

Commission on Public Service and Extension  
Minutes of Meeting on September 16, 1994

Members Present: Ralph Badinelli, Deb Williams, Pat Edwards,  
Bob Martin, William Swecker, Connie Kratzer, Donna Dunay,  
Patrick Liverpool, Doug McAlister, Thomas Hohenshil, Brenda Olafsen,  
Fred Krimgold, James Jones

Alternate: Gerald Cross for Fred Lamb and Judith Jones for Bill Allen

Not represented: Ted Settle, Gregory Brown, Jerald Robinson,  
David Johnson, Bill Mashburn, Heather Pert, SGA

1. The meeting was convened and chaired by Ralph Badinelli, who presented the agenda for approval. There being no requests for alterations, the agenda was adopted.

2. As the minutes for the prior meeting were not available, no minutes were approved.

3. Deb Williams agreed to share the responsibilities of Commission secretary with Ralph Badinelli as these individuals are responsible for reporting Commission activities to the Staff Senate and Faculty Senate, respectively.

4. The Committee assignments were presented by the Chair who then solicited comment. Several Commission members said that they had not received the assignments via e-mail prior to the meeting prompting the chair to promise to send the committee document via e-mail after the meeting. Patrick Liverpool expressed his desire to be removed from the position of Chair of the International Programs Committee. The Commission Chair agreed to this request. Bob Martin asked the Commission if his serving as Chair of the Committee for the Coordination of Total Outreach Activities could be considered a conflict of interest as he also serves on the Outreach Task Force. There was general agreement that his dual appointment would be an asset to the Committee.

5. The charge of the Commission was read by the Chair in order to clarify the role of the Commission as a body within the governance system that generates proposals for consideration by University Council that would affect the University's ability to carry out its mission in Outreach and Extension. The chair expressed the opinion that this charge excluded the use of the Commission as an advisory group to Outreach or Extension unit managers and that the oversight of Outreach and Extension activities should be restricted to that which is germane to an issue being considered by the Commission.

A discussion of how agenda items and policy changes could be recommended to the Commission proceeded. The recommendations can come from a multitude of sources, not limited to Commission members, other University Commissions and committees, University Council, etc.

6. A proposal for the electronic revision and approval of meeting minutes was presented by the chair. Some discussion followed. No motion was made in connection with the proposal. The Chair agreed to modify the procedures outlined in the proposal and to experiment with the electronic dissemination and review of minutes in parallel with the conventional method. Minutes will be sent out electronically to all CPSE members. Changes may be returned via the listserve. We will continue to do the final approval in the Commission meetings, but this procedure should shorten the approval process significantly.

7. Several action items were presented by the Chair as suggested topics for Commission deliberations in the coming year. There was general agreement that the following topics were worthy of the Commission's attention.

7a) The connection between VCE, CE, PS and other outreach  
- One-stop shopping :

This issue subsumes several ideas for expanding the role of extension offices throughout the Commonwealth through their involvement in various activities that are administered through non-extension offices such as those of Continuing Education, Public Service or academic departments. There is potential for high growth in the CE and PS areas, while VCE is very important to the state. The goal is to connect all these areas and make the extension office more accessible. This plan is only in the preliminary discussion stages.

Judith Jones said that she and Ted Settle had discussed this concept several times. She said that the basic idea is to have each extension office act as the front door to the University. In order to play this role, she suggested that the extension offices could provide for electronic admission requests, dissemination of University Catalogs and other literature, downlink sites for televised Veterinary-Medicine continuing education courses, connection to Telstar, logistical support for off-campus credit programs, etc. Judith pointed out that additional resources would be needed if the extension offices are to carry out expanded duties such as those described above.

Patrick Liverpool indicated that there are many different points of contact with Virginia Tech and folks are not sure whom to call. Extension, however, is a known entity. The 107 extension offices form a vast resource for points of access by the public to Virginia Tech. There are many options being discussed.

Gerald Cross stated that such advances in outreach programs cannot be implemented until the University adopts a common understanding or definition of outreach activities and the evaluation of those activities. The discussion then spilled over into the questions of the clarification of the roles of outreach, extension, research and teaching and the question of the involvement of faculty. The Chair stated that he would charge the Committee on the Coordination of Total Outreach Efforts to identify the significant issues related to this proposal.

