



Organizational Development Strategies

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE RESEARCH AND EDUCATION (SARE)
NORTH CENTRAL REGION
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (PDP)
EVALUATION PROJECT
FINAL REPORT

NOVEMBER 2003

Organizational Development Strategies
2044 West Warner Avenue, Suite 206
Chicago, IL 60618
(773) 348-7299

OUTLINE

- I BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT
- II EXTENSION EDUCATOR SURVEY
 - A. Introduction
 - B. Demographics
- III SURVEY FINDINGS
 - A. Strategic Conclusions
 - B. Highlights of Findings
 - 1. Attitudes About Sustainable Agriculture
 - 2. Motivation of Educators and Producers
 - 3. Educator Expertise
 - 4. Educator Practice
 - 5. Relationship of Educators to SARE
 - 6. Community Outreach
 - 7. Sustainable Agriculture Advocates
- IV FINDINGS BY DEMOGRAPHIC CATEGORY
- V SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS WITH PDP/SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE COORDINATORS
- VI PROPOSED NC SARE EVALUATION DESIGN
 - A. Assumptions
 - B. Components of the Design
 - C. Evaluation Schedule (2004 –2007)

I BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROJECT

In August 2001, Organizational Development Strategies was contracted to conduct an internal assessment for USDA-CSREES-SARE. The purpose of the assessment was to assist SARE national and the regional staff and Administrative Councils in conducting an internal assessment of the organization and to provide the basis for a future external assessment.

The major goal of the assessment was to develop an understanding of what was working well within SARE and to seek ways to improve the program. The project utilized two consultants, Michael Groh, Consultant, Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Peter Coolson, Chicago, Illinois on the project.

The internal assessment took place from September 2001 to April 2002 and a final project report on the assessment was presented in May 2002 at a national SARE meeting.

In January 2003, Paula Ford, Professional Development Program Coordinator, North Central Region invited consultants to bid on an evaluation project for the region. The purpose of the project was to identify, collect and analyze critical baseline data from extension educators and PDP coordinators and to help create an evaluation framework in which NC SARE could evaluate the effectiveness of regional activities and the impact of expanded funding opportunities in the future.

In February 2003 the North Central Region selected Organizational Development Strategies (ODS) as the project consultant. The desired project deliverables included

- A. Development and Administration of a regional Extension Educators Survey
- B. Collection and Analysis of Baseline Data that will describe the current practice among PDP Coordinators and help to develop an evaluation framework for the region.
- C. Comprehensive Project Report including a summary of the findings from the extension educators survey and an evaluation framework for NC SARE including consultant recommendations as to how the NC Region should proceed with the next phase of the evaluation.

The project approach incorporated planning sessions with regional leaders, a review of past evaluation efforts, a survey of extension educators in the region, telephone interviews with PDP/Sustainable Agriculture Coordinators and regular conference calls with a regional planning committee. The consultants who worked on this project were Peter Coolson, Chicago, Illinois, Michael Groh, Minneapolis, Minnesota and Richard J. Petronio, Ph.D., Santa Fe, New Mexico

II EXTENSION EDUCATOR SURVEY

A. Introduction

Organizational Development Strategies, working with Surcon International, developed a 90-item survey questionnaire aimed at understanding the attitudes, knowledge level and practice of extension educators concerning sustainable agriculture.

The survey was administered on the Internet to 1175 educators during August and September 2003. All of the states in the region participated in the survey with the exception of South Dakota.

Completed surveys were received from 580 educators for an overall response rate of 49% and an overall margin of error of +/- 2%. In addition, sufficient responses were received from 8 states that permitted a separate analysis of data for Illinois (+/- 3%), Indiana (+/- 2%), Iowa (+/- 5%), Kansas (+/- 1%), Missouri (+/- 4%), Nebraska (+/- 5%), North Dakota (+/- 3%) and Ohio (+/- 3%).

B. Demographics

The results of the survey indicate that the NC SARE region is composed of 82% male and 18% female extension educators. Only half of the extension educators are responsible for a single county, about one quarter work in multiple counties and the remaining relate to either a larger region/district (15%) or a statewide constituency (13%).

Educators in the region have a very high level of formal education. About one in five have only a Bachelor's Degree, while the remaining four-fifths have either a Master's Degree or a Doctorate.

