NAEPSDP Annual Conference Proceedings

November 30 - December 3, 2020

Celebrating 10 Years

— *of* —

Excellence and Embracing Change

Table of Contents

Conference Committee – 2020 NAEPSDP Conference

Conference Co-Chairs:

Cynthia Wilson Willis –	Fort Valley State University
Latasha Ford –	Fort Valley State University
Matt Benge –	University of Florida

Committee Members:

Danae Wolfe –	The Ohio State University
Rich Poling –	University of Arkansas
Diane Craig –	University of Florida
Suzanne Stluka –	Montana State University
Craig Rotter –	Texas A&M University
Diane Mashburn –	University of Arkansas
John Diaz –	University of Florida
Vikram Koundinya –	University of California-UC Davis
Debra Davis –	Louisiana State University
Steve Siegelin –	Montana State University
Karen Vines –	Virginia Tech University
Nav Ghimire –	Idaho State University
Celeste Carmichael –	Cornell University
Teresa McCoy –	The Ohio State University
Amanda Rysz –	The Ohio State University
Gwyn Shelle –	Michigan State University
Jared Morrison –	The Ohio State University

Proposal Reviewers – 2020 NAEPSDP Conference

Michele Walsh –	University of Arizona	Amber Shanahan –	University of Minnesota
Steve Siegelin –	Montana State University	Mariah Morgan –	Mississippi State University
Kristi Farner –	University of Georgia	Laura Akgerman –	Ohio State University
Lynn Khadiagala –	NIFA	Craig Rotter –	Texas A&M University
Sarah Baughman –	Virginia Tech University	Melissa Cater –	Louisiana State University
Christian Schmieder –	University of Wisconsin	Jana S. Ferris –	Washington State University
Michelle Stumbo –	Ohio State University	Brian Raison –	Ohio State University
Scott Cummings –	Texas A&M University	Catherine Croft –	Kentucky State University
Jamie Varner –	Mississippi State University	Amy Parrott –	University of Arizona
Rochelle Sapp –	University of Georgia	Thomas Jerold –	Ohio State University
Katherine Soule –	University of California	Meredith Weinstein –	NC State University
Anil Kumar Chaudhary –	Pennsylvania State University	Amanda Rysz –	Ohio State University
Stacey Stearns –	University of Connecticut	Karen Vines –	Virginia Tech University
Teresa McCoy –	Ohio State University	Kit Alviz –	University of California
Nancy Hegland –	University of Minnesota	Julie Robinson –	University of Arkansas
Andree' Walker Bravo –	Utah State University	Mary L. Halbleib –	Oregon State University
Brenda Allen –	Iowa State University	Martin Smith –	University of California
Terry Janssen –	Iowa State University	Beth Flynn –	OSU Leadership Center
Adeola C. Ogunade –	Kentucky State University	Mike Hauser –	University of Arizona
Rebecca Sero –	Washington State University	Rich Poling –	University of Arkansas
Donna Peterson –	Mississippi State University	Debbie McDonald –	National 4-H Council
Suzanna Windon –	Pennsylvania State University	Jeremy Elliott-Engel –	University of Arizona
Lendel Narine –	Utah State University	Diane Mashburn –	University of Arkansas
Marina Denny –	Mississippi State University	Linda Manton –	University of California
Julie Fox –	Ohio State University		

Civil Rights Compliance Review Process

Jessica Creighton
National Institute of Food and Agriculture, USDA

Abstract

Our presentation is intended to provide an overview of the USDA/NIFA civil rights compliance review process. The presenter will present both Extension and research program content to provide a holistic picture of civil rights.

Guiding Evaluation Capacity Building of Extension Professionals using Perspective of Extension Educators

Anil Kumar Chaudhary, Elsie Assan, Farhan Sadique, Graduate Student
The Pennsylvania State University

John Diaz
University of Florida

K.S.U. Jayaratne
North Carolina State University

Vikram Koundinya
University of California, Davis

Nav Ghimire
University of Idaho

Scott Chazdon
University of Minnesota Extension

Abstract

Extension educators have the responsibility of assessing the impact of educational programs to meet the increased accountability needs of their organizations. However, many Extension educators often have inadequate knowledge and skills necessary for conducting good quality evaluation because educators are mostly hired based on their subject matter expertise. Most commonly, Extension organizations use professional development of their employees related to core competencies including evaluation (Brodeur, Higgins, Galindo-Gonzalez, Craig, & Haile, 2011). To guide professional development related to program evaluation, the Authors (2020) conducted a Delphi study with a national panel of evaluation specialists. Using the Delphi panel, the Authors (2020) developed an evaluation competency development model consisting of 36 evaluation competencies.

Using the newly developed evaluation competency model, the evaluation specialists can guide professional development related to evaluation, but the model lacks the perspective of Extension educators, the end-users of evaluation competencies. To address this weakness of our model, we conducted eleven focus group interviews with Extension educators who represent different program areas, different tenure, age, education, and geographic locations (e.g., rural, urban, suburban). The eleven focus group interviews were conducted in six states (i.e., Pennsylvania, Florida, North Carolina, Minnesota, California, and Idaho) representing all four US census regions and different types of Extension systems. In these focus group interviews, we sought views and comments of Extension educators about the newly developed Extension evaluation competency model, how to use it for evaluation capacity building of Extension professionals, and what should be done to build the competencies specified in the model. We used the constant comparative thematic analysis method to analyze

focus group data. During analysis, we maintained a thorough audit trail and our analysis had a more than 90% intercoder reliability.

The Extension educators perceived the evaluation competency development model as important and appropriate for professional development related to evaluation competencies. The educators recommended a phased implementation of the model with a team-based approach to program evaluation. Other themes related to the implementation of the model have also emerged, but due to space constraints can't be presented in abstract and shared during the presentation. Concerning the needs of educators related to the building of evaluation competencies, the educators suggested mentoring opportunities for them and the need for sharing of successful examples of the previous evaluation. Regarding enhanced engagement of educators in evaluation capacity-building efforts, educators first stressed on the need to show them the value of evaluation along with providing rewards and incentives and clear communication related to evaluation from their supervisors. Overall, the educators felt 36 competencies are overwhelming and need to be further thought out.

In this presentation, we will share findings from our focus group interviews with Extension educators regarding the improvement of our previously developed evaluation competency development model along with ideas for broader implementation and adoption of the model to enhance the evaluation capacity of Extension educators. Using the findings from this presentation, the NAEPSDP participants can better engage Extension educators in evaluation capacity-building efforts and learn how an evaluation competency development model can be employed to guide evaluation capacity-building efforts.

References

Brodeur, C. W., Higgins, C., Galindo-Gonzalez, S., Craig, D. D., & Haile, T. (2011). Designing a competency-based new county Extension personnel training program: A novel approach. *Journal of Extension, 49*(3), Article 3FEA2. Retrieved from https://www.joe.org/joe/2011june/pdf/JOE_v49_3a2.pdf

Linking Organizational Behaviors to Employees' Critical Psychological States

Marina Denny, Marty Ellard
Mississippi State University

Abstract

Introduction/Background/Significance

Annual Conference for Mississippi State University (MSU) Extension is the sole event at which the majority of Extension personnel gather for networking, organizational updates, recognition of efforts, and professional development. However, it was unclear if there was a significant relationship between the intended outcomes determined by Extension administrators and the experience and gain of the conference participants. We proposed an evaluation framework that classifies Kruse's (1986) organizational leadership behaviors as causal variables that may influence the critical psychological states defined in the Job Characteristics Model (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). From this framework, we developed an evaluation instrument to determine if there was a relationship between intended organizational behaviors embedded in Annual Conference and employees' 1) experienced meaningfulness of work (i.e., job satisfaction, job motivation); 2) responsibility for outcomes (i.e., professional accountability); and 3) knowledge of results (i.e., organizational awareness). Specifically, the instrument solicited information regarding the impact of the various components of Annual Conference on participants' views of leadership, job satisfaction, job motivation, professional accountability, and organizational awareness.

Methods

We first interviewed the Director of MSU Extension to determine the intended outcomes and associated activities of Annual Conference (Neves, Lavis, & Ranson, 2012). The interview provided context and set the stage upon which to build the evaluation instrument. The evaluation instrument included demographic questions, general satisfaction questions, and questions about the conference activities and how they correlated to six leadership organizational behaviors derived from Kruse's (1986) original instrument – Interfacing; Motivating task commitment; Planning and organizing; Harmonizing and team building; Informing; and Recognizing and rewarding. Two state Extension specialists in program and staff development and evaluation and an Assistant Professor in the Agricultural Education, Leadership, and Communications program at MSU reviewed the instrument for face and content validity. The instrument was disseminated electronically via Qualtrics to all attendees (N=356) to Annual Conference in 2018 and 2019.

Results and Discussion

Respondents (n=138) self-identified as having programmatic responsibilities in 4-H youth development (77%), community resource development (62%), agriculture (45.6%), family and consumer sciences (41.8%), and natural resource and/or Sea Grant (31.6%). The average respondent had 12 years of work experience with MSU Extension. Data revealed a slight, but not significant, impact of certain conference activities on participants' knowledge of results and responsibility for outcomes. Respondents identified the awards luncheon as being effective at praising performance, showing appreciation, and rewarding effective performance with tangible benefits (knowledge of results). The Director's State of Extension address was effective at helping participants

learn about decisions, plans, and events that affect their work (responsibility for outcomes). There was a weak relationship between Annual Conference and employees' meaningfulness of work.

Benefit to NAEPSDP and Practice

The data collected from this evaluation will serve to inform Extension administration at MSU of needed changes to Annual Conference and other similar professional development events to increase participation and tailor them to meet the changing needs and wants of Extension personnel. The framework for this evaluation instrument can be adapted at other institutions to develop more in-depth assessments of the impact of certain planned professional development activities/events on desired personnel and organizational outcomes.

References

Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60*(2), 159-170.

Kruse, S. K. G. (1986). *An analysis of job characteristics, leadership, teamwork, and job satisfaction in the cooperative extension service* (dissertation). Iowa State University. 8091. https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/rtd/8091

Neves, J., Lavis, J. N., & Ranson, M. K. (2012). A scoping review about conference objectives and evaluative practices: how do we get more out of them? *Health Research Policy and Systems, 10*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.1186/1478-4505-10-26

Cultural Competence in Extension Education: Developing a Competency Framework Based on Expert Consensus

John Diaz, Cecelia Suarez, Cody Gusto
University of Florida

Jay Jayaratne
North Carolina State University

Lendel Narine, Celina White
Utah State University

Abstract

Importance

The need to expand training for Extension professionals in cultural competence has been well established (Banks & Banks, 2009; Nieto & Bode, 2007). This need relates to evidence that Extension clientele continue to become more diverse, requiring special considerations for the development of culturally responsive Extension programs. According to the Pew Research Center (2019), there were a record 44.4 million immigrants living in the U.S. in 2017 that accounted for 13.6% of the nation's population. This represents more than a fourfold increase since 1960, when only 9.7 million immigrants lived in the U.S., accounting for just 5.4% of the total U.S. population (Pew Research Center, 2019).

These immigration trends are expected to continue in the United States with Hispanics accounting for the largest proportion of growth. The U.S. Hispanic population reached a record 59.9 million in 2018, which was 1.2 million more than the previous year and up from 47.8 million in 2008 (Flores, Lopez, & Krogstad, 2019). Hispanics accounted for 52% of all U.S. population growth from 2008 to 2018 (Flores, Lopez, & Krogstad, 2019). While the South saw the largest population growth among Latinos at 33%, states like North Dakota (135%) South Dakota (75%), Montana (55%) and New Hampshire (50%) also experienced rapid growth during this period, demonstrating the extent of this population dynamics (Flores, Lopez, & Krogstad, 2019).

Experts assert that programs that do not consider the cultural differences of their participants are frequently less effective (Banks & Banks, 2009; Gay, 2002; Nieto & Bode, 2007). A gap currently exists between wanting to educate diverse audiences and being prepared to do so highlighting the need for cultural competency training. To develop training programs, we need to conceptualize a cultural competency framework to identify training needs among educators and strategically address those needs. There are several frameworks to use but the challenge is they have not been developed systematically or within the context of Extension education. For example, the framework of Culturally Responsive Teaching (Gay, 2002) was developed for the traditional classroom not considering the intricacies of nonformal education. Another example is the Navigating Difference competency framework that was created for the Extension context but the competencies were not systematically explored or identified. These examples demonstrate a need to systematically explore and develop a competency framework that works for the Extension Education context to better position its educators to meet the needs of all clientele.

Methods/Results

The purpose of this study was to systematically develop and come to a consensus on a competency framework for Extension educators. We utilized a three-phase Delphi study approach to leverage the expertise of a national panel of cultural competency trainers. The panel included 36 experts from across the country with the participation of the authors of highly recognized curricula such as Navigating Difference, Coming Together for Racial Understanding, Intercultural Development Inventory, and others.

The first phase of the study asked the panel to identify the competencies they perceived to be important for the development of a culturally competent Extension educator. This included competencies related to culturally responsive teaching and facilitating civil discourse. The responses from the first phase resulted in the identification of over 200 competencies. We utilized the second and third phases to refine the list based on what is important and practical to develop among Extension educators. The panel agreed upon the core competencies related to (a) intercultural competence, (b) culturally responsive teaching, and (c) facilitating civil discourse.

Recommendations for Future Practice

The results of this study should serve as a competency framework to ensure the development of a culturally competent Extension system. The framework can be integrated into current needs assessment efforts so that cultural competency gaps can be identified and trainers can strategically connect curricula to the areas of needs to make the most impact. Additionally, this framework may allow for national collaboration and synergy due to the broad participation in its development. Since many Extension systems struggle with issues of capacity, working towards common competencies can form regional or national collaboration in training and assessment.

Benefits to NAEPSDP Participants/Practice

NAEPSDP members will have the opportunity to better understand the need for this framework, the experts that were involved in its development and the applications for their own system. Using the results will allow them and their organizations to develop a proactive and systematic approach towards related professional development efforts. The findings of this study will contribute to building the cultural competency among the Extension professionals enabling them to better serve the ever increasing diverse clientele.

References

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2009). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. John Wiley & Sons.

Flores, A., Lopez, M., & Krogstad, J. (2019). *U.S. Hispanic population reached new high in 2018, but growth has slowed*. Retrieved from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/07/08/u-s-hispanic-population-reached-new-high-in-2018-but-growth-has-slowed/

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(2), 106-116. Retrieved from https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0022487102053002003

Nieto, S., & Bode, P. (2007). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Allyn & Bacon.

Pew Research Center. (2019). Facts on U.S. Immigrants. Retrieved from
https://www.pewhispanic.org/2019/06/03/facts-on-u-s-immigrant/

Specialist-Engaged Process for Refining Extension Program Area Competencies

Marina Denny, Alisha Hardman, Kennie Hicks III
Mississippi State University

Abstract

Introduction/Background/Significance

Competencies show employees what knowledge and skills they need to perform well in their jobs (Stone & Bieber, 1997), and Extension has adopted the use of competency models as decision-making tools to enhance the relevance, usefulness, and quality of their educational programs. McGregor and MacCleave (2007) reported a very low level of global agreement on family and consumer sciences (FCS) professional competency domains. University of Tennessee (UT) Extension developed a framework for assessing gaps in knowledge among FCS Extension professionals (Franck et al., 2017). The goal was to help identify training needs that should be addressed in order to bring Extension agents to basic competence in four FCS knowledge areas –Human Development; Health and Safety; Nutrition and Food Safety; and Consumer Economics (Franck et al., 2017; University of Tennessee, 2017). Each knowledge area is divided into concepts, which are further divided into competencies. In 2019, Mississippi State University (MSU) program and staff development (PSD) specialists adapted the UT FCS competencies and assessed agents' perceived importance and efficacy of each competency. As a continuation of that study, in 2020 we planned to determine the agents' actual knowledge of these competencies to inform targeted learning and development opportunities. However, upon further reflection, we recognized the need to first determine the suitability of and determine whether gaps were present in the existing concepts and competencies, before assessing actual competence. Rather than employ a traditional Delphi methodology, we developed a more open-ended, reflective process with which to solicit input and feedback from FCS state personnel. These steps are presented as a potential alternative for other PSD professionals doing competency research and training with Extension educators.

