psychological, and technical-rational leadership have their places but their roles should be in support of professional and moral authority.

Investigating these two primary sources for authority, they are explored by virtue of their characteristics and strategies. Professional authority applies an informed craft with knowledge and personal expertise. These leaders promote dialogue that explicitly states professional values and accepted tenets of practice. Moral authority applies the obligation and duty derived from widely shared community values, ideas, and ideals. These leaders identify and make explicit the values and beliefs that define the center of the organization as a community. In the end, leaders must be decisive. Leaders must be forceful. Leaders must have vision. Leaders must manipulate events and people so that their vision can become reality. Leaders, in other words, must lead (Sergiovanni, 1992).

Theoretical Perspectives

As huge bureaucratic systems that serve large numbers of customer residents, I feel that one theory will help to shed light on issues related to the Land Grant Institution and the Cooperative Extension system. This is the theory of Representative Bureaucracy. Representative Bureaucracy is the concept that the demographic make-up of organizations and their leadership should reflect the clients, customers, or residents they serve (Lim, 2006).

Original Representative Bureaucracy Theory began circa mid 1940’s. It states that the cross-sections of the population that should be represented in a bureaucratic or political system must be included by class, occupations, and geography (Kelly, 1998). Since then, the concept of which groups should be represented has expanded to include
racial and ethnic groups, women, and more recently in some circumstances the disabled and the elderly, among others (Kelly, 1998). The application of Representative Bureaucracy Theory here could help illuminate the characteristics that preserve the dominant culture to the detriment of the minority culture (Meier, 1998). There are numerous new researchers who have investigated this theoretical perspective such as: Lim, Konisky, Collins, and others. They have studied this theory from political, non-profit, and corporate perspectives. Further, they have researched data that informs us of specific nuances within the theory itself.
CHAPTER III - METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The overall methodological technique to be employed in this study will be a qualitative case study. The use of case study will allow for the application of a systemic analysis of data across numerous unique experiences of the organization under study (Stake, 1995). The focus is to investigate how the rural and production agriculture cultures impact organizational decision making and leadership within The State University Land Grant Extension system as it relates to the establishment of the new Metro Research and Outreach Center in the target city. Case study research is not based on sampling. The obligation is to understand this intrinsic case in its uniqueness (Stake, 1995).

Although some qualitative researchers operate from a similar philosophical position, most recognize that the relevant reality as far as human experience is concerned is that which takes place in subjective experience, in social context, and in historical time. Thus, qualitative researchers are often more concerned about uncovering knowledge about how people think and feel about the circumstances in which they find themselves than they are in making judgments about whether those thoughts and feelings are valid (Thorn, 2000).

My intention is to explore the decision making process from a variety of perspectives. Extension stands as an advocate and ally of rural America and serves as a rural missionary to urban areas with an appearance of wanting to spread its values there. The rural and production agriculture custom is the dominant culture. The central claim is
that those in the majority continue to marginalize those engaged in the urban Extension efforts. This study is designed to better understand the cultural shift necessary to move in directions that are diametrically opposed to the established culture. Further, the researcher intends to illuminate the specific, personal, and professional perspectives in that process.

Qualitative data are not the exclusive domain of qualitative research. Rather, the term can refer to anything that is not quantitative, or rendered into numerical form. Many quantitative studies include open ended survey questions, semi-structured interviews, or other forms of qualitative data. What distinguishes the data in a quantitative study from those generated in a qualitatively designed study is a set of assumptions, principles, and even values about truth and reality. Quantitative researchers accept that the goal of science is to discover the truths that exist in the world and to use the scientific method as a way to build a more complete understanding of reality. Although some qualitative researchers operate from a similar philosophical position, most recognize that the relevant reality as far as human experience is concerned is that which takes place in subjective experience, in social context, and in historical time. Thus, qualitative researchers are often more concerned about uncovering knowledge about how people think and feel about the circumstances in which they find themselves than they are in making judgments about whether those thoughts and feelings are valid (Thorn, 2000).

This research will include a collection of various data used to advance the study. A thorough review of historical literature will be necessary. Further, the intent is to review documentation that consists of various written data. The central activities are a series of open ended interviews with a variety of key, high level leaders in order to
provide balance and variety. The issue is to maximize the opportunity to learn as much as possible about the urban / rural divide (Stake, 1995) and to apply these perspectives to the metro initiative being undertaken. Collectively, these data will be used in the triangulation process for verification of all data gathered.

Primary Sources

*Interviews*

Interviews will begin with the three major State University institutional leaders engaged in the effort to establish a Metro Research and Outreach Initiative in the target city. These individuals hold positions of University vice president, dean of the College, and state director of Extension. This initiative is proposed to be a major shift in organizational effort and supports a direction that is diametrically opposed to traditional production agriculture and rural stakeholder support. The three individuals will allow for the collection of data from three different administrative viewpoints. Each has a unique perspective in that they all reflect possible differing cultural perspectives. During this process, interpretation will proceed in order to better assert what I can uncover and find meaningful (Stake, 1995).

The three backgrounds of the selected individuals are sufficiently different in their support rationale that the perspective distance will allow for meaningful determination of outcome data and provide some valuable insight. These three individuals are the key decision makers and hold the future of State Extension and any metro initiatives in their hands. The total number of interviewees has not yet been determined and the researcher will use both theoretical sampling and snowball techniques
to identify additional specific actors (Delamont, 2002). Essentially, snowball sampling allows me to use my few and carefully selected participants to get leads to other relevant and potential contributors. Leads received from earlier participants can snowball to larger numbers of interviewees (Shank, 2006). Guiding the questions will be issues related to: organizational culture, the degree to which the interviewees feel they represent the residents of The State, institutional perspective, potential for political gain and loss, and influence of stakeholders in decision making.

The theoretical sampling strategy has a purpose such as demographic, stratified, or modified samples. In this case, I will be identifying initial interviewees who are rich in information and politically savvy (Shank, 2006). Here, the individuals I have identified to begin the interviewing activities hold significant information and perspectives on both the institution as well as on the metro initiative being considered. To a great degree these individuals are relatively easy to access and hospitable to my inquiry (Stake, 1995). These individuals are also aware of others in and out of the system who can add depth and insights into this inquiry. As such, I will utilize snowball techniques to widen the circle of interviewees.

As the study incorporates a wider circle of interviewees the direction will be dependent on the data uncovered. Other interviewees may include: other individuals in high ranking administrative positions, lobbyists from the agricultural community, University legislative relations staff, traditional as well as non-traditional stakeholders, and County Extension Directors from other major metro areas. It is hoped that this process will provide significant insights in helping me to understand the major perspectives and related rationale. The study will attempt to fully illuminate elements of
Extension as they relate to: organizational motivation, leadership tendencies and culture, and representative bureaucracy leadership theory.

This collection of interviews will be open ended with a directional influence to help examine the research central and secondary questions that follow. What is Extension’s fundamental identity and how is it conceptualized by the institutional leadership? Other secondary questions are also important as exemplified here. How do institutional leaders navigate through issues related to a new metro identity? What types of changes in leadership attitudes are needed to re-calibrate the Extension system in order for it to more easily allow metro initiatives? What is necessary for Extension to take root in a metro setting?

Documents and Communications

A thorough review of historical literature will be necessary. There are a number of historical texts written on the history of the Land Grant and Extension organizations. A tremendous amount of data exists in the legislative language of the Acts that created both the Land Grant and Extension systems. These data are readily available and are rich with history.

Further, the study will include a review of documentation that consists of various written data. This data may include official paper and e-mail correspondence, meeting minutes related to the urban issue as well as any that may help illuminate the perspective of the more traditional program. The College of Agriculture newsletters, college departmental publications, and other university or college documents are also available for review. These methods of data collection will be used in the analysis process for
verification of data to enhance the trustworthiness of any findings. That is, data will be
derived from observation, interviews, and document review in order to provide sound
validation of all data collected and interpreted (Stake, 1995).

Confidentiality

All participants in the study will be provided with specific information related to
this study as well as primary interview questions. In accordance with requirements as
outlined by the Institutional Review Board of Duquesne University. Informed consent
will be documented using a detailed e-mail correspondence and or hard copy format. The
participants will be free to determine if they wished to participate and will be informed
that their identities will be anonymous thus pseudonyms are being used for participants,
locations, program names, etc. Upon completion of the research, all recorded data along
with any transcriptions will be destroyed using the appropriate time frames.

Trustworthiness and Validity

My main data sources will be from open ended interviews and follow-up
informational sharing. During this process, interpretation will proceed in order to better
assert what I uncover and find meaningful (Stake, 1995). Reading and re-reading the
transcriptions will allow for the development of categorizations of all relevant data. Lists
for questioning and strategic direction will be used. The interview sessions will address
the issues of urban / rural cultures as they relate to affecting decisions and decision
makers, as well as an exploration of perceived representative bureaucracy matters.
A review of historical literature will be conducted from available legislative language of the acts that created both the Land Grant and Extension systems. These data are readily available and are heavy with history. As mentioned the study will include a review of documentation that consists of various written data. These methods of data collection and analysis will be used in the triangulation process for verification of data to enhance the trustworthiness of any findings. That is, data will be derived from the interviews and reviews of various documents in order to provide sound validation of all data collected and interpreted (Stake, 1995).

Analysis and Interpretation

I will draw from previous studies carried out by metro Extension researchers such as Dan Panshin; Jack Kerrigan; Morse, Brown, and Warning; Chester Felis, and only a few others. An historical review will allow us to see from where the program came and the context for the here and now. The focus will help to begin to unravel the perspectives in which metro programs operate within a traditional culture and to determine opinions of institutional leaders as they approach decisions related to metro areas such as the Target City. The intent is to investigate the rural/urban divide and explore decisions related to metropolitan impact.

The primary form of analysis will be the construction of categories and themes that recur in patterns across the data. Case study interviews, historical literature, and written documentation will be dissected and reassembled in order to better segment information. Patterns will be sought in order to develop and generalize concepts that are key to this study (Glesne, 2006). Specifically, I will be looking for patterns in all the data.
Once a pattern is found, there is a distinct possibility that something systemic is creating it. This pattern is viewed as a theme (Shank, 2006).

Triangulation is used as a way to confirm certain findings by tracking them across data. At this level it entails examination of the same phenomenon, concepts, theoretical applications, and other data from different perspectives. The intent is to use this triangulation strategy to ensure validity that will bring to focus different data such as historical analysis, cross referencing prior research, written documentation, and information from one or more interviews. Various charts, tables, and graphs will be used in the analysis process, all of which will be available for review. It is critical to incorporate the dependability of data by maintaining an “audit trail” of data and ensure credibility through long-standing relationships with interviewees and in some cases researchers who may also be included. Methodologies will be clear and open regarding the nature of raw data, how it was analyzed, and how categories and themes were formed (Shank, 2006).

Theoretical Framework

Considering the issue of public policy, revenue allocations, stakeholders, leadership, and the interrelationship of these factors, one theory will help to illuminate the issues. The theory of Representative Bureaucracy is the concept that organizations and their leadership should reflect the clients and population they serve (Lim, 2006). Much of the literature about Representative Bureaucracy, understandably, is in relation to democratic governing. The theory, however, continues to be used to illuminate other layers of public service and public administration. It can easily be argued that State
Universities and Land Grant Institutions fall into this latter category. In the theory’s early conceptual framework it was thought that a few cross-sections of our population should be represented, that is they should encompassed class, occupations, and geography. As the concept developed, the notion grew in that group profile representation should be expanded to include racial and ethnic groups, women, more recently in some circumstances the disabled and the elderly (Kelly, 1998), and in this research study, urban and rural cultures.

It appears that this theory has evolved from a simple bureaucratic definition of motivation to a fairly involved description of how individuals and their values affect decisions in more complex organizations. The application of Representative Bureaucracy Theory here could help illuminate the characteristics that preserve the dominant culture to the detriment of the minority culture (Meier, 1998). The question of who is and should be represented, how they are represented within the decision making process, and who should have standing on relevant issues is critically important (Kelly, 1998).

The perspective that Kelly (1998) brings to light is quite valid and is directly relevant to the claims in this research study. She, rightly, draws comparisons with a number of management systems including TQM and New Public Management to help illustrate the importance of the Representative Bureaucratic theory at work. While most in the metro Extension field recognize the disparity in the urban / rural leadership culture, there has been no empirical or scholarly research done especially from this theoretical perspective. I believe that this focus can be significant to the entire Extension field by justifying the need for changes in the established leadership and organizational culture.
The perspective is that those in the majority (e.g. scholars in production agriculture, rural affairs, and the leaders) continue to marginalize those engaged in the urban Extension efforts. I hope to explore the fact that almost the entire systemic leadership in The College and Extension are made up of traditionalists who have moved up through the ranks in traditional agricultural fields and have advanced into leadership positions. Little or no movement in support of metro programming can occur without a leadership that is more culturally diverse in its orientation (Konisky, 2007).

Again, it appears that empirical research in the area of representative bureaucracy is a fertile ground. There are numerous new researchers who have investigated this theoretical perspective such as: Lim, Konisky, Collins, and others. They have investigated this theory from political and non-profit perspectives to those of corporations. Further, they have researched data that informs us of specific nuances within the theory itself. These studies are broad and provide numerous viewpoints on the topic. Representative bureaucracy will also allow exploration of the aspect that an organization could also be provided with insulation from criticism of being a homogeneous culture.

In a recent study, it has been found that administrators who perceive themselves as possessing significant discretion and who are able to assume the role of “minority representative” are more likely to enact policy outcomes that favor minority interests (Sowa and Coleman-Selden, 2003). In this respect, this research study will hope to use representative bureaucracy to illuminate issues as they relate to the needs of the minority urban culture and the leaders who may be held accountable by specific homogeneous stakeholder groups.
Summary

This chapter addresses issues of methodology and approaches to this proposed qualitative study. It is likely that as the research progresses, some modifications may occur to the study in order to enhance its quality. The intent is to remain true to the core purpose of examining the urban versus rural cultures within the Extension system and how they impact the development of the Metro Research and Outreach Center. Of particular interest is the impact on internal leadership decisions of policy and program direction as they relate to the establishment of this initiative and how representative bureaucracy theory helps to define and illuminate the effort.

It is the intent of this study that the data will clarify the issue of rural and urban culture in a Land Grant institution. Further, the study will allow readers a window into the very traditional operations of the College of Agriculture and Cooperative Extension. It will explore how they maneuver through challenging issues and how they take steps into new environments and cultures as while moving towards the establishment of a Metro Research and Outreach Center.
CHAPTER IV - RESULTS

Introduction to Results

After collecting data by interviewing individuals who were engaged in or familiar with, the establishment of the Metro Center, analyzing numerous documents related to the Metro Center, and reviewing electronic correspondence among individuals in the institution, a thorough process of coding revealed numerous emergent themes regarding the planning, development and implementation of this initiative. This chapter provides a description of these themes and explores their interrelationship relative to my major research questions: What is Extension’s fundamental identity and how is it conceptualized by the institutional leadership in its effort to establish a metro initiative? And, how did the traditional College and Extension systems move ahead with the decision to establish an enhanced urban presence?

The effort will begin by introducing the individuals who were interviewed. I will present detailed biographies for each participant in order to establish their possible frames of reference, the culture out of which these individuals have come, and to provide a detailed understanding of them as dedicated and trustworthy individuals. It is important to understand the roots of these interviewees in order to establish the driving forces that caused them to embrace an urban effort that has eluded the mainstream Land Grant and Extension Systems for much of their existence. These individuals, most in key decision making positions, form the foundation for the successful establishment of an urban presence for this state. This core informational data, thematic development, and topical exploration will be presented. This will include data extracted from report documents and
acknowledged communication in the form of e-mail correspondence as well as other key material.

**Backgrounds of the Interviewees**

Eleven interviews with key University personnel were collected between July 8 and August 18, 2008. Each interview began with questions related to the individual’s upbringing. Some of the major questions included: where they grew up, what types of activities they enjoyed as children, their family situations, educational experiences, and their employment history. While some of these items do not directly address the research question, they are critically important in establishing the character and culture of the leadership and support personnel who play key roles in the affirmative decision to move forward with the Metro Center and related activities. Further, they provide insights into the character and trustworthiness of the individuals.

Interviewees are divided into three categories based on their level of influence and position within the institution. All are employees of the institution but serve in different departments and offices. Only one College was represented, that being the College of Agriculture. Descriptions of each category precede the clustered biographies under that section. Please see Table 3 for a breakdown of the interviewees by alphabetical order.
Table 3

*Interview Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Organizational Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldo</td>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>High Level Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>High Level Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo</td>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delfina</td>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>Mid Level Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journey</td>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>Mid-Level Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>University Structure</td>
<td>High Level Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lilli</td>
<td>University Structure</td>
<td>Mid-Level Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>University Structure</td>
<td>High Level Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terri</td>
<td>College of Agriculture</td>
<td>Mid-Level Administrator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biographies of interviewees in this case study

*High Level University and College Administrators*

These individuals are engaged in decision making at the highest levels of the University and College, enabling them to direct significant resources and programming efforts on a system wide level and have direct communications with members of the University board of trustees and other high level internal and external stakeholder groups.

*Administrator 1, Karl*

Karl, who is white, grew up in a small town about 25 miles outside a major American Midwest city in the late 50’s and 60’s. He lived in what is now termed the “T” Zone or the outer ring of suburbia. This community had easy access to the city. While he did not live on a farm, these were easily accessible. The town in which he lived was somewhat close to a section of this major city that was probably one of the most violent in America. This city section was about 97 percent black, and his town was about 99 percent white.

He loved going to the city and was able to attend that city’s major league baseball games with regularity. Karl said, “My grandmother and grandfather worked during the day, but somehow got a popcorn stand in the major league baseball park. So, I used to go to the games all the time. We'd sit there for three innings and then go down and hang out at the popcorn stand to eat. It was right next to the opposing team's dugout. So I got to meet lots of different players, and my grandmother knew all the home team players
because they'd hang out at her popcorn stand.” He was often able to meet and speak with the players. To some degree, this helped shape his keen interest and pursuit of sports.

In those days, almost everywhere in Karl’s community was safe. After going to church each summer morning, he and his friends were free to investigate their town and just be kids. There was total freedom to walk around the town without fear. What he liked most was the fact that you could get into the city and still live in a safe, quiet place. This is important and speaks to a possible link to his interest in urban programming.

Karl attended the local Catholic grade school and high school. He often used his connections with baseball to get bats and autographed balls for use at church festivals or at fundraisers as Karl explained:

I went to Catholic grade school and high school. Whenever we had a festival or a fundraiser, we would get autographed balls with St. Louis Cardinals, or Milwaukee Braves or whatever. My grandmother used to always get us broken bats. And the bats were, I don't know, 42 ounces or more. So whenever we played baseball in the neighborhood, my brother would bring out these bats. He had to stack them a certain way, you know?

For one, some would crack terribly and others were so heavy we could hardly pick them up. Every time we'd play baseball, we'd have our stack and there'd be a Hank Aaron broken bat or whatever. So that was nice.

His father grew up on a farm but aspired to go into a different vocation. After graduating from high school, he went to college to be an electrical engineer. In his sophomore year, his brother got drafted into WW II. Karl’s father was then forced to
return home to keep the farm going while his brother was in the war. So, his dream to be an electrical engineer was denied him because of having to help out on the family farm:

He would have much rather been an electrical engineer than an electrician. And so we went on through Catholic grade school and high school and all of us went to college. I mean, really, that's probably one of the biggest impacts as far as why I'm so focused on adult learners. He lost an opportunity because he just couldn't afford it. He was actually on a tennis scholarship too. I mean, he could have finished college. But, back then he had to go home and help out on the farm. He ended up getting into the union and then in some kind of management role but, it was — it was a lost dream.

This was a prominent life lesson in the family and one that was not lost on the children. Again, this provides some background as to how important issues of adult education and availability are important in his life.

It is obvious that his father’s inability to attain his dream helped to focus Karl’s aspirations. He learned on a fundamentally personal level how terribly important it was to get an education. Another defining character experience was his dad’s activism in the desegregation movement. He marched to help integrate the city. As a child, Karl recalls people throwing objects and hollering inflammatory remarks at his father and other marchers who opposed segregation and all that it represented. Through all of this, his father remained steadfast in his core belief of equal opportunity and freedom for all under the law regardless of race or ethnic background.

As Karl grew up, he excelled in a number of sports. Once out of high school, he attended college and moved quickly through his studies eventually earning a Ph.D. in
education. He attributes much of his success and motivation to his Catholic high school and a particular Jesuit priest, who emphasized that you're supposed to do something to contribute to society. Absorbing the priest’s influence and observing his father’s frustration with his career options convinced Karl that he must devote himself to getting an education. This was transformational for him.

Karl is tall in stature with thinning hair that has begun the graying process. His demeanor is one that is both calm and assertive. He has an easing calm about him that is accentuated by his ability to sit and listen to individuals with whom he is engaged. Self assured and well spoken, he can command attention with his presence. In his heart, Karl believes that what he does is really God's work. He is inspired by the passion his employees bring to their duties each day. He feels his position is fully aligned with his core beliefs:

I am so darn passionate about this work. Sometimes I don't know what my avocation and my vocation are because they are so intertwined. But I saw my father's experience. I saw the transformational nature of learning. This was very powerful for me.

He understands that the institution for which he works is a “steward in place”. That is, unlike corporations, these institutions cannot get up and move to another city or state. There is an alignment of interests with the citizens and communities.

The need for metro engagement was apparent for Karl throughout his career. He held numerous positions within universities that had a presence in downtown areas. He understood the needs of these audiences and the resources his institutions could bring. “You need to be part of the fabric of the community.” This perspective has extended to
his current position. He has the ability to influence decision making processes and align institutional resources to the needs of this current effort. The metro center concept is one that resonates in him, and he has been a staunch supporter of the effort. Karl reports to the president of the institution.

Administrator 2, Alex

Alex was born in an area about 15 miles south of a major metropolitan area located in the Mid Atlantic region. Alex is somewhat slight in stature with medium brown hair that does not reflect his true age which is possibly closer to retirement than one would guess. His manner is quite mild for one in his position and he is reflective when speaking. Conversation flows easily with him and he is happy to share his thoughts and perspective on most any subject. Confident and composed, his voice remains soft and easy throughout any discussion. Humor sometimes blends into his articulations with keen intellect behind the words. He has a very pleasant nature and is engaging, always courteous in his manner.

The region in which he was raised is known for its coal mines and steel mills. His great-grandfather emigrated from Scotland in the mid to late 1800s to find work in America. As with many immigrants, coal mining served as the prime choice of work. His grandfather was eventually able to purchase a couple mines from which he derived decent income. The next generation ended up working in the steel industry as did so many from that region in those days. His father worked for 40 years in a well-known steel mill close to the town in which he grew up.
The value of a college education was a poignant lesson for Alex. Having worked a number of summers in the nearby coke mill, the experience helped him to appreciate the potential benefits of education. While the money was excellent for an 18 or 20-year-old, there was no doubt that he could not wait to get back to college at the end of each summer. It became obvious to him that he would need to study in order to escape a life of dirt and hard labor. Alex stated, “It was a great experience – to see a slice of life that is typical in that industrial region.”

As a young child, his father eventually was able to purchase a plot of land outside of the town in which he was born. His father built the house himself. This new area was somewhat rural, cleaner, and more spacious than the house in the small town. While there were farms in the area, he did not grow up on one. There were benefits of living in this area. One such advantage was the ability to ride horses from nearby land owners. He was also engaged in numerous farming activities by helping neighbors in cleaning stalls, feeding cattle, and bailing hay. For a couple of years he even showed livestock at the local county fair although, he did not own the animals. These experiences were not part of any formal youth organization such as 4-H but, were simply opportunities he enjoyed and was able to exploit by virtue of where he lived.

Alex eventually went to college at a university in the southwest United States. He was able to secure admission through a music scholarship. Having spent many years studying percussion instruments, he was quite good. He explained this as follows:

I went out there to play music. But, fortunately I did not have to be an actual music major. So in many ways, I had the best of both worlds. I could play my music, get paid for it through the scholarship but, went into the
nutrition/biochemistry science track. I have extremely fond memories and a great appreciation for that. My parents were not wealthy by any stretch, so basically my music paid my way through college and I was able to travel extensively with the band.

Fortunately, it was not necessary for him to pursue a study of music at that institution. The opportunity to play music while studying was a marvelous experience for him. In fact, he played in the halftime show of the first NFL / AFC football championship game, the Green Bay Packers and Kansas City Chiefs. Of course, this was the pre-courser of today’s Superbowls. While music was his avocation, in the final analysis it did not become his vocation. After college, he entered the military during the Vietnam War as Army infantry.

Every young man was going to serve in the military one way or the other. I was in for almost 3 years at the end of the 60s. I got orders to ship out for Vietnam. Fortunately, my commanding officer felt that I was too valuable to be sent abroad and thus told them that he needed me here, stateside.

During this same period, he had aspirations to join the Army band. He managed to do well in auditions and ended up being selected.

I had a particular desire to be the Army Fife and Drum Corps. As you know they dressed in revolutionary costumes. But, I wasn’t tall enough. I was a good drummer and passed the music auditions. However, if you’ve ever seen them, there between 5 foot 10 and 6 feet tall. They are within about an inch of one another. You see, they are a straight line of people, all of equal height and build. On my best day, on my tiptoes I would never reach 5 foot 10 or 11.
He returned to the Washington, DC area where he completed his term of military duty. Being well adjusted, highly competent, and confident, these attributes may well explain some of the motivation needed when looking at a challenging decision like the establishment of an urban presence for the Extension program.

Alex exited the Army three months early. He was able to manage this by applying and being accepted in to the graduate program in the same southwestern institution from which he received his bachelor’s degree:

So, why did I go to that southwestern university for graduate school? Because, I could get in by making a phone call. I called my advisor from that school and said, “I need your help. If you can help me get into graduate school, I can get out of the Army three months early”. Within a matter of a few days, he got me accepted into that University’s graduate program. And as they say, the rest is history. Not a whole lot of career planning was going on there.

Since the country was in the midst of the Vietnam era, this was a fortuitous situation. Again, he majored in nutrition and biochemistry.

He continued on to earn his Ph.D., holding various research and teaching faculty positions eventually leading to college administrative positions:

Whatever my academic career is today, as a nutritionist/biochemist I owe to the National Institutes of Health since I was working in fundamentally, a biomedical capacity, not in an agriculture area. Not your typical path for a Dean of the College of Agriculture.

This obviously was not the common path one would take to become a top administrator in a renowned College of Agriculture. From this standpoint, he is not a traditionalist
within the organization. At his previous institution, he was able to explore administrative work by being the research Dean for a one-year interim basis. During that time, he found that he was good at it and enjoyed that kind of work. After one year he was offered that position and accepted. He remained there for approximately 3 years prior to moving to his current position at this institution. Alex reports to the provost of the institution.

Administrator 3, Lydia

Growing up on a small family farm in the Deep South that was purchased by Lydia's parents from her grandparents served as the framework for her future. She is of medium stature with short dark hair and penetrating eyes. Just approaching middle age, she has a light and easy way punctuated by a light southern drawl that allows for conversations to flow without difficulty. Lydia is able to keep a sense of balance aided by her ability to see humor during situations in which it may not be readily apparent. She has a sincere confidence and as a leader is not shy about taking calculated programmatic risks. She has a sincere passion for her work which drives her to work tirelessly at her job, regularly referring to her Blackberry to maintain connections with the issues swirling around her.

The farm on which she grew up was quite small at 40 acres. It was primarily set up to supplement income for the family. Timber was also collected from the farm to provide wood for the heating system.

My mom and dad bought the farm from my grandparents. My mom and dad worked off the farm. So, it was just a place where we had a little land and a few cows that provided supplementary income. It was not by anyone's definition, a
full working farm but it was active. I went to a very small school and the farm was located in a very rural area. I often tell people that I lived 3 miles from the nearest paved road. After dark, you would have to travel 30 miles to buy milk and bread. So, it was very, very rural.

Thirty miles was also the distance to that state's Land Grant institution which was located in the closest city with a population of about 25,000. She lived about 300 miles from the largest city in the state.

Lydia grew up performing many of the typical farm chores. This included cutting and bailing hay, feeding beef cows, and cleaning house. Summer work provided her with some spending money but also kept her out of trouble. She was very engaged in sports as were many of the young people with whom she grew up. As she got older she began to work with an uncle who was an electrical contractor. This work allowed her to travel the entire region doing work in factories, apartment complexes, and residential homes. To some degree, these probably helped her gain experiences off the farm and begin a process of expanded vision outside of rural life.

She attended a State University in the Deep South and received two bachelor degrees: one in Banking and Finance the other in Forestry. After graduation, she worked as a consulting Forester for a number of years. The timber market was very depressed at that time and so it was difficult for a consultant.

Consulting foresters don’t make money when timber is not selling and a good consultant does not encourage his land owner to sell timber when the market is down. So, those two don’t fit very well if you are starting off in the consulting business or working for someone else in the consulting business. It was a bad time
to start my own business and it wasn’t a good time to work for someone else either.

One of her good friend’s father knew that she was looking for work and asked if she would be interested in working for Extension. She had no idea what Extension was nor was she involved in 4-H. This lack of connection with the system that she would eventually be responsible for may have helped her form some fundamental opinions about the relevancy of the program and affect her ultimate decision making regarding the establishment of a metro initiative. She and her family had little or no contact with programs offered out of the Land Grant University.

She was successful in obtaining a 4-H agent position in a nearby county. Of course, she had no inkling as to what a 4-H agent did. Lydia recalled, “I was told that if I work hard and kept my nose clean that I could eventually become an Ag Agent. Of course, that was seen as a significantly better position than a 4-H agent and extremely desirable.” She did not understand the program and thus had a pretty steep learning curve during her early time there. The program was quite small and had little impact with a few small successes. Eventually, she was able to move to a larger county that had a more substantial Extension program. There, she began to see the community impact an Extension program is capable of having. Located approximately 100 miles from the Land Grant institution, she was able to complete her master’s studies in Agriculture and Extension Education. Many concepts such as group process, volunteer management, and community development came into focus for her as she worked through her master’s degree. During this time, her career aspirations began to form.
Realizing that in order to excel in this field, she would need a doctoral degree and began to inquire and receive advice on earning that terminal degree. She was informed that it would not be advantageous to receive three degrees from one institution. Already having two from one university, it would be wise to move and work on her doctorate at another institution. One final piece of advice was given: *get out of the South.* It would be important to be exposed to another region of the country. Soon afterwards, she was offered an assistantship at a northern Land Grant institution. This was the opportunity she needed, so she moved north and began her coursework.

She completed her coursework in five quarters by coordinating it with assistantship activities. After completing her courses, she moved back south to a Regional Extension Agent position. Now, 800 miles away from her support network. Her dissertation slowed to a crawl. After several years of fits and starts, she arranged to sequester herself in an office of the nearby University. There she completed and defended her dissertation on coalitions related to youth at risk, and she finally earned her doctorate. Individuals at that institution were aware of her interests in administration and recommended that she apply for several of these. She consequently did submit an application and secured an administrative position in that northern institution as a district director in the state Extension program.

After working for several years as a district director, she was able to earn tenure based on research work she completed related to administrative functions. Soon, a high level administrative opportunity became available in the central office. She worked in this capacity for several years until an opportunity opened at the current institution. Her
application was successful and she moved into an Extension administrative position for several years prior to securing her current position. She reports to both Karl and to Alex.

Administrator 4, Aldo

Growing up in a large northern state, Aldo came from a family fully engaged in the Cooperative Extension system. One would say that he was steeped in the Land Grant system. He was an active 4-H member when he discovered entomology at a relatively young age. “I discovered entomology at the age of 11 and by the age of 12 I had decided that I wanted to be an entomologist.” His uncle had been a long time county Extension agent in his home county. This combination of life experience and family engagement allowed him to quickly determine his life’s work. He continued to be engaged in 4-H projects until he graduated from high school.

He is tall of stature with short cropped auburn hinted, light brown hair. He sports a short beard and is of average build. His conversation is precise which reveals a keen analytical intellect that carries a sincere love of his work. Aldo is quite respected as a leader and has a calm air of confidence. He is good natured and conversation flows easily without hesitation although his words are well chosen and sentences are constructed flawlessly. This characteristic allows for channels of communication to exist broadly throughout the organization and beyond. It is obvious that he cherishes his position and the work attached to it.

Aldo majored in entomology when he entered his bachelor degree program at a northern Land Grant institution not in his home state. After completing this work, he investigated a program that would have led directly to a Ph.D. in that same field. After
some deliberation, he began to have second thoughts about that level of commitment and so, decided to enter a master’s program instead. After completing this degree, he returned to his home state to work as a 4-H Extension Agent. Many of his duties were well outside the parameters of his youth development duties. He explained,

My paper responsibilities were as a 4-H Extension educator. With a Masters degree in entomology, you can imagine who answered the phone on Monday mornings when the folks who moved out of the city out to the lovely suburbs discovered what had been in their bathtub all weekend long. I pried open a lot of envelopes that had gone through the automated canceling machine at the post office, perfectly flattened insects or a pile of insect parts.

I worked for three years as a county agent. I wouldn’t trade it for anything and I wouldn’t ever do it again. I tell people that if it weren’t for horses and the parents I might have stayed as a 4-H agent for the rest of my career. I have a great admiration for teachers now. Not just dealing with kids in the classroom but dealing with parents and with volunteers. It’s quite a challenge. It makes you think a little differently about our organizational structure and the history of how we translate information.

After three years in this position he returned to school to earn his Ph.D.

Those earlier studies were in insect ecology. This field is very statistically oriented with many controlled variables that are basically uncontrolled. In many ways, he tired of that work. Aldo expressed it as follows, “It just was not my cup of tea. Upon returning to school this time, I began to work in insect genetics. Not just genetics, but how to use genetics to unravel questions in the ecology of insects. In this discipline I was
able to apply my genetics expertise to the area of ecology.’ He explored questions such as, how do insect species use host plants differently and does the choice of the plants they use have consequences for the evolutionary path? This work led him to post doctoral activities each progressing through professorial ranks as well as taking him through two Land Grant institutions.

Aldo had been convinced that he could be successful in administration and thus accepted a fellowship in a part time administrative position concentrating on work in the Agricultural Experiment Station. When the individual who oversaw the research component of the College stepped back into a faculty position, Aldo had to determine exactly how much interest he had in administration. He decided to apply for this full time administrative position. This decision landed him in the position he currently holds. This position has heavy managerial and administrative duties that include fiscal accountability, grant and contract compliance, personnel oversight, and programmatic supervision. While an administrator for over five years, he continues to be engaged both in the research and educational processes through active lab work, teaching, and student mentoring. “I just can’t stop being a professor. It has become my hobby. The professor gig is a pretty good job.” Aldo reports to Alex.

**Mid Level University and College Administrators**

These individuals are engaged in decision making at the levels more in line with specific areas of the University or College. These individuals could be engaged in legislative work, marketing communications or state wide programmatic efforts in a
specific discipline. They are able to only direct very limited resources, if any, but may influence specific programming efforts or functions on a system wide level.

Manager 1, Terri

Terri, who has a pleasant southern accent, grew up in a mid-sized metropolitan area in the Mid-West. She is slight of build and is always very well dressed. She carries herself as a confident professional educator who is easy to talk with and has a very friendly demeanor. Her family consisted of 2 brothers, herself and both parents. Her father had retired from the Air Force. She discusses this as follows:

When I was very young he worked as an insurance adjuster. Later, in the mid 50s she decided to change the direction of his work and opened a shop that specialized in repairing and re-chroming bumpers. Back in those days cars had large chrome bumpers. People would ding them up due to accidents. In fact, hail storms insured that he had a steady flow of business. I used to work in his office during the summers to help him out. After twenty years of that, he purchased a farm on which he worked with her brother.

Terri's brother continues to work that farm for his livelihood. Her mother was a nurse by training.

She has a very large extended family with many of them living on farms and in rural areas. She loved to go visit them but they also enjoyed visiting the city where they could go shopping and eat out. She was fortunate to have significant interaction with this extended family. Her home life was somewhat uncomplicated. Terri explained it as follows below.
For a while I attended an urban public school. We lived in a very small two-bedroom house near a large aircraft manufacturer. It was a pretty noisy area because of those jets flying in and out all day and night. Eventually, my parents tired of this and moved to the outer edge of the suburbs.

There, I attended quite a rural high school. We still had all of the amenities of a large city nearby which was kind of nice. But, it was in this the rural high school where I had some real leadership opportunities that I did not particularly have in the city school. I became president of the National Honor Society as well as an officer in a youth group called the K’etts. These organizations allowed me to work with the teachers, learn leadership skills, and engage in community service activities. I think my initiation into leadership began at that high school. These organizations were not 4-H; however, they were similar in the types of activities they afforded her. In fact, 4-H discriminated against people who did not live on a farm. Since she did not, she was discouraged from joining.

Later attending a small liberal arts College in the Mid-West, she majored in business administration and home economics. During her senior year there, she visited the Extension office to see the type of programming being offered. Also, local Extension agents were brought into some of her classes to talk about the work that was being done in the field of home economics at a community level. After completing her B.S., she earned her master’s degree in clothing and textile, and interior design. She had been accepted into a scholarship graduate program that helped college women find careers in community education. As such, she was able to intern with the local Extension office where she developed programs in clothing and textiles then partnered with Extension
agents in the area to deliver the programs in those communities. These experiences helped to shape her understanding of the power of Cooperative Extension by delivering relevant information to local community residents on their own terms.

I was able to organize some community workshops in the field of clothing and textiles. I partnered with Extension agents to do these workshops in their communities. It was that experience that I saw the jobs that could be available to me – I kind of got it then – as to what Extension work was all about. And that it provided education to people who wanted to come to our educational programs. They had a desire to receive more information and education.

We had hundreds of people who would come to these workshops. That was pretty thrilling for a graduate student to see all these people come out to our sewing workshops. That was a lot of fun, being the center of attention. People were hanging around after hours wanting more information, writing us, calling us on the phone. It was like, gosh, can I find a career in this kind of stuff?

Terri had became enamored with the idea of getting information to the individuals and communities that requested and needed it. This realization helped frame her career choices directing them towards work in Cooperative Extension. Upon completing her graduate degree, she was hired into a faculty specialist position in a well known southern Land Grant institution. Serving as a faculty Extension specialist on main campus, she was able to apply her knowledge in the field to the development of materials for use throughout the state. During this time, Extension had significant resources and was able to employ up to five individuals at main campus working as clothing specialist in the textile area. There were also significant resources available for the abundant staffing of
other disciplines such as nutrition, economic development, and housing. She flew all over that state providing educational programming. In some cases, there could be as many as several hundred people attending sessions on sewing and other textile topics. Terri was fortunate to be part of the experience when Extension had significant funds at its disposal.

During this time, her father grew ill so, she took a position back in her home state as a county Extension agent. This allowed her to work closer to her home town and be near her family while still engaging in the work she had quickly grown to love. Again, she offered classes to the general public and always had her classes brimming. This led to her being encouraged to begin working on her Ph.D. at the Land Grant school seventy miles away. She was told that Extension would have a place for her if she completed this degree. This did turn out to be the case and so, after completing her doctoral work under full scholarship, she took a position as a statewide clothing and textile specialist in her home state. This post allowed her to train many Extension agents and 4-H leaders across the state. During that time, in the late 80’s there were over 20,000 youth enrolled in the 4-H Clothing Program across that state, including programming in the many metro areas. These metro programs had reasonably sized staff and provided solid programming to their urban audiences. One county office had a state of the art facility in the metro area where Extension and that Land Grant Institution were quite prominent.

After several years in this position, she was recruited to a Southeastern Land Grant institution into an administrative position. She worked there for some five years overseeing the state Family and Consumer Science program. Here again, there were some very strong Extension programs in large metro areas that served both suburban as well as
urban clientele. These programs were quite visible with significant exposure on local television and radio. After a number of years there, she moved into her current administrative position where she provides program specific, state wide leadership in the area of Children and Youth and Families. This includes the programs 4-H, youth development, and Family and Consumer Science. Terri reports to Lydia.

Manager 2, Journey

Most of Journey’s upbringing occurred in one of the Mid-Atlantic States. She lived with both parents and three siblings, three sisters and a brother. She describes her early years as somewhat mundane. There didn’t seem to be anything out of the ordinary and to some degree may have felt her life was somewhat boring. She is average in build with medium length light brown hair. Her blue eyes are penetrating and she speaks with a passion about her role in the College system. Journey is somewhat reserved but chooses her words carefully when she speaks. She is politically savvy and understands the messages underlying the University and the public system that supports it. Having the responsibility for external communications, she is adept at negotiating the interactions and relationships that affect the College and Extension.

As a teenager, she received little guidance from her parents regarding the field of study she could pursue. Journey attended the Land Grant University of the state in which she grew up. She always had the desire for a living on a farm. Unfortunately, she never got the opportunity to do so. She had and continues to have a great love of animals, horses in particular however, her experience with career guidance took an interesting twist as she explained here.
I wanted to go into veterinary sciences. I started in the College of Agriculture majoring in animal science. Unfortunately, I met with advisers who at that time were very much discouraging people from going into veterinary sciences. They told me that you had to work really hard and it was more difficult to get into veterinary schools than medical school. So, I changed my major to horticulture. Not really sure why but, I did. Looking back, scholastically I think I could have handled it. Would I have gotten into a veterinary school? I don’t know. I mean, I graduated with good grades; with honors. Who knows what could have been.

Since she had a strong background in biology, it seemed that perhaps horticulture was after all the right field to pursue. She met her husband while in college. They were married shortly after graduation; she with a degree in horticulture, he in forestry. Soon thereafter, her husband received an offer to work in the wood industry so, they moved to the south.

She worked as a grower for quite some time with a seed company. As a forester, her husband was employed in a position that engaged him in land management for some large lumber companies. Depending on the extent to which the lumber market rose or fell, he would need to change jobs from time to time. This did require them to move periodically. After some eight years in the south, her husband was offered a position that returned them to their home state. This afforded them the opportunity to return to more familiar surroundings.

Her husband worked in the field of forestry during the time of the spotted owl controversy. She was thrust into one of the most contentious debates in environmental history. As one could imagine with a husband in the timber industry, she became
extremely engaged in issues of public policy, community resources, public education funding, and the local political system. Journey became quite occupied with efforts to diversify the economy and industries in her area to reduce reliance solely on timber. This situation allowed her to begin working closely with a prominent state senator who supported the lumber industry as well as the people and communities he believed it sustained. Working with the local community and an economic development group she explained her experience here.

Living in the middle of the national forest, our school districts were dependent on the national forest lands to generate revenue. This went back to support the communities and was extremely important because it was such a huge part of the tax base. So, when policies began affecting the future of our community, I got very involved. I had pretty good communications skills anyway and was somewhat politically astute. I got this job with a local community development group that focused on hardwood timber. These had been established across the state to address broad issues associated with the hard wood industry. These groups tended to focus on secondary utilization or alternative manufacturing because the hardwood industry just dominates there.

When I moved into the position there were huge environmental issues. One was the spotted owl. They were stopping harvesting all over the place. There was significant land management and it was affecting communities quite drastically. So I got involved in public relations and legislative affairs. We got involved in a lot of policy issues. I even got involved at the national level and won an award for the work I did.
This experience directed her to become even more politically active, eventually being offered positions in industry that were more aligned with lobbying and advocacy efforts.

Journey’s husband was moved once again back to their home state to take a better position in the wood manufacturing industry. She was soon offered a position at this Land Grant Institution that allows her to utilize her knowledge and experience in these matters. Journey states:

This was a really, really nice fit. It’s been a really nice setting combining private industry and academia. Private industry knows that I understand them and can communicate that within academia. I think it’s worked out fairly well. I like to think so. I was a little hesitant at first but I just love what I do. It is so much fun. My daughter says that working for the institution from which I graduated I have come full circle.

Her position is more aligned with the efforts directed to external audiences. These external audiences include, primarily, the traditional stakeholders of a Land Grant institution. These areas of production agriculture, forestry, and rural development are at the core of her value system and she is passionate about her role there. Journey reports directly to Alex.

Manager 3, Lilli

The oldest of three siblings, Lilli grew up in a small town in the center of a Mid-Atlantic State. She and her family would occasionally leave this town in order to attend shows, view entertainment, or just shop. There were some larger towns within about a forty five minute drive, but the big city was almost two hours away. Lilli is thin, always
well dressed and has an air of quiet confidence. Her demeanor is always friendly and easy to approach. She is medium height with a slender build and very attractive at middle age. She has light eyes, and short brown hair that falls in waves around her face.

At the age of eight, she was introduced to her new born, youngest sibling. She recounts it as follows:

I am the oldest of three and am a small town girl who supposedly made big. Being the oldest of three was a little different because the youngest was a handicapped child. And so, I was very involved in taking care of people from a very early age. I was eight when she was born. I was also the most “goody two shoes” you can imagine because I figured that my parents had enough to handle and they didn’t need any crap from me. And so, yeah, I was captain of the cheerleaders, president of the YWCA Youth program, straight “A” student, blah, blah, blah, you know all that stuff. I tried to be the achiever that my parents couldn’t have with their third kid.

