

Class 9 Project Summaries

Dale Whittaker
Class 9

Developed a telephone survey for multidisciplinary institutes within land grant institutions aimed at uncovering successful organizational structures and relationships with traditional departments. The phone interviews will be conducted in the summer.

Visited administrators at all levels of the Texas A&M University System and interviewed them about their role, responsibility, and personal feelings about being an administrator.

Met every other week with my mentor and discussed several issues affecting the college, our department, the future of agriculture in Texas, etc. The primary value was to get to know on a personal and professional basis an administrator for whom I have a great deal of respect.

George Vellidis

Objective: Develop the curriculum for a Certificate in Precision Agriculture for the University of Georgia College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences

Precision Agriculture is a flagship research and technology transfer program of the University of Georgia College of Agricultural & Environmental Sciences (CAES). Nevertheless, adoption of Precision Agriculture techniques and technologies by the private sector is lagging in the southeast primarily because of the lack of adequately trained personnel. My project aspires to alleviate this bottleneck by developing the curriculum for a 2-year course of study in Precision Agriculture. No one in the nation is currently offering such training. This curriculum will allow the University of Georgia (UGA) to offer a Certificate in Precision Agriculture and sister institution Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College (ABAC) to offer an Associate's Degree in Precision Agriculture. Because the curriculum will be offered in Tifton, it will allow CAES faculty at Tifton to participate in the College's teaching program - a longstanding need.

Curtis Weller

My Phase II objective was to assess current level of and strengthen international opportunities for undergraduate students in agricultural sciences and natural resources at the University of Nebraska. My starting point was the list of recommendations that resulted from a previous Phase II project at Nebraska.

Upon review of the previous recommendations and the status of their implementation, my mentor (Dean Don Edwards), the newly appointed Director of International Programs and I decided I should lead efforts to update the international minor for undergraduate students in agricultural sciences and natural resources. An updated International Agriculture and Natural Resources Minor, available to any Nebraska student, was approved this past spring semester.

My assessment and review of international opportunities at Nebraska allowed me to better understand the Office of International Programs within the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources and International Affairs at Nebraska. More subtle but as important was the new network I was able to create for myself within the international areas at Nebraska.

Julia Beamish

Phase II has involved two types of activities. I have visited with numerous administrators through my participation in several university committees and activities and I undertook a study for my mentor, the Dean of Human Resources and Education, that focused on ways to merge the focus and direction of Agricultural Experiment Station research and Cooperative Extension programming within my college. 1) During this year, I chaired a university commission and met regularly with the Dean of the Graduate School and the Vice-President for Research and Graduate Studies and with the University Council. I also served on a university committee to review the Graduate School. This has provided me with an opportunity to better understand the way the university is managed and the roles played by faculty and administration. 2) My project for Phase II has been to conduct a survey among deans of peer programs in Family and Consumer Sciences, concerning the administration and program direction of the AES and CES units. I made a report of the study which included suggestions that would help AES and CES work more closely together. Centers should be expanded to address some issues that could be dealt with by both AES and CES faculty. The Center for Gerontology offers this model to the college, but other areas may need the Center concept to build focus and visibility. A research advisory board should be developed and a five-year strategic plan should be undertaken to help direct the research program. I will continue to be involved in implementing these suggestions.

Gary McBryde

At the start of the ESCOP Phase II activity I became the Interim Department Chair of the Human Sciences Department at Texas A&M University-Kingsville. Part of the responsibilities of the Chair included serving on a design team to plan construction for a new building for a Center for Young Children. Together these two activities absorbed and became my phase II activity. Reflecting back over the year, if there has been a lesson learned, it concerns the distinction between management and leadership, and the special relation each holds towards information and knowledge. In casting a brief and somewhat simplistic distinction, managers use information to make decisions over risky activities. Leaders in contrast become much more intimate with the knowledge within an organization to guide emerging and ambiguous events. Instead of talking about 'decisions' leaders see situations of irresolution, in which a conflict is sensed over "what should be done?" A situation of irresolution is characteristically initiated by a type of claim that can arise from multiple sources, for example a routine evaluation, an external contingency, or a proposal presenting new possibilities. A clue to the nature of the difference in managerial and leadership actions is that the ensuing resolution is not a process in which only purely logical alternatives are considered. Resolution focuses on patterns of people; the past as a pattern of capabilities and the future as potential for further actions. Hewlett Packard's chairman Lew Platt lamented "if only we knew what we know at HP." Building on this distinction between leaders and managers and their relation to knowledge and information. Knowledge requires a knower. Thus, while it makes sense to ask where is the information? It seems odd to ask where is the knowledge. Moreover, this attachment to a knower makes knowledge less mobile than information. Information can be downloaded quickly, but people assimilate and digest information into knowledge based on context less quickly. Due to this, in part, knowledge is seldom seen as contradictory, but information frequently conflicts. The central point is that good managers in making decisions mine information sources often independent from people in the organization. In contrast, good leaders must work the mother lode of knowledge held by people within the organization. The key to the distinction is that while managers can analyze and collect information to solve decisions. Being decisive for leaders is insufficient. In order to be effective helmsmen, to move beyond conflicting claims of irresolution, leaders must engage and motivate people to learn and assimilate information into knowledge. More often than not the task requires our hearts as well as our minds.