Methods

We developed an electronic survey using Qualtrics for each of the four knowledge areas. Questions were presented by concept and asked respondents to provide a definition for, as well as the specific knowledge that agents and educators should have, relative to each concept. The survey also asked respondents to add missing competencies and determine if any existing competencies should be placed in a different concept. Open-ended questions allowed respondents an opportunity to describe/define missing competencies and provide their rationale for adding or moving competencies. For each survey, the authors determined the faculty (including those without Extension appointments) and Extension associates that would receive the survey based on their subject area specialties as well as their own experience in working with Extension agents and FCS educators. This resulted in six participants receiving the Human Development survey; six for the Health and Safety survey; four for the Nutrition and Food Safety survey; and two for the Consumer Economics survey.

Results and Discussion

There was a 100 percent response rate for three of the four surveys, and an 83 percent (5 of 6) response rate for Human Development. Despite a very small sample size for each survey, there was a significant amount of data

to analyze. We developed a qualitative analysis protocol to ensure we followed the same process for each survey. First, we reviewed the responses for the definition of each concept and looked for similar ideas or themes. Next, we recorded the count and percentage of the common themes or ideas across all relevant responses. Then, the common responses were synthesized into a definition for each concept. The authors met to discuss and come to consensus on each definition. Finally, we recorded missing competencies and drafted appropriate language for each so they matched the language of the existing competencies. We plan to present the synthesized definitions and additional competencies to the participants one more time in a virtual focus group setting to generate discussion and consensus before developing the related competency assessments. While it would have been much simpler to use the existing competency assessments developed by UT Extension, we are invested in this process and the need to tailor our competency training planning and implementation efforts to FCS topics and issues relevant to Mississippi Extension personnel. By taking this extra step to incorporate the input from FCS faculty and Extension associates, we also ensure that we have their support and buy-in to this competency training process long-term.

Benefit to NAEPSDP and Practice

We plan to replicate this process for the other Extension program areas in Mississippi – Ag & Natural Resources; 4-H Youth Development; and Community Resource Development. This process could be replicated by other PSD personnel as a way to refine content- and context-specific competencies for Extension personnel.

References

Franck, K., Wise, D., Penn, A., & Berry, A. (2017). Preparing future professionals for holistic family and consumer sciences programming. *Journal of Extension, 55*(6). https://www.joe.org/joe/2017december/a4.php

McGregor, S. L. T., & MacCleave, A. (2007). Analysis to determine Canadian, American and Australian agreement about home economic/family and consumer sciences professional competency domains. *Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM, 17*. https://kon.org/archives/forum/17-2/home_economics_professional_competency_domains.pdf

Stone, B. B., & Bieber, S. (1997). Competencies: A new language for our work. *Journal of Extension, 35*(1). https://www.joe.org/joe/1997february/comm1.php

University of Tennessee (2017). *UT Complete List of Competencies*.

Quality Control as Open Communication: Clarifying expectations, ensuring data quality, and tailoring feedback to local activity reporting during COVID-19

Joel Drevlow, Christian Schmieder
University of Wisconsin

Abstract

Broad geographic presence and a topically diverse educational portfolio are hallmarks of Extension organizations. However, this strength comes with a challenge regarding consistent organizational reporting for the purposes of evaluation, program development and stakeholder engagement. At the University of Wisconsin Madison - Division of Extension, this challenge intensified with the COVID-19 pandemic: With programs and delivery models rapidly changing, educators needed to try on new language to describe these efforts; at the same time, program leadership required structured and manageable information on our COVID-19 response in a fairly rapid manner.

To lead educators through this process, our Data Governance team needed to establish a quality control protocol that provided timely and precise feedback to assist colleagues in their work (easing reporting burden) while assuring the quality of the data pool for analytical products and shareholder communication. In this session, we show how we developed quality control policies and procedures that allowed us to streamline data analysis, quality assurance and responsive colleague feedback utilizing our state-wide reporting portal and Microsoft's 'mail merge' functionality.

We describe how we provided necessary guidance to colleagues, discuss limitations of our approach, and illustrate how our feedback processes led to timely and accurate synthesis of state-wide work during a volatile emergency situation.

Significance

The core strength of the Extension model is to quickly and meaningfully connect needs with actionable resources. This operational model is specifically effective during volatile emergency situations. Our educators rapidly detect disruptions and issues – and they develop, deliver, and update vetted support by collaborating statewide, across organizational boundaries, and in real time. To effectively bring this potential to fruition, coordination and communication of emergent distributed emergency responses is vital - and this in turn requires rapid and nimble ways to quality control data from distributed authors and sources.

Results

Our quality control process has led to an overall improvement and standardization of our institutional reporting process which has enhanced data quality and allowed us to roll out public facing resources that promote Extension work in a clear and consistent manner.

It has also enabled us to identify common data quality issues to target and create pipelines for standardized feedback as well as tailored help materials to provide to colleagues so that subsequent reporting can be

improved. This improvement of overall data quality, in turn enhances the scope and quality of synthesized products generated from the data.

Recommendations for Future Practice

The quality of an analytical product is a reflection of the data from which it is generated. Providing clear and consistent feedback within an organization performing the widespread work expected of Extension requires a system that can flexibly evaluate that work. Integrating this system within the same platform that analytical work occurs creates a greater familiarity with the data, enhancing analyst understanding of the possibilities, limitations, and growth points of the data pool.

Benefit to NAEPSDP Participants and Practice

Demonstrate a tested technique/system and prompt a discussion of the balance between flexibility and precise communication of record feedback. Explore the fundamental relationship between program support operations and educators delivering educational services in communities.

Facilitating teamwork during COVID-19: Lessons Learned from Analyzing Extensions' COVID Response

Christian Schmieder, Joel Drevlow
University of Wisconsin

Abstract

The University of Wisconsin Madison - Division of Extension had an immediate need to understand and communicate our state-wide responses to COVID-19, and how our staff adapted program delivery to online channels and social distancing settings. Additionally, we needed to understand how existing local issues (such as farm sustainability or equitable access to safe and healthy food) intensified during the developing emergency.

With the beginning of the pandemic, our educators were asked to write and update brief weekly narratives on their local work and to submit them to our central Planning and Reporting Platform. Up to 200 narratives per week are submitted to the system, allowing us to monitor how our organization's emergency response develops during a rapidly evolving situation.

Continuously analyzing large amounts of qualitative data is a challenge in itself - the pandemic also intensified this particular challenge because our evaluation team had to analyze data remotely.

In this presentation, we will show how the Data Governance Team at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, Division of Extension managed the analysis of 1500+ activity narratives by leveraging the functions of Microsoft Teams and the Qualitative Data Analysis Software MAXQDA. While describing the technical solutions that helped us facilitate this ongoing project we will focus on best practices regarding staying 'on the same page' as a virtual analysis team, especially during the development of qualitative coding schemes.

Significance

Getting evaluative analysis done using virtual means has become an organizational necessity during the COVID crisis, and may become the 'new normal' in many Extension settings. The development of best practices, workflows and the assessment of various technical solutions is therefore imperative when it comes to understanding, maintaining (and improving) the quality of virtual Extension evaluation work.

Results

Our analytic strategy has led to the timely development of various internal and external COVID response reports as well as to an interactive, weekly updated COVID impact map (https://fyi.extension.wisc.edu/covid19/impacts/). Further, our analytic strategy has provided our organization with a pre-structured COVID response dataset that is currently used by Evaluators and Program Managers for program planning and stakeholder reporting purposes. Further, we currently use analytic products and strategies from our process for an internal study on how Extension serves under-served/non-traditional audiences during the pandemic.

Recommendations for Future Practice

Consistent and focused communication regarding the analytic process, responsibilities and results is key to any analysis project. This is even more so the case when analysts cannot meet in person to discuss processes, to informally check in with questions or to look over each other's shoulder to get on the same page regarding analytic strategy and products. We therefore recommend developing explicit analysis plans and communication strategies so that virtual projects do not automatically become a chore due to physical distance. Based on this, we recommend limiting teamwork to as few technological platforms as possible. We further recommend utilizing Qualitative Data Analysis Software as a backbone for the analysis of program outcome narratives, especially when it comes to keeping the data and analytic products (coding definitions, coded data, draft reports) in one space.

Benefit to NAEPSDP Participants and Practice

Through our presentation, we will share some stress-tested practices and lessons learned from our own work. We also hope to spark discussions related to the virtual team-based analysis of program reporting data. With our contribution, we also aim to create a space for other Extension professionals to share their own strategies, and to potentially seed the collaboration on a set of best practices for team-based data analysis in the "new normal".

Staying Connected: Lessons Learned Utilizing Technology to Link Nonformal Education Lesson Study Facilitators

Janet Fox, Esther Boe
Louisiana State University

Abstract

Importance/Significance of the Topic

The 4-H Youth Development Program is a world leader in offering nonformal experiential education to K-12 youth (National 4-H Council, 2015). Lesson study provides a dynamic pedagogical approach to support learning in experiential settings. According to researchers, the use of lesson study in 4-H is limited to a few 4-H state programs; however, the impacts from lesson study have been favorable (Schmitt-McQuitty, Worker, & Smith, 2019).

Traditional lesson study context differs from nonformal education programs. One major difference is that educators participate face-to-face in the traditional lesson study process. In nonformal education programs, educators often participate in different locations (Schmitt-McQuitty et al., 2019). Recognizing this difference, the traditional lesson study model has been adapted by utilizing technology as a critical tool to bridge distance between participants. Necessary modifications have been critical to adapt lesson study for nonformal educational settings. Lesson study efficacy is measured with educator and student reflection shared through virtual monthly meetings. Process and End-of-year youth evaluations and educator surveys help administrators know whether the program is effective.

Description of the Delivery Method or Results

This study examines the real-life experiences of fourteen lesson study leaders and how they utilized technology to bridge distance in leading lesson study groups.   Each lesson study leader conducted a monthly meeting through Skype or Microsoft Teams, allowing the flexibility of call-in. Lesson study members utilized computers and smart phones to join meetings. Additionally, between meeting communication and follow-up was generally conducted via e-mail and occasional individual phone calls.

Using a case study approach, this investigation revealed lessons learned and promising practices in assembling, implementing, and evaluating a lesson study team at a distance.   Interviews with fourteen lesson study leaders were conducted, recorded and transcribed. Member checking was used to ensure transcript accuracy. Two researchers reviewed the transcripts multiple times coding emerging themes (Creswell, 2013). Four themes emerged regarding integration of technology including: organization, training, intentionality, and communication.

Recommendations for Future Practice

Organization - Organization was critical in maintaining a schedule of virtual meetings, assignments, and timeline. Leaders learned that it was important to pre-schedule a full year of meetings as well as assign roles for shared leadership.   Some saw the value of participants being able to pre-submit questions and reflections, with

one leader asking for a list of benefits and challenges before each meeting. Sharing these tactics would help those leaders who felt that the educators could not participate fully in the meetings. Leaders also asked for training in virtual meeting facilitation to address this challenge.

Training - Training is needed to address the different levels of comfort with technology.   "We had to learn by doing, but we can never have enough technology training." Some teams used additional platforms to collect reflections and enhance lesson content, necessitating additional group leader and educator orientation. One leader suggested that leaders take the responsibility of teaching their members how to best utilize technology and move towards choosing a platform, such as Microsoft Teams, as a universal lesson study hub. Technology training, in the form of frequent brief sessions and user guides, provided a critical foundation to support lesson study facilitation.

Intentionality - Researchers and program administrators should focus on intentional, systematic technology approaches in supporting high-quality lesson study processes. To increase adoption and usage of technology, lesson study members had to be intentionally directed to participate to the virtual platforms with information sharing and assignments.

Communication - Frequent communication was a centerpiece of the success of lesson study, aided by technological tools of saved chats, uploaded files, and calendar reminders. An unexpected benefit of technology utilization was networking among colleagues which connected seasoned educators with new educators.

By adapting traditional lesson study methods and utilizing technology as a tool to bridge distance between geographically distant participants, Cooperative Extension has effectively utilized lesson study to support and enhance professional development and enrich experiential learning among youth members.

Benefit to NAEPSDP Participants and Practice

Cooperative Extension depends on technology to support and enhance professional development. Utilizing technology in practice is necessary to effectively administer this program. Technology has an important place in supporting the pedagogical foundations of lesson study to equitably reach all audiences. Overall, this project placed an emphasis on technology and its utilization within lesson study efforts. This session benefits NAEPSDP members by sharing collaborative efforts among educators which are enhanced by technology. Through communication and collaboration, this methodology highlights individual strengths, diminishes personal weaknesses, advances sound program development, promotes meaningful staff development, and builds synergy.

References

Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Productions.

National 4-H Council. (2015). *Global Clover Network Strategy: Growing a Better Future by Investing in Youth Today*. Available at: https://4-h.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/GLOBAL-CLOVER-NETWORK-STRATEGY.pdf

Schmitt-McQuitty, L., Worker, S. M., & Smith, M. H. (2019). The lesson study model of professional development in 4-H: Supporting data-driven improvements to educator practice. *Journal of Youth Development, 14(*1). Retrieved from http://jyd.pitt.edu/ojs/jyd/article/view/19-14-01-PA-01.

Extension Faculty's Ability to Address Complex Problems of Clientele

Andree' Walker Bravo, Lendel Narine, Paul Hill
Utah State University

Abstract

Cooperative Extension professionals are often asked to be a "jack of all trades", performing duties not only related to their chosen field of study, but also tasks such as working with clientele to solve uncommon and complex issues, demonstrating the value of Extension work to stakeholders, and implementing appropriate educational strategies for different clientele. Thus, Extension professionals are expected to possess a wide range of competencies. Subject Matter Expertise (SME) competence refers to the "technical knowledge and skills possessed to perform tasks related to a specific field(s)" (Harder, 2015, p. 2). It deals with Extension faculty's ability to use specialized knowledge to find, create, and/or apply relevant research to solve complex problems faced by clientele. Given the mission of Cooperative Extension, SME competence facilitates Extension faculty's success in working directly with different target audiences; it entails working directly with clientele to solve their problems. Professional development opportunities targeting SME competence are necessary to support our faculty members at [State] University Extension in their efforts to serve our communities and be successful in the Cooperative Extension System.

This study sought to assess the SME competence of [State] University faculty. A list of SME competencies was identified from a literature review (Harder, Scheer, & Place, 2011; Liles, 2004; Scheer, Cochran, Harder, & Place, 2011; Suvedi & Kaplowitz, 2016). The following SME competency items were examined in this study: (1) Recommend the most appropriate strategies for solving clientele issues; (2) Find research that demonstrates or validates the major problem affecting communities; (3) Work with experts and/or specialists to find solutions to complex problems facing clientele; (4) Solve complex problems facing clientele; (5) Contribute to applied research intended for publication in an academic journal; (6) Conduct your own research on a problem affecting clientele or communities; (7) Find USU research to provide solutions to clientele problems/issues; (8) Use USU research to support your recommendations to clientele; and (9) Interpret USU research in simple language for clientele.

This IRB-exempt study used a descriptive research design (Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, & Walker, 2014). The target population was Extension educators at [State] University Extension directly involved in planning, implementing, and evaluating Extension programs. The study attempted to collect data from a census of the population (N = 134). With a 56% response rate, the final sample consisted of 74 Extension educators (n = 75). The primary data-collection instrument was a Qualtrics questionnaire that followed the Borich (1980) framework. Participants were asked to indicate on a five-point scale (a) their perception towards the importance of SME competencies, and (b) their ability to perform the SMS competencies. The Rank-Order approach was used to assess gaps in SME competencies (Narine & Harder, 2019).

Results indicated faculty perceived all nine SME competency items were of at least above average importance to job success in Extension. However, faculty were less confident in their ability to perform the competencies. Consequently, results from the Rank-Order approach showed a gap between perceived importance and ability for all SME competencies. This suggests a need for professional development in the broad competency area of Subject Matter Expertise. As demonstrated in the literature, results of this study emphasize the importance of

Subject Matter Expertise competencies in Extension (Harder, Scheer, & Place, 2011; Suvedi & Kaplowitz, 2016).

Other land grant universities can replicate or conduct similar studies to assess faculty's performance of SME competencies to determine if such a need exists. Consistently, this study also replicates a new methodological framework (Narine & Harder, 2019) to evaluate professional development priorities. It is recommended Extension in other land grant institutions conduct professional development assessment regularly to measure changes in their capacity to meet clientele evolving needs. These assessments can provide administrators with the information needed to offer opportunities to Extension faculty to participate in relevant professional development trainings.

