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Executive Summary

A Task Force (TF) jointly appointed by the Washington Association of Counties and Washington State University convened between February and June 2011 to address the question of budget reduction expectations while continuing to provide adequate and equitably distributed resources of WSU Extension for implementation in State Fiscal Year 2012 (July 1, 2011). The Task Force Report contains 64 recommendations for action by WSU and Boards of County Commissioners and County Councils. The purpose of the TF was to consider short-term and tactical considerations in this time of decreasing resources and increasing expectations. In summary, the Task Force recommends an office and presence of WSU Extension in all 39 counties in Washington State. The TF Report reiterates the use of the existing Minimum County Contributions towards WSU faculty salary support as the most equitable approach across the various sizes of the counties in the state. The TF Report stresses the retention of powerful locally relevant community connections to the land-grant research university and provides recommendation to improve administrative efficiencies and role clarity for administrators under a new model. The TF reviewed several state models with implications of office closure or restructuring in clusters or multi-county administrative units. Multi-county model of program delivery was embraced but the TF did not propose a multi-county administrative structure. Regardless of administrative model, county partners should not see any personnel changes due to changes in supervisory relations. If a change is noticeable, it will be in a positive way – move visible emphasis and action to address defined program priorities with measureable outcomes benefiting communities, businesses, and youth and families.

Given the limited “charge” and short timeline, it is recommended in cooperation with WSAC that a TF mechanism be explored as a means of providing to WSU Extension in the future on strategic priorities. The work of the Task Force for Restructuring and Refinement is now complete with the submission of the Report.

Respectfully submitted:

Linda Kirk Fox, Ph.D.
Associate Director - WSU Extension

June 21, 2011
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Overview

Washington State University Extension’s ability to deliver educational programs in each of the 39 counties is threatened by the current economic situation in Washington. In the past two years, WSU Extension experienced a state budget cut of more than $3 million, a reduction of more than 25 percent in 2009. WSU also took a 26% reduction to this biennial operating budget, amounting to about $108 million effective July 1, 2011, with yet to be identified cuts to WSU and to WSU Extension. Tuition increases are expected to make up a significant portion of the cut resulting in a net cut to WSU of approximately $39 million or 5.2%. The WSU Budget Office's website (http://budget.wsu.edu/2011-13_budget/) contains more budget details. All Extension program areas have reduced expenditures — primarily in faculty numbers through attrition and program reallocation — to meet current reduction targets by June 30, 2011. The CAHNRS - Extension budget website can be found at: http://www.cahnrs.wsu.edu/fs/budget/.

What might be the most equitable approach to meeting these budget reduction expectations while continuing to provide adequate Extension educational programming and problem solving in communities across the state?

Many states have investigated or moved from a county-based form of operations to a regional model with more specialization. We have a significant number of vacant positions due to retirement of key administrators. This is an opportune time to review administrative structure and functions to meet the needs of WSU and the needs of our valued funding partner – county government.

In January 2011, WSU Extension and the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC) sought volunteers and named eight county elected officials and six WSU Extension faculty to serve on a Task Force for the purpose of reacting to and refining a new vision of the leaner Extension administrative structure and staffing plans. The goal was to complete a review and to make recommendations by mid-June for communication to WSAC leadership and WSU leadership in early summer. Implementation can begin in July 2011 (WSU state fiscal year) and local budget adjustments by January 1, 2012 (county government fiscal year).

The “Charge” to the Task Force by Daniel J. Bernardo, Dean, College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resource Sciences (CAHNRS), WSU

I. Assess and recommend improvements to a model of equitable distribution of Extension faculty, staff and program resources.

II. Consider alternative local funding models to sustain an optimum mix of local funds with university-provided federal and state resources.

III. Look at alternative governance and administrative structures.

IV. Propose modification to the geographic deployment of faculty and staff resources, including consideration of non-county government local partners such as branch campuses of WSU, the
This report outlines responses of the Task Force to the “Charge,” summarizes the background of Extension, outlines strategies considered, and makes a series of recommendations to items I through IV above. This will to be presented to the leadership of WSAC and WSU as follows:

**WSAC:**
- John Koster, President, WSAC, Snohomish County Council
- Paul Pearce, Vice-President, WSAC, Skamania County Commissioner
- Eric Johnson, Executive Director, WSAC

**WSU:**
- Warwick Bayly, Provost and Executive Vice President, WSU
- Daniel J. Bernardo, Dean, CAHNRS and Director, WSU Extension

**WSU Extension Affiliate of WSAC:**
- Arno Bergstrom, Affiliate Chair, Kitsap County Extension Director

Overall, the Task Force further recommends:
- Two webinars hosted by WSU to present findings and implementation options and timeline. The first webinar for WSU Extension County Directors and a second webinar for public officials.
- A joint workshop of Task Force members (WSAC and WSU Extension) in the form of a breakout session for all interested elected officials and WSU County Director for an update on progress of implementation of recommendations at the annual WSAC meeting, November 15-17, 2011, Bellevue, WA

**The Task Force Process**

**Value statements:**
At the first meeting of the Task Force ten principles and value statements pertaining to WSU Extension were reviewed as relevant to the task at hand:

1. Value and retain powerful community connections
2. Improve administrative efficiency and role clarity for administrators and faculty
3. Simplify and reduce complexities in organizational processes
4. Accomplish better integration across programs and missions
5. Balance our attention to rural and urban populations
6. Examine process and system-wide participation for updating Strategic Plan
7. Emphasize our distinctive mission to develop cutting-edge educational programs
8. Reach new audiences with research-based responses to contemporary issues
9. Optimize our position as an organization that spans the entire university
10. Continue to grow partnerships and extramural funds

**Goals:**
1. To increase and enhance greater access by the public to Extension and to WSU resources.
2. To focus the efforts of programmatic teams to work closely to identify emerging educational needs and deliver programs.
3. To offer counties greater choice in the selection of local positions and greater clarity on roles of local staff and regional specialized staff.
4. To assess and recommend improvements to the distribution of faculty, staff and program resources.
5. To consider alternative local funding models to grow and sustain programs.
6. To increase understanding of and ability to leverage federal, state and local funding to more viable funding models and inclusion of other possible partners and funding sources.
7. To consider modifications to administrative structures and geographic deployment or coverage.
8. To involve local residents and stakeholders in programs for more effective interdisciplinary, problem-solving customer focused educational programming.