Lilli’s father was a self taught engineer. He was the first employee of a newly established engineering firm. He became a partner and through his help this company became a prominent engineering firm in the state. Her mother was a stay at home mom raising the children and caring for the youngest child. Her family provided support for Lilli to attend the state’s Land Grant institution from which she graduated with a degree in marketing. She began working in the marketing arena for a large corporation that had a wood flooring division. She moved up in the corporate structure eventually re-locating to the south and spending a number of years there.
During this time, she was married to an individual who was a landscape architect from the area around her home Land Grant institution. They eventually moved to a large New England city where he established a business and where she worked in the corporate headquarters of the company in which she was employed. She helped her husband establish his business which became quite successful.

After a number of years, a position came open at the Land Grant University of their home state. This position seemed to have been written specifically for him. He was hired. This however, required her to leave her corporate position. Fortunately, she was hired in the Outreach section of the University where she is currently employed. Lilli explained it as follows:

I’m glad that we made the move however after that my goal was never to work anywhere for any longer than about a year at a time from then on. And I’ve now been with outreach for 18 years. So, I don’t change employers well. Fortunately, my job changes every couple years or I’d be out of here. Something new comes along that slightly changes what I do and it’s worth staying. So, I do. I would be bored if it wasn’t changing.

Currently, my role is to, primarily, due three things. First, manage a team of people who are developing relationships that should result in enrollments and revenue for outreach units. Secondly, I get involved with helping other people throughout the organization think about external clients and what does that mean and how do we need to change and help them to be stronger in their relationships. And I also help by serving on the outreach executive team looking at how we are doing lots of things but keeping the external client in mind as we’re looking at
new strategies. I also manage the outreach advisory board for the vice president. It has about 35 people seated on it.

Her focus is to establish or strengthen corporate relationships so that the institution can provide educational and training programming. The intent is to assist in enhancing the capabilities of this state’s companies so that they can be more successful in their industry as well as to generate revenue for the institution. Lilli reports to Karl.

Manager 4, Donald

Donald was born into a traditional Italian-American family that, like many, had its roots in a small community referred to as Little Italy. Located in a small city of the mid Atlantic region, there were strong ties with friends and family. Just prior to his birth, his family moved to a community at the outer edge of the suburbs. He is above average in height with relaxed and pleasant features. His thin, dark hair is showing signs of graying. He has an easy-going nature and is easy to speak with. His years of experience in his discipline allow his confidence and humor to blend easily. There is an air of calm and comfort within that lends added confidence to his words.

Growing up, he attended the local public school. His schoolmates were equally divided between those whose families were engaged in either factory work or farming. He was raised in a traditional family with two brothers and a sister and whose father was an accountant for a large manufacturing corporation. For a short period of time he was engaged in Cub Scouts. Donald said, “I was in the Cub Scouts for about two months. One day, my mother called me and said, ‘Donald, it’s time to stop playing your baseball pick-up game and go to the Cub Scout meeting.’ And I said I quit because I didn’t want to stop
playing baseball. Right then and there, that was the end of that.” Like many children growing up in the late 60s, sports played a significant role in his young life. Donald describes it as follows:

All I did was play sports -- all sports. We played in organized sports but just as many disorganize sports. Baseball was my big love although, when I ended up going to middle school and high school, I played basketball as well. I was, however, pretty accomplished at baseball. That was really my sport. And golf in the summertime – I enjoyed golf too. In high school I played baseball, basketball, and golf. That and chasing girls were my only to general activities. And, they were full-time activities.

On occasion he and his friends would also take a short trip over the state border. This neighboring state had an 18 year old drinking law which allowed them to enjoy various beverages typically unavailable to them in their home state.

A very low percentage of his high school class pursued higher education. As with many communities where factory employment was prominent, young people felt that entering that line of work was more profitable than pursuing an education. Of course this fallacy resonated strongly there. Those who came from farming background simply were in line to take over farm operations. After a year and a half of factory work while in high school, it became evident to him that this was not the type of work for which he was suited. He enrolled and was accepted into a branch campus of that state’s Land Grant institution and after two years transferred to the main campus with a major in European history. This was a subject in which he was very interested; even when in high school as he explained here.
I would sit and thumb through the World Book Encyclopedia. That’s how I would often entertain myself. I wouldn’t read books or anything but, I would go through the encyclopedia. I had my favorite letters - W’s for war and P’s for presidents. I was just naturally inclined to and very interested in history. It’s something I always enjoyed and stuck with.

After receiving his bachelor’s degree and in no real hurry to enter the job market, he applied for graduate studies in that same institution. He earned his M.A. degree, again in history. He found this to be a terrific liberal arts discipline and wonderful preparation for his type of future work.

While finalizing his graduate work he developed an interest in diplomacy and politics. Donald decided that he should try to find work in government even though he had no connections within that field. He recalls that period of time.

I knew absolutely no one in Washington D.C. or the state capital. I did have a referral to meet someone in the state capital. Frankly, I didn’t know the difference. My girlfriend would drop me off at the bus station so that I could catch a bus that I would take me to the state capital. I would just get off there and start knocking on doors of different people in the General Assembly. I’d introduce myself and tell them that I was graduating with a Masters degree and interested in working with the General Assembly. Then through a series of introductions and referrals I was incredibly fortunate to be hired by the Democratic leader of the House of Representatives, though I never met him before. I actually met him the first day I started at work. As it turns out, I interviewed with the Chief of Staff who appreciated my background in history – a liberal arts education with the
ability to think, communicate and write well. That single event has set me on a course for the remainder of my professional career.

That legislator was a legend as a state politician and the position catapulted Donald’s career.

During this time, he met a staff member who would eventually become his wife. Needing to do something entirely different, he worked as a stockbroker for a short period of time. He then moved into a position as a lobbyist for the State School Board Association. Donald held a number of educational legislative advocacy positions within the educational system including the school board of a large urban center. Later, he was hired by this state Land Grant institution. He works quite closely with Journey. He and his colleagues report to the president of the institution.

College Faculty and Staff

These individuals are involved in delivering educational activities in teaching, research or Extension work in the College. They typically are engaged in finding resources to support their work. They can direct some very limited resources and programming efforts to a specifically focused field. Over the years, they have been engaged in numerous College support functions such as serving on planning and search committees.

Faculty 1, Angelo

As an Army brat, Angelo’s family moved around quite a bit from New England to Germany to the South, and more. When he was about ten years old, his father retired
from the military with twenty two years of service and the family settled back in New England. His parents were somewhat older when they got married and had children. His father who served in the Pacific Theater during World War II already had in excess of ten years in the Army before Angelo was born. After retiring, his father worked a number of different full time jobs from managing a bowling alley to working in his brother’s liquor store. Angelo’s mother was a stay at home mom until the kids left home. She then went to work as a teller in a local bank.

Of average build, Angelo has thinning hair that shows signs of graying. His glasses perch easily on his nose that is framed by a slightly rounded face. His eyes are light and, as an avid bike rider, his build is somewhat strong but not lean. Always sporting casual attire, he is quite jovial, open and completely honest in his conversation. A passionate supporter of the Land Grant mission, his opinion is not hidden and he has a carefree confidence in his perspective. He will share this with anyone interested in listening. Angelo is a well seasoned faculty member who has much respect from administration due to his entrepreneurial efforts.

Angelo was fortunate to live on Long Island Sound in a town with a population of about 10,000. During the summer months, the town grew to over 30,000 since it served as a haven for tourists trying to escape New York City and other crowded places. There were numerous cottages that were only occupied for those few summer months. He recalls his youth:

I worked a lot. When I was in high school I work 35 hours a week in a grocery store. I think I had more money in my pocket then than I do now. I was on the golf team and the chess team and other kind of stuff but never on the
football team where you would have to spend lots of hours with it. My main passions back then was working on cars - pretty average thing for those days. I never had anything to do with agriculture or anything like that. I don’t think my parents even ever had a garden. We may have grown a few tomatoes but that was about it.

He stayed in New England and attended one of the Land Grant institutions there for his bachelor degree in biology. During his studies, his advisor offered him a job in the insect museum at the university. There he worked with all of the pin specimens. This actually interested him greatly. Growing up in the 60’s, like many of that era, he was focused on the here and now. He recounts what happened next.

I don’t even remember doing this but I applied for entry into a master’s program at the same Land Grant Institution. I totally forgot I did it. Then about two weeks before graduation, I was saying to myself, hmm what am I going to do in two weeks. And then I went to the mailbox pulled out a letter and lo and behold, I had been accepted into the graduate program. Well then, I guess I’ll go to grad school. And so, that’s how it all started. I ended up studying bee biology. Obviously not a whole lot of career planning took place with that.

A number of years later, he consequently earned his Ph.D. from a Mid-Atlantic Land Grant university, in honey bee pollination of blueberries and cranberries. This is where he got his first introduction to agriculture. During this entire time, he had no exposure to Extension and the only knowledge he had was found in the TV program, Green Acres. He was unaware of anything outside of his research activities.
Following his doctorate, he moved to the South and became engaged in research projects for approximately five years, all supported by grant funding. The first of these was to study the biological and economic implications of pesticides regulations. He served as a biologist on that study. Afterwards, he was engaged in research to evaluate Integrated Pest Management practices across the country. Angelo then applied for and was hired at this institution as a tree fruit entomologist leading him to his current position which engages him in national and international activities. Angelo reports to his department head and ultimately to Alex.

Faculty 2, Delfina

Having grown up in a relatively large College town in the mid Atlantic region, Delfina’s family was well-respected with a very rich history in that region. She was the older sister of three brothers living with both of her parents. Delfina is a bit heavy set with a cheerful demeanor. She has a contagious, large laugh and is quite young at heart. She is extremely bright and intuitive with excellent analytical skills. Her colleagues give her significant respect as do many in administration. Being a bit past middle age, she possesses a great deal of wisdom and is very knowledgeable about the history of the College and Extension.

Her grandfather was a primary figure in her life:

He was actually orphaned at a very young age and went to work for an aunt. Her family owned a hotel but they owned and lived on a 250 acre farm. She was a slight woman described as a Battle Axe by many. She ended up actually farming the land herself in her later years. My grandfather ended up with that farm and
was quite an entrepreneur. He was a smart cookie, a very smart cookie. His name was Benjamin Franklin. Totally cool, that was his name. He ended up graduating number one at Cornell in law. He became an attorney but he always loved two things, he loved the country and he loved the College of Ag. So how does an attorney feel so attached to the College of Ag? I always thought the same thing. Who knows what he took as an undergrad but I think it all comes down to his roots. He grew up in the country yet, he could read Greek and he could read Latin. He was one smart cookie.

Her father followed in the same footsteps as his father before him and became an attorney moving into the position of district attorney for this large town. He also maintained a relationship with the farming community performing legal services for many of the prominent farmers in the area. The family was well known throughout the region as being fair and supporting the local farming community through challenges with deeds and other land related controversial issues.

Living in the environment of a large university as a young child was somewhat difficult. College towns typically are quite transient. College students and faculty come and go. This is the nature of areas where a major university is present. As a result there was a lot of rabid change. She found some security through her involvement with Girl Scouts. She attended the local public school and was a strong swimmer on the school teams for both competitive racing and water ballet.

During the 60’s there was significant unrest particularly on and around college campuses. While she distanced herself from many of these activities they continually swirled around her community. During this time her father’s law office was inadvertently
bombed with a Molotov cocktail. Rallies and demonstrations were a regular occurrence. It was quite an exciting place during momentous times. All this helped shape her perspective of the world and the manner in which she would choose to engage it.

As Delfina was growing up, women were not much a part of the labor force. During the 60’s, they were only beginning to make their way into the American workforce. She had a genuine interest in biology and it was obvious that she was quite gifted in the sciences. In fact, throughout her public school years, she took the highest level courses in mathematics and easily aced all of them. This was the time just after Sputnik and science was highly emphasized. So, while she excelled in these studies her sense was that there would be a lack of opportunities for her and other women her age. At one point as she considered college, she expressed her desire to pursue a career in the field of ornithology. Her parents and family, of course, did not think this was appropriate and she explained that here.

You know when I was growing up; women were not in the labor force very much. So, it was just starting to turn over and there were a lot of transitions in a lot of ways. So, I was in biology and landscape architecture for a long period of time because my parents thought that I would be a great florist. Truly, and I said that my strongest suit, mom and dad, is math. I was like; you want me to be a florist? Hummm, I don’t know about that. Actually, I thought I could go into ornithology but, of course, the family said that it wasn’t a girl thing to do either. Their expectation was that at 22 years of age I would simply get married and have a family. Well, this scenario was simply not in the cards. And, I certainly wasn’t going to be a florist.
She attended that Land Grant University in her town with an initial major in biology; this after some contentious family discussions. Unfortunately, there were simply no women in biology and opportunities with such a degree seemed unattainable. It was apparent to her that neither her family nor society supported her decision to pursue this field of study. After a short period of time, Delfina transferred her major to landscape architecture. This program was discontinued. "In mid semester the professor left the room and never came back. I mean never. He must have just taken off and no one ever saw him afterwards. It was real weird." And so she finished with a degree in agricultural economics. She decided on this field because it allowed her to pursue both her math and environmental interests and also enabled her to graduate on time.

Afterwards, Delfina did get married at 22 just like her family had said. There was, however, a twist:

My husband got his degree in chemistry the same time I graduated. He decided he liked the Pacific Northwest. So, he applied to a Land Grant in that region and was accepted. So, he said, I’m going out there. Come on, we’re gonna get married and head out there. We took a 1963 Valiant with a trailer hitched to the back and took it out to the new University job – really far away.

She enrolled in graduate school there and earned her degree in Agricultural Economics, Natural Resources. Her skills in computer programming enabled her to serve as a staff member of that department essentially paying her to get the degree. After eight years there, she moved slightly more west and earned her doctorate, again, in Agricultural Economics, Natural Resources. Soon thereafter, she applied for and was hired at her
current position. Delfina serves as a distinguished faculty member in the College of Agriculture. She reports to her department head and ultimately to Alex.

**Faculty 3, Iris**

As a true Midwesterner, Iris grew up outside of a midsized industrial city with her mother, father and one older brother. This area was somewhat rural and the family business was one of greenhouse production and also served as a truck farm where they would sell products brought in from farms in other areas. As a child she helped in all aspects of the business. She explained, “I did everything from pulling weeds, planting beans, pulling corn, taking it to market and selling at our retail stand. I’d also do similar work in the greenhouse.” Her father was a horticulturist with a bachelor’s degree from that state’s Land Grant institution. He started a nursery business soon after the end of World War II in 1946. He was adept at blending the horticultural science with business acumen. His detailed record-keeping allowed him to determine all of the necessary specifics for growing schedules, quantities, and product. In a different aspect of his life, her father was integrally involved in community activities. Iris explained it as follows:

Another thing that was prominent for me and important to me in my background is that my dad was very much involved in the community – with civic groups, YMCA, the schools. He was also very knowledgeable in governmental issues such as zoning, particularly in how they impacted our place. I was able to see my father beyond horticulture and the business, effectively deal with people, communicate and engage individuals in all of these community-based activities to get things done.
With the growth and expansion of the nearby city, their operation eventually found itself in the midst of suburbanization. As such, all of the pressures regarding land use and development became a part of Iris’ experience throughout her high school years and beyond. This situation, in addition to her father’s engagement in community issues, helped to guide her in her educational pursuit and ultimate career decisions. She, like her brother, attended local public schools. They were both pressed to excel in school due to the high regard for higher education that her parents held. This value for education propelled both she and her brother into high quality universities in the pursuit of an education that could enable them to gain entry into professional career paths.

Being of average height and weight her posture is one formed from years of reading and study. She is thoughtful in her word choices and precise in her descriptions. Her medium colored eyes are penetrating yet kind. She is open and discussions flow smoothly. Easily approachable, she maintains a very friendly demeanor. Iris was once a high level administrator who has recently stepped away from that role and has refocused her energies towards her academic research interests. She was involved in early organizational restructuring activities as well as the launch of a number of new organizational directions. As such, her systemic understanding runs deep and her historical perspective is unmatched. Passion for the organization, its direction as well as academic foci is evident as she discusses these subjects.

Iris attended a small, high-quality, Liberal Arts College in the northern mid Atlantic region. She earned a BS degree in economics. While she intended on studying biology, her second semester there placed her into an introductory economics course. At that point, she fell in love with that discipline. She was fascinated with it due to its social
application and its inclusion of issues related to social justice. Iris recounts this experience here.

I went to university, like many others, thinking they are going to be science majors. I was interested in biology coming out of my background. My second semester I took an economics course – it was an introduction to economics. That was it. I simply fell in love with the discipline. I loved the analytics of it and the social dimension as well. Economics is about social costs and benefits, social issues, if you will. It is not at all equivalent to business. People often make that mistake. There is an aspect of distributive justice and equity. In retrospect, I took that first course from one of the most prominent production economists of the last 30 or 40 years. He was just a young guy who was just out of University of Chicago back then. Looking back, I probably got something that was pretty darn special. He obviously transferred some of that passion to me. So, that was it. I did the switch and have done economics ever since.

This experience led her to pursue her master’s degree and a doctorate from a prominent Midwestern Land Grant institution. Her advanced degrees focused more towards resource economics and policy with an attention to distributive justice all within the context of natural resources, environment, and community development. Her transcendent learning was the belief that as academics, scholarship is pluralistic with many dimensions and seamless from knowledge creation to application.

Curiously, she was not cognizant of the Land Grant and Extension world. During her early days at the greenhouse, her family was visited by the local Extension agent. She did not draw any importance to this as she pursued her studies. Both her master’s and
doctorate were earned through the College of Agriculture at that Land Grant institution and only towards the end of her studies did she become exposed to Extension.

After completing her doctoral work, she moved to this state University as a young faculty member in the mid 70s. After 13 years as an academician, she had the opportunity to shift into a mid-level administrative position where she was engaged in an area with one of the large metropolitan areas of the state. After some years there she progressed into a high-level administrative position in the College and Extension system where she was engaged in major organizational restructuring activities. She served in this capacity for some time until moving back to a faculty position. As other faculty, Iris reports to her department head and ultimately to Alex.

Biographical Summary

Significant time and effort has gone into presenting these biographies in order to establish the culture out of which these individuals came. The details in each provide a glimpse into their backgrounds and allow for some insights into their character. As this study evolves, it is important to understand the paradigm in which each interviewee resides. In particular, the nature of the environment from which the administrative leaders come demonstrates the difference from individuals who may have been raised on a working farm, in rural America with a lifelong career in agriculture or agricultural Extension.
Setting the Stage

As with most all organizations that rely on public funding, the role of special interest groups can wield significant power over funding and programmatic decisions. This State’s Land Grant and Extension programs are no different. Each organization is reflective of the individuals to whom they provide services. For those organizations such as agriculture and Extension, where the clients are more wealthy or connected with various industries and corporations, this support can be quite substantial. The culture of the organization and the nature of its leadership are difficult to alter and almost impossible to ignore. Various data will show that this State University and its Extension system were able to overcome some of the stakeholder pressures in order to establish a progressive urban effort outside the boundaries of the traditional culture and certainly outside of their comfort zone.

As far back as the late 1980s, a previous dean, had developed an urban strategy understanding that it was of critical importance to the future of the College and Extension. This report recommends that the College accentuate its existing presence in urban and metropolitan areas of the state. These urban programs should continue to be grounded in research with some resident educational experience and Extension expertise. In a report completed and published in 1990, the following excerpt appears (A full report appears in Appendix A, College of Agriculture Programming for Urban and Metropolitan Areas, Executive Summary (1990).)

To move towards this goal, we recommend establishing an urban initiative with five components: an urban information system, an urban youth development
initiative, an urban neighborhood/community development initiative, an urban agriculture, food, and environment initiatives, and urban research initiative

This former Dean served in the capacity of what is referred to as a “super Dean”. This was defined as a Dean who administered both the College of Agriculture resources as well as all of the funds that came from federal and state sources in support of the Extension effort. During that time, data showed that he was perceived by many in the organization as no friend to Extension. Further, he had lost favor with the legislators who were seen as significant stakeholders for these same reasons thus making it difficult to receive increases in state budgets for a number of years during his tenure. These many years later, the data seemed to indicate that one of the reasons for his diminished influence was due to his efforts in supporting urban activities. One could say that for decades, this institution has wrestled with the concept of urban Extension. A number of interviewees express this issue regarding the role that the College could have in urban areas. However, with respect to this particular piece of research, Iris explained some of it, in detail.

We defined, I think very clearly, very coherently a role for a college of agriculture in an urban setting that could have been the template for the metro center as we talk about it today. When we did the study it was grounded in the ideas, perceptions, and the sensibilities of community leaders, Extension educators, faculty, and business people from the urban areas within the state. We prepared a document, a brief four page kind of document that was then used by the Dean and presented around the state.
I was frankly frustrated over the years that there was never any action. For whatever reasons, politically, resources, choices that were made by the administration were beyond my ability to impact. You know we never really got anything off the ground until now.

One of the things the College was trying to anticipate at that point in time was that the University was interested in how we could make a larger play in urban areas. One of the reasons for doing this study was to come to the table at Old Main with a reasonable idea about how the College of Agriculture might contribute to that kind of initiative on the part of the entire institution.

Now, the University backed away from that. I don’t know the reasons exactly, probably the usual politics. So, Dean Mancuso was prepared with this idea and I think it was presented. It never really was able to get any traction institutionally. Internally to the College of Agriculture, there is absolutely no questions that there was stakeholder and faculty and educator resistance to the idea because in some people’s mind, this is a cultural thing and a philosophical thing, the urban areas were not areas in which we ought to be doing business anyhow. God knows not to develop a special center and initiative.

Resistance was very real on the part of stakeholders our educators and our faculty. Not everybody but a significant internal political group resisted that. They resisted us being in the larger urban area at all for example. So part of it was philosophical, part of it was a cultural thing.

It’s not something that we do in the College of Agriculture. We’re devoted to paying attention to production agriculture. And also frankly, it was a perception
of loss of resources if we were to invest in a major way in urban areas. These other groups perceive that support for them is diminished somehow. That was a very real issue as well in that dynamic. So, I think those were major forces, stakeholder politics, internal politics, the thoughts and culture of production agriculture. We don’t do much beyond the farm gate.

It became obvious that there was little desire on the part of the University to support this initiative. Thus, receiving no reinforcement from the previous president or from the Board of Trustees for efforts to establish urban initiatives, they were forgotten for some time. In 1996 a new University president was installed. This leader had a different vision for the role of Extension within the context of the greater institution. Essentially, he hoped to expand the role of Extension by expanding it as a major vehicle to provide outreach services from across every College throughout the state. The former Dean of the College of Agriculture was encouraged to step aside and a new Dean, Alex, was hired. At this time, the role of College dean and that of director of Extension were separated and a state director of Extension was appointed with dual reporting responsibilities to both the dean and to the vice president of Outreach. Iris served as the State Director of Extension.

Iris had a strong conviction towards the support of an Extension effort that increased its profile and capacity in the state’s major metropolitan areas. During her tenure, she expressed her frustration often. Through the end of the 1990s and early into the new century, there were a few attempts to elevate programming levels in the urban areas. These efforts, however, were never provided funding nor did there appear to be
sufficient internal and external stakeholder support for the overall effort. Iris continues as exemplified by the following more extensive discourse.

Question: You did mention a good bit here about the internal stakeholders. Could you go into a little more detail with external stakeholders and the kind of pressures they may have exerted and who they might have been, not by name but just by groups or what have you.

Iris: Sure. The classic, the traditional agricultural interest groups and organizations were resistant to a larger urban presence by the Farm Bureau and a couple large agricultural players. I can’t cite you a letter that says this but the other various producer and commodity groups that felt that our attention should be focused on production agriculture and not production agriculture in small farms, small plots on urban fringe but rather extensive production agriculture.

I’ll even state this a little more harshly or a little more definitively. I think we have been captured politically by those interests and those groups. This is a consequence that has been very difficult to bring progressive vision and change to our organization and also to meet our Land Grant commitment. Our commitment as a Land Grant institution it is to serve all the people of the state and I think we have historically allowed ourselves to be captured politically by narrow, relatively narrow interest within the agriculture and food system.

Factors in the Establishment of the Metro Center

After decades of innumerable attempts at developing strategies for addressing the needs of urban audiences through the Land Grant and Extension Systems, there are very
few success stories. Of some 70 Land Grant institutions across the nation, a virtual handful has successfully penetrated the urban boundaries with full support of their state wide systems. Those who were successful required extraordinary leadership, savvy, patience, and luck. While this was presented in Chapter II, it is important to reiterate the position as the discussion regarding the development of the Center unfolds here.

During the research for this case study it became evident that a unique alignment of people and circumstances materialized allowing for the successful establishment of an urban initiative by The State University and its Extension System. Those characteristics that are of towering importance for understanding the circumstances include: the alignment of key leaders, administrative and faculty support during the initial planning process, the strategic plan, and internal and external factors amid the committee driven action plan process. These characteristics will be explored more fully here. Please refer to table 4 for a timeline of these activities.
### Activity Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Group # 6 Final Report</td>
<td>October, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Strategic Planning Team Kick Off</td>
<td>November, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Strategic Plan Submission</td>
<td>December, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Strategic Plan submitted for approval</td>
<td>February, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach Task Force On Urban Areas</td>
<td>February, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Center Committee Charge</td>
<td>May, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Center stakeholder meeting</td>
<td>August, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Center committee final report</td>
<td>December, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alignment of Key Leaders

It seems to be purely happenstance that three champions for the urban and metropolitan agenda found themselves in highly placed, key administrative leadership positions within the University, Extension, and College of Agriculture Systems. As is evident through reading the biographies for each of the highly positioned administrators, we can clearly see that none grew up in a traditional farm and rural household environment. Each found themselves following a career path into the broad field of university engagement due to an affinity with the transference of knowledge from academia to communities and businesses.

As the three lead administrators, Karl and Alex grew up near large cities and while Lydia’s upbringing occurred in a rural area, her family was not exclusively engaged in farming. In fact, she was quite engaged in the electrical trade during her formative years. This was significantly removed from farm life. None followed a traditional agricultural regimen of study throughout their academic endeavors. While Lydia had the most alignment in her studies of forestry, this was somewhat diffused by her studies in business. None worked in an agricultural field outside of academia and only one, Lydia, came close by serving as a forestry consultant and a 4-H agent, each for a relatively short period of time. She then moved into administrative positions relatively quickly.

Finally, each was drawn to urban work through a variety of personal experiences. As an example, Karl’s experience while working in an urban university found his passion there.
We had a downtown center set up in one of the renovated old manufacturing buildings. I got a grant to educate inner-city teachers. With this funding, we were able to renovate four or five classrooms. It was great visibility for the institution.

Our campus was outside the city by about six miles. The University president was showing the city’s mayor around campus and took him up to a high roof top. He began pointing out all of the campus buildings around them. The mayor goes, “Look, you can see the city six miles away. I can see the city from here. I also see a big university flag flying there. I think you guys ought to be down there.” That was the morning of the day that we started working on a deal to open up a downtown center.

Interestingly, the administrator mostly aligned with the traditional mindset of the Land Grant and Extension Systems also understands the opportunity and value. Lydia expressed it as follows here.

Well, if you take it from an issue area and kind of boil it down, I think, nationally, there’s been continuing conversation about working in urban metropolitan areas. Most of the focus however, has been more about working around major cities because our traditional background has been rural and agricultural. Most of us, who believe in the Extension process, linking the University to communities, have always had a much greater vision for Extension. That is, we see that we must work in all communities, but, specifically, more in cities, and around cities.

These individuals, while residing in traditionally oriented institutions, each came to personal and professional conclusions that the Land Grant and Extension missions
must include the delivery of services to urban centers. This issue of leadership alignment is addressed by Alex as he explained why he believes this is taking place now.

Why not 10 years ago? I don’t think we had the interest and commitment at the level of Agricultural administration, and I don’t think we had cultivated an advocate in a high place, i.e. Old Main. Perhaps in the Capitol or a target city but institutionally it had not gotten on anybody’s radar screen.

I’m not saying I’m trying to take credit for this but I think there were enough people that had a similar interest that we came together. It was the right people coming together at the right time. It could have been 10 years ago but it just wasn’t there and this is why I think when this is off and running and successful, other people are going to take a very, very close look at it and ask the question well why this city, why now? My answer will be, “just having enough committed people in high places so that there was strong advocacy for it.”

These personal perspectives begin to provide insight into the motivation necessary for the concept of a Metro Center to be put forward. The following section begins a discussion about some of the mechanics related to the planning cycle and the manner in which administrators can influence the outcomes.

*Administrative and Faculty Roles During the Initial Planning Process*

All Land Grant Institutions and Extension Systems utilize a comprehensive or strategic planning process in order to determine various and appropriate directions both academically and methodologically. In this particular institution, they had moved to a
three-year planning cycle however, Alex had been determined that it was necessary to proceed with a broadly inclusive committee system.

Contrary to popular belief, institutional deans and administrators have relatively little control over the academic direction that faculty pursue. This course must be set at the point of hiring where faculty positions are identified relative to research interests that align with a desired direction. Once faculty members earn tenure, academic freedom allows them to pursue those areas of research in which they have the highest qualifications and interest. Without support of faculty, changes in academic directions of an institution or college are almost impossible.

Wanting to began an urban effort and being fully cognizant of faculty predisposition, the lead administrators, Alex, Lydia, and Karl needed to ensure that the strategic planning process take this issue into consideration. This was carried out utilizing tactically placed individuals in the strategic planning process as well as to align committees with appropriate deliberation. Lydia explained the system like this.

From a Dean’s perspective, the purpose of the College is to employ the faculty to do their work. You also have this idea of faculty governance. Administrators keep the wheels running but, the faculty members are the ones that create programs and things. You can have administrators that provide some leadership by encouraging certain directions. That’s kind of the philosophy within the College for how you get things done. You engage people in conversations, and try to get them to sign on and spend their time working on something.

Most organizations are much more hierarchical. “Here’s the direction we’re going. Get on board!” In a college, it’s kind of, “Okay, guys, where do you want to go?” You can think about it that way to illustrate the difference.
We can plant ideas as leadership, but where it becomes legitimized as a direction is when it comes out of a faculty group. You remember the study committees that were put together for the last strategic plan - and you remember the 6th Study Committee? The urban agenda was an idea that was seeded there. What the leadership did was seeded the idea, put the right people on there to say, “Here are the things we want you to think about”, and up come these different ideas. So then, the Metro Research and Outreach Center was one of those things where we planned the idea of saying, “We need to understand how we’re going to be relevant in urban areas.” Then they come out with the plan. We chose people for a lot of reasons, but we wanted to make sure we had people who had experience working in metropolitan areas. Angelo was one of those and it’s an easy sell from there.

Well over one year prior to the deadline for completing the strategic planning process, Alex created a series of study committees. The study committees were broken down into five categories. These were: animal science, plant science, social science, food science, and natural resources. Each committee was directed to explore the charge given by the Dean, “To identify areas of opportunities for innovation over the next 10-15 years, and to identify how we need to adapt or modify what we do to sustain or build these areas of innovation” (See Appendix A, “Faculty Study Workplan,” 2004). While the focus was eventually to develop specific plans for a three-year cycle, the Dean had provided the charge that required individuals to look beyond the near future and to wander afar of their comfort zones.

It was evident that faculty assigned to these five committees would likely be approaching their duties from a more traditional College of Agriculture perspective. Alex knew that it was unlikely that an urban component would develop out of any of these
committees. Further he felt it was necessary that the College explore areas in which they were not currently engaged. Thus he created the Sixth Committee. This committee had the unusual charge to work to synthesize recommendations and integrate stakeholder feedback. The intent was to find stakeholder groups outside of those traditional constituents to infuse new and diverse ideas into the planning process. After months of work this committee submitted its final recommendations. Its recommendations were considered to be outside of the norm for such a traditional institution. Having been given the formal charge to explore these new areas, the effort was authenticated in the eyes of the organization. In addition, highly respected faculty members served on this committee further strengthening the position of its findings within the greater College forum.

Among a number of paradigm shifts the following excerpt helps demonstrate the mindset of this committee in its introductory section.

This College of Agriculture exemplifies the land-grant mission, as it was originally envisioned. This vision, reaffirmed in the 1990s by Boyer, Glassick et al. and the Kellogg Commission, continues to guide the College as it seeks to serve the public through both basic and “translational’ (i.e., applied research, Extension, outreach and teaching) activities. But what public will the College serve 20 years from now? It is becoming increasingly clear that who the College serves through its land-grant mandate will differ substantially in 20 years. Profound changes in landscapes and the economy, both related to population growth and globalization, will take place in many Northeastern states including this one. This will substantially change the character of agriculture and the critical systems directly related to agriculture-the food system, the ecosystem and the
economic and social systems that we serve. *We are in a time of transition and we must look forward.*

The College is challenged to re-position itself under these evolving conditions. This Land Grant is not alone – other leading colleges of agriculture face the very same challenges. We are no longer just “agriculture” or just “rural”, and yet these are components of what we do and whom we serve. (See Appendix A, “Executive Summary, Study Group 6 Final Report,” 2004).

By validating the need for significant changes in the manner by which audiences were perceived, it allowed for the incorporation of urban environments and the people who lived there. In the opening remarks of this committee’s final report the following statement appears.

Study Group 6 also recommends that College-stakeholder alliances be strengthened with an increased emphasis on teamwork, and that the College acknowledge its significant efforts and increasing impact in metropolitan areas through the establishment of a Metro Experiment Station to work cooperatively with the Agricultural Experiment Station (See Appendix A, “Faculty Study Workplan,” 2004).

This simple statement put into motion a series of events that would ultimately lead to the establishment of the first comprehensive urban center for this institution.

This Sixth Committee had a number of progressive and inquisitive faculty members as well. One such was the co-chair, Delfina. Coming from a background of social sciences, she was passionate about the inclusive nature necessary for a successful college. This inclusiveness certainly encompassed the state’s urban and metropolitan areas. Her leadership from this particular paradigm was instrumental in the exploration
and development of the concepts brought forth by that committee. Delfina describes the initial meetings below.

You know, I think of the first day that we sat there and talked about what things and ideas we had. Remember we used those stickies and – oh, gosh, we had to come up with various ideas of what we wanted to do. But I think if you have somebody like you, and Angelo, you start to say, “What can we do? What are the possibilities?” So people who already have ideas can all throw them up there. I think people were interested in urban programming. There were enough interested in it so that you could get some traction.

In the final analysis, these few champions of an urban effort were able to integrate this idea into the fabric of the final recommendations that would move forward into the strategic planning synthesis and writing process. Embedded in Goal C of these recommendations, Strategy 3: Enhance Partnerships with Current and Newly Identified Stakeholders, a very simple and succinct entry appears, Metro research and outreach center (See Appendix A, “College of Agriculture Strategic Plan 2005-2008; Recommendations from Study Groups and Sustainability,” 2005). The concept has now been submitted in a formal fashion within the planning process and will now be exposed to the scrutiny of those engaged in writing and approving the strategic plan for 2005 through 2008.

*The Strategic Plan*

Strategically, a small but committed number of members from the Sixth Committee were asked to serve on the Core Planning Team for the College strategic plan.
This process began with a kickoff on November 4, 2004. At that time, the committee responsible for writing the plan was given its charge. Excerpts appear here below.

The Dean’s charge to the team:

Provided by Senior Associate Dean on behalf of the Dean.

• Take off your unit hats and be creative.

• Incorporate the work of the six study groups as well as assessment data and other input.

• The draft will then be revised and sent to the College and stakeholders for further input.

• Geraldine will represent the deans’ group on this team.

• The final plan is due to the University President in February 2005.

• You do not need to assume that the College goals should stay the same as they are in the current plan (See Appendix A; “Core Planning Team Kickoff Meeting,” 2004).

This core strategic planning group is made up of 17 individuals. Each of these was selected by the College administrative leadership team. The data shows that each was seen as having a responsibility to not only advocate from their perspective but to explore avenues they perceive to be in the best interest for the future of the College. It is now understood that the leadership team had done what it could in order to secure various interests that they hoped would ultimately appear in the final version of the strategic plan. The administrative leadership team was not present during the consequent two-day retreat and trusted that what they had put in motion would bear fruit in the form of both traditional and progressive ideas for the College.
Over the following month, a series of meetings and retreats occurred in order to better define the structure of the strategic plan. There was little mention of a specific delivery method for services to an urban or metro area and the term Metro Center was not specifically documented. Data also confirms that during that time, the concepts relative to issues addressing urban needs were being stated in terms of stakeholder diversification, new audiences, and the concept of relevance. During the retreat meetings concepts relevant to urban clientele were listed here as an excerpt from a relevant document (See Appendix A, “Core Strategic Planning Team Meeting Notes,” 2004).

Users of Extension programs: College of Agriculture must deliver innovative and useful workforce education programs to the market. Must be contemporary and implicit to this. What is the market?

Public: Programs that attract a diverse student population.

Increase relevance, responsiveness, and effectiveness of College programs through stakeholder driven strategies:

* Expand stakeholders to be more inclusive and diverse.

* Provide avenues for ongoing, open dialogue with stakeholder groups

These were further refined at the December meeting where the Dean provided leadership to the planning members as they continued to synthesize the ideas. At that time, the term Metro Center was revived and appears in excerpts of the draft document as follows below.

Goal 2: Communicate and assure the relevance and responsiveness of College teaching, research, and outreach programs to current and potential external stakeholders
Performance Indicators:

The importance of enhancing our effective engagement in this regard is further underscored by the rationale, priorities, and opportunities identified. It addresses these issues in a comprehensive, integrated, innovative, and immediate manner as follows below.

Strategy 24

Establish a Metro Research and Extension Center to work concomitantly with the Agriculture Experiment Station on issues relevant to non-rural populations. This will enable the College to develop program efforts to better position itself among a broader population and demonstrate impact to that audience.

Measurement – Establishment of new center in cooperation with other local University assets in an urban area.

Impact – Enhanced relationships among metro stakeholders including elected officials (See Appendix A, “Draft 12-01-04; College of Agriculture,” 2004).

In the final analysis, the concept of The Metro Center was formally submitted as a part of the draft strategic plan to the College and University leadership. Following the draft, a final strategic plan for the College was completed, submitted, and approved by the leadership including the University president and provost. This plan was approved in February of 2005 for implementation in July of that same year and represented almost 2 years of work to ensure that an urban and metro presence through a Metro Center concept
was secured. This final plan incorporated wording that reflected an unequivocal commitment to assure programmatic relevance to meet the practical needs of current and future stakeholders. Further the leadership needed to inform public policy through innovation, current research and comprehensive education programs.

This theme continues in the strategic plan section titled, *Future Directions* and can be seen in the first of five strategic issues as indicated here.

We have identified five strategic issues that need to be resolved to enhance our effectiveness:

How can we allocate resources among traditional production agriculture and other new or related areas that are of importance in meeting current and anticipated stakeholder needs?

Then, under Goal C. *Strengthen meaningful communication and mutual education with current and new stakeholders;* Strategy and Actions, the following appears in the final College Strategic Plan.

The demographic profile of this state’s residents has changed, and we see new opportunities to meet the needs of suburban and urban residents whom we previously may not have reached. A Metro Research and Outreach Center strategically located in the State would provide a focus for the College to unite our educational, research, and Extension and Outreach programs with synergistic resources available within campus Colleges and other branch Colleges across the University to better meet the needs of our suburban and urban residents. Reaching suburban and urban residents would also facilitate the College’s efforts to educate the non-farming public about agricultural issues, such as food and fiber
production, farmland preservation, and land-use considerations that are vital to all of our futures. Following is section taken out of the College Strategic Plan.

3. Enhance strategic, cross-functional partnerships with current and newly identified stakeholders.

Establish a Metro Research and Outreach Center (See Appendix A, “College of Agriculture; Strategic Plan 2005-2008,” 2005).

The Strategic Plan timeframe indicated that implementation for the Metro Center was to occur in the third year of the plan. With this plan set to begin in July of 2005, it placed the implementation for July of 2008. The data, as presented, shows that this completed the conceptual formalization of the Metro Center and invites faculty and staff to engage in an environment that was previously difficult in which to maneuver. The leaders in this case study were able to materialize their desire to more systematically support urban and metro needs. They utilized standard organizational systems in order to complete their goal of elevating the presence of the Land Grant and its Extension system with urban audiences.

Curiously enough, and to demonstrate the serendipitous nature of the events leading to the establishment of the Metro Center, documents in Appendix A show that members of the university’s outreach component were beginning to independently explore the issue of how outreach programs of the institution could better align with the needs of metro audiences. Administrator Karl created three task forces, one of which was to explore issues of urban engagement. This group was made up of middle and senior administrators across the state and included Lilli in its membership. This effort can be
summed up with this excerpt from the report generated by Karl’s Task Force on Engaging Urban Audiences.

In December 2004, the University Provost, responding to the recommendations of the University-wide Continuing Education Task Force, asked Outreach “to develop an overarching programming strategy to our three major urban regions to ensure that The State University achieves an appropriate market share of enrollments.” As a first step in addressing this charge, Administrator Karl charged a task force to propose a strategy for engagement. This report contains recommendations in response to that charge (See Appendix A, “Metro Portals, A Model for Urban Engagement,” 2006).

After about six months of meetings and explorations, this committee created a report that provided direction to the effort of elevating the university’s profile in two to five major metropolitan areas. Two of these areas were particularly large and received more scrutiny than the others. This report included recommendations based on the perceived standing of the State University within those areas. It was recognized through the data that the institution was not seen as a local institution but rather, as one residing in the center of the state and away from most urban areas. Branch campuses, for the most part, were also distant from the core major urban areas. While some program leaders in those areas had strong local connections, these were not coordinated well across program areas. This excerpt was taken from the report submitted by the Task Force on Urban Engagement.

Effective engagement requires multiple interactions with a diversity of audiences. Many local leaders see a disconnect between the resources available at the
University and the capacity to address urban needs. Effective engagement requires that a crucial mass of resources is necessary to respond to the unique issues of population density and diversity. Individual University entities have insufficient mass of locally relevant programming to generate greater demand and then to deliver on that. In some cases, a critical mass may exist however inefficiencies related to organization all communication and geography hinder the ability to deliver coordinated programming effectively. Finally, local institutions and other online providers regularly outspend this University on local markets and public relations activities (See Appendix A, “Metro Portals, A Model for Urban Engagement,” 2006).

There were a number of initial conclusions that were developed by this Task Force on Urban Engagement relative to these issues. These seven areas are addressed as summarized here.

1) The University’s response requires a broader commitment and engagement in order to create a more visible University presence in each urban area;

2) Better coordination across branch campuses can help give the University a stronger “on the street” presence, but will not offset the need for a stronger physical presence;

3) The many existing relationships with community organizations should be coordinated to create an integrated network of relationships that allow the University greater influence opening doors to new program opportunities;

4) Shared database of individual and organizational contacts may greatly benefit the goal of a “One University” presence in the urban areas;
5) We need a one-stop option (or at least the perception that we are a one-stop shop) for constituencies not already familiar with The University;

6) The development of an Urban “Consortium” to gather and focus resources from across the University is a logical response but the emphasis must be on creating positive impact;

7) While a single general approach can be defined, it will be important to recognize that each of the three major urban areas has very distinct characteristics and a plan must allow for flexibility in each of these areas (See Appendix A, “Metro Portals, A Model for Urban Engagement,” 2006).

Out of this report was born the University Outreach Metro Concept. The task force specified that this initiative could ensure a more effective coordination among multiple University resources in the urban area to create the effective impact of a unified presence. It even specified a name for these centers essentially using the University name followed by the name of the city such as, The University-Gotham. Further, there were a number of elements that would be included in the effort. These are listed here from that same Urban Engagement Report.

All branch campuses and continuing education offices in the metropolitan area.

Extension offices in the immediate County and, as appropriate, the suburban counties that constitute the greater metropolitan area as defined by the community; this would include any urban research centers currently under discussion in the College of Agriculture.

Tech Transfer offices.

Existing “downtown” offices for Admissions, EOCP, and Alumni.
Other academic and delivery units, based on community need and the commitment of the units to participate (See Appendix A, “Metro Portals, A Model for Urban Engagement,” 2006).

Finally, the Task Force on Urban Engagement identified specific services that could be provided at these centers. While some of these were specific delivery issues others addressed the need for the development of an individual perceived to serve as a local leader yet housed within the University structure. This would be an individual who could ultimately represent much of the University community but in that urban and metropolitan area. Following is an excerpt. A full listing of these services can be found in Appendix A.

It will provide a visible leadership presence and will coordinate individual campus and Extension leadership relationships with key constituencies across all University offices in the urban community.

It will stimulate research and development of signature programs that match The University’s unique resources with community need in order to create a recognized value of The University to address local issues.

It will coordinate the development, promotion, and delivery of non-credit professional development programs by campuses, Extension, and other Outreach units, enhancing the effective impact of these programs in the area.

It will stimulate and coordinate the implementation of student internship/cooperative education opportunities with area employers.

