

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Southeast Research & Extension Center Reports  
and Administration

Southeast Research & Extension Center

---

1994

## Response to Outside Review Team

Southeast Research and Extension Center

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/southeastrextreports>



Part of the [Agriculture Commons](#)

---

Southeast Research and Extension Center, "Response to Outside Review Team" (1994). *Southeast Research & Extension Center Reports and Administration*. 7.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/southeastrextreports/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Southeast Research & Extension Center at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Southeast Research & Extension Center Reports and Administration by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.



# **Southeast Research and Extension Center**

**Response to  
Outside Review Team**

University of Nebraska-Lincoln Cooperating with the Counties  
and the U.S. Department of Agriculture

# ISSUE TEAM RESPONSE TO OUTSIDE REVIEW TEAM'S REPORT

*SOUTHEAST RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CENTER  
1993 ISSUES BASED REVIEW*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Children, Youth and Families at Risk . . . . .	1
Nutrition, Food Safety, Food Quality . . . . .	3
Solid Waste Management . . . . .	6
Agricultural Sustainability and Profitability . . . . .	8
Enhancing Water Quality . . . . .	9
Strengthening Nebraska Communities/Leadership . . . . .	11
Structure . . . . .	13
Urban Programming . . . . .	15

## **CHILDREN, YOUTH AND FAMILIES AT RISK**

### **Response to SREC Review Team Report**

1. **Continue present programming and emphasize juvenile diversion as an emerging issue.**

**Response:** The staff is committed to continuing current programs with efforts to diversify audiences, to develop new programs and audiences as the need arises, and to be proactive rather than reactive in our approach. We will continue to build family focused coalitions and expand our outreach through "training-the-trainer." We are concerned about the review team's suggestion emphasizing juvenile diversion as a major district program thrust. Concerns include lack of resources, expertise and personnel on the local level in the majority of counties, duplication of resources in the urban counties and lack of UNL state support. We feel this decision needs to be made at a county level rather than the district level.

2. **Develop consistent, district-wide evaluation tools.**

**Response:** We will work with state staff to develop an evaluation tool to allow us to compile district statistical data and impact.

3. **We encourage qualified extension educators within the district to pursue coordination roles.**

**Response:** Although an extension educator would be qualified to coordinate CYF programming on a district level, we feel it should be supported by the district with a 50% appointment and should be based in Lincoln. The Panhandle, South Central and West Central all have home economics program coordinator positions. Considering the population of the southeast district and the number of educators working within the area it would seem reasonable that our district have comparable support.

4. **Explore the critical need for a district-based subject matter specialist with a "people" specialty.**

**Response:** We will continue to pursue identifying the appropriate expertise needed and hiring of a specialist for the human development area for this district. We would like to reiterate that family focus/youth issues was the top concern among the majority of EPU focus groups. This is the only issue area in SREC that has no district specialist support.

5. **Empower extension staff to develop and maintain their own internal communications network.**

**Response:** We will continue to develop a more formal internal communication network as we develop and implement a district wide thrust in the area of children, youth and

families.

6. **Further empower staff by developing specialty areas of expertise.**

**Response:** Staff will select areas of interest to focus on and share information with other staff members.

## **Nutrition, Food Safety, and Food Quality Response to SREC Review Team Report**

### **KEY POINTS**

- 1. Develop linkages with people in the university system who have access to this subject matter.**

**Response:** The Nutrition, Food Safety, and Food Quality (NFSFQ) team will continue to develop and expand our already strong linkages within the University system and with other agencies as delineated in our report. New linkages will be sought as they relate to programming. Efforts could be enhanced by a district coordinator position.

- 2. Develop linkages with other agencies which deal with this subject matter.**

**Response:** (Refer to response to Key Point #1.)

- 3. Develop a system of internal communications among educators to share research and program ideas.**

**Response:** A strong system is already in place for receiving research and program ideas from University nutrition and food safety specialists through monthly mailings, E-mail, April Update, periodic inservices and a yearly

Nutrition Update.

