The following is background material from the Administrative Staff Retreat held at the Carnahan Conference Center February 5-6, 2002.

AGENDA
Tuesday, February 5, 2002

1:00 p.m. Welcome, Purpose, Introductions
1:15 Desired Outcomes - Agenda Review
1:30 Norms, Working together...GDM/Johari - ??
2:15 Ladder of Inference
2:35 Agreeing on Current Reality -
   - Validate data scroll - presentation
3:30 Validation - groups dialogue/respond - break on own
4:30 Review changes - validate
5:00 Moving forward - parameters - Interview
   with Larry Turner
5:45 Additional questions
6:00 Dinner
7:00 Environmental Scan
7:45 Feedback to group
8:40 +/- working with norms..and changes?
8:45 Close
Norms

Listen and be non-judgmental in listening and open-minded seek to understand

2 way flow of communication - talking/listening - everybody has opportunity to say what they feel and listen to others

Focus on interests and not position

Get something accomplished - focus on what is important

No repercussions associated with any comments you make - not hold anything against you for speaking up

Don’t take comments personally

Avoid put downs and negative remarks (raise things that are questionable) - all responsible for raising our own reaction if - ??

Openness to learn something new

We are all optimistic

Creative involvement

Do this in a way that the outcome of the whole is valued

Free to lay our concerns on the table

Motivation to make a change

Operate with compassion

Be honest and real
Have fun and humor in meeting

Take our time to reach conclusions

Develop sense of task

Come expecting to get something out of it

Don’t interrupt

Commitment to group consensus decision (once you leave meeting)
Everyone needs to be heard

Bathroom Breaks (allow for people needing to get up and go)

Show RESPECT for each member of the group

Concept of interdependence among our group - aware of everything we do is related

Don’t jump to solutions too quickly

Get past sacred cows

Gather all the information we can

Confidentiality of sensitive information (share consensus) shared w/in group but not outside (let others know) (Review last day and agree)

Clear understanding of why you are here

Set aside walk/personal concerns - keep our minds clear

Willingness to take risks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>February 2002</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>February</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Scope The Challenge - Concurrence</td>
<td>Communicating to others the challenge</td>
<td>Dean &amp; Dr. Turner lay out process, etc.</td>
<td>6. Feb-April Assess data already gathered ie., Speak Out, Conversations, Strategic Teams, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State CEC Introduction Process</td>
<td>4. Transition Team Identify roles, responsible team, etc.</td>
<td>Environmental scan A. Widen circle of influence</td>
<td>8. Look at: what we give up what we add we keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean made statement of the larger purpose of broadening mission</td>
<td>1890's talk to Dr. Benson (next week)</td>
<td></td>
<td>President of UK meeting with Transition Team - face-to-face, 4th week in February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean/KSU Administration meet with Transition Team - 4th Week in February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2002</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I D questions for groups</td>
<td>Specialist focus group environmental scan</td>
<td>Councils focus group</td>
<td>Those not in Extension March Interview Environmental Scan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Association State Conference</td>
<td>Environmental Scan other colleges &amp; programs &amp; department chairs &amp; associate deans on campus in face-to-face session - 3rd week of March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conduct Environmental Scan (stakeholders) - March - April Agents &amp; other staff focus groups (March-April)</td>
<td>Specialists/associate specialists meeting independent facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Scan Agents multi area setting independent facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2002</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Examine the jobs we think we have. Review job descriptions &amp; look at priorities.</td>
<td>Legislative &amp; county officials decision makers - interview &amp; forums by end of March</td>
<td>Support Staff Chi Epsilon Sigma or include in Area Staff Focus groups</td>
<td>Connected agencies/partners personal interviews Completed by end of April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader, local groups &amp; agencies, government groups, face to face county meeting agents</td>
<td>Agents focus groups Area Staff</td>
<td>UK Administration one on one, administration visits Dean, Dr. Turner on-going</td>
<td>Overall Think Tank Stakeholder agents, specialists, AD’s, APD’s, chairs, assistant directors, leaders Visit: strategic elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County &amp; area councils Environmental Scan thru April</td>
<td>Collaborating agencies with agency meetings (agents)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Measure against strategic elements redefine is need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairs Focus groups at monthly meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients POW, councils, speak out information (agents collect)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>May 2002</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Review &amp; validate the vision &amp; mission of CES</td>
<td>4. Identify strategic elements</td>
<td>Examine scenarios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess &amp; summarize date from Environmental Scan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redesign the system staffing program delivery training decision making information flow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TIMELINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 2002</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario planning - Exploring, Looking at all options, Prioritize &amp; select best options - Final Decisions</td>
<td>6. Aligning operational processes with elements (staffing, technology, decisions)</td>
<td>12. Propose the plan</td>
<td>Work on training needs &amp; rewards structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU included in other meetings on-going</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## STEPS TO THE FINAL DECISION