It will provide a one-stop point of contact for employers and community organizations to identify research and consultation opportunities.
It will ensure that The State University takes visible leadership in the community through participation in professional and community associations, foundation boards, governmental boards, etc., on behalf of all The State University participating entities (See Appendix A, *Metro Portals, A Model for Urban Engagement*, 2006).

The recommendations from this task force began an internal process that provided direction towards a *Metro Portal* concept. It is easily perceived as difficult for an institution as large as this to align urban issues across numerous programmatic and administrative silos. Yet, we saw that extremely similar concepts were being driven by different yet related areas of the institution. While there was some very limited overlap between committees at the College level and those at the University Outreach level, this specific idea found fertile ground in both environments. The concept truly demonstrated potential value across numerous functions throughout the Land Grant system.

*The Committee Driven Action Plan Process*

Once the College of Agriculture’s strategic plan was completed and approved by the University, the ground was laid for the development of specific action steps and implementation strategies for the Metro Center. Yet, there was an obvious time discrepancy between the beginning of the College Strategic Plan, July 2005, and the final report of the Outreach Urban Engagement Report of January 2006. In the life of a huge institutional bureaucracy, six months is less than the blink of an eye. The interview data from at least two individuals states that enduring these long periods of inaction becomes quite frustrating. Still, there was obviously momentum for some urban initiative to take
place and a number of leaders among key administrators had set the tone. Feeling somewhat emboldened, the few but vocal advocates such as Terri, Lilli, Angelo, Delfina, and others continued to keep this issue alive. While not scheduled for implementation according to the College Strategic Plan until July of 2007, discussions regarding how this might occur continued to arise in various forms such as departmental meetings and annual conferences as presented in interview data from at least three individuals.

According to the interview data from at least one administrator, leadership had planted the seed of this idea. It was taking root across many departments and offices across both the College of Agriculture and the University Outreach units. Various levels of communication as documented through e-mails–and reflected in the dates of various reports (Appendix A), continued for the better part of the year. All of this fed the fire of resolve among those passionate about the Land Grant mission in urban areas.

As the trigger date of July 1, 2007 approached, individuals began to ask College administrators about a time line for implementation of the urban initiative. Interview data collected from at least two faculty members and one mid-level administrator showed that a number of the interviewees began to inquire as to when steps would be put in place to begin the implementation process. In many ways, this brings full circle the mechanics that were put in place early in the process where faculty and grassroots efforts can now confirm and validate the establishment of this metro effort. The two interviewed College and Extension administrative leaders knew that any major effort needing resources and attention falling outside of the traditional paradigm would need to be pushed from the bottom up.
Having provided the opportunity for such a perspective to be conceptualized and created by the pre-strategic planning process, through the formal planning process, and within relevant committees and task forces across the system, the time had come for action. This action percolated up through faculty and stakeholders. The system was simply responding to these wishes. Interview data from two administrators showed that more and more members of faculty were also beginning to wonder what the status was of the initiative at that time. As advocates for the idea, they were justified in beginning to question the speed at which the initiative was moving ahead. As one of several engaged and interested faculty, Angelo presented an example of what was being verbalized by many.

They hadn’t gotten the go ahead to start. If it was going to start in July, how was that going to happen? Nothing had been done, planning and such. Well, first thing that was in my head is like, we talked about it over a year ago, how come nothing’s moving? But I guess things just move slowly here. I was personally sold on the concept. To me, even though we’re a College of Agriculture, you look around, where do people live? What is the legislative power, all this other kind of stuff? If we’re going to survive as an entity we have to get into some kind of metro programming and get it going.

Angelo was one of many who were asking how this initiative could proceed on time if nothing had been done to prepare for any implementation in the third year of the plan, July 2007 through June 2008. Other faculty and mid-level administrators had also begun inquiring about the time line for implementation. The pressure was building.
In May, 2007, a new committee was constructed with the duty of developing an implementation plan for the Metro Center. The plan needed to be actionable and address the issues presented in the College Strategic Plan. The final report was to be completed by the end of September, 2007. The Dean provided the charge for the committee. Excerpts appear here and the complete document can be found in Appendix A.

The committee’s role is not to duplicate previous efforts, but to focus on those opportunities that are most likely to lead to a recognized presence within urban communities. Specific issues the committee needs to consider are:

1) What should a Metro Research and Outreach Center look like? What programmatic and disciplinary strengths match with the needs of the Metro area?

2) The Deans, along with potential partners, have determined that the Gotham metropolitan area would provide the greatest opportunity for success as a beginning location. This effort is considered a pilot effort.

3) Considering the three functions of the College (Extension, research and teaching), the team should discuss and provide guidance on the following questions:
   a. Identify the program areas that would be an initial focus.
   b. Identify a process to develop stronger political support for urban research and educational efforts.
   c. Identify local partners that will be able to help foster political support for the Center.
4) Estimate the level of existing support and resource investment needs that would ensure success of a Metro Center (See Appendix A, “Metro Research and Outreach Center Dean’s Charge,” 2007).

This Metro Committee was made up of ten members, two of which were involved from the beginning with the Sixth Planning Committee and the College Strategic Planning Committee. Two others were involved in numerous informal and formal advocacy activities. This continuity provided for the relevant information and mindset to persist throughout the entire metro initiative development progression. At this point, the College was looking for specific recommendations from the committee. This committee was loaded with urban advocates and the organizational leaders were expecting them to push the limits of their positions to develop an initiative that would challenge the status quo and forge new directions for the College. Data suggested that many involved felt much like Angelo, who stated, “I knew there were a whole bunch of other things that could happen. So, with the establishment of the new committee, we went into this with an inclusive process and with a lot of zeal and I think we did pretty good.”

This Metro Committee met for approximately 4 months discussing issues of process, methods to strengthen the College and University visibility, physical attributes of the center, partnerships and stakeholders, funding opportunities, administrative structure, and leadership. They decided to invite a group of local stakeholders to gather their perceptions of needs in the target community. This was a diverse group of individuals that included elected officials, nonprofit administrators, business leaders, and other residents. The agenda with this group included processing activities to identify
community needs and, ultimately, to receive input into the design of the Metro Center (See Appendix A, “A Community Conversation Agenda,” 2007.

This community stakeholder meeting generated significant discussion. The group was broken down into subgroups and asked to brainstorm community needs and then have a limited discussion regarding their findings. The notes from these meetings showed that the key issues discussed included items pertaining to: quality of life, environmental issues, the built environment, economics, education, the elderly, education, diversity issues, family issues, jobs, crime, and several more. The entire list can be seen in Appendix A, “Notes from the Metro Meeting (2007).

During this same time, a survey of College of Agriculture faculty was administered in order to ascertain the level of interest in urban and metropolitan work. The survey included a number of questions related to their area of expertise, level of interest for working in urban areas, and their appointment relative to research, teaching, and Extension (See Appendix A, “Faculty Questionnaire,” 2007). The findings of the survey were somewhat surprising to those on the committee and certainly for University and College leaders. The survey identified some 50 faculty who had interest in working in urban and metropolitan areas. This was quite shocking since many assumed that most faculty members would have little or no interest in doing work with urban environments and audiences (See excerpts in Appendix A, “Metro Center Committee Report,” 2007).

Several of the interviewees provided data suggesting that this committee report and the embedded faculty survey became another driving force behind the establishment of the Metro Center. Not only was it delivered by a committee having a cross-section of administration, faculty, and Extension educators, but it also included hard data in the
form of local community stakeholders’ needs cross-referenced with survey results of faculty. The leaders provided interview data saying they knew that this report would provide the necessary push for implementation of this concept. An initial draft report was submitted to the Extension and College Leadership Teams for their review and preliminary comments. The Dean’s Leadership Group responded with a number of specific requests for some additional information and more focused recommendations. In December of 2007, a comprehensive report from the Metro Center Committee was submitted to that leadership team. In this report, ten specific recommendations were identified. The full report is available in Appendix A. A few key items appear here:

1. Launch the Initiative immediately with program development concentrating on Urban and Community Greening, then expand into the other two areas listed below. Initial activities will be carried out by creating interdisciplinary, issue-oriented teams made up of faculty from these disciplines and County Extension educators and staff.

2. Create incentives for faculty and staff to participate.

   An incentive structure will be developed during Start-Up and in place during the Transition Stage.

3. Create the Center Director position and describe administrative responsibilities regarding the Extension office and/or MROC.

   Center director position and support staff should be placed early in the Start-Up Stage.
4. Create a local *advisory board* that reflects broad representation.

*The board should be constituted during the Start-Up Stage and strengthened as the initiative moves forward.*

5. Engage local, state, and federal elected officials regarding the development of the MROC as soon as possible.

*Personal communication from the director will be sent to state and local officials early in the Start-up Stage.*

6. Provide an easily accessible, high profile presence within a half mile of downtown.

*Utilize the two development stages to establish a long term presence in The City market. Begin with the Start-Up Stage* (See Appendix A, *“Metro Committee Final Report,”* 2007).

With the completion of the report, the Dean’s Leadership Group had an opportunity to move forward. All of the groundwork was in place, all the studies were completed, faculty members were surveyed, and members of the local community were aware that change was coming. All that was needed was for the Dean to launch the effort and appoint or hire the center director and staff. Two of the faculty members interviewed indicated that since most of the hard work was completed the leadership team should approve the report with the launch of the center to follow. Actually even before the final report was submitted, in mid-November the communication data (Appendix B) shows that the committee was informed that the project had wheels and the launch was imminent pending acceptance of the committee’s report. With the report in the leadership hands in mid December, the Christmas Holidays arrived quickly. The New Year Holiday
came and went as did January, and still no word from the Dean to announce the initiative. Data provided through the interviews from those on the Metro Center Committee indicated that they had no inkling as to the status of the Metro Center except that they were being told it was imminent.

Once again, internal faculty and external stakeholders began to exert pressure on leadership to launch the Metro Center. For example, a local state senator inquired about the status of this project. An excerpt of that letter appears here (refer to Appendix A to read the full letter):

I am curious to know why this initiative has taken so long to manifest here. I understand that there are numerous processes that you must engage and consider during this time however, I hope that you are able to begin this new initiative sometime soon. My district stretches from the heart of the City to rural neighboring counties. While urban issues are paramount, this Metro Center could lend significant expertise in addressing challenges to outlying areas at the urban / rural interface.

While serving as Senator here, I also am the treasurer of the City Redevelopment Authority. From both perspectives, I am very interested in supporting your efforts to move this initiative forward expeditiously. My elected colleagues in this area are also interested in this effort and we are awaiting your decision to move ahead.

This letter was indicative of the support for the Metro Center among local policy makers. It provided institutional leaders the support necessary to implement the plan even though the effort was seen by some others as lying outside the organizational culture.
Institutional leaders found it hard to argue against this groundswell of support for the Metro Center.

These areas of key leader alignment, administrative and faculty support of the planning process, the strategic plan, and internal and external factors in committee action plans were all key factors in the development and implementation of the Metro Center as expressed by a number of interviewed administrators. These factors provided a foundational backdrop to the exploration of some other major themes that surfaced through the data analysis process. These themes will now be explored and placed within the context of the development and implementation of the Metro Center.

Exploring the Major Themes

There were tremendous pressures on publicly funded organizations as was previously presented through interview and documentation data. These pressures involved identified groups of individuals who received services as well as those who did not receive services but who wished to do so. Further, as was identified by all of the interviewees, these pressures and groups exist both inside as well as outside of the organization. In both cases it was demonstrated that the intent was to sway action or policy in a direction that was in alignment with the needs and beliefs of that group.

As presented in Chapter II, perceptions of the Land Grant and Extension systems were heavily weighted to agriculture and country issues. These systems did such tremendous work in these areas that they created a paradigm that was seen by many as being inextricably connected to the farming community. Even with the outstanding and diversified academic programs of the State University, when the term Cooperative
Extension or Extension were connected to the name such as, The State University Extension, the overwhelming perception was that it was a farm related program. Alex presents this dilemma as follows.

One of our biggest challenges is we’ve got a very large stereotype to overcome, you know, cows and plows. I think that is something that can be overcome but it’s there and must be dealt with. Then there are competing interests of many people in this state, or Illinois or Wisconsin who continue to believe that the good ole days is the way it ought to be, cows and plows and shouldn’t be anything else.

The significant interview data and official report documentation in Appendix A indicated that this specific stereotype weighed heavily on the organization as it considered moving in a new direction. The fact that the system was so incredibly successful in supporting production agriculture and rural communities was precisely the reason it had difficulty changing. This success pigeonholed both the extent of the resources directed there as well as the general perception of society. When discussing this, Terri said, “I think that much of the system would be pretty defensive. They really wanna make sure Extension and the College stay rural. The research needs to relate to rural communities when possible.”

To the system’s credit, evidence from the interview data taken from at least two of the administrators and others suggested that it had changed somewhat. Internally there were incremental differences that permeated the institution. Many of these were seen in the types of programming that had been developed over recent years in non-farm subjects such as land use, and alternative energy. Yet, it was confirmed that this overwhelming
paradigm of the farm and agricultural production continued. Angelo expressed it in this manner.

Let’s talk about when I first came here 25 years ago. They had very good agriculture relations with active commodity groups and stuff like that. Agriculture was very strong in the state. You know there were many, many more old farms and farmers back then than there are now. They had their power in the legislator. A lot of it came from legislators that had feelings for agriculture because that is where they came from. They knew how to preserve it. Those things have fundamentally changed in 25 years.

Over these years, the change for those outside the system had been almost too subtle to recognize. Interview data from faculty and administrators also suggested that paradigm changes within the College and Extension systems that were considered to be monumental were somewhat curious to those masses of consumers living in metropolitan areas. In particular, interview data indicated that the soft science side was marginalized by the overwhelming collection of faculty and programming directed towards hard agricultural sciences. Delfina, who was engaged in the social sciences side of the College, had an interesting perspective that supported this traditional paradigm in which much of the College’s past energy was invested. She expresses it as follows:

The College here was defined as agriculture. That is very different from some other Land Grants. Here, it is defined as agriculture, production agriculture. It was very farms and poultry and feed and all that. At least from over here in the social science area, that’s what it looked like. So, then you have people out there saying,
“We do community development.” Well, the community development was okay, as long as it was rural.

In the 1980s, it was determined that to help rural areas they needed agriculture. So, rural support became reframed. It was the same perspective you had over here for a long time because they think of social science as being more applied. We become the translation from the science to people. This gets to the issue that many talk about how the College and Extension here seem to always want to focus on cows, fields, and number of trees as opposed to the people.

This perspective seems to be very much in line with how urban and metropolitan residents perceived the College and Extension. Evidence offered in Chapter II showed that those who had programmed in densely populated areas found that most people had no recognition of the programming available through these systems. If they had any perspective at all, it was one that reflected the traditional paradigm.

Analysis of the interview data suggested that there was a balancing act that occurred behind the scenes. While stakeholder groups could be broadly recognized, the influence they wielded could not be so clearly defined. Honic (2006) offers that influence and pressure are clearly applied through the alignment of groups or individuals and their proximity and access to the leadership. This concept of influence and pressure to systems of funding applied to publicly funded entities such as universities and colleges as well. The issue of stakeholder pressure was at the core of much of the decision-making process across the many organizational strata.

One of the comments that most interviewees mentioned was the idea that “the time was right” or “the stars were aligned” for Extension work to take hold in urban
areas. When pressed, they provided significant insights into what this meant. An analysis of comments and reports indicated that there were a few themes at work. These themes were at the core of decisions to move forward with the Metro Center. The theory of Representative Bureaucracy was applied as a lens from which to view the data. While not overt in nature, it served to examine situations from that perspective and help determine themes and sub-themes as well as influence the manner in which these themes were organization and presented within the constructs of this study. Through a detailed analysis of the data, three major themes have percolated to the surface: 1) Internal pressures and turf issues, 2) External stakeholders, and 3) The changing culture of Extension. Each of these thematic areas was further dissected into subthemes. These subthemes were thoroughly analyzed and explored by breaking down data from each category with more specific focus.

Internal Pressures and Turf Issues

Each organization has internal groups that wield various levels of institutional power. In some cases, this power is derived by virtue of the standing of one’s position in a bureaucratic manner while in others it is an informal power derived from a moral base and supported by networks of influence (Sergiovanni, 1992). Further, individuals within organizations attempt to sway decision-making to meet their specific needs. Almost every interviewee identified groups vying for power within the College and Extension systems. These interviewees also identified that many of these groups were defined as having more traditional roots in agricultural and rural issues. These same interviewees also
contend that resources should be made available to urban and rural audiences on an equal basis.

*Defining Internal Stakeholders*

As defined in the *Terms* section, Webster’s dictionary defines *stakeholder* as one who has a stake in an enterprise or one who is involved in or affected by a course of action. In this institution, the overwhelming interview data indicated that the alignment of stakeholders varies. Some of these factions were: applied and base researchers, branch campuses and outreach entities, and rural and urban. At the College level, at least two interviewees indicated that there were conflicting factions between applied researchers and basic researchers. The Metro effort clearly would engage the applied researcher more directly. This did not necessarily mean that basic researchers would oppose the urban initiative. It is possible that they would simply not support it and be neutral. Delfina explained the perspective typical of the applied researchers in this study like this.

I think that applied versus basic research was also a problem because the social-applied science groups here don't want to be second-class citizens to the science departments like biology. That’s my view. So as a result, you have people that want it all to be basic science. But you also have those that sit there that say, “Well, we’re also applied.” Right? So it has that kind of back and forth stuff. “Well, what are we doing for the common folk? Or what are we doing applied?” I don't think they cared. Did John, the basic researcher, really care about what they did in application? No. It’s those journal articles and to be able to get the journal articles published. That’s what they live on. They want to be National Academies
people. They want to be known for what they do. They, in some cases, do not have that much allegiance to the University, frankly. It isn’t to the institution; it’s to the science. It’s to the discipline. It’s to themselves. I mean let’s be honest about that. It allows them to get more equipment and more people working for them because they very much are entrepreneurs.

Interview data from a few study participants indicated that there were also University level internal stakeholder alignments along the lines of branch campuses versus outreach activities. Further, these stakeholders were more concerned about turf issues relative to the geography of their service areas. This same interview data indicated that there was a possibility that the establishment of a Metro Center could be perceived as threatening a particular territory. The administrative leaders interviewed presented data that for this effort it would be beneficial to place emphasis on the Extension portion of the center rather than outreach activities since outreach can sometimes be seen as intruding on branch campus territory. At least three of the interviewees felt that integration of Extension with Outreach in the Metro Center pilot project would be better accepted by those regional campuses. This was due to the fact that it would be more Extension like and less threatening. Since there is an Extension office in every county, campuses accept these programs without regard to turf.

Fundamentally, the major area of interest for this study was the alignment of production agriculture and rural environments as one block of influence; even as these industries and demographics showed a decline in the state for these activities as presented in Chapter II. Data from almost all of those interviewed identified this perspective. It is exemplified in these remarks by Journey:
My sense was, at that time, that there was great concern that traditional agriculture was declining, and we needed to maybe move into some newer territory, shift our relevancy. My perspective of that is that there was kind of a panic, too. The numbers were dropping and some people felt agriculture was becoming less relevant.

However, the data also showed that the issue of declining demographics alone did not find much traction among those who supported that traditional paradigm. This same data seemed to indicate that decades and generations of tradition do not change easily.

Within this environment, most interviewees identified stakeholder groups who continued to press the issue of the College and Extension role in the production agriculture and rural fields. During the time of the 1990 report on urban programming (Appendix A), there was significant internal stakeholder alignment that resisted the idea because it was perceived as turning away from their traditional audiences. Here, interview data showed that this was a commonly held perspective. For example, Iris explained:

> Internally to the College of Agriculture, there is absolutely no question that there was stakeholder and faculty and educator resistance to the idea. The urban areas were not areas we ought to be doing business in anyhow. God knows not to develop a special center and initiative. That was very real to our educators and our faculty. Not everybody but, a significant internal political group resisted that. They resisted us being in a major metro area at all.

So, part of it was philosophical, part of it a cultural thing. It’s not something that we do in the College of Agriculture. We’re devoted to paying
attention to production agriculture. It was perceived as a loss of resources - if we were to invest in a major way in urban areas. These other groups would perceive, do perceive and continue to perceive that support for them is diminished somehow - and that was a very real issue as well in that dynamic. So, I think those were major forces, stakeholder politics, internal politics, as well as the thoughts and culture of the production agriculture community. We don’t do much beyond the farm gate.

To a major degree, this tended to be the crux of the issue relative to the organizational leadership’s ability to move outside of the traditional programming regimen and into new and uncharted waters. Institutional gatekeepers of the old paradigm could be a powerful force in resisting change and thwarting the efforts of innovative thinkers. The following section begins to explore this particular aspect.

Institutional Insiders in Opposition to Urban Engagement

This idea of institutional gatekeepers is quite powerful when individuals hold high levels of authority within the organizational structure. It becomes significantly stronger when those individuals were highly respected for their tenure and were also in tune with the ranks of traditional thinking organizational members (Sergiovanni, 1992). During critical conversations regarding the establishment of the Metro Center, one or more gatekeepers provided significant resistance to the advancement of the project. There was evidence from at least four interviewees that there was some reservation from within the ranks of College leadership regarding this very topic. Again, the question of traditional agriculture versus urban programming was at issue. This came up specifically, at a time
following the completion of the Metro Center report and during deliberations at the dean’s leadership meetings. It was obvious that Harry, one of the prominent and experienced associate deans, was quite resistant to the ideas delineated in the final report. There was concern expressed, primarily by this one individual that resulted in significant delay of the implementation. He seemed to weigh prominently on the side of the internal stakeholders who did not support the urban direction. He was also resistant to the reports provided by the Sixth Committee a few years prior to this. At that time, his resistance also delayed the report's release. Some in administration were concerned about the direction of the report and he was a champion of that argument.

This same interview evidence showed that there continued to be resistance to the paradigm shift among faculty and Extension educators as well. One of the lead administrators, Karl expressed it simply by saying that, “The most traditional ones in Extension usually just focus on agricultural production. While there are obviously farmers in the city, it's not a major sector. That would equate to there not being real support for urban programming. There's no traditional side of the house for many of them to link to.” This was a standard mindset and is reflected in many of the interviews. In order to try to make this paradigm shift more palatable, at least four study participants provided interview data showing that there continued to be attempts at aligning urban programming as closely as possible to a rural model. Angelo explained it as follows:

I think to me, the biggest stumbling block was the idea that we could take our current way of doing business in rural areas and continue on; that the cities were just other counties, and we could treat them just like other counties. If we figured out whom the county commissioners were we could make deals with them and
stuff like that. We could just say that we’re going to take dairy farming and just translate. Well, not even translate it but just move our programs into urban environment without translating those skills and the things that are actually needed. That was never going to happen.

It continued to be hard to say what level of resistance existed. While data from at least seven interviews indicated that there continued to be a significant core of traditional thinkers, it was unknown if their voices would be found given an opportunity to disrupt the urban effort. In her many years with this institution and at numerous organizational levels Iris expressed it as follows:

My guess is that we will continue to meet resistance. The Metro Center concept, having it on the table, having a director appointed, having a vision cast. My guess is that we will continue to do battle internally and externally over resourcing that center and developing its program. That’s my guess.

We have to continue the process, the political process of changing the perspectives and the minds of some of our faculty and educator colleagues. We have to be vigilant and continue to work on that front because I think there is still a bunch of resistance.

In the end, however, it appeared that at least some who once were extremely resistant to this position were simply no longer in the organization. Three of the interviewees provided data suggesting that some of these individuals retired or moved to different positions during the natural course of their career aspirations. Times seemed to have changed. For this urban effort, most interviewees felt that there was a new atmosphere at play. While traditional thinking was the prevailing paradigm for some
time, its days seemed to have waned. Interestingly, data suggested that there was a need to share the rural culture beyond its boundaries. The idea of distributing this country perspective seemed reasonable. The following section takes a brief look at the idea of linking the urban environment to that of the rural.

*Spreading the Faith to Urban Audiences*

One aspect of this cultural paradigm that was intriguing was that those aligned with production agriculture and ruralness seemed to have a need to convert urbanites or serve as missionaries to large population centers. Interview data from a couple of the individuals showed that many traditionalist thinkers within the system perceived a need to share and promote these values to those who they felt saw the world differently. Delfina explained it as follows:

> The way that it got framed to me that may be interesting to you is always thinking about it as gardens in the city. That’s what I heard, okay? Helping minority students do agriculture stuff. This is the way that it gets translated. Helping minority students have animals. It was all about helping minority students have animals, helping the city have gardens and that sort of thing. I don't know to what extent it was people from the University coming in and doing that, or whether it was more participatory. Okay. I don't think that it was the “we're here to save you” kind of thing. But again, I have no sense of what happened other than here’s what we do relative to horticulture and animals and we’re just gonna do that same thing in a different setting. It will definitely be in line with what we already do, with some adjustments to be more urban.
This statement was indicative of the general sense among most of those interviewed that there was a need to focus on strengths of the College however, when programming fell outside of that hard agricultural science paradigm, it was difficult to gain traction or support for urban programming activities among internal stakeholders. That agriculture and rural comfort zone did not seem to expand much for them. To some degree, this was even reinforced among students on campus. Interview data from Delfina is presented here as she expressed this idea by saying, “I think even the students here would say that being in agriculture means having to be part of the plant discipline, or you have to be part of the beef discipline because it’s Aggie.”

The data from three interviewees confirmed another concept of the need for the agricultural stakeholders to educate their non-agricultural community. That is to say that much of the language used by this traditional population had certain meanings and it was seen to be necessary for metropolitan audiences to understand what was being said. The idea of internal stakeholders needing to educate the masses appeared to be unrealistic. Two of the interviewees spoke specifically to this. As one of the engaged faculty, Angelo presented this concept quite well:

We get into this issue of trying to educate the general public, urban areas, in agriculture. See that is one of those narrowing things that I don’t agree with her very much. You know we’re not trying to make the urban environment agriculture literate. That has nothing to with it. I mean it could be a part of it. But do we want to treat the urban areas just like we treat the agriculture areas? No, we need to be metro literate. What are the problems? How do you handle them? Who cares if
they understand what the problems are in agriculture. You know, it’s irrelevant.

We have to treat the metro people for themselves, not in relation to a farmer.

It seemed that, in fact, many stakeholders in the College were beginning to move past this particular belief. The change in personnel to newer faculty helped to change the perspective by looking at population centers and environments as a place where meaningful work could be accomplished. This of course, brings us to the next section that begins a review of the notion that urban ideas were beginning to penetrate the organizational culture causing changes to occur from within.

_Institutional Insiders in Support of Urban Engagement_

As the more traditional thinking administrators and faculty moved on, younger and more innovative individuals were taking their places. The data from at least two interviewees suggested that the system was seeing an influx of faculty and administrators who had a genuine curiosity regarding environments in which they had little experience. Further, there was a willingness to explore this environment. In some cases faculty even envisioned the exercise as an intellectual challenge as well as an opportunity to impact greater numbers of people using their specific area of expertise. Karl expressed this by saying, “I think there are key faculty members. Look at what John Smith has done in our largest urban area with that field project. We need a few faculty champions who start getting programs that you can talk about, build upon. I don't know what those are right now. We need to find those internal stakeholders.” Interestingly the interviewees felt that there seemed to be a growing number of these individuals. This data was also present in the survey that was completed by the Metro Center Committee (Appendix A).
Initially, internal planning process documentation (Appendix A) showed that the urbanization process required communication that was open so that faculty and Extension educators who were threatened would see it coming and be given the opportunity to provide input to the process. To some degree, this could allay some of their fears and cause them to be less resistant if not embracing the opportunity for new challenges.

Several of the interviewees discussed the issue of open communication regarding this initiative. Angelo, one of the activist faculty, explained it in his own words here.

We needed an inclusive process for a couple reasons. One is to find out where the local challenges or problems align with our faculty skills. The other one is we weren’t going to blindside anybody. The people were going to know this was coming down the pike, we’re wedged in their thoughts, so that when it does get in the house they will have already heard about it, and comfortable with it, and you know, hit the ground running. I think we accomplished that.

There were some questioning about, is this what our College should be doing and stuff? Well, nothing, no big deal. There were a couple of jokes like we’re going to become *metro-sexual* and things like that, that kind of hallway banter. But, actually, nobody really blocked it or anything like that. I think maybe behind the scenes they might not have liked it. Personally, I hadn’t followed a traditional path anyway. I mean, you know, I think these kinds of radical things are expected out of me so people don’t really pay me much attention.

Interestingly, there were also documented cases of strong faculty support for the urban effort where direct and forceful communication to administrators was used to make their point. Delfina provides such an example.
When the strategic plan went through, we pulled Aldo in and said, “If we go way out on a limb on this level, will you take this forward and support it?” And he said he would. It would be slow, but he promised to do that. And I was scared to death to jump, truly. You know, John was much more like, “We’ve got to jump. Okay, who gives a shit about these people?” I was more, “You know if we’re gonna do this, we gotta do it right and start the transition going. You know, really start pushing for the transition.” I haven’t stopped since. But Aldo sat there and he said, “I’ll do it. I won’t leave the two of you hanging out to dry.” Aldo talks great, and I love Aldo, and I think he will eventually take it forward, but he does get afraid. He’s more risk-averse then even I was. He’ll be very strategic as to when to jump in. We’ll see.

This exemplified the issue of stakeholder grouping in that the leadership was being asked to support the initiative by highly respected and well published faculty. While fully supportive of the urban effort, most interviewees felt that there seemed to still be some trepidation caused by an institutional insecurity with the entire idea. Yet, ahead they pressed sensing that perhaps this truly was the time to embrace the idea of urban programming. Two of the faculty interviewed provided evidence that high level administrators in the dean’s office were still not quite comfortable with the notion of urban Extension. Again, after submission of both the Sixth Committee Report and the Metro Center Final Report (Appendix A), faculty sought out assurances from administrators that the recommendations would be carried forward and implemented. While, assurances were given, the pace of change had been slower than
initially anticipated. This did cause some frustration among these individuals since it had been presented that the issue would move ahead with some rapidity.

Of course, in the end, report documentation data (Appendix A) showed that the Strategic Plan moved ahead as did the recommendations from the Metro Committee. Significant interview data showed that there were sufficient institutional insiders who were highly respected but who also supported moving into urban areas. This was obviously a counterbalance that was possibly not present during earlier efforts to establish urban programming. One of the issues that surfaced in the data was that of limited resources and how internal stakeholders use this issue to support their claims to not support the urban effort. The next section explores this issue and attempts to clarify the various perspectives on this concern.

**Diffusion of Resources as a Barrier**

One of the main problems with regard to the establishment of a Metro Center was the need for resources. Data from at least four interviewees showed that the expenditure of these resources could be seen in two ways. First, funds could be seen as being taken away from the traditional programming areas thus leaving fewer resources for the state’s rural and production agriculture audiences. On the other hand, these resources could be seen as investments in a future direction that had great growth potential; growth that could eventually drive additional resources back into the system. Of course, it appeared that stakeholders’ particular paradigms influenced which of the two perspectives they supported. This section explores the first perspective, that of draining resources from the one true mission. Alex, one of the administrators, provides an overview of it here.
We have internal support in agriculture. We spend money on horses. The dairy folks think we should’ve been spending more money on dairy. If you’re spending money on horticulture, the row-crop people think that’s not real agriculture. So it’s a constant balancing battle with us. It’s not something we’re really afraid of. You just have to understand what those stakeholder groups are, and try to be as open and honest with them as possible. Sometimes you don’t bring up certain things. When you want to bring up things, you talk about the things that are important to them.

This issue of scarce resources was not taken lightly and came up regularly in almost all the interviews. It could not be presumed that there was universal support within the system for this initiative because it would be a new competing interest for limited resources. These decisions were made at the highest level of the University. Participants suggested that if the institution made new investments in the Metro Center, it could have been perceived as a redeployment of scarce resources. Data from several interviewees showed that for many in the system, Extension would have been better off using that money for more dairy agents in a rural county. Interview data from several individuals suggested that this old paradigm was changing. The new perspective in which these scarce resources were seen as an investment will be explored in the following section.

Use of Resources as an Opportunity for Growth

Once again, we explored the issue of resource expenditures that were perceived as an opportunity for future growth. In many respects an urban initiative that met its goals as
set out in the Metro Center Plan Report would serve to show success. Most of those interviewed are of the mind that success would drive additional resources to the effort. This would, in turn, strengthen the effort that would, again, drive additional resources.

Data showed that most of the interviewees agreed with this particular point of view.

Angelo had an interesting perspective on this change scenario.

We have to get public about it. We’ve got to publish some success stories. Like this county’s Extension program and the green initiative is perfect because they’re already rolling and we can start claiming and building stuff out of that, and just making them into newspaper articles and things like this. I tell you, if you start showing success, that will be it. I always look at it like in the dinosaur era, you know. The dinosaurs couldn’t change. So, you’ve got all these mammals running around in the bushes and eventually they kind of take everything over. Well this urban initiative is like the little mammals running around in the bushes and these dinosaurs are stomping around but eventually we’re going to win.

So that’s the thing, if I was an administrator I would be the same way as them. You just don’t have the time to keep up with stuff. Their job, whether they realize it or not, is to facilitate the ideas of the people who work in the institution. This is one of the things I like about this University and College; they don’t try to micromanage you. If you have ideas and go get your funding and do it, they’re not going to stand in your way. We’re trained to be self-starting individuals in this system. So, I think with the Metro Center we get a few things rolling and get some success stories and get some publicity, they’ll come right along and it will spiral.
Finally, data from at least three interviews showed that this issue of resource generation was extremely important. The deans were looking for more research dollars to flow through the Metro Center so that it could help the College. Simply put, there would be significant pressure for the generation of revenue in order to offset any future negative repercussions from the traditionalist sector of the organization. Obviously, funding tended to be a fundamental issue. It was apparent in the interview data of almost every dialogue that there was significant opportunity to be realized with a successful urban effort.

There was also a documented recognition that it may take some time to develop this potential. It was understood that these initiatives had to be given an opportunity to generate the local support. This could be seen through the supporting documentation (Appendix A) that established a three year time element. As was mentioned, much of this had to be accomplished through the development of a successful and effective program model that would garner goodwill and support from local stakeholders.

Summary

As was evident here, there were various significant internal pressures aimed at changes in policies, programming, and organizational direction. The leaders who were engaged in this urban effort would continue to be cognizant of these pressures. While significant interview data showed that this organization tended to factionalize itself along lines of self interest, culture, geography, and other items, leaders were able to allay many of the internal fears related to the addition of a programmatic direction with which many were not aligned. Table 5 provides additional summation information for this internal
stakeholder section. Internal pressures of stakeholders were not the only source of
influence. The next section addresses issues of external stakeholders and the part they
played in this organization’s direction.
Table 5

*Internal Stakeholder Section Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defining Internal Stakeholders</td>
<td>General discussion of internal stakeholders and their make up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional insiders in opposition to Urban Engagement</td>
<td>Resistance to the paradigm shift among administrators, faculty, and Extension educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spreading the faith to urban audiences</td>
<td>Internal stakeholders needing to educate the masses in urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Insiders in support of the urban effort</td>
<td>Highly respected institutional insiders who supported moving into urban areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion of resources as a barrier</td>
<td>Urban effort perceived as a redeployment of scarce resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using resources as an opportunity for growth</td>
<td>Potential for significant opportunity with a successful urban effort.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**External Stakeholder Pressure**

This institution, being a quasi-public organization, receives significant public funding, as can be verified by the approximately $45 million of federal and state budget support. As such, interview data from at least five individuals knowledgeable in legislative issues indicated that funding was affected by the public policy of those institutions that wield power at any given time. Legislative bodies and elected officials at local, state, and federal levels each played their part in the allocation of resources and of the dance in which all public players were engaged. As documented by these same interviewee comments, this publicly funded organization employed strategies that helped to promote their activities to those bodies and individuals who had the authority to affect budgets. All of those external to the organizations are considered to be external stakeholders.

Almost all of those interviewed expressed some degree of susceptibility to the influences of individuals and groups having access to these elected officials. This access could be achieved through either relationship building or *lobbying* activities. Since publicly funded organizations were severely restricted by law from lobbying activities, their influence was communicated using third-party advocates. A number of interviewees indicated that these advocates were engaged in the organizational mission as volunteers, service recipients and clients, or programmatically aligned.

This section explores the manner in which influence was wielded on behalf of the Land Grant and Extension Systems. There are a number of subthemes here in order to maintain clarity as this topic was explored. These subthemes include: external stakeholders in opposition to urban engagement, external stakeholders in support of urban
engagement the role of formal boards and councils, funding mechanisms, and recognizing the political realities.

*External Forces in Opposition to Urban Engagement*

Again according to almost all interviewees, data indicated that both the College and Extension had external groups that wielded various levels of power. This power was derived by virtue of their standing in relation to the networks of influence that could affect the habits of policy makers and elected officials. This same interview data further indicated that different advocates for institutions of higher learning attempted to sway decision-making to meet their specific needs within the context of that institution. It was obvious in the data that numerous groups wielded their power to influence funding and regulatory mechanism on behalf of the institution but focused on their specific issues of interest.

According to interview data from almost all interviewees, those who were aligned with the more traditional roots in agricultural and rural areas could be seen as being opposed to efforts in urban areas. Similar to the arguments used by internal stakeholders, they contended that resources should be made available to these sectors only so as not to dilute efforts in production agriculture. There was significant discussion related to this clash of interests as documented in a number of interviews. Lydia expressed it in this manner.

The system infrastructures that we have, the support base that we have, the funding bases that we have are those rural and agricultural constituents. That’s been a real challenge. So it was the stress of “Do you take resources, and put them
into the cities to have the critical mass to make a difference? Or, do you just have a presence there, and be certain, to use as many of your resources as you can to serve those traditional people who deliver the funding for your program?”

This illustrates succinctly, the internal pressures being felt by a system that relied heavily on external stakeholders from the production agriculture and rural interest areas in order to support their budgets and policy interests.

As we begin to explore this arena, data from almost all interviewees showed that there was significant concern regarding potential retribution from the traditional external supporters if an urban initiative moved ahead. Angelo said, “They’re walking a fine line because they want to start going into this new area but they don’t want to rob Peter to pay Paul. So, they’ve got to keep their agriculture audience happy when they move into these non-traditional areas.” Essentially, this spoke for itself in that the leadership group understood that there needed to be somewhat of a balance because the traditional power and influence wielded by production agriculture and rural areas was waning. Again, most of those interviewed provided data indicating that College and Extension leaders were relying on traditional support almost exclusively rather than to diversify their portfolio of supporters. This could have been seen as necessary so as to hedge against a changing culture. Again, this issue was present in interviews of administrators as well as faculty. Iris addressed this quite well:

I wasn’t as close to the executive level discussion in the College then as I was in the last 10 years but certainly the classic, the traditional agricultural interest groups and organizations such as Farm Bureau and general agriculture were resistant to a larger urban presence. I mean I can’t site you a letter that says that
but the other various producer and commodity groups that felt that our attention should be focused on production agriculture, and not production agriculture in small farms or small plots on the urban fringe, rather extensive production agriculture. I’ll even state this a little more harshly or a little more definitively. I think we have been captured politically by those interests and those groups.

The consequence is that it has been very difficult to bring progressive vision and change to the organization and also to meet our Land Grant commitment. Our commitment as a Land Grant institution is to serve all the people of the state and I think we have historically allowed ourselves to be captured politically by narrow, relatively narrow interests within the agriculture and food system.

To further explore the data in this issue, it must be accentuated that this partnership among external stakeholders, the College of Agriculture, and Extension had been in place almost since the inception of these institutions, well over 100 years ago. Strong and consistent interview data suggested that the strict and narrow interpretation of the enabling legislation had served to allow these specific interest groups to maintain control of the system. Yet, over a past few years prior to this study, it seemed that there was a grain of practicality and balance that had begun to permeate this discussion. At one time, these strict production agriculture and rural supporters were exclusively focused on agricultural sciences and their direct impact to the production agriculture industry. Journey expressed it as follows:

Historically, when Extension goes for budget increases in the more social sciences, our traditional stakeholders are not particularly pleased because they
feel like resources are being pulled from the more traditional production types of industry issues. I think constantly showing them value in that is going to be important.

This same interview data indicated that there seemed to be an apparent softening of this position as traditional thinking advocates began to understand the direct interrelationship between the production agriculture side and the urban side.

Interview data provided by at least one administrator as well as several other mid-managers and faculty suggested that consumers in urban areas played a critical role in the life of production agriculture. This interdependent relationship was beginning to penetrate the thinking of the new producers who understood that densely populated areas mandated the type of food they wanted, which impacts the production side of agriculture. Some interviewees felt that there was an obvious need to enhance urban understanding of these systems and that perhaps this idea softened resistance to an urban initiative. It is possible that these traditionalists may have, in the end, helped support it. Angelo discusses this in an interesting manner.

I don’t think that it’s a black and white situation. I don’t think that if we do urban programming all of a sudden agriculture’s going to turn against us. I think that agricultural people read the newspaper and watch TV. They see what’s going on. They know we’ve helped them out over the years and we can take these same skills and apply them to urban areas. That was like the example of what potatoes are and that urban kid’s remarks about not knowing that French fries are potatoes.

I think people in the state are pretty reasonable and understand that their markets are in the cities and that those people should know where their food
comes from. Most of the pushback you’re going to get is from organizations like Farm Bureau where they’re paid to make sure every penny they can get a hold of is used for agriculture. But the average farmer knows you’ve got to spend it all over.

From an administrative position, Lydia addressed this issue by recounting a conversation with some people in Farm Bureau. They were very disappointed about agriculture’s position within the state government budget process this past year and expressed the need to influence the decision making. One strategy discussed was to find a way that agriculture could become more relevant to consumers. Of course, that was a potential function of the proposed Metro Center in the target city according to documents that delineated its functions (Appendix A).

Another interviewee indicated that an additional area for negative stakeholder impact was not related to agriculture but rather to University turf. Essentially, establishing a Metro Center in an urban center that already had some significant urban serving institutions in the area may have caused those institutions to react negatively and pressure policy makers and elected officials to oppose such an intrusion to their geography. Lydia explored this issue among other concerns as follows.

I would prefer to talk about stakeholders as forces. You have internal and external forces. You have forces of agriculture, and you have forces of non-agriculture. You have forces of Extension and of research. You have the forces of having major universities in the area that might see us as competing - and maybe we are competing, in some ways.
This issue of competing institutions was interesting. However, it may be less relevant than was thought. Interview data from one highly placed administrator showed that those embedded in the systems tended to recognize differences and competing interests more acutely than most residents in these urban areas. Essentially, this new Metro Center could be seen as simply another valuable resource in the community. Karl had some experience with this and shared his thoughts.

Part of it is trying to understand the politics of other urban universities in the area. When I was in the state’s other major urban area recently, we were discussing an enhanced presence in a particular part of town. Someone from one of those local institutions said, "Well, that area is City University’s area, that other district is Town College’s district." And the business person said, "City University? What are you talking about? I live in the city. I'm not in City University's area or Town College’s area or any other university’s area." We universities create these areas. People don't say, "I'm in City University's area." They're in this city and that’s it. It seems that at the time of this writing, this particular stakeholder group may have been less of an issue and in some cases could potentially serve as partners for helping to address some extremely complex urban issues.

It is difficult to say if, in the end, these external stakeholders could have fully derailed the urban effort. To some degree the question was the extent to which leadership could be swayed by those pressures. Would leadership be able to hold these detractors at bay while the initiative had the opportunity to prosper? The need for these institutional leaders to support the effort in the face of potentially significant adversaries was essential. The ability to provide this nascent effort time to grow would be critical to its
ultimate success. Time was vital as the new effort established stakeholder support.

Interview data from several individuals indicated that these new stakeholders would come from areas that were cognizant of the services and not vocal, as well as from new clients who saw future benefits. Several interviewees addressed this particular item and again, Lydia represented this quite precisely here.

There are a lot of stakeholder groups out there. A real target with this effort is going to new stakeholder groups who do not see us as somebody that is relevant to them. They don’t see themselves as stakeholders but we want to cultivate those relationships to see that we have many resources that can help them accomplish things that may be important to them; either businesses, communities, or whatever.

Angelo, as one who reflected on this data, also had a unique perspective on the issue and expressed it as follows:

We’re going to have our old stakeholders remain with us and maybe some will drop out, some will stay with us. There’s a whole lot of the ballgame out there that we have to cultivate. You know, cultivate these new stakeholders. I think that’s very uncomfortable for many people. There has been talk about this for quite a long time before our recent announcement. I mean like from last week into history. They have been facing this for some time. What kind of contact have we had between administration and urban efforts? Not much, nothing.

Fortunately, they formed this committee that would start to work on the metro area and maybe they’re getting more comfortable with it. We were like the first ones that dealt with the urban issues. I mean, there are a few voices in the
wilderness out there. You and other people I would say were really hot on this issue. But it was not a formal program and none of our administrators really had any kind of experience with it. So, I think it was very uncomfortable. That’s my take on it, anyway.