7b) Credit programs through Continuing Education

Patrick Liverpool stated that Penn State has a program that offers credit programs through its Continuing Education unit. This unit generates revenue of \$26 million, half of which is due to credit programs.

Gerald Cross raised the question of the potential for the Commission to work at cross purposes with the Outreach Task Force sponsored by Patrick Liverpool and Len Peter's task force on the extended university. In response, Patrick Liverpool clarified the role of the Task Force and agreed to share the charge of the Task Force with all members of the Commission.

The Chair stated that this issue would also be sent to the Committee for the Coordination of Total Outreach Efforts for better definition.

7c) Proposal for the Academy of Public Service Excellence

Commission members agreed the title was possibly obsolete, but agreed

not to waste time arguing about a name. This was being addressed by other task forces and committees within the university. Also, after discussion, we agreed for the same reason not to discuss changing the name of the Commission.

Committee members for the Academy of Excellence Award were charged to begin the review process and "get the job done!" It is an idea that has been around a long time and was to have been implemented in 93-94. The goal is for the award to be ready for Founder's Day.

As a result of the name discussion Ralph Badinelli will issue a statement prior to next month's meeting outlining that, for the Commission members' purposes, we should consider the term Public Service in the broad sense of Outreach.

#### 7d) Faculty rewards

The committee on Outreach and Promotion and Rewards was charged to, once again, look into faculty rewards. The Chair stated that his charge to the Committee will ask for ideas that are concrete and innovative. The Commission also agreed that a system of evaluation and a measurement process is needed.

#### 7f) COTA:

Ralph Badinelli and Patrick Liverpool explained the status of COTA and its history to the best of their abilities. COTA appears to have been created in connection with the Hotel Roanoke project. The Chair expressed his desire to put any considerations of COTA on a back burner as this program area reports to the Provost and not to Patrick Liverpool.

#### 7g) Provost search:

Will Commission have a role? We want to have a voice. Commission members were requested to send Ralph Badinelli their suggestions for questions they want asked in the interview process for the new provost. The Commission agreed to request that the chair participate in the interview process. Ralph was to check on this and respond back to the Commission members.

There being no additional business the Commission adjourned.

The next CPSE meeting will be October 14 from 1-3pm in 210 Burruss.

Commission on Public Service and Extension

Minutes of Meeting on October 14, 1994

Room 210 D Burruss Hall

Members Present: Ralph Badinelli, Donna Dunay, Bill Mashburn, Gregory Brown, William Swecker, Connie Kratzer, Patrick Liverpool, Heather Pert, Deb Williams, Brenda Olafsen

Alternate: Jim Bowen for Bob Martin, Robert Dunay for Pat Edwards, Tom McAnge for Bill Allen, Linda Leffel for Ted Settle

Not represented: David Johnson, SGA, College of Business, Fred Krimgold, James Jones, Doug McAlister, Thomas Hohenshil, Fred Lamb

1. The meeting was convened and chaired by Ralph Badinelli, who presented the agenda for approval. There being no requests for alterations, the agenda was adopted.

2. The minutes for the meeting on September 16, 1994 were approved.

3. The memorandum of understanding regarding the meanings of the term Public Service, MOU#1, that had been distributed to all members of the Commission was adopted without revision.

4. Bill Mashburn, Chair of the Committee for the Implementation of the Academy of Public Service Excellence, raised several questions about what was necessary to implement this awards program. Connie Kratzer provided clarifications from the bylaws of the Academy of Public Service Excellence. She indicated that, in addition to the awards for Extension Service excellence, as many as four awards can be given for public service excellence. She also said that the Commission was charged with selecting the winners of the award.

Bill's committee will determine a plan for making the first public service awards this year.

Bobby Lowe queried the need for dollars behind the award. There must be some source of funds. Ralph Badinelli charged the committee to investigate the source of funds and develop a plan to provide for making the award as requested by Founder's Day with nominations being due before the end of the semester.

5. Discussion of potential roles played by Extension offices.

This discussion continued the discussion on this topic from the previous meeting of the Commission. Several topics were raised and debated. The summary of the discussion given below lists the points made by individuals.

Tom McAnge:

- Extension offices are currently being used for the distribution of literature that Virginia Tech would like

to disseminate throughout the Commonwealth. This activity can continue and could be expanded.