Level of Education	Percent of Educators
B.A./B.S.	19%
M.A./M.S.	66%
Ph.D.	15%

Educators in the NC SARE region have a great deal of employment experience with Extension Service. About three-fourths of them have 10 or more years experience and almost one-third of the educators have over 20 years of experience with Extension.

Experience Level	Percent of Educators
Less than 1 Year	03%
One to Five Years	23%
Six to Ten Years	17%
Eleven to Twenty Years	28%
Over Twenty Years	29%

The percent of educators in NC SARE (29%) who have over 20 years experience, presents both a threat and an opportunity for the region. Over the next ten years, the region could lose almost 1/3 of its educator workforce to retirement. This represents a potential loss, as these individuals are among the most experienced extension professionals in the region.

However, as these educators retire, the region will also have opportunities to develop a new sustainable agriculture constituency among younger extension professionals entering the field.

III SURVEY OF EXTENSION EDUCATORS

The questionnaire asked for educator opinions about attitudes, knowledge and practice concerning sustainable agriculture. In addition, it queried respondents about their connection to SARE and their participation in SARE activities.

In completing an analysis of the survey data, the consultants reached a number of strategic conclusions about extension educators in the region.

A. STRATEGIC CONCLUSIONS

1. Educator Attitudes About Sustainable Agriculture

Extension educators are overwhelmingly positive about the importance of sustainable agriculture and about its potential for application in the region.

2. Motivation of Educators and Producers

A huge disparity exists between the strong interest of extension educators in promoting and teaching sustainable agriculture and their perception that producers are not very interested in learning about sustainable agriculture.

3. Expertise of Educators

About half of extension educators see themselves as knowledgeable in most sustainable agriculture practices, systems and policies, while the remaining half feel that they are “not too” or “not at all” knowledgeable about sustainable agriculture.

4. Educator Practice

Many extension educators have made only modest efforts in teaching and promoting sustainable agriculture in the region, even though virtually all hold highly positive attitudes about sustainable agriculture.

5. Sustainable Agriculture Advocates

The data leads us to an assumption that there is a core group of educators (about 1 in 4) who stand out as strong sustainable agriculture “advocates” in the region. These individuals have a very high interest in teaching and promoting sustainable agriculture, implement one program or more each quarter and regularly conduct on-site teaching with farmers and ranchers.

6. Relationship of Educators with SARE

Most educators in the region use SARE as a valuable information resource on sustainable agriculture and actively participate in SARE activities and grant programs.

7. Community Outreach

Considerably less than half of extension educators are programming outside the traditional producer target groups.

B. HIGHLIGHTS OF SURVEY FINDINGS

1. Educator Attitudes About Sustainable Agriculture

Strategic Conclusion - *Extension educators in the NC SARE region are overwhelmingly positive about the importance of sustainable agriculture and about its potential for application.*

- A. Almost all educators in the region (96%) feel that it is important for farmers and ranchers to be educated on the use of sustainable agriculture practices.
- B. Almost all educators (89%) believe that sustainable agriculture can be implemented on farms and ranches in their area.
- C. Almost all educators (89%) believe that sustainable agriculture promotes production systems that are environmentally sound.
- D. The great majority of educators (75%) believe that sustainable agriculture promotes production systems in their area that are socially acceptable. (One out of five educators are uncertain about the social acceptance of sustainable agriculture in their area.)
- E. A majority of educators (62%) believe that sustainable agriculture promotes production systems that are economically profitable. However, a significant minority (27%) is uncertain about whether or not it is economically profitable in their area.

2. Motivation of Educators and Producers

Strategic Conclusion - *A huge disparity exists between the strong interest of extension educators in promoting and teaching sustainable agriculture and their perception that producers are not very interested in learning about sustainable agriculture.*

- A. The great majority of educators (78%) are “interested or highly interested” in promoting and educating others in sustainable agriculture.
- B. However, the great majority of educators (80%) believe that farmers and ranchers have only “some” or “very little interest” in learning about sustainable agriculture.
- C. Only a minority of educators (20%) believes that farmers and ranchers have “strong interest” in learning about sustainable agriculture.