In the end, numerous interviewees suggested that it was likely that these new stakeholder groups could be critical to the survival of any Metro Center effort. In combination with the small existing stakeholder groups that already supported some of the current efforts, each would be engaged and solicited for their support of this new Land Grant urban initiative. This next section addresses issues of external forces that data suggested were in support of this new programmatic direction.

**External Forces in Support of Urban Engagement**

According to at least five interviewees, the issue of identifying and/or cultivating external stakeholders in support of the urban initiative was possibly one of the most important opportunities of this effort. There were seemingly innumerable issues to which this urban initiative could provide significant expertise and assistance. Significant interview data suggested that each of these issues is connected to a constituency of individuals and groups who could advocate for them. This same data indicated that the key for a successful metro initiative on the part of the Land Grant Institution was to engage these constituencies by providing appropriate and relevant resources to help them further their community or corporate agendas. One of the institutional leaders, Aldo, had some experience with this paradigm shift. He explained his experience as follows.
The study group that was basically looking to integrate across our system was probably the first place where I talked seriously about my passion for reaching out to a clientele that can use our services but doesn’t know we exist. As I mentioned earlier, I grew up in the Land Grant system and having worked as a county agent I have an appreciation for what we can do for communities.

I was actually in an urbanized county. There was a mall at the beltway around the major city. It was built while I was a county agent there. We went from not having a place to have a winter expo for 4-H and Extension to using that mall as it was opening up. It was a transition from a borderline rural county to a suburb of that city. I saw, just in those three years, the difference between the folks outside the suburbs in the rural area and those inside the six lane outer belt. I saw the kinds of questions they were asking. The kinds of needs they had were basically night and day different. So, I thought about this for a long time about recognizing who our audiences really are.

This shift in perspective was a key element in the continued support for the development of this Metro Center idea. Leaders in decision making positions would form the internal advocacy and support network necessary for this effort to take hold. It was critical that external stakeholder groups help sustain the efforts of these individuals.

Further describing the importance of supportive external stakeholders in this process is data from the several interviews which suggested that the system needed to begin by recognizing the transitional process requiring traditionalist thinkers to consider the value of a Land Grant urban presence. Aldo again captures the essence that others had also expressed as follows:
With regard to the whole concept of the metro, it’s all about the external stakeholder and I think we wrote this into the strategic plan that we need to acknowledge the consumer driven needs that are out there because they are complementary to our producer driven needs that we’ve done so well with for 150 years. So, in the metro concept, those external stakeholders are incredibly important to identify and address.

I guess I’m hopeful that the director and his team have enough presence there to understand not only what some of the key stakeholder needs are but what they are going to be. I think some deep changes are required within our functions in terms of thinking about how to serve that group. I think looking at some of these new stakeholder groups will be rough. We need to understand them, understand their needs, identify who they are, and discover how they partition out into groups that we can work with. We need to understand how we contact those people. What is our point of contact? We need to understand what their needs are. And, I think in a situation like the metro, we better identify some of the things that are going to be high visibility but also high chance of success early on to get our foot in the door. And then we need to mobilize our folks to understand that not only do we have a new audience, we may need to actually come up with some new ways to deliver that material.

This idea of perceiving urban audiences as new clientele was interesting since it was well documented that Extension had been present in urban areas since the beginning as presented in Chapter II. Extension programs operating in these environments were already engaged with numerous stakeholder groups. Interview and other data provided in
Chapter II also indicated that, essentially, designated levels of resources had been insufficient. This could lead to inadequate market penetration. Thus, while there were supportive stakeholders, they were insufficient in number and power. The Metro Center hoped to rectify this by providing sufficient resources to have more significant impact in the broader community as can be seen in the Center’s mission (Appendix A). Donald, a well placed mid-level administrator, put this in perspective with the following remarks echoed by a number of other interviewees:

I would imagine that external stakeholders within the County region would really welcome the investment by The State University, and would see it as a community enhancement and would want to work with us to see how we could nurture the initial investment and make it grow.

This perspective seemed to be the one for which the institutional leaders were hoping.

By providing an initial investment and enhancing the engagement capabilities, the documented mission was to significantly increase the amount of good work that was being carried out in these areas. Numerous interviewees indicated that this good work includes programming across the Extension spectrum from youth development to nutrition and from urban horticulture to alternative energy. The logical sequence then was to reap the benefits of that effort through support of these new urban groups which would advocate for additional support resources. Iris, a highly experienced faculty, expressed this situation quite well:

I think there needs to be change with respect to the composition and voice of our stakeholders groups. We need to work with urban people, if I can state it that way, to develop their voice with respect to our contribution in urban settings. Urban
folks need to know what expertise we have and we need to have discussions about and co-create applications of that expertise. We need to develop that political voice on behalf of what we bring.

This next section begins to explore the more formal external stakeholder pressures through institutionalized structures with the organization.

The Role of Formal Boards and Councils

This Land Grant institution is organized as all others and is a matter of public record. Next to the president at the pinnacle of power and authority is the Board of Trustees. While a board can be seen as being part of the organization, board membership is made up exclusively of individuals not employed by the institution. This board has overall fiduciary and policymaking authority for the institution. Those who sit on that board can wield significant influence on the direction of the institution. The structure of this board is such that a variety of different interests were represented. Iris explained this interesting structure in detail as follows:

The State University has a Board of Trustees. I don’t remember the exact number it's in the 30-35 range I believe. Some are appointed by the Governor. Most are elected by various interest groups if you will within the representing sectors of the state. There’s an industry group, education, other areas, etc. Well, there is also a group from agriculture. There’s a unique election process that is followed every year that brings what we call the agricultural trustees into the total trustees group. There is a rotation. I think there are six agricultural trustees if I remember
correctly. You can check those details if you need to. They aren’t all elected each year, there is a rotation process.

Well, the agricultural trustees play a key role in representing the College of Agriculture, but more broadly agricultural interests in the state on the Board of Trustees. Historically, the preponderance of that representation has been for production agriculture as opposed to post farm gate interests. There had been some post farm gate representation but the preponderance over time of agricultural trustees has represented sectors of production agriculture. Depending on the issues, their influence within the Board of Trustees and with the present Provost varies.

There would be no question in theory and I think in actuality that with respect to the College of Agriculture issues, and agricultural issues in general in the state, that the agricultural trustees carry substantial weight. Their opinions, their viewpoints, carry substantial weight in the trustee discussions. At the College level, the dean’s group and the Director of Extension work quite closely with those agricultural trustees. They share information about what is going on, what is intended, what our plans are, what the political issues are, where we need help and that sort of thing.

As is evident, this formal board structure had significant sway in the direction of the College of Agriculture and Extension. If the agricultural trustees were resistant to the decisions of program expansion into the urban environment, they could sway the remainder of the board to their wishes. During the thrust for urban programming in the late 80’s, data presented in Appendix A, Report on Programming for Urban and
Metropolitan Areas (1990), suggested that the board was swayed in this way causing University administration to reconsider its approach and reverse the president’s effort to follow up with an urban effort.

The environment during the time of this study however, did not seem to be as polarized and as such, there had been little, if any, opposition from the board regarding this new Metro Center effort. It is possible that the fact that the last two board presidents came from urban areas could have provided the shielding necessary to allow the urban effort to move ahead. There is some basis in at least one of the interviews that in the end, it was likely that those board members who align themselves with production agriculture had begun to see the advantages of programming in urban audiences to address issues of the consuming public.

The next level of formal influence using board structures is the Agricultural Advisory Group. As documented in interview data of an individual closely aligned with this function, this group provided input into programmatic direction and served as a third party advocating body. It was capable of directing energy and resources towards the influence of policy makers and elected officials. This group operated in a very strategic manner with relatively high levels of organization and structure. In order to present this in a comprehensive manner, Journey, one of the mid-level administrators, provided a detailed description. Excerpts of this are presented here:

Our Agricultural Advisory Group is an industry advisory group at the College level, not the academic unit or departmental level. It’s comprised of approximately 100 organizations that represent industry sectors in agriculture. So you’ve got everything from the beekeepers, to the dairy, to the Farm Bureau. We
have a couple corporate members as well but most of them are trade associations that represent a particular sector.

There’s an association for everything and we do not actively go out and try to get every association to join because of the way we organize our events. We don’t want 200 members. We want strategic members, and we want sectors represented, so it’s pretty diverse. We’re always looking at what’s missing. There are a few that are very active such as: the wine association, the mushroom people, milk, dairy, beekeepers, landscape and nurserymen the Farm Bureau, the Grange, pork, and a few others. So it’s somewhat of a unique coalition of industry in the state, and we use them.

We have full-day programs where we will take issues that are relevant to the industry, and talk about them. We bring in speakers from the outside, plus a couple of locals as well. So it’s, ”What is the issue to the industry? What resources are out there, and what role can the College play in it? What resources do we have within the College?” That’s been a really successful model. I think, both from the College leadership: learning what the issues are from the industry and the industry learning what resources we have in the College that can help them address that issue.

So, we do that twice a year. We also have a planning committee that picks the issues to be discussed. It’s got a full board of directors. We have twelve board members. We have three active committees, and a couple ad hoc committees. They’re also the ones that sponsor our major visits to the capitol where we visit as many legislators in one day as possible - that’s their project.
They also do the Research Tour where we bring legislators up to the university. We have what we call the Agriculture Action Network which is a legislative advocacy network we communicate with. It’s that group that communicates the value of our programs to the legislature, as constituents in the district. They’re a very active group. They’re very active as well in our strategic planning process. We’ve spent an incredible amount of time over the past year, in very formal ways, bringing expertise in from these groups to weigh in on our College strategic plan.

This group was seen as the ultimate guardian of the production agriculture and rural paradigm within the bureaucracy. It serves an institutionalized function outside the College and Extension systems. While they were seen as a large block supporting the production agriculture community, three interviewees provided data showing that they also had factions within that vied for support for their particular interests. Each member, essentially, represents different commodities or agricultural interests. Lydia, one of the administrators, had an interesting perspective on this:

When I took the job as administrator, I ran into somebody shortly afterward. I was introduced as the Administrator at this University, or something like that. I don’t remember who it was. Somebody looks at me, and said, “How I pity you. That’s a job where you have seventy different stakeholder groups on any given day. Sixty-nine of them are probably wanting something, and the other one is mad, or vice-versa.”

This group, while grounded in the Agriculture side, appeared to have a counterpart in the outreach arm of the University. The Outreach Advisory Group had
significant input into the University-wide outreach effort. They were made up of high powered business and community leaders from across the state and beyond. While technically, Extension is part of that outreach function, there continues to be a significant separation in both administration and funding mechanisms. As such, documentation in state and university budget records showed that Extension dollars were not used much outside of the College of Agriculture. While there were discussions of more closely aligning these delivery systems, they had not yet done so to any measurable degree. Yet, the Outreach Advisory Group was asked to provide input into Extension and its programmatic alignment across the institution. After a presentation to them about Extension, Karl explained their reaction to this rural urban alignment.

It's like our Advisory Group is saying "What the hell is this about?" So then they drilled down more in there. I think that they just thought it was common sense. They could not understand why we're not in urban areas. They didn't see it as much agricultural orientated as some people would say. It just seemed like simple common sense.

Documents in the form of meeting minutes (Appendix A) suggested that these formalized board structures had softened their opposition to an enhanced presence in urban areas. Interview data from Iris and at least one administrator suggested that it was likely that even five years prior to this study, this may not have been possible. They believed that ultimately, everything comes down to money. What were the funding mechanisms? How did the system secure its portion of state and federal budgets? And, what support systems can be affected so that the policy makers can support the dollars needed to provide the services to state constituents? With budget and resource
implications central to much of the discussion, the next section provides a detailed perspective on the funding topic and addresses the role of institutional leaders in that process.

Funding Mechanisms

As was mentioned earlier, the funding mechanism for the Extension System was somewhat convoluted at the time of this writing. In this state, the public budget documents show that there were two separate funding lines for Extension in the University’s budget, one for Research and one for outreach activities. The Extension research budget line supports the base and applied research being conducted relative to the College of Agriculture Extension effort. The Extension outreach budget line supports all of the county based educators as well as other knowledge transfer components of the program. There were numerous factors that played into budget allocations of the University as well as for the Extension categories. Interview data provided by at least five individuals argued that external stakeholders were effective at advocating for increased funding. One individual who was extremely close to this state’s budget process and understands the mechanisms, however, indicated that it was not so clear cut. In fact, he argued that it was unlikely that all of these advocacy efforts did little to change the base funding of the institution that included general education support, Extension outreach, and Extension research. Donald, an influential mid-level administrator engaged in legislative activities, provided a relatively detailed description of this complex system as it appears here.
We had a miserable 2008 budget. Other significant interests just swamped us this year. All of agriculture did badly, and we had an absolutely beautifully coordinated effort with the farm bureau, the agricultural industries, and these other organizations, yet this year agriculture was just set aside.

21st century state politics is a byproduct of several hundred years of evolution. Higher education funding issues are not determined based on what's happening here and now or what the different universities are doing here and now. They're determined decades and decades ago, and the private sector in higher education in this state and past general assemblies. Past governors' response to the private sector is just as influential today as it was decades ago. Like I say, the inertia of what had gone on before is the most powerful force in state politics. The second most powerful force is a competent governor who knows how to use the inherent powers of the office of the governor. Those are the two forces.

Donald did indicate that there was some small opportunity for influence in the state General Assembly. He specified that a more powerful force was a politically skilled and competent governor who had specific agendas on which he focused. If higher education, Extension and general agricultural issues were high on the list, all of Extension and the College of Agriculture tended to do well at budget times. If not, they did poorly.

While this was a general overview of the funding mechanisms, there were significant and more specific issues of budget maneuvering within the College and Extension systems. In particular, interview data from at least three sources exists indicated that there were institutional issues impacting the distribution of those funds
internally. These systems could be influenced by both formal and informal external stakeholders. Aldo, a high ranking administrator, was quite well-versed in these systems and provided a somewhat detailed description of this process. This description however, seemed to contradict that which was presented by Donald above:

So, where did the agriculture research and agriculture Extension money come from at the state level? It comes primarily from our stakeholders who are touched by Cooperative Extension programming. They’re the ones who talk to legislators at the very grass roots level and say this is what these programs do for us. You’ve got to support them.

The budget process has been tough. Some years the state can give us reasonable increases. They could have done it this year. In fact the house budget actually gave us a two percent increase. The governor’s budget proposed a two percent cut. They basically said to take away what the legislature gave us last year. The governor has been saying zero percent increase every year, a flat budget. The legislature gave Extension money last year. The governor said, “Take it away that’s my starting point.” The House actually restored that and added three million dollars to each line. That was part of the faire share legislation that was proposed and that was a consortium of environmental and agriculture interests.

But my understanding is that as soon as the House passed the budget they were told by the Governor, “I’m the democrat in charge here – you guys are done.” And so the Governor then worked directly with the Senate, the House was never engaged to any great extent. And the Governor was thinking about his starting point and apparently the Senate budget was actually a cut as well. We
ended up with flat funding. In this particular budget climate with the people negotiating, the senate republicans and the governor, it might be considered a minor miracle that we got it back to zero.

The fact remains that we can’t abandon the rural component of our state. We have a lot to offer in terms of quality of life, economic development opportunities, etc. We can’t abandon our role in supporting agriculture production. The fact is we have to continue to attend to those folks but we have to recognize that through them we have less and less power, less and less voice in the legislature. It’s coming back full circle; the pragmatic reason to argue for a metro presence is we need to educate a whole new set of stakeholders who will educate a whole new set of decision makers about the value of the product we have.

They could care less about how we manage a wood lot or whether we no till corn or whether we rotate or whether we have confined cows or not. Frankly, they could care less. They don’t understand what any of those things are. What they understand is when they go to the grocery store there needs to be a wide selection of relatively inexpensive, diverse, safe, nutritious foods. So, we have to connect with them on that level. We have a huge presence in growing plants. There’s a whole group of stakeholders out there who don’t want to grow wheat, they want to grow their lawn. They want to grow shrubs.

To some degree it was a matter less about how some of these funding decisions were made in reality and more about how they were perceived by the decision makers in positions of authority within the institution. It is also possible that this was simply a
matter of definition between *base* funding and *special appropriations*. The fact remains that perception was reality. Of eleven interviewees, most took it for granted that intense external stakeholder interaction could have an impact on the bottom line. Alignment would occur with those stakeholders who could deliver their messages to public and elected officials on behalf of the institution. Further, interview data from at least two interviewees exists to support the opinion that internal distribution of funds may also be affected by these same external stakeholders. In either case, the College and Extension systems continued to place significant value on external stakeholders who they perceived could impact resource delivery and appropriation decisions.

While we were able to see the organizational impact of external stakeholders, there are other influencing factors. It is now important to begin understanding the environment in which external stakeholders function. Significant interview and documentation data (Appendix A) show that there is a tremendous diversity of these individuals and groups who each pursue advocacy activities based on what their specific needs are. The individuals to whom they plead are elected officials and local leaders. The next section explores this arena.

**Recognizing the Political Realities; Politics, Politics, and More Politics**

Virtually every interviewee provided data that supported the concept of creating a Metro Center program strong enough to attract the attention of key leaders and, in particular, elected officials. With funding streams connected directly to legislative processes, there was an undercurrent of pragmatic strategic intent. While most of the interview data showed that there was unequivocal support for providing high quality
services and programs, there was also a need to drive resources to those programs in order to sustain their efforts.

In one manner or another, every interviewee referred to issues of political advocacy, legislative power, or educating public officials. All of these were perceived similarly in that resources were fundamentally necessary for there to be significant impact, yet, if the effort showed no impact, could it attract more funds? Lydia’s comments exemplify the nature of this dilemma:

It’s kind of the chicken and the egg thing: you’re not going to get political support from cities unless you make a difference, and you can’t make a difference unless you have funding. If you take it away from one (rural), you give it to another (urban); there’s always that question. We typically have not had a political support base of any leaders, or anybody standing up for Extension funding who came from cities. And, the reason for that is, basically, we’ve been irrelevant.

This certainly was an incredible dilemma. Interview data from across the organizational spectrum as well as supporting literature presented in Chapter II, indicated that for generations Extension resources had gone primarily to the area of agricultural production and rural development. The focus at this institution’s Extension program and the effort of the College of Agriculture had been highly weighted in this realm. With such intense focus on these specific arenas, there was insufficient attention given to anything urban. After generations of programming to the same audience, to the exclusion of others, the system was at a loss as to how it should proceed in developing a program strategy that addressed an environment with which it was poorly aligned. Data from several interviews
showed that this intense belief had begun to change, however, the capacity building had not yet truly commenced.

Data from several interviewees commented that Extension researchers continue to be heavily focused on traditional issues. While there were new faculty members interested in urban areas, their specific relevant expertise was lacking. With the establishment of the new Metro Center, there seemed to be interest in exploring this new horizon. Yet, when discussing issues of programmatic impact in urban areas, and public officials’ recognition of these efforts, the College of Agriculture simply had limited resources with which to address it in a significant way. It needed to be strategic in the manner it delivered these programs. Journey expressed it as follows.

I would think that a goal of this Center is: make sure that the good work that it does is recognized by some people that we’ve identified that need to be carrying that message for us.

Planning documents, committee reports (Appendix A), and interview data from most individuals confirm this College was in fact highly qualified to deliver services in areas of environment, natural resources, and urban farming/gardening. Thus, it appeared that a political base needed to be built to utilize the strengths of the organization in these areas and to build capacity through access to other areas of the College/University. Alex said, “We’re starting from a relatively strong base with Cooperative Extension. Start from a relative position of strength and then just broaden the mission so to speak and hopefully it will be successful.”

Demographic data presented in Chapter II showed the changing population of the state from rural to metropolitan over a number of decades. These changes were reflected
in the legislative re-districting that realigned them in a manner that increased
metropolitan elected officials at the state level. The rural and farming block which was
once a strong faction in the State no longer had the political power it once did. This
change could jeopardize the Extension appropriation if the trend continued. Journey
expressed it as follows.

We’ve lost a lot of the leadership. When Senator Jones went out, that was a huge
hit for us. Now you’ve got a number of others leaving as well, and so many left
last year. Some key people have left and yes, we definitely have our work cut out
for us. New people are coming in and these are more non-traditional agriculture
people, so you have to start building up your relevance to them. That’s something
that’s more difficult to do from the way we’ve done it in the past.

According to the perspectives shared in a number of interviews, the system was
trying to demonstrate greater relevance with a higher profile in the metropolitan area.
This could broaden their support in the Capitol by going beyond just rural and agriculture
legislators to also include the urban legislators. It was hoped that this broadened support
would lead to greater state investment. Along these lines Donald presented his
perspective as follows:

I think that engagement really needs to bring resources. We really need to reach
out to the political leadership and the business leadership of Gotham County. And
as long as we're coming to them with ideas that say, “Here's the resources we
have at The State University. We're happy to deploy these resources at the Metro
Center, but we need resources to do that. Go with us to the Capitol to try to get
them. We'll commit our own resources but we're not going to redeploy unilaterally.

In fact, interview data from administrators and others suggested that this was a critical area in which the system was interested. Interviewees presented the opinion that there were huge opportunities to build and enhance the political base for the University and do good things for people. In the end, this same interview data showed that there were significant unselfish reasons for the development of the Metro Center and it was understood that in order to do so, funds were required. The only way for this program to increase its programmatic impact was through elected officials efforts to increase appropriated resources. In order to jumpstart this, it was necessary to invest initial resources in an attempt to enhance the presence and hope that this enhanced presence could be achieved and critical mass attained.

Given this understanding, it was curious to find that throughout the planning process, documents such as meeting notes and committee reports as presented in Appendix A confirmed that there was only marginal attention given to the amount of resources that might go into the establishment of the Metro Center. As mentioned earlier, there was a significant discussion regarding the shifting of resources. This was an item that was brought up by almost all interviewees and the data supports the fact that there was some worry as to the amount of support and time that might be required for the initiative. The success of the Center may well have been determined by the level of funding and sustained support over a number of years. The increased funding level coupled with the size of the metropolitan area begged for significant dollars and for a
multiyear effort. This tended to be somewhat difficult with the cultural and stakeholder pressures discussed previously.

Interview data from two of the administrative leaders and at least one of the mid-level manager suggested that the manner in which to grow Extension’s presence in the target urban area was to build on the reputation of the Extension program. This program had made significant strides over the past decade and had established relationships with a significant numbers of policymakers, elected officials, and community leaders. The leaders organizing this urban effort decided to select this particular city and move the director from the Extension operations to the new Metro Center. All of the four high level interviewees reflected on this process and indicated that it was sound. Lydia captured what all had come to realize.

When we examined all of those situations, we felt like we had the strongest program, the strongest office, was in Gotham City. It would probably have the strongest connections. We had some very complimentary county Extension offices around the target county that were tied together and we had an individual sitting there in that leadership role that was a lifetime Gotham person. He is from there, integrated into there and we weren’t going, to finding somebody else, and drop them into a place to try to start anew. So we felt like our best opportunity for success was this city to have that integrated Research /Extension/ Outreach kind of a program.

In April 2007 some decisions were made to create the director position for the center and to establish a reasonably sized budget in order to support the initial effort (See Appendix B, memo Wednesday, April 30, 2008). This document shows a reasonable
projected budget for the effort and provides a breakdown of sources. These sources spread the budget across three different institutional functions: Outreach, Extension, and The College. In November 2008, a final budget was provided that showed significant support for the project, albeit with different budgetary figures (see Appendix B, *Metro Budget*). It appeared that even with the well publicized nationwide economic downturn, the commitment to this initiative continued.

Finally, interview data from most participants indicated that this concept of elevating the institutional presence was bound to the political realities of influence and government appropriations. The cycle of engaging third party advocates in the community to speak on the institution’s behalf was strife with complexity. Urban areas had incredibly challenging and complex issues from the community level to the corporate level. While the institution could be the answer to many of these, it had to be seen with a higher profile as well as a competent partner by both the citizens of the community and by the local elected officials. In the final analysis an eye always had to be on the engagement of political leaders since they were an important component of the web necessary to ensure successful and sustainable funding of the Metro Center initiative.

**Summary**

The challenge with respect to external stakeholders was the extent to which these groups could be nurtured through their positive experiences of the resources that the Land Grant could bring to bear in their communities. These resources needed not to conflict with or duplicate efforts of existing organizations, agencies, and institutions. Further, interview data from across the spectrum of those participating in this study suggested that
these stakeholder groups had to prove that they had political sway with local policy makers and elected officials. These relationships should, by nature, reinforce effective programming addressing the real challenges of the urban environment. The institutional administrative leaders who were interviewed expected that this very issue was at the center of their aspirations to fully realize the mission of the Land Grant system, to extend its knowledge resources to all communities across the state. Aldo expressed it as follows.

So, where does the Agriculture Research and Agriculture Extension money come from at the state level? It comes primarily from our stakeholders who are touched by Cooperative Extension programming. They’re the ones who talk to legislators at the very grass roots level and say this is what these programs do for us. You’ve got to support them.

Balancing state needs across various constituencies was one of the most challenging responsibilities of this institution’s leadership. Again, Aldo continues by saying, “It’s one of those things where you know that if you’re going to grow into the future, and serve the whole state, you have to find a way to be relevant within the cities. You have to do that in such a way that provides you some cover from those people that think you’re abandoning their narrow definition of what it is you should be doing.”

Finally, significant interview data as well as documents in Appendix A showed that the establishment of the Metro Center took all of these issues into account. Boards, funding, external forces in opposition to or support for the effort were all sources of pressures on the urban initiative. The College and Extension leaders felt that they needed to be diligent in the assessment of these issues as well as thorough in their strategic development. Journey expressed it as follows:
I think our historic stakeholder base was more rural, but I think our relevancy is equal. It’s a matter of convincing people about it. The first page of our strategic plan says, “Only two percent of the population is involved in the production of food, but 100 percent consume it” I think that’s a relevant fact.

This issue of balance had been at the core of these programs from the beginning. As presented in Chapter II the target country’s documented demographic changes regarding urban and rural populations did not occur overnight. This societal evolution had caused the internal directional questioning for the Land Grant and Extension systems for decades. Iris summed it up quite well.

My guess is that we will continue to develop the Metro Center concept - having it on the table, having a director appointed, having a vision cast; we’ll continue to do battle internally and externally over resourcing that center and developing its program. That’s my guess.

Time will tell if the development of new stakeholder groups would be sufficient to sustain an urban effort in the state. Table 6 provides additional summation information for this external stakeholder section. This issue of external stakeholder groups leads to the consideration of the changing culture of the College of Agriculture and the Extension systems. The next segment of the study begins to explore the issue of cultural change.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Forces in Opposition to Urban Engagement</td>
<td>Those who were aligned with the more traditional roots in agriculture and rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Forces in Support of Urban Engagement</td>
<td>Cultivating external stakeholders in support of the urban initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of formal boards and councils</td>
<td>Influences of University Board and other advisory groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding mechanisms</td>
<td>Budget and funding nuances and related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing the political realities; politics, politics, and more politics</td>
<td>Issues of political advocacy, legislative power, and educating public officials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Changing Culture of Extension

The issue of organizational culture has been researched and documented quite extensively as offered in Chapter II. The matter of culture with respect to this study was primarily focused on both internal institutional bureaucratic nuances as well as the interrelationship of urban versus production agriculture and rural paradigms. This section will illuminate these issues within the context of The State University, its College of Agriculture, and the Extension system.

Here, understanding the culture in which the interviewees and organizational leaders were raised will elucidate the motivation for supporting the urban initiative. Their formative experiences play a critical role in their decisions that led to the establishment of the Metro Center. The backgrounds of these individuals speak to their ability to see beyond traditional constituencies and explore the possibilities of the new horizons. Keeping in mind the biographies of the participants from whom the data was collected for this study is an important consideration when reviewing this segment of the study. This section will explore the issue of the changing culture within this institution and will be broken down into a number of segments that include the following: Relevance and a question of survival, Community imbedding and looking in the mirror; Balancing risk and opportunity as they swinging for the fence, Moving outside comfort zones and facing resistance, Same thing different place encourages change, Determination, passion, and replicability, Confirming relevance and adhering to quality, and Doing the right thing.
Confirming Relevance and Adhering to Quality

In order for the Metro Center to become successful, one of the essential elements was that the leadership who supported and were driving this effort needed to believe that relevance of programming and resources were core requirements. This is not to say that awareness was not important however, a deep-seated belief in the principle that rural programming could not be simply transferred to urban environments was integral.

Interview data from several participants as well as data presented in planning documents and committee reports (Appendix A) demonstrated that a paradigm in which the institution and Extension system simply transferred what was done in rural areas into urban areas would simply not succeed. The same data also showed that, certainly among faculty and mid-level administrators, this was an accepted perspective. Here as well, was an indicator that administrators understood this concept and that it had become embodied in their actions. Representing this type of reflection, Lydia expounded on this thought.

The United States is becoming much more centered around population centers and populations around cities, maybe not in cities, but the areas around cities is growing. Rural population is typically not growing. Agricultural people that are producing agricultural products, that number’s going down, therefore, if you’re going to have relevance in the future, you need to be thinking about how you’re relevant to that growing population area. So we’ve got to find some of the right formula to be successful in developing programs around cities.

There was an understanding that significant knowledge resources existed that were fully relevant to urban constituents. The question became the manner in which these resources were tapped and how they were to be made available. A number who were
interviewed believed that the College of Agriculture should be seen as the catalyst that gets this started for the University. It can then become a much larger effort. Other colleges such as engineering certainly had things to offer. Public records on institutional standings demonstrated that this institution had stellar Colleges in Engineering, Arts and Architecture, Health and Human Development, Medicine, and others. These resources and knowledge bases that existed across the institution could eventually be brought to bear. The interview data from a few administrators and mid-level managers further suggested that by staying with the traditional delivery structure of Cooperative Extension, they were in a position to lead this effort and potentially encourage the engagement of the entire system.

In this regard, Aldo expressed what other administrators had indicated in the data collection. He expounded on this as follows.

I’m committed to the fact that we have to constantly challenge ourselves about what our role is and who our stakeholders are. It’s a terrible mistake to basically shut people out of access to the knowledge we have simply because we don’t try to extend it to them. I think I have a lot of different ways I try to measure success in my own role as a research administrator but a key measure of the success is the creation of teams that are working together taking fundamental scientific knowledge to apply to solving practical problems. I think that’s what we do as well as anybody in the world. I think there are fundamental practical problems in these metro areas that we just haven’t touched.
This was a specific commitment to align research assets in a manner that would address specific problems in urban areas and did not attempt to press rural and production agricultural research into these new markets.

Relevancy also addressed issues of diversity. In a system that did not include many field staff members who came from diverse racial backgrounds it was imperative that this issue be better addressed. Only two interviewees addressed the issue of diversity however, it was important to include this discussion in the form of audience relevance. There was significant documentation in the public realm that supported efforts made by this institution to address the matter of diversity at all levels. Within the context of this study Terri expressed, with some specificity, what was in the forefront of many administrators and others in the system?

I think much of the issue is around diversity, serving our diverse populations. Our diverse populations primarily are in urban settings in this state, and the evolution of the population becoming more diverse occurred initially through the urban settings and then moved into rural areas. So when you had a Hispanic workforce in the major urban area, they started working in the agricultural industries: the mushroom industry, the horticulture turf industry. This certainly impacts our work in agriculture and then, again, transfers back and forth to the city.

I think it permeates throughout, at least through vision, the desire of reaching diverse audiences. We’ve certainly had diversity on our agenda, for at least a decade or more. It’s about reaching out to diverse communities, institutions, audiences, organizations that employ or reach a diverse audience. We really kept that out there in many ways. I remember one time I asked an urban
Extension director in the state for some information about the programming in that city and county for diverse audiences. He said, “Well, we’re diverse all the time, you know. It’s just our normal way of doing work.” That’s how it should be everywhere. Obviously that county is just natural like that. We haven’t had to push it or force it in any way like in some rural counties where they are just now becoming diverse as the population migrates to their community. But there are many other services and programs that we need to continue to find ways to deliver in the big cities.

The issue of relevance is almost exclusively about the types of University resources and services that were available to these audiences. This did bring the conversation back around to programming.

At the end of the day, most interview data reflected that the quality of the services provided should be extremely high. Regardless of audience be it rural or urban, the delivery of educational and research services should be relevant to the issue it was attempting to address as well as needing to maintain a high standard. The data from several interviews showed that this institutional leadership was less worried about jeopardizing what they already had. They believed that the future of serving a very narrow audience was a limiting future. The expanded view included those populations who resided in cities and around cities. It was evident that they understood that this was something that had not been done very well. The interview data from at least three individuals was clear that some of these quality programs that had universal appeal, while being offered with regularity in rural areas and for which Extension and the University were well known, could be redirected to metropolitan areas if adjusted for the specific
need. This focus on the work was exemplified by Lydia looking at it from an administrator’s perspective. She offered the following comments.

I remember having a conversation early on where people talked about, “We’ve got to worry about the future of Extension.” I said, “No. The organization that we call Extension today is not important. The work that we do is what’s important.” Remember it’s not the entity, but it’s the work.

In the end, the organization made the decision to establish a Metro Center partially based on the belief that The Land Grant system could not ignore large segments of the state’s population. Most of the interviewees presented this viewpoint from a variety of perspectives yet all agreed that relevancy of programming to urban areas was critical for a healthy future of the Extension program. The following section explores the manner in which the organization sees itself in relation to its culture.

Community Embedding and Looking In the Mirror

The organizational leadership team needed to take into consideration the nature of the new environment and its ability to make decisions based on accurate insights. The issue of community embedding here refers to the ability of an organization to either recognize that they had such personnel resources in place or at a minimum needed to establish them effectively. Lydia expressed it as follows:

I don’t think we have really addressed the community aspect of that in order to do Extension work the way we’ve done it in rural areas. Will we ever be able to have the capacity to address communities in metropolitan areas the way that we address them in rural areas? I am not real hopeful that we’ll be able to do that.
If you’re going to change a community, you have to be a part of that community. Another big argument for choosing this director for the Metro Center was we’ve got a person from that City who everybody knows and knows that he is a city person; that he can go over there and represent the University. They know that he’s also from the City; that he has the region’s best interest. He’s established there. He grew up there. His family’s there. He’s going to be there. They know that he’s committed. There’s a lot to be said for that.

The need to establish this depth of relationship within the new urban culture was extremely important and was presented in the interview data from several participants. This scenario allowed for the development of more effective trusting relationships that enhanced communication and candid discussion. In representing the sentiments present in the data of several interviewees, Lydia continues:

In rural areas, we have Extension agents. Maybe they move into a county, and maybe they’re not considered to be natives but when you see them in church, and you see them in a grocery store, you see them at the Little League games; they quickly become a part of that community, and people start seeing them as a community leader. If you’re going to change communities, you have to work with those communities. Help them change from the inside. Then our role can be that of a conduit back to other types of resources at the University.

This institution, while doing very well with integration into the rural communities and culture, had not done well with respect to continuity of staff in the largest of the urban areas. Tracking personnel changes in that largest urban area over a number of years showed that staff and leadership changed with some regularity over the previous 15
years. This lack of consistency and relationship building hindered progress there.

Contrary to this, the same interview data indicated that the target urban area had significant stability over that same period of time. Staff was highly stable with few changes. This allowed for noteworthy relationships to be built and the promotion of the State University Extension Program was such that it had a significantly higher standing in the public arena. This standing was due to the alignment with all those things urban. The relationships were urban and so, colleagues were also urban. Those staff members who worked in that environment were comfortable with it because this was who they were.

Interview data from at least one faculty member indicated, however, that the institution was somewhat queasy because it was beginning to sense that its culture could be changing based on the company it was keeping. That self image of what it did in the field was reflecting a new paradigm with which it was not fully familiar. The company it kept had changed and as a body, it was not yet comfortable with that.

Interestingly, there was an organizational reflection seen by some administrators and that image did not appear to be in tune with their perception of the organization’s self image. According to three interviewees, if the system invested hard dollars into a new endeavor like the Metro Center, it will look very hard at itself prior to doing so. What would the traditional stakeholders say? Would they lose support from them? There was, however, a disclaimer route that allowed new programs to find their own money and do whatever they wanted. The College could say that they were still the same rural organization, particularly when it was outside the realm of their core activities. Angelo expressed it as follows.
One thing is you really don’t need the administration to do what you want to do. If you get your own money, come up with your own ideas they won’t stop you. That’s one thing I like about this place, they’re not micromanagers, especially if you get your own resources. And so in that way, it’s a very great place. As an example, in our program we’ve been able to take advantage of it. We’ve been able to do some things a little bit different. They never said we couldn’t. You know we’re not using millions of dollars of College money. We’ll get our own money. Now, the thing is when that system has to breach the College policy level, like building a Metro Center or something, that’s when the conservatism happens. As long as you’re operating in this box that is self-financed, it doesn’t force the College to portray itself any differently than it has in the past. To me, you’ve got total freedom. You can do what you want.

Once you have to actually get the College to change its self-portrait or its direction in terms of what it tells the public, that’s when things get very conservative. To me they fold back to how they’ve remained stable all these years through the rural county citizens who lobby the legislature every funding cycle. You know, they say, “We might make somebody mad on that. They’re not going to lobby for us next year. Well, they did it this year.”

As is evident here, this issue of moving outside the culture was somewhat terrifying for this institution. The more a new paradigm was reflected back to it, the more challenging change became. The risk was torn open for viewing. In the past, data presented earlier indicated that the organization’s first reaction was to retreat back to its
comfort zone. It appeared that at this juncture, the organization saw this new reflection and chose to move ahead just the same.

*Balancing Risk and Opportunity as They Swing for the Fence*

Although everyone was encouraged to be creative, it was the leader who could best create the environment, challenge the old ways, encourage risks, and protect others who took risks; even if they had not always been successful. Often, new ideas were not allowed to occur in an organization as they might conflict with existing, established, models or ways of doing things. Leaders have the task of confronting these existing assumptions without invoking defensiveness or anger. (Marquardt, 2000).

In this study, interview data from almost all those participating indicated that there was a significant amount of risk taking across numerous levels of administration. This was found in almost every facet of data collection. There was an undercurrent of potential loss if the Metro Center effort was not successful. To some degree, the reputations and careers of the leaders were in jeopardy depending on the relative success or failure of this effort.

The issue of risk aversion for an extremely traditional institution was presented in Chapter II. The system was not known for being bold from an administrative perspective. While as a major research institution, certainly there were bold innovations in the areas of research and educational methodologies, these did not necessarily transfer to innovations of a bureaucratic or organizational nature. Thus, this effort had been given significant acknowledgment in regard to innovation and systems thinking. The effort necessary, in
light of the risks, was documented through at least seven of the individuals who were interviewed for this study. Lydia captures this in the following statement.

You know, the Center is a risk. Think about the portfolio of the College-backed sciences. That’s the context in which you’re looking at it. Here, you’ve got all of these different things that are no-brainers. Sometimes you’ve got to swing for the fence and the Metro Center is a swing for the fence. If we hit a home run with the Metro Center, it’s going to be awesome. We’re going to win the World Series. We’ll go on to next year. If we miss, we strike out, but there’s two more batters it would not be the bottom of the ninth, yet, either.

Data presented through both the administrative interviewees and those from middle management suggested that it was necessary to keep the metro program machine running with all of those identified personnel who were already engaged through much of the early planning process. This effort was being presented as the next level of Extension. It could be that Extension was being seen as a delivery method rather than a program in and of itself. It became more of a vehicle for how to transfer knowledge beyond just resources at the College of Agriculture. This would be seen as a major cultural shift.

There were at least six interviewees who addressed the issue of tipping the balance with respect to potential opportunity and growth. This tipping occurred under the watch of institutional leaders who were not necessarily children of the traditional culture. Their perspective allowed them a certain confidence and understanding needed for the risk to be seen as a manifestation of their personal experiences rather than attempting something fully in the realm of the unknown. The institution had gotten to the point where some key people were empowered to try something new. At this time, two
somewhat related but different bureaucratic systems within the institution, Extension and University Outreach, were both engaged in investigating an urban effort. Again, as an administrator, Lydia had some insight into this particular perspective that reflected the thought of a number of interviewees for the study.

I think there have been a lot of people that thought this way for some time. There’s an aspect of, “Do you have the courage to act?” even, with where we are today. I still question whether or not some people will have the courage to follow through on the Metro Center, so we’ll see. Is it a change? It’s just a change in behavior, not a change in rhetoric I would say.

In the end, the desire of these individuals to drive ahead was significant. Swinging for the fence required a commitment on the part of these leaders to support the effort beyond rhetoric. This next section continues to explore this perspective of risk-taking from the standpoint of comfort zones and resistance.

Moving Outside Comfort Zones and Facing Resistance

Interview data from at least three sources showed that moving outside of comfort zones had become less difficult with the infusion of new faculty. One area of comfort that was becoming less so for those engaged in agricultural production, was that in this state there continued to be a decline in that industry. Data presented through the faculty interviews indicated that it was not as easy to justify appropriated state resources for this program effort when less and less of the population was engaged in it and where production was already at all-time highs. As a faculty member, Delfina provided
significant insights into this issue in relation to the state budgeted resources for
Extension.

We have 3,400 large farms in the state. That’s it. Okay? That’s it in the 2002
census. I just think it needs to have a reinvention, a new view of things. I think the
question that’s going to be tough is the types of things that the College has
expertise in. They were what I consider the traditional areas.

This issue of stepping outside of the traditional comfort zone brings with it
significant risk for the leaders who had been advocating for this position. Interview data
from at least one administrator indicated that the system could create change, but
transformational change that completely transforms who they were and what they did
would be extremely difficult. In this traditional College and Extension there could be
more casualties than successes. Again, this same data showed that the resistance came
from the personnel who embody the rural and production agriculture culture. It was
unknown what, if any resistance could mount once the initial excitement of establishing
the Center subsided. The leadership group believed that the risks outweighed the
potential rewards of acting on the Center idea. Lilli presented it as follows in this next
statement.

I think part of our job as leaders is to continue to try things, and try to encourage
change. The Metro Center is not the first attempt I’ve seen at engaging with a
metropolitan area in an effective way. I’m sure it won’t be the last and I hope that
we’re learning something from it as we go along. I hope that we have learned that
we need to adapt and adjust as we’re implementing it to understand how we can
get it done and help it adapt to the environment in which it needs to exist.
Data collected from at least five individuals also discussed issues that addressed the inherent difficulty of being able to come outside their comfort zone. Some of the stagnation had to do with personal inertia. A part of the change problem, regardless of the issue, was getting outside of personal inertia, getting uncomfortable. If something was to be done differently, something new must be learned, possibly learned from new people and in new ways. It was this organization’s nature to resist change.

Documents such as committee reports (Appendix A) as well as a few interviews also provided data that as a University, it needed to be willing to make a large financial commitment. Making a significant commitment for research and education in urban settings would demonstrate a significant stance by the institution. The system had resisted that politically. This same data also confirms that there had been a significant amount of support and advocacy from within leadership circles. Iris, the faculty member with administrative experience, explores this particular perspective comparing the current environment with that of a few years earlier.

I think that we had some strong leadership and courage exhibited on the part of Alex and Lydia on this matter. I think that Karl was also an advocate. That’s my sense with the trustees, with external groups and internally. Second, I think there are relatively more interested and committed internal people, especially faculty than there were previously. I can take a circle of folks who I know who are strong advocates now. We didn’t have those advocates previously. They are more out there on the edge.

I think there is a growing recognition among everyone including trustees, administrative leadership, faculty, educators, and external stakeholders that urban
and rural areas are interdependent. There is a need for a change in the way we do business in the College of Agriculture if we are going to have any chance of surviving. I think there is a growing recognition of that, of course not a ground swell, but enough to say ok let’s do something a little different.

Significant documentation data available in Appendix A and interviewee comments showed that stepping outside of the traditional comfort zone and facing the variety of resistance may have been the only course of action. Establishment of the Metro Center was an indication that the system, and those who led it, had in the end, come to realize that the Land Grant and Extension Systems included all segments of the population both rural and urban, white and people of color, farmers and manufacturing workers, as well as all those categories of people who lie in between.

*Same Thing Different Place Encourages Change*

To some degree, there was a hedging of bets with regard to risk-taking when the nature of programming strayed from the core competencies of Extension or the College of Agriculture. Three of the four administrator interviewees indicated that there was an understanding from the agriculture research standpoint that agriculture research needs to be relevant to cities as well. There seems to be sufficient overlap in a number of programmatic areas. As examples, issue areas related to food and fiber, green industries, natural resources and a few others were aligned well across urban and rural challenges. These studies were important to research regardless of their location.

The same data also indicated that there was a need for faculty and educators in the system to understand the true impact related to the fact that consumers of agricultural
products were primarily located in highly populated areas. If faculty and educators focused on assisting in the production of food, it was necessary for them to begin programming activities in urban areas so that a fuller understanding of the processes might enlighten these audiences. This was somewhat of a new idea which had developed over the past ten to fifteen years. Several interviewees and document data in Appendix A indicate that this really was two sides of the same coin in that training and education in urban farming techniques, as an example, was a way of heightening the awareness of metro audiences while also enhancing the capabilities of that effort. Issues of alternative energies were another way of educating the urban population relative to what it took to produce biomass as an energy source.