- Extension agents are educators, not administrators, and they should not be diverted from their educational mission.
- Many current activities carried out by the Extension offices as well as future roles of the offices do not require an extensive amount of agents time. Also, many of these activities are paid for by departments at Virginia Tech on a direct-cost basis.
- It would be a good idea to look at opportunities for expanding the role of Extension offices by categories, distinguishing between programs and activities and between opportunities that requires new funding and those that would require a shift in existing funding.

Deb Williams:

- The Commission needs to be educated in the job responsibilities of Extension agents.
- The fact that the University now has one division where there was two before makes the issue of funding for activities in the Extension offices rather fuzzy. She will look into this question and report to the Commission at its next meeting.
- For now, the Commission should simply make a list of potential roles for the Extension offices and evaluate the merits of each one, and worry about the funding question later.

Linda Leffel:

- In 1989, the University undertook a study of the integration of outreach efforts and the Extension offices. She recommended a review of this report by the Commission.
- She suggested that the Commission should define the roles that it wants the Extension offices to play, then look into the issue of resources. Patrick Liverpool supported this idea but added that the Commission should also study the needs and desires of the customers of the University s outreach activities
- In response to a question from William Swecker about the use of faculty for extension programs on a pro bono basis, she explained that there is a continuing education policy that explains how revenues for such programs should be shared with the faculty.
- Bill Stephenson in the Engineering College has led a task force to try to coordinate the rewards for faculty participation in Extension and Continuing Education.
- In response to another question from William Swecker about the distinction between consulting and continuing education, Linda said that, in some instances, there may not be a clear distinction between these two activities, but the Continuing Education Division has a mechanism for judging if an activity is to be considered consulting or continuing education.

Jim Bowen:

- Extension is a popular institution and should be able to secure funds for worthwhile activities.
- Many of the suggestions for new activities carried out by the Extension offices are secretarial activities or tasks that do not require agents time. Therefore, funding conflicts should not be a major issue.

Bill Mashburn:

- Whatever Extension does in the field, its activities ideally should be an extension of some on-campus working

group. The rewards system for faculty do not promote the integration of faculty efforts with extension work.

- Plans for Extension should include expansion of Extension into services for industry support, not just for support of agriculture.

Brenda Olafsen:

- Many Commission members are not aware of what goes on at an Extension field office. It might be a good idea to hold a Commission meeting at one of these offices.

This would allow Commission members to recognize that the offices experience heavy traffic. The offices do far more than answer phone calls or function as a place for citizens to pick up brochures.

## 6. Discussion of the provost search

Ralph Badinelli told the Commission that he had not received any response to his request for questions to put to candidates for the provost position. This request stemmed from the Commission's concern, expressed at the September meeting, for the value that a new provost would place on outreach activities.

Bill Swecker asked why we need to make a special effort to make sure that the outreach mission of the University is raised in the interviews for the provost. Linda Leffel and Ralph Badinelli responded that, historically, outreach efforts by the faculty were under-rewarded, and did not receive the respect and acceptance of other missions of the University.

Gregory Brown stated that the deans will have an opportunity to interview candidates for the provost's job, but that, in doing so, they will focus on administrative and funding issues. Faculty must have some input to reflect concerns of faculty as opposed to those of administrators. While the administrators will discuss process, structure and funding they may not elicit a candidate's view on value and direction of the three missions of the University.

Heather Pert suggested that the Commission define extension and outreach and communicate this definition to the Search Committee. Deb Williams revised this suggestion to that of asking each candidate to articulate his/her definition of the role of Extension/Public Service in the university, and Commonwealth.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35. The next meeting will be held on Monday, November 14, at 3:00 pm in 400D Burruss.

Commission on Public Service and Extension

Minutes of Meeting on November 14, 1994,  
Room 400D Burruss Hall

Members Present: Ralph Badinelli, Bill Mashburn, Deb Williams, Ted Settle, James Jones, Doug McAlister, Bob Martin, Terry Swecker, David Johnson, Fred Lamb, Connie Kratzer, Donna Dunay, Patricia Edwards, Fred Krimgold, Brenda Olafsen