George Vance

Title: Enhancing USDA National Research Initiative Competitive Grant Writing and Evaluating Collaborative Efforts Between Land-Grant University and Agricultural Research Service Scientists.

Two projects were developed as part of my ESCOP Phase 2. During the fall semester I was primarily involved in enhancing faculty and staff efforts in writing research grants. I also continued to promote other sources of research funding during the spring semester. In addition to Phase 2 activities at the University of Wyoming, I developed a project with the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) to evaluate cooperative efforts between ARS and Land-Grant University (LGU) scientists. University of Wyoming faculty had submitted between six and ten grant proposals per year to the USDA National Research Initiative (NRI) Competitive Grants Program from 1996 to 1999. To encourage faculty and staff to submit NRI grants I first attended the NRI Workshop in Orlando, FL and then prepared and presented seminars to all the departments in the College of Agriculture that explained the NRI program and the process for submitting proposals. I also assisted faculty and staff by providing information, guidance, and evaluation on their NRI proposals. This year the University of Wyoming submitted 29 NRI proposals. Some of the individuals who submitted proposals have already been notified that their proposals will be funded. In addition to the NRI program, I also assisted with other research activities that were part of Wyoming's Agricultural Experiment Station and Research function. In particular, I participated in the spring Western Agricultural Experiment Station Directors annual meeting and served on the Research Implementation Committee. Another ESCOP Phase 2 activity, which included part of my sabbatical leave, involved working with the Northern Plains Area (NPA) ARS. As an ARS collaborator/consultant, I visited several ARS and LGU Research and Extension centers, interviewed numerous scientists, research leaders, center/laboratory directors and provided assistance to the NPA Director's office. A survey was developed as a result of my initial ARS activities, as well as information gathered from LGU scientists and administrators, and was sent to approximately 250 NPA ARS scientists and 1,500 LGU faculty and administrators. I am currently collecting the surveys and plan on statistically evaluating the results. A survey summary will be provided to ARS and LGU personnel.

Jodie Holt

ESCOP/ACOP Leadership Development Program

Description of Phase 2 Project

Jodie S. Holt

May 19, 2000

Name: Jodie S. Holt Institution: University of California Address: Botany and Plant Sciences Department Riverside, CA 92521 Telephone: 909-787-3 801 Fax: 909-787-4437 Email: { [HYPERLINK "mailto:Jodie.holt@ucr.edu" }](mailto:Jodie.holt@ucr.edu) }Jodie.holt@ucr.edu Keywords: Experiment Station, facilitation, proposal for funding, workgroup Project Title: Facilitation of Faculty Participation in UC Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources Workgroup Process

Description: In the new organizational structure of the University of California (UC) Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR), resource allocation is driven by programmatic considerations and developed through a participatory process. To facilitate greater involvement by Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) faculty in this decision making process, I worked with the UCR College of Natural and Agriculture Sciences (NAGS) Associate Dean for AES/CE to develop a new proposal for allocation of supplemental Hatch funding, to be awarded for support of increased integration of AES research with DANR priorities, specifically through the workgroup format. My activities involved meeting with the Associate Dean on a regular basis to learn more about the organizational structure, analyzing data on current AES projects, matching current or potential projects with high priority DANR target issues, and meeting with chairs of all AES/CE departments at UCR to gather data, build consensus, and facilitate acceptance of the process. The final activity was to prepare a draft

proposal for submission to the Vice President of the DANR. During this process I developed a better understanding of the workings of the UCR NAGS College as well as the UC DANR.

Phase 2 Project Report: Margaret E. Smith

Title: Pushing the Envelope on Engagement

The recent Kellogg Commission report, "The Engaged Institution," carried a challenge to our land grant system to become more engaged in the problems and issues facing communities. My project focused on this concept of engagement, and explored models for being a truly "engaged institution" when dealing with controversial and rapidly emerging issues.

I considered the debate regarding genetically engineered organisms and how Cornell is responding to it. Like any other institution, Cornell does not speak with one voice on this issue, however we must strive to take an educational rather than an advocacy approach if we are to maintain credibility. Those who are most well informed about a technology like genetic engineering tend to be the researchers involved with that technology. Naturally they have vested interests in its future, which provides a built-in incentive towards advocating for the technology. This is a challenge inherent in the current funding and rewards structure of research. The distinction between education and advocacy needs to be continually clarified and reinforced by leaders in the college. Another significant challenge is equipping extension professionals with the information and tools needed to help local communities debate this issue. Educational resources need to present sufficient detail on this complex topic that the educators feel confident in discussing it, despite the fact that our educators are expected to be able to address a tremendous breadth of complex issues not just this one. In addition, the educators need tools like facilitation and conflict resolution skills, that go well beyond the bounds of what most of us receive as disciplinary training. Needs like these have motivated us to re-think the qualifications and expectations of extension educators in our system.

Another emerging and controversial issue that I considered was the college's response to growing concerns about the possible re-emergence of West Nile Virus this summer. In this case, the research base is evolving rapidly and public concerns are heightened by the conflicting risks of contracting the virus and of pesticide sprays that might be used to control its mosquito vector. In this case, we established a partnership between Cornell Cooperative Extension and the lead agency responding to this issue, the Department of Health. Given the many information sources readily available on any topic these days, our efforts were focused on directing people to high quality available resources and filling the resource gaps, rather than trying to provide a full set of resources from Cornell. This sort of model seems useful for rapidly emerging issues, in that it does not cast Extension as the disaster response agency, but rather allows us to respond in a timely manner within the realm of our educational role.