To some degree, the system was struggling with the issue of continued funding for an arena that had been instrumental in creating the most abundant and effective agricultural system in the world. There had been monumental changes in production agriculture over the past 30 to 40 years. There was a question relative to marginal increases in traditional methods and balancing sustainability issues as a reaction to market forces. Perhaps the continued drive to produce more and more food had tapered off. Perhaps there were other areas to which resources could be directed in order to achieve significant enhancements in the name of social justice, public good, and community and economic development. Iris addressed it with this statement.

From a Land Grant perspective you go back to the Land Grant philosophy. Why should we devote millions of dollars, tens of millions of dollars, to eke out a marginal increase in productivity and profitability in green beans, for example, when in fact we could apply our disciplines in areas of our society where the
contribution, the benefit can be enormous. I’m not saying we should get rid of green beans or the green bean work. Poverty, environmental understanding, developing young people, whatever it is, community development, IPM; this is where we could have great impact. We’re better off in terms of the contribution if we make investment in terms of our Land Grant mission, our societal perspective, putting our time, effort, resources where the marginal contribution is greatest as opposed to eking out a little bit of productivity and profitability on green beans.

This thinking certainly was a change in paradigm. This transformation was representative of the kinds of strategic thinking that seemed to be occurring within the Extension system.

There seemed to be no question that faculty involved in the College and Extension were beginning to look at the possibility of taking their discipline and applying it in different environments. The data from at least four interviewees suggested that an excitement was mounting for this concept of academic exploration of environments outside rural communities and production agriculture. Interestingly, Delfina addressed this issue of changing faculty as a driver for expanded organizational effort in metropolitan communities.

I don't think it’s going to happen among the older generation. John and I have talked for hours and hours about this. People who are approaching retirement, who are going into retirement now are just saying, “Well, I’m already too old.” You know? Why give that energy to making this happen? I mean I think this is all related to it. If you look at the age structure of this College, we're old. So, are you gonna be able to look at them for this infusion of energy to get the Metro Center
going? It all needs to be recreated. I think it is a time for a new vision, and you
know, the Metro Center is part of that new vision, without a doubt.

The need to establish a Metro initiative, had attempted to balance risk and opportunity
while providing sufficient support to nurture this new effort. The following section
explores this idea.

*Determination, Passion, and Replicability*

In the case of the Metro Center the issue of replicability was important because as
a prototype, it would be vital that the structure serve as a model for other centers to be
opened elsewhere in the state. Data collected from among the administrators in this study
showed that passion and determination were present and manifested themselves in a
variety of ways. Lilli, an influential mid-level administrator, approached it as described
here.

I think if we’re doing the right thing it could make a difference, but I think doing
the right thing is our end game. I think our end game is trying to make a
difference in the community, helping to save jobs, helping train the workforce,
bringing more people into the city because it’s a better place to be. To me, it is a
lot more important than worrying about whether we get another quarter of a
percent of funding from state government because we’ll be okay. We will.

Interestingly, the willingness to forgo even a small increase in government support
exemplifies the importance and enthusiasm of the work being done.

There was no question that respondents in the interviews all had a significant zeal
for this initiative. During these interviews the expressions seen and words recorded
reflected an excitement for this work. After many decades of struggle for urban programming within the systems, it was apparent that this strategy had found significant support across a broad spectrum of University personnel from high-level administrators to faculty. The zeal was evident from each respondent about extending programming across a broad spectrum of highly populated areas. Interview data from at least four individuals also supported the perception that the excitement came from two areas: 1) the challenge of developing programs relevant to this population and, 2) its ability to demonstrate that resources were significant and that impact could positively affect individuals, communities, and businesses. Iris expressed it as follows.

I had the experience of working in a region with a major urban area where there’s a huge opportunity, in my judgment, for the College of Agriculture to have a presence in urban areas, not just to do horticulture and the usual things. To do those things, yes but to do a whole range of other community development oriented things for want of a better term. I saw huge opportunity, huge passion, and I felt there was an opportunity to build our political base, enhance the political base for the University and do good things for people.

Interview data taken from a few faculty members also bears out that there was a new generation of faculty members who had a broader vision. They saw the opportunity for application of their disciplines as an important context that staff had not seen before. There was some faculty who wanted to make a societal contribution beyond the rural agricultural setting. There were also some, macro and micro secular changes that continue to occur. As people trained in traditional disciplines, whether faculty or educators, they were coming to see the broader, wider application of these disciplines to
help people. They were committed to work on behalf of community people in helping to resolve the many complex issues they faced. This did not suggest that it was a *take it or leave it* proposition. Faculty interview data suggested that the communities were looking at the nature of available expertise and understood it. This was necessary in order for faculty to partner on the creation of new opportunities and new programming. These were research and education programs that were done with and for people. The intent was to co-create programs so that communities could be better served and so that they were able to develop their voice as an urban constituency. Each one of these traditional disciplines could make a major impact in this metropolitan setting.

In general terms, the organization continued to evolve in this manner. Data collected from those interviewees who were in administrative positions confirmed that issues of properly motivated personnel and empowerment of staff were important imperatives to follow. As an organization that was experiencing a variety of changes including retirement of older faculty with the replacement of younger staff, this issue was critical if the organization would be more engaged in future urban related activities. Lydia exemplifies the data and addressed this as follows.

We pride ourselves in being an organization that can create and energize community change. The only way you can do that is focusing in on the front-end of that curve. I think we have more people now who are innovators and early adopters. We want to make sure that we’re hiring people who are innovators and early adopters themselves, but also with an appreciation for history and culture.

Document data in the form of plans and committee reports (Appendix A) shows that taking this initial model and adapting it for use in other metro areas was an important
component of establishing the Center. There was a need for an effective model to be challenged and refine so that mistakes that were made with this effort had less of a chance at being repeated in a new environment. Data taken from administrators, who were interviewed for this case study, all referred to this effort as developing a prototype or model for future deployment. Aldo expressed this component as follows.

My vision of what I hope happens in this Metro Center which I would then hope could be transported to other metro centers is that we truly find a way to more robustly bring in all of the functions that our College represents. I would like to see researchers drawn into projects and Extension educators involved. Get the Extension educators engaged in these research projects because that cements the link between this applied research and the translation through the programs and the knowledge and the products.

Finally, there seemed to be an assumption that this initiative really was only the beginning. While the target city was not the largest in the state, it was apparent that the desire to move this format to that city as well as to other smaller urban centers was borne out by interview data with several participants. In comments made by Donald, one of the mid-level administrators, it was apparent that expanding this effort into other areas was simply taken as a matter of fact.

I was very supportive of the notion of creating a greater presence in both major cities of the state and in other communities. I was supportive particularly for those two metropolitan areas simply because as part of our Extension mission it is to provide support to families and youth. Urban families and youth are just as
appropriate and deserving as the rural families and youth, and we have programs that can obviously serve those more metropolitan areas.

While it was unknown what timeline might be followed with another center, clearly the intent was that momentum could be garnered from a successful effort with this initiative. For this to occur, it is necessary to have programs align with needs. This next section addresses this.

**Doing the Right Thing**

Nine of the participants passionately claimed that serving urban and metropolitan audiences was both a function of The Land Grant and Extension Systems as well as an opportunity to provide programmatic excellence to urban populations. This concept was summed up quite well in the comments made by Aldo, one of the higher level administrators:

For me it’s driven by the opportunity, it’s driven by the understanding that we have millions of people sitting out there who don’t know we exist but who could benefit greatly from the kinds of things we could bring to them. This is a real difference and I think that we cannot abandon our commitment to working in those school districts, working in those communities and providing information, services, and programs that help those folks. This concept of being there for people was reflected regularly throughout the interviews and the data that supports this was quite strong.

This idea of doing good work was often characterized within specific programmatic areas. That is, a number of interviewees who engaged in specific areas of
research and/or educational programming refer to the need to strengthen the capacity of urban communities and enhance their ability to address unique problems. All three members of the faculty who were interviewed present information that their particular areas of research and teaching could be extremely valuable to urban and metropolitan communities. While Angelo speaks of integrated pest management, Delfina speaks of the interrelationship of people living at the edge of the urban rural interface. Iris, one of most experienced faculty, refers to her interest in community and economic models to enhance urban capacities in these areas. Clearly, there was a basic commitment to service regardless of geographical location, population density, or culture.

This particular enthusiasm was also reflected among those in leadership positions. These individuals, who wielded authority over program direction and resource allocation, seemed highly committed to establishing a significant presence in urban areas. Fundamentally, each provided data that supported the notion that there was a true commitment to these constituents. The manner in which this institution’s approach to challenges was particularly strong relates to its scientific basis. Research provided the support to ensure that the very best practices were being employed in each situation. That zeal as presented by an administrator like Karl was an example of the manner in which administrators in the institution saw their role. He expressed it as follows.

What we bring is evidence-based interventions. It's not like you're saying "Well, I really think this program's going to help." We've got faculty doing research to figure out what does work, and then they get to apply it. To me it's a no-brainer. But I think what we need to do is to really shift. What is the Extension of the 21st century? And to me it's more needed and necessary than ever. It's just shifting the
focus to include urban and it's not abandoning agriculture at all. In fact, it still might be 70 percent agriculture, but it's looking at what else we can do. I think that's the issue.

In the final analysis, leaders of this organization believed that they worked within the system that was a tremendous repository of knowledge and some way needed to escape the bounds of the University walls. This knowledge needed to be distributed freely among all sectors of this state’s population; from public to private endeavors, from rural to urban communities, and every other corner within its influence. In order to accomplish this, it was necessary to admit that the changing demographics insisted that the institution recognize where people live and, in turn, transform itself in an appropriate manner.

Summary

As presented here, there was a specific pattern of institutional shared basic assumptions as they addressed problems of programmatic and resource adaptation as well as the need to integrate these internally. For several generations, this culture flourished and was in sync with much of American society. That strategy worked well enough to be considered valid and effective throughout that same period of time. Data presented in Chapter II showed that as American society slowly changed and became more urban and less farm production oriented, this system failed to make similar changes for many years.

Data was presented that while members of its own organization signaled that change was afoot and that a paradigm shift was necessary, little could be done to address this inequity. Even with the decision made to establish the Metro Center, the rural and production agriculture culture continued to be strong and healthy within the organization.
The nature of this had an impact on the level of support provided to this new initiative and the extent to which it could deliver meaningful resources to the urban area.

The leaders within the cultural context of the Institution decided to support this Metro Center. This was apparent in the interview data as presented. This leadership team was a supporter and advocate for the effort. These individuals were able to hold off challenges by other well-positioned, high-ranking individuals who held the old cultural perspectives yet, these leaders managed to maintain their focus. Addressing issues of relevance, educational programming, and research spoke volumes to their commitment. Significant interview data supported the fact that the organization did want to provide quality services to all sectors of the state regardless of their demographics even in the face of historic and cultural issues.

Finally, data presented in this section also indicated that the Metro Center required an infrastructure and a stakeholder support system that understood the changing culture. Further, it needed to be built all together at the same time because past paradigms had not allowed for the development of resources essential for broad programmatic implementation in urban areas. These cultural issues proved to be quite challenging. There was a real risk for this organization. There was risk of failure. There was risk of alienating stakeholder groups or other traditional champions. There was risk of being perceived as promising, but unable to deliver for the new constituents. Losing credibility was a possibility if they were unable to deliver on at least some of the institutional potential. To this end, there were real challenges as well as tremendous organizational peril. Table 7 provides additional summation information for this changing culture of Extension section summary section.
### Table 7

*The Changing Culture of Extension Section Summary*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-section</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirming Relevance and Adhering to Quality</td>
<td>Relevance of programming and resources were core requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community embedding and looking in the mirror</td>
<td>Take into consideration the new environment and making decisions based on accurate insights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing risk and opportunity as they swinging for the fence</td>
<td>Leader create the environment, challenge the old ways, encourage risks, and protect others who took risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving outside comfort zones and facing resistance</td>
<td>Stepping outside of the traditional comfort zone brings risk for the leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same thing different place encourages change</td>
<td>Agriculture research needs to be relevant to cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination, Passion, and Replicability</td>
<td>Passion and determination were present and manifested with the ability for duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing the right thing</td>
<td>Serving urban audiences was both a function as well as an opportunity to provide programmatic excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Thematic Context

An examination of the data relative to the major thematic areas revealed that the time was right for the establishment of a Metro Center. The analysis of comments and reports allowed for the exposure of these thematic concepts. These themes helped to categorize the various decisions to move forward with the Metro Center initiative. The analysis broke down the major thematic areas into Internal Stakeholders, External Stakeholders, and the Changing Culture of Extension. Each of these allowed exploration of the bureaucratic system, the external environment relative to Extension, as well as various characteristics of individuals within a cultural paradigm while engaged in the process to establish the urban initiative.

Divided into subthemes, the major themes revealed the various details within the constructs of each characteristic. As had been documented, the themes involved intricate, interdependent, and complex relationships among various groups inside and outside of the institution. Those pressures within the institution were seen in the interview data. These entailed, in some cases, conflicting objectives from cultural, methodological, and personal preference. It became clear that decisions were affected by varying spheres of influence, many of them detailed in the study.

Institutional pressures were also exerted from outside of the organization primarily by those who had been generations-long advocates for the traditional programming directions. These long time allies were shown to be incredibly supportive of the research and educational aspects of the College and Extension. These same support networks however, had also served to stifle any development of new audiences regardless of their need. The needs of these urban communities faced major challenges for which
the institution had significant resources that could be used to address them. This coveting of resources for self-serving or limited serving activities was a serious matter for consideration because various pressures continued to sustain that mindset.

Interview data showed that individuals in leadership positions recognized the imbalance of resources and services and were willing to apply their leadership skills in attempts to rectify the matter. These individuals, who personally had limited historical connection to that culture, were prepared to support the new urban initiatives. As such data was presented confirming that in the face of significant risk, they had moved to establish the Metro Center. Further, the findings unveiled a strong vein of support across many sectors of the institution. It appears that in this case study, there was a major commitment to these audiences outside the parameters of the Land Grant Extension system.

These findings allowed for the display of the inner workings of this traditional system in its effort to make a cultural transformation. This study that included 11 interviewees, reflected opinions and observations that were deeply rooted in the College of Agriculture and Extension Programs. Further, these perspectives were openly given with candor and honesty. To a great degree, there was a passion to the conversations that was palpable when discussing the opportunity for programming in metropolitan areas of the state.

This qualitative investigation allowed for the fundamental telling of a story of the establishment of this state’s first Metro Center. The study exposed tightly held perspectives in a manner that allowed for a better understanding of the motivations behind the actions. In Chapter V, this discussion will continue in detail by exploring
issues of research, theoretical perspective, recommendations, and implications for others interested in this topic.
V. DISCUSSION

With regard to the fundamental mission of the Land Grant institution that is carried out primarily through Cooperative Extension, it is interesting to me that there is a system fully aligned with unique demographics without regard to the needs of larger demographic groups. Many of the challenges that face the urban underserved communities are generally not addressed by other institutions of higher learning. None have the basic and legislated mission of conducting applied research, translating that research, and delivering it to residents of the state. Nor do any have a substantial infrastructure, with sustainable funding with which to effectively deliver comprehensive educational services directly to communities.

I am surprised that a symbiotic relationship continues between Extension and exclusive demographic segments of our society. My passion for the integration of urban Extension into the greater whole was bolstered as the course of this study advanced. I continue to be astounded that the fundamental and sustained inequities in the Extension service delivery system have managed to survive. Yet, there have been signs of its weakness relative to sustainability. Flat and reduced funding at the federal level and very slow growth from the state should have provided sufficient warning for a system that I feel is badly broken and only now awakening to the reality of our modern demographics. The system continues to place a positive spin on the fact that it is diversifying its funding portfolio with grants and contracts. I believe this is simply another way of saying that the arguments supporting a small segment of society receiving substantial government funding without regard to the multitudes of metropolitan audiences is eroding. The next
phase can either be one that embraces change and returns the system to a thriving enterprise by serving the majority of our population or it can fall into disaffection and lost opportunity continuing its downward public funding cycle.

I am further troubled that an urban initiative requires monumental organizational effort and very specific characteristics in leader alignment to have any chance for success. The systemic effort necessary to implement this change is simply untenable. I believe that everyone, regardless of the location of their home, has the right to receive educational information and services from their Extension program. Concomitantly, that institution has an obligation to provide access to relevant knowledge assets to all of the citizens of a state. There are millions of individuals and families in urban areas who are deprived of these resources suggesting that the entire issue is one of social justice.

The current national Land Grant environment can only be perceived as an entitlement for one segment of the population to the exclusion of others. This chapter provides a review of the body of research to which this study contributes. It also includes a review of the findings as they relate to representative bureaucracy theory, a description of the current status of the Metro Center, a discussion of the implications this study may have on the national urban Extension effort, and suggested areas for future research.

Finally, personally and professionally, I believe I have grown. The qualitative research process has caused me view the world in a slightly different manner. The ways in which I interpret data and communication has changed as have the methods in which I perceive interactions with those around me. This is not to say that it is better, rather, different due to the experiences in which I have been engaged for the past several years. I
believe that engaging in this intensely focused process, has caused me to be somewhat more analytical and certainly has allowed me to perform in my position more effectively.

Research Context

The significant lack of empirical literature related specifically to urban Extension allows this study to contribute significantly to the body of existing research focused on that specific sector of Cooperative Extension. The vast majority of research presented to the scholarly community incorporates a perspective that is highly rural in nature and includes rural audiences almost exclusively. This study intended to illuminate the manner in which a traditional Extension system imbedded in the fundamental structure of a Land Grant Institution can break the cycle of limited urban programming and make a leap into a new environment. This is the primary research context and reflects a critical need for strengthening research linkages among similar research projects as they develop.

The study of this new urban initiative addressed the need within the specific field of urban Extension for a significant increase in qualitative and quantitative study of organizational culture, leadership, funding policies, organizational advocacy, and institutional bureaucracy. It is necessary to explore the effectiveness of addressing needs in urban areas using the Extension delivery model. This includes the provision of program content from areas that are relevant to metropolitan communities and that may not be found within traditional colleges of agriculture structures. Studies that address issues from a variety of Extension programmatic perspectives are less important than looking at more global policy, cultural, and funding dynamics. This study explores the premise, and lends support to the general assertion that urban Extension holds a minor
position within the system and as such requires a certain alignment of resources and characteristics for the development and implementation of a successful urban initiative.

The Current Status of the Metro Center

One of the key activities carried out by the Metro Center Committee was the survey administered to the faculty in the College of Agriculture. This surprising and positive response from faculty interested in engaging urban and metropolitan challenges was a significant boost to the effort (See Appendix B, E-mail #1). Even after the decision for establishing the center was completed, there was hesitancy regarding the formal announcement of the effort (See Appendix B, E-mail #2). This was the continued reflection of the manner in which these urban decisions were perceived as risky.

During the very early part of 2008, clarifications regarding the nature of the center were being finalized (See Appendix B, E-mail #3). As of this writing, the Metro Center had secured multi-year, institutional funding and support across the University system that included Extension, the College of Agriculture, and the Outreach components at the University level. This support was also spread across the functions of research, teaching, and Extension. The effort has broad and deep institutional support and is being guided by a leadership group that understands that the future of Extension may well lie in a successful service delivery model to highly populated areas of the state (See Appendix B, Internal Memorandum). This, along with a significant shift in the federal direction with the election of Barack Obama, may serve to secure Extension well into the future.

Currently, an effort is underway to select a location central to the city and with easy access using either private vehicles or public transportation. The new center will
house institutional programming components that are currently spread across multiple locations and with varying levels of institutional identification. The intent is for an enhancement of the institution’s profile through a physical presence in the city core that is currently not present. A formal name has been identified and external announcements are being prepared in order to inform the community of this effort. A director has been named into this role and the individual is actively working at the duties (See Appendix B, Internal Memorandum). As of January, 2008 - almost one year to the date when The Metro Center Committee submitted its final report- the entire process has required over four years of planning and implementation.

Implications and Recommendations for Others Considering the Possibility of Establishing an Urban Initiative

There are a multitude of issues that plague urban centers. As in this case study, Extension programs located in these highly populated areas required a support system that was difficult to address. The commitment of resources and partnerships within the institution is absolutely necessary for a successful program. In his study, Kerrigan (2005) addressed this issue from a national perspective.

These issues bring into question Extension’s organizational ability to effectively develop programs with adequate breadth and depth without increased interaction with the entire land-grant university, urban universities, and other potential private and public partners. The multitude of problems and the many urban populations that can be served, require that Extension make difficult decisions about appropriate programs and audiences. How will Extension balance requests
for programs for various audiences? How should urban Extension’s resources be focused for maximum impact? Who should Extension involve in the decision-making process on these issues? What additional funding sources should be cultivated and how will the change in funding patterns affect programming, target audiences, staffing patterns and all of the other factors involved in this change? With these issues in mind, it is critical that patterns of success be identified so urban Extension professionals may set meaningful goals against which to measure their achievements.

One of the fundamental intents of this study was to present the manner in which a successful urban initiative was developed for this state. While this case study should not be generalized across the nation, there are a number of characteristics that may help others understand and navigate the pitfalls and opportunities in their attempts at similar initiatives. Each state is different as are each of the Land Grant institutions connected to them. The character of the population differs as do the politics surrounding the issues. Further, internal and external leadership issues will vary greatly across institutions.

The hope is that others can learn from this experience and borrow those things that may align while discarding the rest. Based on this study’s findings, other Land Grant Institutions might consider the following components if and when they decide to proceed with urban efforts: a) impact on institutional procedures, b) sensitivity to stakeholders, c) impact on institutional funding mechanisms, d) consideration of organizational culture, e) impact on programmatic relevance, and f) impact on leadership characteristics.
An Urban Initiative Should Impact Institutional Procedures

Based on the experiences of those engaged in this case study, Extension systems or Land Grant Institutions could consider changing various institutional procedures that might hinder the establishment of urban initiatives. These can vary but should, at a minimum, include the strategic planning process. This process should be open and transparent in both process and product. The planning process should also include strong and assertive individuals from urban areas who understand the institutional politics as well as the capacity for programming in urban areas. According the findings from this study, these individuals should have a standing within the system so that their opinions and input are valued as being honest, honorable, ethical, and sincere. There should be a balanced number of these individuals who span across all strata of the organization (including administrators, managers, faculty, Extension educators, and clients). Without these assets in place, the functional, academic process of faculty directed efforts within the system cannot take place.

This study suggests that there are two components to the process of programmatic redirection towards urban initiatives. First, it is critical that there are a core number of faculty members who believe that urban programming and support is important. Second, the study showed that the promotion of these ideas should be done in a systemic manner. In this case study, that process was the strategic planning system. If there are insufficient faculty who believe in urban programming and willing to advocate on its behalf, the effort is doomed to failure. The Extension system at its core relies on faculty generated knowledge to be transferred into educational programming and material for delivery. If there is no interest at that level, success could be out of reach. Further, it is the nature of
academia to support the direction pressed by its faculty. Since faculty members are those
who generate research dollars in support of their areas of interest, they also provide
significant indirect cost resources for use by the institution. This relationship is
significant.

Faculty members often may assert influence in changing directions when
administrative leaders are resistant to do so. Particular research faculty, who are
motivated by their specific interest, may recognize changes while administrative leaders
are concerned with stakeholder and political issues. They may be less inclined to make
changes if certain political realities are resistant to it while faculty members are able to
press issues beyond these constraints. This political reality is another issue that
complicates issues of institutional direction.

In some cases, communication with elected officials may be limited by certain
administrative procedures whereby local staff and faculty may be prohibited from direct
contact with them. This successful urban initiative required some level of relationship
building with local elected officials. Without this, a critical component could be missing.
To reflect on representative bureaucracy, these local public officials would be advocating
for their local constituents and in many cases mirror their nature. While sometimes these
officials may not be aware of Extension efforts in their communities, it is extremely
important for them to recognize engagement efforts both historically and currently
underway but also the potential for significant increases in services to their districts.
Finally, these institutional procedures of strategic planning, faculty advocacy systems,
and political communication can provide fundamental support for an urban Extension
initiative.
An Urban Initiative Should Be Sensitive To and Affect Internal Stakeholders

Structurally, champions for urban programming at the highest levels of the organization were extremely important in this study. Reflecting on the findings of this case study, these individuals should serve to push the agenda and be willing to speak on behalf of the effort. Individuals throughout the organizations should be willing to advocate for urban efforts and provide hard evidence and sound thinking when doing so. Urban efforts should also be cognizant of individuals who strongly oppose urban work regardless of whether it is due to their rural cultural alignment or their negative perception of the urban environment. Ensuring that there is a counter balance to these individuals or structural situations would allow the opportunity to provide well designed counter arguments to those positions.

Administrators and others who hold formal and non-formal leadership positions within the institution who resists change to urban programming can be a significant roadblock. In this study, one individual was able to delay actual implementation by many months. This can be done using a variety of methods that include requiring additional study, delaying decisions, and pressing objectives even when the greatest majority of decision makers are in line with the proposed change. Counterbalances could be provided by champions of change. These individuals can continue to press the issue when in years past, and perhaps in other situations, they would have succumbed to traditional pressures.

Urban Extension efforts should be aware of turf issues. Such efforts should determine their causes and ensure that there is sufficient confidence that the urban initiative will not adversely affect their turf. It may be helpful to use internal partnerships
and collaborative strategies whenever possible. They might also investigate the issue of co-locating multiple Land Grant Institutional programmatic resources in the vicinity under one roof in order to magnify the presence and profile of their initiative. It may be difficult to identify where turf issues will become a detriment. It is necessary to be sensitive to these concerns and have a strategy in place that will allay fears and encourage those who are protecting turf that, in fact, this initiative could expanded their field of influence. One possible way to address these concerns is by accentuating characteristics of the initiative that will enhance their position.

Ultimately, the study found that the development of a core, competent, and assertive group of faculty and administrators who all favor urban programming can push the issue forward. Once they experience ownership of the concept, their advocacy both structurally and programmatically, could supersede much of the traditionalist perspective. This core of individuals within the institution could serve as companions in the effort to propel a vision of urban programming into reality.

*An Urban Initiative Should Be Sensitive to and Affect External Stakeholders*

There are a number of strategies necessary with regard to external stakeholders that were effective in this case study. This cadre of individuals, groups, and organizations could be those nurtured to become future Extension stakeholder support systems. One argument against urban programming for Extension is the fact that there are no clear support systems willing to speak on its behalf and promote it as an essential asset to their environment. This is in contrast to rural and agricultural stakeholders who continually support and promote Extension at every level. Within this context there are a number of
items that should be considered. These are: engagement of clients from urban areas to provide external stakeholder support by communicating with institutional leaders, establishment or strengthening connections with local leaders and elected officials, and cultivating local support broadly.

The development of urban stakeholders willing to support and advocate on behalf of the Land Grant Extension urban effort could help allay fears of the loss or potential counter argument of rural and production agriculture constituents. The manner in which this could occur is to engage local citizens, groups, and organizations that have a standing within the community. Extension should align itself with those who have influence or are close to influential people. The development of sound relationships that are genuine, mutually beneficial, and respectful are critical in developing a level of support necessary to counterbalance or replace those present in rural areas. Extension leaders at the local level certainly are engaged in these activities, however, in some cases, these leaders may not reflect basic urban characteristics. Applying the theory of representative bureaucracy at the local level requires that leaders of urban Extension programs should be urban in nature themselves or at least have a passion for urban work. Those coming from rural or production agriculture backgrounds may have difficulty in fully aligning with the broad challenges of urban areas that fall outside of the traditional subjects. In other cases, it is possible that regular staff turnover at the leadership level hinders the development of meaningful relationships with key local constituencies.

With regard to the established local relationships, these stakeholders could serve well in the process of maintaining strong local political ties. When the recipients of quality and effective local programming services speak on the institution’s behalf, their
voice could be significantly louder than when staff and faculty do so. Local political ties also assist with connection to state elected officials who may have input into the funding mechanisms necessary for sustained resources. Ultimately, state elected officials are a key to the success of any effort. If they are unaware of the institution’s programming and constituent impact, it is impossible for them to support an urban effort. These individuals are an integral part of the local leadership network that needs to understand the nature of Extension’s effort and affect on the local environment.

This study illuminated the fact that development of an urban model that incorporates institutional resources beyond Cooperative Extension allows for a significantly broader scope of impact. Further, the utilization of institutional partnerships across colleges can provide access to knowledge bases that may be more appropriate when addressing challenges related to urban areas. All of this serves to provide a greater array of services and resources to urban communities and enhances their relationship with an institution that may have been perceived as being outside of their geographical area. In addition, casting a broader net across urban constituencies, particularly when corporations can access institutional assets as well, will likely strengthen the overall perception of The Land Grant Institution and Extension.

Fundamentally, this study showed that enhancing urban programming by driving additional resources from the institution to that area will require significant stakeholder support. The development, nurturing, and stabilization of these constituencies are critical for any urban initiative to maintain its effort over the long term. These local Extension leaders should be sensitive to urban needs without projecting traditional characteristics on these communities.
**An Urban Initiative Should Use Funding Mechanisms to Develop Reasonable Budgets**

An effective strategy witnessed in this case study was to utilize stakeholder support at the administrative level to ensure multiyear budget resources for the urban initiative. An urban effort could not be established with tentativeness reflecting in a one-year trial. When considering the incredible effort necessary to change an institutional paradigm, never could this occur over one, two and possibly three years. Once a commitment is made, the budget requirements should be sustained and secure for at least a multi-year period of time. These should be targeted dollars committed in order to allow the effort to become sufficiently established. Transition and start up times will be required and should be taken into consideration when establishing a timeline.

Funding should be provided to support a wide range of new efforts. The budget should provide resources to enhance current urban focused work, create opportunity for faculty to engage in existing programming, provide support for faculty to engage in new and creative opportunities, and even for the hiring of new local staff and faculty to engage in areas of study not currently provided by the College of Agriculture. These are all considerations that should be in place for a successful effort.

Funding mechanisms should also provide adequate resources for one time startup costs as well as sufficient facility costs to ensure that a high profile location can be secured somewhere in the heart of the urban area. Based on this study, there should be a significant investment that is on a scale large enough to provide reasonable impact and visibility in the community. It is well documented in Chapter II that on a per capita level,
urban Extension programs are funded at a significantly lower rate than their rural counterparts. It is unreasonable to expect that sufficient impact can be realized in an area with the population magnitude found in an urban area when insufficient resources are made available. The only manner in which true impact can occur is for a significant investment in resources is made sufficient to raise the consciousness and awareness of that community. Essentially, the investment should be proportionate to the size of the urban area not in relation to current funding structures or formulas that are applied most appropriately to rural areas.

An Urban Initiative Should Address Issues of Changing the Extension Culture

This study addressed the issue of organizational culture from the perspective of those aligned with the traditional rural and production agriculture paradigm and potential conflict with those aligned with an urban or metropolitan paradigm. Likely, it is less an issue of conflict and one of ignorance or lack of interest. According to our urban interest survey, those engaged in subject areas related to animal science may have little interest in urban areas. While it may not be fair to isolate this particular arena within a college of agriculture, issues of livestock rarely perceive urban and metropolitan environments as interested in or needing their expertise. While in some states equine issues might be found in metropolitan areas, likely they are not found in the urban core and further to some degree this field is not necessarily perceived as a core issue of urban people. Virtually all other departments within the College of Agriculture could easily translate into programming that is relevant to areas of high population density.
From a viewpoint of representative bureaucracy, it is interesting to apply the theory not necessarily to the leadership of the organization but rather to the staff and faculty. There is an argument to be made that Cooperative Extension should not be the exclusive source of translated research for the outreach mission of the Land Grant Institutions. A case can be made that those resources aligned with Extension simply do not reflect sufficient diversity to address a state’s broad needs. Applying the representative bureaucracy premise would mean that there should be a balance not only according to population demographic characteristics but also programming towards issues that align according to the needs of both rural and urban constituents. These alignments do not currently exist within the environment of the State University. There is, however, a fundamental recognition that there are significant gaps in knowledge resources that need to be made available to address urban and metro challenges. There are steps being taken to access those knowledge resources by either hiring faculty who are more aligned with these or, accessing resources from other colleges within the institution that have them within their academic programs. In the end, the simple recognition of this gap may be a large step towards rectifying it. Only a few years ago, that recognition simply did not exist because the rural and production agriculture paradigm may not have allowed its identification.

It is important to be aware of organizational culture relative to the rural and urban divide. The younger faculty may be more likely to engage with metropolitan issues that tend to align to their areas of interest. These alignments in this particular case study have occurred in the areas of horticulture, soils, community and economic development,
nutrition, youth, natural resources, and others. Clearly these particular areas can easily transcend the rural and urban divide.

There has also been significant discussion regarding transition zones where urban moves through suburban to transition areas and then to rural environments. This has been particularly important in the issue of the development of more and more green space and sustainability or smart growth initiatives. The blurring of these lines has added significance to much of the work that could have been seen as primarily rural but now begins to penetrate layers of metropolitan areas. This expansion of interest areas has also tended to blur the cultural polarization.

There seems to be evidence that this traditional polarization of cultures is beginning to fade as the reality of our national demographic continues to infringe on traditionalist perspectives. Within the context of an urban Extension effort, those engaged should ensure that there are sufficient progressive minded individuals willing to move outside of their comfort zones and into new environments. Drawing these individuals into transitional areas of interest could avoid confrontations and focus on positive support activities. For those aligned with the concept of an urban effort, exciting research and study opportunities may open for them. The establishment of a Metro Center could allow faculty and others to participate in urban and metropolitan activities easier due to bridges built by the effort. Creating an environment accessible to faculty that has high levels of comfort in both physical and relational areas can be extremely helpful. Oftentimes the lack of local relationships with certain constituencies can serve as a barrier for those university faculty members willing to take a chance and engage urban environments.
Ultimately, it is necessary to take advantage of those who are interested in advancing rural and farming concepts in urban areas then build on those concepts and expand into other related areas. This transition will likely continue and engaging in cross cultural activities will probably continue to blur these lines. Often, these efforts are based on the establishment of trusting relationships among those actively engaged in the urban effort as well as with those who have a minor interest. This study shows that State University Extension took advantage of the faculty who had interests in issues and were willing to study those issues regardless of the setting. Crossing such boundaries allows others to see the value of environmental diversity and the potential enrichment of their studies. These issues may now become secondary to stakeholder and funding issues that seem to be the playground for power and manipulation.

An Urban Initiative Should Impact Programmatic Relevance

Critical to the State University’s urban Initiative was the relevancy of programming available to its environment. Since most Extension programs and colleges of agriculture mostly address issues of environmental importance, it is imperative that the application of these disciplines be suitable for urban environments. Oftentimes, emphasis is placed on urban farming practices and programs of that nature since they are the strength of Extension programs. While these efforts can be somewhat effective and do have value, they are, in fact, a relatively small issue within the greater context of challenges facing these urban areas. These efforts are however, feel-good programs for those who simply want to transplant rural programs into urban environments. Further, there may be limited political support for these types of programs when there are other
highly controversial and complex needs. This is not to demean these efforts, but an attempt to place them in a greater context. Realistically, it is necessary to begin urban efforts by leveraging the knowledge base for which colleges of agriculture are known. These can be extremely beneficial for areas such as urban farming, vacant lot issues, etc. and are important to various segments of the urban population. It would be foolish not to align early efforts with these significant institutional strengths. While initially it is important to align these interest areas, there should be parallel efforts to substantially expand these areas.

Advocates of urban initiatives should address needs as identified by the urban communities themselves. This study showed that there were significant areas of overlap such as youth development, nutrition, water issues, and problems with soil contamination found on former industrial sites. Extension had to be willing to stretch outside of its historical and cultural mind frames and access knowledge bases outside their colleges of agriculture. They had to penetrate colleges across the institution where there are highly relevant compatibilities between urban challenges and research based knowledge. These issues of institutional access can be quite complicated and are entangled deeply in fundamental funding mechanisms of these colleges and Extension systems. This did not, however, mean that they were insurmountable. Initial efforts needed to be made to access the knowledge bases beyond those traditionally utilized by Extension.

For years there was also a concept of partnering with urban serving universities and to couple their expertise and research bases with the Extension delivery system. Utilizing experiences within this current case study, it appears that this strategy is significantly more difficult to envision then accessing the knowledge bases found simply
within the Land Grant system. There are fundamental characteristics of the Land Grant system relative to its outreach mission that simply are not present within many of the urban serving institutions. While there is some outreach work that is carried out, the fundamental identity of these organizations do not lie with outside engagement but rather with issues internal to their institutions such as faculty research and student education. These are indeed, critical components of higher education and there is no criticism of these values. Land Grant Institutions have yet another mission that was legislated almost 150 years ago, that of translating research into information that is readily accessible and delivered to the citizenry of each state. That elemental characteristic is manifested in Extension. The key will be to extend that mission to address the needs of the urban and metropolitan audiences in a manner relevant to their lives and environment.

An Urban Initiative Should Address Leadership Practice

Leadership was a linchpin in the process. We should, however, address leadership from the perspective of practice. It is a matter of how leaders utilize leadership techniques and their level of effectiveness. Much of this can be achieved through a series of committees and study groups used to develop action steps for a fully developed implementation plan. It should also be reflected by the manner in which these committees and study groups are constructed, utilized, and whose recommendations are sincerely considered. Every institution has numerous committees and study groups in operation at any given time. It is, however, unknown how many of the recommendations are actually implemented. Fortunately for the Metro Center in this study, the recommendations of study groups from the earliest stages of strategic planning through implementation
committees have been honored by the leadership. This sharing of leadership was critical in the implementation of the Metro Center and reflected a mature and sound leadership practice at the highest levels of the institution.

Institutions implementing these strategies should adhere to this tenant. Recommendations from committee efforts should be given a balanced opportunity for achieving reality. Should this not occur, and effort is seen as a diversion for action, irreparable harm may come to the initiative. To some degree, this requires leadership to be risk takers. If institutional administration is unwilling to take calculated risks for potential future opportunities, there may be no success. Administrative leadership should show an unyielding air of confidence. This confidence is necessary to outweigh the traditional institution’s aversion to risk in the form of conflict with generations old, external stakeholders. Commodity organizations and industry groups may wield significant pressure to maintain their domination of the decision-making process within the system. A weak leader may have significant difficulty in resisting these demands.

Leadership should also provide support and cover for those individuals within the institution who have taken a risk by moving into areas that are seen as threatening to traditional structures. Often times, a leader can be measured by the extent to which they are willing to engage adversity in order to shield or support those who report to them. Commonly known as loyalty, this relationship should also be reciprocated by the actions and commitment of those reporting to that leadership. Each should recognize that their efforts will reflect on all those who had taken risk in support of a direction that may not have high levels of popularity and that retain a potential for organizational danger.
Finally, the issue of representative bureaucracy from the perspective of rural and urban cultures can be a fundamental issue. Leaders who align themselves strongly with rural culture were unable to respond to the needs of state residents living in non-rural areas. Most states have significant portions of their populations living in urban centers. The Land Grant System does not identify different demographic population segments for the provision of services. In many instances, those who abide to the strict definition as presented in the Morrill Act have lost their perspective of relevancy to modern America. Holding to that limited belief that a small segment of the population deserves support from substantial public funds is both foolhardy and shortsighted. Further, we should not discount the possibility that leaders can change from being internal blockers to internal supporters. In this case study, one of the leaders was present during some of the early defeats of urban efforts and is present at this time as a proponent of the cultural shift. Credit and recognition should be given to these individuals as well.

The unbalanced represented bureaucracy that currently exists with most Extension Systems cries for justice. Leadership teams that are not balanced based on relative demographics of urban and rural populations will likely not be motivated to support urban initiatives. These leadership teams should be diversified, in every sense of the word, in order for them to be able to perceive and advocate for urban culture and their challenges. Leadership teams where all members were raised in traditional farming communities, engaged in traditional rural culture, and educated in production agriculture or rural studies will continue to serve as advocates for their perceived constituents. This bias has possibly retarded the growth of the Extension System by ignoring rich opportunities in a variety of environments in which they were unwilling to penetrate.
Urban serving universities are beginning to apply pressure to take on Extension responsibilities in our cities, even without mechanisms to do so. Aldo, one of the high ranking research administrators, presents this with this following discussion.

I think the urban opportunity is actually validated by the fact that within the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges – (NASULGC), there has been, just in the last few years, a dues paying urban serving universities component. I think in this state, one urban serving institution might be a dues paying member of that group. But the fact is when you look at their agenda, what they are talking about is doing Cooperative Extension, the translation of science based information into practical programs. They are doing Cooperative Extension in an urban venue. Why can’t we do that? What is it about our Land Grant mission that says don’t help people understand their food system. Don’t help people understand the issues between fuel production from food crops and the availability of food. Don’t help people understand green buildings and new construction practices. That’s what we’re all about and I think we have to be bold in re-interpreting where we’re willing to take our mission. I don’t think our mission is different but I think we’ve constrained ourselves into thinking we’re farms, rural, and forests.

The Extension System could be impaling itself with a double edged sword. The first edge is the unwillingness to serve the greater majority of the population of the state. The second is advocating for service to a relatively small constituency of this country.

Land Grant and Extension Systems that see this inequity should take action by exchanging current leadership teams with those who represent the culture of the state in
which they exist. It is necessary that the current leaders of these institutions look deep within themselves and question the motives for restricting access to their knowledge bases by constituent segmentation. They should begin to look beyond the antiquated societal perception of their states and open their eyes to broader needs of residents. For many years, Extension resources from federal and state sources have remained flat or have been reduced. In some cases there have been modest gains. This, in and of itself, should inform the leaders that there is something fundamentally wrong with the overall direction of the system. It is unlikely that significant public funds will continue to be directed towards small percentages of the population.

According to much of the literature, progressive leaders are known for being visionary and intuitive about the future. They can see the shifting sands and find patterns that inform them of risk and opportunity. These individuals, while pragmatic in their execution, understand the changing times and take advantage of them by seizing the prospects. Effective leaders also recognize that within their organization there are individuals who are first adopters or who may lead a charge into uncharted territory. It is the ability to capture those who the leader feels may have an innovative idea and nurture their efforts on behalf of the organization as a whole. Unfortunately, many of our institutions have leaders who tend to be fully risk-averse and hold onto seemingly safe paradigms in hopes of maintaining the power that comes with that relationship.

Fundamentally, this current Extension System does not reflect the state’s population in, racial diversity, gender diversity, or rural and urban cultural distinctions. There are a number of others who have held this same opinion for the system across the country, (Panshun, 1992), Fehlis, 2005), (Schutjer, 1992). The suggestions presented here
are substantial steps that can be taken to develop urban initiatives rooted in the theory of representative bureaucracy that this study posits.

Recommendations for Future Research

After significant searching, there is a notable lack of empirical research that focuses on urban Extension systems. There is an entire galaxy of investigation that could be carried out. Some could focus on the institutional president, president’s councils, and boards while other may address issues of various internal personnel characteristics. This research should not focus on programming or on issues related to diversity but rather address issues of systems, culture, economic models that measure impact, funding models, etc. That is not to say that diversity or programmatic studies would not have value, rather, that in order to advance the urban agenda, it is necessary to develop empirical data to support the movement.

For at least fifteen years, there has been significant effort to enhance urban efforts across the country. A variety of successes have occurred in a number of states but they have been limited in number. Each has managed success but not even a few have been studied in a scholarly manner. Each of the scholarly writing mentioned earlier cries for more empirical research in order to help substantiate the premise that urban Extension is necessary for a healthy Extension system. It is somewhat puzzling that in a Land Grant system consisting of some of the most well-respected research institutions, there has been little or no empirical research in urban Extension organizational efforts. Research in any aspect with this focus would be extremely valuable to the urban Extension agenda.
Conclusion

Fundamentally, this current Extension System does not reflect the state’s population in, racial diversity, gender diversity, or rural and urban cultural distinctions. There are a number of others who have held this same opinion for the system across the country, (Panshun, 1992), Fehlis, 2005), (Schutjer, 1992). The suggestions presented here are substantial steps that can be taken to develop urban initiatives rooted in the theory of representative bureaucracy that this study posits.

This study examined the extent to which issues of representative bureaucracy affected the planning, development, and implementation of an urban and metro initiative for this state. The national Cooperative Extension and Land Grant University Systems struggle with issues of relevance related to urban and metropolitan audiences. This traditional system that follows customary rural, production agriculture focus has resisted change for decades. The State University, one of the major Land Grant institutions, was able to establish a metro initiative in one of the state’s largest cities. This case study explored this by dissecting the various themes that emerged from the data. These themes, that included stakeholder pressures, turf issues, the changing Extension culture, and leadership characteristics helped to identify issues relevant to the planning and implementation of the Metro Center.

Due to the question of rural and urban cultures and the prominence of rural and production agriculture backgrounds of the traditional institutions, representative bureaucracy theory was appropriate and useful in helping to identify characteristics of leadership and the interplay of the various elements that surround the Extension and Land Grant systems. The findings of this qualitative case study suggest that although there was
significant cultural grounding in the rural and production paradigms, the diversity of leadership supported by some key internal components, allowed the institution to move into the urban environment against the overwhelming national trend to resist such action.

