

**1997 SARE Professional Development Program
FINAL REPORT**

**Section I
General Information**

1. **Project Number:** ENE95-12
Grant Number: 1
Funding Period: October 1, 1995 - September 30, 1997
2. **Project Title:** Sustaining Agriculture In Northeast Communities:
New Roles, New Skills for Agricultural Educators
3. **Project Coordinator:** Thomas A. Lyson, Director
Farming Alternatives Program
Department of Rural Sociology
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-7801
607-255-1684
FAX 254-2896
tal2@cornell.edu
4. **Type of Report:** Final
5. **Date of Report:** December 1, 1997
6. **Reporting Period:** October 1, 1995 - September 30, 1997

Section II **FINAL REPORT:** **SUSTAINING AGRICULTURE IN NORTHEAST COMMUNITIES**

1. Objectives

The major educational objectives were to provide Cooperative Extension, USDA agency field staff, and other “multipliers” with resource materials, training, and assistance in:

1. Organizing and facilitating community-level dialogue and, where needed, mediating conflicts about agricultural issues among people with diverse perspectives and interests in the community.
2. Facilitating community-level strategic planning and development projects to sustain local farming.

As a result of this project, it was expected that participants would be better prepared to provide leadership to a wide range of *community-based agriculture development* opportunities, including:

- addressing local “agricultural illiteracy”
- helping farmers and non-farmers work together to address water quality issues in the community
- working with local restaurants and institutions to promote the purchase of locally grown and raised farm products
- organizing a farmers market or a marketing cooperative
- promoting local agritourism
- organizing local farmer-to-farmer learning networks
- improving farmer-neighbor relations
- identifying new local and regional marketing opportunities

2. Abstract

The purpose of this two-year project was to provide Extension personnel, USDA agency field staff and other local multipliers with educational programs, resource materials, and ongoing support, to help them work with diverse farm and non-farm audiences to become more effective leaders of local *community-based agriculture development* efforts. Such efforts include addressing local “agricultural illiteracy”; helping farmers and non-farmers work together to address water quality issues in the community; promoting institutional purchases of local farm products; organizing farmers markets or marketing cooperatives; promoting local agritourism; farmer-to-farmer learning networks; improving farmer-neighbor relations; and identifying new marketing opportunities.

The project began in October, 1995, with initial outreach and planning for a February workshop. A December meeting brought together 26 participants to identify major themes and resource people for the workshop. Project staff then organized, publicized and conducted a successful workshop February 28-29, 1996, which included three types of sessions: group process skills-building sessions; focus sessions on particular agriculture development topics; and team project planning sessions. Ninety-two people attended the event, 80 percent of them registering as teams of partners from a local or regional community. An extensive Resource Notebook was compiled for workshop participants, with over 400 pages of materials provided in thirteen different content areas.

After the 1996 workshop, follow-up support was provided by project staff to a number of community-based teams, and to a statewide working group which was organized to continue the networking process. In the fall of 1996, more than a hundred participants attended two study tours contrasting two community agriculture development strategies in two very different contexts: Dutchess County and Jefferson County, New York.

A second leadership workshop was held in March, 1997, and attracted another set of community-based teams for a similar blend of skills-building and informational sessions. Workshop resource materials were updated, expanded, and made available to a national audience either as a complete Resource Notebook (400+ pages) or as separate topical resource packets. A final comprehensive bulletin, tentatively entitled “Farming For the Future: A Guide to Sustaining Agriculture in Your Community,” is soon to be published.

3. Specific Project Results

A. Accomplishments

The two year project included the following activities: 1) two annual “Farming For the Future” leadership workshops to build participant skills and knowledge for successful community-based dialogue, strategic planning and agriculture development projects; 2) two study tours for participants to learn firsthand about innovative community agriculture development strategies; 3) ongoing outreach, networking and direct assistance to help participants put training into practice; and 4) production of printed resource materials to reach a wider, national audience.

All of these activities were designed to help participants gain skills and knowledge for increased effectiveness in:

Organizing and facilitating community-level dialogue and, where needed, mediating conflicts about agricultural issues among people with diverse perspectives and interests in the community. (Objective 1)

Facilitating community-level strategic planning and development projects to sustain local farming. (Objective 2)

In addition, project activities fostered an interactive network of participants who could continue to learn from each others’ experiences in the field.