Leadership in these situations requires the ability to communicate clearly about college and extension roles as educational organizations, both within the institution and with external partners and stakeholders. It requires establishment of effective partnerships with other agencies. Finally, it requires careful consideration and articulation of extension's unique role in a situation where information is readily available from a multitude of sources, and where there are not clear, science-based answers to issues of public concern.

Tim Garrow

My phase II project is to assess the state-of-the-college in regards to evaluating faculty performance via the annual review process. As an introduction to the complexities of performance evaluation, in October I attended a conference entitled "Developing a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System". Since then, with Assistant

Dean for Academic Affairs (Dr. Cleora D'Arcy), I have interviewed all of the Department Heads in the College to ascertain the methods they employ to access faculty performance. The perceptions of the faculty about the process and outcome (merit raise) of the evaluation of their performance will also be assessed. The goal is to understand the different methods employed to measure faculty performance within our college and to get an idea of where faculty and administrators believe improvements can be made. Ultimately, I plan to share this information with all of the college administrators and faculty, perhaps in "best practices" type of seminar or short paper.

Ramble Ankumah

Project Title: Improving Coordination between Research, Teaching and Outreach in Environmental Sciences.

Description: My Phase II activities included fine tuning research, teaching and outreach in the environmental sciences. I coordinated the research and teaching activities in the Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and the Experiment station and explored ways to integrate these activities with extension and outreach. During this time, my mentor exposed me to the workings of the University Administration and outside agencies. My activities included attending the ESS meeting and SAES/ARD workshop in Memphis, TN; the NASULGC meeting, in San Francisco, CA; and the ARD and CARET meetings in Washington DC with my mentor. I was also trained in writing Impact Statements and I, in turn, trained a number of faculty in Impact Statement writing. The Research and teaching team also revised the Environmental Science curriculum and our research focus in water quality and environmental research.

Carl E. Sams
The University of Tennessee
Department of Plant and Soil Sciences
PO Box 1071
Knoxville, TN 37901-1071
Phone: (865)974-8818
Fax: (865)974-7997
e-mail: CARLSAMS@UTK.EDU

Phase II Project Summary

keywords: research administration, leadership, grants and contracts

DESCRIPTION: My phase II experiences were largely devoted to understanding the decision-making process in the Experiment Station setting, with emphasis on management of the Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station and impacts of state, federal and grant and contract funding on the Experiment Station programs. No release time was available and no formal project was undertaken. The administration of the Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station scheduled time to discuss budgets, operations and future planning for the Experiment Station. I also worked on developing a proposal to initiate an in-house grant system. The purpose of this system would be to give initial support to investigators who were developing and writing grant and contract proposals. The funds would be used to collect support data and to write and develop proposals. The Experiment Station Dean retired this winter and I will pursue this proposal with the new Dean next year. I have enjoyed the opportunity to interact with the Administration and feel that the ESCOP/ACOP program has given me a unique opportunity to experience both the trials and tribulations of Administering Agricultural Experiment Stations. The experience has been enlightening and enjoyable (most of the time).

Aufa'I ropeti Areta
Extensionon Program Coordinator
American Samoa Community College
Agriculture, Human & Natural Resources (AHNR)
American Samoa Community College (ASCC)
P.O. Box 5319
PagoPago, AS 96799
Phone (684) 699-1575 Fax (684) 699-5011

ESCOP PHASE 2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION/SUMMARY

The first component of my project was to develop an appreciation and understanding of the American Samoa Community College (ASCC) Department of Agriculture, Human & Natural Resources (AHNR) organization and function of the Experiment Station, Instruction, and Extension. This was accomplished through individual meetings with the AHNR Dean/Director, Research Coordinator, and Extension Program Managers. In addition, I reviewed the history of the Land Grant System through reading the Legacy. A Centennial History of the State Agricultural Experiment Station 1887-1987 by N.A. Kerr; Taking the University to the People. Seventy-five years of Cooperative Extension by W.D. Rasmussen; New Director/Administrator Briefing Book by the Personnel and Organizational Development Committee (PODC) of ECOP; and other CSREES documents including the Hatch and Smith-Lever Acts. I also reviewed local documents on the history of the Land Grant System in American Samoa.

By serving as the Acting Director of the ASCC-AHNR during the Director's absence, I was able to accomplish the following goals: Gain knowledge of the director's involvement in managing the overall program; Gain a perspective of the role of agricultural administrators in the context of the total college; and Become familiar with the day-to-day activities of the director the experiment station, instructional program, and extension service. Moreover, I had the opportunity to represent the Dean/Director to meetings with ASCC administrators, representatives of other government agencies, Non-government organizations (NGO's), and AHNR clients. I also represent the Dean/Director to various ASCC Committees.

The second component of my project was to develop an understanding of the function and role of the decision-makers in the administration of ASCC. This was accomplished through individual meetings with the Chairman of Board of Higher Education, President of ASCC, Dean of Instruction, Dean of Student Services, Dean/Director of AHNR, Chief Financial Officer, Human Resources Manager, Director of Administration, Director of Institutional Advancement, and Department Heads. After meeting the aforementioned decision-makers, I was able to accomplish the following goals: Learn how ASCC is structured and administered; Become familiar with ASCC governance process; Gain an understanding of their roles and how they impact the mission of ASCC; Gain an understanding of how the departments are organized and the role they play in ASCC; Gain an understanding of the Financial Management Policies and Procedures; Gain knowledge of Personnel Regulations and Procedures; and Understanding the general administration (communications, facilities, housing, security, utilities, grounds, maintenance, reproduction).