The study contributes to the fields of both leadership and organizational theory by providing insights and recommendations for the establishment of an Extension metro initiative that is guided by specific characteristics of leadership, community engagement, organizational culture, and stakeholder pressures.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Agriculture – The science and industry of managing the growth of commodity plants and animals for human use.

Cooperative Extension - The educational agency of the United States Department of Agriculture that is organized to coordinate the work of the department and the land-grant colleges in bringing practical beyond-the-classroom educational programs to the public.

Extension – Same as Cooperative Extension. Please see above.

IPM – Integrated Pest Management refers to a method of managing pests of all kinds using the least toxic method for control.

Land Grant Institution – State Colleges that were engaged by the federal government in 1862 and 1890 to apply research based information to the needs of the citizenry. At that time, agriculture and related industries were the major occupations.

Metropolitan (metro) – A large urban area, usually one that includes a city and its suburbs and outlying areas.

The State University – Serves as the state’s Land Grant institution.

Rural - Relating to or characteristic of the country or country living.

Stakeholders - Persons or groups with a direct interest, involvement, or investment in something.

Traditional – Within the context of this study, the culture of rural America and those involved in the agriculture and farming industry.
REFERENCES


Morrill Act approved (first), July 2, 1862.

Morrill Act approved (second), August 30, 1890


http://ebn.bmj.com/cgi/content/full/3/3/68?ck=nck.


U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). Retrieved from 
http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GCTTable?_bm=y&-geo_id=01000US&-
_box_head_nbr=GCT-P1&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&-format=US-1,


APPENDIX A

REPORTS, PLANS, AND OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS
The College of Agriculture exemplifies the land-grant mission, as it was originally envisioned. This vision, reaffirmed in the 1990s by Boyer, Glassick et al. and the Kellogg Commission, continues to guide the College as it seeks to serve the public through both basic and ‘translational’ (i.e., applied research, extension, outreach and teaching) activities. But what public will the College serve 20 years from now? It is becoming increasingly clear that who the College serves through its land-grant mandate will differ substantially in 20 years. Profound changes in landscapes and the economy, both related to population growth and globalization, will take place in many Northeastern states including the target state. This will substantially change the character of agriculture and the critical systems directly related to agriculture – the food system, the ecosystem and the economic and social systems that we serve. We are in a time of transition and we must look forward.

The College is challenged to re-position itself under these evolving conditions. The State University is not alone – other leading colleges of agriculture face the very same challenges. We are no longer just “agriculture” or just “rural”, and yet these are components of what we do and whom we serve. For the College to reflect this new reality, Study Group 6 strongly recommends the adoption of a systems approach, with research, extension and resident education activities organized around three dominant and interrelated systems-oriented themes: 1) landscapes and ecosystems, 2) economic and social systems and 3) the food system. The importance of systems research for conducting internationally-recognized basic science, for serving the critical problems faced by society that increasingly require interdisciplinary efforts, and for educating a new generation seeking new ideas and new directions convinces us of the value of this approach.

This new approach requires College-wide structural changes that foster and encourage collaboration and integration across units and across missions. Study Group 6 believes that there needs to be greater inter-unit collaboration that is actively encouraged and fostered by the unit leaders. Additional structural recommendations relate to 1) hiring based on thematic objectives, 2) investing in faculty-driven research-based centers on the basis of the three themes and involvement in translational activities, 3) demonstrating engagement by all College personnel in translational activities, and 4) a better alignment of ‘credit’ and reward structures with inter-unit efforts. Our committee also believes that faculty and extension educators have become increasingly isolated from each other in their respective mission compartments, and that this weakens the College’s ability to meet its land-grant mission goals. Recommendations related to integration between the
research-extension missions include 1) providing a mechanism for ‘limited-term problem-solving teams’, and 2) requiring better integration across research and extension functions that have too often functioned separately in the College.

Recommendations for reinvigorating the educational mission also represent a key component of the Study Group 6 Report. Our undergraduate and graduate programs increasingly have difficulty attracting students – the College is viewed by many as lacking innovative educational programs that appeal to prospective students and truly represent our College’s strengths. To remedy this, strong majors should be retained and new majors initiated to attract students to the College. The reports from the previous five Study Groups provide many possibilities for new exciting majors, often designed to include multiple units or even multiple colleges. Study Group 6 recommends that the education of our students -- recruiting, teaching and providing students with educational opportunities -- become a top priority of ALL faculty and staff. Study Group 6 also recommends that college-stakeholder alliances be strengthened with an increased emphasis on teamwork, and that the College acknowledge its significant efforts and increasing impact in metropolitan areas through establishment of a Metro Experiment Station to work cooperatively with the Agricultural Experiment Station. Finally, following the strong consensus across the other study groups, Study Group 6 recommends that the College change its name to more accurately reflect its current and future activities and to attract a new generation of students who will benefit from the new and exciting programs envisioned for the College.

STUDY GROUP 6 FINAL REPORT

1. REVIEW OF THE COLLEGE’S COMMITMENT TO THE LAND-GRAIN MISSION
The land-grant mission is the defining mission of The State University. In fact, George Atherton helped forge a “vision of the land-grant college as a comprehensive institution attending to the liberal, scientific, and even civic education of well-rounded men and women, and not merely the technician or vocationalist” (Williams, 1991, p. 7). Although Atherton argued in the early 1870s that the term “agricultural college” was a misnomer and that “national schools of science” might be a more descriptive phrase, today the land-grant mission is clearly evident in the College of Agriculture.

Several publications help understand the roles of the land-grant university and of public higher education: “Scholarship Reconsidered” (Boyer, 1990 and the follow-up report, “Scholarship Assessed” by Glassick et al., 1997), and “Returning to Our Roots: The Student Experience” (Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities, 1997). In the report of the Kellogg Commission, a group including current and former Presidents of U.S. public and land-grant universities described three components of the land-grant tradition: 1) a combination of high-quality affordable education, world-class research, and public service, 2) a practical, real-life orientation, and 3) a sense of responsibility to the society that supports the university. The Kellogg Commission’s agenda for change is based on the land-grant ethic of access to higher education and practical research, both as contributions to the public good.
The public land-grant university emphasizes teaching and access to a quality education; research, including practical relevance; and service. These activities may occur primarily on-campus (the traditional emphasis), or they may be more extended in location (as outreach). Furthermore, teaching, research, and outreach activities may be direct contributions to the public good, e.g., as a non-credit short course addressing short-term educational needs, or they may be contributions to the public good in a more indirect manner, as in basic research. The activities of the land-grant university should include a balance of on-campus activities and outreach activities, and a balance of more- and less-immediately applicable activities and short- and long-term goals.

Among the colleges at The State University, the College of Agriculture is probably the closest to the model of the land-grant envisioned by Atherton, Boyer, Glassick et al. and the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. Within the College of Agriculture, the land-grant mission is handled by integrating research, extension and teaching. The goal is to achieve a careful balance across functions so that the public is served and served well.

2. THE COLLEGE’S CHANGING ROLE

The role of a college of agriculture at a land-grant university was originally defined in terms of support for the production agriculture segment of the economy and for the often poorly-educated rural people engaged in this activity. It is now recognized that production agriculture is part of a much broader set of systems—a food system, an ecosystem and an economic and social system. Moreover, today the poorly educated live in both rural and urban settings, while increasingly the distinction between those settings in the state becomes less and less clear. Given these important demographic and economic changes, a college of agriculture must continuously re-position itself to remain relevant to the current situation and to the future. Since the College of Agriculture comprises a collection of knowledge and skills including those found in other colleges at The State University but differing in focusing also on ‘translational activities’ (applied research, outreach, extension), the question becomes “translation for what, and for whom?”

The number of farms in the target state continues to decline, with growth in farm numbers occurring at the ends of the farm size distribution: the very largest farms, although comparatively few in number, have increased in prevalence as have the smaller farms (NASS, 2002 Census of Agriculture). This structure is a result of economic and social forces that influence farm viability on the one hand and preferences for a farm lifestyle, on the other. Further, a greater proportion of jobs in agriculture are found downstream from agricultural production, in the food and fiber processing and distribution industries. These jobs are increasingly found in metropolitan environments and present a new challenge for a College that very often displays a “rural” face.

Changes in The state’s landscapes and population. Profound changes in the state’s landscape and population are apparent. This is occurring against a backdrop of rapid globalization. The state continues to lose farmland, with more than one million acres of farmland lost between 1974 and 1997 and no abatement since 1997 (NASS, 2002 Census of Agriculture). Spurred by population growth in the Northeastern states, there is continuing conversion from sparsely-populated rural to densely-populated rural to suburban to urban environments. Although some in the state’s communities continue to deal with rural issues,
others are challenged by the effects of population growth. The continued hyper-dispersion of
governances and population centers will produce an ever more even population distribution
(Brookings Institution, 2003). There is less and less justification for identifying the College’s
“target audience” as “rural” or its sole clientele as state citizens or even American. The global
focus of most top-notch colleges of agriculture in the U.S. precludes such a narrow
definition, if we are to remain competitive.

As metropolitan centers spread, even the most rural communities in the Northeast will be
challenged by this significant transformation. Production agriculture will continue to
diversify and rely more on technology and highly-trained graduates. Farms of all sizes
located amid the growing number of consumers who choose to live in the countryside or at
the rural-urban fringe will create conflicts between agriculture and the general public. And
farm practices will be under even greater scrutiny from a public who increasingly questions
the use of pesticides, herbicides, GMOs and other technological advances in agriculture.

Conflict is not the only outcome of sprawling populations. Spreading metropolitan
development is bringing consumers closer to the sources of some agricultural products,
creating opportunities for development of local or regional producer-consumer economic
systems. Some agricultural activities, like landscaping, diversified food production and
value-added spin-offs, agro-tourism, the green industry, equine activities, and organic
agriculture are uniquely suited to and are developing in these interfacial or interdigitated
environments. As population centers develop and spread, the fraction of land area and the
economy devoted to these activities are likely to increase.

The spreading metropolis also will be virtual, not simply physical. Communication advances
will increasingly link individuals, farms, and communities, effectively reducing the distances
among them. Such technological advances are influencing all aspects of research, education
and program delivery, expanding our capabilities as educators and researchers as well as
translators to the public. The demand for accessible and timely information from production
clientele as well as new entrepreneurs will increase, and greater use of the internet will
provide access to many competing sources of information. The College increasingly finds
itself in competition with other sources of information needed by stakeholders and policy-
makers, weakening the College’s public and policy voice and influence.

Competition for high-quality undergraduate and graduate students is unlikely to abate, given
an expected decline in college-age students in our state. While the College is a good fit for
many students at The State University, this population often is not acquainted with the
aspects of the College that could benefit them.

Reconsidering the College’s self-definition. It is clear that the College of Agriculture has
defined itself in terms of human populations, activities, and a landscape that is changing
rapidly and will differ even more during the next 20 years. In fact, evidence suggests that the
College’s current clients and activities no longer are consistent with its traditional definition
of itself. In addition to work with production agriculture, the College of Agriculture is
actively engaged in basic and translational research and outreach on environmental issues;
animal and human health; basic plant, animal, and microbial biology; sociology and human
development in communities from very rural to urban; a broad range of economic issues;
value-added activities; information technology; and engineering, all at local, regional,
national and international levels. For many, this is not “agriculture” as most people define the
word. What is it? Common themes emerge from the College’s present pattern of engagement. Economic development, maintaining environmental quality, natural and managed resource use, and human development are all important components of the current dossier. Some of these components include aspects of “traditional agriculture”, many do not.

There is a growing appreciation of the systems organization of agricultural enterprises. As the USDA CSREES ecosystems statement makes clear: “We live in a global ecosystem. We need clean air, clean and sufficient water, and appropriate land use that provides living space, food production areas, and wilderness areas. We need to preserve diverse types of ecosystems. When managed wisely, they create environments with healthy living conditions for different types of plants, animals, insects, and microbes. CSREES programs advance public understanding of the ecological functions that are crucial in identifying solutions to environmental and health challenges and to protecting our quality of life.” This is a perspective that also has been adopted by leading colleges of agriculture nationwide, and deserves consideration as the basis of an organizing theme for our College.

Further, by seeking to improve the lives of the least well-educated and the financially disadvantaged whether they are rural or not, our College can maximize its contribution to the development of human resources and potential. With a focus on human-environment interaction systems, the College can draw on its strengths, marshal existing resources to address emerging issues and problems, identify newly-needed expertise, and continue to lead the University and the world in the land-grant mission.

For our College to evolve and yet remain true to its land-grant philosophy while acknowledging important societal changes and looking forward, it must determine how its contributions can be of the greatest value and have the greatest impact, and align resources accordingly. Wise use of natural and managed resources, how people use them to create products, communities and economies, and how human communities and economies in turn impact natural resources comprises a system of interactions linking all of the expertise comprising the College of Agriculture. We suggest that recognizing the systems organization of human-environment interactions, integrating food and fiber subsystems with the natural ecosystems from which they come and the social and economic systems that use and benefit from them, would allow the College of Agriculture to build on its knowledge, skill, and expertise base to become a flexible leader and supporter of economic development in a changing world.

3. ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE: CHALLENGES The central challenge the College faces is to reconfigure itself and its resources to meet its land-grant mission goals as landscapes, populations, and economies change. Increasingly, both problem-solving and the science underlying it are interdisciplinary. Our College has twelve academic units defined by a range of historical academic “disciplines” covering animal, plant, food, social sciences (including business and management), engineering, and natural resources. Our College also has extension units differentiated by their geography. In many respects we “look” the way a college of agriculture did 30 years ago even though we have evolved in very important ways over that period. Our vision and its portrayal need to change.

Many of the units in the College frequently act independently of each other. While technically there are few barriers to developing cooperative programs among units, there also are few rewards for doing so as well as some disincentives. Unit leaders often appear to act exclusively on the basis of direct benefits to their own departments and programs when
deciding whether to back a new hire, allow faculty to teach or advise graduate students in or jointly with other units, or develop outreach activities among units. The approach of seeking consensus among unit leaders has exacerbated this territoriality since it permits holdouts to scuttle initiatives beneficial to the College. As long as units see their “fitness” increased by guarding their own resources rather than cooperating across disciplines and across missions, the College will not be able to develop the interdisciplinary approaches demanded by both modern science and problem-solving. A greater emphasis on a systems approach to problem-solving and the interdisciplinary perspective that this requires may encourage units to work collaboratively to offer their programs in teaching, research and extension. Adopting this perspective, we believe, will result in the development of more innovative programs that are particularly attractive to students as well as to society and will enhance the College’s scientific reputation. In some College of Agricultures this may mean active collaboration across College of Agriculture departments while in other College of Agricultures the collaboration may be between College of Agriculture and other colleges or interdisciplinary programs at The State University.

(Full listing on original document)

4. DEALING WITH THE FUTURE
Evolutionary changes in agriculture, higher education, and land-grant institutions are all motivating factors for planning the future direction of the College. The College must assume a position at the forefront of this evolution and establish new paradigms for dealing with these changes. We must develop and provide leadership, and foster our mission of discovery, learning, and engagement. While the College of Agriculture has already begun this development, there remains much to be accomplished. Agriculture is increasingly viewed as a human-impacted biological system that interacts with other human-impacted biological systems. In dealing with complex issues associated with these systems, the College will need to expand its engagement beyond production factors to non-production factors such as valued-added products, people, communities, economies, and the environment as well. Addressing the needs of its stakeholders in the future will require interdisciplinary approaches to problem-solving, bringing expertise from a variety of areas to bear on specific issues. In meeting this challenge and evolving towards international leadership, the College needs to develop an innovative, integrative approach and to examine the structural or cultural issues within the College that may hinder this approach.

Opportunities and adoption of the systems approach. Study Groups 1-5 identified plenty of opportunities for accomplishing the College’s goal of enhancing the public good in the future. The state provides what may be an ideal test-bed for several ongoing changes in the agricultural arena, including the ‘encroachment’ of population on formerly rural settings, a well-organized effort to structure sustainable local and regional producer-to-consumer systems, new production systems and enterprises such as the ‘green industry’ and small-acreage diversified production, proximity to global markets as these strengthen, and a growing equine presence, among others. When added to the more traditional interests of the College, one has to wonder how to focus attention, especially during a period of transition from one set of demands to another.

Exploiting a systems approach requires a cross-disciplinary team — biologists, computer scientists, chemists, engineers, mathematicians, sociologists, economists, educators — who
speak and understand each other’s languages and can work together to develop new approaches to maximizing system productivity, economic development, and sustainability into the future. These scientists also need easy access to data acquisition, storage, integration, and analysis tools of GIS, computational biology and statistics. It is a major cultural challenge to get these often disparate and isolated experts to communicate and understand each other. As our College pursues excellence in this kind of teamwork, it should be training future agricultural scientists and practitioners so that a new generation will find these interactions natural. This requires new approaches to describing and teaching our subject matter.

(Full listing on original document)

5. RECOMMENDATIONS
THEMES AND TOPICAL FOCUS
Recommendation 1. The College of Agriculture should adopt a focus on biological, economic and social systems gradually de-emphasizing an individual-commodity, individual-audience perspective.
The College is no longer engaged solely in activities that conform to the traditional understanding of the word “agriculture” and its clients are no longer solely “rural”. Recognizing this, a reanalysis of the College’s activities points to historical and continuing engagement with how humans interact with their environments, from the impact of the ecosystem on food and fiber production and processing through community and economic development to the impact of people on the ecosystem and extension of these interactions to other systems, regionally and globally. As the National Research Council National Committee on Science Education Standards and Assessment report put it, “The natural and designed world is complex; it is too large and complicated to investigate and comprehend all at once. Scientists and students learn to define small portions for the convenience of investigation. The units of investigation can be referred to as ‘systems.’ A system is an organized group of related objects or components that form a whole. Systems can consist, for example, of organisms, machines, fundamental particles, galaxies, ideas, numbers, transportation, and education. Systems have boundaries, components, resources flow (input and output), and feedback.”

The College’s historical, current, and future foci can be broken down in terms of systems it considers important. But as argued in this report’s introductory chapters, the importance of particular systems and system components changes with time and human interests. To maximize its flexibility and impact, the College should focus on interactions common to most or all systems as much as it does on the details of system components. The goal should be to think, analyze, teach and act in terms of systems.

(Full listing on original document)

Recommendation 2. The College of Agriculture should reformulate its approach to research, education and extension activities around three dominant systems, “landscapes and ecosystems”, “economic and social systems”, and “the food system”. We infer from an analysis of recurrent themes in the previous five Study Group reports as well as our own analysis that the College’s current strengths, developing strengths, and the
The needs of the Commonwealth and its extended global interests can be grouped into these three focal systems. We believe that organizing the College’s efforts and investments around these three themes will provide a pathway to innovation and continuing impact on the future.

**SYSTEM FOCUS 1: LANDSCAPES AND ECOSYSTEMS**

One useful organizational unit for understanding both lightly-managed and heavily-managed activities is the “ecosystem”. An “ecosystem” is simply a subdivision of the landscape based on the boundaries of its material and energy inputs and outputs. It conforms to the ideal of a system because it has boundaries, components, resource flow (input and output), and feedback.

An ecosystem may comprise a large area, such as the Chesapeake Bay, it may be a single watershed, or it may comprise one or a few farms, if the movement of materials in and out is similarly bounded. Ecosystems scientists believe that systems with similar elements function similarly, so that one can identify types of ecosystems, such as tall grass prairie ecosystems, or various kinds of agricultural ecosystems. Because humans are a part of even natural ecosystems, the ecosystem providing space and resources for human uses forms the original basis of early community and economic development. Eventually, human activities become increasingly independent of the ecosystems in which they develop, and have a greater and greater impact on their surroundings. All organisms, from microbes to human beings, fall within the ecosystem framework, as do environments ranging from forests to agricultural lands, to the neighborhoods and industries of growing metropolitan centers.

**Social and Economic Development**

**Ecosystem composition and function Human impacts**

Community development Economic development Policy & government Abiotic resources Biotic resources Ecosystem services Exploitation (uses) Individual & household Social household Ecosystem management is established as the approach of choice for land and natural resource management (see Box). The US Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, US Fish and Wildlife Service, and USDA CSREES all acknowledge the ecosystem as a basis for resource production and distribution, and for management. Agricultural activities and their management belong in systems, and particularly an ecosystems, context.

Virtually everything the College of Agriculture does occurs in the context of the ecosystem. While the landscape and ecosystem provide the basic context for the food system, food production is only one way humans influence ecosystems and is influenced by them. The landscape and ecosystems developed on it determine the nature and extent of biodiversity, the economically-viable uses to which land can be put, interactions with adjacent ecosystems, economic and community development, and individual and family health and well-being. No “agricultural” or other similar human activity can begin without being shaped by the ecosystem in which it occurs. Increasing human population growth and impact alter the landscape and ecosystem, until the nature of human communities and use of resources may become uncoupled from the original ecosystem context. The ability of an ecosystem to maintain ecological processes, “services” and functions, biological diversity, and productivity in the face of changing human impacts is a definition of ‘sustainability’ (USDA Forest Service, 2004). Understanding how communities and economies develop, optimizing sustainable resource use, and maximizing family and community well-being all require a
systems view that integrates from

This has led to the focus on a management strategy commonly dubbed "ecosystem management."
The practical applications of this strategy are not yet completely defined, but the philosophical shift has already been made, and it is fundamental and far-reaching.

Ecosystem management means looking at the big picture, beyond federal agency boundaries, and working closely with other land managers, both public and private. It means addressing the long-term consequences of today's decisions, and it means thinking of various resources as interrelating parts of systems rather than as individual components to be managed separately. It means awareness of many scales of effect, from local and national to international and even global.

The tough choices won't go away. However, a fundamental principle of ecosystem management holds that decisions must be based on the best information science can provide, with sustainability as the goal. This framework provides a means to evaluate objectively the trade-offs of different management choices.

(*Full listing on original document*)

**SYSTEM FOCUS 2. ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL SYSTEMS**

The land-grant system is designed to serve people. Humans form economic and social systems that are outgrowths of and dependent on the ecosystems in which they live. The “outcomes” of individuals, families and households, e.g., their food consumption choices, health and wellness, and their ability to cope economically vary depending on their socio-demographic characteristics and are importantly affected by the places or communities where they live. Communities in turn are strongly affected by social and economic forces that play out at the local, regional, national and global levels. Economic and social systems are a part of the overall ecosystem -- human systems or the society interacts with the natural environment and with the other systems that comprise the ecosystem.

Three levels can be differentiated within economic and social systems: 1) individual, family and household, 2) communities and institutions, and 3) various levels of government where public policy is formulated. Examples of public policy particularly relevant to the work in the College include food policy, land use policy and policy related to development.

(*Full listing on original document*)

**SYSTEM FOCUS 3: THE FOOD SYSTEM**

The food system should be a fundamental emphasis in the College. Although the production agriculture work in the College has been a historical strength, recognition of this strength as part of a larger food system has been lacking. The food system includes many components after the farm gate. The food system can be thought of as having five broad components: 1) agricultural production, 2) processing and manufacturing, 3) wholesaling, distribution, retailing and food service, and 4) consumers. Each component of the system serves to add value to the materials acted upon. Rather than view the system solely as something with directional flow of materials, one may also view the system as a means for the consumer to exercise control of that flow. The food system is a subset of the ecosystem, but many of its components extend well beyond the ecosystem into social and economic systems. Since maintaining a safe, healthy food supply is a major part of the College’s mission, this subsystem warrants its own focus.
The consumer. A major change in the food system with which the College must deal is the movement from a producer-driven to a consumer-driven system. The food system exemplifies the stage in human-ecosystem development in which the human elements increasingly impact and dominate the ecosystem. Consumer preferences for food products have significant impacts on the rest of the system, which responds to consumer demands. It is impossible to understand this system, much less protect or enhance it, without understanding the consumer end of the chain and its feedback to upstream components. It is not clear from any of the Study Group reports where we might find clusters of faculty with existing strengths in consumer science. But the need for a systems approach requires development of this end of our knowledge and expertise. Although programs in entrepreneurship and business management, as well as survey and evaluation expertise, can be found in the Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Agricultural and Extension Education, and Food Science departments, these programs should be enhanced. Additional opportunities may lie in coalitions. The College’s strong expertise in land use analysis can help extend this information back to the production end of the system, and help link consumer preferences and attitudes with local and regional economic and community development. But the College needs to coordinate and develop its ability to understand the end-point forces that increasingly influence what, where and how agricultural products are produced, how value is added through the rest of the food system, and how consumer decisions affect the entire food system.

STRUCTURAL RECOMMENDATIONS RELATED TO ALL TOPICAL AREAS
The following suggestions have to do with “structural” characteristics of the College of Agriculture that influence its ability to meet its goals, whether or not the College adopts the topical focus suggestions above.

Recommendation 3. Willingness to cooperate in interdisciplinary efforts should be a top criterion in hiring unit leaders, and unit leaders should receive training in both the concepts and practice of collaborative administration. The unwillingness or inability of units to cooperate, including sharing resources, was a recurring theme in all study group deliberations. The critical nature of the leadership role of those serving in this middle-level administrative capacity (now the unit leaders and regional directors) should be acknowledged, and steps should be taken to strengthen the capability of those persons to perform this role effectively. The necessary capabilities include 1) serving as a leader within the academic unit or region and also 2) serving as a member of a leadership team that functions at the level of the College. We believe that the latter role is currently underdeveloped, and that new hires to middle-level administrative positions have the opportunity to receive guidance concerning the nature of the full scope of their responsibilities and concerning best practices in carrying them out. Performance in teamwork should also be a highlighted component of performance evaluations.

Recommendation 4. Faculty hires should be based on thematic initiatives, independent of unit needs or demands, and on a willingness to participate in team initiatives. Again, the College needs to maintain an investment focus consistent with its thematic foci. And while there is always a place for the talented solo worker, much of modern science and problem-solving requires teamwork. The ability to work with diverse teams should be a
highlighted criterion for hiring and success in our College.

**Recommendation 5.** Encourage the formation of research-based “centers”, but if these centers are to receive significant support from the College of Agriculture, require **demonstrated engagement in translational research and extension.** Such centers can be very effective in developing national and international reputations, and they can provide the understanding needed for translational activities. Centers must be faculty-initiated, and they may provide much of their own funding via extramural sources. But to receive intramural support, they need to participate in the College’s mission, with programmatic efforts to translate research into practice or product, and/or include regular participation of extension faculty and educators.

**Recommendation 6.** Eliminate matching contributions by single units for the development of “centers” or other faculty initiatives and distribute costs at the College level. At present, the Huck Institutes (for example) require a small amount of matching support from the “home” (PI’s) department for a “Center Development Grant”. This policy and others like it enhance the territorial nature of units, reducing motivation for cooperation.

**Recommendation 7.** Any College of Agriculture investment in faculty-proposed “centers” should be justified and prioritized on the basis of their contribution to the three thematic emphases: Landscapes and Ecosystems, Economic and Social Systems, and the Food System described above. The College cannot be all things to all people, but working within a limited set of thematic foci allows it to maintain a consistent core of expertise and outlook while shifting emphasis with changing landscapes and economies. It also encourages the interdisciplinary collaboration needed for solving complex problems.

**Recommendation 8.** The means by which “credit” accrues to units by participation in undergraduate or graduate programs in other units or colleges needs to be clarified to both unit leaders and faculty. Repeated attempts by several Study Groups to discern how cross-unit efforts are rewarded were unsuccessful. Naturally, this influences a willingness to cooperate and work across the land grant mission.

**INTEGRATION ACROSS THE MISSION**

**Recommendation 9.** Provide a mechanism for forming “limited-term problem-solving teams” and make participation a criterion for advancement. Teams comprising fundamental and applied researchers, educators, extension personnel would be formed for a limited time period (1-3 years) to address a specific problem. This is done now by a (very) few on an ad-hoc basis; when it does, it provides a model of effective mission accomplishment (see Box). We propose that effective participation in at least one such team comprise an important part in evaluation of all college faculty and extension personnel. This could be facilitated via multi-investigator Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) projects.

**Recommendation 10.** Modify and enhance the “impact” component of reporting requirements and proposal for AES projects. Require evidence of some tangible engagement in non-research (teaching, outreach, extension) activities. This is NOT to be construed as “service” (to the university, profession, etc.), but it may range from cooperation with extension educators through outreach participation to actual extension activities.

**NOTE:** Both Recommendations 9 and 10 require that unit and College promotion and tenure
and annual evaluations be done on a “3-part mission” basis, irrespective of the appointee’s contractual assignment. This effort will require some adjustments in the College’s culture and faculty attitudes. The College and University are on record as viewing appointments in this way (see the UniSCOPE Report), but faculty and administrative committees will have to abide by that viewpoint if the 3-part mission is to be successful.

**Recommendation 11.** Include faculty without formal extension appointments in extension Plans-of-Work (POW) teams, as is already supposed to be the College of Agriculture but usually doesn’t occur. Also include these faculty in other ‘extension’ events.

**Recommendation 12.** Reorganize the College’s undergraduate majors, eliminating some that are undersubscribed, retaining those that are successful, and adding new majors. It is crucial for the College to become a leader in the President’s plan to make The State University a “student-centered university”. While it is beyond the ability of this committee to provide details of potential new majors, we do recommend that the College
a) evaluate undergraduate major performance, much as graduate programs are evaluated, establishing criteria for success and continuation.
b) retain majors deemed “successful” (as per a), merge where appropriate, and eliminate others.
c) establish new interdisciplinary (multi-unit) majors and/or majors across colleges be aggressively developed. These may be entirely new, they might incorporate existing majors, or they could become ‘tracks’ of existing majors.
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**Recommendation 13.** Broaden participation in residence education by researchers, extension faculty/educators and outreach personnel. This would require blurring the contractual assignments, emphasize the 3-part mission, and bring researchers and faculty together (where they might even interact).

**Recommendation 14.** Participate aggressively in the University’s K-12 education initiative, linking College of Agriculture to schools in innovative ways. Use innovative technology when applicable to link high school students to the college classroom. The College should take the opportunity to lead in these efforts.

**Recommendation 15.** Expand the College of Agriculture recruitment staff; consider a full- or part-time internship manager. Many liberal arts colleges with smaller enrollments than the College of Agriculture have recruiting/admissions staffs of several people. The recruitment office should produce a strategic plan.

**Recommendation 16.** Offer several dynamic, highly visible undergraduate courses open to majors or undecided students in other colleges to attract students to the College of Agriculture. The College needs to demonstrate to students the modern reality of what goes on in our College, focusing on issues of current interest and concern (e.g., biodiversity, urban sprawl, world population growth).

**Recommendation 17.** Support recruiting visits by faculty to Commonwealth campuses
and to extension events where recruiting may be accomplished.

**Recommendation 18. Employ the power of the State University public relations and recruiting apparatus.** Use up-to-date visual media to attract new students to the College of Agriculture. Portray the College as innovative, current and exciting.

**Recommendation 19. Continue to expand international study abroad opportunities for students, matching opportunities to the three thematic areas.** Advertise these opportunities widely, again to attract students to the College of Agriculture.

**Recommendation 20. Develop stronger linkages with those industries employing our graduates.** Ensure that new or redesigned curricula contain opportunities for students to match employer needs. Internships and engaging employers in the courses are two ways to accomplish this.

**Recommendation 21. Combine PhD programs to create thematic, interdisciplinary degrees, and provide full “credit” to units for participation in IDGPs.** The Office for the Dean of the Graduate School is already demanding this. We suggest using the above thematic foci as organizational structures.

**Recommendation 22. Change the name of the College (see Final Recommendation, below).** The study groups repeatedly encountered the observation that the College’s name is a barrier to recruiting students.

**STRENGTHENING COLLEGE-STAKEHOLDER ALLIANCES**

**Recommendation 23. Use the College’s in-house resources and association with PSAC to provide regular updates to units on the state, regional, and international trends, including demographic and economic trends.** Since the client base and the physical and economic landscapes change continuously, engagement with the mission would be improved by up-to-the-minute knowledge. Perhaps a College service or facility could be generated for this. The College certainly has access to the information technology to keep every interested party in the state and beyond up to date on changing landscapes, populations, economies, and policies. Information flow should be 2-way; too few of our faculty know what stakeholders think or confront.

**Recommendation 24. Institute interactions among faculty, ULs and PSAC and similar groups that constitute discussions of issues rather than lectures.** Reorganize the annual PSAC tour to enhance 2-way exchanges.

**Recommendation 25. Form faculty-extension-stakeholder coalitions to provide information to funding sources.** These groups would be formed short- or long-term as clearinghouses and sources of information used in dealing with legislators, etc.

**A GREATER RECOGNITION OF College of Agriculture CONTRIBUTIONS TO NON-RURAL POPULATIONS**

**Recommendation 26. Establish a Metro Experiment Station to work concomitantly with the Agricultural Experiment Station on issues relevant to non-rural populations.** We envision a ‘station without walls’ enabling the College of Agriculture to better position itself and have an impact among a broader range of populations. Economic and societal issues are
not always specific to non-metro or metro. With the wholesale development of farmland, it could be argued that the interface of these two should hold a much higher profile. Many of the opportunities for excellence identified in Working Group reports 1-5 target increasing populations and the interface between populations of different densities. Examples include the equine, companion animal, and green industries as well as local production-to-sales markets. The College of Agriculture already invests heavily and has expertise in activities in metropolitan centers.

FINAL RECOMMENDATION

Change the name of the College. Logic and the experience of recruiters and others interviewed for this and the other 5 Study Group reports convinced everyone that a name change is needed. Many prospective students who would be interested in what the college actually does are not attracted by the word “agriculture”, apparently misunderstanding what we do. The populations we serve are no longer simply “agricultural” or even “rural”, much of what the College does would not be described as “agriculture” now, and it certainly will not be “agriculture” as currently defined in 10-20 years. The State University is already behind the curve on this; many Colleges of Agriculture have been renamed in recent years.

The word “agriculture” already fails to describe what the College does, and it certainly will be even less appropriate in the future. One approach to naming may be to consider names that are independent of subject, audience, or activity, but based instead on the history of College of Agriculture within the University. An example might be The Founding College, or Founders’ College. A name like this could be followed by a list of the specific thematic areas of the college on promotional materials. Alternatively, the College name might emphasize its unique investment in translational activities, as in the College of Applied Sciences. But despite much deliberation and thought, this committee was unable to identify a generally-satisfying alternative. There was general agreement that our college is mainly engaged in basic and translational research and outreach on issues having to do with management of natural and human resources, and we are in strong agreement that a change is needed. Hence, we recommend that the College form a committee, perhaps.
College of Agriculture
Faculty Study Group Workplan (Tentative)

Project Goals: To identify areas of opportunities for innovation over the next 10-15 years and to identify how we need to adapt or modify what we do to sustain or build these areas of innovation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #1: Introductions, charge from the Dean, ground rules, identification of issues and trends</td>
<td>April 15, 04 1-3 p.m.</td>
<td>May 13, 04 8:30-11:30</td>
<td>June 25, 04 1-4 p.m.</td>
<td>July 29, 04 9-noon</td>
<td>Sept 8, 04 9-3</td>
<td>This fall, a sixth faculty team will work to synthesize recommendations and integrate stakeholder feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #2: Identification of focus areas based on issues and trends, determination of other desired inputs from outside sources</td>
<td>May 3 10-2</td>
<td>June 1 1-4 p.m.</td>
<td>July 20 1-4 p.m.</td>
<td>Aug 26 9-noon</td>
<td>(see 9/8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #3: Develop by consensus a prioritized list of research foci and related extension foci, start identifying gaps</td>
<td>May 24 10-2</td>
<td>June 23 9-12</td>
<td>July 28 1-4 p.m.</td>
<td>Sept 9 9-3</td>
<td>Sept 13 9-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #4: Develop by consensus a prioritized list of teaching foci and related extension foci, start identifying gaps</td>
<td>June 8 1-4 9</td>
<td>July 7 10-1</td>
<td>Aug 3 1-4 p.m.</td>
<td>(see 9/9)</td>
<td>Sept 27 9-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #5: Develop by consensus a list of actions needed to reach future aims</td>
<td>June 28 9-noon 9</td>
<td>July 22 9-noon 102</td>
<td>Aug 24 1-4 p.m. and Aug 31, 9-12</td>
<td>Sept 30 9-noon</td>
<td>(see 9/27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study group reports will be advisory to the Dean. Following report submission, the following process will take place:

- Discussion with departments and deans; revisions as necessary.
- Revised issues reviewed with other stakeholders and revised again to incorporate new ideas.
- Revised issues/themes reviewed again by departments and deans and modified if necessary.
- Report distributed to stakeholders and THE COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE units for comment and final revision.
Core Planning Team Kickoff Meeting
Dean’s Charge to the Committee
November 4, 2004

Attending: Cathy, Natalie, Bill, Walter, Ann, Delfina, Ben, Bhushan, Clayton, Michelle, Walt, Mary Wirth
Not attending: Terry, John, Karl, Jack, Rich, Roy

Action Steps Prior to Next Meeting:
1. Review all materials in binder. Come to the retreat prepared to discuss three specific items:
   a. What do the data tell us about stakeholder needs and concerns?
   b. What critical factors will influence our success?
   c. What are (tentative) strategic issues?
2. Michelle will share information on setting alerts on Sharepoint.
3. Ann will send out definitions of mandates and strategic issues, and the 5th and 6th study group reports when available.
4. Sustainability report and index to binder materials will be posted on Sharepoint.

Charge to the Team:
Provided by the Associate Dean on behalf of the Dean.
• Develop and write the first draft of the College’s strategic plan before Dec. 2nd
• Take off your unit hats and be creative.
• Incorporate the work of the six study groups as well as assessment data and other inputs.
• This team provides continuity from the study groups as well as new input from other stakeholders.
• The first draft should be something that can be implemented with confidence in subsequent years.
• On Dec. 2nd, work with college leadership team and study group members to discuss the draft.
• The draft will then be revised and sent to the college and stakeholders for further input.
• The deans’ group is sponsoring the strategic planning initiative. Ann represents the deans’ group on this team.
• The final plan is due to the President February 2005.
• You do not need to assume that the college goals should stay the same as they are in the current plan.

Discussion of Team Member’s Past Planning Experiences:
Common themes were input into the process by stakeholders, time to do the work, build on input already received including sustainability report, communication is essential, alignment with Federal benchmarks, and having a useable document with an implementation plan.
Overview of the College Strategic Planning Process:
Handouts described the overall process (College Strategic Planning Process, 2005/06 through 2007/08) and the timeframe for core team meetings. See the college strategic planning website at http://www.ca.edu/StrategicPlanning/default.html.

Team Operating Principles:
Transparency
Purposeful input
Listserv for communication
Sharepoint website
Consensus decision making

Assessment Data:
The associate deans have provided us with a report card on the implementation of the goals in the current college strategic plan. We can use that to learn what we have done/missed/should do better next time.
Information that will be added to the notebooks as it becomes available includes the reports from the 5th and 6th study groups, and feedback to be received from the Alumni Society Board later this month.

The next meeting of the core strategic planning team is a retreat to be held on November 9, 1:30-5:00 p.m. and November 10, 8:30 a.m. -1:30 p.m.
Core Strategic Planning Team Meeting Notes
November 9 & 10, 2004

Attending: Bill, Walter, Ann, Terry, Delfina, John, Carl, Ben, Bhushan, Clayton, Michelle, Jack, Walt, Mary Wirth, Rich, Roy
Not attending: Cathy, Natalie

1.) Analyze Stakeholder Needs and Mandates
Definition: A **stakeholder** is anyone who can make a claim on our attention, resources, or output, or is affected by our output. A **mandate** is an externally imposed requirement; a formal or informal prescription of what must or should be done under our policies, laws, codes, and regulations.

**Results of brainstorming:**
Students/Parents/Industry: Career focused majors
Evaluate majors to ensure they are relevant and students will be employable, i.e., make sure they can get a job based on their education
Students/Industry: Increase “real world” experience of students—internships, business training, work ethics
Employers of graduates: College of Agriculture needs to prepare skilled, communication-effective graduates who can solve problems and move society forward.
Students: lack exposure or incentive to engage in business/entrepreneurial activity. Such activity would blend well with the College’s established goals of increasing output in terms of patents and also would provide further sources of extramural funding.
Students often mentored solely toward careers in the traditional academic realm.
Students (graduate and undergraduate)
1. Flexibility in choosing courses
2. Internships--1 semester
3. Research--1 semester
   Needed to complete a degree program

Prospective Employers: Train students to better meet our needs
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2.) Identify and Frame Strategic Issues
Definition: **Strategic issues** are fundamental challenges that affect mandates, mission, programs, students, costs, and/or financing. If not addressed, they will have potentially destructive consequences for the college. Frame each issue as a question.

A. Systems Thinking:
How can we allocate resources between traditional production agriculture and new social science programs in a way that meets current and anticipated stakeholder needs?
   • To what extent are agricultural and environmental issues compatible?
• Ag and environmental issues are currently perceived as being incompatible, with negative perceptions on both sides.
• Polarization of interest groups.
• As educators we have polarized ourselves. We need to find solutions and not take sides. Make it an “and” issue.
• Is there a way the College can take leadership on the issue of sustainability?

B. Marketing and Public Awareness:
How do we attract increasing numbers of high quality students and produce graduates that meet the needs of an evolving career market place? (relates to terminology)
• How do we relate the College to a career in the minds of potential students?
• How do we show the relevance of what we do to a broader audience in a compelling way?
• How do we present the college to funders? How do we market college programs?

C. Engagement and Public Policy: How can we enhance engagement between stakeholders and the college to provide an ongoing dialogue that impacts public policy?
• Who are our important future stakeholders?
• How can we promote science-based policy?
• How do we position the College of Agriculture to be more responsive to issues of public interest and policy?
• How can we engage K-12 (students and teachers) to support their efforts in meeting state academic standards in both science and agriculture?

D. Program Renewal:
How can we engage in program renewal to redefine our relevance to society and potential students?
• How do we sustain and grow graduate and undergraduate learning experiences?
• Are undergrad programs attractive and relevant to future workforce needs?
• Can we improve our programs by collaborating in some way with Commonwealth campuses?
• How do we provide lifelong learning experiences?
• Being accessible and responsive to adult learners
• How can we continue to diversify our faculty, staff and students?

E. Collaboration and Integration:
How can we enhance integration across the mission?
• How can we solve complex problems thru integrated teams?
• How can we get units to work together?
• How would you form teams?
• How would you know about what each other is doing?
• How can we make it easier to form rapid response teams and recognize their efforts?
3.) Identify Tentative Goals and Strategies to Address the Strategic Issues

1st Breakout Group
Strategic Issue: Systems Thinking. How can we transition into a systems approach?
Goal: Reorganize and reallocate resources around three dominant systems approaches: ecosystems, economic and social systems and the food systems. (Emphasis is on the cross disciplinary approach-relook at names of systems and definition)
Strategies:
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Performance Indicators
Number of faculty, educators, staff hired and working in systems areas

Strategic Issue: How can we enhance collaboration and integration across the mission?
Goal: Create a culture of collaboration among disciplines and integration of learning, discovery and engagement.
Strategies:
* Realign the review and the reward system to recognize collaboration and integration.
* Promote collaborative interdisciplinary work

2nd Breakout Group
Strategic Issue: Student Recruitment & Success, Relevance, and Public Policy

(Full listing on original document)

3rd Breakout Group
Strategic Issue: Stakeholder Driven Renewal
Increase relevance, responsiveness, and effectiveness of college programs through stakeholder driven renewal.
Strategies:
* Expand stakeholders to be more inclusive and diverse.
* Provide avenues for ongoing, open dialogue with stakeholder groups.
* Design grad/adult learners/research undergraduate programs that are responsive to market needs.
* Increase real world experience/internships
* Increase responsiveness to issues of public interest and policy makers.
* K-12
4.) **Refine or Affirm Current Mission, Values, and Long-Term Vision for Preferred Future**

Mission and values were not discussed. Decision to use the systems thinking issue as the new college vision statement.

Decision to further define three goals of
   a.) Student Recruitment & Success.
   b.) Engagement and Public Policy, and
   c.) Collaboration and Integration.

   Decision to develop strategies under five categories for each goal:
   a.) marketing,
   b.) program renewal,
   c.) diversity,
   d.) human resources, and
   e.) international. Also describe how the goal ties to the vision.

5.) **Next Steps**

Divide into three groups to further develop goals and strategies for discussion at 11/22/04 meeting. Post to Sharepoint by Thursday, 11/18

- **Goal 1:** Terry (convener), Ben, Clayton, Rich, John
- **Goal 2:** Walter (convener), Karl, Jack, Bhushan, Walt, Mary, Ann
- **Goal 3:** Roy (convener), Jill, Natalie, Bill, Cathy, Michelle
Strategic Plan for the College of Agriculture
Draft 12-01-04

The College of Agriculture

Vision Statement
To be the regional, national, and international leader in understanding natural and human systems underlying agriculture in all its forms, in translating that understanding to enhance quality of life, and in educating the leaders of the future.