As a district team, NFSFQ holds a yearly share session, including some type of educational speaker. Periodic letters are sent out by the team leader on additional topics that might be of interest to the team. Informal information sharing occurs among educators of resource and program ideas. A system is also in place during annual program planning for giving specialists feedback on types of materials, etc. desired.

The NFSFQ team will seek ways to strengthen and increase feedback and sharing to and from specialists and with each other in a timely manner. One possibility would be to have some type of central clearing house or district coordinator position to which concerns, materials, etc. could be funneled on a regular basis. These would be summarized and shared back to the group and/or to the appropriate specialist. This might be through phone, mail, fax or some type of E-mail communication.

The group will meet to discuss best procedures for implementation of this and other aspects of our future planning at the most expedient future date after our report has completed the review process.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **Efforts in meat quality assurance are not the top priority in this area and should be addressed by another initiative.**

**Response:** The NFSFQ team does not view this topic as our top priority. It is included in our report as national and state initiatives list this in our area. As relevant, we will do cross-disciplinary programming with other initiatives wishing to work in this area. We will continue to seek ways to relate production, consumption and health as relates to Nebraska agricultural products as part of an interdisciplinary team.

2. **Develop a method to sort out valid research from "junk."**

**Response:** We will alert specialists if we come across a concern and encourage them to put their response on E-mail to all educators (not just those with primary nutrition and food safety responsibilities) who might possibly be connected to this topic.

3. **Focus resources on health matters.**

**Response:** The NFSFQ team recognizes preventive health as related to diet and food safety as an important part of our area. At one time, the word "health" was included as a descriptor for our team -- we feel that the word "health" should be added back.

We will investigate and implement some type of demographics and/or needs assessment. In turn, we will work together on some type of program district wide. The length of the program will be determined by the focus of the issue.

We also recommend that state Cooperative Extension provide some type of linkage with the medical center to temporarily fill Leon Rottman's health-related position to keep his linkages viable until this position is filled.

4. **Develop a 900-number system which can be manned on a daily basis not only by extension educators, but also by representatives of other agencies.**

**Response:** The NFSFQ team questions the feasibility of offering such a system without further exploration. For example, seed money would be needed to fund a position at one location to handle these calls; supplemental funds might be needed to support this position if insufficient calls were received to pay for this position. The NFSFQ team also questions at how high a priority we should set phone calls in relation to the amount of time and resources devoted to them. The team recommends developing an 800 number fact sheet, to be updated annually by the district team coordinator. As many calls as possible that are not related to our program focus would be referred to these numbers.

5. **Don't wait for a formal assignment to coordinate district efforts in these areas. Identify someone to take this assignment and begin the progress.**

**Response:** The NFSFQ team recommends the pursuit of a 20% reassignment of an extension educator to serve as a district coordinator. It is recommended that this position be housed in the district office for this 20% of time with district program costs funded by the district.

6. **Develop one program a year that can be carried on across the entire district which would provide in-depth program information.**

**Response:** (Refer to response to Recommendation #3.)

7. **Develop a computer network among educators to share programs, resources, research data.**

**Response:** (Refer to response to Key Point #3.)

8. **Three essential recommendations are necessary and can be enacted immediately. These include adapting materials for multi-cultural audiences, exploring delivery methods for non-traditional audiences and staff inservice.**

**Response:** We will continue current contracting and explore additional contracting with qualified individuals who specialize in non-traditional audiences residing in our district. Our team will work with this person(s) to obtain, adapt or develop materials for multicultural audiences. With help from a consultant(s), the NFSFQ team will learn ways to involve other cultures in program planning so as to provide educational activities that take into account their cultural practices and values.

Extra funding is needed to pay for this assistance. Limited materials are available in our state. New materials that are culturally appropriate for the people in our district must be developed or adapted in cooperation with a knowledgeable consultant(s) or purchased if culturally correct for our clientele as determined by the consultant(s).