Project participants. As in other SARE Professional Development efforts, the primary target audience for this project was Cooperative Extension field staff and other USDA agency staff who work directly with farmers. In addition, since by definition community agriculture development brings together diverse stakeholders, this project was designed to engage farmers themselves and a wide variety of potential leaders, including members of community development groups, planning boards, watershed protection organizations, County Agriculture and Farmland Protection Boards, agribusiness, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, environmental groups and agencies, and interested individuals. Our focus was primarily on New York State and secondarily the Northeast region, however many participants in the second leadership workshop came from outside the region.

The project was quite successful in attracting an appropriate diversity of participants. This diversity was one of the most important and valuable features of project activities, as it allowed participants to directly experience and benefit from diverse perspectives and knowledge, and reflected the same variety of stakeholder groups they are likely to have to work with back in their own communities.

The high level of participation of Cooperative Extension staff is noteworthy. Previous annual conferences organized by the Farming Alternatives Program had never been so successful in attracting Extension personnel. We believe our success this time was due to several factors:

- High level of interest in agriculture development at the local level (the right issue at the right time);
- Cornell Cooperative Extension Administration's direct sponsorship of the project, which included help in publicizing and encouraging field staff to participate (the right partners with the right connections and leverage);
- Increasing acceptance of "sustainable agriculture" and organizations identified with it, including the Farming Alternatives Program, by "mainstream" agriculture groups such as Extension.

The Leadership Workshops. The two annual Leadership Workshops, held in the winters of 1996 and 1997, were the centerpiece of the project. Planning for the first leadership workshop began in the fall of 1995. A preliminary mini-workshop was held on the Cornell campus on December 6, with 25 invited participants representing active community-based agriculture development groups, and campus-based and county-based programs of Cornell Cooperative Extension. Five local community initiatives were presented as case-studies, showing a variety of approaches and a high level of innovation, commitment, and optimism for the future of agriculture.

The mini-workshop was effective in raising the awareness of Cornell faculty and administrators of the diversity, strength and support needs of community agriculture development initiatives around the state. It also provided confirmation of the need for increased cross-learning among community-based groups, and helped to identify important focus-session topics for the first leadership workshop.

The first "Farming For the Future" leadership workshop was held in February 1996 in Cazenovia, New York. In order to provide an intensive, highly interactive experience, registration had been initially targeted at 70 participants. However the level of interest was very high and eventually 92 participants were accepted into the workshop. Participation might have been 20-30% higher were it not for the limitations of the conference facilities and the interactive design of the sessions.

In developing the workshop and the promotional brochure, we tried an experiment to encourage partnership-building on the local level. We strongly encouraged, and offered a reduced registration fee to "teams" of two or more individuals who would come and work together during the workshop on a specific project or issue facing agriculture in their community. We had no idea

whether people would respond to this encouragement, but in fact 78 of the 92 participants registered as part of a team, for a total of 24 teams in the workshop.

In final preparation for the workshop, we asked one member of each pre registered team to complete a brief team profile, describing the project(s) they were working on at the time, if any, and their expectations for the workshop. This information was compiled and included in the Resource Notebook as important networking information for the rest of the workshop participants.

The team profiles showed that the workshop would have to accommodate both well-established teams with a specific, well defined project and teams which had been put together specifically for this workshop, which did not have a particular project to work on and were essentially in the idea-gathering mode. We had expected this challenge, and knew that some flexibility would need to be incorporated in the workshop agenda, in case we encountered difficulty meeting the needs of this diversity of teams. Below are a handful of examples of these team profiles, with participant names omitted, showing the differences among them in their degree of focus and experience.

TEAM 3

Project: Presently working with the Leatherstocking Dairy Team on “Ag Development in CNY.” Progress is being made both regionally and locally. A mission statement has been developed and a Steering Committee appointed to move forward with the ideas put forth on promoting agriculture in our area.

Expectations: To be able to compile a list of contacts/resources, and listen to “success stories” presented.

TEAM 10

Project: Will be related to economic development.

Expectations: To better identify a project and begin the planning process.

