

# Assessing System Gaps in Extension Education Evaluation Resources

April 2017

By

Jennifer Kushner, EdD

Mary Crave, PhD and

Larry Jones, PhD

Program Development and Evaluation

Cooperative Extension, University of Wisconsin-Extension

Introduction	1
The presenting issue	2
Our response	2
Current context	4
Root causes	6
Desired future state	7
The solution and solution-in-practice	8
Return on Investment	11
Conclusion	12
Appendix A	14

# Introduction

The National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) of the United States Department of Agriculture expended more than \$511 million on Extension education programs and projects in FY 2016, which accounted for more than one-third of NIFA's total budget that year. National Program Leaders (NPLs) administer these funds within four institutes and an international center, with support from NIFA's Planning, Accountability and Reporting (PARS) Office and the Office of Grants, Awards and Management. Funded projects are implemented mostly by 1862, 1890, and 1994 Land Grant Universities (LGUs) throughout the U.S., and through both competitively funded and formula-funded streams. Both competitive and formula funded projects are relevant and included within the scope of this project.

An important component of program administration—performance measurement—is inconsistent and inadequate. To address this, NIFA aims to do the following:

- Provide access to evaluation resources that facilitate and promote performance measurement and evaluation in Extension programs within the context of larger systems or systems-related issues in order to enhance Extension's capacity to demonstrate program impacts.
- Create a shared vision and common language for program performance measurement and evaluation on a national scale.
- Be adaptable and responsive to program performance measurement, evaluation needs, and reporting at the local, state, regional, and national levels.

For the purpose of this report, we define performance measurement as the systematic use of data to monitor progress toward goals. We define evaluation as the systematic use of data to measure and describe the results of program efforts, as well as the factors contributing to those results.

To address these above aims, from August 2016–February 2017, NIFA contracted with the University of Wisconsin-Extension (UWEX) to lead a project for these purposes:

- Develop a plan to support NIFA in its effort to serve as a catalyst for, and leader in, a national dialogue about program and project evaluation needs of LGUs' staff; and
- Develop a roadmap for connecting Extension educators and administrators across the LGU system to NIFA's and each other's evaluation resources.

Leading this effort at NIFA was Dr. Aida Balsano, an NPL in the Division of Family and Consumer Science within the Institute of Youth, Family and Community. In addition, the initiative engaged leaders across the agency and from within the LGU system.

This report, developed by the UWEX team, describes the plan and roadmap, including the current issues and needs, context, and root causes of the roadblocks the project faces. In the roadmap, we also suggest solutions, discuss how these solutions can provide a return on

NIFA's investments, address limitations to the study, and identify recommendations for implementation. The report includes a one page graphic roadmap that serves also as an executive summary.

## The presenting issue

NIFA initially framed the presenting issue as the need for a national portal to improve evaluation capacity within the Land Grant system. In short, the issue was framed as a solution to a perceived gap.

- The perceived gap is that the Land Grant System's evaluation capacity is lacking in some way, shape, or form.

*The university colleagues we support often do not do a good job of program development and evaluation (PDE), both in grant proposals and in practice.*

- The proposed solution to address this gap is a national portal designed to improve evaluation capacity across the Land Grant System.

*We, and those we support, need a centralized, easy-to-access, culturally relevant portal that supports all potential grant applicants and others with resources to effectively develop and evaluate programs.*

## Our response

The project team's initial purpose was to understand the presenting issue, utilizing an iterative approach. Initially, this involved situating the presenting issue within the broader context of evaluation capacity within the Land Grant System. This resulted in identifying a number of crosscutting, contextual themes. The second step of the process was to vet these themes with NIFA colleagues and others, toward the end of identifying root causes of the original presenting issue and articulating a preliminary vision for the future. The final step was to share preliminary findings with others for further reflection, feedback, and input, and to use the results to build a roadmap for the future.