3. Expertise of Educators

Strategic Conclusion – *About half of extension educators see themselves as knowledgeable in most sustainable agriculture practices, systems and policies, while the remaining half feel that they are “not too” or “not at all” knowledgeable about sustainable agriculture.*

- A. Over half of extension educators feel that they are knowledgeable in nine of the thirteen sustainable agriculture practices, systems and policies listed in the survey.
- B. Educators have the greatest practice expertise in management intensive grazing systems. Most (67%) are “knowledgeable” and over 20% are “extremely knowledgeable” concerning management intensive grazing systems.
- C. The areas where educators have the least expertise include agro forestry and alternative land use practices, community food systems and federal information and regulations.
- D. In general, educators are not as knowledgeable about policy as they are about sustainable agriculture practice and systems.
- E. The majority of educators lack sufficient knowledge of federal information, regulations and programs regarding sustainable agriculture.

Sustainable Practices	Knowledgeable Educators
Management Intensive Grazing Systems	67%
Alternative Marketing Approaches	60%
Organic Agriculture	58%
Technology Assessment/Appropriate Technology	53%
Agro Forestry and Alternative Land Uses	34%

Sustainable Systems	Knowledgeable Educators
Whole Farm Planning Approaches	58%
Sustainable Agriculture and Community Development	50%
Farm Business Planning for Sustainable Agriculture	51%
Establishing Farmer to Farmer Information Networks	50%
Community Food Systems	38%

Sustainable Policies	Knowledgeable Educators
Farmland Protection	57%
Federal Programs to Support Sustainable Agriculture	46%
Federal Information and Regulation	38%

Alternate Sources of Learning

In addition to SARE, extension educators use a number of sources when presenting information on sustainable agriculture. The following shows the percentage of educators who get information on sustainable agriculture from these sources.

SOURCE	Percent of Educators
Land Grant University	92%
SARE	73%
Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas/ATTRA	32%
Sustainable Agriculture Network (SAN)	22%
Alternative Farming Information Systems (AFSIC)	08%

In addition, educators use other state-based systems (e.g. Missouri Alternative Center, Ohio Ecological Farmers Association) and other regional or national NGO's (e.g. Rodale Institute and Center for Rural Affairs) among their sources of learning.

4. Educator Practice

Strategic Conclusion – *Many extension educators have made only modest efforts in teaching and promoting sustainable agriculture in the region, even though virtually all hold highly positive attitudes about sustainable agriculture.*

- A. Over the past two years only one-fifth of extension educators have delivered from 6 to 10 or more programs on sustainable agriculture. Over half have delivered from 1 to 5 programs and one out of four educators have not delivered any programs on sustainable agriculture over the past two years.
- B. Only one fourth of extension educators work “often” with farmers and ranchers, *on their farm*, in promoting sustainable agriculture. Almost half of extension educators do on-farm work only “occasionally” and about one out of three “seldom” work with farmers and ranchers on their farm.
- C. Almost 3/4 of educators are not reaching limited resource or socially disadvantaged farmers. Less than one-third has delivered sustainable agriculture programs to limited resource or socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers over the past two years.
- D. An exception exists in the area of programming to small farms. About two-thirds of educators have delivered sustainable agriculture programs to small farms (with gross farm income of less than \$250,000) over the past two years.

Number of Programs (2 year Period)	Percent of Educators
10 or More Programs	09%
6 to 9 Programs	12%
2 to 5 Programs	39%
1 Program	14%
No Programs	26%

5. Sustainable Agriculture Advocates

Strategic Conclusion - *The data leads us to an assumption that there is a core group of educators (about 1 in 4) who stand out as strong sustainable agriculture “advocates” in the region. These individuals have a very high interest in teaching and promoting sustainable agriculture, implement one program or more on sustainable agriculture each quarter and often conduct on-site teaching with farmers and ranchers.*

- A. About 1 of 3 educators (30%) relate that they are “highly interested” in personally promoting and educating others in sustainable agriculture.
- B. One out of five educators (21%) have conducted from 6 to 10 or more programs on sustainable agriculture over the past two years.
- C. One out of five educators work “often or very often” with farmers and ranchers, on their farm, in promoting sustainable agriculture.