This study also recommends Utah University Extension provide professional development opportunities for Extension faculty on SME competencies to ensure they can effectively meet the complex needs of clientele. Specifically, the SME competencies that were of highest priority for professional development were "Recommend the most appropriate strategies for solving clientele issues" and "Find research that demonstrates or validates the major problem affecting communities". Professional development trainings could focus on strategies for meeting needs of diverse clientele through strategic initiatives with stakeholder support. Finally, the study recommends conducting an annual assessment of Extension competencies to monitor and respond to the changing professional capacity of [State] University Extension. Such assessments can ensure consistency in the quality of Extension programming.

References

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen, C., & Walker, D. A. (2014). *Introduction to research in education* (9th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Cooper, A. W., & Graham, D. L. (2001). Competencies needed to be successful county agents and county supervisors. *Journal of Extension, 39*(1), Article 1RIB3. Available at: https://www.joe.org/joe/2001february/rb3.php

Harder, A. (2015). *Priority competencies needed by UF/IFAS Extension county faculty*. Florida Cooperative Extension Electronic Data Information Source. Retrieved from http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/wc236

Harder, A., & Israel, G. (2011). *Strengthening extension program development competencies: A MEAS Training Module*. Retrieved from https://meas.illinois.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/MEAS-TM-Strengthening-Extension-Program-Dev-Competencies-Harder-Israel-Oct-2011.pdf

Harder, A., Scheer, S., & Place, N. (2011). Improving the future of U.S. Cooperative Extension: A Delphi study. *Journal of Extension Systems, 27*(2), 1-10.

Henning, J., Buchholz, D., Steele, D., & Ramaswamy, S. (2014). Milestones and the future for Cooperative Extension. *Journal of Extension, 52*(6), Article 6COM1. Available at: https://www.joe.org/joe/2014december/comm1.php

Lieberson, S. (1976). Rank-sum comparisons between groups. *Sociological Methodology, 7*(1976), 276-291. doi: 10.2307/270713

Liles, R. T. (2004). Core competencies: a systems approach for training and organizational development in extension. *Journal of Agricultural Education and Extension, 10*(2), 77-82.

Lindner, J. R., Murphy, T. H., & Briers, G. E. (2001). Handling nonresponse in social science research. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 42*(4), 43-53.

McClelland, D. (1973). Testing for competence rather than intelligence. *American Psychologist, 28*(1), 1-14. doi: 10.1037/h0034092

McClure, M., Fuhrman, N. E., & Morgan, A. (2012). Program evaluation competencies of extension professionals: Implications for continuing professional development. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 53*(4), 85-97. doi:10.5032/jae.2012.04085

Scales, J., Terry, R., Torres, R. M. (2009). Are teachers ready to integrate science concepts into secondary agriculture programs? *Journal of Agricultural Education, 50*(2), 100-111. doi: 10.5032/jae.2009.02100

Scheer, S. D., Cochran, S. D., Harder, A., & Place, N. T. (2011). Competency modeling in Extension education: Integrating an academic extension education model with an extension human resource management model. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 52*(3), 64–74. doi: 10.5032/jae.2011.03064

Suvedi, M., & Kaplowitz, M. (2016). *What every extension worker should know: Core competency handbook.* U.S. Agency for International Development. Retrieved from https://agrilinks.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/MEAS%20(2016)%20Extension%20Handbook%20%20Suvedi%20Kaplowitz%20-%202016_02_15.pdf

Program Playbooks: Choose, Clarify, and Create Cohesion in Program Efforts

Teresa McCoy
Ohio State University

Virginia Brown
University of Georgia

Abstract

Importance/Significance

The Extension system is a dynamic, changing organism. While it may appear to be static in many ways, each unit experiences changes in leadership, educators, and program focus. Further, outside forces including pandemics, budget crises, and changes in political leadership can affect the functioning of the organization. It is vital for Extension personnel to have a way to preserve institutional knowledge of our program and research efforts to ensure the foundations and quality of Extension programs. We need strategies to collectively choose, clarify, and create cohesion among program team members. A program playbook provides understanding of program efforts both to internal and external stakeholders. It is a one-stop source—a repository—that makes explicit program theories being used, programs offered by the organization, and agreed-upon evaluation approaches.

Description of Delivery Methods

During the past five years, UME's Family and Consumer Sciences program experienced the retirement and departure of many senior faculty. New educators were being hired to fill these gaps, and new positions were being established in clusters that typically had not had a full-time FCS educator. The organization also was focused on strengthening the on-boarding and mentoring of all new educators. The dovetailing of these organizational events led the FCS team to seize on the opportunity to articulate the program areas goals and focus; identify foundational theories and frameworks of programs; and, research and document situation statements in each focus area. In addition, common evaluation indicators were developed to use across the programs. All of this was combined into a document called a "playbook." Playbooks, such as those used in sports, provide the plays of the team, are used by all team members, and give the common vocabulary and language of the team. In theatre, playbooks contain scripts and stories to prepare actors to perform. The goals of the FCS playbook were much like that of football and theatre: have a document that could be given to a new educator that would provide the common understanding of programs, including the theoretical frameworks, situation descriptions, program implementation, and program evaluation.

To create the playbook, Extension specialists, the director of evaluation and a mix of tenured and nontenured faculty volunteered to join a work group. The team met face-to-face once a month with research or homework occurring between. The team first focused on critically examining existing programs efforts and how those aligned with the newly released Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) Health and Wellness Framework. The team also reviewed many of the current wellness models and chose to use the Eight Dimensions of Wellness model created by Peggy Swarbrick and Jay Yudof. This wellness model incorporates eight (8) dimensions of wellness: physical, emotional, social, occupational, intellectual, financial,

environmental and spiritual. The creators of this particular model define wellness in similar terms to the National Wellness Institute. Wellness is a conscious, deliberate process that requires being aware of and making choices for a more satisfying lifestyle (Swarbrick and Yudof, 2015).

Behavioral and health theories used by the major programs were identified and summarized. A situation statement of each target area was created reflective Maryland's communities, serving as a baseline for efforts. Each major program was examined to identify target outputs and outcomes for common measurement. Finally, the playbook was intentionally made a living document to allow for refinement and updates.

Recommendations for Future Practice with NAEPSDP

The results of this effort were both organizational and programmatic. The Playbook has served as an onboarding document for all new FCS faculty. When created new programs, the playbook is consulted to ensure alignment with our focus areas. It has allowed faculty to identify how they contribute to not only Maryland work but the broader Cooperative Extension System. Finally, it serves as a repository for program outcomes and assists in the creation of new evaluation efforts. We believe this type of effort can be built upon and/or duplicated by other FCS programs.

Benefit to NAEPSDP

Association members will benefit through learning the: 1) process and approaches used to create the playbook, 2) content of the playbook, and 3) benefits of engaging in this type of effort. Members will also benefit through the incorporation of this material into their own unique playbook.

References

Swarbrick, M., & Yudof, J. (2015). *Wellness in eight dimensions*. Collaborative Support Programs of New Jersey, Inc.

Applying Focused Excellence: The Program Area Framework

Amy Parrott, Michael Hauser, Joshua Farella,
University of Arizona

Abstract

Significance of Topic

A challenge for Cooperative Extension personnel is balancing specialization and generalization. Generalization is required to satisfy the diversity of needs encountered by Extension professionals. While not in direct opposition to academic achievement, we all recognize that our generalist role oftentimes dominates our schedules at a cost to academic success. This as a reality of Cooperative Extension, yet we must also establish mechanisms to achieve within our field and institution. The concept of 'focused excellence' is recognized as a valuable strategy in accomplishing this. In the application of focused excellence, we propose there are three key areas – program delivery, program management, and program development. These essential elements, which we have termed the "Program Area Framework," (PAF) are a useful template for recognizing time, energy, and other investments made that effect outcomes and productivity. We suggest here that the Program Area Framework be utilized by faculty as a guide for the achievement of focused excellence, i.e. a means to assess the efficacy of programming efforts and focus the allocation of time and energy towards greater success.

Delivery Method or Results

As Extension professionals, we need to become specialized to earn legitimacy and recognition. Leahey notes that, "Specializing serves as professional capital because it is foundational to almost every conceptual definition of professional expertise," (2007, p. 538). Our presentation will address the gap between the need for academic success, and the multi-directionality that permeates Extension work. The Program Area Framework is designed to bridge academic visibility/legitimacy, and the multitude of stakeholder needs inherent in day to day work. The Program Area Framework is a step towards creating an applied model for the implementation of focused excellence. Extension faculty and staff spend significant time delivering, designing, and managing programming and content. This model outlines the roles and responsibilities in each of these areas. This framework can be useful within Extension to assess staff roles, understand how resources are utilized, and adapt efforts for better outcomes.

Benefit to NAEPSDP

The Program Area Framework:
Program delivery is most basic level of programming. It is doing all the activities related to a program. This program areas is essentially logistical – gathering materials, organizing supplies, organizing specific activities, and planning day to day details. The time required for direct delivery can often limit a staff member's ability to focus on the overarching goals, purpose and desired outcomes.

Program management is supervising people and resources. It is time spent on training, coaching, and directing people, in addition to responding to situations that arise. This is not just managing people as they perform their duties and functions, it's helping others see the bigger picture to create buy-in. This helps volunteers see the

vision and understand the objectives to eliminate possible conflict or misunderstanding at the end of the program. Commonly, too much time and energy are spent on managing personnel and not enough on program evaluation and outcomes.

Program development is creating, growing, analyzing, building, evaluating, improving, assessing, or changing a program to meet stakeholder needs. This area necessitates seeing the big picture and is perhaps the most important task for Extension Agents. This area can be frustrating and hard to see immediate results. It is time consuming to turn activities into programs, but that is the nature of Extension. It can be even more difficult to step back and let local leaders, program staff and others ensure that the details of a program are addressed. However, it is necessary that Agents spend time evaluating and sharing the results of these efforts.

Recommendations for NAEPSDP

Focused excellence is essential for maximizing institutional success, and creating effective outcomes within a field. The Program Area Framework should be utilized by Extension professionals to implement focused excellence, i.e. clearly define their areas of expertise, and manage time and energy more effectively. We see the PAF as a pathway towards subject matter expertise, institutional connectivity, productivity, and visibility. Recognition is achieved when the scholarly community knows your name, is familiar with your work, and generally thinks highly of your intellectual contributions, (van Dalen and Henkens 2005). This allows faculty to achieve legitimacy for their area of focus and brings attention to the work being done at the University. Essentially, these processes culminate in a faculty member becoming the 'clear' contact for programming or information, i.e. the assumed reference for certain expertise. The challenge is maintaining focused excellence while being pulled in multiple program directions. It is difficult to know and acknowledge what programming direction is optimal when being pulled in different directions on a continuous basis.

References

Aiken, L.H. & Sloane, D.M. (1997). Effects of specialization and client differentiation on the status of nurses: The case of AIDS. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior 38*, 203-22.

Archer, T. M., Warner, P.D., Miller, W., Clark C.D., James, S., Cummings, S.R., & Adamu, U. (2007). Excellence in extension: Two products for definition and measurement. *Journal of Extension 45*(1).

Birnbaum, P.H. (1981). Integration and specialization in academic research. *The Academy of Management Journal 24*(3), 487-503.

Braverman, H. (1975). *Labor and monopoly capital: The degradation of work in the twentieth century*. Monthly Review Press.

Cole, Jonathan & Cole, S. (1973). *Social stratification in science*. University of Chicago Press.

Cole, J. R. & Zuckerman, H. (1984). The productivity puzzle: Persistence and change in patterns of publication of men and women scientists. *Advances in Motivation and Achievement 2*, 217-58.

Collins, H. M. & Evans, R. (2002). The third wave of science studies: Studies of expertise and experience. *Social Studies of Science 32*(2), 235-96.

Faulkner, W., Fleck, J., & Williams, R. (1998). *Exploring expertise: issues and perspectives.* Macmillan Press.

Garfield, E. (1981). The 1,000 contemporary scientists most cited 1965-1978. *Current Contents 41*, 5-14.

Hackett, E J. (2005). Essential tensions: identity, control, and risk in research. *Social Studies of Science 35*(5), 787-826.

Leahey, E. (2007). Not by productivity alone: how visibility and specialization contribute to academic earnings. *American Sociological Review 72*(4), 533-61.

Saunders, K. S., & Reese, D. (2011). Developing a roadmap for excellence in extension. Journal of Extension 49(3).

Smith, R. A. (2002). Race, gender, and authority in the workplace: theory and research. *Annual Review of Sociology 28*(1), 509-42.

Turner, S. (2001). What is the problem with experts? *Social Studies of Science, 31*(1), 123-49.

van Dalen, H. & Henkens, H. (2005). Signals in science: on the importance of signaling in gaining attention in science. *Scientometrics, 64(*2), 209-33.

Zuckerman, H. (1977). *Scientific elite: Nobel laureates in the United States*. Transaction Publishers.

United States Census Bureau. https://www.census.gov/data.html, accessed 6/2020

Extension Work in a World with Artificial Intelligence, Remote Work, and New Funding Models

Thomas Jerold, Julie Aldrige, Emma Newell
Ohio State University

Abstract

Since March of 2020 much of the world, including cooperative extension, has been forced to work in a shutdown world. But we are creating a new world of work. One that has experiments in virtual worlds and uses emerging technologies. Our conversation focuses on discussing emerging technologies and their impact on Extension. Among the technologies and trends we will discuss are:

- Artificial intelligence
- Virtual work
- Virtual teaching
- Economic Impacts
- Demographic changes

Importance/Significance of the Topic

All of these trends will impact Extension and outreach/engagement. As we move away from working in a central office we also need to change our work processes, including how teams work, how supervision is applied, and how we measure productivity. One example is the ROWE model developed to focus on rewarding agreed to results versus activity.

Description of Delivery Methods

The results will be shared via an online presentation focusing on what the trends are and their impact on Extension. A link to slides and a resource handout will be provided.

Recommendations for Future Practice

We will share not only findings, but implications for future Extension practice. These will cover future workspace, funding issues, human resources, what impact trends like artificial intelligence will have on Extension work.

Benefit

Participants will benefit from the presentation and discussion by having not only an increased awareness of emerging trends, but also how models like the POST method and ROWE can be used in Extension settings.

Developing a Standardized Situational Needs Assessment for Statewide Use: Pilot and Testing in Utah and Florida

Amy Harder, University of Florida
Lendel K. Narine, Utah State University
Diane Craig, University of Florida
Matt Benge, University of Florida
Glenn D. Israel, University of Florida
Olivia Caillouet, University of Florida

Abstract

Importance/Significance of the Topic

The foundation of a successful Extension program is a solid needs assessment (Angima et al., 2014). Needs assessments have been described as a systematic method for identifying deficiencies between the current and desired state (Caffarella, 1982). Needs assessments primarily benefit "people who the organization or agency serves" (Witkin & Altschuld, 1995, p. 6). Regarding Extension, needs assessments have been described as a useful tool for meeting "urban, suburban, and rural community needs" (Bayer et al., 2020, para. 2).

Extension has conducted needs assessments of itself, existing clientele, and for specific program needs. However, Extension needs assessments have tended to focus on secondary needs and limited data exists regarding primary needs (Mincemoyer & Corbin, 2011; Phibbs et al., 2005; Singletary et al., 2017; Willie et al., 2019). There appears to be a lack of published statewide needs assessment data, which is a challenge for Extension because this organization was founded with the mission of sharing research-based information to meet community needs (USDA, n.d). It is vital that Extension understands stakeholders' needs to effectively plan programs, allocate resources, and aid in multi-state programming efforts (Garst & McCawley, 2015).

Description of the Process and Results

The initial development of a Situational Needs Assessment survey instrument was conducted for Utah State University Extension (USU Extension) and followed an iterative four-step process. First, secondary data were gathered from governmental and non-governmental sources. National-level sources included the U.S. Census Bureau, and the County Health Rankings and Roadmaps. At a state level, secondary sources included the Utah Department of Health, and the Utah Foundation. Needs assessments conducted by other land-grant institutions were reviewed to identify problems and needs addressed through existing Extension programming in other states. A review of secondary sources led to a comprehensive list of state-specific needs-based items for the questionnaire. Following, an expert panel was created to provide feedback on a questionnaire. The panel consisted of Extension program leaders, specialists, and college-level administrators. The panel was asked to consider the mission of USU Extension and review the list of needs for relevance and accuracy. With a final list of needs-based items, the questionnaire was edited following recommends from Dillman et al.'s (2014) discussion on the basics of crafting good questions. Finally, a pilot test was conducted with 50 individuals of the target population.