1. Dean and Dr. Turner lay out the process, reasons behind, etc. (February 2002)
2. Transition Team(s) - Identify roles and responsibilities (February 2002)
   1. ID the questions for groups (early March 2002)
   1. Environment scan - Stakeholders, Agents (April 2002)
   1. Review and validate mission and vision (early May 2002)
   1. Assess data we already have
      Speak out on Extension, 4H conversations
      Strategic Teams, Adv. Councils
      Customer Service (February, March, April 2002)
   1. Examine the jobs “we think we have.” Review job descriptions to look at priorities. (April 2002)
   1. Look at what we give up and what we add, what we keep (April 2002)
   1. Training needs and reward structure (on going)
1. Assess and summarize data  
   (May 2002)
1. Create and examine scenarios  
   (May/June 2002)
1. Decision Time!
   (June 30, 2002)

## ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Who’s Responsible</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension Administration</td>
<td>Retreat</td>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co.-Area Extension Council</td>
<td>State Meeting</td>
<td>Asst. Dir’s. APDs</td>
<td>Feb. 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>Area Staff</td>
<td>APDs</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/Association</td>
<td>State Meeting</td>
<td>Rick/Larry/Paul</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU</td>
<td>Include in other mtgs. Admin. Visit</td>
<td>As above Larry, Dean</td>
<td>by April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Chairs</td>
<td>Monthly Mtg.</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Staff</td>
<td>CES-Jabez Mtg. &amp; Area Staff</td>
<td>Paul APDs</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td>POW, Councils, Speak out info</td>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>March April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Adm.</td>
<td>Adm. Visits</td>
<td>Associate Dean Dean, et al</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collab. Agencies</td>
<td>Interagency Mtgs.</td>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-users</td>
<td>POW, speak out Interagency, councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logical process laid</td>
<td>exercise on stakeholders - meant more if I thought about primary customers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-work really helped</td>
<td>better if we had stayed in same location - get benefit of “after retreat”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>best job of process see beginning to end</td>
<td>didn’t have realistic handle on goal coming in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everybody had opportunity to give input and methods to get it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mixing of groups - constant rotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process lead to $\frac{1}{2}$ AH HA!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>really like scroll $\frac{1}{2}$</td>
<td>need more time to revisit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wouldn’t have been as successful w/o Dr. Turner being here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conversation w/dean yesterday morning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work in presenting what you heard - putting it in perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faster than I thought we could do it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEPS TO FINAL DECISION

1. Explanation of process from dean and Dr. Turner
2. Gather data
3. Involve stakeholders &
   - broad base involvement
   - advisory councils
   - agents
   - program assistants
   - specialists/associates
   - 1890 KSU

1. Analyze data
2. Prioritize

---

STEPS TO FINAL DECISION

1. Scope the challenge - (concurrence)

2. Communicating to others this challenge
   a. (Began with downsizing APD’s, redrawing area lines - overhauling the system)
   b. Communication - President’s office, Billy Joe Miles
      - Agents, councils - stakeholders