Alternate: Judith Jones for Bill Allen,

Not represented: SGA, College of Business, Thomas Hohenshil,  
Heather Pert

1. The meeting was convened and chaired by Ralph Badinelli, who presented the agenda for approval. There being no requests for alterations, the agenda was adopted.
2. The minutes for the meeting on October 14, 1994 were approved.
3. Ted Settle reported on the progress of the Committee on Outreach Promotion and Awards. He recommends that the Committee act as a 'legislative arm' of the Provost's Task Force that is looking into the issue of faculty rewards for outreach activities. Several questions ensued. Bob Martin asked what the Committee and the Commission would do if the Provost disagrees with the recommendations of the Task Force. Fred Lamb asked what role the Committee and Commission would play if we disagree with the recommendations of the task force. Judith Jones asked for a clarification of who proposes legislation. Ted pointed out that the Task Force is co-chaired by John Randolph and Greg Brown. Its report should be available sometime during the Spring Semester. Ralph Badinelli attempted to clarify the role of the Commission as the body that proposes legislation in any event, whether or not that legislation is consonant with the recommendations of the Task Force or the opinions of the Provost.
4. Bill Mashburn, Chair of the Committee for the Implementation of the Academy of Public Service Excellence, presented an update of the progress of his Committee. Bill reported that Patrick Liverpool has put up \$4000 for the awards, \$1000 for each of four awards. Bill passed out drafts of the following documents:
  - a) a cover letter to announce the award to the Virginia Tech Community
  - b) a statement of the purpose of the award, the evaluation criteria and eligibility for the award
  - c) nomination guidelines
  - d) a list of winners of the alumni extension awards for the last three years

Bill's report led to discussion that consumed the rest of the meeting time. The discussion revolved around five issues: When and how to present the awards, how many awards should be granted, what the selection criteria and eligibility should be, who should sit on the selection committee, what the nomination process should be. Most of the questions arising from these issues find answers in the by-laws of the Academy and in the history of the awards program. Bill Mashburn and Connie Kratzer provided information from the by-laws and Doug McAlister acted as the Commission's historian.

According to the by-laws of the Academy of Public Service Excellence, the awards are to be presented at a meeting of the Academy held each spring, after the founder s day celebration. Doug McAlister responded by saying that the idea for this meeting dates back to the initiation of the idea for the awards six years ago, but the meeting, like the awards,

has never occurred. He expressed the opinion that it would be better to 'mainstream' the awards by presenting them at the Founder's Day ceremony. Even so, the Commission Chair should convene the spring meeting.

The by-laws state that any Virginia Tech employee is eligible for the award. This fact led to a discussion of whether or not to set aside some of the awards for faculty and some for staff or whether or not to commit to granting all four awards. The by-laws include a clear statement of the purpose of the awards, eligibility and criteria. The Commission decided to include this wording in the awards announcement.

The by-laws also specify the makeup of the selection committee. This committee is appointed by the Commission and must consist of from four to six members. Some previous winners of the award, who in the current year must be considered those who have won the alumni extension award, are to be on the committee. The Commission decided to create a selection committee consisting of three Commission members and two members who are previous award winners. Pat Edwards, Terry Swecker and Deb Williams were nominated by the Commission for service on this committee.

The Commission decided to make the nomination process somewhat consistent with that of other University award programs. To wit, a simple nomination statement will be required from any Virginia Tech employee who wishes to nominate someone for an award. The selection committee will then contact those nominees as it chooses with a request for a dossier of information that would support the nominee's award application. Based on these submissions the committee will make a decision.

The wording of the documents handed out by Bill were reviewed and edited by the Commission. Deb Williams was asked to update the documents and send them to the Commission for final approval via e-mail. The Commission intends to send out the award notice before the end of the fall semester. The deadline for nominations will be January 31, 1995 and the deadline for dossiers will be February 28, 1995.

##### 5. The role of Extension offices

As there was very little time left of the allotted meeting time, the Commission did not discuss this agenda item. Bob Martin, Chair of the Committee on the Coordination of Total Outreach Efforts, passed out a draft list of opportunities for expansion of the roles of Extension offices. The Committee and the Commission will discuss these options in future meetings

The meeting adjourned at 5:00. The next meeting will be held on Monday, December 12, at 3:00 pm in 400D Burruss.