TEAM 12

Project: To be decided at conference

Expectations: To gain ideas on how to implement various ag development awareness projects

TEAM 17

Project: Agriculture is currently identified as one of 8 major theme/resource areas for NYS’ Seaway Trail region. This conference will act as the catalyst to create a comprehensive Seaway Trail Agree-Tourism Theme Plan.

Expectations: Seaway Trail team members will have an opportunity to bond and broaden our vision for a 10-county plan. Discussions should trigger our project brainstorming and initial direction.

A similar mix of experienced and inexperienced teams participated in the second leadership workshop in March, 1997. Our expectation had been that many of the 1996 workshop participants would return in 1997. However, this was not the case—only 10 of the 62 participants were repeats. Aside from competition from other conferences around the same date, and ever-shrinking agency budgets, we don't why so many of the 1996 participants chose not to come back. Thinking positively, it may be that they felt they had absorbed enough information for the time being and needed now to focus on implementing their projects.

This positive interpretation is supported by the fact that many 1997 participants reported hearing rave reviews of the 1996 workshop. They chose to attend based on personal recommendations and on what they had heard “through the grapevine.” Interestingly, 35% of the 1997 participants were from outside of New York State, while only 13% of the 1996 participants were non-New Yorkers. The 1997 workshop attracted sizable teams from Ohio, Rhode Island, Missouri, Massachusetts and Maryland.

Workshop structure. The Leadership Workshops included three types of sessions: group process skills-building sessions; focus sessions on particular agriculture development topics; and team project planning sessions.

Skills building sessions used a combination of presentations by the workshop facilitator, mixed-group exercises in which participants were encouraged to work with people they did not know, and whole-group discussion and reflection on the exercises. Community Agriculture Development was defined as a partnership effort involving diverse stakeholders in the community, built on the foundation of a shared vision for the future of agriculture within the community. It is a participatory, holistic planning and development process requiring skills in communication, group process, and conflict resolution. These skills and specific group process techniques were modeled by facilitators throughout the workshop, and were reflected on during whole group discussions, in which participants had the opportunity to explore how they might be adapted in their own local situations.

The 1996 exercises were designed and facilitated by the project coordinator, Judy Green, and were based on a variety of models including the “Economic Renewal” process developed by the Rocky Mountain Institute, and the “Holistic Resource Management” process developed by the Center for Holistic Resource Management in Albuquerque, New Mexico. The 1997 exercises were led by Judy Saul of the Community Dispute Resolution Center of Tompkins County, and focused on stakeholder analysis and participatory process design.

Participants also attended *focus sessions* on specific community agriculture development topics. Nine sessions were offered in 1996 and ten in 1997. The focus sessions engaged over a third of

the workshop participants as resource people. Most focus sessions were structured as peer-learning situations—panelists shared their experiences with various approaches to community agriculture development, and time was reserved for questions and open discussion with the other participants.

Because most panelists were drawn from the pool of registrants for the workshop and not invited ahead of time, it was a challenge to organize all of the session topics and presenters. The strategy we used was to include a list of a dozen “suggested” focus session topics in the preliminary workshop publicity, and then narrow the list to nine sessions based on the interest level of pre registrants and the availability of resource people from among the pre registrants. This process worked very well.

Two *team project planning sessions* were included in each of the workshops, in which the teams met to assess the status of their own projects and plan ahead for the coming year. The major challenge in these sessions was accommodating both those teams with a specific well defined project and those just in the early idea-gathering stages. In addition, several participants came without a team. As it happened, the planning sessions worked fairly well in spite of these challenges. Individuals without teams, or without a specific project were “adopted” by established teams that interested them, and their fresh input proved valuable to those teams. The workshop facilitator encouraged teams to work on the suggested exercises if they felt it made sense, otherwise they were free to work on whatever planning activity seemed most important to them. Teams made good use of the time in various ways appropriate to their stage of development.

Towards the close of each workshop there was a whole-group discussion of lessons learned during the two-day experience. The need for continued networking and sharing of information and experiences across the participating communities was expressed repeatedly.

Study Tours. In the fall of 1996, more than a hundred participants attended two study tours highlighting community agriculture development efforts in Dutchess County and Jefferson County, New York. Some of the tour participants had attended the 1996 leadership workshop, but most had not. Our original goal was to attract just a dozen or so participants for each tour, but the interest was much stronger than anticipated.