With permission from the original author, the Program Development and Evaluation Center (PDEC) team at the University of Florida began work to adopt and adapt the Situational Needs Assessment in Spring 2020. The original instrument was distributed to four PDEC team members to begin an iterative process intended to (a) ensure the existing items were valid for the Florida context, (b) add items unique to the Florida context, (c) shorten the length of the instrument, (d) improve item clarity when necessary, and (e) collect additional demographic information. For example, unique items added addressed hurricanes, saltwater intrusion, and language spoken at home. Questions about respondents' preferences for getting information were removed entirely in the Florida version.

The final Utah instrument had 197 items. A total of 1,043 respondents averaged 26 minutes for completion. The final Florida instrument had 126 items. A total of 1,500 participants averaged ~14 minutes for completion. Utah respondents took slightly longer than Florida respondents (7.8 seconds to 6.6 seconds, on average) to answer each question. The revisions made to the Florida survey may have lessened the cognitive load (Sweller, 1988) for respondents, enabling them to proceed more quickly through the questions. Both instruments resulted in data usable for creating needs-based Extension program plans.

Recommendations for Future NAEPSDP Practice

It is the duty of Extension to both understand and help meet the needs of local constituents; however, needs assessments are often underutilized and not conducted properly. NAEPSDP members should be utilizing strong methodologies to ensure accurate and reliable data to drive Extension practice and programs; collaboration across states can decrease individual workloads and increase the quality of the process and resulting data. NAEPSDP practitioners can replicate the use of the Situational Needs Assessment instrument to inform programming decisions at various levels throughout their state.

Benefits to NAEPSDP Participants and Practice

Participants will learn about the design, implementation, and results of both the Utah and Florida statewide surveys so they can replicate in their own state. Extension practice can improve by having agents and specialists utilize valid and reliable needs assessment data to develop their own Plans of Work, create situational analysis infographics, and/or build interactive data dashboards for strategic planning.

References

Angima, S., Etuk, L., & King, D. (2014). Using needs assessment as a tool to strengthen funding proposals. *Journal of Extension, 52*(6), Article v52-6tt1. https://joe.org/joe/2014december/tt1.php

Bayer, R., Mitchell-Hawkins, V., & Travis, A. (2020). Needs assessment tool kit. *Journal of Extension, 58*(1), Article v58-1tt1. https://joe.org/joe/2020february/tt1.php

Caffarella, R. S. (1982). Identifying client needs. *Journal of Extension, 20*(4), 1-11. https://www.joe.org/joe/1982july/82-4-a1.pdf

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Garst, B. A., & McCawley, P. F. (2015). Solving problems, ensuring relevance, and facilitating change: The evolution of needs assessment within Cooperative Extension. *Journal of Human Sciences and Extension, 3*(2). https://www.jhseonline.com/article/view/684/588

Mincemoyer, C. C., & Corbin, M. (2011). Computer-mediated needs assessment to identify 4-H youth curriculum needs. *Journal of Extension, 39*(5), Article 5R1B7. https://www.joe.org/joe/2001october/rb7.php

Phibbs, E., Relf, D., & Hunnings, J. (2005). Implementing a needs assessment for long-term strategic planning in 4-H horticulture programming. *Journal of Extension, 43*(4), Article 4R1B7. https://www.joe.org/joe/2005august/rb7.php

Singletary, L., Smith, M., Hill, G., Daniels, S., Smutko, S., Ayres, J., & Haaland, K. (2007). Strengthening Extension's capacity to conduct public issues education programs: Results of a national needs assessment. *Journal of Extension, 45*(3), Article 3FEA1. https://www.joe.org/joe/2007june/a1.php

Sweller, J. (1988). Cognitive load during problem solving: Effects on learning. *Cognitive Science, 12*, 257–285. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15516709cog1202_

United States Department of Agriculture [USDA]. (n.d.). *Extension*. Retrieved from https://nifa.usda.gov/extension

Willie, C. G., Garcia, Z., & Garcia- Pabón, J. (2019). Collaborating across state lines to leverage cultural competency expertise. *Journal of Extension, 57*(3), Article v57-3tt6. https://www.joe.org/joe/2019june/tt6.php

Witkin, B. R., & Altschuld, J. W. (1995). *Planning and conducting needs assessments: A practical guide*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Formative Evaluation of a Remote Work Program for Utah Organizational Leaders

Amanda Ali, Paul Hill,
Utah State University

Abstract

Introduction and Theoretical Framework

Remote work is the ability to work any location other than a central office (Siha & Monroe, 2006). With advances in technology and internet speeds, remote work is increasingly popular as an alternative work arrangement (Katz & Krueger, 2016). The availability of enhanced mobile and internet connections at affordable rates further propels the prospect of remote work opportunities in organizations (Allen et al., 2015). In [State], more people migrate out of rural communities in search of job opportunities, and businesses struggle to find workers (Heaton, 2019). A needs assessment (Narine, 2019) found well-paying and 'steady jobs' to be in the top three priority needs for rural [State] counties. As such, [State] Legislature viewed remote work as an economic development priority and strategy to reduce rural unemployment and rural-urban migration. The Master Remote Work Leader (MRWL) certificate course was developed as an innovative one-month educational training for [State] organizational leaders. Although this course started before COVID-19, remote work is critical to business continuity, economic development, and employment opportunities.

Purpose and Objectives

The aim of the course was to provide organizational leaders with core skills and appropriate techniques to create a remote work environment in their organizations. The course's evaluation plan was aligned to Rockwell and Bennett's (2004) Targeting Outcomes of Programs (TOP) model. Following the TOP model, the study's purpose was to conduct a formative evaluation of the course's short-term outcomes. The specific objective was to describe the knowledge, attitudes, skills, and aspirations of participants after completing the MRWL course.

Methods

The target audience were organizational leaders with businesses located along the urban [region]. This study collected census data from participants enrolled in the April 2020 cohort (N = 37). Two instruments gathered data; a pre-and-post-test measured knowledge gain, and an exit survey assessed attitudes, perceived skill acquisition, and aspirations to create remote work environments. The pre-and-post-test consisted of multiple-choice questions based on seven modules. The exit questionnaire consisted of operational constructs for skills, and items for attitudes and aspirations. An expert panel reviewed the exit questionnaire for validity. A five-point Likert scale assessed statements under each construct. Overall mean scores were interpreted as follows: 1.00 – 1.49 = much worse, 1.50 – 2.49 = somewhat worse, 2.50 – 3.49 = stayed the same, 3.50 – 4.49 = somewhat better, and 4.50 – 5.0 = much better (Scales, Terry, & Torres, 2009). A paired t-test measured knowledge gain, and descriptive statistics were reported for attitudes, skills, and aspirations. The null hypothesis for the paired t-test was rejected at $p < 0.05$.

Findings and Results

Participants were mostly female (62%) and on average 46 years old. For knowledge, results showed statistically significant differences between pre-and-post test scores for six modules; culture (t = 5.10, p < .001); performance management (t = 4.90, p < .001); conflict management (t = 5.34, p < .001); vision (t = 7.64, p < .001); change management (t = 4.05, p < .001); and learning and development (t = 3.58, p < .05). Participants demonstrated significant increases in their knowledge of creating a remote work environment. Regarding attitudes, participants felt favorably towards creating remote work environments. For skills, all participants expressed an increase in their remote work leader skills. There were high overall mean scores for: remote work culture (M = 4.73, SD = 0.36), communication (M = 4.74, SD = 0.35), performance management (M = 4.70, SD = 0.43), conflict management (M = 4.65, SD = 0.42), vision (M = 4.74, SD = 0.40), change management (M = 4.65, SD = 0.49), and learning and development (M = 4.65, SD = 0.54). All participants felt their value as a remote work leader improved; 91% said they were likely to create remote work positions in their organizations.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The MRWL course showed progress in meeting short-term outcomes with increases in knowledge, favorable attitudes, improved skills, and positive intentions to create remote work environments. With the ability to effectively manage remote employees, organizational leaders were willing to create remote work environments in their organizations. These results suggest participants value remote work as an option for business continuity and employment opportunities in rural [State] communities. In the long-run, this ultimately helps reduce rural unemployment and rural-urban migration.

Although the preliminary evaluation showed positive short-term outcomes, there is room for improvement. The communication module showed no statistically significant differences in pre-and-post test scores. The study recommends conducting short follow-ups with participants for feedback on module improvement and continued formative evaluation for overall course refinement. Continued evaluation is important for program enhancement which supports tracking outcomes in summative evaluations to show eventual program impact.

References

Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychology Science in the Public Interest, 16*(2), 40—68. 10.1177/1529100615593273

Heaton, K. (2019). *The state of rural Utah: 2019 report*. The Utah Community Development Office. https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/e4afbad5b37d46dba5fc99e90f8d8a60

Katz, L., & Krueger, A. (2016). *The rise and nature of alternative work arrangements in the United States, 1995-2015* (Working Paper 22667). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://www.nber.org/papers/w22667.pdf

Narine, L. K. (2019). *Situational needs assessment of Utah*. Utah State University Extension. https://extension.usu.edu/employee/program-evaluation/statewide-needs-assessment

Rockwell, K., & Bennett, C. (2004). *Targeting outcomes of programs (TOP): A hierarchy for targeting outcomes and evaluating their achievement*. https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/aglecfacpub/48/

Scales, J., Terry, R., & Torres, R. M. (2009). Are teachers ready to integrate science concepts into secondary agriculture programs? *Journal of Agricultural Education, 50*(2), 100—111. 10.5032/jae.2009.02100

Shia, S. M., & Monroe, R. W. (2006). Telecommuting's past and future: A literature review and research agenda. *Business Process Management Journal, 12*(4), 455—482. https://doi.org/10.1108/14637150610678078

Learn and Lead for Success

Nancy Hegland, Trisha Sheehan, Amber Shanahan
University of Minnesota Extension

Abstract

The need to provide consistent, relevant, and meaningful staff development has never been greater. The University of Minnesota Center for Youth Development has always prided itself in providing strong onboarding, however discovered that additional training was essential to keep employees engaged, strengthen their sense of belonging, and have them feel welcomed to our organization. This need for Extension organizations to deliver high quality training continues to be a topic that garners strong interest throughout all stages of one's career.

Youth Development Learn and Lead consists of three co-hort trainings, focused on providing the learning needed at the right time for employees. The YDLL cohorts ground new educators in the training they need for the first six months, allows them to go deeper in the Anchor co-hort where they also complete an Action Learning project, and the final co-hort focuses on a specific topic, such as volunteer development. The co-horts not only provide the content that new educators need, it also allows them to connect with others and develop relationships.

The YDLL Onboarding co-hort begins on their first day of employment with specific content for the first two weeks. On weeks 3 and 18, new educators come to the U of M campus to meet colleagues and have hands on learning experiences. On weeks 4-17, webinars are conducted weekly which allow new educators to learn more specifics through a consistent message with regional follow up later. This change has been successful in ensuring that all new employees hear the same message. The onboarding co-hort has been in it's current fomat for two years, with evaluation data providing opportunties to adjust for the next sessions. In MN, we hire local educators three times per year, with consistent start dates, which allows the training to delivered to the co-hort of new hires.

YDLL - Anchor was the first pilot to develop a closed-cohort learning model that provides more ongoing support past the onboarding stage. Using the closed-cohort model of program delivery can enhance students' professional learning and skill development (Barnett, Basom, Yerkes, & Norris, 2000; Hebert & Reynolds, 1998; Peel, Wallace, Buckner, Wrenn, & Evans, 1998) because it creates a learning environment where all participants experience a sense of belonging (i.e., feel valued and accepted), understand their collective purpose (i.e., share common commitment and goals), and actively and purposefully engage in group learning activities (i.e., recognize the value of interdependence and interaction) (Barnett et al., 2000).

The anchor co hort is designed for staff who have completed the onboarding process and had been in their roles for six to 18 months. The eight month cohort is offered both face-to-face and online; the hybrid nature providing continuous connection while limiting travel time and expense related to in-person meetings.

YDLL objectives were notably focused on networking and relationship building and were determined based on feedback:

Enhance professional youth worker relationships and foster a learning community through networking and collaborative activities.
Influence professional relationship building through the sharing of applicable skills and theory, and by providing a community of practice to discuss ideas and share resources.
Build tangible skills that can be applied immediately to their position.
Deliver relevant and research based information.

Recognizing the richest resources for learning reside in adult learners themselves (Ota, DiCarlo, Burts, Laird, and Gioe, 2006), the cohort design is based on participatory leadership and the Art of Hosting practices, allowing participants to co-lead throughout the experience and providing space for facilitated dialogue and informal discussion. The development and modification of each subsequent cohort series relies heavily on feedback from participants to ensure the training remains relevant and valuable.

Our staff development plan emphasizes the need to create cohorts for learning as the ongoing, long-term model with participant-led action learning used as a mechanism to establish participant ownership of the training. This model is focused on cohorts of learners who are part of YDLL - Onboarding and YDLL - Anchor, which is their main training for the first two years in their role.

Based on feedback received through an experienced staff survey as well as requests for additional staff development, we implemented the Sustain version of the YDL&L cohort. The Sustain Cohort was developed to focus on a specific topic of learning that would provide more in depth training. Recent evaluation results from the five years of co-hort learning will be shared during the presentation.

Youth Development Learn and Lead has led to colleagues feeling supported, motivated, and welcomed, and prepared for their role in our organization.

References

Arnold, S., & Place, N. (2010). What influences agents to pursue a career in Extension? *Journal of Extension, 48*(1), Article 1RIB1. Available at: https://joe.org/joe/2010february/rb1.php

Branham, L. (2005). *The 7 hidden reasons employees leave*. New York, NY: AMACOM.

Barnett, B. G., Basom, M. R., Yerkes, D. M., & Norris, C. J. (2000). Cohorts in educational leadership programs: Benefits, difficulties, and the potential for developing school leaders. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 36*(2), 255–282.

Hartje, J., Evans, W., Killian, E., & Brown, R. (2008). Youth worker characteristics and self-reported competency as predictors of intent to continue working with youth. *Child and Youth Care Forum, 37*(1), 27–41. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10566-007-9048-9

Growing Together - 4-H Professional, Research, Knowledge, and Competencies 2017 USDA - NIFA https://nifa.usda.gov/sites/default/files/resources/4-H-PRKC-2017-guide.pdf

Demonstration of Cooperative Extension reporting systems: Reporting amidst a global crisis

Kit Alviz
University of California

Todd Hurt
University of Georgia

Diane Mashburn
University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture

Christian Schmieder
University of Wisconsin

Abstract

COVID-19 changed Extension program delivery. This presentation will share how four institutions capture virtual programming as Cooperative Extension reached audiences in new ways. The University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Georgia Extension, University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture, and University of Wisconsin-Madison Division of Extension will provide demonstrations of their reporting systems and share any lessons learned about outcomes reporting and reporting during the pandemic. Accurate and flexible reporting systems are needed to gather outputs and outcomes information from Cooperative Extension programs for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Institute of Food and Agriculture (USDA NIFA) annual plans and reports of work as well as for communication with other stakeholders There are well-documented evaluation strategies and ideas to meet federal reporting requirements and raise the visibility of Cooperative Extension (Abbot, Graves, & Woodcox 2020; Baughman, Boyd, & Kelsey 2012; Wise 2017). The purpose of these demonstrations is to spark dialogue among participants about innovative strategies and lessons learned related to outcomes and accountability reporting.

References

Abbott, A., Graves, L., & Woodcox, S. (2020). Evaluation Tool for Collecting Statewide Outcomes for Single-Session Programs. *Journal of Extension, 58*(3), Article v58-3tt2. Available at: https://joe.org/joe/2020june/tt2.php

Baughman, S., Boyd, H.H., & Kelsey, K.D. (2012). The Impact of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) on Two State Cooperative Extension Systems. *Journal of Extension, 50*(1), Article v50-1a3. Available at: https://www.joe.org/joe/2012february/a3.php

Wise, D. (2017). Evaluating Extension impact on a nationwide level: Focus on programs or concepts? *Journal of Extension, 55*(1), Article v55-1comm1. Available at: https://www.joe.org/joe/2017february/comm1.php

Developing Micro-Credentials for Professional Development: A Case Study

Justin McKenzie, Chris Plein
West Virginia University

Sarah Baughman
Virginia Tech

Andy Crocker
Texas A&M

Abstract

Importance/Significance

Micro-credentials and badges have evolved in recent years. The founding philosophy behind badges and micro-credentials embraces an ethic of self-directed learning, experiential learning, and peer-to-peer education available to a wide spectrum of audiences. This open-access and open-system approach is attractive and laudable, but not without hazards.