**Background Information About Extension Work in Washington State**

**Preface**
The first Morrill Act of 1862 created a nationwide system of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities. A land-grant college or university is an institution that has been designated by its state legislature or Congress to receive the benefits of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. The original mission of these institutions, as set forth in the first Morrill Act, was to teach agriculture, military tactics, and the domestic and mechanic arts as well as classical studies so that members of the working classes could obtain a liberal, practical education. The Land-Grant mission of teaching was originally supported by revenues from the sale of federal lands granted to the states. Over time, the mission and funding sources for Land-Grants have expanded greatly through the Hatch Act of 1887 which added funds for each state to establish agricultural experiment stations at their Land Grant institutions, with federal appropriations initially allocated via a formula based on the number of small farmers in the state. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 created a Cooperative Extension Service to disseminate the information gleaned from research and created a funding mechanism similar to Hatch but with a required state match. The 29 native American tribal colleges established in 1994 are sometimes called the “1994 Land-Grants.” WSU is the 1862 Land-Grant and Northwest Indian College is the 1994 Land-Grant in Washington State. Refer to What is a Land-Grant College? [http://ext.wsu.edu/documents/landgrant.pdf](http://ext.wsu.edu/documents/landgrant.pdf).

Extension in Washington State began in Wahkiakum County in 1913 with the hiring of the first county agent. Washington State codified agriculture and home economics extension in RCW 36.50.010.

**Cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics authorization:**

_The board of county commissioners of any county and the governing body of any municipality are authorized to establish and conduct extension work in agriculture and home economics in cooperation with Washington State University, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by any such board or governing body and the director of the extension service of Washington State University; and may employ such means and appropriate and expend such sums of money as may be necessary to effectively establish and carry on such work in agriculture and home economics in their respective counties and municipalities._


**Funding Model**

In the current set of 39 county Extension offices, WSU and county partners share in the contribution toward salaries based on a table of counties by size or “tiers.” WSU pays faculty and staff benefits, and county partners pay for all others expenses — building costs, administrative support, computer hardware, etc. This results in county dollars leveraging significant additional resources available in each county.
County government in Washington enters into an Interagency Agreement (sometimes referred to as the Memorandum of Agreement, MOA) with WSU for purposes of funding local extension offices and identifying salary contributions based on Minimum County Contributions updated annually (2011 - Appendix E). For purposes of recovering expenditures incurred by WSU for use of Facilities and Administrative (F&A) costs, normally WSU charges sponsoring agencies negotiated cost recovery reimbursement rates. Given the long-term and ongoing partnership relation with county government as established in the 1914 Smith-Lever Act, WSU does not charge county government F&A (typically 26 percent for off-campus programs). In addition, WSU Extension pays Labor and Industries (L&I) insurance premium for all enrolled volunteers. WSU pays benefits of all employees designated in the Interagency Agreement. The Minimum County Contribution is recommended for salary of WSU Extension faculty and does not include funding for office space, in-kind contribution for county funded employees/staff and operations budget(s).

**Funding Sources**

Unlike many states, Washington State University Extension and the Agricultural Research Center are not separate, individual line items in the Washington legislative budget. WSU Extension budget is an allocation by the university from the total university budget. Because of that, no funds that the University generates from tuition are used to support Extension.

**Task Force Response to the “Charge” and Recommendations**

Over the period of four months through several face-to-face meetings and conference calls, the Task Force reviewed materials and data, heard presentations by guest speakers, and reviewed opinions expressed by others through an online survey. In order to develop observations and a set of recommendations, all county elected officials (county commissioners, county council members, and county executives) were asked midway through the process to provide input on the best way to address several issues. (Appendix A: WSAC and WSU Extension Task Force Survey for County Officials and Appendix B: WSAC and WSU Extension Task Force Survey for WSU Extension County Directors)

| Overall, in Washington State, county government is pleased with Washington State University Extension. |
| 98% value the educational programming and applied research |
| 94% believe Extension is an excellent return on investment by the county |
| **Survey Questions 1 and 2, n=53** |

| Overall, in Washington State, WSU Extension county directors believe local government officials are pleased with Washington State University Extension. |
| 97% value the educational programming and applied research |
| 94% believe Extension is an excellent return on investment by the county |
| **Survey Questions 1 and 2, n=32** |

I. **Assess and recommend improvements to a model of equitable distribution of Extension faculty, staff and program resources.**
WSU Extension currently employs 791 full time equivalent employees both on and off campus, including 96 FTEs employed in the County Extension Districts. Extension faculty specialists are appointed in various college departments (115 employees, 110 FTE) and in the County Extension faculty (96 employees, 62 FTE). The ratio of state-level Specialists in CAHNRS to County faculty is 1.5 to 1.

**Recommendations:**
1. WSU should continue to have faculty resources on and off campus(es), maximizing long standing partnership with county government.
2. Organizationally, Extension provides both an educational brokering function that facilitates unbiased, research-based responses to critical needs AND provides disciplinary specialization to address critical needs.
3. There is the desire to have a county office in every county and presence where funding can support faculty or staff positions.
4. WSU and WSAC should continue use of the “Minimum County Contributions” per county/WSU Interagency Agreement. The MCC presents order of county by size and proportionate minimum salary contribution by the county partner for WSU faculty educator(s) and county director.
5. WSU complete a thorough assessment of current staffing and opportunities for consolidation with other agencies and organizations.
6. WSU county-based educators and regional specialists should work in teams with state level specialists [department appointment faculty residing on main campus, branch campuses, or at four Research and Extension Centers (Wenatchee, Prosser, Puyallup, Mt Vernon)] to determine program priorities and Plan of Work.
7. WSU should balance the ratio of county-based faculty to state level specialists to 1 to 1, reducing specialists assigned to campuses and Research and Extension Centers and increase the county numbers.
8. Staffing models and assignment of tenure track or non-tenure track faculty status will take into consideration WSU expectations for faculty scholarship local community needs.