### Step 1—Understanding context of the presenting issue

The project team initially sought out multiple perspectives throughout the Land Grant System concerning their perception of the presenting issue. The team collected feedback from the following groups through interviews and a face-to-face meeting that included distance participants:

- National program leaders, division and institute directors, and the PARS unit at NIFA
- Project directors at 1862 LGUs

- Project directors at Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs)
- EXtension CoP
- PDE experts

In addition, the project team sought to incorporate the work of two other initiatives already underway: the Evaluation Capacity Building TIG of the American Evaluation Association, and the North Central Region's (NCR) *Building Capacity and Quality in Program Development and Evaluation (PD&E) Initiative*.

The team analyzed the findings gleaned from these different perspectives, identifying an initial set of crosscutting contextual themes relevant to, but in some cases reaching beyond, the original presenting issue.

#### Step 2—Understanding root causes and articulating a vision for the future

- The project team next facilitated a two-day face-to-face meeting with NIFA staff members at the Waterfront Centre in Washington. At different times during the meeting, the group sought input from a small group of external reactors via teleconference. Participants in the event included those listed above, as well as representation from the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) and national Extension regional directors.

The purpose of this meeting was fourfold: (1) to present the roadmap as an overarching organizing construct; (2) to vet and further clarify contextual themes; (3) to identify root causes of the presenting issue; and, (4) to articulate a preliminary vision for the future (See Appendix A. for the meeting agenda).

#### Step 3—Further reflection, feedback, and input

The UWEX team documented all activities, ideas, and feedback and compiled the results into a draft roadmap and accompanying report. The draft documents were sent to all participants for review, and to ensure all key ideas were accurately represented. This feedback was collected through survey and direct email responses. The UWEX team reviewed all recommendations for revision and incorporated the feedback into the final versions. The team will work with Dr. Balsano to share results with internal NIFA stakeholders and external participants and stakeholders, as is deemed appropriate.

#### Limitations

The scope of this project, both in terms of time and resources, challenged the research team to identify key stakeholders and influencers to inform articulation of the current landscape, underlying issues, and causes. In terms of participation, there were only about ten to twelve Land Grant institutions directly contributing feedback. Within NIFA, while all institutes were involved, one or two of the institutes, and PARS, had a disproportionate level of engagement or influence in the process.

Many intersecting factors affect the degree to which an investigator or his/her institution is competitive or engaged with NIFA awards. Evaluation capacity is just one factor that is not likely standing alone. In some states, NIFA is not seen as the primary Extension funder, which influences how much attention and priority are given to its leadership and requirements.

## Current context

There are many perspectives of, and stakeholders in, the evaluation of USDA-funded programs—including Congress, NIFA, ECOP, Extension regions, and the states/LGUs. NIFA initiated its project about an evaluation portal at the same time some of these other stakeholder groups were addressing gaps and needs with regard to evaluation capacity building. We drew on these diverse perspectives and efforts, and sought to understand their potential to be synergistic and mutually reinforcing.

There are federal, government-wide initiatives and trends influencing the current context. For example, the Office of Management and Budget is promoting “learning institutions” and there is widespread emphasis on evidence-based decision-making. With the federal focus on evidence, there is an opportunity to build greater organizational and system capacity in data collection, analysis and use (i.e. data literacy). Within NIFA, PARS is in the process of gathering stakeholder input and revising the reporting system for Plans of Work. PARS is working with program staff to develop performance metrics and exploring new technologies for capturing grantees’ accomplishments across programs and portfolios.

Simultaneous to this national dialogue, the NCR has been developing a regional PDE portal. Many of the issues and dynamics identified at a national level are relevant at smaller, local scales, like regions and states. Thus, a team of regional program development and evaluation experts has been creating a resource inventory, researching platforms, and developing a sustainable business model that address many of the themes identified through the NIFA project.

Based on an analysis of information from these diverse sources, several themes emerged that describe key elements of the current context for national evaluation capacity. From the perspective of NIFA staff, LGUs, and investigators implementing NIFA-funded projects:

### Leadership

- Leadership roles and contributions for Extension education evaluation are not clear nationally among and between NIFA, ECOP, states/regions and the profession of evaluation.
- Shared leadership in program performance management and evaluation between NIFA, ECOP, LGUs, and the PDE profession is unrealized.