The Military Families Learning Network (MFLN) is a virtual learning network for those providing support and services to active duty military families including Cooperative Extension educators. The MFLN is exploring the development and use of micro-credentials to assist in their professional development opportunities. A pilot study was conducted in 2019 to gauge Extension professionals' interactions with military families and to begin to identify the competencies and skills required for successful engagement with these families.

Description of the Delivery Method or Results

The survey was developed with input from MFLN team members and was coordinated and implemented by Andrew Crocker (Texas Agri-Life). Administered through Qualtrics, the survey yielded 19 responses. A relatively short instrument aimed at assessing experiences and perceptions regarding interaction with military families and awareness of issues, the survey included open-ended questions. The survey also asked respondents to rank order training priorities for Extension professionals interested in working with military families. The priorities were organized around five themes related to military policies and structures, the dynamics of military families, cultural competencies, outreach and engagement, and community capacity building. The identification and prioritization of themes can be especially helpful in developing training and learning opportunities.

The exploratory survey identified common themes amongst respondents and yielded helpful insights regarding Extension's role and interaction with military families in select Texas communities. The preliminary results also identify why professional development micro-credentials and badges may be relevant and what might be emphasized in learning content. The survey responses and analysis suggest:

Proximity is key, especially when there is a military presence or installation in the community.
Youth programming may be a gateway to further interaction between the military and Extension.

Many encounters with military families are through traditional programs where the families are perceived as part of the general population. Facilitating military family access to Extension programming may require proactive efforts by Extension professionals.

Like all surveys, the study is not without limitations. Broad generalization is prohibited by the relatively few number of respondents. As an opinion survey, the instrument seeks to gain attitudinal perceptions of what is thought to be important or relevant – it is not an independent measure of Extension capabilities nor military family need. However, as will be discussed in the presentation, the survey responses offer a wealth of information.

Recommendations for Future NAEPSDP Practice

As is illustrated by our exploratory research, Extension colleagues play an especially important role in providing insight and input to learning experience construction and objectives. This resonates with the Extension ethos of participatory contributions to professional development. As noted by Berven et al. (2020), "Extension employees must be part of the process of identifying necessary competencies for their positions." In addition, the interest expressed in the surveys for more technical and specific knowledge about military policies, institutions, and dynamics affecting families speaks to the core competency of subject matter expertise identified by Texas AgriLife some years ago (Stone and Coppernoll 2014) and broadly shared across the Extension community.

Benefit to NAEPSDP

Extension has also been an important player in advancing higher education's role in developing micro-credentials and badges. Notable has been the University of Wisconsin Extension efforts to form a consortium of universities to provide learning services involving micro-credentials through the "University Store" learning initiative (Schejbal 2019). Extension has also engaged in the use of badges and micro-credentials for children and youth (Barker et al. 2013). It has been identified as an approach for professional development within the Extension community (Garst et al. 2014) and has recently been adopted in disabilities awareness training for Extension professionals (Keywood and Brill 2020). In short, there is a need to further understand the place and potential of micro-credentials and badges in the Extension context.

This presentation provides an opportunity to share: 1) a general overview of trends in the evolution of micro-credentials and badges and their relevance to professional development in Extension, 2) a model for engaging Extension colleagues to help in program development through the use of surveys that invite open-ended comment, and 3) a general strategy for developing and sustaining micro-credential professional development programs.

References

Barker, B., & Valentine, N. (2013). Digital badges in 4-H. *Journal of Extension, 51*(3).

Berven, B., Franck, K., & Hastings, S. W. (2020). Investing in Extension's workforce: Assessing and developing critical competencies for new agents. *Journal of Extension, 58*(2).

Garst, B., Baughman, S., &Franz, N. (2014). Benchmarking professional development practices across youth-serving organizations: Implications for Extension. *Journal of Extension, 52*(5).

Keywood, J. R., & Brill, M. (2020). Developmental disabilities training series. *Journal of Extension, 58*(3).

Schejbal, D. (2019). *Not all initiatives succeed, and that's okay: The university store initiative*. Unbound (Spring). https://unbound.upcea.edu/leadership-strategy/continuing-education/not-all-initiatives-succeed-and-thats-okay-the-university-learning-store-initiative/

Stone, B., & Coppernoll, S. (2004). You, Extension, and success: A competency-based professional development system. *Journal of Extension, 42*(2).

Visualizing Statewide Needs Assessment Survey Results

Diane Craig
University of Florida

Abstract

In 2020, the Program Development and Evaluation Center at the University of Florida's Institute for Food and Agricultural Sciences (UF/IFAS) conducted a statewide survey of 1,500 Florida residents. For dozens of issues related to the state, respondents were asked the level of effort Extension should expend on the issue. In addition, respondents rated the importance of the various community assets such as affordable food and access to reliable public transportation, and their level of satisfaction with the availability of those assets in their community. The primary purpose of the survey was to provide valid and reliable needs assessment data to Florida Extension agents and specialists to help them develop their plans of work. A secondary purpose was to provide data for the UF/IFAS Extension strategic planning process.

Conveying the results of a large survey with more than 100 questions and a dozen demographics is a daunting task in the best of circumstances. It is especially difficult when it must serve the needs of hundreds of Extension agents and specialists who reside in 67 counties, with a wide range of programs and diverse clientele. A written report with lots of data tables is a common way to summarize the data, and the most likely to end up on a shelf, gathering dust. An infographic or PowerPoint presentation that highlights a few key findings is useful in some cases. But these methods are static and limited as the creator is presuming what is important to the consumer. Data visualization is more exploratory in nature while infographics are more explanatory (Knaflic, 2015; Lankow et al., 2012).

Online data dashboards that display key metrics or survey results and allow the user to filter the results geographically and demographically, and more easily make comparisons or see trends, are becoming increasingly popular in today's tech-savvy society. Businesses have used this type of data visualization internally for decades, but widespread use began in the early 2000s as Microsoft Excel charting improved and new desktop software designed for a non-technical user became available. Today, many universities and colleges are using interactive data dashboards for their "university factbook" (i.e., student enrollment, faculty and staff counts, degrees awarded, etc.) and graduate exit or other student-focused surveys.

Extension, with its reliance on evaluation and needs assessment data, is well-positioned to use data dashboards to tell the Extension story to external stakeholders and provide useful, accessible information to its Extension agents when developing their plans of work. This presentation will demonstrate how Tableau software is used to disseminate the results of the statewide survey to UF/IFAS Extension faculty and administrators. It will also cover how interactive dashboards are useful for strategic planning purposes, allowing for data exploration and flexibility to answer emerging questions.

During the presentation, participants will view the results of the survey in Tableau data dashboards. Discussion among participants about how the data were visualized, other possible types of Extension data that may be suitable for data visualization, and how to best disseminate the results to internal and external audiences, is expected and encouraged.

References

Craig, D. D. & Borger, R. H. (2019). *Communicating with data: Telling the extension story in credible and actionable ways*. In B. Silliman & S. R. Cummings (Eds.), Special Edition: Credible and actionable evidence in extension practice. Journal of Human Sciences and Extension, 7(2). Retrieved from https://jhseonline.com/issue/view/88/

Knaflic, C. N. (2015). *Storytelling with data: A data visualization guide for business professionals*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Lankow, J., Ritchie, J., & Crooks, R. (2012). *Infographics: The power of visual storytelling*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

University of Arizona Cooperative Extension Common Measures: Creating an Evaluation System across Cooperative Extension Program Areas

Michele Walsh, Deirdre Avery, Madeleine deBlois, Rachel Leih, Kara Haberstock Tanoue
University of Arizona

Abstract

Evaluation capacity building and developing common measures to assess quality across programs can support data-driven program improvement, outcomes research, and communicating the effectiveness and importance of Cooperative Extension programs to stakeholders across the state. These statewide efforts are difficult to launch. This session will describe the process being used in Arizona and will provide examples for attendees on how to envision and facilitate such a process in their own state.

The goal of the University of Arizona Cooperative Extension (UACE) Common Measures project is to build organizational capacity to support the systematic collection and use of evaluation data This project began in an organizational environment of limited understanding and/or application of common measures, but with personnel who had a strong desire for additional evaluation training and skill building. In addition, it is being undertaken during a time UACE evaluation personnel are facilitating a statewide cultural shift towards viewing evaluation as a discovery process rather than a burden. In addition, there is currently an administrative shift of strong support for developing a statewide system to support data-driven decision making to be used across UACE.

Project activities from a National 4-H Challenge Cohort project in 2018 laid the groundwork for the development of the Arizona 4-H Common Measures, which expanded to include common measures for Family, Consumer and Health Science topics. An element of this effort, which was key to the success of our 2018 4-H Common Measures work, is the incorporation of compelling hands-on, participatory learning activities developed in collaboration with 4-H partners for evaluation capacity building. In addition, we knew that central to gaining buy-in and support for a statewide system was giving data back to those who collected it as well as providing tools to communicate results to stakeholders. The proposed session will provide examples useful to the audience on both those topics: engaging, participatory educational experiences for evaluation capacity building, and ways to document the "so what" of data collection. The latter include documents that highlight research linking results to potential longer-term outcomes and infographic templates to support UACE personnel visualizing and sharing program results.

In addition, we will discuss the development and launch of a web-based "survey-builder". This tool is designed in response to an expressed need by UACE personnel for help in creating surveys and is an interactive platform across key UACE content areas that allows people to select questions and build their own custom surveys. Information and examples presented during this session will also discuss the pragmatics of such a system, such as IT resources, and mechanisms for data aggregation, so that participants.

All of the processes and tools presented in the proposed session will be useful resources for others in Cooperative Extension seeking to build systematic data collection and diffusion.

Using Geovisualization to Facilitate Program Planning and Evaluation

Michele Walsh, Kara Haberstock Tanoue, Madeleine deBlois, Rachel Leih
University of Arizona

Abstract

Importance

Geovisualization, the interactive display of geospatial data to support decision-making, can be a powerful tool for program planning and evaluation. Showing the geographic distribution of need, as well as current program activity locations, can help program implementers consider whether their current activities are properly located to meet need. There have been a few efforts to use GIS dashboards in Extension programs, such as SNAP-Ed programs, but such approaches are not yet widespread (Stone, 2011). Wider use and understanding of geovisualization can be an important part of program planning, evaluation, and community engagement capacity building within Extension.

Background: The UA SNAP-Ed Mapping project was a collaborative process between evaluators with the Community Research, Evaluation, & Development (CRED) Team and faculty and staff from the University of Arizona's Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Education (UA SNAP-Ed) that sought to equip Extension agents and staff to answer the question, "Why does the UA SNAP-Ed do what it does, where it does?", through the creation of an interactive GIS mapping tool displaying community-level data related to need, community resources, and food and activity environments across the state of Arizona.

Specific Competencies

In this workshop, we will use lessons learned from the UA SNAP-Ed Mapping Project to enable participants to enhance their own skills in using geospatial data to help with needs assessment, program planning, and community engagement. By the end of the workshop, participants will:

--Be able to read and interpret geographic data at various scales

--Be able to use interactive tools to incorporate data across geodata themes (e.g., administrative, socio-econmic, and so on) to answer program-related questions

--Be able to use information gained through geographical data to enhance community engagement

Teaching Plan

Using the interactive mapping tool our team has developed, we will take participants through a series of activities that will help them use geovisualized data to understand the unique and varying characteristics of communities at different scales. Participants will have the opportunity to interact directly with the maps on their own computers during the session, using guided activities to explore data related to

--Needs (e.g., high poverty rates in a community)

--Current activities (e.g., active SNAP-Ed sites)

--Opportunities (e.g., community partners)

--Gaps (where are there places of high need but little service?)

Through facilitated discussions, participants will consider how these data can be used to inform what programs might be useful in a particular community, as well as to think through how the information can be used to support equitable community engagement. We will also consider how staff and community members can be involved in exploring these kinds of data together. Participants will leave the workshop with resources to facilitate these types of "data sharing summits" in their own state.

Qualifications

Michele Walsh, PhD, is the Arizona Cooperative Extension Evaluation Specialist and team lead for the University of Arizona Community Research, Evaluation and Development (CRED) team, with over 20 years of community-engaged evaluation experience. Kara Tanoue, MA, is a data scientist and geographer with the CRED team, with a background in geospatial analysis and mixed-methods studies of social and health-related issues. Madeleine deBlois, ScD, is a social epidemiologist with the CRED team who has worked extensively with Extension faculty and staff to help them use local data to better understand how social and economic contexts influence the well-being of youth and families in communities. Rachel Leih, MEd, MPH is a research professional with the CRED team, with a strong background in promoting civic and community engagement in public health and education. The team have facilitated a number of Extension and community trainings in evaluation and in program and strategic planning.

Tone, M. (2011). Enhancing the delivery of supplemental nutrition assistance program education through geographic information systems. *Journal of Nutrition Education and Behavior*, S148-S151.

Helping Educators Pivot to Online Teaching and Learning

Celeste Carmichael
Cornell University

Renee Pusey
Pennsylvania State University

Abstract

An urgent need for helping Extension Staff to shift to engaging online teaching and learning techniques emerged this year with the onset of COVID-19. While ZOOM and social media have been available for a number of years, online learning has not been the first response for conferences, workshops, and program offerings - until now. How did your state prepare staff and volunteers to make this quick shift?

Join us to learn strategies and approaches used by Penn State University and Cornell Cooperative Extension to prepare staff with staff development opportunities, particularly for leading engaging online learning experiences. In this workshop we will review techniques, tips and strategies. Participants will also take a typical lesson plan for an in person workshop and apply a framework for engaging online learning for a hands-on component.

Participants in this Workshop Will

• Explore the advantages of online learning
• Examine strategies for delivering engaging webinars
• Review the Penn State and Cornell Cooperative Extension staff development approaches for training staff to deliver engaging online learning
• Discuss options for staff training and motivating implementation
• Convert a lesson plan into an engaging online learning plan

Selected References

8 Resources for Effective Digital Learning Communication. (2020, March 26). Venngage. https://venngage.com/blog/digital-learning-tips-templates/

Best Practices for Engaging Content | Center for Teaching Innovation. (n.d.). Retrieved June 4, 2020, from https://teaching.cornell.edu/resource/best-practices-engaging-content

Clark, R. C. (2016). *E-Learning and the science of instruction: Proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning* (Fourth edition.). Wiley.

DuBois, B., Krasny, M. E., & Russ, A. (2019a). Online professional development for environmental educators: Strategies to foster critical thinking and social interactions. *Environmental Education Research, 25*(10), 1479–1494. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504622.2018.1564247

Engaging Students | Center for Teaching Innovation. (n.d.). Retrieved June 4, 2020, from https://teaching.cornell.edu/teaching-resources/engaging-students

From Telling to Teaching by Dr. Joye Norris. (n.d.). Retrieved June 4, 2020, from http://www.learningbydialogue.com/about.html

Humphrey, P., Giacomini, J., Hruskocy, C., & Baldwin, E. (2014). Creating On-line Course Shells for Teacher Education Courses: *Strategies and Methods for Success*. 889–894. https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/130877/

Innovative Applications of Online Pedagogy and Course Design | IGI Global. (n.d.). Retrieved June 14, 2020, from http://www.igi.global.com/gateway/book/189161

Palloff, R. M. (2005). *Collaborating online: Learning together in community*. Jossey-Bass.

Tucker, C. (2020, March 8). *Tips for Designing an Online Learning Experience Using the 5 Es Instructional Model*. https://catlintucker.com/2020/03/designing-an-online-lesson/

Vai, M. (2016a). *Essentials of online course design: A standards-based guide* (Second edition.). Routledge.

Cultivating Stakeholder Entrepreneurship through Collective Action

Keith Taylor, Vikram Koundinya
University of California – Davis

Abstract

Virtually all University Extension professionals work with their stakeholders on initiatives requiring collective action. From integrated pest management (farmers, policymakers, and adjacent residents) to economic development (independent business and community college workforce development), Extension is under constant pressure to see to it that community groups can collaborate, voluntarily, on complex social and technical issues. How can we help our community stakeholders work together, better? Is there a toolbox of social-scientifically-informed practices we can access to enhance and elevate community stakeholder skillsets?