CHALLENGES:

1. Time Management This included managing time to accommodate regular work schedules, availability of decision-makers for meeting sessions, and unforeseen circumstances such as supervisors' directives for immediate action on various projects.
2. New Styles This involved trying to emulate new management techniques and leadership styles in a bicultural setting.

OPPORTUNITIES I. The Phase 2 project provided opportunities:

- a. To meet with high level/ key decision makers at ASCC and AHNR
- b. For key decision makers to share with me their experience, knowledge, and effective leadership styles
- c. For key decision makers to share with me their own challenges and frustrations and also solutions to problems at ASCC and AHNR
- d. To work with AHNR research, instruction, and extension programs on joint projects
- e. To emulate new management and leadership styles while working with subordinates and supervisors on a daily basis

INSIGHTS: I acquired leadership knowledge in our research, education, and extension programs as result of my Phase 2 project. In addition, I was able to put into practice effective leadership styles, tools, principles, and concepts. Consequently, positive changes in my leadership styles were evident in the results of my GOALGETTER Assessment and recognition by my supervisors, colleagues, and staff. I also received public recognition, letters of appreciation, and committee leadership appointments from the ASCC President and AHNR Director who is also my mentor and immediate supervisor

Cynda R. Clary

Phase 2 Summary:

My mentor was my academic dean. I went to his staff meetings and spent time with him learning about academic administration. It surprised me to learn how little of the college's budget is actually discretionary - most of the fund allocations are relatively fixed. Of course, even with this knowledge, I continued to ask for academic monies to fund my undergraduate activities.

As part of my project, I wanted to develop teaching support services for the NMSU College of Agriculture and Home Economics. I co-wrote two grants on this topic and submitted them to the USDA Higher Education Challenge Grants program. At this time, I am still waiting to hear about funding. My dean did commit space to the teaching support program assuming that the funding comes through.

The most important thing that I learned from ESCOP/ACOP was to not take conflict personally. I have tried to incorporate the "Four Guiding Principles for Resolving Conflict" into both my personal and work life. In fact, I was able to take a hostile work relationship with a colleague and turn it into a respectful working relationship (at least from my perspective - which is the critical one).

H. Michael Harrington

Phase 2

Hawaii agriculture is moving in a opposite direction to the rest of the US in that there has been an explosion of small farm operations. This increase in small operations has been driven by the dramatic decline in sugar production releasing thousands of acres of prime agricultural lands and by Hawaii's excellent climatic conditions in which nearly every crop can be grown. Because of the scale of Hawaii agriculture, much of what is done may be considered as meeting niche markets. Other major factors limiting success are the costs of production, distance to markets, and quarantine restrictions.

My project has been to help move the industry toward capitalizing on Hawaii's competitive advantages. What can Hawaii do better than anyone else? How can growers capitalize on the "Hawaii Mystic"? Can growers work together to meet larger markets? In other words, what could be done to make money in agriculture in Hawaii. To begin this effort I developed a presentation on the future of agriculture, then identified some underlying principles that could be used as a guide for the future. This presentation has been given six times

to various industry groups, at state-wide visioning meetings, and to a legislative task force. One major impact has been to have a large sugar company begin to diversify its operation.

H. Michael Harrington Interim Dean College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources

Jeffrey C. Silvertooth
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

Phase II Summary

The objective of this part of the program (Phase II) has been for me to develop a functional understanding of the administration and management that is currently operational in the College of Agriculture (COA) at the University of Arizona (my home institution). In so doing, I have been given the opportunity to interact with the COA Executive Council (Dean and Associate Deans) which has provided some excellent insight regarding strategic planning and implementation for research, instruction, and extension in the context of the financial and political constraints that are imposed. I have been given the opportunity to discuss the philosophy and objectives provided by an excellent group of experienced administrators. It has been extremely interesting and valuable for me to be able to evaluate the manner in which leadership is provided for the college.

I have also had the opportunity to interact with and discuss the philosophy and application of leadership at the departmental level with several department heads and consider the impact provided by leadership provided at the college level. An additional and critical element to a COA is that of the research and extension centers located off-campus around the state. I have also taken the opportunity to interact with the administrators of several of these units in AZ (Marana, Maricopa, and Yuma), evaluate leadership at that level, and consider the effects of policies and decisions that are made at the college and departmental levels.

I have enjoyed this phase of the program a great deal. I can honestly say that I have learned a lot and I know that I have benefited from this. In relation to Phase I, and what I have learned during Phase II, it is very clear to me that interpersonal dynamics are extremely important in leadership and program management. Thus, as we spent a considerable amount of time exploring in Phase I; individual personalities, perspectives, and opinions become critical in determining how leadership is developed and implemented. For example, I was extremely impressed by how well the Executive Council with the UA-COA worked together. The four-hour sessions they held every Tuesday morning were always heavily laced with critical and controversial issues. They discussed issues openly and directly and each of the participants always treated one another with respect, even when they were in clear disagreement on an issue or a point. Despite any disagreements, they always were able to come to a decision. Sometimes decisions and further discussion had to be tabled for a subsequent session. However, when decisions had to be made, they were taken care of. It has also been clear to me that the strategic plan, at least at a basic philosophical level, is always a fundamental part of the decision making process. This came up several times in an explicit fashion as the discussion was developed regarding several critical issues requiring some difficult decisions. I have also been able to witness the same process to some extent at the departmental and experiment station level.