Commission on Public Service and Extension  
Minutes of Meeting on December 12, 1994  
Room 400D Burruss Hall

Members Present: Ralph Badinelli, Bill Mashburn, Deb Williams,  
Ted Settle, Doug McAlister, Bob Martin, Terry Swecker,  
Connie Kratzer, Patricia Edwards, Brenda Olafsen, Thomas Hohenshil, Gregory Brown,  
Bill Allen, Patrick Liverpool

Alternate: Jerry Cross for Fred Lamb

Not represented: SGA, College of Business, James Jones, Fred Krimgold, Heather Pert, David Johnson, Donna Dunay

1. The meeting was convened and chaired by Ralph Badinelli, who presented the agenda for approval. There being no requests for alterations, the agenda was adopted.
2. The minutes for the meeting on November 14, 1994 were approved.
3. Most of the meeting was devoted to finalizing the documents that will be sent out to all department heads and deans in order to solicit nominations for the University Public Service Excellence Awards. Numerous changes to wording were debated and implemented in these documents. Revisions to the first two pages were made at the meeting. The revision of the final page was almost completed at the meeting. The Commission chair agreed to send the final draft by e-mail to all Commission members for final approval prior to December 16.
4. The provost search was discussed. The Commission Chair reviewed the candidates for the Commission members who did not get a chance to interview the candidates. In light of the short time available for review and discussion of the candidates and the generally high qualifications of all of the candidates, the Commission decided to submit a letter to President Torgersen that emphasizes the value of UOIP efforts to the future of the University and recommends that he consider the influence that the next provost can have on UOIP.

Bill Allen made the point that we should break from the pack and use outreach as the key to building a university that meets real needs.

Terry Swecker suggested that the new provost meet with the Commission to discuss the much-anticipated Report from the Task Force on outreach.

Gregroy Brown suggested that we tell President Torgersen that we see the chief academic officer of the University as having a key role in developing outreach.

The Commission Chair agreed to draft the letter and send it to all Commission members via e-mail for their review prior to its submission to the President.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00. The Commission Chair will schedule meetings for the Spring Semester after he receives

information from Commission members regarding their individual spring schedules.

The next meeting will take place in room 400D Burruss Hall on January 23 at 3:00.

Commission on Public Service and Extension  
Minutes of Meeting on January 23, 1995  
Room 400D Burruss Hall

Members Present: Ralph Badinelli, Deb Williams, Ted Settle,  
Doug McAlister, Bob Martin, Terry Swecker, Connie Kratzer,  
Thomas Hohenshil,  
Gregory Brown, David Johnson, Donna Dunay, Fred Krimgold,  
Bill Allen

Alternate: Jack Muench for Fred Lamb

Not represented: SGA, College of Business, James Jones,  
Bill Mashburn, Brenda Olafsen,  
Heather Pert, Patrick Liverpool, Patricia Edwards

1. The meeting was convened and chaired by Ralph Badinelli, who presented the agenda for approval. There being no requests for alterations, the agenda was adopted.
2. The minutes for the meeting on December 12, 1994 were approved.
3. The Chair announced the schedule of meetings for the rest of the year as follows:
  - February 13, 3 - 5pm
  - March 21, 10 - noon
  - April 11, 10 - noon
  - May 2, 10 - noon

All meetings are in room 400D Burruss Hall.

4. The Commission discussed the progress of the Selection Committee for the University Public Service Excellence Awards. Terry Swecker reported that the Committee elected Pat Edwards as its chair.

Terry expressed concern over the distribution of the awards notice. Ralph Badinelli reported that the notices were sent out to Deans, Directors and Department Heads on January 3, 1995. Deb Williams notified the Commission that classified staff had not received a copy of this notice and that she had distributed electronically to all staff senators and their alternates a transcript of Patrick Liverpool's letter. Jack Muench indicated that extension personnel had received the notice. Ralph Badinelli said that he would find out from Patrick Liverpool's secretary what mailing list was used for the distribution of the awards notice. Bill Allen noted that the best way to distribute information to extension personnel is to send it to the distribution center. He also cautioned the Commission against using e-mail for communicating with extension offices as this generates long-distance telephone charges.

Terry wondered about the making of a plaque or certificate for each award winner. Ralph Badinelli said that he would look into this.

Ideas for improving the awards selection process were discussed. The Commission agreed that in future years the process should start earlier with notices being distributed in early fall. Terry Swecker mentioned that some departments have awards committees that review all University award programs each year with the objective of

nominating members of the department to any awards for which they appear to be qualified. He said that we should distribute the award notices early in the fall in order to accommodate the efforts of these committees.