Care must be taken to avoid a "one-size-fits-all" solution. Differences in perception among various members of the culture must be taken into consideration, such as intergenerational differences and length of time in our country.

SREC PROGRAM REVIEW  
ISSUE TEAM RESPONSE REPORT  
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

The issue team appreciates the positive comments received from the review team in regards to programming efforts, linkages established, and media education. The issue team concurs with some sections of the response and disagrees with other recommendations.

The three recommendations from the review team are:

1. Move from this initiative to a broader resource management effort
2. Encourage the use of the Waste Stream project
3. State-wide responsibility for BSE position

The issue team's response to the review recommendations is as follows:

1. "move from this initiative to a broader resource management effort"

The team both concurs and disagrees with the full content of this recommendation. The review team questioned if solid waste should be a major district initiative for the future. While the issue team concurs with the recommendation to broaden the scope of the environmental program to encompass a wider array of issues, the team believes that waste management should remain an integral part and a major emphasis within this broader resource management scope for the next several years.

The issue team welcomes the opportunity and the challenge to broaden the issues for a more encompassing environmental ethic. In addition to the issues raised in solid waste management, there are issues of air quality, land use, urban and rural sewage disposal, habitat, land conservation, and many, many more environmental issues to bring to the discussion arena.

With regard to solid waste management, legislated recycling bans into the year 1996, recycling goals set until the year 2002 will call for increasing the means and avenues within the community to participate in public policy decisions. Local decision making facilitation, education, and coalition building are ways in which Extension can perform a key role. As this response is being written, none of the 23 counties in the district nor any of the communities within have submitted their solid waste management plan--all plans calling for citizen input in development. At least two areas in the district are in pending litigation over

policy decisions, two petitions are circulating to recall elected officials over waste management issues, and one community has an entirely new council as a result of a recall over waste management issues last year, and increasing reports are being filed on ditch and road side dumping. One large city in the district recently voted \$80,000 to "begin" a city wide education program on issues relating to solid waste management.

Furthermore, the need for continued educational efforts in this area is evidenced by DEQ's inclusion of "education" as an integral part of the 20-year integrated solid waste management plans being developed by municipalities and counties in Nebraska. As already demonstrated in several communities throughout the district, Cooperative Extension staff, with their ready access to research based information and their existing accessibility are ideally suited to meet this need.

2. "encourage the use of Waste Stream Project"

The issue team strongly supports educational activity for all segments of Nebraska's population, rural and urban. The youth programming, using Waste Steam project, is an excellent beginning. Other informational efforts, such as Environmental Echoes, will be continued and hopefully expanded.

3. "biosystem engineering position probably has relevance throughout the state...the position would have state and district responsibility"

The issue team believes that additional staff to support the greater environmental programming area would be most helpful in the areas of public policy to enhance societal attitudes and behavioral changes rather than in a technical biosystem engineering position. Extension educators with additional public policy education, group dynamics skills training and people building skills could provide the foundation to build and develop local environmental policy. The issue team agrees that good technical research information to support environmental programming is needed. The group believes that there is considerable information available from agronomy (soils), the water center and existing engineering programs, and that the most immediate issue now is to take the technical information currently available and help local citizens shape their social, political, and economic future based upon the existing and forthcoming information. Community and regional organization for recycling market developments and cooperative management programs are the elements that need to be built. These activities will be best served by personnel trained in the social sciences.