My conclusion is that at every level the process of leadership and decision making is a matter heavily dependent upon the: 1) character and 2) commitment of the individuals involved.

Jeffrey C. Silvertooth, Ph.D.
Professor and Extension Agronomist - Cotton
Forbes 214, Bldg. #36
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
520-621-7616 (W)
520-621-7186 (fax)

Deborah Kipp

Phase 2 Summary Revised

The objectives of my Phase II project were to discuss a) ways to promote overall communications and interactions between Extension faculty of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences at North Carolina State University (NCSU) and ARS faculty in the School of Human Environmental Sciences at University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG), b) mechanisms to disseminate information on the research being conducted by ARS faculty at UNCG that might be of interest and pertinent to extension agents throughout North Carolina and visa versa, and c) means by which the NCSU Extension faculty and UNCG faculty interact on an on-going basis for research and education purposes. A number of meetings took place between myself and key administrators and faculty of both campuses to discuss these objectives and the best approach to use. Because there are nutrition, family sciences, and textiles faculty in both Extension and part of the NCARS faculty at UNCG, it was decided that the first interactions would be for nutrition-related faculty. Once that interaction was underway, other such meetings would take place for the human development and textiles faculty. A workshop is currently being planned for nutrition-related faculty from both campuses to meet, to discuss their current work, to discuss ways to maintain an open exchange of information between campuses, and to discuss ideas of ways to enhance collaborative efforts. This project will continue beyond the ESCOP/ACOP leadership program.

Phase 2 Summary

Gary J. Brewer
Professor and Chair
Department of Entomology
North Dakota State University
202 Hultz Hall
P.O. Box 5346
Fargo, North Dakota

I have been leading North Dakota State University's Leadership Initiative for Institutional Change (LILAC) project. We are part of a tri-state alliance of North Dakota State Univ., South Dakota State Univ., and Univ. of Minnesota called Northern Lights LILAC and we are affiliated with Kellogg's Food Systems Professions Education Vision for Change initiative. We are defining leadership models that promote university citizenship and active engagement within and among our land-grant university systems and engagement with our communities. We have been involved in interrelated activities at the local, regional, and national level. Locally we are examining the issues of collective leadership and university citizenship. Regionally we have partnered with South Dakota State University and University of Minnesota to develop mutually supportive local leadership projects to support engagement. Nationally we have participated in 6 national workshops focusing on leadership and engagement. Specific local projects include working with the President's office to define engagement. To that end we have authored a document titled, A Vision for Engagement at NDSU, that states what engagement is and should be at North Dakota State University and puts it in context of our current activities. And as a culminating experience melding collective leadership and engagement we have partnered with education specialists in Novartis, American Crystal, and Cenex Cooperatives to develop a framework for a distance MS in Plant Protection that will provide new educational opportunities for agricultural professionals. Concurrent with this effort is a graduate certificate program in Plant Protection. The time line for approval of the MS degree is January 2001.

Dr. Ray Lamond

Phase 2 Summary

My Phase 2 project was an in-depth evaluation of Kansas State's experiment field system. A survey asking about roles and responsibilities of the fields and the field agronomists, as well as questions about field location and coverage was sent to current field agronomists, extension personnel, producers, and ag-business people. Nearly 800 of the surveys were returned. I am currently summarizing results. We're trying to see if what our people see as major roles of the fields are similar to what our clientele think. We are also trying to see if our existing fields meet the needs of our clientele-are we covering the major soil/climate regions of the state. Do we need new fields-are we duplicating, etc. I plan to write a final summary and share with our dean and the director of the ag experiment station. Survey respondents will also receive a summary.

The project has been worthwhile as I've worked with many people in completing the survey. Summarizing the results has been a challenge.

Yolanda Brady
Phase 2 Experience

My Phase 2 Experience has helped me set realistic goals for myself. I have learned to set priorities in my research as well as my personal life. Weekly meetings with my mentor have helped my stay on track with my goals and priorities as well as learn more about my academic department. I have developed better organizational skills that my students and colleagues have noticed. I am still a "leader in training", but I feel confident that the skills I learned and have applied for the last 9 months will only continue to improve through my career.

Yolanda J. Brady, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Aquatic Animal Health
Auburn University
Fisheries & Allied Aquacultures
Swingle Hall
Auburn University, AL 36849-5419

Office: 334-844-9122
FAX: 334-844-9208
e-mail: ybrady@acesag.auburn.edu

Larry M. Shuman, University of Georgia
Phase II Project

Title: Raising the 'Environmental Image' of the University of
Georgia College of Agriculture and Environmental Science

My project was to work with the newly appointed Office of Environmental Science within the college, which acts as a liaison between faculty and the state environmental community, including state and federal agencies and private environment groups. I attended state legislative committee meetings during the 2000 session as well as committee meetings of the Department of Natural Resources Board. I learned first hand about state environmental issues and how they were being addressed by government. I observed the interaction among these state bodies and private environmental groups. I also became involved in a university committee that assisted the state Environmental Protection Department draw up permitting rules for non-swine animal feeding operations. The unfinished business is to take the information gained and contacts made to individual faculty

within the college targeted to their individual expertise and interests so as to enhance the involvement of our college in environmental issues that are important to the state of Georgia.