Vision Narrative
Source: Study Group Six Final Report.
The College of Agriculture should shift its focus to a “systems perspective,” reformulating its approach to research, education and extension activities around four dominant systems, “landscapes and ecosystems,” “economic, social and health systems,” “the food system,” and “biological products.” Using a systems perspective means that we attempt to understand how the elements interact to produce products, communities, and economies; the goal is to understand how the system works and develop management tools for achieving economic success and sustainability. This requires knowledge of and integration of both the elements and the interactions.

To a great extent, the College of Agriculture has the necessary expertise, and if it develops a truly collaborative operating principle spanning both its mission and other units in the University, it can capture a leadership position among its peers. With attention to cultural and structural hurdles, the College can mobilize its current and developing strengths to take a new approach to fulfilling its mission.

Exploiting a systems approach requires a cross-disciplinary team—biologists, computer scientists, chemists, engineers, mathematicians, sociologists, economists, educators—who speak and understand each other’s languages and can work together to develop new approaches to maximizing system productivity, economic development, and sustainability into the future. It is a major cultural challenge to get these often disparate and isolated experts to communicate and understand each other. As our College pursues excellence in this kind of teamwork, it should be training future agricultural scientists and practitioners so that a new generation will find these interactions natural.

Proposed is the adoption of a systems approach with research, extension and resident education activities organized around four dominant and interrelated systems-oriented themes:
1) Landscapes and ecosystems
2) Economic, social, and health systems
3) Food system
4) Biological products
Brief Explanation of the Proposed Systems

**Landscapes and Ecosystems**
As in the food system, working within a landscapes and ecosystems context begins with understanding what is there and how it functions. The College has considerable strength in remote sensing and characterization of landscapes, and in fundamental plant, animal, and microbial biology as well as ecology all of which normally focus on components of (more-or-less) natural ecosystems.

*(Full report on original document)*

**Economic, Social and Health Systems**
The land-grant system is designed to serve people. Humans form economic and social systems that are outgrowths of and dependent on the ecosystems in which they live. The “outcomes” of individuals and households -- their consumption choices (food, clothing, housing, etc.), health, employment, and ability to cope economically -- vary depending on their socio-demographic characteristics and are affected by the communities in which they live. Communities in turn are strongly affected by social and economic forces that play out at the local, regional and global levels. *Source: Study Group Six Final Report.*

*(Full report on original document)*

**The Food System**
The food system includes five broad components: 1) agricultural production, 2) processing and manufacturing, 3) wholesaling, distribution, retailing and food service, and 4) consumers. Each component of the system serves to add value to the materials acted upon. Rather than view the system solely as something with directional flow of materials, one may also view the system as a means for the consumer to exercise control of that flow. The food system is a subset of the ecosystem, but many of its components extend well beyond the ecosystem into social and economic systems. *Source: Study Group Six Final Report.*

Biological Products
*Source: Core Strategic Planning Team*

**Goal 2: Communicate and assure the relevance and responsiveness of College of Agriculture teaching, research, and outreach programs to current and potential external stakeholders**

**Performance Indicators:**
- External stakeholder satisfaction measurements (survey results)
The pace of change in society today and the imperatives of our land grant mission demand that the College anticipate and identify emerging issues important to this State’s citizens and the world so it can bring to bear its expertise and intellectual resources in an effective and timely manner. At the same time, the College needs to be an international leader in interdisciplinary, curiosity-based research that fuels the translational engine of
problem resolution. This can only be accomplished if the College maintains an ongoing dialogue with our multiple, diversified stakeholders in which all are informed about current advances in understanding as well as current and emerging problems. Open, meaningful communication and mutual education are needed to facilitate the collaborative development of responsive research portfolios, to ensure effective dissemination and marketing of solutions, and to enhance public policy development.

The Report of the Working Group on Achieving a Sustainable College, The Social Sciences Study Group, and the 6th Committee each identified the importance of an integrated approach to maximizing its understanding of and responsiveness to the needs of a broader stakeholder population. Adapting to changing state, national, and international trends is critical to our long term vitality and sustainability. To reach this goal, the College needs to improve efforts to communicate the value of its knowledge, skills, and ability to solve problems to legislators, key stakeholders, new stakeholders, public officials, and the public at large.

The importance of enhancing our effective engagement in this regard is further underscored by the rationale, priorities, and opportunities identified in the UNISCOPE Report, The Kellogg Commission Report on the Future of State and Land Grant Universities, and the Carnegie Foundation (Boyer) Report to name but a few. Each of these documents highlights the need to address these issues in a comprehensive, integrated, innovative, and immediate manner.

**Strategies Implementation**

*(Full report on original document)*

16. Use the College’s in-house resources and association with other groups to provide regular updates on the state, regional, and international trends, including demographic and economic trends.

Measurement – New policies and procedures in place to provide a regular communication flow among research, teaching, extension, stakeholders and policy makers.

Impact – *Demonstrated increase in understanding College of Agriculture programs.*

17. Establish an external Executive Advisory committee to the Dean designed to provide strategic advice in areas including: program priorities, resources for additional funding, performance assessment and accountability, etc. Measurement – New Committee established with members in place.

Impact – *Valuable feedback attained.*

18. Explore the value of changing the name of the college to better reflect the breadth of expertise the college encompasses. Measurement – New name.

Impact – *Marketing value realized.*
19. Modify and enhance the “impact” component of the reporting requirements reflecting evidence of tangible, cross-functional engagement and distribute results more broadly. 
Measurement – New policies and procedures in place.
*Impact – Marketing value realized.*

21. Provide formal avenues for open and ongoing dialogue with current and newly-identified stakeholder groups at the college and unit levels.
Measurement – Establishment of systematic opportunities for meaningful input into curricula, etc. *Impact – Demonstrated increase in understanding College of Agriculture programs. Relevancy of programs.*

22. Participate aggressively in the University’s K-12 Education Initiative, linking College of Agriculture to schools in innovative ways.
Measurement – Develop new initiatives and materials to increase K-12 engagement using current 4-H School Enrichment model.
*Impact – Increase k-12 participation by 30% in 2 years*

23. Better inform Extension and Outreach about research being accomplished throughout the College, so that results can be better applied at the grassroots level.
Measurement – New policies and procedures in place designed to unite research and extension.
*Impact – At least 6 new initiatives will be developed using this method over 2 years and shared at statewide meetings.*

24. Establish a Metro Research and Extension Center to work concomitantly with the Ag Experiment Station on issues relevant to non-rural populations. This will enable College of Agriculture to develop program efforts to better position itself among a broader population and demonstrate impact to that audience.
Measurement – Establish a new center in cooperation with a branch campus in an urban area.
*Impact – Enhanced relationships among metro stakeholders including elected officials*

26. Ensure that new or redesigned curricula address employer needs through the development of stronger linkages with those industries employing our graduates.
Measurement – Establishment of at least 8 new and different courses that were developed due to direct industry communication and that meet those identified needs. At least 4 of these courses will include activities that engage the industry directly.
*Impact – Increase in student placement by 15% for three years.*

27. Align college research and outreach resources with state and national priorities as identified by public policy makers and others.
Measurement – Establishment of at least 2 new relationship groups (one federal and one state) with elected officials who have, to date, not been engaged and identify at least 3 priorities in each with plans to address them.
*Impact – Support of 10% funding increase for College of Agriculture and Extension.*
28. Institute interactions among faculty, ULs, and similar groups that constitute meaningful two-way communication as a means to better familiarize the broad spectrum of stakeholders with various efforts in the college. Measurement – Establishment of at least 3 new forums allowing for the engagement of groups of stakeholders with college staff and faculty. *Impact – Enhanced relationships among external stakeholders.*

29. Form faculty-extension-stakeholder coalitions to provide information to generate new resources. These groups could be devised as task forces with specific sunset time parameters. They should serve as clearinghouses and sources of information used in dealing with legislators and other key contacts. Measurement – Establishment of at least 6 new and different stakeholder coalitions and identify at least 3 projects in each with plans to complete them. *Impact - Receipt of a total of $100,000 per group for 3 years.*

30. Hire a marketing specialist to develop communication strategies designed to increase the visibility and support of the college so that it has broad appeal across all sectors of the state and beyond. Measurement – New marketing specialist hired. *Impact - Development of comprehensive strategy to promote College of Agriculture and Extension.*

31. Focus faculty recruitment on balancing the depth of knowledge in a particular discipline with a breadth of understanding about the systems involved. Measurement – The highest quality faculty will be recruited and retained. *Impact - 80% of new hires will reflect the “system” concept.*

32. Implement appropriate organizational and administrative changes to increase the college’s ability to respond to changing stakeholder needs by establishing rewards and recognition in the personnel evaluation, promotion, and tenure systems. Measurement – New policies and procedures in place. *Impact – Faculty and staff will be motivated to engage external stakeholders and adjust programmatic efforts accordingly.*

33. Broaden contact with external stakeholders to be more inclusive and diverse to represent a more balanced reflection of our state. Measurement – Establishment of new communication and partnership networks with at least 3 new, non-traditional, external stakeholder groups. *Impact – Successful engagement of additional advocates who embody significant numbers from underrepresented groups.*
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The goal of this planning cycle is to assert leadership and foster innovation through organizational improvement and change. Industry needs and societal needs are changing, and consumers are increasingly driving changes in the food, fiber, and natural resource systems in the Commonwealth and beyond. Our college is uniquely positioned to continually strive to meet these changing needs by virtue of our integrated missions of teaching, research, extension, and outreach. We feel that our college, more so than any other at The College, embodies The College’s vision to be the nation’s finest university in the integration of teaching, research, and service. Implementing the elements of this strategic plan—our road map for change—will position our college to be a worldwide center of excellence and to be viewed as creating the future that will serve the State, the nation, and the world.

The 2002–2005 college strategic plan focused on financial issues, and we have made significant progress toward reallocation to address diminishing traditional funding sources. The 2005–2008 plan puts forth a new vision to achieve excellence. The centerpiece of our new vision is to organize teaching, research, and extension around three interrelated systems: (1) food and fiber system, (2) ecosystem, and (3) socioeconomic system. Through this approach, we see exceptional opportunities for collaboration, discovery, and advancement of our disciplines, as well as for training students who can work within and across these systems. An integral part of this vision is an unequivocal commitment to assure the relevance of our programs in meeting practical needs of our current and new stakeholders and to inform public policy through innovative, responsive, and cutting-edge research and education programs.

The four new goals of our 2005–2008 strategic plan are the first steps toward achieving our long-term vision. These goals are to (1) increase enrollment and enhance student success, (2) enhance knowledge discovery and translation, (3) strengthen meaningful communication and mutual education with current and new stakeholders, and (4) lead and manage the college as a system. Each goal has a number of measurable targets, strategies, and actions and will help our college to attract students and train them to be tomorrow’s leaders, to conduct the most promising research, and to provide the most effective and relevant educational programs through extension and outreach. Appendix A summarizes the key features of the 2005–2008 strategic plan.

The 2005–2008 college strategic plan was developed through an open and inclusive process with input from multiple stakeholder groups. The college has a strong track record of participatory planning, and this year we complemented the tradition by adding several additional avenues for direct stakeholder involvement. At the heart of this planning process were six study groups comprised of faculty and extension educators. Using a ten- to fifteen year time horizon, the six groups identified opportunities for excellence both within and across college disciplines, and their reports are posted at http://www.ca.***.edu/strategic planning/. Furthermore, in spring 2004 the college surveyed graduating seniors, and during fall 2004 the college surveyed the agricultural industry representatives. Retreats were held with members of the Ag Council, Council of Cooperative Extension Associations, and the Alumni Society to discuss study group recommendations. Survey results and notes from stakeholder retreats are posted at http://www.ca.***.edu/strategic planning/External.html. A core strategic planning team developed the first draft of the plan, which went through multiple revisions and was made available to all members of the college for input. Details of the college planning process are posted at http://www.edu/strategic planning/ProcessPlanning_2.pdf/.
PROGRESS REPORT ON THE 2002–2005 STRATEGIC PLAN

The college has made major strides in accomplishing the strategic directions and specific goals of the 2002–2005 plan. Our new plan builds on these successes. Examples of goal achievement include the following:

- Extramural funding for college projects increased from an average of $39 million per year in the previous planning period to an average of $53 million per year during this planning period. Proposals involving college personnel increased from an average of 657 to an average of 705 per year.
- Despite budget reductions of $6 million over the past several years and resultant recycling of more than 160 faculty, county educator, and support staff positions in the college, we still have managed to make strategic reinvestments in faculty and staff hires to cover critical support areas and, more importantly, to build areas of excellence such as chemical ecology and toxicology. In times of budget constraints, we consider these as bold moves to continue advancing the excellence of the college.
- Faculty hired during the 2002–2005 planning period address the priority areas identified in that strategic plan:
  - a. Enhancing profitability in the food and agriculture system (8)
  - b. Protecting water resources (1)
  - c. Improving forest management and use of wood products (3)
  - d. Ensuring agricultural bio-security (3)
  - e. Strengthening families, youth, and communities (4)
- We have moved to an operating mode of “no entitlements” to resource allocation to units of the college. All position vacancies return to the dean to meet budget shortfalls and to make strategic reinvestments. Budget cuts are no longer across the board. Graduate assistantships were also reduced to meet deficits and a new system for allocating tuition grants-in-aid has been implemented.
- Teaching resources were reallocated to the animal sciences and forest resources to address student enrollment patterns.
- Cooperative extension has significantly increased funding from non-appropriated sources. Funding from grants and contracts has nearly doubled from $10.5 million in FY2001–2002 to $19 million in FY2003–2004. Gifts accounted for $1.4 million in FY2003–2004, and in that same year fees enabled cost recovery of over $600,000.
- To enhance organizational effectiveness, the cooperative extension regions have been reorganized from eight to six regions. A state dairy program leader has been named with the goal of strengthening our multidisciplinary, cross-functional focus on the dairy industry.
- The college has actively participated in and leveraged faculty position and/or program support funding from The Huck Institute for Life Sciences; The College Institutes of the Environment; Children, Youth, and Families Consortium; The Social Sciences Research Institute; and Materials Research Institute.
- The College’s Office of Conferences and Short Courses has been merged with our College Relations Office to enhance efficiency and to better meet college program goals and client needs.
- Major investments have been made in building our college’s Office of International Programs. Student, faculty, and staff involvement in international experiences has increased substantially, grant funding has grown significantly, and our international programs office is providing University-wide leadership in building inter-college collaborations.
The College has spent considerable effort in developing a Plan for Diversity, which is available at http://diversity.ca.***.edu/04 ImplementPlan.pdf/. We continue to make substantial investments of money and personnel to advance our progress on all aspect diversity and climate issues of the college. Professional development of all our personnel has continued to be a top priority. Communication among faculty and staff a ways to enhance such interactions are being actively addressed.

Efforts on undergraduate student recruitment are starting to pay off in several majors. Over the past three years, enrollments have grown from 71 to 122 in agribusiness management, from 62 to 67 in food science from 109 to 126 in the landscape contracting majors. However, much more work is needed we address this in our new plan.

The student scholarship and awards program has grown from $1,417,851 awarded to students in 2001-2002 to $1,563,593 awarded to students in 2004-2005—a 10.3 percent increase in three years.

A Web-based survey of students was developed and is administered each semester to graduating seniors to assess student satisfaction and outcomes realizations.

As a result of a series of workshops on “infusing multiculturalism into the curriculum” faculty included multicultural learning activities at least eight existing course syllabi.

A new course, SPAN 105: Spanish for the Ag Industry was developed and is being offered each semester through the Department of Spanish, Italian, and Portuguese.

“Report Cards” with additional details on performance indicators associated with the goals of the 2002–2005 plan are presented in Appendix B. Appendix C provides a longer-term summary of college efforts to increase income and cost savings.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

Early in the current planning process we studied the college’s performance on the 2002–2005 goals and strategies, as well as internal and external challenges that we believe will affect the successful implementation of new goals. We have identified five strategic issues that need to be resolved to enhance our effectiveness:

How can we allocate resources among traditional production agriculture and other new or related areas that are of importance in meeting current and anticipated stakeholder needs?

How do we attract increasing numbers of high-quality students and produce graduates that meet the needs of an evolving career marketplace?

How do we enhance engagement between stakeholders and the college to provide an ongoing dialogue that informs and guides public policy?

How do we engage in program renewal to redefine our relevance to society and potential students?

How do we enhance integration across our functions?

Our peers across the nation are facing similar strategic issues, and we believe The College is well positioned to lead in resolving these issues. As we look ahead, and in the context of our new strategic plan for 2005–2008, we consider the following key elements to advancing our college:

1. The essential need to enhance collaboration within and outside of the college as part of our systems approach.
2. The high priority of undergraduate student recruitment and making our programs and majors more relevant and appealing.
3. The need to project the college in a new light while still being responsive and relevant to both present and new stakeholders.
4. Continued reference to the six study group reports in the college’s decision-making process.
5. Continued very selective investment and reallocation in tight budget times to areas of excellence and elements of this strategic plan.
6. Continued strong commitment to University initiatives.
7. Commitment to the college’s human resources, including diversity and climate issues and professional development and mentoring of all employees.

The first three elements relate to the priority needs and expectations of our external stakeholders, and the last four derive from internal stakeholder recommendations. All seven issues are interdependent and will require focused discipline for achievement. Recent interaction with stakeholders has reinforced the urgency with which many of them view the need for the college to take an even more active role in identifying science-based solutions to ensure the vitality of the state’s food and fiber sector. As one external stakeholder said, “We want you to ‘capture the science’ to help us make better decisions.” This comment articulates the unique niche we have within the University and the Commonwealth, and our new strategic plan illustrates the way in which we envision strengthening our contribution to this niche.

MISSION, CORE VALUES, AND VISION

Mission

The mission of The College of Agriculture is to discover, integrate, and disseminate knowledge to enhance the food and agricultural system, natural resource and environmental stewardship, and economic and social well-being, thereby improving the lives of people in the State, the nation, and the world.

Core Values

❖ Excellence and productivity in the scholarship of resident education, research, and extension/outreach
❖ Creativity, innovation, and openness to change
❖ Stakeholder engagement and responsiveness to emerging issues
❖ Access to information and knowledge to facilitate lifelong learning for all residents
❖ Interdisciplinary, cross-functional collaboration and communication to solve complex problems for the common good
❖ Dedication to diversity, multicultural understanding, and cross-cultural competence
❖ An atmosphere of mutual respect that promotes listening, openly sharing ideas and viewpoints, and debating issues and concerns
❖ The highest standards of integrity, honesty, shared responsibility, and mutual accountability
❖ Commitment to our employees and an environment that nurtures personal and professional growth and development

Vision

The College of Agriculture aspires to be the regional, national, and international leader in understanding the natural and human systems underlying agricultural sciences, translating that understanding to enhance quality of life, and educating the leaders of today and the future. We will organize our approach to teaching, research, and extension/outreach around three interrelated systems: food and fiber system, ecosystem, and socioeconomic system.
A significant opportunity for our college—the potential for developing and accepting bio-based resources—exists at the interface of the food and fiber, ecosystem, and socioeconomic systems. Bio-based resources are renewable and can be used to produce a variety of value-added materials in addition to their well-recognized importance as

This renewed vision for our college was derived from the findings of the six faculty/extension educator study groups. Their work emphasized that continuing and expanded collaborations within our college and with other college consortia, institutes, and units of the University are an essential component to realizing our vision for the college. Crucial to this effort will be cross-disciplinary teams that speak and understand each other’s languages and can work together to develop new approaches to maximize system productivity, economic development, and sustainability. These teams include disciplines both within our college and across the University such as biology, computer science, chemistry, engineering, mathematics, sociology, economics, and education. Due to our success in developing collaborative initiatives within our college, with the University at large, and with external agencies, we are in a strong position to achieve our vision. As our college continues to pursue excellence in this kind of teamwork, we will train future agricultural scientists and practitioners so that a new generation will find team interactions second nature.

To achieve our vision we recognize and validate that our college must move toward an approach where resident education, research, and extension/outreach activities organized around three dominant and interrelated systems. Capitalizing on this approach requires a thoughtful balance between fundamental and applied science and between disciplinary and interdisciplinary excellence.

Each of the three systems described in our vision statement is unique to the college’s mission wherein teach research, and extension/outreach are truly integrated wherein our work, including the most fundamental research, seeks relevance and practical application, and wherein these systems are interrelated. At the interface of these systems we see exceptional opportunity to collaborate, discover, and advance the frontiers of our discipline. We will discover how the systems interact to produce products, communities, and economies, and will transform this knowledge into management tools that will support our stakeholders in achieving economic success, quality of life, and environmental sustainability.

Historically, the college has had considerable strength in teaching, research, and extension programming in the production and processing of food and wood products. Over time, U.S. agriculture has evolved from a producer-driven system to a decidedly consumer-driven system. We will continue to provide science-based research and educational materials to the producers of agricultural and food commodities. However, we recognize significant opportunities to serve our long-standing stakeholders by better serving the consumers of agricultural products, whether through providing nutrition education, by assisting local governments with land-use decisions, or by helping producers develop and find new markets for value-added products. The need to better integrate activities through a food and fiber systems approach is best illustrated by the fact that the State’s food processing and manufacturing segment represents approximately five times ($20B) the value of farm gate production ($4B) of agricultural goods. Likewise, the wood products and paper industries of the Commonwealth account for over $15 billion in sales annually (Source: Economic Census for the State and Agricultural Statistics). This State remains strategically situated relative to consumer markets and remains the leading food processing and manufacturing state in the region and one of the leading states in the nation. Similar competitive opportunities exist for wood products.

Food and Fiber System

The food and fiber system includes five broad components:

(1) Agricultural and forest production, (2) processing and manufacturing, (3) wholesaling and distribution, (4) retailing and food service, and (5) consumers. Each component of the system serves to add value to the materials acted upon. Rather than view the system solely as something with a directional flow of materials, we may also view the system as a means for the consumer to exercise control of that flow.
alternative energy sources. The agricultural industry has been identified as a key source of bio-based resources. Our college can be a catalyst in expanding the College’s educational and research opportunities in bio-based systems. In our vision for bio-based products, we can contribute in areas such as novel uses for wood and other plant-based materials; development of new products for human, animal, and plant health and nutrition; bio-based fuels and lubricants; and a variety of bio-mimetic (materials designed to mimic biological characteristics) products and devices. A bio-based economy also provides new opportunities for rural communities and will require science-based policy decisions, both of which we are well positioned to lead. We will endeavor to enhance linkages with Materials Research Institute and campus-wide.

**Ecosystem**

The interactions of humans with the environment—from agricultural production to natural resource utilization to response by local communities to increased suburbanization—are best characterized and studied at the level of the landscape and ecosystem. Ecosystems, which are subdivisions of landscapes, can be areas as large as a forest or the Chesapeake Bay Watershed or as small as a single farm or even the rhizosphere of a single plant. The college has decades of experience in team-based approaches to addressing complex problems at various scales. A systems focus on ecosystems employs this long-standing capacity and provides a framework for identifying the challenges and opportunities that face us in the future. It further recognizes that much of our work is in ecosystem and landscapes where the presence of human activity has had a significant effect on the natural interactions of the biological and physical world.

This State possesses substantial natural and agricultural resources. Our ability to sustainably and profitability manage these resources into the future dictates that we continue to seek and disseminate science-based solution sets to both existing and emerging challenges. For example, despite years of research on water resources, nutrient issues, and wildlife management, accompanied by a change in how that population is distributed, has created new challenges in land use that necessitate the distribution of new information. The college will focus on assembling interdisciplinary teams to teach, conduct research, and solve problems in ecosystems.

We will use our expertise to help citizens of the Commonwealth, nation, and world balance biodiversity and ecological sustainability with production and economic viability. The college’s strengths in plant and animal production; natural resource issues involving forests, watersheds, and wildlife; invasive species; geospatial analysis; environmental microbiology; and community vitality enable us to address critical questions as diverse as preserving air and water quality and making informed land-use decisions. Our teams will unite biology and chemistry with sociology and economics in search of answers to practical problems in resource (e.g., food, fiber, open space) management. Underlying our practical solutions will be solid science that derives from research ranging from the molecular to organismic to ecosystem to landscape levels. We expect that our efforts will contribute to advancing science, solving real-world problems, and crafting policies to guide future decisions.

**Socioeconomic System**

Humans form socioeconomic systems that are outgrowths of and dependent on the environment in which they live. Their consumption choices (food, clothing, housing, etc.), health, education, employment, quality of life, and ability to cope economically vary depending on their socio-demographic characteristics and are affected by the communities in which they live. Communities in turn are strongly affected by socioeconomic forces that play out at the local, regional, and global levels. A socioeconomic system has three levels: (1) individual and household, (2) local community and regional economy, and (3) the various levels of government where policies related to food, land use, and economic and social development affect human outcomes.
involve faculty and educators working in the local, regional, national, and even international arenas. At the individual, household, local community, and regional economic levels we partner with other College organizations such as the Social Science Research Institute (SSRI), the Population Research Institute, and the Colleges of Health and Human Development and Education; external to The College we partner with various state and regional entities to examine and propose solutions to a wide range of social and economic problems. Examples of the problems addressed include implications and impacts of environmental policies on agriculture and natural resources; impacts of government policy and economic and social forces on communities, agriculture, and land uses; implications of demographic change (e.g., aging); impacts of global and technological forces on the economy, families, communities, and the workforce; causes of rural poverty; declines in the younger generation’s civic engagement; alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use; childhood obesity; enhancement of K–12 learning; and out-of-school programming for youth. We strive to seek additional partners to address these and new emerging issues.

At the policy level, we use our science-based expertise to work with county, state, and federal government to ensure that public policy decisions are made based on sound scientific knowledge. The scholarship exercised within these systems also is integral to examining the issues and forces that drive and affect functioning of both the food and fiber system and the ecosystem.

**GOALS, MEASURABLE TARGETS, STRATEGIES, AND ACTIONS**

Our goals indicate the long-term direction we intend to take to achieve the newly refined college vision. Our goals have changed from the 2002–2005 plan due to significant current and anticipated changes in our environment. For each goal we identify a small number of strategies, which we define as the means by which we will achieve our goals. At this level we will assign specific accountability for implementation. Each strategy includes actions that we have identified as short-term activities to implement the strategy. These are likely to change more frequently as we modify our efforts to respond to future challenges.

To help ensure and determine successful implementation, we have identified a small number of measurable targets. These articulate the outcome we desire from goal achievement. When setting targets for growth we considered current capacity and identified areas where we need to build additional capacity.

We continue to ensure that college goals are aligned with the goals of the University, which are to (1) enhance academic excellence through greater support of high-quality teaching, research, and service; (2) enrich the educational experience of all The College students by becoming a more student-centered University; (3) build a more considerate and civil University community; (4) serve society through teaching, research, and service; and (5) develop new sources of income and reduce costs through improved efficiencies.
Our goal to enhance student success relates to University goals 1, 2, and 4; the focus of the University’s self-study for reaccreditation; and the President’s initiatives on world campus/resident education curriculum revitalization, K–12 partnerships, and faculty-to-student ratios.

Measurable Targets

- Increase undergraduate enrollment by 5 percent each year for three years to reach 2,350 students by fall 2008.
- Increase graduate enrollment by 5 percent each year for three years to reach 545 students by fall 2008.
- Increase funding for student scholarships by 30 percent over three years to $2 million per year.
- Increase student achievement of program learning objectives.
- Increase student, employer, and alumni satisfaction measures.
- Increase GRE and SAT scores of incoming graduate and undergraduate students.
- Increase enrollment in lifelong learning programs.

Strategies and Actions

1. Increase efforts to recruit and retain a high-quality and diverse pool of undergraduate and graduate students. Reach out to wider/nontraditional student audiences. Involve all county extension offices in the recruitment process. Enhance and increase faculty and extension educator working relationships with campus colleges to include faculty contact with students interested in University Park programs.

- Intensify efforts to establish relationships with high school teachers and high school guidance counselors and ensure their understanding of the wide breadth of careers available to college graduates.
- Enhance faculty and staff resources devoted to recruitment in units and at the college level where appropriate.
- Intensify college marketing efforts to increase awareness of program relevancy through a partnership with The College’s Public Relations and Enrollment Management units.

- Target new scholarships to first-year students whenever possible.

- Sponsor precollege activities (e.g., competitions, camps, workshops, and symposia) that provide college visibility to prospective students.

- Explore the value of changing the name of the college.

- Revitalize undergraduate and graduate curricula in new and emerging areas that are consistent with the three systems, starting with the programs identified in the faculty study group reports.
- Assess curricula for relevance to market needs and revise accordingly.
- Assess student learning outcomes to ensure mastery of program objectives.
- Plan and implement actions to enhance the excellence and effectiveness of all graduate programs.
- Ensure curricular integrity across campuses and delivery systems in accordance with the recommendations of the University’s self-study for reaccreditation.

- Provide relevant programs to increase enrollment in our cooperative extension programs, conferences and short courses, and other lifelong learning opportunities.
- Increase enrollment in youth programs such as 4-H, after-school programs, and other youth-development activities.

- Improve programs that appeal to urban and suburban audiences (e.g., companion animals and horticulture).

- Increase the number and quality of conferences and short courses offered through the college.

- Increase collaborative programming with campus colleges to include faculty engagement with extension and other outreach programs.
Goal C. Strengthen meaningful communication and mutual education with current and new stakeholders

Anticipating and responding to changing state, national, and international trends are crucial to the success of our stakeholders and therefore to the long-term vitality and sustainability of the college. We need to continually improve the way in which we translate the knowledge we have generated into accessible and useful formats for agricultural producers, consumers, legislators, citizens, employers, public officials, and other current and new stakeholders. We should provide our stakeholders with regular updates on state, regional, and international trends, including demographic and economic trends. We need to listen to current and new stakeholders to determine their perceptions, needs, and expectations. Open, meaningful communication and mutual education will facilitate the collaborative development of responsive research portfolios. This will in turn help ensure effective dissemination and marketing of solutions and the development of public policies that are informed by science. The demographic profile of the State residents has changed, and we see new opportunities to meet the needs of suburban and urban residents whom we previously may not have reached. A Metro Research and Outreach Center strategically located in the Commonwealth would provide a focus for the college to unite our educational, research, and extension and outreach programs with synergistic resources available within campus colleges and the Colleges of Health and Human Development, Medicine, Education, and Engineering to better meet the needs of our suburban and urban residents. Reaching suburban and urban residents would also facilitate the college’s efforts to educate the non-farming public about agricultural issues, such as food and fiber production, farmland preservation, and land-use considerations, that are vital to all of our futures. This goal addresses the President’s priorities of K–12 and social science initiatives and relates to University goal.

Measurable Targets

- Increase stakeholder satisfaction measures.
- Increase the number of venues through which stakeholders can provide feedback to the college.

Strategies and Actions

1. Design and implement systematic stakeholder engagement and share assessment results broadly throughout the college to inform program priorities as well as change and renewal efforts.
- Expand opportunities for current and new stakeholders to provide strategic advice to the college in areas such as program priorities, resources for additional funding, performance assessment, and accountability.
- Involve researchers in interaction with current and new stakeholders through outreach programs and professional and public service activities.

2. Improve the college’s dissemination of research results to ensure that both external and internal stakeholders are fully informed of results and their impact on economic viability.
- Enhance Web-based materials to ensure that resources are more readily available.
- Encourage opportunities for extension educators to be meaningfully involved in appropriate research activities.
- Create opportunities to cross-fertilize department interests, including the establishment of an annual college scientific conference to allow us to enhance synergy between initiatives.

3. Enhance strategic, cross-functional partnerships with current and newly identified stakeholders.
- Establish a Metro Research and Outreach Center.
- Expand the college’s contribution to agricultural literacy initiatives.
- Expand partnerships with diverse audiences and appropriate international entities.
- Survey program recipients to assess impact of extension recommendations and determine ways to increase satisfaction.
CONCLUSION

We believe that the goals, strategies, and actions outlined in this plan will facilitate significant movement toward achieving our vision over the next three years. We have the benefit of committed employees and external stakeholders to partner with the college in implementation efforts. The College of Agriculture at The College is positioned to strengthen our role in leading the disciplines of agricultural sciences to new heights of excellence.

Goal C Report Card

Goal C: Increase the relevance, responsiveness, and effectiveness of cooperative extension educational programs on important current and emerging issues pertaining to the food and agriculture system; natural and environmental resources; children, youth, and families; and economic and community development.

1. Number of Participants in Cooperative Extension Programs Statewide During the fiscal years 2001 to 2003, The College Cooperative Extension offered educational opportunities to more than 2.3 million citizens across the Commonwealth.

2. Number of Underrepresented Participants in Cooperative Extension Programs Statewide Extension educators and faculty provided educational opportunities to more than 223,000 individuals from underrepresented groups during the past three years.

3. Evidence of Participant Knowledge, Attitude, Skill, or Practice Change in Major Program Areas

Outcomes of the educational programming in major program areas (see below) are reported by extension educators and faculty annually. Of the nearly 770,000 individuals reached each year, an average of 321,000 participates annually in evaluations to determine the effectiveness of the educational programs offered. Approximately 70 percent of these participants (223,000) indicated increases in knowledge and skills as well as changes in attitudes and behaviors as a result of participation in educational activities each year.

Major Program Areas

*Enhancing profitability in the food and agriculture system
*Protecting water resources (wise use of environmental resources)
*Ensuring agricultural bio-security (safety and security)
*Improving forest management and use of wood products
*Strengthening families, youth, and communities

This publication is available in alternative media on request. The State University is committed to the policy that all persons shall have equal access to programs, facilities, admission, and employment without regard to personal characteristics not related to ability, performance, or qualifications as determined by University policy or by state or federal authorities. It is the policy of the University to maintain an academic and work environment free of
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This Executive Summary and Action Plan for the Metro Research and Outreach Center (MROC) reflects the Metro Center study committee’s effort to address the Dean of the College of Agriculture (CA) charge and the Dean’s Council’s response to the draft report submitted in September, 2007. We are recommending action focused on three initial topic areas. These topic areas reflect the results of a faculty survey, a stakeholder meeting in Gotham City, as well as deliberations with the Dean’s staff. In addition, we believe these recommendations will address all three missions of a land grant institution through:

- Enhancement of the recruitment of students to the College of Agriculture (CA),
- Engagement in applied research in urban communities,
- Strengthening urban Outreach and Extension capabilities, and
- Increasing CA and State University relevancy to urban/metro stakeholders.

The committee believes the most effective way to launch the metro initiative is to establish an independent MROC to facilitate a collaboration of the research, resident education, and extension mission of CAS as well as accommodate a relationship with University Outreach (Appendix 1). Leveraging current resources can hasten the establishment of a physical presence at a location closer to downtown Gotham City with easy access and provide space for future expansion. Facility cost can be delayed while both the program and political support grow. In the meantime, MROC programming can be initiated in presently available facilities.

**The MROC provides an opportunity for CA to grow within its mission.**

*The mission of the College of Agriculture is to discover, integrate, and disseminate knowledge to enhance the food and agricultural system, natural resource and environmental stewardship, and economic and social well-being, thereby improving the lives of people in The State, the nation, and the world.*

Goal A - Increase enrollment and enhance student success through better access to metro schools and prospective students.

Goal B - Enhance knowledge discovery and translation through research in metro related issues.

Goal C - Strengthen meaningful communication and mutual education with current and new stakeholders through engagement with new local supporters such as, elected officials and policy makers.

Goal D - Lead and manage the college as a system through nurturing the potential assets of metro areas and ensuring that all residents see CAS as relevant to their lives.

MROC has close relevance to the newly proposed adjustments to the CAS strategic plan including:

- Energy conservation education as part of the alternative energy objectives
- Protection of plant, animal and human health
Sustainable environments
- Food Safety and Quality
- Regional economic stability
- E-learning and CAS sustainability

MROC can link metro audiences with the traditional Agricultural audience by:
- Creating new regional and neighborhood markets for PA grown crops.
- Sensitizing metro communities to agriculture through formal and non-formal education
- Demonstrating the use of agricultural principles in the Community Green topic areas.
- Demonstrating that integrated pest management principles developed in agriculture can be adapted to urban environments.

**COURSE OF ACTION**
We believe that the best course of action is to proceed with a three-phase timeline for the establishment of a high-quality, sustainable, and comprehensive Metro Research and Outreach Center (Appendix 2). These phases are: Start-Up, Transitional, and Final.

**Start-up**
During the Start-Up Phase, a virtual presence will be emphasized utilizing existing resources available through the local Extension office. This phase will establish team membership and identify specific research and outreach activities in line with the three subject matter topic areas. This initial step will include the announcement of a director and the launching of initial program development activities, partnerships, and logistics. Much of this phase will be virtual, focusing on establishing the human infrastructure for research, resident education, and outreach programs as well as plan for the development of a physical presence. Initial partnerships, both internal and external, will be developed and plans will be devised to establish a temporary location. This facility will be established as a partnership with the local Extension office leveraging local resources. We suggest that future facilities hold the County Extension office and the Metro Research and Outreach Center as separate entities in the same building.

**Transitional**
The Transitional Phase will include the identification and establishment of a physical presence and continued team building. The facility for this stage would be a leased building that could accommodate all of the activities necessary for the transition period leveraging local funds to help offset costs.

Goals, objectives, and strategic activities will be clearly defined for the research and program teams working in the three initial topic areas. This Phase, spanning a three to five year period, will initiate or accomplish the following:
- Fully develop research, resident education, and outreach activities;
- finalize specific facility needs, requirements, and design specifications;
- develop a strategic capital development plan;
- begin hiring strategic personnel;
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- fund research and associated activities; and
- integrate all appropriate Outreach components.

Additional topic areas will be developed based on stakeholder input, faculty interest, and available resources.

**Final**
The Final Phase is the realization of a fully functional research and outreach center housed in a state of the art, living building in close proximity to downtown. All MROC activities will transfer to the new facility as will the local Extension office. The operation of this center will include activities in all three areas of the Land Grant mission: Research, Extension/Outreach, and Resident Education. Three to five full time faculty or research associates will be engaged in local research and Extension activities with allowance for expansion based on research and other grant funds for metro opportunities. Frequent interactions with all local partners will develop relationships with new, non-traditional stakeholders and ensure responsiveness to local needs and challenges.

The facility and staffing will be in place to help support MROC activities that are relevant to the Greater Gotham City area and beyond as well as collaborating with other successful Metro efforts across the state and country. The facility would be highly visible and attract residents to its outstanding programming. Special classes (both local and distant) would be available for individuals interested in pursuing studies in the CAS. The Extension operation would serve as a major partner, as would the State Continuing Education, Penn Tap, Management Development, and other Outreach programming initiatives. MROC will be a direct conduit to the College of Agriculture, University Outreach and the State University allowing for a free, multi-directional flow of resources, information, and influence to better serve the residents of the state and to enhance the standing of The State University in our metro environments.

More specifically, recommendations follow.

**1. Launch the Initiative immediately with program development concentrating on Urban and Community Greening, then expand into the other two areas listed below.** Locally identified community needs and current programming will make the Greening issue the easiest to engage immediately. Initial activities will be carried out by creating interdisciplinary, issue-oriented teams made up of faculty from these disciplines and County Extension educators and staff (Appendix 3). **Activities for Start-Up Stage include:** Faculty engagement and commitment to engage in metro activities, funding of team activities, initial implementation activities and searches for new faculty/staff.

1. Urban and Community Greening *
2. Urban Agriculture and Food Production *
3. Entomology and Plant Pathology

* Activities that can begin immediately include:
Vacant Lot remediation and greening strategies,

Varietal trials for turf species and woody ornamental plants best suited to urban environments,

Lead remediation strategies establishing sound practices based on solid research,

Community and Economic development modeling and evaluation of sound practices,

High Tunnel research in communities with high levels of pollution and other variables,

Marketing and economic development related to urban farming,

Sound urban farming practices differing from traditional methods.

Integrated teams will coordinate MROC activities. One of the duties of the teams will be to recruit other faculty and extension expertise and identify further gaps. Members of the team can be involved in both research and extension activities and may also help recruit State University applicants as well as teach local citizens either in person or via the internet. Teams should be funded and team members should receive recognition for their participation. Any faculty based at MROC will be managed similarly to faculty at the Tree Fruit Research and Education Center, answering both to their home department as well as the MROC director.

An MROC Administrative Council will be formed and will include at least one member from each topic area team as well as representation from the Associate Deans of Research, Extension, and Resident Education. A representative from Outreach may also be included. The purpose of the Administrative Council is to provide for communication among the topic area teams, the MROC Director, and CAS administration.

2. Create incentives for faculty and staff to participate.

An incentive structure will be developed during Start-Up and in place during the Transition Stage.

Incentives can include:

- College seed grant funds to stimulate these team development and stakeholder contacts,
- Modification of job descriptions,
- Acknowledgement of activities during evaluations and in the tenure/promotion process,
- Grad Students stipends/fee waivers,
- Facilities and resources in Gotham City,
- The opportunity for improved ties between county staff and UP faculty.
3. Create the Center Director position and describe administrative responsibilities regarding the Extension office and/or MROC.  
*Center director position and support staff should be placed early in the Start-Up Stage.*  
The director would manage MROC operation, assist in development efforts, and help to coordinate all local linkages. The position will report to the CAS as well as to the Outreach System. The Director should participate in the CAS policy and decision making processes at a level equal to a Program Leader.

4. Create a local advisory board that reflects broad representation.  
*The board should be constituted during the Start-Up Stage and strengthened as the initiative moves forward.*  
This board will reflect a broad representation of local partners and stakeholders (Appendix 4).

5. Engage local, state, and federal elected officials regarding the development of the MROC as soon as possible. All state elected officials should be notified immediately upon appointment of the MROC director.  
*Personal communication from the director will be sent to state and local officials early in the Start-up Stage.*

Emphasis should be placed on local and state elected officials to bring them into the loop regarding the short and long term plans. This will allow them the opportunity to align themselves with a new, high profile initiative. Significant dialogue should begin prior to the official announcement and continue beyond the start date. These are actions recommended to establish a systemic relationship.
- Encourage CAS political/industrial liaison to form relationships with metro elected officials and business leaders.
- Provide periodic reports of MROC progress and needs to state legislature members in our metro issues
- Establish CAS/University representation on local government commissions, etc.
- Directly engage elected officials to become active in Center activities.

6. Develop a funded communications and marketing strategy to include in-house and external expertise.  
*An initial, draft marketing plan should be completed early in the Start-Up Stage. Implementation of plan should coincide with the placement of the director. Continued marketing will be significant in all Stages.*

The College should partner with University marketing to build and manage the campaign. The effort will be responsible for developing communication plans and materials that can promote the presence of the MROC to the Gotham City community.

7. Create formal linkages with local universities, community colleges, local school districts, and non-profit organizations and align partnerships to assist in supporting the effort (Appendix 5).  
*Formal linkages should begin in the Start-Up Stage emphasizing major universities first then progressing to other entities (community colleges, NGOs, etc.). Process will carry on into following Stages.*
The Center, on behalf of The State University, Outreach, and the College of Agriculture, should establish formal agreements with these entities. These agreements should be in process within six months of the establishment of the Center.

8. **Expand CAS Resident Education presence and resources at undergraduate and graduate levels to provide students with metro experiences by providing increased opportunities to conduct community-driven participatory research.** The intent is to attract students, both undergraduates and graduate, to apply to the college. Engagement procedures should be developed during the Start-Up Stage and implemented during the Transitional Stage. It is likely that some already may exist and only formal recognition is necessary.

The College has an opportunity for faculty to utilize the Gotham City area as a collaborative learning environment. Examples include offering undergraduate and graduate level courses on–site and/or via distance education, facilitation of internships and summer employment opportunities, a locale to facilitate student research projects/theses, and a site for youth based educational programming in the food, agricultural, and natural resource sciences. Physical facilities could be provided as a “dock” in the metro area for use by visiting teaching faculty. Extension staff members and community partners are prepared to facilitate this effort. The physical facilities of the MROC should accommodate attractive informational displays to inform potential students. These facilities should also include at least 2 conference rooms with high speed data links (Internet II) to campus, a projection unit and computer to facilitate teaching and connectivity to UP campus and other VTC sites. Someone from the Resident Education Office should be assigned to the committee.

9. **Enhance funding and leverage opportunities for urban youth to learn leadership, citizenship, and life skills by participating in CAS educational programs such as 4-H national, state and county events, summer programs, and special events.** Determine specific science-based, technology-oriented, and career track educational activities for participation and appropriate funding. Develop an approach for promoting educational events to interested youth and leaders during the Start-Up Stage with continued development. Maximize effectiveness of the program delivery strategies and communicate the relevance of youth programming to parents, leaders, and youth.

10. **Provide an easily accessible, high profile presence within a half mile of downtown.** Utilize the two development stages to establish a long term presence in the Gotham City market. Begin with the Start-Up Stage.