**II. Consider alternative local funding models to sustain an optimum mix of local funds with university-provided federal and state resources.**

Expending federally appropriated Extension funds in local communities requires a local partner. Historically, this partner has been local government. The primary value of having local government decision makers as partners is that they understand and provide input into what Extension programs provide what support to their community. Local government is also an important source of funds. It has never been a requirement that county government be the required local partner However, few county commissioners have been willing to lose the input in the development and deployment of Extension programming in their community. In some counties, fiscal and political issues prevent county government from maintaining its role as the local partner.

*Are there alternative local funding models to consider to maintain the required local partnerships and provide Extension programming that addresses the needs of rural and urban communities?*

Steven Lundin, author of The Governments Closest to the People: A complete reference guide to local government in Washington State (2007), presented information and possibilities of:
Increasing county tax revenues.
Expanding state support.
Shifting responsibilities to the state.
Increase county budget flexibility.

What county officials responded when asked: *If a lack of state funds would dramatically compromise the ability to staff and to deliver local Extension programs, which of the following funding strategies would the county be willing to consider?* (Check all that apply)

- 76% Share expenses with neighboring county
- 70% Maintain current county funding
- 66% Campaign for private fund raising
- 54% Provide office for personnel funded by other partner agencies
- 52% Increase user fees
- 30% Secure funding agreement with other local municipalities, districts, utilities, industry, Tribes
- 14% Support local funding option exclusively for Extension

Survey Question #9 County Officials responses in order from high to low
N=53

What WSU Extension county directors responded when asked: *If a lack of state funds would dramatically compromise the ability to staff and to deliver local Extension programs, which of the following funding strategies would the county be willing to consider?* (Check all that apply)

- 84% Share expenses with neighboring county
- 91% Maintain current county funding
- 84% Campaign for private fund raising
- 47% Provide office for personnel funded by other partner agencies
- 44% Increase user fees
- 66% Secure funding agreement with other local municipalities, districts, utilities, industry, Tribes
- 84% Support local funding option exclusively for Extension

Survey Question #9 WSU Extension County Directors responses
N=32

There was significant difference of opinion between elected officials surveyed and WSU county directors related to two items: 1) Support local funding option exclusively for Extension (14% of county officials strongly agreed/agreed while 84% of county directors supported this funding strategy); 2) Secure funding agreements with other entities (30% of county officials strongly agreed/agreed while 66% of county directors supported this funding strategy).

**Recommendations:**
1. Continue to position Extension as a “public good.” Task Force members noted that the prevailing attitude of the public is that Extension is more of a public good than a private good.
2. Consider the positive financial contribution of potential long-term partnerships with municipalities and other potential partners under the same conditions offered county government.
3. WSU should explore developing interagency agreements and waived F&A to establish long-term contracted support for faculty and offices of WSU in municipalities and neighborhoods. County Government should remain in the lead role in future agreements and partnerships crafted with municipalities.

4. In many states, taxpayer approved funded service districts are key to Extension’s financial future. In Washington, this is not a tool currently in use. However, establishing local funding options exclusively designated for Extension was not well supported by survey responses of local officials.

5. Develop a plan to more closely align revenue generated from Extension programs to determine market value of the programs. WSU should identify key questions and factors that should be considered to set fees (market).

6. Address local sensitivities to any portion of revenue generated by locally imposed fees going back to campus or central administration.

7. Transparency and consistency of accounting should be established for fees collected and distributed, whether locally or fees set as a statewide program standard.

8. WSU should complete an assessment of the true cost of programs before considering the case for market derived fees.

9. It may be difficult, if not impossible or even illegal, to simply charge more for programs that have a long history of providing a service for a particular fee.

10. Program Directors should be expected to estimate how fees will become part of the overall budget.

11. Pilot test fee-for-service programs and adjust after review.

12. County government should not supplant local budget allocations due to WSU Extension’s entrepreneurial success. The Task Force recommends that successful fee-for-service, grantsmanship, and private fundraising should be rewarded and will add to county budgets, not replace the budgeted funds.

13. County officials should establish expectation of level of external dollars leveraged for the county investment. Locally discuss annually with the county director the expected level of external dollars generated. County officials should encourage diligent efforts to acquire grants, gifts, and contracts that leverage the county investment in Extension. County officials should discuss the strategy for this annually with the county director.

14. WSU will increase transparency of information on funding (WSU contribution and all other sources) to support the local office. County directors should complete the existing and recommended “Fact Sheet”. Ensure there is broad awareness of the impact of Extension programs locally, and the value of public investment in these programs.

15. WSU will standardize through training and checklists the communication by county directors with local elected officials. Quality and quantity of information conveyed to county government is apparently more uneven than realized and appears non-existent in some counties.