Paul E. Nyren
Director Central Grasslands Research Extension Center
Phone: 701-424-3606 Fax: 701-424-3616
Home page: www.ag.ndsu.nodak/streeter/

Phase II Project Summary

Title: A review of the Research Extension Center system in North Dakota

Periodically questions are raised by taxpayers and lawmakers concerning the number, location and mission of the Research Extension Centers in the state. I was asked to review the Research Center system and try to determine answers to these and other questions.

To accomplish this task I designed a set of short, straightforward questions and interviewed various groups of producers, agricultural leaders, agricultural lenders (bankers), and agricultural media both print and broadcast. The individuals selected for the interviews were chosen for their role as leaders in the agricultural industry and their geographical distribution throughout the state of North Dakota. Care was taken to avoid selecting only those who had a positive view of the system (those that support the REC's) but rather a more random selection.

It was my feeling that before we can internally evaluate or change our systems we need to know what the perception is of our current programs. What are our strengths and shortcomings, etc.

In addition to the survey I am attempting to do a short history of the REC system. Throughout the nearly 100 year history there have been many changes including the addition of new centers and the closing of early established ones. The programs at the Centers are evaluated annually, new projects are started and existing ones terminated, yet we frequently hear people say that we never change or never end a program once it has started. As the administration lines of the Agricultural Experiment Station have changed and become more complex this concern increases. It is my goal to develop a document that will be a reference as new people become involved at all levels of our system.

Throughout the time I have been conducting my phase II project I have been actively involved in the preparation of the budget for the next legislative session. Interacting with administrators on all levels of agricultural research at NDSU has given me a better understanding for the need to communicate clearly and remember the mission of a land grant university and what it stands for.

Paul Heinemann
Professor of Agricultural Engineering
Department of Agricultural and Biological Engineering
The Pennsylvania State University
(814) 865-2633

Phase II Project Summary

My phase II project established "The Community of Teaching Excellence" within the College of Agricultural Sciences at Penn State. This is an annual award program to recognize outstanding teaching within the

college. Unit leaders forward the names and supporting information of faculty in their units considered to be outstanding teachers. This information is evaluated by a committee made up of Community members, and nominees who meet the criteria become part of the Community for that year. Faculty who are recognized by the Community for the third time are permanently inducted into "The Academy of Teaching Excellence". The nomination process is streamlined so that information gathered through the regular annual faculty evaluations at the department level is used for the nomination process rather than requiring additional solicitation of supporting documentation. The Community operational procedure is officially starting on June 1, 2000.

The biggest challenge of the phase II project, as I'm sure many people will attest to, was finding the time to do the work. My mentor provided me with an office to work in, and I committed myself to spending two mornings a week there (approximately 20% of my time). However, I found that I probably spent 2 - 50% of my time there when it was all totaled.

The experience of working in a different office with a dean's staff, rather than my regular department staff, was interesting. I also found that if you have a good idea, it will be generally supported but faculty tend to zero in on the details immediately before they will respond to the bigger picture. I had a great deal less resistance than I anticipated as I worked this idea through the system, which went from a group of former ESCOP/ACOP participants, the chair of the college Faculty Awards Committee, the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Dean, the Dean himself, and finally the unit leaders. Overall, there was much enthusiasm for my idea, but much contradiction of ideas as to how it should be implemented and what the specific awards should be.

Maintaining an open mind to suggestions, responding to faculty concerns, weighing the options, and finally coming to a decision that may please some and not others but that I felt would work best for the college, were all experiences that drew on information that I learned (or reaffirmed) from phase I.

Clark F. Seavert
Superintendent and Extension Economist
Mid-Columbia Agricultural Research and Extension Center
Oregon State University
3005 Experiment Station Drive
Hood River, Oregon 97031-9512
phone:541.386.2030x12
fax:541.386.1905

Phase II Project Summary

My Phase II project was a continuation of my current position as Superintendent of the Mid-Columbia Agricultural Research and Extension Center (MCAREC), but with two goals in mind. The first was to develop a Mission, Vision, and Values statement for the MCAREC and create an advisory board that would provide guidance to research programs, priorities, and resources necessary to be a successful research station. Developing the Mission, Vision, and Values statements created an opportunity for the faculty and staff to express their personal vision, purpose and values for their programs as well as for the Center. It also put into effect a sense of unity, teamwork and purpose for them. Moreover, faculty and staff understand that these statements are used almost exclusively as the guide in the decision-making processes for the Center. Assembling the Advisory Board was challenging. Finding a diverse group of citizenry that was interested in serving on the same Board was difficult. Membership includes six producers (small, large, organic and traditional growers), two agri-business people and four elected public officials (county and port commissioners from two counties). Although diversity amongst the membership was accomplished, finding complete, or even somewhat, agreement on research programs and priorities was not. The challenge is to listen carefully to each member of the group as well as persuading others to do the same, finding neutral or common grounds and noting when to step forward as a leader. As a result, the Board has become very powerful and active in the

political arena at the county and state level and has a common goal and agenda based on the Mission of the Center.