The Commission Chair clarified the charge that he made to the Selection Committee by stating that they will report to the Commission in March their choice(s) of winners. The Commission will not review these choices or be empowered to approve or disapprove the decisions of the Committee. In addition to reporting their decisions, the Committee is asked to report any problems with the awards selection process and to suggest ideas for improving this process in future years.

Terry Swecker discussed selection criteria saying that the Committee would consider either job performance beyond the requirements of a persons position or exceptional work within the requirements of a persons position. He also expressed concern over the possibility of someone winning both the Public Service Excellenc Award and another award such as the Alumni Extension Award. The Commission agreed that the Selection Committee needs to coordinate its efforts with selection committees of other awards to make sure that someone does not win two awards for the same performance.

Deb Williams asked the Commission to consider accepting late nominations as the next meeting of the Selection Committee is on February 10, 1995 and the deadline for nominations is January 31, 1995. The Chair said that he would be willing to allow an extension of the deadline as long as notice of the extension was distributed to everyone.

5. Ted Settle indicated that position papers on the offering of credit courses through the Division of Continuing Education may be forthcoming. This issue could be an agenda item for the Commission after March.

6. The rest of the meeting was devoted to Bill Allen's report on the budget reductions for VCE recommended by the Governor. Using rough figures he commented that VCE had sustained approximately a 25% reduction in support since 1989. So far, these reduction have been distributed fairly evenly across programs with a few exceptions such as the loss of volunteer programs in the Division of Public Service. The suggestion of the Governor on December 19, 1994 for a massive budget cut to VCE came as a surprise. In fact, VCE was, at that time, hoping for restoration of the \$600,000 budget cut that had been scheduled for the next fiscal year.

Bill estimated that the new budget reductions, if they are approved, will cause closure of 1/3 to 1/2 of extension stations, a precipitous drop in 4H enrollment and the loss of approximately 250 extension positions. The Colleges of Agriculture and Life Science and Forestry and Wildlife Resources would be affected more than other colleges. Numerous educational efforts by supporters are underway in an attempt to restore these budget cuts.

Greg Brown reported that a subcommittee of CFA is looking into establishing a reduction-in-force policy for the case of financial exigency as a policy currently does not exist.

The Chair said that the Commission would stay on top of the

funding situation and look into any ideas that would help VCE adjust and make the best of any changes in its status.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45.

Commission on Public Service and Extension  
Minutes of Meeting on April 11, 1995  
Room 400D Burruss Hall

Members Present: Ralph Badinelli, Bill Mashburn, Deb Williams, Connie Kratzer, Brenda Olafsen, Thomas Hohenshil, Doug McAlister, James Jones, Bill Allen, Ted Settle, Bob Martin, Patricia Edwards, Gregory Brown

Not represented: SGA, College of Business, David Johnson, Donna Dunay, Patrick Liverpool, Terry Swecker, Heather Pert, Fred Lamb, Fred Krimgold

1. The meeting was convened and chaired by Ralph Badinelli, who amended the agenda to include a discussion of the candidates for the chair of the Commission next year. There being no other requests for alterations, the agenda was adopted.
2. The minutes for the meeting on February 13, 1995 were revised in response to a request for correction by Bill Allen of a statement attributed to him in the minutes. The minutes were then approved.
3. The floor was opened for discussion of the preliminary report of the Provost's Task Force on Outreach.

Deb Williams began the discussion by mentioning that she thought the definition of outreach contained in the document is rather broad. Greg Brown, who co-chaired the Task Force responded by saying that the committees of the task force entertained even broader definitions and that the definition in the report represents a "trimming" of some concepts of outreach. He said that a final version of the report should be completed some time in May.

Bill Allen then asked how the Task Force arrived at its recommendations about organization of outreach administration. In particular he expressed concern about a section in the report that suggested that the Extension Director report directly to the Provost instead of to the Dean of the College of ALS. This point initiated a long and lively discussion.

Greg Brown reported that the Task Force believed that there should be better coordination of all outreach programs motivating the recommendation about Extension's reporting arrangement.

