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August 25, 2009
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I. Minutes: July minutes are not yet complete and will be released for review and approval at a later date.

II. Response to Keynote Presentation:
   a. The Farm Bill has already affected/threatened the CD committee in the following way: Lack of a CRD voice or representation in the process of setting priorities, continues to constrain comprehensive, integrated, innovative programs limiting responsiveness to the Land Grant University constituents. This results in a lack of sustainability of core CRD programs.
   b. The CRC Committee’s response to the above effects/threats is/was/will be: Responded by seeking nontraditional resources and new collaborative opportunities. Attempting to parlay new programming to sustain core programs. Need to continue to articulate the importance and value of CRD internally and externally.
   c. In light of this issue, the CRD committee intends to propose working with the following committees to further strengthen the CRD’s role in the Extension System by:
   d. Funding issues have already affected/threatened the CRD Committee in the following way: loss of FTE, resulting in loss of programming that impact the ability to respond to community constituents.

III. Logic Model Report Development:
   a. Are these types of logic models useful on a regional basis?
      i. Yes, easily adopted/adapted to meet state programmatic needs.
      ii. Yet, one size does not fit all. Each state should adapt to individual cases.
   b. What is the value of logic models that cover programs of all/most states in the region?
      i. Easily adopted
      ii. Easily adapted
      iii. Development provides a forum for exchange among colleagues
      iv. Provides a framework to assess regional impacts
   c. How might regional-based logic models be used?
      i. Standardized evaluation tool for regional programming
      ii. Serve as a basis for demonstrating value of programs
iii. Aid for securing external funding

d. How might multi-state indicators of success be useful in programming efforts?
   i. Enhance ability to work across state/committees by identifying
      commonalities, e.g. cross-fertilization with 4H-entrepreneurship, FCS family
      economics, value-added agriculture, and CRD entrepreneurial communities.
   ii. Provide a feedback loop to ensure desired impact

IV. Updated 2008 Plan of Work and Accomplishment Report for 2009. See PLN website
    for resulting products. [http://srpln.msstate.edu/crd/index.html](http://srpln.msstate.edu/crd/index.html)

V. SRDC update:
   a. Foundations of Practice – The Fall 2009 series will launch in September. See the
      SRDC website for registration information.
   b. SERA reports – Bo and Alan gave updates on the SERA 37, SERA 19, and SERA 39
   c. Know Your Region – Plans are underway to expand this training to include a joint
      initiative with USDA Rural Development.
   d. e-Commerce – A new round of materials will be released this fall through a webinar
      series in preparation for a second implementation mini-grant opportunity due
   e. Turning the Tide on Poverty – Five states are participating in this pilot public
      deliberation process to address poverty. The Kettering Foundation and the Farm
      Foundation are providing support for a joint Extension and research effort.
   f. Cashing in on Business – The curriculum has been revamped and will be released
      this fall.
   g. Youth Entrepreneurship – a youth component has been added to the eXtension
      Entrepreneur and their Community CoP.
   h. Disaster Resilient Communities project – SRDC partnered with five states through
      the Spring 2009 semester to conduct roundtable discussions exploring how
      emergency management planners could better connect with the needs of
      disadvantaged audiences. A final report will be completed this fall.

VI. Information & Action Items:
   a. Institutional participation – Several southern region institutions have not identified
      representatives for CRD committee participation. The CRD committee will seek
      representation from these by October 15th
   b. Regional CD capacity analysis – Because of current economic conditions,
      assessment of CRD capacity across the southern region is needed. CRD will
      conduct an analysis of CRD-targeted resources and impacts for use in determining
      program directions by August 2010.

VII. Cross Committee Work and 2009-10 Plan of Work:
   a. CRD members participated in all ten cross committee issue discussions. From these
      discussions, the CRD committee incorporated seven items on the 2009-2010 Plan of
      Work aimed toward five of these issues. (See Plan of Work for details
      [http://srpln.msstate.edu/crd/crd_pow_09-10.pdf](http://srpln.msstate.edu/crd/crd_pow_09-10.pdf))

VIII. NACDEP nominations:
   a. The following names were recommended for nomination to the 2010 slate of
      NACDEP officers: Cynthia Pilcher – President Elect, Notie Lansford – Treasurer,
      Stan Ralston – Secretary, and Harry Crissy – Southern Representative.