Development and Private Fundraising:

Linda Bailey, Assistant Director of Development, WSU CAHNRS and Extension and Executive Director, WA 4-H Foundation, presented information on private fundraising and the Campaign for WSU. To date, Extension has raised $26 million towards the $47.5 million campaign goal (2006-2015) with 80 percent of the funds from corporations and foundations and 20 percent from individual gifts. Ms. Bailey described the benefits of working through the WSU Foundation to promote, accept and maximize private support, management of the investments and legal expertise to ensure compliance in accepting, recording and stewarding gifts. Each college of WSU has its own Development office staff that reports jointly to the dean of the college and to the WSU Foundation. As an agent of WSU, the
Foundation promotes, accepts, and manages all private gifts and private grants in accordance with the donor’s wishes and within applicable state laws. See [http://wsufoundation.wsu.edu](http://wsufoundation.wsu.edu)

**Recommendations:**

1. Create a county Extension-wide system to support county- and area-based development efforts through county director training and support for a fundraising Campaign.
2. Elements to include for county-based development support:
   a. annual giving;
   b. major gift program;
   c. planned giving program; and
   d. donor stewardship plan.
3. WSU should provide county directors and faculty training and web-based tools to launch private fundraising by distributing:
   a. *Process for Donations to County Extension 17A Accounts* (Appendix C)
   b. Process to retrieve and expend funds from 17A account(s) to benefit local Extension programs (TBD)
4. Educate Extension employees and county government partners on the benefits of private fundraising. Correct the misperceptions held by many, including WSU employees, that WSU or the WSU Foundation charges fees for 17A account-held funds.
5. Educate Extension employees and county government partners on the differences between grants managed through the WSU Office of Grants, Research and Development (OGRD) and private gifts managed through the WSU Foundation.
6. County partners should encourage the use of the WSU Foundation for purposes of raising funds for WSU Extension, and avoid creation of any new independent 501(c) 3 entities for this purpose. This will avoid confusing donors, supporters, and volunteers.
7. Establish clear communication documents and web sites about establishing endowment agreements for purposes of county 4-H endowments (or any other program). Encourage “big picture” transformative fundraising efforts, utilizing endowments or other permanent funds made possible through individual donations, business and corporate contributions, and fundraising campaigns. County partners should consider hiring of a local fundraising person to interface with the WSU Foundation Development Officers in support of WSU Extension in the county.

**III. Look at alternative governance and administrative structures.**

The services of Cooperative Extension are being cut in many states whether from cuts proposed by the governor, legislature, or university. No state is spared. Many states are viewing restructuring as an option. The Task Force asked for a review of different states’ restructuring models and potential for WSU.

Six states and regional models were considered:

- Multi-county cluster model (Iowa, Michigan, Ohio)
- Office consolidation and hub-and-spoke delivery model (Illinois)
- Office consolidation and “tier” of services purchased model (Georgia)
- Integrated Adaptive model (Oregon)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iowa State University</th>
<th>Eliminated 90 county Chair positions (administrators at the local level) and reduced the dollar amount previously</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State University</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Eliminated 5 District offices, consolidated budget and personnel functions in one on-campus business office for the entire organization, reduced local administration and formed 4 administrative units called Program Institutes, assigned county faculty to Program Institutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>County offices organized into nine Extension Education and Research Areas (EERA) with shared resources and educator expertise and programming across county lines in the EERAs. Reduced administration by concentrating EERA multi-county administration into fewer administrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois</td>
<td>Closed a number of “center” offices and administered county programming locally instead, also consolidated three to five county offices reducing number of directors and staff into “hub” offices. Factors for retaining a local office are: Partner agencies, geographic resources, potential for clients to work together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>Adaptive Integrated Model. Will retain county offices, additional integration will occur across academic disciplines, county-level staff chairs will no longer supervise faculty and instead become more mission critical. Over time, one level of Extension administration will be eliminated (Area Administrator).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Counties are ranked based on several relevant criteria and assigned a Tier. Services and educational programs increase at higher tiers, from Tier 1 (no local office, 4-H in schools only), to Tier 6 (multiple agents jointly funded by UGA and county).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WSU Current Administrative Staffing and Budget Savings Options Considered:**

County Directors are responsible for educational program leadership, communication among individuals and organizations and the university, and administration of the local office or offices. The County Director serves as a departmental chair or unit lead in county government. A change was implemented beginning in January 2011 in reporting and supervisory relations. With a presence in every county at a minimum, local program assistants/coordinators and county clerical support staff are supervised by the County Director, who are in turn, supervised by the Program Director. In counties with multiple extension faculty educators, they will also be supervised by the Program Directors, who report to the Associate Dean/Associate Director, WSU Extension.

**How much does county government value local administration of programs/offices?** How county officials responded when asked:

- 80% believe in importance of having a designated supervisor/administrator (County Extension Director) in the county.
- 75% willing to share supervisory capacity in order to concentrate administrative duties and enhance program and service delivery.
Survey Questions 3 and 4  
N=53

**How much does county government value local administration of programs/offices?**  How WSU Extension county directors responded when asked:  
87% believe in importance of having a designated supervisor/administrator (County Extension Director) in the county.  
48% willing to share supervisory capacity in order to concentrate administrative duties and enhance program and service delivery.

Survey Questions 3 and 4  
N=32

There was significant difference of opinion between elected officials surveyed and WSU county directors related to the issue of sharing supervisory capacity among more than one, or a few neighboring counties (75% of county officials strongly agreed/agreed they are willing to share supervisory capacity while only 48% of county directors supported this strategy.  

Regardless of administrative model, county partners should not see any personnel changes due to changes in supervisory relations. If a change is noticeable, it will be in a positive way – more visible emphasis and action to address defined program priorities with measureable outcomes benefiting communities, businesses, and youth and families.

At the current time, WSU has held open vacant administrative positions in anticipation of review and recommendations by the WSAC/Extension Task Force. Three scenarios were presented and each has positive and negative consequences of implementing. Savings to the university in state funds through administrative restructuring can net between one half a million dollars to $1.1 million.