A special effort was made to attract economic development leaders and planners to the study tours. This was especially successful Jefferson County, largely thanks to the aggressive promotion of that tour by a cosponsoring organization, the NY Rural Development Council.

The two study tours provided contrasting examples of successful agriculture development strategies in two very different contexts. In the case of Dutchess County, proximity to an affluent

consumer base in the Hudson Valley and New York City has sparked a very market-oriented agriculture development effort. A strong partnership among the county's government, Cooperative Extension, tourism and economic development agencies has successfully expanded agritourism and direct marketing, created a "Hudson Valley Harvest" product identity for the region, and aggressively promoted Dutchess County farm and food products to local, national and international markets.

Jefferson County, on the other hand, is a very rural upstate county with a rich agricultural land base, strong dairy industry and fewer, less affluent consumers. Jefferson County's Industrial Development Agency (IDA) was one of the first in the nation to hire an "agriculture development specialist," whose efforts have focused on improving farmer access to credit for expansion, diversification and technology improvements. The Jefferson County specialist also launched the first farmer recruitment effort, aggressively marketing the benefits of the county to farmers in Pennsylvania, New England, and other areas where urban pressures are making it more and more difficult to farm.

The high level of attendance and enthusiastic response to the 1996 study tours suggests that this is a very effective way of cross-fertilizing the agriculture development process among diverse communities.

Ongoing outreach, education and assistance to local communities. Over the course of the two year project, a variety of media were used to communicate the concepts of community agriculture development, to share examples from local communities, and to recruit participants for the leadership workshops and study tours. These included Extension and other USDA agency channels, the Farming Alternatives Program newsletter, farm and rural press, electronic mail and the world-wide web.

In the fall of 1996 we conducted a telephone survey of the teams which had participated in the first workshop, to find out how their projects were progressing, to assess the longer-term impacts of the workshop experience, and to solicit ideas for the 1997 workshop.

After both the 1996 and 1997 workshops, the project coordinator and colleagues Duncan Hilchey and Joan Padula of Cornell's Farming Alternatives Program provided numerous phone consultations, resource materials, referrals and other assistance to workshop participants as they put training into action in their communities. An electronic mailing list was developed and used to share information on upcoming events, resources, and funding opportunities. A limited number of site visits were also conducted.

Although workshop participants agreed on the importance of sharing progress reports with each other as their work progressed, it proved a real challenge to obtain this information from them. The telephone surveys described above were valuable but very labor-intensive. It was also necessary to aggressively solicit project updates for the quarterly Farming Alternatives Program newsletter, which features a regular "Network News" department. Clearly, the networking process demands continuing inputs of time and energy.

Resource Materials. In preparation for each leadership workshop, project staff compiled a large 3-ring Community Agriculture Development Resource Notebook, packed with over 600 pages of informational materials, model projects, related research, and resources in about 15 different subject areas. These materials have been made available to the public from the Farming Alternatives Program office, either as a complete Resource Notebook or as separate topical collections. Over a hundred copies of the 1996 and 1997 Resource notebooks have been sold. The Resource Packets were just made available Fall 1997 and have been selling well to a national and even international audience. These materials are being used in a number of other training programs around the country, providing a significant "multiplier effect" for this effort.

The final product of this two year project is a publication which is currently being reviewed, to be published by the Farming Alternatives Program in early 1998. Tentatively entitled *Farming For The Future: A Guide to Sustaining Agriculture In Your Community*, it is an introduction to key concepts of community-based agriculture development, and a practical guide to organizing action in local communities. Profiles of some of the participating groups are included. We expect this to be a landmark publication in the emerging field of agriculture development.

B. Publicity for the Activities and Programs

- Numerous articles in Farming Alternatives newsletters: Fall, 1995 - Fall, 1997 (Appendix)
- Feature article in Northeast SARE for "Innovations" newsletter, Summer 1996 (Appendix)
- Cornell News Service press release to agriculture and general media (Appendix)
- Workshop brochures distributed to 3,000 individuals (Appendix)
- Study Tour brochures distributed to 1,200 (Appendix)
- Workshop and study tours information disseminated via internet to SANET, SAED-Share, Cornell Cooperative Extension field staff, Cornell faculty, Northeast Extension Statewide SARE Coordinators, and project participants
- Workshop articles in CALS News and Syracuse daily newspaper (Appendix)
- Study tour article (Appendix)

4. Potential Contributions and Practical Applications

A. Trainee Adoption and Direct Impact

This project has had a major impact in changing peoples' thinking about the kinds of approaches needed to sustain agriculture in the Northeast. The term "agriculture" development" was rarely heard at the beginning of this project. It is now one of the hot issues in most county Extension offices in NYS.