6. Relationship of Educators with SARE

Strategic Conclusion - *Most educators in the region use SARE as a valuable information resource on sustainable agriculture and actively participate in SARE activities and grant programs.*

- A. The great majority of educators (73%) use SARE as one of their information sources in preparing for presentations.
- B. A majority of educators (61%) include SARE as a primary source of learning about sustainable agriculture.
- C. About half of extension educators in the region are engaged with SARE through meetings and conferences (54%) or other PDP activities (43%).
- D. Almost one third of educators (29%) have participated in SARE tours of research sites.
- E. The SARE grant processes have reached about one out of four educators as cooperators in research and education grants (27%), producer grants (25%) and PDP grants (21%).

7. Community Outreach

Strategic Conclusion - Considerably less than half of extension educators are programming outside the traditional producer target groups.

- A. Less than half of educators have delivered sustainable agriculture programs to consumer or general public groups over the past two years.
- B. About one out of three educators have delivered sustainable agriculture programs to commodity groups, youth groups and other public agencies over the past two years.
- C. Only a minority of educators regularly partner with non-profit organizations when delivering programs on sustainable agriculture.
- D. Only a small minority of extension educators has delivered sustainable agriculture programs to environmental groups over the past two years.

Audience	% of Educators Doing Programs
Small Farms	66%
Consumer/General Public	42%
Commodity Groups	35%
Youth Groups	33%
Limited Resource Farmers	29%
Other Public Agencies	28%
Environmental Groups	15%

Partnering with Others

When delivering programs on sustainable agriculture, almost half of extension educators (45%) partner with groups of farmers or ranchers, while less than one third of educators (29%) partner with nonprofit organizations.

IV Survey Responses by Demographic Category

In addition to the overall analysis, data was reported out by gender, educational level, geographical responsibility and tenure with Extension Service. The following are highlights from each demographic category.

1) Gender

- Attitudes about sustainable agriculture are very similar in most areas of the survey regardless of gender.
- Male and female educators are very similar in their practice regarding sustainable agriculture.
- However, with a few exceptions, women educators see themselves as significantly less knowledgeable about sustainable agriculture than their male counterparts see themselves as knowledgeable about sustainable agriculture.
- Women educators are significantly less participative in SARE programs and grant processes than their male counterparts.

2) Educational Level

- Positive responses regarding educator attitudes, knowledge and practice of sustainable agriculture go up slightly as the educational level advances from Bachelor to Master's and Ph.D.
- Doctoral level educators are twice as likely to perceive farmers and ranchers as interested in learning about sustainable agriculture than their Master's level and Bachelor's level counterparts.
- Bachelor level educators work least frequently with farmers/ranchers, on their farm, compared to their counterparts.
- Ph.D. level educators are two to three times more likely to participate, as a cooperator, in SARE funded research and education projects than their counterparts in the region.

3) Geographical Responsibilities

- Extension educators with statewide responsibilities are more likely to view sustainable agriculture as promoting production systems that are socially acceptable than do their single or multiple county counterparts in the region.
- Educators with a statewide focus are more likely to work with farmers and ranchers, on their farm, than other multiple county agents and twice as likely to do on farm work than single county agents.
- Single County and multiple county extension agents are more participative in SARE activities than statewide agents, with the exception of SARE funded research and education grants.
- Region or District educators have delivered more programs with farmers and ranchers than their single county, multiple county or statewide counterparts.

4) Length of Service with Extension

- New extension educators (less than one year experience) are much more likely to view sustainable agriculture as promoting production systems that are economically profitable than are their more experienced counterparts.
- Educators with six or more years experience have more positive attitudes and better knowledge concerning sustainable agriculture, than do those with five years experience or less.
- Educators with six or more years experience conduct significantly more programs with farmers and ranchers than do their less experienced counterparts.
- Educator participation in SARE activities and grant processes goes up progressively after educators have six or more years experience with Extension.

V SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS WITH PDP/SUSTAINABLE AGRICULTURE COORDINATORS

In September and October, 2003 the project consultants interviewed, by telephone, sixteen PDP/Sustainable Agriculture Coordinators from ten states (Michigan did not participate in the interview). The purpose of the interviews was to talk with coordinators about their work with extension educators and their ideas concerning evaluation.

The following are themes that frequently surfaced during the interviews.

- A. What are the highest priority sustainable agriculture results that you are trying to achieve in your work with Extension Educators?
 - 1. Educators will have a greater awareness and deeper knowledge of sustainable agriculture and related alternative practices.
 - 2. Extension educators will teach and promote sustainable agriculture principles and practices to end users, officials and the public.
 - 3. Producers will change their practices as a result of these efforts.