**Administration Structure – Where we are currently:**  
- Seven (7) Program Directors (Agriculture, Natural Resources, 4-H Youth Development, Community Development, Family Living, Professional Development, Energy)  
- Four (4) vacant administrative positions (3 District Directors (DD) currently supported by 3 District offices support staff (Spokane, Vancouver, Puyallup) and the vacant Assistant Director (Pullman)  
- Much of the administrative oversight is now the responsibility of county directors/faculty and Associate Dean and Associate Director

**Administration Restructuring**  
**Option #1: Continue where we are currently**  
- Do not fill any vacant administrative positions (3 DD and 1 Assistant Director) and maintain 3 District offices support staff  
- Continue substantial but variable level of County Director administration, perhaps more, to county directors/faculty (11.6 FTE of administration ranging from 5% to 80%)  
- Saves WSU $$$

**Option #2:**  
**Fill one statewide administrator position**  
- Assumes no District offices
• Fill one statewide administrator (call it the "Assistant Director") to provide all administrative support from Pullman campus
• Identify core functions and minimal support staff for this office
• Continue to have 39 county directors/faculty with substantial administrative burden (11.6 FTE)
• Saves WSU $$$

Option #3: One statewide administrator and 8 or 9 multi-county clusters for administration
• Assumes no District offices
• Fill one statewide administrator and provide greater Pullman-based administration support
• No county director administration
• Replaced by realigning county administrative structures into 3-5 county clusters or areas
• Define clusters or areas, reduce administrative burden to 8 or 9 persons but at 50% of his/her time
• Saves WSU $$$

The structural changes considered by the Task Force focused on aggregating currently disaggregated county-level administration and supervision of faculty into area administration and supervision, reducing net administrative costs to address very real budget cuts and moving those funds to additional Extension programming. Reviewing the optimal number of District Directors (a working title for those three regional administrator positions currently vacant) was seen as a place to start.

Recommendations:
1. Administrative functions/structure and program leadership structure should be considered separately.
2. Changes should add value to the organization and benefit both partners or save money.
3. Reorganization will adhere to university policies.
4. The target or level of budget savings WSU needs in the biennial budget should direct the level of cuts/savings needed from administrative restructuring.
5. Streamline administrative functions of WSU overall and in Pullman specifically.
6. Preferring Option #2 in a modified form: Continue with County Director appointments as currently staffed. Phase out Districts (no District Directors and no District Offices) and establish state-wide “Program Units” for Agriculture, Natural Resources, Community and Economic Development, and Youth and Family, each led by a program director.
7. Establish a single state-wide administrator for administrative leadership and support County Directors in their administrative duties and county office operations.

IV. Propose modification to the geographic deployment of faculty and staff resources, including consideration of non-county government local partners such as branch campuses of WSU, the Agriculture Research and Extension Centers, non-governmental organizations, etc.

WSU Extension educators have worked effectively across county lines as evidenced not only by formal arrangements in Benton/Franklin, Chelan/Douglas, Grant/Adams counties, but also informally throughout the state. In response to economic constraints, currently many of Washington’s extension educators work across county lines in multi-county areas and this could be formalized. Reviewing the County Extension organizational structure may determine a preference to continue a presence in each county with educators housed in county offices but assigned to one of five major program areas and assigned to a minimum of one statewide team with state specialists that addresses critical issues.
Administration and ‘line reports’ could be reduced resulting in more depth of programmatic expertise and gains in efficiencies and cost saving operations. This is one step towards reduced administration, increased program delivery and measurable positive outcomes.

**How willing are county officials to more formally share program personnel with other counties?**

- 76% willing to share expertise and program leadership of Extension Educator with neighboring county in a more formal arrangement (and 14% do not know)
- 44% agree if resources are limited, willing to maintain presence in the county through non-WSU program managers and with program leadership from regional WSU faculty (34% disagree and 22% do not know)

Survey Questions 5 and 6
N=53

**How WSU Extension county directors responded when asked: How willing are county officials to more formally share program personnel with other counties?**

- 90% willing to share expertise and program leadership of Extension Educator with neighboring county in a more formal arrangement
- 30% agree if resources are limited, willing to maintain presence in the county through non-WSU program managers and with program leadership from regional WSU faculty (47% disagree and 23% do not know)

Survey Questions 5 and 6
N=32

**Recommendations:**

1. Some elements of the six state models reviewed are worth noting, but the geography of our state makes the multi-county cluster model unacceptable. It is also unacceptable to consider the office closure and consolidation (hub-and-spoke or “tier” of services purchased) model a viable choice at this time.
2. Keep Extension faculty close to the users.
3. There may be some counties where maintaining a local office will not be feasible due to lack of local funding. In those cases, the Extension presence will be defined as: “Access to programming via WSUE web-based resources and ability to participate in area, regional or state educational programming through assessment of fees. Fees will be based on program costs and county contributions to support WSU Extension educators and the necessary infrastructure to maintain the research, education and outreach functions of the Extension system. If there is no funding for office space and no in-kind contribution, and no support for a minimum of one educator, there will be no 4-H Program enrollment or program offerings.”
4. Educators will specialize in various subject matters and will work across county boundaries within each multi-county area. For the greatest organizational outcome, educators will work in impact areas where they have specialized training and experience.
5. At a minimum, *50 percent of the educator’s time* will be dedicated to his/her subject matter of content area, and in most instances the percent of time devoted to the specialization will be expected to increase over time. This educator specialization strengthens programs within the individual counties due to a greater availability of expertise.

6. It is also the goal of the College for Extension educators to have a *Faculty Affiliate* appointment within a WSU academic department.

7. The Task Force encourages WSU to adopt the 4-H staffing plan as the first example of faculty specialization where 4-H educators serve multiple counties in his/her area of expertise (e.g., leadership, STEM, etc.). (Appendix D – 4-H Staff Model)

8. The 4-H educator in the multi-county area will provide supervision and oversight of the county 4-H program assistant/coordinator in each county. This will ensure that the county 4-H Youth Development program continues to receive the highest quality youth development educational opportunities, follows current 4-H policies and procedures, and that the program assistant/coordinator in each county receives the training needed to effectively manage the 4-H activities within the county. (A more specific description of the duties and responsibilities of these positions are in Appendix D – 4-H Staff Model.)

9. For multi-county programming, the county that houses the educator will serve as a “home base,” with travel to other counties determined by educational program needs and county support. Educators may not necessarily be provided an office in each county. Some educational programming may require more travel during peak times of the year.