3. Environmental Scan
   a. Widen circle of influence
4. Identify strategic elements

5. Scenario planning - exploring/looking at all options
   - Prioritize and select best options - Final decisions

6. Aligning operational processes with elements (staffing, technology, decision making, structure) - Transition team
## STRATEGIC ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.K. Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents/Department Chairs/Specialists</td>
<td>Review vision and mission in light of environmental scan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Councils</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information Needed from Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Specialists/Associates</td>
<td>Extension efforts related to promotion and tenure?</td>
<td>What interests do they have in relationship to environmental scan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>What skills or assets do you have to address environmental scan?</td>
<td>What current programs meet or address environmental scan?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APD’s - A.D.</td>
<td>What job functions need to be changed to address and support outcomes of environmental scan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clientele/Citizens</td>
<td>Skills to address scan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Process for data</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>By Whom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) State Extension Council Council Area Extension CEC Advisory groups</td>
<td>Carry Environmental Scan process back to areas - county - CEC’s - advisory councils</td>
<td>Same questions as this group</td>
<td>Larry and Paul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2) Agents/Specialists/Associates | *February staff meeting  
*March conference | Same questions as this group | APD’s and Larry |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3) Youth Development Community</td>
<td>Data County conversations</td>
<td>Summary of conversations data</td>
<td>Agent in county State 4-H Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) All citizens of Kentucky</td>
<td>Town meetings</td>
<td>Broaden inputs of data for U.K. land grant mission</td>
<td>President Todd (via technology)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Virtual community</td>
<td>Web</td>
<td>Web survey</td>
<td>Ag Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Department Chairs</td>
<td>Henning Committee Next quarterly meeting</td>
<td>Analyze report focused on training and support (same as rest)</td>
<td>Larry Dean</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Steps to Final Decision to Restructuring Organization**

- Dean make statement of the larger purpose of broadening mission of CES to organization and stakeholders.

- Environmental Scan

- Measure against strategic elements, redefine if need

- Transition (concern a loop is being open to all members of the organization)
- Redesign the system
  - staffing
  - program delivery
  - training
  - decision making
  - information flow

### STRATEGIC ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who Stakeholder</th>
<th>Process Data</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All stakeholders representative - agents - specialists - AD’s - APD’s - chairs - assistant directors/deans - leaders</td>
<td>Overall committee</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### STRATEGIC ELEMENTS

- mission/vision
- values/organization structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHO</th>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>INFO</th>
<th>BY WHOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Same people as enviro scan</td>
<td>analyze data</td>
<td>changes identified in Enviro Scan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prioritize info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>determine long term &amp; short term goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change in guiding principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>design operational structure to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### INFORMATION NEEDED
1. What changes (trends, discontinuities) in the environment will influence how we design and perform our work?
   - Economic
   - Social
   - Technological
   - Competitive
   - Other

2. What are our assets? Gaps?

2. Who are our stakeholders?

2. What are priority issues you see CES addressing?

2. How do we structure for the future?

---

ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Process Data</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>By When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Who</td>
<td>When</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents and other staff</td>
<td>focus groups</td>
<td>APD &amp; AD</td>
<td>March if clear org. mess out there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councils</td>
<td>focus groups regional</td>
<td>agents &amp; APD &amp; AD (teams)</td>
<td>Spring 3/11 &amp;12 KEHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist Associates</td>
<td>focus groups</td>
<td>Ads &amp; APDs</td>
<td>mid March specialist meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>those not in support of Extension</td>
<td>interviews review doc.</td>
<td>Selected individuals</td>
<td>by end of March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision makers</td>
<td>interviews and forums</td>
<td>team</td>
<td>by end of March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890’s</td>
<td>talk to Dr. Benson</td>
<td>Dr. Turner</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>connected agencies</td>
<td>personal interview</td>
<td>AD’s</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTIONS TO ASK**

1. What are the critical needs of KY that can be addressed by CES?
   - ▲ Health
   - ▲ Families
   - ▲ Youth
   - ▲ Environmental Needs/Concerns
   - ▲ Resource Management
   - ▲ Economic Growth Potential
   - ▲ Changing Ag

2. What feedback do they have on our service delivery and where are our opportunities for growth?

2. What do we need to drop or do differently?
QUESTIONS

1. Is there anything that showed up in Env. Scan that make us want to change our mission & vision statement?

1. Are we being true to our values?

1. Is there some way to enhance our mission & vision?

1. What needs to be changed operationally to better address our mission & vision?

Review mission/vision values

Put certain functions we do on hold - ex. Performance evaluations

design how to select represents groups for focus group

Revisit “Speak Out on KY” and make participants more inclusive of the whole community. (Regionally based)

1. What changes (trends, discontinuities) in the environment will influence how we design and perform our work?

ECONOMIC

Agriculture

GROUP 1

a. fewer farms/farmers

b. change in tobacco
c. complex issues in Ag (i.e., genetic engineering)
d. less farmland/more urban (urban/farm interface)
e. labor force issues
f. less farm income

GROUP 2
a. loss of tobacco
b. need new markets
c. diversification
d. fewer farmers
e. part-time workers
f. health care
g. tracking from farm to consumer