- B. What are the major kinds of activities (interventions) that you implement with extension educators to achieve these results?
 - 1. Staff trainings, workshops and in-services.
 - 2. Tours and onsite visits to farms and ranches.
 - 3. Travel scholarships/financial supports.
 - 4. Mini grants.
 - 5. Websites and newsletter.

- C. How much time of your "SARE" time do you spend on planning and implementing these activities?

Both the amount of time that state coordinators spend on SARE activities and on working directly with extension educators varies greatly from state to state.

- D. What methods are used to evaluate the impact of these activities on extension educators?
 - 1. Pre and post-test instruments after trainings, meetings and other events. (Some of the post testing is done up to six months later to determine the impact of the training or activity.)
 - 2. Conversations and anecdotal sharing

- E. What methods do extension educators use to evaluate the impact of their work with producers?
 - 1. Written evaluations conducted at sponsored events
 - 2. Surveys
 - 3. Pre and post test instruments
 - 4. Written impact statements and questionnaires

- F. Of all of your activities with extension educators, which seem to give you the “best bang for the buck,” (the best results for the investment of time, money and energy)?
 - 1. Onsite tours
 - 2. One to one conversations and relationship building
 - 3. Showcasing those who have done something positive.

- G. What are your preferred evaluation methods for evaluating your sustainable agriculture activities?
 - 1. Surveys
 - 2. Pre and post evaluations of trainings
 - 3. Informal dialog and feedback
 - 4. Longitudinal studies.

- H. If we had a “just right” evaluation tool or method, what would it measure and evaluate?
 - 1. The extent and breadth of attitude changes about sustainable agriculture.
 - 2. Changes in the kinds of sustainable agriculture programming being implemented by extension educators.
 - 3. Actual use of sustainable agriculture practices by producers.

- I. What is your current level of evaluation expertise?
 - 1. Moderate (average, pretty good)
 - 2. Low

- J. What evaluation capacity building or training do you need?
 - 1. Seminars to build knowledge base, learn about tools and interpret results.
 - 2. Timely and efficient phone and email consults and technical assistance.
 - 3. Knowing who has relevant information and how to access it.
 - 4. Having templates and website based examples and tools.

- K. State coordinators stated that they could devote about 10 to 15% of their SARE time to implementing outcomes evaluation in their state.

- L. Other perspectives on developing an evaluation framework for the region include the following ideas:
 - 1. Make it simple and fit what we already are doing.
 - 2. Evaluation is important and we have to keep at it.
 - 3. Focus on end-user and producer impacts.
 - 4. Longer-term tracking and longitudinal work is needed.

VI PROPOSED NC SARE EVALUATION DESIGN

The project consultants recommend that NC SARE review, revise and/or adopt this proposed evaluation design. It presents a comprehensive approach that is intended to substantially advance the evaluation agenda of the region over the next four years. However, if adequate resources are not available to implement the entire plan, the region may need to prioritize and select those components that it can accomplish with available time and resources.

A. ASSUMPTIONS

This proposed evaluation design is based on a number of consultant assumptions derived from meetings with the regional planning group, interviews with State PDP/Sustainable Agriculture coordinators, analysis of current evaluation efforts, input from regional staff and results from the extension educator survey.

- The evaluation design should be simple and respect the limited time that PDP/Sustainable Agriculture coordinators have for SARE evaluation efforts.
- The evaluation design should utilize national SARE, NC SARE and state level university evaluation resources.
- The role of the regional office in evaluation is to direct and manage larger evaluation efforts, facilitate training and technical assistance and promote consistency among the states in the region.
- The evaluation approach should incorporate a “building block design” whose components are staged in over time, build on prior results, advance from the easier to the more complicated components and share responsibility for evaluation between the NC SARE region and the states.
- A regional committee will need to be created to direct and give guidance to evaluation activity in the NC SARE region,

B. COMPONENTS OF THE DESIGN

The major approach of the proposed NC SARE PDP evaluation design is to accumulate data over time, gradually build evaluation competency and baseline data and regularly share evaluation results with stakeholders in order to influence and change sustainable agriculture practice in the region.