10. Resources and technologies needed to assure just-in-time learning and program delivery while reducing response time lag will include use of the most current technologies, to include but not limited to:

   - Smart phone and Email
   - Digital cameras and other technologies
   - Video conferencing capabilities in each county
   - Interactive web technologies that can optimize effectiveness
   - Interactive online course offerings using learning management system technologies

11. WSU should increase program delivery through Internet and social media. Increase the access of county-based departments and agencies to Internet videoconferencing and technologies. WSU and Extension currently do this to an increasing extent but do not completely replace face-to-face interactions.

12. WSU will be responsible to take the initiative and host conversations in potential multi-county areas with county officials to explore multi-county administrative savings and programmatic specialized assignments of faculty.

13. WSU Extension and counties will host listening sessions with all interested parties (stakeholders, clientele, public, and employees) before implementation.

14. WSU should explore if the county partner is willing to provide office space for personnel funded by other partner agencies. Only 54 percent of county officials responding to the survey supported this notion (n = 15).

15. Partners need to understand this is not a ‘light switch’ with instant change nor is it a ‘one size fits all’ model.

16. Extension educators within a multi-county area will confirm membership on programmatic Teams. Team responsibilities include: needs assessment, program development and implementation, evaluation, reporting, marketing and promotion and support of educational and research activity.
17. Review the positive and negative aspects identifiable at existing joint Research and Extension Centers across the state.

18. Look closely at each location across the state where a separate Agricultural Research and Extension Center exists in proximity to one or more Extension facilities. Consider these opportunities within the discussion and planning for area administration for Extension.

19. Consider the distance between existing Research and Extension facilities and county government offices. There are successful examples of integrated Research and Extension facilities. Some are co-located; others are managed through separate facilities that remain available to local clientele.

20. Sustain the strength of youth development programs which were rated the highest of all mission-critical programs by all survey respondents.

21. Strengthen the use and management of volunteers in program delivery. However, do not use volunteers to replace faculty/staff in program design, administration, leadership or assessment.

22. Provide each county with access to a statewide pool of 4-H youth development expertise to support county funded coordinators and regional (multi-county) 4-H youth development faculty.

23. Balance deployment of faculty resources with size of county and degree of economic and social impacts dependent on sectors served by Land Grant Extension functions.

24. “Size” needs to take into consideration population, geography and diversity of Extension-dependent enterprises.

25. Determine the minimum critical number of county faculty and ensure Extension maintains resources for a core number of faculty in each county. If counties want more, they pay for it. The Task Force did not try to determine this minimum critical size.

26. College department chairs with Extension responsibilities must be engaged in determining Extension faculty priorities; their department tenure home for state level specialists. Just as county commissioners and county agents perceive needs and priorities differently, deans and department heads may see needs differently.

27. Use University and Extension strategic plans to prioritize technical specialties and deployment of county and on-campus faculty.

28. Update the WSU Extension Strategic Framework (2005-2011). Develop a system to update program priorities to cover the signature areas of the College (CAHNRS) and the University.

Respectfully submitted:
Linda Kirk Fox, Ph.D.
Associate Director - WSU Extension

June 21, 2011
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Demographics of Survey Respondents

Of the 39 counties in Washington, 53 county officials responded to the survey overall. However, only 38 responded to the question as to what county they represent (12 skipped the question). Overall the county officials responding represent 26 counties. Those counties identified are:

- Adams
- Asotin
- Benton
- Chelan
- Clark
- Cowlitz
- Ferry
- Garfield
- Grant
- Island
- Jefferson
- King
- Kitsap
- Lewis
- Lincoln
- Pend Oreille
- San Juan
- Skagit
- Skamania
- Stevens
- Thurston
- Wahkiakum
- Walla Walla
- Whatcom
- Whitman
- Yakima

Of the 38 WSU county directors, 32 responded to the survey (26 responded to the question about what county they were from). The county directors who responded were from the following counties:

- Asotin
- Chelan
- Clark
- Cowlitz
- Ferry
- Franklin
- Grant
- Island
- King
- Kittitas
- Lincoln
- Mason
- Okanogan
- Pend Oreille
- San Juan
- Skagit
- Skamania
- Spokane
- Stevens
- Thurston
- Wahkiakum
- Walla Walla
- Whatcom
- Whitman

June 21, 2011
APPENDIX A

Survey Results – County Officials
### 1. Please rank the following statements from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree or Don't Know.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As an elected/appointed county official, I place a high value on the</td>
<td>49.1% (26)</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational programming and applied research offered through WSU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension faculty and staff in our county.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 6

- answered question 53
- skipped question 1

### 2. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on the ratio of our county funds to leveraged state and federal</td>
<td>35.2% (19)</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding for WSU Extension, I feel that our county is receiving an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent return on our investment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 4

- answered question 54
- skipped question 0
### 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.4% (24)</td>
<td>33.3% (18)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 10

- answered question 54
- skipped question 0

### 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.4% (15)</td>
<td>45.1% (23)</td>
<td>23.5% (12)</td>
<td>2.0% (1)</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 12

- answered question 51
- skipped question 3
5. Our county would be willing to collaborate in a more formal arrangement with a neighboring county to support delivery of Extension program in a particular topic area (natural resources, agriculture, community development, 4-H youth and family living) by sharing the expertise and program leadership of one or more County-based Extension Educator (s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
<td>51.9% (28)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 10