Our competency building workshop will a) expose Extension professionals to the Strategic Doing method of facilitation, b) provide an overview of its applicability in community-engaged research and development, c) discuss how we are applying Strategic Doing methods to an economic development initiative in Mendocino County, California, and d) run participants through a truncated simulation of Strategic Doing, asking "what would it look like if Extension professionals were perceived as the primary source of public knowledge?" The workshop will help those participants I need of an accessible toolbox of methods for collaborating with their stakeholders (typically referred to as participatory action research), and demonstrate through simulation the ease by which the tools may be used.

Keith Taylor is a Cooperative Extension Specialist in Community Economic Development, and will co-lead the workshop with Vikram Koundinya, a Cooperative Extension Specialist in Evaluation. Participants will learn how to create productive convenings, moving beyond local impasses, and how to advance initiatives in resource-constrained settings. Additionally, Strategic Doing provides accessible citizen science based evaluation approaches, allowing community stakeholders to measure and track progress. In this manner, workshop participants will learn new facilitation skills, have access to a network of values-aligned organizers, and build a complementary skillset necessary for elevating the public entrepreneurial capacities of the communities Extension serves.

Class is in Session: Maximizing the Impact of Teaching through Lesson Study

Janet Fox, Esther Boe,
Louisiana State University

Debbie McDonald
National 4-H Council

Martin Smith
University of California-Davis

Importance/Significance of the Topic

Are you looking for an avenue to enhance your high-quality programming efforts? Are you seeking ways to save time in lesson preparation? Are you interested in offering meaningful professional development for faculty? Are Extension educators stressed out with lesson preparation and you want to save them time? Are you looking for methods to field test curriculum? If you answered yes to any of these questions, you want to learn more about lesson study.

To be successful, Extension professionals must have the knowledge and the skills to deliver high quality programs. Effective professional development is critical to ensure that Extension professionals are appropriately equipped to deliver high quality programs (Garst, Baughman, & Franz, 2014). Research supports that professional development experiences enhance educators' knowledge and skills and improves practice (Schmitt-McQuitty, Worker, & Smith,2019). Therefore, intentional professional development is paramount for building proficiency in delivery of high-quality educational programs.

The most common professional development experience is one-time expert-led training (Smith, et al., 2019). Traditional training methods or "one-shot, fix-em-ups" are hierarchical and are taught (Fleischer & Fox, 2003, p. 259). Researchers found these professional development experiences unsuccessful in building knowledge since they are disjointed, lack context, and do not account for individual learners' needs (Bissonnette & Caprino, 2014).

Over the last ten years, reform-based professional development approaches have become popular strategies for addressing the specific needs of educators. Many of these reform-based professional development models have common characteristics such as being learner-centric, taking place over an extended period, supporting social interactions, and involving active learning (Smith & Schmitt-McQuitty, 2013).

Communities of practice is a reform-based professional development tool that is a "learning partnership among people who find it useful to learn from and with each other about a particular domain. They use each other's experience of practice as a learning resource" (Wenger, Trayer, & de Laat, 2011, p. 9). A key to success is the social interaction that educators use to work toward shared learning goals (Hunzicker, 2011). Buysse, Sparkman, & Wesley, 2003), are in the leadership role, and being responsible for learning from each other rather than having experts who guide learning (Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002). Lesson study is a community of practice in which educators work together on the shared goal of analyzing and improving instruction. Through this process, educators meet on a frequent basis to design and teach lessons by describing

and reflecting upon what happened during lesson delivery (Lewis, 2016). Research on lesson study reveals gains in knowledge, skills, confidence, and pedagogical practices (Smith, 2008).

Benefit to NAEPSDP Participants and Practice

Lesson Study enhances subject matter understanding for presenters, supports a team approach to improvement, enhances reflective practice, and uplifts what works and does not work in the real world of extension. Lesson Study can increase knowledge for both facilitators and learners, is deceptively easy to implement, and saves time.

Description of Specific Competencies Participants will Learn

During this competency-building workshop, participants will learn about a variety of competencies that will enhance their pedological foundation. Through the workshop, participants will understand how to create an effective learning environment by understanding how to modify instruction based on context. Participants will gain knowledge about reflective practice and its implications to planning and designing dynamic, appropriate learning experiences. Participants will learn more about ongoing assessment and observation ability used to monitor learning.

Statement of Teaching Plan and Method

Using an experiential learning approach, this session provides an overview of what Lesson Study is, the lesson study process, lesson study impacts, and lesson study practices. An interactive visual ice breaker will introduce the concept of lesson study. Through a human barometer activity, participants will distinguish between lesson study and traditional professional development methods. Participants will be broken up into lesson study teams to experience the lesson study process. The session will be culminated with a lesson study panel sharing best practices and answering participant questions. The session will be ended with a reflection activity that can integrated in a real-life lesson study team.

Instructors' Qualifications for Teaching the Specified Competency/Competencies

Lesson study is a newcomer to non-formal education. The presenters have over 30 years of experience with leading lesson study programs. These professionals have been involved in a multi-year project that has taken lesson study from the University of California 4-H program to 4-H programs at 41 Land Grant Universities across the United States. All the presenters have a background in pedagogical methods and directs professional development opportunities for professionals and volunteers.

Bissonnette, J. D., & Caprino, K. (2014). A call to action research: Action research as an effective professional development model. *Mid-Atlantic Education Review, 2*(1), 12–22.

Fleischer, C., & Fox, D. L. (2003). Beginning words: Toward meaningful on-line professional development in English education. *English Education, 35*(4), 259–261.

Garst, B. A., Baughman, S., & Franz, N. (2014). Benchmarking professional development practices across youth-serving organizations: Implications for Extension. *Journal of Extension, 52*(5), Article 5FEA2. Retrieved from http://www.joe.org/joe/2014october/a2.php

Hunzicker, J. (2011). Effective professional development for teachers: A checklist. *Professional Development in Education, 38*(2), 177–179.

Lewis, C. (2016). How does lesson study improve mathematics instruction? *ZDM Mathematics Education, 48*, 571–580 (2016). Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-016-0792-x

Schmitt-McQuitty, L., Worker, S. M., & Smith, M. H. (2019). Lesson study model of 4-H professional development: Data-Driven improvements to educator practice. *Journal of Youth Development, 14*(1), 131-154. Retrieved from http://jyd.pitt.edu/ojs/jyd/article/view/19-14-01-PA-01/776

Smith, M. H. (2008). Volunteer development in 4-H: Constructivist considerations to improve youth science literacy in urban areas. *Journal of Extension, 46*(4), Article 4IAW2. Retrieved from https://www.joe.org/joe/2008august/iw2.php

Smith, M. H., & Schmitt-McQuitty, L. (2013). More effective professional development can help 4-H volunteers address need for youth scientific literacy. *California Agriculture, 67*(1), 47–53. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274145361_More_effective_professional_development_can_help_4-H_volunteers_address_need_for_youth_scientific_literacy

Wenger, E., McDermott, R., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Wenger, E., Trayner, B., & de Laat, M. (2011). *Promoting and assessing value creation in communities and networks: A conceptual framework*. The Netherlands: Ruud de Moor Centrum. Retrieved from http://wenger-trayner.com/documents/Wenger_Trayner_DeLaat_Value_creation.pdf

Programs with a Purpose: Aligning Community Needs with Engagement and Evaluation

Danae Wolfe, Teresa McCoy, Debby Lewis
Ohio State University

Abstract

The LIFE framework is a human-centered, empathy-focused, and solutions-based approach to community engagement that leads to positive community outcomes. The framework provides a way to operationalize Extension program planning through a simplified and fluid process that guides Extension professionals through four phases of program development – Learn, Interpret, Frame, and Engage. During the Learn phase, Extension professionals engage in a series of empathy-focused activities to learn about their community and local issues while simultaneously building relationships and trust with local agencies and community members. Building community trust during this stage of program planning is pertinent to ensuring the community is ready to engage with Extension around topics of importance. During the next phase, Interpret, Extension professionals begin to prioritize and define community needs to determine the topics of highest impact and need. During the Frame phase, Extension professionals consider intended programmatic outcomes and community context as part of program design. Finally, Extension professionals design a program that intentionally leads learners through five stages of engagement – Awareness, Exploration, Initiation, Support, and Advocacy. Research in consumer marketing suggests that consumers enter into different phases in their journey to engage with, purchase, and review or advocate for products. There is no reason to believe engagement with Extension should function differently. We must intentionally and strategically lead learners to strengthen their relationship with Extension in ways that engage and encourage positive outcomes.

The LIFE Path framework draws inspiration from planning models and processes including design thinking, marketing, and interpretation and is supported by theory across a wide range of topics including communication, community change, and trust.

Significance

Evaluation is a fundamental part of Extension work. We must justify time, resources, and money spent on community programming through evaluation and impact reporting. The LIFE framework is the first Extension program design model that aligns engagement phases with specific evaluation metrics. As such, the framework simplifies and operationalizes evaluation in a way that is easy to digest for evaluation novices.

Additionally, the LIFE framework shifts Extension away from quota-based evaluation metrics and into impact-driven programming. The framework also shifts us away from the idea that a community needs assessment need only be a survey but should instead lean heavily on empathy-focused relationship building that informs program planning and design

Competencies

Session participants will learn skills to:
- Build community relationships that foster trust and inform program planning
- Prioritize and define community needs

- Understand how community context can help shape programs
- Create programs that align engagement phases with specific evaluation metrics

Benefit

The LIFE Path framework is a comprehensive toolkit for Extension professionals that simplifies the program planning process by combining needs assessment, program development, and evaluation into a single functional framework. Traditional Extension program planning models silo needs assessment, program development, and evaluation into disparate and unconnected stages. These models, which Extension has relied on for decades, lack translational stages that help practitioners interpret current community conditions and translate needs into strategic programming for positive community outcomes. The LIFE Path framework seamlessly connects program planning stages into a fluid and adaptable pathway that fosters a human-centered, empathy-focused, and solutions-based approach to community engagement.

Given the virtual conference platform, we intend to present this session via Zoom meeting, using a combination of instruction with PowerPoint slide deck, Zoom chat, and polling to engage participants.

Instructors Qualifications for Teaching

Danae Wolfe is the educational technology specialist for Ohio State University Extension. She has spent the last 5 years designing and refining Extension engagement techniques that lean on design thinking and innovation. Her work has been recognized by Extension nation-wide through numerous national conferences and webinars, keynote presentations, and awards.

Teresa McCoy is Director of the Learning and Organizational Development unit at Ohio State University Extension. She has been an adult educator for 30 years and completed a graduate certificate in adult education at Johns Hopkins University. She has designed and delivered programs at the local, state, and multi-state levels; taught program development and evaluation to Extension Educators; and, contributed to scholarship in the field of PD&E.

Debby Lewis is a member of the Ohio State University Extension Learning and Organizational Development Team. During her 25-year Extension career in Ohio, she has designed, delivered and evaluated programs at the local, state, regional and national levels. Since 2002, she has worked with faculty and staff across all program areas (4-H, family and consumer sciences, community development, and agriculture and natural resources) providing them training on how to develop and evaluate programs and report program impacts in the most effective way." "A visual of the framework can be provided, if needed. The following is the theoretical foundation on which the LIFE framework rests. The theory alignment is separated into the stages of the LIFE framework (interpret and frame are presented together):

Resources and Supportive References

Learn Phase: The Learn Phase rests on a foundation of community relationship-building that leads to the development of trust between Extension and the communities we serve.

Theory Z (Ouchi, 1981): Collaboration is important in organizational success. Organizations are more likely to succeed when all members are seen as equals.

Motivation Hygiene Theory (Herzberg, 1966): If an employee has an opportunity to have some level of responsibility on the job, the individual will have higher likelihood of being satisfied and then work harder. There are certain "hygiene" factors that also motivate people to perform well – proper working conditions, salary benefits, and company policies. People want to feel taken care of by their employer.

Onion Model of Organizational Culture (Miller, 1999): In order to get to underlying values and assumptions, we must peel back outer layers like artifacts and behaviors.

Trust (Michael Carolan, 2005): ""Thus, if we believe a social network to be trustworthy, we will likely feel the same about knowledge that comes from that social network – that is, we will likely consider such knowledge to be true.""

Theory-driven Evaluation Theory (Huey Chen, 2012): Programs exist in an open system, consisting of inputs, outputs, outcomes, and impacts. Evaluators should start by working with stakeholders to understand the assumptions and intended logic behind the program

Social Exchange Theory (Thibault and Kelley, 1959): if the costs of the relationship are higher than the rewards, such as a lot of effort or money put into a relationship and not reciprocated, this could lead to problems.

Transformational Education Model as Extension Model (Mezirow, Boyd, 1970s and 1980s): For learners to change their ""meaning schemes (specific beliefs, attitudes, and emotional reactions),"" they must engage in critical reflection on their experiences, which in turn leads to a perspective transformation.

Design Thinking: Design thinking is a non-linear, iterative process that teams use to understand users, challenge assumptions, redefine problems and create innovative solutions to prototype and test.
Five phases -
Empathize: Gain empathetic understanding of users
Define: State users' needs and problems (and validate)
Ideate: Challenge assumptions and create ideas
Prototype: Begin to create solutions
Test: Try your solutions out

Interpret and Frame Phases
The Interpret and Frame Phases rest on a foundation of properly defining root causes of community issues and considering community and learner contexts in program design.

Social Cognition Theory (Albert Bandura, 1960): Considers how our social environment is influenced by and influences personal behavior. People are self-regulators and have the capacity for forethought. Observational learning (learning by seeing, rather than doing) greatly influences our interpretation of the world. Technology has broadened observational learning far beyond one's physical environment.

Social Contract Theory (Thomas Hobbes, 1500s): One's moral and/or political obligations are dependent upon a contract or agreement among them to form the society in which they live.

Realist Evaluation (Pawson and Tilley, 1997): Realist evaluation explains change brought about by an intervention by referring to the actors who act and change (or not) a situation under specific conditions and under the influence of external events (including the intervention itself). The actors and the interventions are considered to be embedded in a social reality that influences how the intervention is implemented and how actors respond to it (or not). The context-mechanism-outcome (CMO) configuration is used as the main structure for realist analysis.

Human Development EcoLogic Model (Scheer, 2020): The HD-ELM components are as follows: HD—human development characteristics and implications for target audience; E—modified ecological systems theory, or the surrounding systems that influence program participants; and LM—revised logic model (objectives, inputs, outputs, outcomes, and program assessment). Users of the HD-ELM can account for missing gaps that prevent programs from being successful by addressing the target audience's developmental characteristics and the surrounding systems in which programs exist

Engage Phase
The Engage Phase rest on a foundation of strategically moving learners through five phases of engagement around a community issue:

Awareness: Learner is informed of issue
Exploration: Learner explores issue to increase knowledge
Initiation: Learner studies issue to gain understanding
Support: Learner engages in network of support
Advocacy: Learner advocates for community change (thereby beginning the awareness phase over with a new set of learners)

Model of Mediated Communication/Model of Computer-Mediated Communication (Harold Lasswell, 1948): Who said what, in which channel, to whom, with what effect?

Social Presence Theory (Short, Williams, Chrisie, 1976): non-verbal cues make the presence of communicators more salient to one another and enhance the warmth and friendliness of interaction

Media-richness Theory (Daft, Lengel, 1980s): There is an optimal match between communication task and communication media from which to choose. Rich mediums have: instant feedback, capacity to transmit multiple cues (body language, voice tone, inflection), natural language, personal focus (like one-on-one communication). Lean media in inappropriate for conveying emotionally complex issues and are poor carriers for interpersonal communication.

Staircase Model of Relationship Development (Mark Knapp, Anita Vangelisti, 1996): People engage in certain types of information at different levels of a relationship (whether with a romantic partner or friend).

McGuire's Matrix (McGuire, 1989): To be successful, campaigns must hold sources attention, have a message that is comprehensible, message must go through channel that audience accepts, receiver must retain information. This process will lead to awareness, attitude change, belief change, and behavior change.