This will establish a combined space for the Extension office and the metro initiative to form the Metro Research and Outreach Center. These facilities can begin as virtual facilities where services are developed first and delivered from the existing county Extension office. As MROC grows to the Transition Stage, physical facilities can be expanded/obtained. This facility, while meeting many of the identified needs will be used only as a temporary space since it may have some limitations. The Transitional Stage will leverage current resources to expand available space for the permanent
housing of all metro initiative activities. The Transition and long term facility costs could be kept at a reasonable rate while both the program and political support grow. This facility must have the following: easy accessibility, street level entrance with high visibility, sufficient flexible space for conference / classrooms and labs, and offices for both visiting faculty and those assigned to the center. Further, there should be a reasonable amount of ground. These are to be used for research, demonstration, and education. If grounds are not available on site, efforts should be made to secure access to reasonable land within a short walking distance (Appendices 6 & 7).
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## Appendix 2

### Metro Research and Outreach Center Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Evidence of implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Establish Center transitions costs with justification for expenditures</td>
<td>Negotiated, finalized budget with expenses justified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ID Center resident faculty and focus area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create incentive plan for prolonged, sustained faculty and student involvement in Center activities</td>
<td>List of ID’d faculty and focus area with documented agreement to participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documented incentive plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ID existing available Extension staff &amp; program area</td>
<td>List of staff and program area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Official placement of Director with development/implementation of marketing plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop C of A metro programming leadership team to participate in College policy and decision making processes</td>
<td>C of A announcement of placement of Director and documented marketing activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documented team membership list and schedule of participatory activities (meetings, etc.) for 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Develop descriptions for needed Center faculty/staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertise position openings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hire new staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct orientation</td>
<td>Written job descriptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ads taken out by HR and locally</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New staff on board</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Documentation of orientation schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Plan for move to downtown facility</td>
<td>Documentation of facility address options, contact information; Transition plan (notifications, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Develop advisory board</td>
<td>List of confirmed board members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Faculty engagement commitments finalized</td>
<td>Documented engagement agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Conduct inaugural advisory board meeting</td>
<td>Documentation of agenda and minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Educate local/State political leaders on Center development</td>
<td>Documentation of communication activities with political leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Begin implementation of program/research/outreach plans</td>
<td>Documentation of implementation activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Develop plan with identified funding streams to engage youth in summer experiences and pipeline recruitment programs for encouraging application to State University</td>
<td>Written plan specifying funding opportunities, available summer activities, participation requirements, funds receipt procedures, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>ID downtown Center location: Permanent Space ID and facility planning</td>
<td>Documentation of permanent address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written plan with full facility specs (specific office detail)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Engage local colleges/universities for</td>
<td>Documentation of engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of MOU’s for collaborative activities</td>
<td>Activities with specific institutions and copies of completed MOU’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Identify specific opportunities for engaging local public schools and non-profits in Center activities</td>
<td>Documentation of engagement opportunities with specific contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Conduct enhanced needs assessment with stakeholders/community residents</td>
<td>Documentation of enhanced needs assessment meetings/focus groups with contacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Key County Extension Personnel for all three focus areas**
The following are existing The County staff who has knowledge in one or more of the three topic areas. Additional personnel needed for the three topic areas are listed below as ‘new hires required.’ If possible, educators from surrounding counties can join teams.

- Mike, Senior Extension Educator - Local team leader
- Sandy, Associate Extension Educator
- John, Extension Project Associate
- Mark, Regional Extension Urban Forester
- Joseph, Extension Program Assistant
- Support in Leadership and Youth will also be available as necessary.

**University Faculty**
About 80 faculty expressed a high degree of interest in metro extension, education, and outreach in a recent web-based survey in various capacities. Faculty members on these lists have been approached and have expressed an interest in this project. A follow up process is being completed to confirm faculty willing to begin actively collaborating upon formal initiation of MROC.

**Topic Area Teams**

**Urban and Community Greening**
Urban greening is broadly defined as activities that engage local residents and transform unsightly, unhealthy, vacant lots that are considered liabilities to communities into well designed, very low maintenance, landscapes that are considered assets to communities.

There is a substantial urban and community greening project already underway in The County. This will allow this topic area to start immediately and show near-term results.

- Rob, Horticulture Green roof
- Jim, Horticulture Arboriculture
- Jim, Horticulture Arboriculture
- Pete, Crop & Soil Turf management
- Al, Crop & Soil Turf management
- Jim, Forestry Forest management
- Bill, Forestry Urban and community forestry
- Sandy, Forestry Forestry and youth outreach
- John, Forestry Tree and genetic research
- Bryan, Forestry Well Water/ponds
- Rick, Crop & Soil Soil remediation
- Gary, Plant Path. Diseases of ornamentals
- Greg, Entomology Ornamental IPM
- Claudia, Ag & Ext Ed 4H and youth programming
- Al, Ag Eco/R. Soc Policy and development
Identified GAPs in expertise:
Brownfield Remediation Researcher (placed at MROC) – new faculty hire
Storm water / water management - Faculty from other colleges can be recruited such as from landscape architecture and civil engineering.

Urban Agriculture and Food Production
Urban Agriculture is defined as a small, economically stable agricultural effort in the urban area dedicated to providing healthy produce to area residents, increasing local food security, and remediating the land. It also includes the establishment of local markets that can connect rural farms with urban retail opportunities.

University Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Specialty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>High Tunnel and Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Food Science</td>
<td>Food Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy</td>
<td>Food Science</td>
<td>Food Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>Ag Ext Ed</td>
<td>Local food choice &amp; systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>Ag Eco/R. Soc</td>
<td>Sust. Ag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>Ag Eco/R. Soc</td>
<td>Women in Ag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>Specialty Crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>Ag &amp; Ext Ed</td>
<td>After School Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim *</td>
<td>Ag Eco/R. Soc</td>
<td>Econ Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Ag Eco/R. Soc</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>Ag Eco/R. Soc</td>
<td>Production Economics/Marketing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identified GAPs in expertise:
County hires:
Urban Farming and Economic Development Faculty Specialist (placed at MROC) – new hire
Urban and Sustainable Farming Educator (Economic Development background) - new hire

Integrated Pest Management (Entomology and Plant Pathology)
Integrated Pest Management (IPM) suppresses pest populations to acceptable levels in an economic way with special attention to minimizing environmental degradation and protecting human health. IPM includes the pest sciences of entomology, plant pathology, weed science, microbial management and others. IPM in a metro environment mainly addresses pests in buildings (roaches, rats, mice, termites, hyperallergenic molds, etc.) as well as pests in exterior landscapes (trees, shrubs, lawns, etc.)
### University Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyn</td>
<td>IPM Program</td>
<td>Community IPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nichole</td>
<td>Ag &amp; Ext Ed</td>
<td>Service Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>IPM Program</td>
<td>Community IPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerry</td>
<td>Pesticide Ed</td>
<td>Pesticide Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>Ornamental IPM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick</td>
<td>IPM Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen</td>
<td>Ag. Engin.</td>
<td>HVAC expertise for Indoor air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>Entomology/IPM research and extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>Insect IPM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identified GAPS in expertise:**

Urban entomologist (placed at MROC) – new hire – research and extension support for urban IPM

Environmental Health Educator - new hire – county staff

*(Full Appendices on original document)*
The State University Metro Portals:
A Model for Urban Engagement
The Report of the Task Force on Outreach to Urban Areas
February 24, 2006

In December 2004, the Provost, responding to the recommendations of the University-wide Continuing Education Task Force, asked Outreach “to develop an overarching programming strategy to our three major urban regions to ensure that The State University achieves an appropriate market share of enrollments.” As a first step in addressing this charge, the Vice President charged a task force to propose a strategy for engagement. This report contains recommendations in response to that charge.

Task Force on Urban Engagement members are:
William, Senior Director for Statewide Continuing Education,
Walter, County Cooperative Extension Director
Edward, Continuing and Distance Education
Gary, Associate Vice President
Becky, Director, Corporate and Foundation Relations
Jane, Director of Continuing Education, Branch Campus A
Curtiss, Chancellor, Branch Campus B
Erin, Associate Director for Continuing Education, Branch Campus C
Lilli, Director, Outreach Client Development
Ann, Chancellor, Branch Campus D

General Observations
The Task Force on Urban Engagement has evaluated the issues that surround The State University’s ability to engage in the State’s major urban areas. While each area has its own distinctive characteristics and needs, several generalizations can be made about them and our system:

1. In two major urban areas, especially, The State University is not perceived as a “local” institution, but as a Central State institution. It has no campuses in the downtown areas of the major cities. As a result, it is not on the radar screen when local leaders think about institutions that can help respond to local needs. In many ways, Extension is seen as local, but somehow different from the “real” The State University.

2. Southeastern campuses have reported the perception in one of the urban areas that The State University takes resources—talented young people—away from the community by sending them to University Park and on to careers elsewhere.

3. Campus and Extension leaders in the urban areas have relationships with key constituencies in the cities. However, these are not coordinated to ensure that there is a single, felt The State University presence.

4. Effective engagement requires multiple interactions with diverse communities within the urban area. The State University cannot compete simply by offering programs. While campuses and Extension offices are part of the local
community, the disconnect occurs when local leaders see the disparity in The State University resources and capacity available to meet urban needs.

5. Engagement requires that we have a critical mass of resources available to respond to the unique population density and diversity of these areas. Individual The State University entities do not have sufficient critical mass of locally relevant programs and outreach services in place locally to generate greater demand and to deliver on that demand. In some cases, the critical mass exists, but inefficiencies related to geography, organization, communication and/or coordination limit the ability to deliver. Competing local institutions and on-line providers regularly out-spend The State University on local marketing and public relations.

Initial Conclusions
In exploring ways to respond to the situation outlined above, the Urban Engagement Task Force drew several conclusions:

- The primary goal is to increase engagement through Outreach, measured by increased adult enrollments in The State University credit and noncredit programs. However, The State University’s response requires a broader commitment and engagement in order to create a more visible University presence in each urban area. This must be seen as a University issue first and then as an Outreach and campus issue.

- The State University’s resources in the two major urban areas are currently dispersed and, from a strategic perspective, largely uncoordinated. Better coordination across campuses can help give The State University a stronger “on the street” presence, but will not offset the need for a stronger physical presence. It is important to emphasize that each area will require a somewhat different response that reflects data-based differences in the communities and, thus, different perceptions, uses, and opportunities for coordination in the physical infrastructure that is already in place.

- The many existing relationships with community organizations—political, civic, economic, social, cultural—should be coordinated to create an integrated network of relationships that allow The State University greater influence and that open doors to new program opportunities.

- The University’s Office of Development use of a shared database of individual and organizational contacts is an excellent example of the coordination of information and contacts that can lead to a strategically defined goal. Given the breadth of The State University assets already committed to the regions in question, a similar structure for communication, contact, and follow-through may greatly benefit the goal of a “One State University” presence in the urban areas.

- We need a one-stop option (or at least the perception that we are a one-stop shop) for constituencies not already familiar with The State University.

- The development of an Urban “Consortium” to gather and focus resources from across the University is a logical response. Knowledge bases and research can then be identified and directed so that it can be applied when and where necessary. A successful consortium of The State University assets and interests
will greatly increase the institutional impact of The State University in key urban communities. The emphasis must be on creating positive impact.

- While a single general approach can be defined, it will be important to recognize that each of the three major urban areas have very distinct characteristics and that The State University’s effective presence in each area is different. A plan must allow for flexibility in each of the three major urban areas.

The goal must be to bring together multiple The State University resources to allow the University to strengthen relationships with all aspects of these communities in an integrated way that builds the image of “One State University.”

Options

There are many ways The State University might achieve this goal. The Task Force discussed several radical approaches—some of which may be under consideration elsewhere in the University. Some of these more radical approaches have value, but they also require significant organizational change and new resources. The Task Force recognizes that its recommendations are being made at a time of fiscal constraint. As a result, it recommends a third option that we believe can be implemented more quickly and with less new cost: the development of “The State University Metro Portals” in the three largest urban areas.

The State University Metro Concept

The State University Metro “portal” concept will help facilitate more effective coordination among multiple The State University resources in an urban area. It will work to establish a more unified engagement function in order to demonstrate a unified presence for The State University. The effective sense that there is one The State University, coordinated for maximum impact, in an urban community will allow for more competitive Outreach efforts, more effective academic programming and recruitment, and more efficient use of The State University Extension services and University-wide research capabilities. Metro portals will combine both physical and virtual presences in these communities. This new approach will go by the name of the urban area; i.e., The State University –Gotham City. For the purposes of the model, we will use the name The State University Metro.
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Program Focus

In addition to providing general access to The State University resources, it will be important, at least initially, to identify a programmatic focus in a small number of disciplines or professional fields where there is an intersection between community need and The State University expertise. This will allow The State University Metro to differentiate itself from other local institutions. Allied health professional development may be an example where The State University can have an impact across multiple campuses, Extension, and Outreach, in collaboration with relevant University Park colleges. Final decisions in each area should be supported by needs assessment and market research to determine how best to respond to specific audiences and needs,
The program foci will be identified by the Campus and Extension leadership in the area, working with an “urban consortium” of committed faculty and academic units. Faculty and academic units will be encouraged to align around urban issues. Programmatic responses will draw on those academic units and individual faculty who make a commitment to participation. This will help to identify and guide research, teaching, and service initiatives for the Portal. Central resources will be needed to support the alignment of Campus and Extension faculty with urban needs and areas for development.

**Marketing**

Each The State University Metro should be supported by a local Metro marketing plan to position all The State University resources in the area under the “One State University” umbrella. A single The State University Metro marketing plan should coordinate local promotion and central Outreach marketing resources to achieve a scale that will allow The State University Metro to compete for attention with local institutions that already invest heavily in local outreach programming and promotion. An Outreach investment in marketing research and implementation of a marketing plan for awareness and recruiting is essential to allowing these campuses and Extension offices to compete for attention with other local institutions.

Marketing should be supported by a The State University Metro website, linked to the State University homepage. Participating The State University units will be supported by a customer service specialist(s) who will be familiar with all The State University resources in the area. The Metro customer service specialist(s) will be able to direct inquiries to the appropriate office and track inquiries to ensure follow-up.

The essence of the Metro concept of “response” is to differentiate The State University through market awareness and follow-up. The State University’s urban engagement will be measured by our ability to be a responsive institution. The resulting agility will further differentiate The State University assets in the Metro area.

**Engagement Events and Leadership Presence**

Each year, The State University Metro will organize at least two special events that will bring together the key leadership contacts in the community. These will be community engagement events around important issues that will bring The State University leadership (President, Provost, and others) and leading faculty in the relevant disciplines to the community in a workshop environment. The goal will be to set and follow up on an education-community agenda in areas of local need.

**Organization and Leadership**

The State University Metro will be constructed to maximize the visibility of current and future The State University locations in order to present The State University as an integrated entity. It will be a collective means to extend the resources of all The State University units, to expand The State University’s engagement, and to enhance The State University’s presence.

*(Full report on original document)*
Infrastructure

The goal of this model is to allow The State University to begin quickly and to minimize new infrastructure costs. The Task Force recognizes that these recommendations are being made at a time when resources for the campuses are very tight and when other groups are exploring options for the campuses. However, if the vision of The State University Metro is to be fully realized, several new services will be needed:

1. Central funding will be needed to support Outreach facilitation in each area where The State University Metro model is implemented.
2. Expenses associated with community leadership events should be centrally supported.
3. A web landing page for each Metro from The State University home page—a “city page” with direct links to The State University offices, programs, and services.
4. A single phone number for The State University Metro in each area that is staffed by an informed person who can easily direct calls to various campuses, Extension offices, and other local The State University resources. This could be an existing phone line that is marketed as the single point of contact, but must be staffed by an informed person.
5. An Outreach marketing budget—to include market research, advertising, media placement, and publications—is needed.
6. Rental space may be needed to ensure a visible “downtown” presence in each area. The specific location needs to reflect the needs and interests of the targeted population.
7. A minimum commitment of three-to-five years is needed to allow this approach to mature and to support incremental changes that might result from the initial implementation to emerge.

Anticipated Outcomes

The Task Force anticipates that implementation of The State University Metro in the two largest urban areas will result in several positive outcomes for The State University that will improve our ability to effectively engage in the major urban areas:

- It will generate a coordinated network of civic, political, economic, social, and cultural leadership relationships through which The State University can open doors to increased engagement with organizations, employers, and individuals.
- It will stimulate greater and more effective The State University leadership presence in the metropolitan areas, helping to overcome the idea that The State University is distant and not focused on the needs of the state’s urban centers.
- It will allow The State University campuses, Extension, and Outreach to integrate promotion and sales of its programs as “One State University,” thus creating a greater public understanding of The State University’s programmatic presence in the urban centers.
- It will create new opportunities for research and development with public organizations and companies in the urban centers.
- It will allow The State University to be more effective in addressing workforce education needs in these areas.
• It will greatly increase The State University’s visibility with urban state legislators and other local elected officials who currently do not see The State University as having a positive impact on their constituents.
• It will allow The State University to create social capital by broadening the community of leaders who understand The State University’s current impact and its potential contribution to the urban centers.
• It will increase enrollments in both credit and noncredit programs at area campuses, generating revenue to sustain the initiative over time.
• It will stimulate new opportunities for fund-raising from alumni, companies, and foundations as The State University increases its visibility and engagement in the urban communities.

Implementation
This task force included representatives from campuses in the three urban areas under consideration, as well as Extension in Gotham County, and Outreach staff. However, for the approach that is being recommended to work, implementation teams should be created in each area to define The State University Metro for that area and to identify its focus. That team should be selected from among the following groups: Chancellors and Chief Academic Officers from area campuses, county and/or regional Extension Directors, Directors of Continuing Education, and Outreach representatives. Each implementation team will be responsible for applying the preceding recommendations to the local situation in the three major urban areas and proposing a specific approach to creating The State University Metro in that urban community.

The implementation team will:
• Identify the specific The State University offices and units to be included in The State University Metro.
• Develop a cost estimate for initial and ongoing implementation.
• Identify the programmatic focus for the work
• Develop a plan for ongoing communication and facilitation, including the specific role of the Outreach facilitation function.
Goal three of the College of Agriculture Strategic plan states as follows:

**Enhance partnerships with current and newly identified stakeholders.**
- Establish a Metro Research and Outreach Center
- Expand the college’s contribution to agricultural literacy initiatives
- Expand partnerships with diverse audiences and appropriate international entities

Any metro effort should engage all three components of the land grant institution: Education, Research, and Outreach and should accomplish the following if it is to be successful.

*Enhance the recruitment of students to the College of Agriculture* by establishing a “feeder system” for students interested in receiving a degree in the subjects offered through the college. This would also provide access to a stream of urban students who are not familiar with the many careers encompassing “agricultural sciences”. Work with urban campuses to enrich their offerings by including programs that link to the College of Agriculture.

*Engage in applied research opportunities in communities* not currently connected with the college or with The State University. The urban/metro environment is rich with applied research opportunities for both research studies as well as for local community impact and benefit. This center should also provide basic local resources for faculty from main campus who could use assets such as office space, phone, computing, advanced communication (PolyCom) etc. Making this available will open additional opportunities for applied research – even by engaging the various “university based centers” such as the Children, Youth and Family Consortium and others.

*Strengthen and enhance the urban Outreach and Extension capabilities* by providing local access to faculty and extension educators who may have disciplinary responsibilities and/or interest in relevant areas and by enabling teams of people who can work together to address locally identified issues. The ability for enhanced “presence” of “subject matter expertise” that would be available to Extension and Outreach programming could significantly elevate the profile of The State University and the college in the urban/metro core.

*Relevancy should also be addressed.* An enhanced “presence” of The State University and the College in the metropolitan area should be an explicit goal of the effort. Within this context, the relevancy of The State University, the College, Extension, and the programs they offer would be significantly enhanced by addressing issues that have significant meaning to state residents and their legislative representatives living in urban and metro areas.
Metro Center Development Committee Charge

The Dean’s group recognizes that several studies have been complete within the College and University identifying the breadth of research and educational opportunities within the state’s urban communities. Thus, the committee’s role is not to duplicate previous efforts, but to focus on those opportunities that are most likely to lead to a recognized presence within urban communities.

Specific issues the committee needs to consider are:
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5) What should a Metro Research and Outreach Center look like? What programmatic and disciplinary strengths match with the needs of the Metro area?

6) After considerable study and discussion, the Deans, along with potential partners, have determined that the Gotham metropolitan area would provide the greatest opportunity for success as a beginning location. This effort is considered a pilot effort that will determine best practices to be replicated in the other metropolitan areas. This decision was reached considering existing relationships, capacity, partner support by Gotham County, potential political impact on state appropriations, and existing leadership.

7) Considering the three functions of the College (extension, research and teaching), the team should discuss and provide guidance on the following questions:
   a. Identify the program areas that would be an initial focus.
   b. Identify a process to develop stronger political support for urban research and educational efforts.
   c. Identify local partners that will be able to help foster political support for the Center.
   d. Identify local partners that will help strengthen urban programming.
   e. Identify faculty and staff currently working on urban research and outreach programming and their areas of focus.
   f. Identify faculty and staff that could potentially enhance the activities of the Metro Center and whether they are interested in working within an urban environment.
   g. Identify within university collaborations opportunities and linkage to university outreach.

8) Estimate the level of existing support and resource investment needs that would ensure success of a Metro Center?

Angelo has agreed to chair the committee and lead it through its deliberations on the questions posed by the Deans. Angelo has significant experience with urban programming and has put in place some innovative partnerships with the IPM program.

The Current County Extension Director has been identified as the co-chair and member of the group. His charge is to provide information on existing programs and identified needs, contacts that may be helpful, and access to existing groups and relationships and potential groups and individuals that may be important for success of a Metro Center.
The State Metro Research and Outreach Center
A Community Conversation
August 7, 2007
Extension office
Gotham City, 55555

AGENDA

10:30 am  Welcome, Introduction, and Plans for the
The State University Metro Research and Outreach Center  Extension
Director
  • Introduce participants
  • Inclusive nature of the Metro Research
    and Outreach Center development

10:45 am  Community Conversation  Terri
  • Brainstorm and discuss ideas about
    needs of Gotham City Metro area
  • Record and consolidate ideas

Noon    Catered lunch

12:45 pm  Impression and brief reports
  on needs from morning activities  Terri

1:00 pm  Closing Remarks and Final Thoughts  Angelo

1:20 pm  Adjourn
Notes from Metro Meeting
County Extension Office
August 7, 2007
Recorded by: Cindy and Leona

Quality of Life for Community:
Note: The following items should benefit ALL people in the community, and citizens should be engaged in community planning. Those of low socio-economic status need to be considered.

Environmental Issues:
- Water Quality and Use
  - Upstream management, watersheds, flooding, sewer management, and infrastructure.
- Air Quality
- Land Use
  - Vacant land management- What could this land be used for? Such things as growing food and using land to have youth activities.
  - Cleaning up vacant lots to be community assets rather than liabilities.
  - Remediation for lead and other soil toxins.
  - Urban Farm initiatives – Help people use vacant land/economically sustainable urban farms.
  - Farmer Incentives- Paying farmers money to grow food for food banks, etc, and to maintain environmentally suitable lands.
  - Urban Forestry- Trees improve the quality of life.
  - Parks-There are many parks that are very accessible to the public. Parks could be used to display initiatives such as demonstration gardens or laboratories.
    - “Parks right now are starving” Need methods for sustainable parks using very low maintenance techniques
    - Brownfield remediation- helping to make brownfields usable again.
    - Green roofs and other technologies to reduce atmospheric pollution/improve environment.
    - Bio-fuels development – as applied to use of urban crops, alternative energies, sustainability, environmental pollution, and job creation.
    - Resource management – to know what’s available
    - Invasive species eradication to enhance urban biodiversity
- Soil Quality and Use
  - Plants affect water quality in communities – riparian buffers, etc.
  - Soil Erosion.
- Energy Conservation:
  - Alternative forms of energy should be pursued (wind, solar, etc.)
  - What are the incentives to people, such as farmers, who lease their land to house such things as wind turbines?
  - Promotion of green energy and finding research that can support advocating for these.
**Built Environment:**
- Green buildings (living buildings)
  - Encourage green buildings at schools. What research exists to help people understand the benefits of having green buildings?
  - Brownfield remediation, green roofs, bio-fuels development (job creation areas)
  - Economic impact of Green buildings
- Best management practices for builders
  - Many builders make plans with no thought of how it will affect the water environment
    - First tier and second tier development and its effect on land management.
- Infrastructure – sewage, storm water, and other water systems

**Economics:**
- Systems and agencies need to function together within the same community when developing their community. This can save money.
- Outreach to industry to assist them in solving problems
- Entrepreneurship for youth and adults

**Education:**
- Youth and Families
  - Develop prevention programs to educate youth on topics (i.e. nutrition, drugs/alcohol.)
  - Workforce and career development programs need to be offered.
  - Technology needs to be available to all youth.
  - Experiential learning opportunities should be used with all programs.
  - Parent and families need to know what is available for their youth, and how they can get their children involved.
- After-school programs – offer what children are interested in – integrate into children’s education; engage youth/adult partnerships
- Loss of young people who emigrate out of area
  - Use partnerships to get youth involved in green space
- School District push is to go to college—education has misled many—many trades as important as going to college—perception needs to be given being a mechanic is OK, other options are OK—informal education to teach life skills
- Adults -- 3rd generation of youth at risk
  - Lack of regard for environmental sciences and plant sciences—“zero plant sciences (plant biology) in public schools”
  - Impact of testing and No Child Left Behind –
    - Expand definition of horticulture/agriculture – get message out---Ag affects everybody
  - Elementary kids – think outside the box—schools teaching toward test---
    - Extension can show new opportunities---Follow State Standards through creative education
  - Groups competing for classroom time---Extension focus on after-school and out-of-school
- Extension and 4-H curriculum augment school curriculum
- Environmental issues vs. global warming -
- Partner with Community College—have done needs assessments with trades, schools—contact for ideas for research needs
- Preschool
- After school programs

- **Elderly**
  - The community needs to meet the needs of its seniors.
  - The senior population has different needs depending on their age bracket (such as a 60 year old had different needs than an 80 year old.) Too often, they are all lumped together.
  - Nutrition is an important topic to concentrate on. Urban agriculture can help meet nutritional needs, along with farmers’ markets.
  - When educating the elderly, we need to use terms that they can understand and relate to (technology makes many seniors nervous!)

- **Practical**
  - Education – biology/chemistry – entomology explain what bugs are /mean regarding crops
  - Apprenticeships – absent from horticulture industry – need to get people interested
  - “Need to standardize and quantify to show results and impact of programs” --
  - Brownfield and job skill development
  - Education of new Immigrants-life skills; Young mothers

**Diversity:**
- Employers and employees need to be educated on different cultures, backgrounds, and generations, because there is an increasing amount of diversity in the workforce.
- Workers of different education and skill levels need to be considered.
- Diversity – in-migration very low---region very conservative---need to be more appreciative of others coming in
- How to attract skilled immigrants
- Workplace conflict management

**Location of programs/activities:**
- Metro programs need to happen at various locations throughout the community so that they are accessible to all. Educational institutions and other agencies can collaborate to offer programs at their sites.
  - Transportation – coordinating people getting to/from programs
  - Clients, Students, Faculty

**Family:**
- Nutrition – childhood obesity
- Develop initiatives to help people live and work here
- Issues related to parenting of the children---offer preschools for low income parents to give children a start in going to school---help children development skills to “break the chain”
- Budgeting and money management
- Food management (pantry goods), food prep (pantry goods)—“70% of people live paycheck to paycheck” “youth see instant gratification, no long term planning”
- At food bank teach volunteers at pantry to make foods (chili, etc.)—pantry operators “macaroni not moving, in bag, separate cheese” “convenience foods society
- Family communication
- Drugs—deal with kids on the street; nowhere to go after school, nothing to do, no mother/father at home, people working 2 jobs—after school until 6:30 is key time
- Universal health care
- Awareness for parents/families – example “battle bots”- families fight with each other

Jobs:
- Jobs in green industry---make connection to employers in horticulture industry---“waste money on projects that are not sustainable”---programs put emphasis on ‘projects’, not on what can be sustained
- Broad career education – make connection between green industry and jobs--
- Use of legislation that passed providing $125M for training in green jobs---what are the jobs??-Jobs – people leave because can’t get a job – move to NC, FL, DC-Universal health care
- Fortune magazine rated our county 12th in quality of life and State 47th in job growth-“Develop jobs with a living wage”

Agriculture:
- Greenhouses- in one area used to be 5, now only 1—
- Lose people in green industry because of pay scale (farmers)--physically rigorous work,
- Brownfield remediation, green roofs, bio-fuels development are areas for job creation.
- Expand definition of horticulture/agriculture – get message out---Ag affects everybody (Bayer looks for people with Ag degrees who know how to work with chemicals to mix aspirin) ---encourage kids to get 2-year degree and work at Bayer—{e.g. Bidwell partners with employers in industry— externships with Bayer that leads to jobs}
- Apprenticeships – absent from horticulture industry – need to get people interested
- Team up with local science center regarding food science issues
- Provide technical advice for small urban farms, gardens, horticulture issues

Crime:
Serious issue with youth population. In the old jail had 400 prisoners; the new jail, population is 25/2600
Drug/alcohol—repeat offenders is 65%--“need to look at dark side to improve the county”

Marketing/Branding:
- For the State University to be successful, re-brand what service delivery method is and carve out niche for the new Center
Health Care:
- Nurse education (public health including IPM)
- Preventive Medicine

Partnership:
- Community Colleges
- Outreach
- Carnegie Mellon and other local universities

Public Policy:
- Metro unique
- A lot for Extension
Gotham City Metro Research and Outreach Center  
*Faculty Questionnaire*  
*July, 2007*

The location of The State University may limit faculty interests and work in urban areas. One solution is to create Metro Centers across the state that would, “enhance the recruitment of students, increase applied research in diverse communities, enhance urban outreach and extension abilities, and increase the relevancy of The State University in urban areas.” A Metro Area is defined as a city and the surrounding communities that have a high degree of integration with that city. The Dean has chosen Gotham City as the pilot location, and our committee is charged with helping define The State University Metro Research and Extension Center to be created there. There may be program, graduate student, and research funding available to faculty members through these centers.

As part of a process, which includes meetings with Gotham City elected officials and representatives from public institutions and non-profits, we are seeking input from faculty about their interest and experience in Metro research, education, and extension. This should take about five minutes to complete. The survey is for our planning purposes and will not commit you to any responsibility. We also hope to use the results of this survey to provide information to our Metro partners regarding The State University’s ability to work in their locations.

**First, we would like to ask some contact information.**  
Your Name  
Your Email  
Your Department

**Next, please provide us with some information on your expertise and experience.**  
Briefly, what are your specialties in the following?

Research  
Teaching  
Extension

Have you participated in a Metro Area activity in the last five years?  
Yes  
No

If yes, please very briefly describe the types of activities in each of the following categories.

*Research Activities:*

*Education Activities* (e.g., student and faculty engagement in projects, work in local courses and distance education):

*Extension Activities* (speaking at workshops, providing technical assistance, facilitating local programs and activities):
If you have not engaged in metro activities but feel that you may have an interest in doing so, please briefly describe any activities that you think are important to do in a Metro Area.

Research Activities:
Education Activities:
Extension Activities:

We would now like to ask a few questions about your interest in working with a Metro Center.
If research opportunities arise to work in association with Gotham City or other Metro Center how interested would you be?

1  2  3  4  5
not interested  moderately interested  very interested

If educational opportunities arise to work in association with the Gotham City or other Metro Center how interested would you be?

1  2  3  4  5
not interested  moderately interested  very interested

If extension opportunities arise to work in association with the Gotham City or other Metro Center how interested would you be?

1  2  3  4  5
not interested  moderately interested  very interested

Lastly, two questions to help us inform you and others.
Can you provide the name and contact information of faculty outside of the College of Agriculture who are working, or may be interested in working, in Metro Areas?

Would you like to be placed on an email listserve to be updated on the development of the Gotham City and other Metro Centers?
Yes  No

Thank you very much for your help with this faculty survey. If you have any questions or comments please feel free to call Angelo, or the Extension Director, co-chairs of the Metro Implementation Committee.
APPENDIX B

LETTERS AND E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE
Hello All,

Late today, I received the feedback from the Dean's group on our Metro Report. It is as we expected in that they lauded our effort and are now asking for more specific planning details. You can read the comments yourself.

Angelo is in China and not due back until about November 5th - not including jet-lag time. So, I would like to begin some work on the final implementation plan - Executive Summary Recommendations. If we can have some of this done by November 5th, we can have a substantive conversation soon thereafter.

The three focus areas are:

1. Urban and Community Greening
2. Urban Agriculture and Food Production
3. Entomology and Plant Pathology

So, if you would permit me to ask that a few of you perform some of this work, Angelo and I would be quite grateful.

First, please check your calendars for a telephone conference call some time the week of November 5th. Probably later in the week so that Ed can get his feet under him. Currently, I have the following days/times available. Figure about 1 1/2 hrs for the call. Please let me know if you are available for any of these - November 7th am - any start time with meeting ending before noon; November 8th am - any start time ending before noon and starting after 2:30.

Activities to complete before the meeting.

Terri, Bill, Leona, & Cindy - Can you put together a skeleton plan document with some of the elements necessary to launch the effort. I think we will need to use draft dates here but will need committee consensus for the actual launch time. Remember that this entire document is to be only 3 pages - plus appendix.

1. Specific details on an implementation plan that fully addresses the Dean’s original charge.

Bill, Delfina, Tracy & Mike - Can you please put together specific faculty who will commit to working in the metro research effort based on the program areas identified by the Dean's group? Include a few recommendations for faculty positions necessary to fill known gaps. We should also make linkages with local staff in these areas. See what we can put together from both areas Research and Teaching / Extension.
2. The specific identify of faculty and staff (within and outside College) that would make up a team working in each program area and any personnel gaps (missing expertise/discipline strength). I will modify wording here and present draft via e-mail.

3. Under the general recommendations section (starting on page 19):
   a. modify the wording on number 1, from .....“Some or all the areas”… to .... “in these three areas”....
   b. Link recommendation number 3 to number 1 by identifying the team that meets the requirements listed as requested above for each topic area. I will construct a local advisory board and present as a draft via e-mail.

4. For recommendation number 7, provide specific names of individuals that will make up the local advisory board and a time line for implementation of the board. I will write up a method for #6.

5. For recommendation number 8, make sure that engagement of the elected officials is kept in the forefront of your efforts. Jonathan, can you please put together a more specific marketing plan. Instead of dates, use terms such as "30 days before launch", "on launch date", and "15 days after launch", etc. I think I disagree a little with the recommended time line here - so put your best thinking on this for a "sound marketing plan" that may start earlier than what is suggested below. If their suggestion reflects sound marketing practice - then whatever it is.

6. For recommendation 9, the Dean’s group felt that until the Center is in place and has program visibility it is too early to begin a major communication and marketing effort. However, as part of the timeline to the final report include a discussion of when these efforts should be ready to go. I will eliminate the section on Other City for this report.

7. Eliminate reference to future efforts in The Other City.

OK - this is too cool. I think I can taste the Metro Center. I know we are all very, very busy with our daily responsibilities but we are so so close. We have all aspired for a long time to see this thing become a reality and we are on the verge of making a national splash. With all of the work we have put into the initial report, I don't see any reason why we can't put this together and have it back to the Dean's group by November 15th. Who knows, maybe we can set a launch date for New Year's 2008!

Thanks to all of you for your great work. We'll keep in touch to finalize the conference call date/time.
From: Lydia
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2007 1:43 PM
To: Angelo & Co-Chair
Cc:
Subject: Metro Center

Just wanted to send you a quick note that in conversations with the Alex and others on the leadership team, this initiative has wheels. I think it is on the move and we hope to get it rolling soon.

Lydia
Feedback from Dean’s Group to
Metro Research and Outreach Center Implementation Committee
October 26, 2007

Thanks for the Committee’s hard work and draft report, “The State College of Agriculture Metro Research and Outreach Center: Recommendations for initial activities, organization, and investment”. The Dean’s group has read the draft report and met to discuss the next steps in finalizing the report. We are providing the following set of suggestions to help move toward a final implementation plan.

Based on the Committee’s list of strong alignments of research, extension and resident education and faculty, educators and stakeholder groups, we have identified three areas we feel the College has opportunity for impact. Under the general theme of Personal, Community, and Environmental Health, we selected:

4. Urban and Community Greening
5. Urban Agriculture and Food Production
6. Entomology and Plant Pathology

We would like the committee to consider these area and if in agreement with the Dean’s group move forward with a final implementation plan or suggest an alternative list.

It is the Dean’s group thinking that these three areas capture topics that the College of Agriculture has a strength which separates us from other Universities or agencies working in the Gotham City area. Both Urban and Community Greening and Urban Agriculture and Food Production focus on issues around brown fields and differentiate us from the University of Gotham City and the Other University’s efforts. We bring the expertise to address amending marginal soils, agricultural production methods, green roof technology, street trees and open spaces management, public landscapes, and much more to address these important topics. Also, we can bring these strengths to the table for future collaborative efforts with other organizations. The Entomology and Plant Pathology area allows the College to expand its current efforts on insect and pathogen related illnesses (i.e. asthma and molds) and IPM in Schools into the Gotham City area.

If the Committee is in agreement that these three areas are the best topics to move forward with, we would ask that the Committee to provide the following in a final report:

1. Specific details on an implementation plan that fully addresses the Dean’s original charge.
2. The specific identify of faculty and staff (within and outside College) that would make up a team working in each program area and any personnel gaps (missing expertise/discipline strength).
3. Under the general recommendations section (starting on page 19):
a. modify the wording on number 1, from "some or all the areas"… to "in these three areas"…

b. Link recommendation number 3 to number 1 by identifying the team that meets the requirements listed as requested above for each topic area.

4. For recommendation number 7, provide specific names of individuals that will make up the local advisory board and a time line for implementation of the board.

5. For recommendation number 8, make sure that engagement of the elected officials is kept in the forefront of your efforts.

6. For recommendation 9, the Dean’s group felt that until the Center is in place and has program visibility it is too early to begin a major communication and marketing effort. However, as part of the timeline to the final report include a discussion of when these efforts should be ready to go.

7. Eliminate reference to future efforts in the Other Urban Area. The intent is to implement a center in Gotham City, but it is understood that future centers may be developed in other urban centers. Concentrate on the details of implementing the center in Gotham City.

The final report should be a three page executive summary, with appendices as needed. Please review the original charge by the Dean and provide detail. We are looking for a very specific set of implementation recommendations around the three topic areas and a timeline. If the committee feels the Dean’s group suggested topics should be modified then provide your recommendation and a justification. We do not want more than three key topics to start with. What are the steps that must be taken within the next year to begin implementation of the plan? Who is going to lead these efforts? What resources will be needed? What partnerships need to be developed? Address each item in the Dean’s original charge and be specific. We want more than general statements. Tell us what we need to do step by step.

In addition, the Dean’s group also felt the original draft report should be cleaned up with more explanation. Particularly, provide a better description of how to read and interpret the results of the survey and what the nine digit numbers mean on pages 29 to 32. This report will provide an historic record of your work to assess the situation and provide guidance. The shorter final report will be the executive summary with specific recommendations and a timeline for guiding our actions.

Best wishes in moving forward and again thanks for the Committee’s leadership and work.

Dean’s group
From: Alex  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 3:36 PM  
To: Angelo;  
Cc: Lydia; Pat  
Subject: RE: Faculty Responses for Metro

This is a great response. Lydia and I discussed this briefly this morning and we’ll take it up again on Friday. This is indeed getting exciting.

Alex

Alex, Ph.D.  
Dean, College of Agriculture

From: ****  
Sent: Wednesday, January 02, 2008 3:24 PM  
To: Alex  
Cc: Lydia; Angelo; Pat  
Subject: Faculty Responses for Metro

Hello Alex,

Hope you had an enjoyable and restful Holiday.

Attached is an update on the responses we are receiving from the faculty survey that was done in December. This survey was sent to faculty who expressed interest in the Metro initiative or was identified by the Metro committee as we constructed the staffing for the three initial programs (community greening, urban agric., IPM).

As you can see more that 63% (n=48) responded positively meaning that they would like to be involved. Those without “x” marks have not yet responded and we continue to await responses. We will provide you with faculty updates as they become available and believe that additional faculty will confirm their interest. In any case, we are confident in the list of faculty team members who are ready to focus efforts on the initial three priority areas.

We hope that you able to briefly discuss this at this Friday’s Deans’ meeting. We anxiously await your decision to launch this initiative. Let us know if you need more info.

Thanks much,

Angelo
From: ***
Sent: Friday, January 04, 2008 11:59 AM
To: Angelo; and Co- Chair
Cc: AssocDeans@lists.edu
Subject: Metro Report

Dear Angelo and Co-chair:

The Dean’s group met this morning and discussed the Committee’s report. The report was a great improvement and well received. The Dean’s group is now ready to begin the process of laying out a path forward to implement the plan. At this time, we would like to request your participation at the next Leadership Team meeting on January 15, 2008 from 1:30 to 3:30 PM in Room 118. Could you please let me know as soon as possible, if you would be available to discuss the plan with the College Leadership Team (academic, service, and regional unit leaders plus the Dean’s group)? This is your opportunity to share the plan broadly within the College.

D****
From: Alex  
Sent: Tue 4/29/2008 8:52 PM  
To: Lydia; Alex  
Cc: Karl  
Subject: RE: Directorship

I agree. Keep this low key for now but I can understand the Center Director wanting to let people know. I've talked with Karl and we both feel we need to personally talk this through with the Chancellors at the local regional campuses so they hear it directly from us. I don't think Center Director has done this, but I could be wrong. This is a sensitive "turf" kind of issue and we want to make sure communication

Alex, Dean  
College of Agriculture

-----Original Message-----
From: Lydia  
To: Alex  
Sent: 4/29/08 5:23 PM  
Subject: RE: Center Directorship

I think he should proceed as the Director. That means working with potential partners etc. I just don't think we should roll out much in the way of a press release until we get rolling. I have proposed that we put this announcement in the Ag newsletter in May and plan stories in the college and outreach magazines in the following months.

Lydia

From: ***  
Sent: Tuesday, April 29, 2008 11:35 AM  
To: Lydia; Alex  
Subject: Center Directorship

Dear Alex and Lydia:

I spoke to the Center Director and he wants to know whether he is free to let people outside the institution know he is now Director of the Metro Center to build relationships and collaborations. We had indicated we wanted to wait until we had something to show before making a public announcement, but should this hold the Center Director back from letting potential collaborators know he is officially the Director. He is unsure how to operate and could use your advice. Please let me know what to tell him.
February 7, 2008

Dean
College of Agriculture
Agricultural Admin Bldg.
The State University

Dear Dean,

For a number of years, I have been aware of the work your Cooperative Extension office has been engaged in here in Gotham County. I have worked with your local director and some of his staff on a variety of community based projects that were significant in our local communities. Some months ago, I was invited to participate in a meeting at which the concept of a Metro Research and Outreach Center was presented for Gotham City and surrounding areas. One of my senior assistants attended since I was not in town on that date. I was very interested to learn that this new investment in our metro area could bring additional State University expertise and resources to bear on a variety of challenges we face.

I am curious to know why this initiative has taken so long to manifest here. I understand that there are numerous processes that you must engage and consider during this time however, I hope that you are able to begin this new initiative sometime soon. My district stretches from the heart of the City to rural neighboring counties. While urban issues are paramount, this Metro Center could lend significant expertise in addressing challenges to outlying areas at the urban / rural interface.

While serving as Senator here, I also am the treasurer of the City Redevelopment Authority. From both perspectives, I am very interested in supporting your efforts to move this initiative forward expeditiously. My elected colleagues in this area are also interested in this effort and we are awaiting your decision to move ahead.

Sincerely,

Jim, Senator
State Senate District ##
Just for clarification. The College hasn’t had a discussion about which function in the College will pay for each line in the budget. My starting point was the Extension function will pay the salaries line and the remaining categories would be split by 1/3’s between teaching, research and extension. This formula may not be the final distribution. It could be that research and teaching will pick up all the remaining costs beyond salary. So, the final distribution may be different then my estimate. It could also be that the research and teaching budgets will cover a 1/3 of the salary lines as well. Thus, when the final funding distribution is determined, these numbers may change considerably.

Darien

Karl, as you requested, here is the split for the planned costs for first year of the Metro Center:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach</td>
<td>$83,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coop Extension</td>
<td>$222,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Ag</td>
<td>$12,723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planned cost for the center total $318,079

Lilli
## Final Metro Center Budget 11/30/2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Source</th>
<th>Outreach</th>
<th>College of Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter*</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backfill Funds, Supplements, etc.*</td>
<td>$18,423</td>
<td>$18,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salary</strong></td>
<td><strong>$71,556</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 89,979</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Operations</td>
<td>$ 7,500</td>
<td>$ 14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start Up Program Funds</td>
<td>$ 6,500</td>
<td>$ 7,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing - Central Support*</td>
<td>$ 7,950</td>
<td>$ 99,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website Development - Central Support*</td>
<td>$3,334</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>$ 12,725</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total DA</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,225</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 154,674</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Support</strong></td>
<td><strong>$91,781</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 244,653</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>