6. If resources are limited, in order to maintain a WSU Extension presence in my county, I would support staffing the Extension office with non-WSU program managers, with program leadership provided from regional WSU faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>35.2% (19)</td>
<td>27.8% (15)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 7

answered question 54
skipped question 0
7. If a lack of state funds would dramatically compromise the ability to staff and to deliver local Extension programs, which of the following local funding strategies would your county be willing to consider? (Please check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain current county funding</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with the neighboring county to fund Extension personnel, two or more counties sharing expenses for WSU personnel</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide office space for personnel funded by partner agencies for WSU personnel (e.g. commodity commissions, NGOs)</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure funding agreements from other local municipalities, special districts and utilities, industry groups and Tribes</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support a local funding option exclusively designated for Extension</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase user fees for Extension programs and/or services</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support local efforts to campaign for private fund raising efforts through the WSU Foundation with all funds designated to local programs</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 54

skipped question 0
8. In the same circumstances, would your county be willing to consider increasing the amount of local county funding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 53
skipped question 1

9. Our county would be willing to increase the amount of local funding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 2
skipped question 52

10. Is there any additional input you would like to contribute regarding the presence of WSU Extension in your county - now, or into the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 19
skipped question 35
11. What is the name of the county which you serve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. In my position, I serve as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>an elected official</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an appointed official</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. The population of my county is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500,000 - 2,000,000</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 - 500,000</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 - 200,000</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 90,000</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50,000</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 51
skipped question 3
APPENDIX B

Survey Results – County Extension Directors
1. Please rank the following statements from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree or Don't Know.

| As a WSU Extension county director, I believe the elected officials in my county place a high value on the educational programming and applied research offered through WSU Extension faculty and staff including volunteers. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Don't Know | Rating | Average | Response Count |
| 37.5% (12) | 59.4% (19) | 3.1% (1) | 0.0% (0) | 0.0% (0) | 1.66 | 32 |

Comments: 15

13 answered question

0 skipped question

2. Based on the ratio of our county funds to leveraged state and federal funding for WSU Extension, I believe our elected officials feel that our county is receiving an excellent return on our investment.

| Based on the ratio of our county funds to leveraged state and federal funding for WSU Extension, I believe our elected officials feel that our county is receiving an excellent return on our investment. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | Rating | Average | Response Count |
| 37.5% (12) | 56.3% (18) | 6.3% (2) | 0.0% (0) | 1.69 | 32 |

Comments: 13

32 answered question

0 skipped question
### 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.6% (21)</td>
<td>21.9% (7)</td>
<td>3.1% (1)</td>
<td>3.1% (1)</td>
<td>6.3% (2)</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** 18

**answered question** 32

**skipped question** 0

### 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.8% (4)</td>
<td>34.5% (10)</td>
<td>48.3% (14)</td>
<td>3.4% (1)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:** 18

**answered question** 29

**skipped question** 3
### 5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40.0% (12)</td>
<td>50.0% (15)</td>
<td>3.3% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>6.7% (2)</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 19

answered question 30

skipped question 2

### 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.7% (2)</td>
<td>23.3% (7)</td>
<td>13.3% (4)</td>
<td><strong>33.3% (10)</strong></td>
<td>23.3% (7)</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments: 22

answered question 30

skipped question 2
7. If a lack of state funds would dramatically compromise the ability to staff and to deliver local Extension programs, which of the following local funding strategies would you recommend we explore with your county elected officials? Please check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain current county funding</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborate with the neighboring county to fund Extension personnel, two or more counties sharing expenses for WSU personnel</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide office space for personnel funded by partner agencies for WSU personnel (e.g. commodity commissions, NGOS)</td>
<td>46.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase amount of local county funding</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure funding agreements from other local municipalities, special districts and utilities, industry groups and Tribes</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support a local funding option exclusively designated for Extension</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase user fees for Extension programs and/or services</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support local efforts to campaign for private fund raising efforts through the WSU Foundation with all funds designated to local programs</td>
<td>84.4%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 32
skipped question 0
8. Is there any additional input you would like to contribute regarding the presence of WSU Extension in your county - now, or into the future?

Response Count

answered question 23
skipped question 9

9. What is the name of the county which you serve?

Response Count

answered question 26
skipped question 6

10. The population of my county is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Range</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500,000 - 2,000,000</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 - 500,000</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 - 200,000</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,000 - 100,000</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 90,000</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 50,000</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 31
skipped question 1
11. I have been a county director for WSU Extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to three years</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four to nine years</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten to fourteen years</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifteen to twenty years</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than twenty-five years</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 32
skipped question 0
APPENDIX C

Process for Donations to County Extension 17A Accounts (WSU)
Process for Donations to County Extension 17A Accounts

1. Donor sends gift to WSU County Extension office
2. Fill out Gift Transmittal Form (GTF)
3. Attach Check (Gift) to GTF
4. Mail to: CAHNRS Alumni & Friends
   Attn: Linda Bailey
   P.O Box 646228
   Pullman, WA 99164-6228
   (Ensures gift goes into proper Account)
5. Thank You Note Sent from Alumni & Friends
6. Transmittal Form and Check Sent to WSU Foundation
7. Gift Placed in Designated 17A Account (WSU Gift/Donation Account)
8. WSU Foundation Sends Tax Receipt and Stewards According to Appropriate Gift Level
9. County Extension Office Access 17A Accounts According to Normal Policies and Procedures just like any other account (i.e. through District Office)
APPENDIX D

4-H Staffing Plan
Staffing Plan and Position Summaries – 4-H Youth Development
For 4-H Statewide Personnel Effective July 1, 2011

Director, 4-H Youth Development

Provides strategic planning, vision, prioritization of programs, risk management and policy recommendations to assure safe environment for positive youth development and high quality adult mentors. Allocates financial resources and provides mentoring and annual review of staff performance including WSU department, county and area based faculty and staff assigned to 4-H no matter what proportion of appointment. Oversees external relations, fund raising and communications, authorizes use of name and emblem. Encourages innovation, entrepreneurship, partnerships to address core content (STEM, Healthy Living, and Citizenship) and professional development. Advance WSU 4-H in the region, country and internationally through active participation on relevant committees and boards.