- Evaluation expectations are inconsistent at the NIFA level—from Request for Applications, to panel reviews and reporting—and are therefore carried out inconsistently at the programmatic level.
- Organizations offer few rewards or incentives for best practices in program/project performance management and evaluation.

#### Data quality and use

- While there has been a change in administration, the previous administration’s focus on promoting learning institutions, and its emphasis on evidence-based decision making, remains fundamentally important and points to the need for building greater organizational and system capacity in data collection, analysis, and use (data literacy).
- Data use varies within and among stakeholders, and thus a systems approach needs to account for multiple purposes.
- Outcome data is weak across the board, as is NIFA’s ability to track longer-term effects that result from short- and medium-term outcomes (results) leading to significant broader change in conditions.
- National and regional conversations about developing more meaningful outcome measures will enable NIFA and the broader system to more easily group reports of programs that share objectives.

#### Systems and structures

- Units like PARS inside NIFA, or PDE units inside LGUs, are often under-recognized, under-resourced, or not invited to the table in providing leadership for evaluation and performance management in general.
- Program evaluation and program planning are not well connected.
- Within NIFA, PARS is in the process of gathering stakeholder input and revising the reporting system for Plans of Work. PARS is working with program staff to develop performance metrics and exploring new technologies for capturing grantees’ accomplishments across programs and portfolios.

#### Resources and capacity

- MSI have limited staff, including in evaluation, to compete successfully with larger institutions for NIFA-funded programs. A lack of resources to develop and conduct culturally relevant project performance measures and evaluations perpetuates a lack of representation and engagement of MSIs.
- Critical Extension evaluation capacity disparities exist across states and institutions.
- NIFA and the LGU System lack multicultural evaluation resources.
- Most NPLs do not have the background or knowledge to integrate rigorous evaluation in their programs or to build capacity in grant applicants, nor should they. PARS should have the authority to build capacity and set policy expectations, as well as help NPLs implement them.

- The NCR has been developing a regional PDE portal. Many of the issues and dynamics identified at a national level are relevant at smaller, local scales, like regions and states. Thus, a team of regional program development and evaluation experts has been creating a resource inventory, researching platforms, and developing a sustainable business model that address many of the themes identified through the NIFA project.
- AEA and eXtension is well positioned to start to speak about and inform evaluation expectations at national or regional levels. AEA and eXtension are preparing for that role already by developing competencies and supportive professional development opportunities around evaluation competencies.

## Root causes

Underlying the presenting issue of needing a national evaluation portal is an issue of leaders not having at the conclusion of projects' funding period the data that they need to provide meaningful outcomes and impacts reports at the project and program levels. As part of the two-day event at USDA, we unpacked with NIFA leaders exclusively the idea of why many of them felt they or their organization does not have the data they need. Given our UWEX team's experience working across states and regions, we might also extrapolate that these issues are relevant in multiple contexts. We identified four root causes to the problem of a lack of data:

- 1) Institutional cultures support different, and at times conflicting, data uses.
- 2) Some of our data needs are shared, while others are unique to our respective institutions.
- 3) Evaluation capacity within NIFA and across the Land Grant System is inadequate.
- 4) Information technologies are viewed as the primary solution. However, tools/technologies need appropriate conceptual grounding to be effective.

Specific details about these root causes within NIFA are listed below:

Organizational culture: NIFA's culture does not fully embrace the collection, analysis, use, and communication of data (i.e. data literacy):

- NIFA leadership has not articulated a vision for data literacy that would bridge the cultures of discovery (academia) and performance (public trust). A vision that is clear, simple, and easily translated into the work conducted at the program leader, division, institute, and agency levels is lacking.
- Some of NIFA's leaders are effective in using data to inform their programmatic decisions. However, these same leaders do not have sufficient opportunities to learn from each other and/or share their learnings with their counterparts across the institutes and with PARS.

Data use: There is not shared understanding about the multiple purposes and uses of data across and within organizations and stakeholder groups. Additionally, NIFA needs rigorously collected and analyzed data to demonstrate evidence of success or impact. Communications

functions seek data as material for telling impact or value stories, yet communications staff are not necessarily trained in discerning if the data they use is valid and credible.