*SEREC Agricultural Sustainability and Profitability Team Response to Review Team Comments:*

- The Agricultural Sustainability and Profitability Initiative Team (AGPROF) agrees with recommendations 1, 5, and 6 on page 10 of the Exit Report.
- Recommendation 2;page 10 -- The intent of the AGPROF to explore programming on issues among urban audiences about rural/urban concerns was not politically motivated and programs will be educational and informative.
- Recommendation 3;page 10 -- The AGPROF thinks this is an important issue in SERC but are unclear what the "human" issues the review team is suggesting. Is it a human or environmental issue or does it matter? These are issues currently coming to the fore front of our clientele.
- The shift in education program direction from strictly technical aspects of production towards financial management, integration of production systems, and environmental impacts of agriculture reflect the strength of past extension education programs. There is less need for general production information, and more need for assistance in managing a farm business.
- Recommendation 4;page 10 -- The intent of the AGPROF was to work first through ICCS and initially not spend SREC faculty time putting this together. The hope would be that a person(s) in ICCS be responsible to work with SREC on this effort, if that didn't materialize, SREC would explore a position in the district office with responsibility for this effort.
- The AGPROF would agree with comments 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 on page 11 made by the Review Team.
- The AGPROF would like to have more direction and pointed comments by the Review Team for item 2;page 11. On-farm research and demonstrations has been an active, an important, and effective educational opportunity for specialists and extension educators in SERC. However, with budget cuts, faculty have been asked to do more with less. To continue this educational effort, we need to consider an extension/research technologist to lead this effort and to "free-up" the specialists. The on-farm research is beneficial because it fits the goal of Extension to strive toward "train the trainer" programs that have a multiplier effect on our audience.
- We have a difficult time understanding the comment by the review team "This issue team needs to take more risks". Perhaps we did not adequately convey the strengths and flexibility in the current programs. We feel our educational programming is innovative, on-target, futuristic, and responsive. If we become any more responsive we become "all things to all people", which is simply not possible with limited resources. We strive to develop long range educational programs to meet priority needs while being asked to put out brush fires.

As diagrammed on page 11, the future desire of the staff of SEREC is to become even more responsive and take more risks. Our programs are research based and we need to continue that approach or we reduce our creditability. How much can we risk?

The AGPROF would like to see more comments from the Review Team concerning the comment "take another look at value-added production".

**SOUTHEAST RESEARCH & EXTENSION CENTER**  
**ENHANCING WATER QUALITY TEAM'S RESPONSE**  
**TO THE OUTSIDE REVIEW TEAM REPORT**

The Southeast District's Enhancing Water Quality Initiative Team identified important water quality issues that need to be addressed in the next five years to meet clientele needs. In their introductory statement, the review team questioned whether all these could be adequately addressed as a district effort. We concur that it would be impossible to introduce or expand on all of the programs identified at all locations. We maintain there is a need for flexibility to prioritize these issues on a local basis.

We also recognize the possible impact if one or more of these issues was selected and addressed on a district-wide basis. The FARMSTEAD ASSESSMENT program has potential as such a program, although, if modified for Nebraska, would receive special emphasis state-wide. This program, if selected, would also address "risk assessment programs" which were identified in the opening statement. The concept of a specific, district-wide water quality program is something the Team will need to explore further.

The review team felt *"that pesticide and chemigation issues may be so regulatory in the future that staff won't be addressing them... [and we should] see if there are ways to begin phasing out now."* Assuming the decision regarding Cooperative Extension's role in private applicator and chemigation training will be made at the state level, the Team does not agree with this assessment. We specifically identified the need to "continue to provide and improve chemigation and private applicator training." We did suggest that alternative methods of delivery, such as satellite downlinks, might be just as effective and a more efficient use of staff time and resources. We do encourage Cooperative Extension to periodically review our role in mandated training programs.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. *...water data needs to be compiled in one location, perhaps the Water Center.*

We neither concur nor disagree. This need was not identified by the Team, but was suggested by a review team member. While the Team agrees the concept has merit, it was not and is not identified as one of our top needs. Developing and maintaining a data base of this nature would require significant staff support, but could be a valuable resource throughout NU as well as to outside agencies. Accordingly, the Team recommends the Water Center explore the need for, feasibility, and resources required for this type of arrangement.