John C. Baker
Michigan State University
G-100 Veterinary Medical Center
College of Veterinary Medicine
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824-1314
(517)432-2388, FAX (517) 432-1037
baker@cvm.msu.edu

Phase II Summary

Project Title: A re-emerging disease in Michigan: Bovine tuberculosis

Description: In 1994 a deer was harvested in the northeastern corner of the lower peninsula of Michigan and was found to be infected with *Mycobacterium bovis*, the causative agent of bovine tuberculosis (TB). At that time, Michigan was classified as a bovine TB-free state, and only 8 times previously had bovine TB been recognized in a wild deer population in North America. The prevailing belief was that bovine TB could not establish and perpetuate itself in a deer population. Subsequent surveys in Northeastern Michigan revealed that bovine TB had become endemic (established) in the white-tailed deer population. Additionally, beef cattle herds with bovine TB were identified in this area, which resulted in herd depopulations. Prior to January 2000, it was thought that bovine TB could be contained to a six-county area in Northeastern Michigan. However, in 2000, intensive surveys of the deer population throughout the state revealed that there was bovine TB in deer outside of the quarantine zone in Northeastern Michigan. Also in 2000, the first dairy herd infected with bovine TB was identified.

Because bovine TB is a disease that is regulated at both the state and federal level, I became involved in this problem when the director of the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station (MAES) and the dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM) requested that I help define MSU interaction with these agencies. Three committees were formed to broadly cover MSU involvement in the bovine TB problem and included extension, research, and diagnostic services. Liaisons from these committees meet monthly with the director of the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station (MAES), Michigan State University Extension, the dean of CVM, and representatives from the USDA, Michigan Department of Agriculture (MDA), Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), and Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH). I serve as the liaison for the research committee and serve as a member of the diagnostic services committee.

I was also given the assignment to coordinate the building of a cattle depopulation facility on campus to facilitate the depopulation of herds identified with bovine TB. This task encompassed addressing the concerns of the campus community and concerns in regard to biosecurity; multiple interactions with the institutional animal use committee, the Office of Radiation, Chemical and Biological Safety, MDA, MDNR, and USDA; and the generation of detailed SOPs related to depopulation of TB-positive cattle herds. The facility was constructed within a short time frame and was first used in April 2000 for a cattle depopulation.

Because this is the first time that bovine TB has ever become endemic in a white-tailed deer population in North America, resolution of the problem will require research, particularly into wildlife-livestock interface and the issue of transmission and pathogenesis in the white-tailed deer. I worked with the director of MAES to internally reallocate resources from MAES, MSU Extension, CVM, the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, and the College of Social Science to support campus research on TB. We also successfully obtained a USDA special grant for bovine TB. I accompanied the director of MAES to Washington in January 2000 to meet individually with staff from the Michigan congressional delegation to brief them on bovine TB in Michigan. I subsequently represented the director of MAES at a Michigan congressional briefing by MSU,

MDA, and MDNR in Washington. Efforts are currently underway to further increase our research support for bovine TB through USDA special grants. Other activities included media training and participation in a news conference with one of Michigan's U.S. senators.

The bovine TB problem is ongoing, but science-based steps are being taken to achieve eradication in wildlife and livestock. It is estimated that eradication will take 10 to 15 years. The economic impact on the state in the areas of agriculture and recreational activities is substantial. During this last year alone, the State of Michigan allocated 45 million dollars for a new veterinary diagnostic laboratory at MSU with BL-3 biocontainment capabilities to enable work on bovine TB.

L. Garry Adams
Texas A&M University
Dean's Office
College of Veterinary Medicine
College Station, TX 77843-4461
979-845-5092 Fax: 979-845-5088
gadams@cvm.tamu.edu

Phase II Project Summary

Keywords: Executive Leadership, Graduate Students, Faculty Liaison, Animal Health

Project Title: Enhancing Shared Vision Leadership for Administration, Faculty &
Graduate Students in Animal Health Research

Description: After visiting with administrators of research and graduate studies programs in the colleges of veterinary medicine at Cornell and North Carolina State Universities and comparing their programs with those at Texas AM University, a plan for enhancing research programs and graduate studies was generated through a two day leadership development activity at the executive administrative level. With the able assistance of professional consultants from Triangle Associates, an executive leadership development retreat resulted in significantly improved working relationships of deans, department heads and other executive administrators by building on mutual strengths while reconfirming and converging more effectively on a shared vision for the long term growth of college's animal health research and graduate studies. Other more tangible benefits derived from the ESCOP supported leadership activities included: (1) developing high quality web sites for recruiting graduate students, (2) generating web sites showcasing college animal health research programs, (3) sponsoring a professionally presented two day college-wide grants writing workshop (75 faculty and graduate students participated), and (4) writing a college-wide grants manager program that tracks all aspects of the grants research enterprise. Collectively, these ESCOP-facilitated achievements by the administration, faculty and graduate students are projected to have long term benefits for expanding and enhancing the role that the college of veterinary medicine at Texas A&M University is expected to have as a land grant institution in the development of human resources who will in term improve the quality of animal health for society's needs.

Vernon L. Jones
Langston University
School of Agriculture and Applied Sciences
P. O. Box 730
Langston University
Langston, OK 73050

(405) 466-3836
vjones@mail.luresext.edu

Phase II Project Summary

Keywords: impact statement; impact databases

Project Title: Impact Statement Enhancement for the School of Agriculture and Applied Sciences

Description: This Phase II Project was devoted to enhancing the quantity and quality of impact statements submitted by my University's Agricultural Research and Extension Faculty. I attended a "2000 *Impact Submission Training Session*" on October 4-5, 1999 in Atlanta, Georgia. Impact statement training was in the areas of definitions, importance, writing, rating and entry into impact statement databases.