Summaries of participants' evaluations of both workshops are provided in the Appendix. Most participating teams experienced an immediate benefit from project analysis and planning exercises. The fall, 1996 telephone survey of participating teams provided additional information on impacts. The following are responses to one of the survey questions: *"In what ways, if any, did the February workshop help your team move forward with planning or implementing a community agriculture development project?"*

Did the workshop help you...	Yes	No	In part
Gain new ideas, awareness, knowledge?	19 (95%)	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
Make important new contacts?	18 (90%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)
Understand issues better?	16 (80%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)
Identify key stakeholders?	15 (75%)	3 (15%)	2 (10%)
Clarify your vision for the future?	14 (70%)	5 (25%)	1 (5%)
Improve your team's process for working together	11 (55%)	6 (30%)	3 (15%)
Recruit new partners for collaboration?	9 (45%)	9 (45%)	2 (10%)
Develop a solid implementation plan?	9 (45%)	8 (40%)	3 (15%)
Set a clear project goal?	7 (35%)	11 (55%)	2 (10%)

Throughout the two-years of this project we have learned of numerous cases of community agriculture development models and strategies being picked up and adopted by another community as a result of our workshops, study tours, newsletter or other networking channels. Here are a few examples:

- After the 1996 workshop, Howard County, MD, County Executive appointed an Agriculture Development Council based on the Chenango County, NY model provided in the workshop. Howard County also hired an Agricultural Marketing Specialist based on the Dutchess County

model provided in the workshop (letter in Appendix.) The person hired by Howard County was then a featured resource person at the 1997 workshop, where he inspired further adoption of this agriculture development model.

- Orange County, NY, recently hired an Agriculture Development Specialist based on the Jefferson County, NY, model provided in the workshop.
- Wayne County, NY, recently approved the hiring of an agriculture development specialist.
- Extension agents in St. Lawrence and Franklin Counties, NY, began a farmer recruitment program after learning of the Jefferson County example at our workshop.

B. Potential Benefits or Impacts

By sharing information and experience, strengthening personal and professional networks, and building skills in community agriculture development processes, this project has helped participants become more effective as local leaders, working with diverse partners in their communities to strengthen agriculture in a variety of ways. These leaders will be a powerful force in improving the social and economic environment for farming in their communities and region. As an example, Dutchess County has documented a 45% increase in direct marketing sales over the last several years due to the innovative agriculture development efforts of Cooperatives Extension and other partners.

Other potential impacts at the farm level include: higher profitability due to improved access to markets and value-adding opportunities; more diversified production to meet regional and local market demands; more environmentally sensitive farming practices as farmer-consumer and farmer-neighbor relationships are strengthened; fewer farm management headaches due to more supportive local policies; easier transfer of farm businesses to the next generation due to innovative programs to support beginning farmers; and higher quality of life for farm families as the support of the community is demonstrated, new production and marketing opportunities are identified and farm profitability improves.

C. Feedback from Farmers

A number of farmers participated directly in our educational programs, and of course many others have been involved in the local community-based projects. Farmers who become aware of the project are excited to see that creative approaches to agriculture development are finally moving into the mainstream of Cooperative Extension and other agencies.

5. Individuals Involved - Number of Extension and/or NRCS personnel in attendance:

Workshop Planning Meeting	18
---------------------------	----

February, 1996 Workshop	53
Fall 1996 Study Tours	25
March, 1997 Workshop	30
Follow up consultations, visits	38

6. Future Recommendations and Areas Needing Additional Professional Development

Agriculture development efforts are multiplying across the region, not just on the local community level, but also at the state and regional level. There is a continuing need to share information about successful and unsuccessful strategies among all of these groups, through workshops, study tours, electronic media, Extension and ag media, publications etc. The process of building skills, knowledge and experience needs to continue, both to strengthen the effectiveness of current project participants and to reach greater numbers of individuals and communities.