Transtheoretical Model of Behavioral Change (Prochaska, DiClemente, & Norcross , 1970s): Demonstrates that people go through six stages as they adopt a new behavior or belief:
1. Pre-contemplation (not ready)
2. Contemplation (getting ready)
3. Preparation (ready)
4. Action (current action)
5. Maintenance (monitoring)
6. Termination

Marketing Funnel (William Townsend, 1924)
Awareness: the customer is aware of the existence of a product or service
Interest: actively expressing an interest in a product group
Desire: aspiring to a particular brand or product
Action: taking the next step towards purchasing the chosen product

Reinforcement Theory (Skinner, 1953): individual's behavior is a function of its consequences. It is based on "law of effect", i.e, individual's behaviour with positive consequences tends to be repeated, but individual's behaviour with negative consequences tends not to be repeated

Comparative Analysis of Program Types (Boyle, 1981):
Informational: Exchange information
Institutional: Growth and improvement of an individual's basic abilities, skills, knowledge, competencies
Developmental: Define and solve individual, group, or community problems

Other Models
Theory of Reasoned Action (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1980): Intention is the best predictor of action. Behavioral intent is based on one's beliefs about performing a behavior, evaluation of beliefs, and the subjective norm.

Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1985): Similar to theory of reasoned action with the addition of perceived behavioral control (attitude toward behavior, subjective norm, perceived behavioral control)."

Changing Our View of Identity in a Time of Change - A Starter for Agency Diversity Education

Craig Rotter
Texas A&M University

Abstract

An increasing need for the ability to navigate avenues for diversity education is upon us. Social movements calling for historic change and civil unrest focused on equity are at the forefront of our news cycles, our community engagement, and our current experiences within the United States. Identity awareness is a solid area in which to begin dialogue and conversation that can lead to greater understanding of one another and the issues so deeply woven into our existence. If there was ever a more poignant time to improve skill sets, increase knowledge, and explore the topic of personal identity and the impact it has on who we are as individuals and as a collective, is it now. Exploring identity without demonizing is a key to the success of this tested workshop. Demonstrating a process through which conversation may lead to greater understanding is a foundation of this workshop.

Through this Workshop, Participants Will

1. Explore self-identity and personal thoughts and feelings about identity
2. Define aspects of one's individual identities in comparison to that of others, understanding the impact of this natural comparison behavior
3. Learn of the multiplier effects that intersections of identities have on an individual
4. Reflect upon personal awareness of identities of self and others via a timeline
5. Examine the concepts of cultural programming, stereotyping, and majority-influence identities and their impact on power and influence.

Being able to converse about diversity and identity comfortably and confidently and having a knowledge base of relevant concepts and definitions is of benefit to NAEPSDP participants. Recognizing how identities impact the overall culture of an organization and day-to-day relationship internal and external to the agency can prove valuable.

The presenter will work through a methodical process, layering the lessons shared via a PowerPoint presentation. Breakout sessions via Zoom will for additional dialogue.

The workshop will include the following itinerary:

• Welcome and General View
• Personal Identities and Activity (Breakout if available)
• Intersectionality and Activity (Breakout if available
• Reflection Questions
• Cultural Programming and Stereotyping
• Majority-Influence Identity Groups
• Challenges
• Closing Points – Dialogue and Awareness

- Brief Dialogue and Discussion
- Completion – Leave Zoom Meeting

The facilitator has over twenty years of experience as a diversity education instructor and social justice facilitator, working with both adult audiences (community leaders/members) and university students (both undergraduate and graduate). He holds Master's and Doctor of Philosophy degrees in leadership education with a focus on inclusion and change agency and has taught leadership education at a university level for over 18 years.

References

Adams, M., Bell, L. A., & Griffin, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (2nd ed.). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group

Jackson, B., & Hardiman, R. (1982). *Social identity development model*. Amherst, MA: New Perspectives.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=w6dnj2IyYjE

American Psychological Association. (2017). *Multicultural guidelines: An ecological approach to context, identity, and intersectionality*. https://www.apa.org/about/policy/multicultural-guidelines.aspx

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HqYpJ5Bh4n8

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LTDikx-maoM

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LHA8vWkXjew

Developing Extension Program Innovation Capacity to Tackle Complex Social and Environmental Challenges

Rebecca Meyer, Nathan Meyer, Mary Jo Katras
University of Minnesota

Abstract

Innovation is often referred to as something tangible, a new technology or program design that we can put our hands on or a concept that we can define. But these things result from a program innovation process that NAEPSDP members can support to make it easier and stronger for individuals and teams. As Extension professionals, we are called upon to be innovative, but there are certain individual, group and organizational factors that enable and challenge the process. In the proposed workshop, we will show how innovation is an ongoing, iterative process through which individuals and teams develop needs and opportunities into improved program performance. Using examples from a study of innovative Extension programs in Minnesota and nationwide as well as years of experience in a variety of Minnesota professional and staff development contexts, we will describe a framework of five key factors that can support or resist innovation, and share some useful tools to help faculty use this framework in a variety of ways to strengthen program innovation through improving the factors that support it.

Extension faculty are being increasingly called to support individuals and communities in working to address complex social and environmental challenges like sustainably feeding growing global populations, alleviating poverty and closing education achievement gaps. It's impossible to develop a precise plan, or follow a series of steps to tackle such grand challenges. Instead, research suggests practical solutions emerge through a messy networking and social learning process, called social innovation, through which a range of different citizens and professionals from a variety of backgrounds and worldviews co create new ideas about how to manage these problems, and then collaborate in attempting and refining these strategies. We believe it is possible to strengthen and accelerate such innovation through Extension programming that reflexively builds and strengthens these networks AND creates learning environments to help these groups develop and scale innovation strategies. We have proposed an iterative process of "program innovation" critical to develop and strengthen such programs (Meyer, Boyce & Meyer, 2015). We have also described a set of organizational factors that support and enable the program innovation process (Meyer, Meyer & Katras, 2018). This process and framework can be used to guide staff and professional development to help Extension individuals and groups strengthen their capabilities to iteratively design programming to substantially support innovators in addressing complex challenges.

A range of the disciplines that encompass NAEPSDP member roles and responsibilities have recently focused on adapting to the context of innovation to address complex challenges. For instance, developmental evaluation has emerged to explicitly support "innovation development to guide adaptation to emergent and dynamic realities in complex environments" where "innovations can take the form of new projects, programs, products, organizational changes, policy reforms, and system interventions" (Patton, 2011, p.1). Design thinking (Brown, 2009) is becoming more and more widely embraced as an essential framework to structure group problem solving. A growing number of case studies demonstrate that these kinds of strategies can enhance social innovation by facilitating a creative and evaluative thinking to resolve uncertainties and guide co creation of new ideas and strategies (e.g., Brown, 2009; Patton, McKegg & Wehipeihana, 2016). However, we find that the

majority of studies to date have primarily focused on helping the end-innovators manage complex problems (i.e., the ultimate aims of many Extension programs). There is much more limited information about how and tools to help Extension faculty and create learning environments to support these kinds of innovators.

We believe it is subsequently instrumental to support Extension faculty in understanding program innovation and learning to strengthen their innovation capabilities. Our research (Meyer, Meyer & Katras, 2018) echoes others in finding that a group of individual, group and organizational factors enable or resist innovation capability in the context of Extension. We have subsequently developed a capitals framework that is useful to support Extension faculty in working intentionally to increase their abilities to be innovative. We will describe our experiences over the past five years in a variety of individual and group settings to introduce and build understanding of program innovation. We will also give workshop participants a virtual hands-on opportunity to use tools we have developed to help faculty use our framework to target work on their group composition, culture and practice, administrative or stakeholder support to strengthen their innovation capabilities. We believe this framework fills a unique niche for helping NAEPSDP members in developing and supporting Extension group abilities to make their own innovative leaps in developing programming to help communities address complex grand challenges.

References

Brown, T. (2009). *Change by design: How design thinking transforms organizations and inspires innovation*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.

Meyer, N. J., Boyce, S., & Meyer, R. L. (2015). A Call to Embrace Program Innovation. *Journal of Extension*. http://www.joe.org/joe/2015june/comm1.php

Meyer, R. L., Meyer, N. J., & Katras, M. J. (2018). Taking the Leap: Exploring a Theory of Program Innovation. *Journal of Extension*. Special Issue on Innovation 2018 https://joe.org/joe/2018september/pdf/JOE_v56_5a4.pdf

Patton, M. Q. (2011). *Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use*. The Guilford Press, New York.

Patton, M. Q., McKegg, K. and Wehipeihana, N. editors. (2016). *Developmental Evaluation Exemplars: Principles in Practice*. The Guilford Press, New York.

Enhanced 4-H Club Experiences for Gay Male Youth

Jeff W. Howard
University of Maryland

Teresa McCoy
Ohio State University Extension

Chenzi Wang
University of Maryland

Abstract

Importance and Significance

For many rural gay youth, 4-H may be the only extra-curricular outlet they have and, for others, the only positive youth development program available to them. For many gay men within the agricultural community, the 4-H experience was one that they look back on with fondness. This research explored the consistent elements of the 4-H club experience that may have been supportive or encouraging to gay male youth in feeling included and accepted. We will provide an overview of major research findings that will help Cooperative Extension advise 4-H workers regarding suggested practices and constructs that could help create more inclusive and accepting environments for LGBTQ+ youth.

Implications for NAEPSDP Practice

We believe that our research will inform Extension workers of how volunteer staff trainings for 4-H club leaders could positively enhance club environments.

Roundtable Session Plan

A research overview will be provided to enable potential participants to familiarize themselves with the information. The live presentation time will be devoted to results about: 1) the elements gay boys and adolescents experienced that made them feel included and accepted, and 2) those elements that hindered positive experiences. We will then present our suggestions for best practices and ask these two questions:
1. How could we change our training curricula used with volunteer club leaders to ensure that these best practices are incorporated?
2. What elements can be put into place so that program planning with inclusion and acceptance as a staple component becomes a philosophical norm.

Evaluation Using an Adversary-Oriented Approach

Marina Denny
Mississippi State University

Abstract

Most evaluation approaches assume that the evaluator should be impartial (Worthen & Sanders, 1987). However, bias exists in all aspects of a program's evaluation – from the type of data identified for collection and instruments used, to the population sampled. An adversary-oriented approach to evaluation attempts to balance, rather than reduce, potential bias by incorporating both positive and negative views into the evaluation itself. It is a planned effort to generate opposing points of view to highlight existing deficiencies in the program and reflect a conscious effort to arrive at a fair result (Levine, 1982). There are three general approaches to adversary-oriented evaluation: 1) "two-view" adversary hearings; 2) adversary hearings where more than two opposing views are considered; and 3) use of debate and other forensic structures (Worthen & Sanders, 1987).

As evaluation becomes less of an afterthought and more of an essential consideration in the planning process of most Extension programs and processes, understanding different ways to conduct evaluations will add to the repertoire of PSD professionals. Additionally, an adversary-oriented approach lends itself to stakeholder involvement beyond a needs assessment, providing additional opportunity to enhance buy-in and engagement in the overall process and final product.

This roundtable session will focus on the third approach -- use of debate and other forensic structures -- in the context of Extension, with a discussion of the process and discussion regarding possibilities for application in other areas of Extension PSD efforts.

1. What are examples of "deliberative" approaches to evaluation you have employed in your respective work? In what contexts? What worked and didn't work?
2. How might this type of evaluation approach be used in the context of current/future online/hybrid L&D efforts?
3. What are some potential barriers to incorporating this type of evaluation approach? How might we address those barriers?

References

Levine, M. (1982). *Adversary hearings*. In N.L. Smith (Ed.), Communication strategies in evaluation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Worthen, B. R., & Sanders, J. R. (1987). *Educational evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. New York: Longman Inc.

The Policy, Systems and Environmental Framework within an Extension Context

Rebecca Sero, Carrie Backman, Clea Rome, Laura Ryser
Washington State University

Abstract

Topic Summary, Importance, and Significance

The notion of Policy, Systems, and Environmental (PSE) change has recently emerged as a way of approaching complex public health problems, such as obesity. Practitioners are addressing not only an individual's choices, but the broader landscape that influences behavior, including the policies, systems, and environments that shape those behaviors (Leeman et al. 2015). Our roundtable will demonstrate that, beyond the public health sector, taking a PSE approach is a useful framework to guide the work of Extension practitioners in a variety of program areas, including natural resources stewardship and food systems.

Implications for NAEPSDSP

The complex issues Extension professionals work on require a framework that utilizes our universities' strengths to conduct applied research for data-driven solutions without the pressure to fund ongoing programs that are costly to administer. PSE is a systematic approach that can be used anywhere to create long-term change and provides the structure to help guide the diverse work Extension undertakes within the community.

Session Plan

In our session, we will briefly outline the PSE framework that was developed by the Centers on Disease Control, provide examples of effective PSE approaches, and discuss how this framework has been – and can be – applied to Extension work at the local level beyond just community health.

Proposed Questions: 1. Thinking about the projects we shared, what types of similar projects are you also doing in your Extension work? Does the PSE framework seem like a viable option to guide your work? Why or why not?

References

Leeman, Jennifer et al. *Policy, Systems, and Environmental Approaches to Obesity Prevention: Translating and Disseminating Evidence from Practice*. Public health reports (Washington, D.C. : 1974) vol. 130,6 (2015): 616-22. doi:10.1177/003335491513000611

The use of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivators to Achieve Excellence in Extension Programming

Steven D. Siegelin
Montana State University

LaJoy Spears
New Mexico State University

Alda Norris
University of Alaska

Abstract

Do we, as leaders in Extension, choose extrinsic motivating strategies when working with Extension professionals fulfilling our missions? Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman conducted foundational qualitative research of professionals and their book Motivation to Work (1959). In 1993, Herzberg reflected on the research and its impact. He observed that "the results showed that people are made dissatisfied by bad environment, the extrinsics of the job. But they are seldom made satisfied by good environment, what I called the hygienes. They are made satisfied by the intrinsics of what they do, what I call the motivators" (2017, p. xiii).

In this roundtable we will learn together through reflection on motivational strategies that are in use at our institutions; consideration of strategies to shift towards intrinsic motivators; and looking at our roles within the greater Extension missions. These discussions will begin a process where individuals and organizations can explore strategies to shift toward intrinsic motivators. This shift should result in the mutual benefits of increasing the satisfaction of Extension professionals and improving the quality of the documentation of their work. The overarching question to be discussed is: What if Extension professionals were motivated intrinsically to pursue excellence for all facets of the Extension programming continuum, including documentation and reporting of successes?

References

Herzberg, F; Mausner, B; and Snyderman, B. (2017). *Motivation to Work* [Kindle iOS version]. Retrieved from Amazon.com

Moving Online: A national conference review with discussion to share best ideas

Brian Raison, Jared Morrison
Ohio State University

Abstract

Roundtable Topic Summary

As the pandemic of COVID-19 forced schools and businesses to move work online, organizations found themselves scrambling to cancel traditional in-person conferences and move them online. We wish to crowd-source ideas and co-create approaches that will improve our future on-line meetings (regardless of whether they're mandatory or not).

Implications for NAEPSDP Practice

Sharing and learning from our collective experiences is a powerful approach to developing new approaches and techniques. By convening a conversation around "best practice" or "proven practice", attendees can learn, grow, and gain tools that they can subsequently use in their work.

Roundtable Session Plan

In this roundtable, we will briefly introduce a case study of the National Association of Community Development Extension Professionals (NACDEP) annual conference that was moved online in June of 2020. We will describe the process, challenges, and the approach (agenda/break schedule) ultimately decided upon that led to a 3-day event that received high post-conference evaluation marks.

Our main goal is to engage attendees asking them to share their experience planning or attending an online conference. We plan to deploy a small group breakout session and capture notes on "proven-practice" via crowd-sourcing that can then be shared broadly to help other organizations.

Proposed Discussion Questions

- What innovative or unique strategies, tools, approaches have you seen (or used) to improve "engagement" in online conferences?
- What innovative or unique strategies, tools, approaches have you seen (or used) to improve online teaching? (i.e., teaching techniques that truly engage)

Is there a Business Model for Extension Education and is it Consistent Across LGUs?

Celeste Carmichael
Cornell University

Abstract

Roundtable Topic Summary

This year the NAEPSDP Professional Development Committee developed a survey asking "What program design model does your institution use and how does your LGU encourage/train your staff to develop Extension programs?"   This question was prompted by a question posed to several members which asked ""Does Cooperative Extension have a Business Model for conducting extension work and training staff?"" 30 responses were received from members that represent 28 Land Grant Institutions.

Significance

Educational programs are our product in cooperative Extension, and such – training for new and veteran staff around how to design and evaluate programs could be viewed as imperative.

Implications for NAEPSDP Practice

Identifying consistencies or parallels for the design of educational programs across the country may lead to some shared resources or trainings on this topic – or at the very least – provide for peer to peer sharing. The topic is at the heart of the National Association of Extension Program and Staff Development Professional's practices.