GROUP 3
a. loss of property
b. loss of tobacco
c. new enterprises
d. marketing strategies
e. enterprise vs “hobby” Farm
f. rural urban interface
g. part-time farmers

GROUP 4
a. bigger farms specialized
b. more small farms in urban areas
c. specialty crops
d. reduction in tobacco
e. global/grain prices
f. fewer potential farmers for future
g. environmental governmental constraints

ECONOMIC Family
a. income more in below-middle category
b. more single parent
c. job skills - lack of skills
d. hispanic family needs (housing, income)
ECONOMIC
General
1. state of the economy
2. change in mfg. in KY
3. move toward more “high tech” jobs
4. educational levels

SOCIAL
Family
GROUP 1
a. families moving “off farm”
b. more different “family types”
c. “browning” of KY
d. less isolation
e. family resiliency

GROUP 2
1. family
2. structures
3. day care
4. new populations
5. health - KY “uglies”
6. 49-50 rank of women and children

GROUP 3
a. dual income family multiple job
b. single parent/grandparent families
c. alternatives lifestyle families
d. aging population
e. multi-cultural families
f. POVERTY - POVERTY

GROUP 4
a. single parents
b. blended families
c. financial management
d. aging population
e. child care
f. safety

g. sandwich generation

h. grandparents as parents

i. housing

j. transient population, lack support of nuclear family

k. working poor

······ SOCIAL

  Youth

GROUP 1

a. latch key

b. some busy, some not

c. youth/adult partnership

d. "adultism"

e. violence/safety

f. youth interest in community decision process

g. peer group influence

h. employability

GROUP 2

a. day care

b. after school issues

c. hunger

d. career skills/opportunities

e. motivation

f. technology

g. violence

h. funding driving partnerships

i. volunteers - adult/youth

j. substance abuse

GROUP 3

a. children alone @ home

b. children in poverty

c. education of children to meet future needs of workforce

d. teens have more responsibility at a younger age
e. drugs/alcohol, i.e., ecstasy, oxycontin

---

GROUP 4

a. violence
b. career training
c. peer pressure
d. part-time jobs
e. exposure to internet (globalization)
f. financial management/education - credit cards
g. education/finances

---

SOCIAL

Education

GROUP 1

a. quality
b. teacher certification
c. have & have nots
d. KERA
e. school safety
f. vocational
g. life-long learning to “retool” for new jobs
h. non-traditional - distance learning virtual classrooms
i. cultural learning/language
j. non-public: parochial/home schooling
k. special education

---

GROUP 2

a. life skills
b. life long learning
c. home schooling/alternative schooling
d. KERA
e. competent/available teachers
f. out-of-school time for youth education
g. vocational training
h. technology

---

GROUP 3

a. job skills
b. workforce preparation
c. stay in school
d. drop-outs
e. literacy
f. community involvement
g. outcome based
h. informal/SOS program
i. life-long learning
j. life skills
k. leisure ed.

**GROUP 4**
a. high drop-out rate
b. disillusionment of teachers (low morale, accountability, KERA, etc.)
   teachers leaving
c. equal access to education
d. cost
e. opportunity for continuing ed. for all of family
f. virtual education

---

**SOCIAL Health**

**GROUP 1**

1. preventive
2. wellness
3. fast food/nutrition
4. diabetes adult and youth
5. Kentucky cancer and heart disease rates
6. obesity
7. stress

**GROUP 2**
a. disease prevention
b. cost, insurance/uninsured
c. diet, obesity, nutrition educ.
d. availability
e. prenatal ignorance
f. aging
g. living beyond the income
GROUP 3
a. drug ed.
b. insurance/cost
c. access to health care
d. aging population
e. health costs
f. health education
g. diet nutrition & exercise
h. genetic engineering
i. biotech

GROUP 4
1. health care costs
2. insured/uninsured and cost of insurance
3. rural health care i.e., doctors
4. specialization of health care
5. lack of preventative health care
6. aging population of KY

SOCIAL
Community

GROUP 1
a. new diversity cultural/race/language
b. rural/urban interface
c. jobs
d. economic viability
e. infrastructure
f. water, cable, internet access

GROUP 2
a. public health
b. lack of public transportation
c. violence/safety
d. less community
e. lack of leadership
f. ethnic, racial mix
g. rural; loss of population
h. economics - expanded services
i. decline of down towns - ?