Research is very much needed to evaluate which strategies are effective in actually stabilizing and sustaining agriculture as an economically viable, environmentally enhancing and socially-enriching component of Northeast communities. As a first step, "sustainability indicators" for agriculture need to be established, on the local level and by state or regional. Data need to be collected or at least assembled from a variety of sources to establish benchmarks for measuring progress towards or away from sustainability. This would require a combined research/professional development effort to identify these indicators and put them into practice.

Another need is to help Extension educators be more effective in providing marketing assistance to local producers. There are a variety of roles which can be played, including researching marketing opportunities; connecting farmers with wholesale buyers; educating consumers; helping to organize marketing initiatives such as cooperatives; facilitating other agency involvement; nurturing new marketing enterprises, etc.

7. Slides

We do not have slides of project activities at this time.

8. List of Participants - See Appendix

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I: Participant Lists

- 1996 Workshop
- 1997 Workshop
- Study Tours

APPENDIX II: Participant Feedback

- 1996 and 1997 Workshop evaluation summaries
- 1996 Telephone Survey results

APPENDIX III: Publicity for the Activities and Programs

- Articles in Farming Alternatives newsletters: Fall, 1995 - Fall, 1997
- Feature article in Northeast SARE for "Innovations" newsletter, Summer 1996
- Cornell News Service press release to agriculture and general media
- Workshop brochures distributed to 3,000 individuals
- Study Tour brochures distributed to 1,200
- Workshop articles in CALS News and Syracuse daily newspaper)
- Study tour article

APPENDIX IV: Publications

- 1997 Community Agriculture Development Resource Notebook (sent to SARE under separate cover)
- Community Agriculture Development Resource Packets:
 - Adding Value with Small-Scale Food Processing and Specialty Dairy Products
 - Agricultural Economic Development
 - Agritourism
 - Developing New Markets to Support Local Agriculture
 - Engaging the Public in Local Agricultural Issues
 - Urban Connections and Community Food Security
 - Who Will Farm? Supporting Farm Families and Farm Workers
- Farming For The Future: A Guide to Sustaining Agriculture In Your Community (DRAFT)

APPENDIX II

Participant Feedback

- 1996 and 1997 Workshop evaluation summaries
- 1996 Telephone Survey results

1996 WORKSHOP

Evaluation Summary

Section I

1. What do you feel are the most important things that you learned as a participant in this workshop?

- Focus sessions brought up many different issues.
- Commonalty with some extension folks.
- Reinforcement on other methods for doing this work.
- What other people are thinking and doing.
- That I already know enough about process to be able to help others do good work.
- That even the dairy farmers can get out of the mode of their traditional marketing and have more of an entrepreneurial approach.
- The various issues involved with the food and fiber system.
- Workshop was not what expected. Thought there'd be more info than process.
- What is going on in the state--good/bad opportunities/challenges.
- Picked up ideas on economic development.
- Network support/common ground.
- Talked to energetic, exciting people with new ideas.
- Personally it was valuable to witness the sense of optimism I felt in this group especially considering the reality of problems in the ag. sector. I also got a better sense of how many areas are moving forward on farmland protection and ag. literacy issues. I found the BR&E talk by Bob Rich useful in analogous applications to our work. Gained useful practical ideas to help increase diversity of participation in Ag Summit.
- More appreciation for agribusiness and the related problems and areas.
- Lots of interest and farmer/agricultural support.
- The diversity of items to consider--land, animals, product, politics, etc. Various processes to unite common bonds with differences. Specific sources for information, assistance.
- Better process for collaboration.
- Diversity of interests--yet who can work together/networking.
- Better networking opportunities and paradigm breaking thinking.
- That there is a tremendous interest in many different aspects of ag. economic development.
- There are a lot of resources/individuals with common interests and goals that can and should be approached. Created vision--it is possible!
- Excellent focus session.
- Dairy industrial park.
- Continuing understanding of sust. ag. industries/NY specific.
- Networking with new people with common interests.
- Marketing ideas--appreciating environment.
- There are many "experts" available (a phone call away) to share information regarding agricultural enhancement and preservation.
- Value of getting all these groups around the state together for cross-fertilization.
- That we are not alone in our quest to strengthen the position of agriculture through education of all stakeholders.
- What other groups/agencies are already working on in many ag development areas.