The evaluation design consists of the following four major components:

1. Regional Evaluation Committee
2. Capacity Building of PDP Coordinators
3. Development of a Standard Evaluation Instrument
4. Expansion of the Regional Data Base

1. Regional Evaluation Committee

In order to give direction to and oversee the implementation of the evaluation design, it is recommended that the region create an Evaluation Committee. The committee could meet in conjunction with regular Administrative Council meetings or other regional meetings or by conference call.

Potential members might include regional staff, Administrative Council members, State PDP coordinators, evaluation specialists from Extension departments in the states and staff from the SARE national office. The chair of this committee should preferably be someone who has specialized expertise in evaluation.

2. Capacity Building of PDP/State Coordinators

Training of coordinators should emphasize a steady, modest and continuous growth in evaluation knowledge and expertise, taking very seriously the cutbacks and overwork dynamics affecting state coordinators. In this design, PDP/State coordinators are seen primarily as facilitators and consumers of evaluation.

Emphasis should be placed on helping coordinators understand and interpret results and define implications of these results for the practice of sustainable agriculture in their state. In the end, evaluation results should be used to change practice in the region.

As part of the capacity building process, the region will conduct an “evaluation users workshop” for PDP/State Coordinators that incorporates findings from evaluation activities completed to date, assists them in interpreting these findings and develops useful strategies for coordinators to implement as a result of the findings. The workshop will engage resources from NC SARE, national SARE, universities and other SARE regions in conducting the workshop.

3. Development of a Standard Sustainable Agriculture Evaluation Instrument

Because of the great variance among the states, both in evaluation methods and evaluation efforts, it is recommended that the NC SARE region create a simple, common questionnaire that could be used by PDP/State Coordinators and Extension Educators in all twelve states to evaluate sustainable agriculture workshops, in-service training, site visits and other presentations with a variety of audiences.

Each state would use the standard questionnaire when evaluating sustainable agriculture events and activities and, if so desired, would add additional questions that are relevant to their own state. The questionnaires could be aggregated on a semi-yearly or yearly basis to give a good regional overview of how sustainable agriculture customers feel about what was offered and how it impacted them.

4. Expansion of the Regional Data Base

The approach in this design is to develop baseline data in two critical areas over the next four-year period, measure progress in each area during alternate years and continuously build on the results. This will be followed by a longitudinal study that will track progress with producers over three years.

A) Extension Educator Survey

The Extension Educator survey, administered in the summer of 2003, will be repeated in 2005 in order to learn what progress has been made in educator attitudes, knowledge and practice concerning sustainable agriculture.

B) Producer or Campus Leadership Survey

A second regional survey will be developed and administered in 2004 and re-administered in 2006. Based on input from this project, it is recommended that the region conduct either a survey of Producers or a survey of Campus Leadership. This second survey would help the region understand the critical attitudes, knowledge and practices of another important group of sustainable agriculture stakeholders. The method used could be either quantitative (written or web-based survey) or qualitative (interviews and/or focus groups).

A producer survey would seek producer opinions about sustainable agriculture attitudes, knowledge and practices similar to those asked in the survey of Extension Educators. It could also include the opinions of producers about the impact extension educators on producer behavior concerning sustainable agriculture. A survey of campus leadership (i.e. deans, administrators, regional directors, professors and central staff on campus) would be geared towards understanding the attitudes, commitment and priorities of campus leadership concerning sustainable agriculture.

C) A Longitudinal Study of Grant Recipients

A common concern raised by PDP/State Coordinators was the need for the region to demonstrate impact of NC SARE activities on producers. In order to measure producer outcomes, a longer, more rigorous study will be necessary.

The approach that we recommend is to use NC SARE grant recipients funded in 2006 and 2007 as the study group and follow them over a period of three years. The longitudinal study would address critical questions about the impact of NC SARE grants on producer attitudes and on actual producer behavior concerning sustainable agriculture. Since such a study would require increased financial resources, the region might seek to partner with national SARE on this project.

C. PROPOSED EVALUATION SCHEDULE (2004-2007)

This proposed evaluation schedule details major regional evaluation activities conducted in the four-year period from 2004 through 2007.