- Colleagues identified multiple uses for data, such as for measuring performance, articulating program impact, identifying innovations for scaling, and communicating externally to the Land Grant System. NIFA lacks clarity and focus in its data uses and the types of data that will inform these uses.
- There was an acknowledgment that among key participants in this project, we often do not know the data needs of each other's partners. With a core value placed on partnerships at NIFA, understanding the data needs of the diverse institutions making up the Land Grant System is critical.

Evaluation capacity: Many states have decreased their commitment to PDE resources at a time when demand for evidence-based decision-making and accountability is increasing. Similarly, NIFA is under resourced in evaluation and analysis expertise.

- Tools and materials (non-human resources) are perceived to be an adequate replacement for human capacity.
- On-boarding and ongoing professional development in evaluation is limited in many institutions.
- Wide disparities exist within and among institutions, especially between MSIs and 1862s.
- Competencies and best practices familiar within the profession are not embraced or integrated within LGUs and NIFA.

Information technology: The problem is often framed as an infrastructure/technology problem (e.g. "our platform is old; it doesn't have the right buckets; it can't do this or that"). While the currency and functionality of technology is important, organizations often overlook the bigger problem of a lack of data literacy within institutions. Organizations that are limited in human capacity that can meaningfully collect, analyze, and use data are limited by the boundaries of the tools they use.

- Effective technologies to manage data cannot produce results if not coupled with robust data literacy within the organization.

## Desired future state

NIFA leaders, alongside key external LGU stakeholders, articulated a desired future state. The activity leading to this vision looked two years into the future, thus focusing on something achievable, and yet with time to develop. In particular, NIFA, as the extramural science-funding agency within USDA's Research, Education, and Economics mission area, is positioned to leverage its funding authority to build evaluation capacity within the LGU system. With this capacity, NIFA would be better able to communicate to Congress the impact of its integrated portfolio in the advancement of agricultural research, education, and extension toward the solution of societal challenges.

Within the desired future state, NIFA has a common language and approach to evaluation shared by its four institutes and their respective divisions, the Center for International Programs and PARS. There are four main components of the desired future state:

- NIFA uses evidence to inform Extension programmatic decisions.
- NIFA and LGUs effectively communicate, as a system, the significance of our integrated portfolio to elected officials, key stakeholders, and the public at large.
- We address our respective programmatic performance management expectations.
- We leverage our varied funding authorities to build Extension evaluation capacity equitably across the LGU System.

## The solution and solution-in-practice

Attainment of a desired future state is best achieved through shared understandings and “mutually reinforcing activities” (Kania, John, and Mark Kramer. "Collective impact." 2011: 36-41) among key players in the larger Extension/LGU system. “Mutually reinforcing activities” is a core element of the Collective Impact framework first published in Stanford Social Innovation Review, and speaks to the idea that a group of organizations working toward shared impact, and with a common agenda, can implement their unique role in a way that enhances or mutually reinforces the efforts of the others. To be able to do so, one must be intentional about the following: a) identifying and naming key players in the larger context; b) articulating the relationships among these players; c) understanding each player and stakeholder group’s unique perspective; and d) understanding the distinctions each makes. We took this type of systems approach when developing the roadmap (i.e. solution) to desired future state that would respond to the goals of NIFA’s FY 2016 Extension Evaluation Portal project.

## Solution

The *solution*, or roadmap, reflects the essential, distilled, top-level strategies needed to bring about the desired future state. Each of these strategies will need detailed planning within and among the key players listed below, as well as further engagement of key stakeholders within or related to the larger NIFA/LGU/Extension System. In order for NIFA to raise Extension Evaluation Portal capacity, the following needs to occur:

- Resources to support PDE—such as PDE resource hubs and evaluation staff directories, trainings, and best practices—must be available and relevant to all institutions eligible to apply to NIFA for funding, including Minority Serving Institutions.
- There must be equity in access to resources and support for their use across institutions (including MSIs), states, and regions.
- All national reporting systems for NIFA-funded projects need to be integrated or aligned.
- All data collection and analyses of funded Extension projects need to be informed by a shared understanding of the role of program performance management and evaluation within NIFA’s mission.