Bill Allen commented that such a change in the reporting relationship of the Extension Director could weaken the political support from some key constituencies that VCE has benefited from - especially in recent years. The community of farmers and others involved in the agriculture industry may feel alienated by a change in the reporting relationship of the Extension Director that might appear to separate the Director from of the College of ALS. Bill emphasized the point that he did not disagree with the intent of the proposed reorganization. He also emphasized his commitment to all aspects of VCE's mission, including the expansion of services in the areas of Community Resource Development, Urban Planning, etc. mentioned by Pat Edwards. The point of his argument is that, in today's funding climate, it is crucial to have a base of support for any programmatic or administrative change before making such a change. Bill mentioned that some other states have lost the support of their farm bureaus. In the case of VCE, the Farm Bureau has been essential to receiving state support of Extension and loss of backing of the Farm Bureau would be serious.

Discussion regarding the history of VCE and the reorganization implemented by President McComas continued. Bill Mashburn wanted to know why VCE has never instituted an industrial extension program and why the last two

governors tried to reduce or eliminate VCE. Pat Edwards questioned the positioning of VCE in the CALS under President McComas as this seemed to move VCE away from its missions in CRD, urban planning, family assistance, etc.

Bill Allen responded by saying that VCE is continuing a long-running effort at trimming the number of programs it offers and ensuring that its programs meet real needs within the State. From 220 programs a few years ago, VCE now runs 116 programs. This number could eventually reach approximately 40. The needs that VCE responds to in developing and maintaining programs and in eliminating others are needs that are not restricted to agriculture. In recent months, however, this effort was disconnected from the Governor's agenda as the executive branch seems to have changed its expectations of VCE in an effort to justify budget cuts. As far as the reorganization brought about by President McComas is concerned, Doug McAlister, the Commission's historian, suggested that President McComas may have received some biased advice in the matter. Doug also made the following points.

- Bill Allen has consistently represented VCE, not the more narrow interests of agricultural extension in his job as VCE Director.
- The Governor's agenda has changed over the last year because of budget constraints. Furthermore, some people in the budget office of the executive branch have little understanding of VCE and its services.
- The work of the Task Force should be followed by a study of the external customers of outreach.
- Any plans for improving our outreach efforts should include the establishment of a single point of entry for someone outside the University. This point was driven home by comments made to Doug by people at the Volvo-GM plant in Dublin.

Greg Brown responded to the request for a market survey by saying that the idea came up in the Task Force's deliberations and was rejected due to the cost and time that it would require. Instead, the Task Force's interviews with department heads elicited information about the how well the constituents of different departments were being served by outreach programs.

Commission members pressed the point of taking an external survey. The Commission chair promised to draft a statement to the Provost recommending such action. This statement would be available for review by the Commission before the next meeting.

4. The Commission Chair asked members to comment on the plans for Continuing Education drafted by Harold Kurstedt. Of particular interest is the potential for diversion of the resources of Continuing Education towards high-profit, externally staffed programs at the expense of programs that would assist faculty and Colleges to expand their outreach connections and influence.

Bill Allen commented that the outreach mission should be able to embrace both paying and nonpaying customers.

Bill Mashburn expressed the opinion that the University had drifted too much in the direction of non-profit types of programs and would benefit from some renewed emphasis on profit-making outreach.

Tom Hohenshil raised the issue of faculty rewards as an impediment to faculty involvement in outreach apart from the amount of assistance provided by CEC. Bob Martin affirmed the relevance of faculty rewards in outreach by asserting that in his college, outreach is rewarded and, consequently, he does not expect to see the level of faculty outreach activities diminish as the CEC changes its focus.

Ted Settle updated the Commission on Harold's plan. He made it clear that

Harold's responsibilities focus primarily on continuing education as opposed to outreach in general. Also, COTA is now a budget line in the Continuing Education budget. As such, the COTA's funding is not restricted to the hiring of a certain number of people to be designated COTA scholars, associates, and fellows of some type. Instead, the money can be used for a variety of activities including market research, program development, site selection, etc.

5. Doug McAlister added the following resolution to the agenda which was adopted.

Whereas the University Public Service Awards program is a long-awaited stimulus to the propagation of outreach work among faculty and staff, and

Whereas, the Commission experienced great difficulty in trying to implement the University Public Service Awards program in previous years, and

Whereas, the Commission allowed very little time this year for selection of award winners,

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Selection Committee of the Commission on Public Service and Extension have earned the praise and gratitude of the Commission for successfully implementing the awards program this year.

6. Ted Settle said that he would try to make arrangements for the next meeting of the Commission at the Hotel Roanoke.

7. The Commission Chair asked everyone to consider whom they would like to nominate for next year's Chairperson.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30.