2. *Put more effort into looking ahead.*

We concur there is a need to look ahead to emerging issues. However, we disagree with the inference that the Team currently is not adequately identifying and addressing these issues. The Team meets at least twice a year. At these meetings time is set aside specifically to identify emerging needs and programs. We also feel many programs identified by the Team currently are not being addressed or are receiving minimal emphasis. Among these would be: landscape water management, wellhead protection areas, educational programs on water quality issues and competing demands on water resources, the FARMSTEAD ASSESSMENT program, educational programs on new farm bill components related to water quality, protecting surface water from pesticides, better pesticide management and new application technologies, and working with manures, sludges and composts in proper nutrient management.

3. *...successful and innovative programs [should be]... expand[ed] into other EPU's.*

We concur. This is already being done at Team meetings where time is set aside to share success stories. The Team identified this as contributing to the success of water quality programming in the Southeast District. We weren't clear if the review team was suggesting we share programs outside the Southeast District. If this was their intent, we recommend district representatives on state initiative teams take the leadership to convey successful program ideas to staff in their respective districts.

4. *...converting an existing educator to 50 percent animal waste management may not be necessary. Developing this specialty can be done within the current EPU system of specialization...*

We disagree. While staff can develop a certain level of expertise within the framework of their EPU, we do not feel the level of expertise nor the district-wide leadership and program coordination we envisioned this position providing could be achieved by EPU-based staff. However, we will monitor the level of support from the new state livestock bioenvironment engineer to see if this meets our needs.

5. *...an assistant would be useful for the water quality demonstration activities.*

We concur and will explore both internal and external sources of funding to support this position. Since more positions of this nature are grant-funded, we encourage Cooperative Extension to provide additional support to assist Extension Educators and Extension Specialists prepare competitive applications for these programming resources.

6. *...strongly support maintenance of a soils specialist position in the district.*

We strongly concur!

## **Strengthening Nebraska Communities & Leadership Development**

### **RESPONSE TO OUTSIDE REVIEW TEAM'S RECOMMENDATIONS**

March 30, 1994

After reviewing the oral and written report from the SREC Outside Review Team, our committee communicated via letter to develop our final response to the Review Team Report. The report did not deviate from our original recommendations by very much, however, we did make a few minor revisions in our response that were a result of comments we received during and after the review.

Following are our responses:

\*Our Committee agrees with the recommendation to maintain inclusiveness with regard to such factors as age, gender, race, socio-economic conditions, ethnicity, disabilities, etc. in fulfilling the goals and objectives stated in the report.

\* We agree with the Review Team's recommendation to use a team approach to facilitate assistance through teaching and/or facilitating the formation of coalitions to identify and address local priority and long range issues.

- a. Request the director of the Center for Leadership Development (CLD) communicate ways in which the resources of the CLD can be utilized in SREC programming efforts.
- b. The director of the CLD, in conjunction with the SREC district director should be requested to provide opportunities for interested extension educators to affiliate with the CLD.

\* We concur with the recommendation that the SREC director coordinate with Assistant Vice Chancellor Hartung to explore ways in which they can contribute to ongoing IANR image-building efforts, which may include hiring a person to facilitate and create a positive relationship between the public and the university.

\* Our recommendation met with the approval of the Review Team that a fund be made available at the district level to help carry out the development of coalitions (i.e. travel between EPUs, materials for workshops, cost of speakers, registration fees for staff, etc.) as well as to gather data for developing and conducting and processing surveys.

- a. a committee be established to determine the amount of resources needed and ways resources might be acquired.
- b. we will want to utilize already existing data before going ahead with new data searching tools.

\* Our recommendation met with the approval of the Review Team that the staff be supported in allotting time necessary to develop the skills and to implement and maintain community development and leadership programs in each EPU.

\* Our recommendation to identify a specific leadership package for extension educators to utilize when providing programs on developing leadership in a community. (Would help staff access and provide a uniform program throughout the district), also met with the approval of the Review Team.