On December 10, 1999, I conducted an impact statement workshop for the School of Agriculture and Applied Sciences' Research and Extension Faculty. The workshop consisted of video presentations (2), a PowerPoint presentation, sample impact statement handouts and an impact statement writing activity.

Additional impact statement writing experience was gained during a "*Region V Impact Statement Team Work Session*" on December 13-16, 1999 in Nashville, Tennessee. That session provided an opportunity for me to further refine my impact writing and rating skills.

In February of this year (2000), fifteen (15) impact statements from Langston University's Research and Extension Faculty were submitted and entered into the national impact statement database.

Mark F. Miller
Meat Science Laboratory
Box 42162
Lubbock, TX 79409-2162
806-742-2804 Fax: 806-742-0169
mfmrraider@aol.com

Phase II Project Summary

Keywords: Evaluating Administration Leadership

Project Title: Administration Relationships at the University, College and Departmental Levels.

The activities of the Texas Tech University Administration at the University, College, and Departmental levels were observed by attending various committee and special meetings. The dean and associate dean's of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources were the "mentors" who helped me to understand the processes of administration. The administrators were very open and I was treated as one of the administrative team members. I participated in the discussion and decision-making processes within the college in the selection of three new department chairs as well as the budgeting process. The complexity of managing a budget for the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources was a great learning experience. The teamwork necessary and prior planning process before implementation of new programs was an eye opening experience. The complexity of the personal relationship among various departments shows the need for good communication and team building activities. The opportunity to work with the universities central administration and to see the interrelationships among the dean's of the eight colleges was invaluable. The open door policy shown by the campus administration allowed me to broaden my understanding of the operations of the University.

Donna L. Minnis, PH.D
College of Forest Resources/Forest and Wildlife Research Center
Mississippi State University

Phase II Project Summary

From January 1 to June 30, 2000, I served as Special Assistant to the Interim Dean of the College of Forest Resources (CFR). In this official capacity, I assisted the Interim Dean in areas pertaining to academia. I was a proxy for the CFR Associate Dean (AD) position, representing the AD at meetings and supervising the CFR Office of Student Services. The supervisory function involved providing supervision of two professional staff members and overseeing the day-to-day management of an office that serves over 300 students. I prepared a summative report which documented OSS operations for the semester and presented recommendations to improve the office's efficiency and effectiveness. Related to the OSS responsibilities, I led the overhaul of the CFR Undergraduate Handbook, facilitating the revision of academic policies and doing the formatting of the 70-page manual. I also represented the Interim Dean/Director (my Phase II mentor) at various administrative events, such as awards banquets and Dean/Director meetings. Finally, I interviewed the Commissioner of the MS Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning regarding leadership styles and philosophies and practices of academic governance.

In April 2000, I participated in a leadership workshop, The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People®, which nicely complemented the ESCOP/ACOP leadership workshop (Phase I). I integrated recommendations for improvements in my leadership style gleaned from these two workshops' 360° evaluations in my role as CFR OSS supervisor. For instance, I made a conscious effort to be more sensitive to personality styles different than my own (specifically to Feelers, as per the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator) and to "seek first to understand" when a problem arose.

My Phase II experience has given me first-hand exposure to university administration and an opportunity to improve my academic leadership style. I now have a much clearer understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the different administrative levels at a land-grant institution (especially between Associate Deans and Deans). The responsibility of supervising the CFR OSS also provided many lessons regarding office and personnel management and basic challenges and considerations in the operation of a service office.

Bruce A. Watkins
Purdue University

Objective: Determine the feasibility of developing a faculty led multi-disciplinary/multi- institutional center with a focus on nutraceutical and phytochemical research. My project will identify faculty participants that wish to engage in this activity, consult administrative groups in departments and schools on how to bring diverse groups together for a concerted research effort, and help to organize the faculty groups to achieve funding success.

Proposed name: Center for Enhancing Foods to Protect Health (<http://www.efph.purdue.edu>) Proposed mission. Conduct research on nutraceuticals and phytochemicals and optimize the health protectant capacity of these compounds. Create delivery systems for designed/functional foods to reduce disease risk and improve health in humans and companion animals.

Rationale: Functional foods is a rapidly growing area of food research and product development that encompasses human nutrition, health related research, plant genomics, molecular biology, agriculture, and food science. Functional foods and health protectants (nutraceuticals, phytochemicals, and botanicals) are

perceived as one of the greatest opportunities in agricultural and biomedical research for improving human health in the new millennium. A recent U.S.D.A. report cites that chronic disease risk is diet-related and could be significantly decreased by changing dietary habits. Specifically, diet-related chronic diseases contribute to five (heart disease, cancer, stroke, diabetes and arteriosclerosis) of the 10 main causes of death leading to an estimated \$250 billion lost in productivity from the U.S. economy in 1999. Moreover health care costs continue to exceed \$1 trillion annually. The vision is that the center at Purdue University would promote proper nutrition practices for reducing disease risk influenced by dietary habits, fitness, lifestyle choices, and genetics. These efforts are one way to link research on food with the current scientific advances in the life sciences.