**YEAR 2004
January – March**

ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE PERSON OR GROUP	MAJOR COMPONENT
Analyze, revise and/or adopt proposed evaluation design.	Bill Wilke, Paula Ford, and regional leadership.	Administration
Provide technical assistance to state PDP coordinators on the interpretation of the extension educator survey results.	Regional Staff	Capacity Building
Recruit and Convene a Regional Evaluation Committee.	Regional Staff/Committee Chairperson	Evaluation Committee

April – June 2004

ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE PERSON OR GROUP	MAJOR COMPONENTS
Disseminate analysis of Extension Educator Survey results and their implications for practice.	Regional staff	Expansion of Data Base
Plan and develop a standard regional questionnaire.	Regional Staff/Evaluation Committee	Development of a Standard Instrument
Catalog evaluation resources in each state.	State PDP Coordinators and Regional Staff	Capacity Building
Hold Conference Call with Regional Evaluation Committee	Regional Staff/Committee Chairperson	Administration

YEAR 2004
July – September

ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE PERSON OR GROUP	MAJOR COMPONENTS
Hold Regional Evaluation Committee Conference Call	Regional Staff/Committee Chairperson	Administration
Plan and develop a second regional survey (i.e. Producer or Campus Leadership survey).	Regional Staff/Evaluation Committee	Expansion of Data Base
Disseminate Standard Questionnaire to state coordinators.	Regional staff	Standard Instrument

October – December 2004

ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE PERSON OR GROUP	MAJOR COMPONENTS
Hold Regional Evaluation Committee Meeting	Regional Staff/Committee Chairperson	Evaluation Committee
Plan a Regional Evaluation “Users Workshop”.	Regional staff/Evaluation Committee	Capacity Building
Administer Campus Leadership or Producer Survey.	Regional Staff/Evaluation Committee	Expansion of Data Base
State coordinators incorporate evaluation activities in 2005 Plan of Work	State PDP Coordinators	Administration

YEAR 2005
January – June

ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE PERSON OR GROUP	MAJOR COMPONENTS
Hold Regional Evaluation Committee Meeting.	Regional staff/Committee Chairperson	Evaluation Committee
Collect state data from standardized questionnaire.	State PDP Coordinators and Regional Staff	Standard Instrument
Analysis of Campus Leadership or Producer Survey results and implications for practice.	Regional staff	Expansion of Data Base
Convene a Regional “Evaluation Users Workshop”.	Regional Staff/Evaluation Committee	Capacity Building
Plan Re-administration of Extension Educator Survey.	Regional Staff/Evaluation Committee	Expansion of Data Base

July – December 2005

ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE PERSON OR GROUP	MAJOR COMPONENTS
Hold Regional Evaluation Committee Meeting.	Regional Staff/Committee Chairperson	Evaluation Committee
Re-administer Extension Educator Survey.	Regional Staff/Evaluation Committee	Expansion of Data Base
Collect state data from standardized questionnaire.	State PDP Coordinators and Regional Staff	Standard Instrument
Conceptualize Longitudinal Study.	Regional staff/national SARE office	Expansion of Data Base
Collect data on NC SARE grant recipients in preparation for longitudinal study.	State PDP Coordinators and Regional Staff	

**YEAR 2006
JANUARY – DECEMBER**

ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE PERSON OR GROUP	MAJOR COMPONENTS
Hold Regional Evaluation Committee Meetings.	Regional Staff/Committee Chairperson	EVALUATION COMMITTEE
Collect and analyze data from consumer questionnaires in all states.	State PDP Coordinators and Regional Staff	Standard Instrument
Re-administer producer or campus leadership survey.	Regional Staff/Evaluation Committee	Expansion of Data Base
Develop Longitudinal Study RFP.	Regional Staff/Evaluation Committee	
Seek funding for Longitudinal Study.	Bill Wilke, Paula Ford, and regional leadership	
Collect data on NC SARE grant recipients in preparation for longitudinal study.	Regional Staff/Evaluation Committee	
Analysis and dissemination of campus leadership/producer survey results and implications.	State PDP Coordinators and Regional Staff	

**YEAR 2007
JANUARY – DECEMBER**

ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE PERSON OR GROUP	MAJOR COMPONENTS
Hold evaluation committee meetings	Regional Staff/Committee Chairperson	Evaluation Committee
Implement Longitudinal Study of Regional Grant Recipients	Regional Staff/Evaluation Committee	Longitudinal Study
Develop a regional evaluation plan for 2007-2010	Regional staff and leadership.	Administration