## STRUCTURE TEAM'S RESPONSE TO THE REVIEW TEAM REPORT

The Southeast Research and Extension Center Structure Committee operated with the following questions in mind.

1. What should be the structure of the unit and the faculty's role?
2. What are our research responsibilities? Should extension specialists continue to have appointments in the center or should they move to departments?
3. Is the location of the district headquarters important?
4. What will be the best county organizational structure to serve Southeast Nebraska? How do we balance the number of personnel in the Unit versus the number of administrators for the Unit?
5. What are the needed qualifications for the next district director?

These additional charges were given to the Review Team from the Deans.

1. How can we access other parts of the university? Joint appointments? Dollars to buy additional expertise?
2. Should we have a different name for the Southeast Research and Extension Center?

Staff of the SREC pride themselves in being innovative with programs and on the leading edge of several major changes, including the development of issue teams and EPU's. Because of this, we tend to disagree with the introductory statement of the review team that "the faculty review document essentially recommended no change in present structure." Key changes that were recommended by the structure committee are:

1. extension educator part time specialist appointments;
2. empower EPUs to reduce administrative duplication;
3. provide administrative assistance to the district director;
4. short term specialist appointments directed by future priority issues;
5. use of non extension and non IANR personnel in the specialist role;
6. increase urban/rural education and interface.

Our reactions to specific recommendations of the review team are:

- 1) **Recommendation: SREC remain on campus or look at co-locating with Southeast Community College.**

Response: We concur with leaving the center on campus. With the vast number of resources in the district, including many community colleges, small colleges, universities and business areas, it might not be an advantage to align ourselves with one. Our greatest connection is to the University of Nebraska. It offers the greatest networking possibilities and the most cost saving way to do business. We see no benefit from moving to SECC.

- 2) **Recommendation: "present system of assigning specialists...is working well."**

Response: We concur. No change is needed in specialist assignments.

**Recommendation: Explore short-term specialist assignments based on identified program needs and allow extension educators to serve as temporary part-time specialists.**

Response: We concur. Implementation of this recommendation will require that administration prepare the framework at both the local, district and campus levels for such appointments so that as issue teams recommend such appointments, the process can be expedited.

3) **Recommendation: Leave the name as is.**

**Response:** We concur.

4) **Recommendation: Consider giving EPU unit leaders more responsibilities.**

**Response:** We concur. Furthermore, we stress the concept that EPUs be given flexibility to do this in a manner which meets their needs. Allow experimentation on the EPU level with encouragement and guidance, rather than mandates, from the district level. Flexibility in the Southeast District EPUs could be a way of pilot testing various plans. In this document, we use EPU unit leader as an administrative function and EPU coordinator as a program leadership function.

**Recommendation: Consider reducing the size of the unit.**

**Response:** See item 6 for our response.

**Recommendation: Consider providing additional administrative support.**

**Response:** We concur. Administrative support is necessary for an effectively managed unit and to prevent administrator burn-out.

5) **Recommendation: The need for the rural-urban interface argues against creating a separate urban district. . . may be merit in reconfiguring the Metro EPU lines.**

**Response:** We agree with the recommendation to not create a separate urban district.

Regarding EPU lines, they are always subject to change. Our concern is that EPU lines not impede cooperative programs and any push for greater urban-rural interface.

6) **Recommendation: Consider moving the Midland IV EPU and East Central EPU to the Northeast District, and perhaps moving some EPU's or counties to the South Central District.**

**Response:** If we agree that the basic goal of our efforts is to deliver the best issue based programming and to achieve behavior change as a result of that programming, it does not appear the best approach would be to disrupt the strong working relationships and priority initiative teams already developed. We looked at this from a district perspective and did not consider the impact our recommendation will have on the Norfolk Learning Center. However, we believe that in addition to the impact on the proposed Norfolk Learning Center the impact of current working relationships with Central Community College in Columbus and Metro Community College branch site in Fremont needs to be considered. We see no justification for moving any counties to the South Central District.