- Evaluation capacity building, including professional development for colleagues and partners, needs to be current, robust, and available to all.

Each aspect of the *solution* has relevance across the system, with different key players having their own circle of influence and with it, positioned to contribute to the desired future state in specific ways.

## Solution in practice

The *solution in practice* refers to those specific strategies best led by each key stakeholder group in alignment with their unique role, position, and mission. We identified the following four key players in the success of desired future state vis-à-vis NIFA's Extension Evaluation Portal project:

- 1) NIFA—through its competitive and non-competitive programs, grants, and relationship to Congress.
- 2) ECOP—through its partnerships, system-wide policies, and commitments.
- 3) Extension efforts/groups at regional and state levels—through their resource investments and sharing.
- 4) The profession of evaluation—through the development of evaluation resources, communities and competencies.

Below is an articulation of specific strategies by key players. If implemented, these strategies will contribute to a comprehensive change. Additionally, we recommend building on opportunities for collaboration, such as the National Extension and Research Administrative Officers Conference, where NIFA-LGU capacity building in performance measurement and evaluation can occur. Strategies specific to NIFA are the primary focus below.

## NIFA

### Shared mission-driven data

Direction for data collection and use within NIFA, and all those it supports, should follow a shared set of principles or guidelines that is relevant to all, but not so prescriptive as to limit the needs of diverse programs and portfolios. Data collection and use should be grounded in a shared understanding of the organizational mission, and be able to help the organization speak to its stakeholders about the progress and actualization of that mission. Program or agency priorities should be connected to data gathered through planning, evaluation, and performance measurement activities.

### Organizational development

NIFA plays a key role as a national leader in setting direction and expectations for PDE within the LGU System, and is in a position to do this through its competitive and non-competitive grants programs. To take advantage of this leadership role, NIFA should continue to develop itself in ways that not only make it competitive and current with other federal agencies, but also as a leader in PDE.

NIFA could be more effective at realizing its potential with regard to PDE by doing the following:

- 1) Identifying, sharing, rewarding, and incentivizing best leadership PDE practices across the organization. Currently, places where innovative practices are being implemented are not being effectively leveraged.
- 2) Improving accountability and performance plans, with both NIFA employees, as well as the grants projects they oversee.
- 3) Creating greater consistencies across the agency when it comes to PDE, for example by developing shared standards across RFAs and grants panels on program performance measurement (e.g. shared language, templates, review criteria, panel expertise, reporting expectations, and accountability/performance measures).
- 4) Integrating PDE into existing portfolio review processes.
- 5) Clarifying the roles and responsibilities of PARS, and be in closer alignment with how other federal agencies carry out planning and accountability functions.
- 6) Developing a national framework for tribal program and evaluation expectations.
- 7) Clarifying expectations for what level evaluation should take place and the relationship between evaluation at different scales (e.g. at the program level with NIFA as the responsible party; at the project level with PIs as the responsible party; within research/education/extension equally).

### In-house capacity building

NPLs are hired for their scientific, technical and administrative expertise that does not necessarily include training/experience in evaluation. Many NPLs would benefit from stronger orientation, professional development, and guidance related to program development, performance measurement, and evaluation.

### Resources

Although NIFA is not directly involved in the development of many resources in the area of PDE, the agency wants to be able to direct awardees and prospective future applicants to accessible, relevant, current, and effective PDE resources. In order to achieve this, NIFA needs to stay current with the state of the PDE field. Four core strategies would assist with this:

- 1) Explicitly fund innovations in PDE
- 2) Hire more evaluation and analyst professionals at NIFA
- 3) Find and engage international partners, or those working in the international arena, who have been successful in PDE capacity building
- 4) Develop resources and training specifically for Federally Recognized Tribes Extension Program educators to do real-time program assessment.