Commonalities in all ag. areas--and the successes.

- There are many things working. "Just do it" small projects make a difference. Positive efforts are happening.
- Ag is alive and well! Market, market and market.
- The diversity of audience was very helpful--educators, producers, economic development people, etc..
- I really enjoyed the focus on Agritourism and conflict resolution but my favorite part was working on our own issues with new and interested/interesting people.
- Networking and the value of working with diverse groups on shared interests.
- Synergy is possible. Interest is incredible. Reality needs to find its way in.
- Contacts with various people and projects working in ag. development.
- What are the state and local concerns of farmers and agriculture.
- How to direct some of our ideas, where to go for info., and our team had some serious work together time.
- Suggestion that will help me get better organized and be more effective in my work.
- That I am not a dreamer--that there are real opportunities out there. It will take a lot of complex work to take advantage of those opportunities. I'm thinking smaller initiatives now.
- The importance of building community support. What's happening in other communities. Who is involved. I really appreciate the work that has gone into this.
- Confirmation of the ideas I believe in and work out of.
- Because of having participants from outside Cornell, a better perspective of processes and issues of current concern.
- A bit of the larger picture of the scope of work being done around agriculture in the state; surrounding. And a glimpse of the way the work is structured and funded.
- As a non-ag person, I came to learn more about agriculture and I did. I am very glad I came.
- The tremendous variety of organizations whose membership have a desire to help and a stake in preserving a hardworking and noble segment of our economy.
- Some creative ideas are out there. A large amount of committed interesting people throughout state.
- Networking, dialogue with others.
- The focus of farming alternatives as demonstrated; not what I had conceptualized. I have a more broad understanding of issues and positions related to these.
- How to bring Ag. Ed. into the community.
- Tracy Ferry.
- The value of enthusiastic leaders, committed to what they believe.
- "Who will be knocking on your door to ask what you have done."
- Networking with others on certain issues. Sharing information and experience.
- Having the time set aside from routine daily chaos to work on an important project is essential.
- Shared vision with others interested in topic.
- What other regions are doing to promote "Farming for the Future." Realized that agriculture in the northeast is taking on a much different look.

Section II: Please rate each session you attended and share comments.

2. Opening Plenary Session

How would you rate the usefulness of this session to you? (circle one)

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
1	30	20	2

(Other-OK=1)

Comments:

- Good networking.
- The small group exercises were very good! Thank You. Overheads were good but sitting
- Too basic.
- Great exercises but needed more connection 1) with other exercises (why this order, etc.) and 2) with larger purpose. What is the point and why is this point important in this context.
- More discussion would have been useful.
- Interesting to see the variety of groups represented.
- Introductions for group culture established.
- Good opening. Unfortunately the groups were so mixed that it was hard to take home much from work session.
- It depends, useful as an introduction to a process. not useful or at least not enough time to be useful as a true visioning of our quality of life, landscape etc., issues.
- This was not my focus so I felt it was only minimally useful.
- Took a while for me to understand the purpose of this session. But once I saw where it was headed in the skill training realm, it was useful.
- The dynamics of group function are a new area for me as a potential project leader.
- One good icebreaker/mixer enough.
- If had been framed as a good method for working with group as we could use it ourselves-- would have felt more patient with its abstractness (we are in crisis mode on our problem).
- Too crowded, too disorganized.
- Very effective ice-breaking and thought-stimulating session to begin the workshop.
- Morning session good. Afternoon structured session not as good.
- Would have been better if we had done as team but was fun to meet new people.
- Would have preferred to do this with our own team.
- Squirt guns R cool.
- Good clear presentation on meaning and necessity of local ag. development. Always fun to get to know other participants better. Maybe leaving us in our own small groups would have been better-you assume we know one another.
- Excellent discussion.
- The afternoon plenary session was very helpful and useful.
- I was looking for more immediate problem solving/project attack work and didn't expect this kind of session, although hit was very helpful in getting acquainted.
- Just like HRM-it was a little confusing but still quite useful.
- A bit obtuse/improved by more context even ask people for this.
- Good methods of getting the group to mix and get to know each other--group discussion