**Recommendation: Enhance EPUs by dissolving county lines, have one EPU board, one EPU unit leader, rotate program coordinators and possibly reduce the number of county offices.**

**Response:** We concur with the general idea but again want to stress flexibility for the EPU to choose different structures because of different financial and political situations. Administration needs to begin the process of attempting to change extension legislation so that any structural changes recommended by any EPU (Extension educators and pertinent extension boards) can be planned and implemented. We understand the danger of changing legislation and think that caution should be used to insure that the EPUs have flexibility in their structural decisions.

## ***URBAN PROGRAMMING***

After reviewing the oral and written reports from the SREC Outside Review Team, our committee communicated via meetings held on February 9, 1994 and March 1, 1994 and the mail to develop our final response to the Review Team Report.

### **Response to the Outside Review Team's Recommendations (3/1/94)**

\* Form an urban team to work in concert with the IANR urban programming committee and insure that the work in Urban programming be carried forward. There is a concern that the vision of the IANR Urban Committee be expanded. It was recommended that department heads need to meet to define what can be offered to urban audiences.

\* Explore 1-900 numbers to call for information. Minnesota and Iowa are utilizing this concept. Can we tap into the telephone? Can we manage these systems with graduate students? It needs to be investigated through U.S. West, A T & T, and LTT. It was recommended that an urban taskforce needs to explore the 1-900 number and other technologies. Depending on the findings from the taskforce, this system could be adopted by the whole state.

\* Bring Campus and district staff together for training, planning, and working with diverse audiences. With the introduction of the new technologies, it is believed that these methods will reach new audiences.

***RECOMMENDATIONS 1 & 5 - Use IANR funds to do a study.*** Consideration should be given to making use of SRI or another related entity to answer Recommendations 1 and 5. It is important that this facilitator be from outside the University community. Although much information is available, the committee feels a need to learn more and interpret the information to direct efforts.

***RECOMMENDATIONS 2 & 8 - Conduct a retreat for staff.*** Leading the retreat should be a part of the contract with an outside research group. It was recommended that we educate administrators during this retreat. IANR should make an effort to create awareness and involve other faculty, staff and administrators with inservice training in planning to address Urban needs.

***RECOMMENDATION 3 - Regarding metro realignment.***

***RECOMMENDATION 4 - Hire a housing specialist.*** The committee believes that this position would be a research-based issue. Engineering, architecture and construction management do conduct research. Where does the public go for unbiased answer housing information? Educator positions might have to be redirected to have a specialist.

***RECOMMENDATION 6 - Glean from IANR's pool of knowledge.***

***RECOMMENDATION 7 - Formalize a process for interdisciplinary teams.*** The committee believes departments need to be offered incentives to get involved in interdisciplinary teams. These teams should not be limited within IANR but must include community colleges, state departments, private colleges and other agencies/organizations. The Urban Programming Committee will create and test a interdisciplinary team model to address issues emerging as a result of the study.

***RECOMMENDATION 9 - Intensify recruiting efforts.*** The committee believes that recruitment of students is not exclusively an urban issue nor the responsibility of the Southeast District Research and Extension Center. The University system that emphasizes tenure and research does not always reinforce a friendly, cooperative environment for students. The challenge in recruiting is having a product related to customer needs and one that can provide marketable degrees to students. This demands a shift in the system. The Southeast District with representatives from the Metro EPU has a Student Recruitment Committee to recruit for the University. A recruitment package has been placed in every county extension office in the Southeast District. The committee is aware of several efforts underway to enhance recruitment of students for UNL. With cooperation from departments, Home Economics Contests, FFA contests, 4-H contests, District Public Speaking Contest and the State Fair could be effectively utilized as recruiting efforts. This issue should be addressed by the whole university.