### Aligned reporting systems

The larger Extension/LGU System needs to be able to tell collective impact stories, as well as learn from practice. To this end, it is essential to be able to aggregate, access and use data

across platforms. The planning and reporting infrastructure at NIFA is out of date. To enable effective data collection, analysis, and use, attention should be given to updating current platforms, as to aligning platforms that collect different kinds of data while contributing to a national Extension story. REEport could serve as the official site for data, if updated, to address multiple user needs. By bringing these changes about, NIFA would benefit from building a shared vision related to program evaluation and data collection on Extension. Additionally, while aggregating data can be useful, NIFA will want to balance steps needed to create data management consistency across programs and portfolios, while maintaining the rich diversity of Extension programming and using data to improve outreach to underserved communities.

## ECOP

A primary sphere of influence with ECOP and the Extension directors is in setting direction for state commitments to PDE resources.

## REGIONS & STATES

Extension efforts/groups at regional and state levels are perhaps the most likely place to develop resources and offer capacity building through the development of regional hubs that offer tools, trainings, and people and communities focused on culturally relevant, competency-driven, accessible PDE practices. The NCR is leading the way with the development of a NCR evaluation portal that could be used as a model or a base for greater national reach.

Regional scale efforts offer a way to more effectively leverage and share evaluation resources across states and institutions (1862s, 1890s, 1994s and HSIs), and to address issues of capacity disparity. Regional efforts provide an opportunity to link program planning or development with evaluation efforts, and do this in ways that are informed by stakeholder needs and shared LGU missions.

## EXTENSION EVALUATION PROFESSION

The profession of evaluation should be leading and informing the focus on resource development and capacity building within the larger LGU and Cooperative Extension Systems. AEA and eXtension both have active communities of practice focusing on Extension evaluation competencies (e.g. evaluative thinking, analysis), as well as infrastructure to support growth in these areas. The profession is somewhat aligned with the needs of LGUs and Extension, but could strengthen its connections between groups working on Extension program evaluation, evaluation capacity building, and evaluation professional development.

## Return on Investment

If NIFA, ECOP, regional and state Extension groups, and the Extension evaluation profession work together to improve resources, infrastructure, mission driven data use, capacity building, equity, and organizational development with regard to PDE, the synergies will lead to an

improved future state in evaluation for all members of the larger Extension system. Specific outcomes and ripple effects include these benefits:

- Greater system capacity to do PDE well
- Greater equity among institutions and grant seekers
- NIFA and LGU leaders have the data they need to communicate programmatic impacts, value, and effort
- Improved impact resulting from formative evaluation results used to direct and guide programs.

## Conclusion

Over the past few years, NIFA has made great strides in articulating to its stakeholders across the Land Grant System the need for project outcomes and impacts. This communication has occurred via a number of different channels, from NIFA's Strategic Plan, to state plans of work and state annual reports, to NIFA's RFAs, and at meetings and conferences attended by NIFA's senior leadership. Still, NIFA is struggling across many of its programs (most notably those without evaluation set-aside funds) to acquire data needed to show that its programmatic investments are reaching intended programmatic goals. The reason for this rests in part on Extension specialists and agents at many LGUs struggling to capture and report on their existing Extension program outcomes, or to articulate how they would measure outcomes of their new projects. The need for an evaluation portal is in part a reflection of this limited evaluation capacity at many LGU institutions.

Developing a National Extension Education Evaluation Portal, as proposed in the 2016 NIFA project, would contribute over time toward the evaluation capacity of the LGUs and Cooperative Extension, especially if complemented with capacity building (e.g. training, mentoring), organizational development, and policy. The portal itself would not resolve NIFA's need for better grants data. As the FY 2016 project uncovered, the need for the portal also reflects an inadequate capacity at NIFA to communicate across all its grant programs appropriate, program-sensitive guidance relative to project performance measurement and evaluation. Inadequate program evaluation capacity at NIFA, if unresolved, will continue to hinder the ability of the LGU System, and especially of MSIs, to strengthen their own program evaluation capacity. Hence, rather than investing in an evaluation portal at this time, we believe that an investment in enhancing NIFA's own program performance management and evaluation capacity is more urgent, both for NIFA and the LGU and Cooperative Extension partners.