j. rural & urban interface

---

**GROUP 3**

a. city/county “boundaries” lack of regional cooperation
b. politics (dirty)
c. lack of qualified leadership
d. migration patterns (losses, gains/ethnic, etc.)
e. people resistant to change
f. lack of jobs impacts resources
g. gone are “Mom & Pop” stores i.e., Walmart

---

**GROUP 4**

c. citizenship/volunteerism
b. participation to solve problems
c. lack of resources
d. “Walmartization”
e. leadership
f. apathy
g. rural/urban
h. infrastructure
i. land use
j. transportation
k. environmental issues
l. health
m. safety

---

**SOCIAL**

---

**Globalization**

---

**GROUP 1**

a. losing jobs to other countries
b. war (effects of)
c. terrorism (bio, etc.)
d. international competition w/Ag
e. technology incl. communications
f. clientele have access to world knowledge
g. mobility of people

---

**GROUP 2**
a. marketing
b. factories closing
c. competition of ag resources
d. language
e. cultural differences
f. trade
g. change driven by many countries

GROUP 3
h. internet
i. travel
j. TV - Media - News
k. foreign ownership of local businesses
l. marketing via Internet (from up the holler)
m. has cost jobs/increased markets
n. kids

GROUP 4
h. Loss of jobs
i. Attitudes against it
j. Closing factories
k. Resistance to GMOs
l. International compliance with food quality/safety
m. More world view by public
n. Tourist $

... TECHNOLOGY

GROUP 1
h. reliability/security/crime
i. digital capabilities
j. constant accessibility (cell phones, PDAs, fax, email)
k. web TV
l. M–? E-learning
m. video communication
n. resistance to technology

GROUP 2
a. internet dependent
b. information overload
c. job displacement  
d. retraining  
e. delivery methods  
a. E-commerce  
b. production methods  
c. appliance selection  

GROUP 3  
1. computers do things for people  
2. computers replace people  
3. accessibility to computers  
4. “digital divide”  
5. changes in education (ways to deliver)  

GROUP 4  
1. literacy  
2. have/have not  
3. cell phones, compatibility  
4. turn over  
5. privacy  
6. other agencies/communications  
7. delivery of information (variety, different methods)  
8. page of change  
9. cost  

COMPETITIVENESS  

GROUP 1  
1. clientele  
2. markets  
3. resources  
4. staff  
5. private sector  
6. delivery method  
7. language  
8. marketing (image)  
9. accessibility to programming, office, hours  
10. other universities  
11. broadening mission
GROUP 2
1. structure of ag. & industry
2. cheap foreign labor
3. increase free trade
4. unionization
5. a lot selling information

GROUP 3
a. more competition
b. businesses competing with government agencies

OTHER
« shared multi-state, multi-discipline & multi-programming
« flexibility
« responsibility
« accountability
« responsiveness
« staffing/flexibility

2. Who are our key stakeholders?

GROUP 1
\~ AD's
1. President
1. Dean
1. Associate Dean
1. APD's
1. agents
1. specialists/associates

\~ APD's
1. YMCA
1. all of the above
1. other college department chairs
1. agents, leaders, co. governments
1. county legislators
1. see scroll
ASSOCIATE DEAN

Legislators - state/federal
Agents
Dean
APD’s
AD’s
Staff
Specialists
Sandy & Pam
Department Chairs
Commodity groups
agencies - state/federal
USDA
other colleges and rest of university

GROUP 2

AD’s
APD’s
agents
specialists
clientele
associates
Dean
Director
Dept. Chairs
all university administration
state agencies
councils

APD’s
AD
Agents
Advisory Councils (county, area and state)
Support Staff
Associate Director and Dean
Legislative process

ASSOCIATE DEAN
AD
APD stakeholders
Dean
President
Department Chairs, etc.

GROUP 3
AD’s
agents
specialists
APD’s
administrations
other university and agencies
leaders
clients
other parts UK

APD’s
agents
specialists
AD’s
administration
advisory councils legislators
county judges
citizens
other regional agencies

ASSOCIATE DEAN
Dean
Associate Provost
Ads
APD
Chairs
Commodity and Interest Groups
All agent Associations
Specialists
Research Associate
Government and Non-governmental Task Forces

GROUP 4

AD’S
APD
Department Chairs
Staff
Specialist
Dean and Deanlets
Commodity groups and interest groups
Non Profits
State and Federal agencies
Councils

APD’s
Administration
total university
agents
public
legislators
staff
each other
councils/county, area and state
county government
district boards
other agencies
AD’s

ASSOCIATE DEAN
APD’s
AD’s
Dean and President
other deans, department chairs
What stakeholders?