Roundtable Session Plan

This roundtable will share the results, and open discussion about what we can learn from each other on encouraging/training educators to follow a model for extension education.

Proposed discussion questions (these could be done in breakout rooms if the group is larger than 15…or we might use a google doc to document ideas in front of everyone)

Given your LGUs practices for staff development –
•   what resources can be shared?
•   what needs do you have for sharing?
•   what platform or type of information might be most useful?

Using the Net Promoter Score® (NPR®) for Capturing Participant Loyalty to Extension Programs

Julie Huetteman, C. Bradford Sewell
Purdue Extension

Abstract

We will share our use of the Net Promoter Score® (NPS®) (Reichheld, 2011) as an indicator of satisfaction and brand loyalty. If we view Extension as a brand, and understand consumers have many choices for receiving information, it becomes clear establishing and reinforcing Extension as a trusted source is important. Using the NPS® to solicit and categorize participant feedback significantly improves the ubiquitous "please provide any additional comments" item common in evaluation instruments. The NPS® targeted approach to feedback easily identifies improvement opportunities.

We strive to measure impact and provide meaningful, actionable recommendations to improve program quality. Through quantitative and qualitative data about customer loyalty, NPS® results help identify areas for improvement and participant loyalty to Extension. Loyal, passionate participants engage more, contribute suggestions, and share praise to friends and colleagues. Understanding word-of-mouth is effective for Extension referral/recruitment, it is easy to see NPS® as an important metric.

Connecting with personnel by using the NPS® helps builds trust, and as evaluators, we gain opportunities to guide further evaluation development. Using NPS® is a new way to build and enhance evaluation capacity.

We plan to share our experiences using NPS® followed by discussion about how others: 1) measure satisfaction/loyalty, 2) have experienced interests for feedback versus outcomes, and 3) identify program improvement opportunities.

Questions

How do you collect satisfaction measures?
Do you find personnel more interested in feedback than outcomes?
In what ways are you successful in building evaluation capacity?
How do you identify program areas to improve? (Continuous Quality Improvement)

References

Net Promoter®, NPS®, NPS Prism®, and the NPS-related emoticons are registered trademarks of Bain & Company, Inc., Satmetrix Systems, Inc., and Fred Reichheld.

Reichheld, T. (2011). The ultimate question 2.0: How net promoter companies thrive in a customer-driven world. Harvard Business Review Press.

Identifying Extension Leaders' Leadership Competencies: A Qualitative Assessment Technique.

Suzanna Windon, Mariah Stollar
The Pennsylvania State University

Abstract

Importance

Cooperative Extension has investigated leadership development for both county Extension educators (Benge et al., 2011; Benge & Sowcik 2018) and state specialists (Radhakrishna, 2001). A gap in the literature was identified in leadership competency assessments for Extension top management and administrative positions. Due to a lack of research on leadership competencies needs for the 21st-century Extension administrator, we developed a qualitative approach to help [State] Extension administrators better understand leader and leadership competencies needed for a thriving modern Extension leader.

Outcomes

Conference participants will have the opportunity to learn about a case study of implementing a new leadership competency assessment tool that can be used among top organizational leaders. The assessment tool helps maximize individuals' contributions, foster dynamic small group discussions, and share a small group's vision with a larger group. Participants will be able to utilize the three-phased leadership competencies assessment tool. Also, we will share only partial results as an example.

Implications

Our assessment tool is only effective when it is results-oriented and provides evidence that it can be used to determine which of the possible competencies are most effective and efficient for achieving the desired results. Results should be able to be implemented by informing the development of future professional development for Extension leaders. Extension organization development specialists can replicate, modify as needed. Overall, we find that applying the leaders' competencies assessment tool led to a more efficient, engaged, effective, and collaborative needs assessment method.

References

Benge, M., Harder, A., & Carter, H. (2011). Necessary pre-entry competencies as perceived by Florida Extension agents. *Journal of extension, 49*(5). http://www.joe.org/joe/2011october/a2.php

Benge, M., & Sowcik, M. (2018). Online Leadership Short Course for County Extension Directors. *Journal of Extension, 56*(6). https://www.joe.org/joe/2018october/iw1.php

To Post or Not to Post: Examining the Influence of Post Frequency on Facebook Page Traffic

Amy Harder, Savanna Turner
University of Florida

Abstract

Importance

The Program Development and Evaluation Center (PDEC) at the University of Florida has been using Facebook to provide professional development since 2015. A significant amount of time is devoted to curating content for daily posts. However, individuals who are subjected to repeated posts from the same source may selectively filter the information and ignore repeated posts (Wurman et al., 2001), leading us to wonder if the investment is worthwhile. However, a strong social presence online may be even more important given the lack of face-to-face interactions occurring during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Outcomes

In February 2020, a four-week experiment was conducted to determine if the frequency of the Facebook posts made a difference in the amount of traffic. Topics, content types, and sources were carefully considered to limit the potential influence of these confounding variables on page traffic. The results of the Mann-Whitney U tests revealed the daily page reach (people seeing any page post) was significantly greater ($U = 16.0$, $p = .03$) for daily posting than for tri-weekly posting. However, no significant difference ($p > .05$) was found for individual post reach based on frequency of posting.

Implications for Practice

An increase of page reach suggests that PDEC's online social presence is stronger when content is posted daily to Facebook, despite concerns about daily content being ignored (Wurman et al., 2001). This finding helps further what is known about best practices for using Facebook as a professional development tool. Daily engagement should be considered an Extension best practice.

References

Wurman, R. S., Sume, D., & Leifer, L. (2001). *Information anxiety 2*. Indianapolis, IN: Macmillan.

Responding in 2021: Can this year's challenges make us better leaders?

Brian Raison
Ohio State University

Abstract

Importance

Without question, 2020 was a challenging year. We endured the pandemic of COVID, racial tensions, economic loss, and the list goes on. But can we leverage these challenges to make us better in 2021? Arguably, what happens to us in life has less impact in comparison to how we respond. Our response, particularly to something bad, can dramatically affect our personal lives and our own mental health. But our response can also dramatically affect our co-workers, teams, office environments, volunteer work, and our families. This talk will share approaches that will help.

Outcomes

In this talk, I will share a few of the most poignant and practical leadership tips borrowed from the 2015 book, Above the Line, which offers excellent, practical, easy-to-remember leadership approaches that you may implement immediately. My hope is that this densely packed presentation will ignite conversation and give participants at least one strategy they can deploy to improve their personal leadership, their relationships, and their lives. Participants will:

- Learn key concepts that are contained in the book.
- Memorize $E + R = O$
- Learn The R Factor
- And (hopefully) memorize 1 of 6 responses!

Implications for NAEPSDP Practice

How we respond to events that happen in our lives impacts our work, our colleagues, our organizational culture, and our personal lives. Learning a few tips on how to respond with insightful, practical, and at times profound simplicity can greatly increase success.

References

Meyer, U., & Coffey, W. R. (2015). Above the line: Lessons in leadership and life from a championship season. New York: Penguin Press.

Challenges and Opportunities of Using Facebook Live to Deliver Extension Educational Programs

Yilin Zhuang, Tina McIntyre, Krista Stump, Eva Pabon, Brooke Moffis, Norma Samuel, LuAnn Duncan, Lisa Hamilton, Caroline Warwick, Communication Specialist
University of Florida

Abstract

Facebook as the world largest social network has been used for various purposes among universities, including formal instruction (Baran, 2010; Mazman & Usluel, 2010) and university program marketing (Assimakopoulos et al., 2017). Facebook Live, a live video streaming feature on Facebook, has been widely adopted by local television affiliates for internet news broadcasts (Hammock, 2017) but is still new in Extension education. Therefore, a group of agents in the UF/IFAS Extension have started a Facebook Live series, Water Wednesday, aimed at educating homeowners on water conservation and protection practices. Every Wednesday we live stream a 30-minute talk about Florida's water and how we can protect it. Topics have ranged from creating your own rain barrel to calibrating your irrigation system and preparing emergency water supplies. Facebook Live is easily accessible and doesn't increase technological difficulties for existing Facebook users. Participants do not need to register or learn a new digital platform. They can interact with the speakers in the comment boxes or watch the recordings. As of July 31, 2020, we have streamed 12 live talks. Average viewership has increased to 25 viewers, and active live talk participants interact with the speakers and ask questions. The Water Wednesday videos have received 1,172 post engagements, reaching 6,759 people and 4,197 views. The novelty of Facebook Live, however, has increased the difficulty to evaluate the knowledge gain and practices adoptions. More empirical research on effective use of Facebook Live and similar platforms to deliver Extension programs is needed.

References

Baran, B. (2010). Facebook as a formal instructional environment. *British Journal of Educational Technology, 41*(6), E146-E149.

Mazman, S. G., & Usluel, Y. K. (2010). Modeling educational usage of Facebook. *Computers & Education, 55*(2), 444-453.

Assimakopoulos, C., Antoniadis, I., Kayas, O. G., & Dvizac, D. (2017). Effective social media marketing strategy: Facebook as an opportunity for universities. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*.

Hammock, L. A. (2017). *The adoption of Facebook Live for internet news broadcasts by local television affiliates*.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 2020

3PM – 4PM   NAEPSP Board Meeting (NAEPSDP Board members only)

4PM – 5PM   New Members and 1st Time Conference Attendees Reception

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2020

11AM – 12:30PM   General Session
- Opening – Terrence Wolfork, 2020 NAEPSDP President, Fort Valley State University
- Welcome – Vonda Richardson, Chair of the Association of Extension Administrators, Florida A&M University
- Keynote – Marlon Argueta, Motivational Speaker

1PM – 1:35PM   Concurrent Session 1 – Oral Presentations and Ignite Sessions

Learn & Lead for Success (Nancy Hegland, Trisha Sheehan, & Amber Shanahan)

Civil Rights Compliance Review Process (Jessica Creighton)

Facilitating teamwork during COVID-19: Lessons Learned from analyzing Extensions' COVID response (Christian Schmieder & Joel Drevlow)

Ignite Sessions: (1) Responding in 2021: Can this year's challenges make us better leaders? (Brian Raison); (2) Challenges and Opportunities of Using Facebook Live to Deliver Extension Educational Programs (Yilin Zhuang)

1:35PM – 2PM   Break

2PM – 3PM   Concurrent Session 2 – Workshops

University of Arizona Cooperative Extension Common Measures: Creating an Evaluation System across Cooperative Extension Program Areas (Michele Walsh, Deirdre Avery, Madeleine DeBlois, Rachel Leih, & Kara Haberstock Tanoue)

Programs with a Purpose: Aligning Community Needs with Engagement and Evaluation (Danae Wolfe, Teresa McCoy, & Debby Lewis)

Helping Educators Pivot to Online Teaching and Learning (Celeste Carmichael & Renee Pusey)

Cultivating Stakeholder Entrepreneurship through Collective Action (Keith Taylor & Vikram Koundinya)

3PM – 3:25PM   Break

3:25PM – 4PM   Concurrent Session 3 – Oral Presentations and Posters

Cultural Competence in Extension Education: Developing a Competency Framework Based on Expert Consensus (John Diaz, Jay Jayaratne, Lendel Narine, Cecilia Suarez, Celina Willie, & Cody Gusto)

Extension Work in a World with Artificial Intelligence, Remote Work, and New Funding Models (Thomas Jerold, Julie Aldrige, & Emma Newell)

Staying Connected: Lessons Learned Utilizing Technology to Link Nonformal Education Lesson Study Facilitators (Janet Fox & Esther Boe)

Poster Sessions: (1) Identifying Extension Leaders' Leadership Competencies: A Qualitative Assessment Technique (Suzanna Windon, Mariah Stollar); (2) To Post or Not to Post: Examining the Influence of Post Frequency on Facebook Page Traffic (Amy Harder & Savanna Turner)

4:15PM – 5:15PM   Happy Hour & 10-Year Celebration with Past Presidents – Debra Davis, 1st NAEPDSP President

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2020

11AM – 11:45AM   Keynote – Tonya Parker, Assistant Dean for Equity and Inclusion, Title IX Coordinator, Wesleyan College

11:45AM – 12PM   Break

12PM – 1PM   Concurrent Session 4 – Workshops

Class is in Session: Maximizing the Impact of Teaching through Lesson Study (Janet Fox, Esther Boe, Debbie McDonald, Martin Smith)

Using Geovisualization to Facilitate Program Planning and Evaluation (Michele Walsh, Kara Haberstock Tanoue, Madeleine deBlois, Rachel Leih)

Changing Our View of Identity in a Time of Change - A Starter for Agency Diversity Education (Craig Rotter)

Developing Extension Program Innovation Capacity to Tackle Complex Social and Environmental Challenges (Rebecca Meyer, Nathan Meyer, & Mary Jo Katras)

1PM – 1:25PM   Break

1:25PM – 2PM   Concurrent Session 5 – Oral Presentations

Specialist-Engaged Process for Refining Extension Program Area Competencies (Marina Denny, Alisha Hardman, & Kennie Hicks III)

Guiding Evaluation Capacity Building of Extension Professionals using Perspective of Extension Educators (Anil Kumar Chaudhary, Elsie Assan, Farhan Sadique, John Diaz, K.S.U. Jayaratne, Vikram Koundinya, Nav Ghimire, & Scott Chazdon)

Developing a Standardized Situational Needs Assessment for Statewide Use: Pilot and Testing in Utah and Florida (Amy Harder, Lendel K. Narine, Diane Craig, Matt Benge, Glenn D. Israel, & Olivia Caillouet)

Demonstration of Cooperative Extension Reporting Systems: Reporting Amidst a Global Crisis (Kit Alviz, Todd Hurt, Diane Mashburn, & Christian Schmieder)

2PM – 2:30PM   Break

2:30PM – 4PM   Concurrent Session 6 – Roundtable Discussions

Using the Net Promoter Score® (NPR®) for Capturing Participant Loyalty to Extension Programs (Julie Huetteman & C. Bradford Sewell)

Enhanced 4-H Club Experiences for Gay Male Youth (Jeff W. Howard, Teresa McCoy, & Chenzi Wang)

Evaluation Using an Adversary-Oriented Approach (Marina Denny)

The Policy, Systems and Environmental Framework within an Extension Context (Rebecca Sero, Carrie Backman, Clea Rome, & Laura Ryser)

The use of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivators to Achieve Excellence in Extension Programming (Steven D. Siegelin, LaJoy Spears, & Alda Norris)

Moving Online: A National Conference Review with Discussion to Share Best Ideas (Brian Raison & Jared Morrison)

Is there a Business Model for Extension Education and is it Consistent Across LGUs? (Celeste Carmichael)

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2020

11AM – 11:30AM   <u>Keynote – Calvin Mitchell, Awards Management Division Director, NIFA</u>

11:30AM–11:45AM   Break

11:45AM–12:45PM   Speakers Panel (Marlon Argueta, Tonya Parker, Calvin Mitchell, Drenda Williams, & NIFA Representative)

12:45PM – 1PM   Break

1PM – 2PM   NAEPSDP Business Meeting and Awards

2PM – 2:30PM   Break

2:30PM – 3:05PM   Concurrent Session 7 – Oral Presentations

Extension Faculty's Ability to Address Complex Problems of Clientele (Andree' Walker Bravo, Lendel Narine, & Paul Hill)

Linking Organizational Behaviors to Employees' Critical Psychological States (Marina Denny & Marty Ellard)

Program Playbooks: Choose, Clarify, and Create Cohesion in Program Efforts (Teresa McCoy, Virginia Brown)

Quality Control as Open Communication: Clarifying expectations, ensuring data quality, and tailoring feedback to local activity reporting during COVID-19 (Joel Drevlow & Christian Schmieder)

3:05PM – 3:15Pm   Break

3:15PM – 3:50PM   Concurrent Session 8 – Oral Presentations

Developing Micro-Credentials for Professional Development: A Case Study (Justin McKenzie, Chris Plein, Sarah Baughman, & Andy Crocker)

Formative Evaluation of a Remote Work Program for Utah Organizational Leaders (Amanda Ali & Paul Hill)

Applying Focused Excellence: The Program Area Framework (Amy Parrott, Michael Hauser, & Joshua Farella)

Visualizing Statewide Needs Assessment Survey Results (Diane Craig)

3:50PM – 4PM   Break

4PM – 4:15PM   Closing – Steven Siegelin, 2021 NAEPSDP President, Montana State University

4:15PM – 4:45PM   NAEPDSP New Board Members Meeting