- - - - -  
Commission on Public Service and Extension  
Minutes of Meeting on May 2, 1995  
Blueridge Room, Hotel Roanoke

Members Present: Ralph Badinelli, Bill Mashburn, Doug McAlister, Gregory Brown, Terry Swecker, Ted Settle

Alternate: Nancy Looney for Deb Williams, J. David Barrett for Bill Allen

Not represented: SGA, College of Business, Donna Dunay, Patricia Edwards, Thomas Hohenshil, David Johnson, James Jones, Connie Kratzer, Fred Kringgold, Fred Lamb, Patrick Liverpool, Bob Martin, Heather Pert, Brenda Olafsen

1. The meeting was convened and chaired by Ralph Badinelli. Terry Swecker requested that the agenda be amended by adding a discussion of the new University Task Force that is reviewing Extension. There being no other requests for alterations, the revised agenda was adopted.
2. The minutes for the meeting on April 11, 1995 were revised in response to a request for corrections by Ted Settle. As a quorum was not present, the Commission did not vote on approval of the minutes.
3. The floor was opened for continued discussion of the preliminary report of the Provost's Task Force on Outreach as well as discussion of the new Task Force that is reviewing Extension.

Doug McAlister notified the Commission of yet another study of Extension that is underway, this one organized by the Virginia Farm Bureau. This study is called the Virginia Farm Bureau Special Cooperative Extension Service Committee. This announcement led to some discussion of the motives behind both the University's review and the Farm Bureau's review. Greg Brown suggested that, in part, both studies are motivated by the preliminary report of the Provost's Task Force on Outreach and the budget battles over VCE funding of recent years. On the second point, Greg indicated that there are philosophical differences across the Federal Government, State Legislature and Governor's Offices over the role of Extension. It seems that everyone concerned hopes that the reviews of Extension that are underway will better define a common vision for Extension that will obviate future budget battles.

The formation of the two University Task Forces without any input from or monitoring by the Commission led to a discussion of the governance system and the role of the Commission.

The Commission Chair offered as an example of administrative circumvention of the Commission the redirection of the Continuing Education effort under Harold Kurstedt. He also mentioned that concerns about the failures of the governance system to work effectively have been voiced in many quarters including the Faculty Senate. Nancy Looney affirmed that the Staff Senate has also discussed these issues.

Doug McAlister mentioned that, historically, Task Forces and study groups were given a "home" in some Commission or Senate. He added that the structure of the governance system is not that bad, but that people do not use the system as it is supposed to be used.

Terry Swecker wondered who in the governance system are the leaders who set vision and who in the governance system are the managers who move the organization towards that vision. He also questioned the qualifications of faculty who serve on commissions and committees to make managerial decisions.

Greg Brown and Ralph Badinelli stated that the slow response time of the governance system is one major reason for the administration to by-pass it. On this point Bill Mashburn said that the governance system reacts to decisions made by others instead of taking initiating action. He suggested that the University could "leapfrog" any improvement in the governance system by looking for examples at other universities in order to completely redesign the system.

The Commission Chair suggested that he write a letter to the Provost with copies to the President and to the President of the Faculty Senate that identifies three recent examples of administrative circumvention of the Commission. These are:

- the formation and monitoring of the Provost's Task Force on Outreach
- the formation and monitoring of the recently formed Task Force on Extension
- the reorganization of the administration of some of the outreach activities with the appointment of Harold Kurstedt to Special Assistant to the Provost and the revision of some of the continuing education efforts that this appointment instigated.

4. As the Chair of the Selection Committee for the University Public Service Awards was not present at the meeting, no suggestions for improving the award program were brought up. The Commission Chair said that he would contact Pat Edwards in order to obtain feedback from the Committee in this regard.

5. Agenda items suggested for next year are:

- The Commission should have something to say about the changes that may be in the offing for VCE. In particular, the possibility that CRD or human resource development programs may be on a "hit list". In general, the Commission should get status reports on VCE and be prepared to respond to any problem areas.
- The Extension offices throughout the State should be set up to be the "front door to the University". This agenda item was discussed this year, however, the awards program and budget discussions cut short the Commission's work in this area.
- Should there be such a thing as an "Industrial Extension Service" or an "Industrial Outreach Program"? It seems to Commission members that the potential is very high for such a program to be popular, but there are many questions about its funding, administration and program content.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30.