- Agents and other staff
- Councils
- Specialists/associates
- Those in community not supportive of Extension
- Decision makers
- President, UK and Dean
- 1890's
- Connected agencies
- Focus groups

3. What feedback do they have for us around service delivery?

*** STRENGTHS

**GROUP 1**
1. Clientele loyalty
2. Local funding $, time
3. Volunteer support system
4. Cooperative - federal, state, co.
5. Councils
6. Flexibility
7. Staff
8. #'s
9. Live where we work - community involvement

**GROUP 2**
1. Timeliness
2. Responsiveness
3. local based  
4. research based  
5. high touch  
6. breadth of subject matter  
7. stakeholder involvement  

**GROUP 3**  
1. presence in every county  
2. have a structure  
3. funding source (co)  
4. less affected by politics  
5. connection w/UK  
6. people oriented  
7. grassroots driven  

**GROUP 4**  
1. local delivery, office in every county  
2. personal, friendly factual service  

***GAPS***  

**GROUP 1**  
1. time of response  
2. inflexible  
3. access  
4. tradition  
5. seeking under served audiences  
6. customer service  
7. location  
8. priority setting  
9. leadership accepting responsibility for programming  
10. program support in certain areas  
11. publications and access of info  
12. funding in some counties  

**GROUP 2**  
1. office hours  
2. limited resources  
3. knowledge to transfer
4. traditional Image/vs new direction
5. tech capability
6. specialist support

**GROUP 3**
1. non-flex hours
2. under served audiences
3. research/Extension lag
4. behind industry
5. use of technology

**GROUP 4**

a. everybody has a different opinion on what we should do
b. slow to change (response)
c. potential audiences (under served)
d. too much to do

*** MEASURES OF SUCCESS

**GROUP 1**

a. Increased financial support at county level
b. Increased # field staff positions
c. program results impact on communities
d. national recognition of programs
e. CES has been asked to do - Phase I, C&ED (enhanced)

**GROUP 2**

1. Increased advocacy
2. County funded positions
3. More Regional Programming
4. High-Level of satisfaction
5. Participation
6. Program variety

< new areas
< more collaboration
< people volunteering

**GROUP 3**

1. local clientele
2. funding - local, state and fed
3. $ impact
4. volunteer involvement - commitment
5. economic

GROUP 4
1. increased funding
2. statewide recognition and national
3. successful stakeholders
4. increase economic base for business, communities, families

... SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE

GROUP 1
1. new program focus
2. “broadening CES”
3. structural change
4. what will we give up - prioritize

GROUP 2
1. program material
   - literacy
   - language
1. accessability
2. contract professional for rapid response to critical issues
3. specialists need to be role models in use of technology

GROUP 3
1. broader base of participation
2. bi-lingual staff
3. representative councils
4. flexible hours for office
5. focus on priority
6. strengthen feed back for/to researchers

GROUP 4
1. targeted reporting
   micro/macro
1. issue-based programming
2. multi-disciplinary
3. statewide priority areas based on grassroots
4. flexibility in staffing
5. flex time - etc.
4. What have we learned from our history that should be considered as we move forward?

GROUP 1
1. local (grassroots) focus
2. local funding
3. market ourselves better
4. not assume that our rural population will take care of us
5. must be political savvy
6. be proactive
7. we can make a difference
8. our uniqueness

GROUP 2
a. don’t do away with local emphasis
   △
   program delivery
   input, needs I.D.
   △
d. must collaborate

GROUP 3
1. pay attention to stakeholders
2. we are adaptable - we've done it before we can do it again
3. agents of change
4. don’t get set in ways
5. open minds
6. we can do anything we put our minds to
7. multiply efforts
8. accountability
9. others want to copy us - Extension

GROUP 4
a. strength of grassroots voice
b. “dance with those that brung ya”
c. unique land-grant organization others want to imitate
d. volunteer leadership potential
e. adoption of scientific practices
AGENDA
Wednesday, February 6, 2002