Personnel:

- Pat BoyEs, Director

4-H Youth Development Specialists

Oversight of program content quality from delivery through evaluation and reporting effectiveness against program goals and 4-H essential elements and 4-H life skills. Ensures program goals, deadlines, staff professional development, milestones and curricula are achieved through productive relationships among team members of employees and volunteers. Specialists have subject matter expertise applied in the context of positive youth development that leads to a specific deliverable(s) important to the successful sustainable and inclusive program. Lead opportunities in professional development with PDAT and assist regional specialists in shift from project based clubs to clubs that are focuses on the outcomes of position youth development. Affiliation with the Dept. of Human Development and appropriate departments in the College of Education or Murrow College of Communication will be required of statewide specialists.

Personnel:

- Mary Katherine Deen, Ph.D.
- Janet Edwards
- Jan Klein
- Scott Vanderwey
- Kevin Wright
4-H Regional Specialists

These multi-county 4-H regional specialists would be WSU Faculty positions skilled in positive youth development (PRKC) dispersed on a regional basis with responsibilities for 4-H personnel training, advanced volunteer development, and programmatic leadership. Approximated 16 total FTE would be a reduction from the current 21.4 faculty FTE statewide. Because of the geography of the state, multi-county assignments could cross district boundaries. (See charts arranged in three existing Districts (2010-2011) Western, Eastern, Southern)

Partial FTE assignments and PBL to oversee volunteer management (A Hennings .25 FTE), camping programs (J Ferris .15 FTE), (P Bachleda .125 FTE) and equine programs (.10 Leach FTE) would end and the responsibilities assigned to regional specialists.

Support staff

Support staff are pooled to provide support to specialists and the director as a team not as individuals with one-to-one administrative assistants. Support staff assist with fiscal information, adherence to policies and procedures, records management systems, purchases and inventory, composes correspondence, agendas, meeting and training/workshop materials, including reports to specialists and the director.

Personnel (all to be assigned to Puyallup with one exception noted below):

- 1 FTE Program Support
- 1 FTE designated for 4-H but assigned to Pullman Computing Resources Unit, web interface for personnel (intranet) and external audiences including youth, communications via personal communications devices, and online enrollment system
- 1 FTE Communications

This represents a reduction in personnel since FY2009 (loss of 1.5 staff FTE)

Project Associates

Emerging and potential youth development professionals with High School and three to four years experience or post-bachelor degree graduates. Project support staff tasks are articulated by the funder. Depending on experience and capability, these individuals may also help develop projects, provide additional facilitation, project management. Expected to assume greater autonomy and responsibility as experience and capability grows.

Grant funded staff will vary. Current personnel:

- Randy de Mars, Department of Defense Military Partnership contract
- Mary Francom, DSHS Contract
- Darlene Munson (Timeslip from DOD Contract)
- Cary Roos, Operation Military Kids
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APPENDIX E

Minimum County Contributions - 2012
# Minimum County Contributions - Salaries of WSU Extension Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KING</td>
<td>1,933,400</td>
<td>134,748</td>
<td>25,955</td>
<td>21,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE</td>
<td>814,600</td>
<td>33,781</td>
<td>25,955</td>
<td>21,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNOHOMISH</td>
<td>711,100</td>
<td>34,927</td>
<td>25,955</td>
<td>21,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOKANE</td>
<td>470,300</td>
<td>17,712</td>
<td>25,955</td>
<td>21,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLARK</td>
<td>435,600</td>
<td>18,900</td>
<td>25,955</td>
<td>21,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITSAP</td>
<td>248,300</td>
<td>12,570</td>
<td>24,510</td>
<td>20,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THURSTON</td>
<td>252,400</td>
<td>10,921</td>
<td>24,510</td>
<td>20,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAKIMA</td>
<td>239,100</td>
<td>8,367</td>
<td>24,510</td>
<td>20,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHATCOM</td>
<td>195,500</td>
<td>10,378</td>
<td>24,510</td>
<td>20,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTON</td>
<td>172,900</td>
<td>6,036</td>
<td>24,510</td>
<td>20,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKAGIT</td>
<td>119,300</td>
<td>6,655</td>
<td>23,070</td>
<td>19,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COWLITZ</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>6,060</td>
<td>23,070</td>
<td>19,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANT</td>
<td>87,700</td>
<td>6,655</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>17,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISLAND</td>
<td>81,100</td>
<td>5,808</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>17,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEWIS</td>
<td>75,600</td>
<td>3,489</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>17,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHELAN</td>
<td>73,300</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>17,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAYS HARBOR</td>
<td>71,600</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>17,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLALLAM</td>
<td>70,100</td>
<td>3,963</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>17,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANKLIN</td>
<td>75,500</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>17,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALLA WALLA</td>
<td>59,600</td>
<td>2,509</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>17,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASON</td>
<td>57,100</td>
<td>3,075</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>17,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVENS</td>
<td>44,300</td>
<td>1,724</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>17,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITMAN</td>
<td>43,600</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>21,630</td>
<td>17,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OKANOGAN</td>
<td>40,900</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>20,185</td>
<td>16,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KITTITAS</td>
<td>40,500</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>20,185</td>
<td>16,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUGLAS</td>
<td>38,500</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>20,185</td>
<td>16,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEFFERSON</td>
<td>29,300</td>
<td>2,186</td>
<td>20,185</td>
<td>16,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACIFIC</td>
<td>22,100</td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td>20,185</td>
<td>16,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASOTIN</td>
<td>21,700</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>20,185</td>
<td>16,790</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Percentage = .36
- Percentage = .34
- Percentage = .32
- Percentage = .30
- Percentage = .28
## Minimum County Contributions - Salaries of WSU Extension Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Klickitat</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>20,185</td>
<td>16,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>18,745</td>
<td>15,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Juan</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td>18,745</td>
<td>15,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pend Oreille</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>14,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skamania</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>14,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>14,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>14,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>14,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wahkiakum</td>
<td>4,150</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>14,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>14,390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage = 0.26

The percentage (P) is based on county population from the Washington Association of County Officials Directory.