We recommend these specific next steps to NIFA:

- 1) Revisit its policy context and determine if there are ways to make improvements that are within its scope, and
- 2) Develop an organizational plan for performance measurement and evaluation that takes into account features identified in this roadmap and includes a common message across the agency. NIFA is well-positioned to lead and catalyze improvements within the larger

LGU/Extension system by working collaboratively with ECOP, states, and the profession to improve national effectiveness in program planning, evaluation, and performance measurement.

# Appendix A

## Extension Education Evaluation Resources Discussion

January 11-12, 2017

Wednesday, January 11, 2017

### Closed Session

12:00PM – 12:30PM **DFCS Research and Evaluation Team Meeting with University of Wisconsin**

*Aida Balsano, National Program Leader*  
*Sydney Nowlin, Program Specialist*  
*Jennifer Kushner, Mary Crave, Larry Jones, University of Wisconsin-Extension*

12:30PM – 1:00PM **NIFA Core Team Meeting with University of Wisconsin-Extension**

*Aida Balsano, NPL, Division of Family & Community Science*  
*Sydney Nowlin, Program Specialist, Division of Family & Community Science*  
*Toija Riggins, NPL, DY-4H*  
*Tim Grosser, NPL, DOCE*  
*Lynn Khadiagala, Social Science Analyst, PARS*  
*Karl Maxwell, Program Analyst, PARS*  
*Jodi Williams, NPL, IFSN*  
*Rob Hedberg, NPL, IFPS*  
*Wesley Dean, NPL, IFPS*  
*Charlotte Kirk Baer, NPL, IFPS*  
*Rachel Melnick, NPL, IBCE*  
*Michael McGirr, NPL, Center for International Programs*

### Open Session

1:00PM - 1:10PM **Welcome and Introductions, Aida Balsano, NPL**

1:10PM – 1:20PM **Opening Remarks, Dr. Muquarrab Qureshi, Deputy Director**

1:20PM - 1:30PM **Overview of Phases, Larry Jones, University of Wisconsin-Extension**

1:30PM - 1:45PM **Purpose & Roles, Jennifer Kushner, University of Wisconsin-Extension**

1:45PM – 2:15PM **What We Learned – Part I, Mary Crave, University of Wisconsin-Extension**

2:15PM – 2:45PM **What We Learned – Part II, Jennifer and Larry, University of Wisconsin-Extension**

2:45PM – 3:00PM **Break**

- 3:00PM – 4:00PM      **Reflection and Feedback, All**  
 Remotely: *Deborah John, Oregon State University,*  
*Allison Nichols, West Virginia University*  
*Scott Cummings, Texas A&M AgriLife Extension*
- 3:00PM – 3:10PM      **Whose Perspectives Do We Need to Deepen Our Understanding?**
- 3:10PM – 4:00PM      **How Does This Resonate With Your Experience? How Would You Deepen/Expand Our Understanding? What's Missing?**
- 4:00PM – 4:20PM      **Root Cause: Why Are Things The Way They Are?**
- 4:20PM – 4:30PM      **Recap and Looking Ahead**

**Thursday, January 12, 2017**

**Closed Session**

- 9:00AM – 9:15AM      **Welcome, Aida Balsano, National Program Leader**
- 9:15AM – 9:30AM      **Reflect Back, University of Wisconsin – Extension**
- 9:30AM – 10:30AM      **Vision for the Future, University of Wisconsin – Extension**
- 10:30AM – 11:00AM      **Break**
- 11:00AM – 12:00PM      **Solutions, University of Wisconsin – Extension**
- 12:00PM – 12:30PM      **University of Wisconsin – Extension Summary**
- 1:00PM – 1:30PM      **Lunch**

**Open Session**

- 1:30 PM – 2:00 PM      **Roadmap Draft Feedback**
- 2:00 PM – 3:00 PM      **Next Steps**

**Closed Session**

- 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM      **Final Reflections – University of Wisconsin-Extension and DFCS Research and Evaluation Team**  
*Aida Balsano, National Program Leader*  
*Sydney Nowlin, Program Specialist*  
*Jennifer Kushner, Mary Crave, Larry Jones, University of Wisconsin-Extension*