8:00 a.m. Welcome .... check in

8:30 Review last night’s data ... based on environmental scan, develop strategy for service delivery

10:30 Present information, consolidate themes, discuss differences

11:30 Full group dialogue (practice inquiry) hopes/possibilities...fears, concerns

12:30 Lunch

1:00 p.m. Identify next steps in process - Actions (what, when, who, how) Transition Team

1:45 Accomplishments

2:00 + / - on following norms

2:10 Close

Validation

1. Is this accurate?

1. Is anything missing?

1. Does anything not belong?

DIRECTIONS
1. Divide into groups in a max mix way - AD - ADP - West Ky/Eastern Ky/Central Ky/ - FCS/AG/4-H

1. Select a facilitator/Recorder -
   Use a separate paper for each question or category
   Ex Social - Family
   Socialize - Youth
   - Education

ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Process for Data Collection</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>By</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

TRANSITION TEAM

Criteria (diversity) - role, gender, discussion + Associate Dean (Larry)

“Big Picture” Thinker

Create/Innovative approach

Detailed person/grandad??

Process oriented

Inclusive - facilitator of others

“People” conscious

History

1. What did you hear?

1. What are your reactions?
1. Any concerns?

1. Alternative suggestion?

Are you willing to use this process - Yes/No

TRANSITION TEAM

APD’s

John Mowbray
Jeanne Davis
Debbie Murray

AD’s

Rick Maurer
Bonnie Tanner

Agents

Janet Johnson
Steve Kelly
Lincoln Martin

Specialists/Associates
David Ditsch
Steve Riggins
Vivian Lasley-Bibbs

Alternatives/Suggestions

• Whole group is administrative
structure sub-committee

• Members have this as official assignment

1. What did you hear?

• Keep administrative staff as “core group” relating to team and review recommendations

• Transition team process

• Make-up of team

• Role of group

• Select the representatives
  Our own (AD's and APD's)
  Others? - recommendations (not associates)

• Chair elected by committee

2. Reactions

• Representative - okay not to use outsiders

• Okay with team (at this point)

• “Trust is earned” - not established yet

• Communication and openness a must!

3. Concerns
1. What did we hear?
   • Inclusive

4. Will you use this process?
   YES
1. What did we hear?

- Time commitment
- Important
- Big picture
- Specifics about composition
- Varied abilities

2. Reactions

- Good blend
- Just do it!!
- Positive 1st step

3. Concerns

- KSU involvement
- Committee members time commitment
- Fresh faces? with qualities
- Urgency/vs patience
- Do committee persons, have right of resusal

4. Will you use this process?

  Yes

1. What did we hear?
• We are going to have a team
• Make up
• This group or team take to Dean
• Administrative group is core team, validates the plan
• Group chooses chair person

2. Reactions
• Good balance between the core group to others.

3. Concern
• Who is chair?
• Larry should appoint or serve as chair.
• Chair should be from core group.
• KSU representative?
• Amount of time as asked.

Alternative
• Each person have name of two AD’s and three APD’s on a card and give to Larry today (geographic, gender, balance - tenure program background).
• APD’s nominated 3 agents
  AD’s nominated 2 specialists
• Larry selects finals.

1. What did we hear?
• Would be a T-team
• Would be a coordinating group
• Identified members (2 AD’s, 3 APD’s, have major input)
• Input on membership
• Team elects/selects chair
• Team findings to Dean and back to team
• ? who presents

2. Reactions
• Others have input to team and add credibility
• Is necessary
• Represents whole system
• Feed back opportunity

3. Concerns
• Agent representative (or anyone) concern for time
• Look beyond the usual people (tenure, experience)
• Time required and time frame
• Department, faculty, constituents (not in loop)
• Consider release time

4. Will you use this process
   Yes

TRANSITION TEAM - Draft final product

Input - agents recommend               Input - specialists recommend

Guide/Lead Process

• Id primary objective of change effort - Project mission
• Desired outcomes of change effort
• Linkage to other initiatives
• Time frames
• Project boundaries
• Draft strategic elements
• Involve others in scenario planning

Draw from pool

Relationship ... Feed back

    AD & APD validation
Agree on recommendation - December

BIW

APD’s need skills also to lead the change

2 AD

3 APD

3 Agents

2 Specialists

1 Associate Dean

Transfer “Steps” and stakeholder information to yellow stickers.

Place them in correct place on timeline.