- should not have been cut short.
- Great to meet everyone and to begin conversations.
- Helped to set the stage. Good for meeting others that had some relation to our work.
- Sharing and finding out what else is happening. Possible resources always helps-process for vision development?
- It was a little short on time--Need a bit more focus, direction, etc.
- Not enough focus within the small groups. Too abstract.
- Really enjoyed hearing from each team...Connections with others depends on hearing what they all do.
- Good way to get acclimated.
- Pretty elementary information.
- Reactions to process were interesting. This will be very useful to me. Planned well and carried out effectively. Flexibility was apparent.
- Too long- ready to get to work. Rather discuss process in terms of identified issue.
- Overviews are helpful but should be limited in time. Be helpful to hear other people and attitudes. Judy was great but wanted to hear other voices too. Get specific--nuts and bolts turn me on and generate more ideas than generalities.
- Finding out who/why important. But who really are did not work out as intend, just more info. in smaller group.
- Too long.

3. Focus Session I - Session Title Ag and Economic Development

How would you rate the usefulness of this session to you? (circle one)

Did not attend	Not useful	Somewhat Useful	Very useful
2	5	21	-

Comments:

- Found different sources of information available that I didn't know existed.
- Duncan's statistics explanation too detailed-though I really appreciated knowing more about how to get stats.
- Excellent information from Tracy Ferry and Judy Schneyer.
- Excellent resource presentations. All different.
- Learned a lot. Both generally and specific--community development and loans.
- Did not match the description of session. Too much focus on Gov't loans not enough on ideas.
- Every county needs a Terry!
- I had already heard several of the presentations-there was some new information which I'll be able to use in the future.
- I'm hoping to bring back ideas to our county agent about ADA's.
- Learned many sources, got several ideas. statistics very weak presentation.

- Data section not extremely useful. Tracy Ferry--excellent.
- The next step--implementing good ideas through forging partnerships.
- Interesting hearing Tracy and Judy from NY Ag and Markets. Duncan also had good info.
- I appreciated the representation of different levels/factors of ag and econ. development.
- We were not focused as a team. Other members went on their own track. OK because we had not other default.
- Best focus session I attended.
- Still have lots of work.

Session Title: Urban Connections

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
-	5	6	-

Comments:

- I was looking for more specifics on types of connections and challenges to doing each. Also there should be more options, brainstorms to come up with new ones.
- I learn a lot about what is going on around me.
- Had no knowledge of CSA's. This helped me to define and expand my knowledge.
- Good sharing with others, good energy, nice mix.
- Very NYC specific/interesting test case.
- Great slides--People who are doing!!! Great ideas.
- Learned a lot about CSA's.
- Loved to hear about the work being done, but the scope of potential for the local rural/urban connection was not scratched.
- A bit too heavy on CSA's--might have been ??? in Ag Tourism.

Session Title: Business Retention and Enhancement

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
1	-	-	-

Comments:

- I did not know from the description that was what the session was going to be about. I would not have attended.
- The issues are very useful for planning "participation" in the Ag Summit and subsequent working groups leading to developing strategic plan.
- The opportunity for a BR&E related to ag is timely for our project.
- Excellent intro.
- Great ideas, need survey ??? for agriculture.
- I question its usefulness in agriculture since it does not address "within" business issues of profitability.
- I learned what it is and how it is used in business and that its being considered for use in agriculture.
Made some excellent connections with Bob--very related to what we are working on--good perspective and great info.

Session Title: Reflections on Values

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
1	4	9	-

Comments:

4. Focus Session II - Session Title Agritourism

How would you rate the usefulness of this session to you? (circle one)

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
-	6	18	1

Comments:

- Not enough time for discussion. Duncan's presentation could have been omitted.
- Very exciting projects going on around the state and beyond.
- Not much time spent on interaction.
- The program was geared towards a different direction than I needed, but the discussion were very informative and helpful.
- Done very well. Liked hearing from others what else is going on in the world of agritourism. Could be its own 2 day conference.
- A regional workshop specifically addressing this concept could be very useful. Very thorough presentation.
- Great ideas in Dutchess county.
- Great ideas from participants--introductions took longer than the presentation--but it was good brainstorm.
- Helped me to bring back into focus on my personal goals for our farm and future.
- Not enough time for discussion. There could have been some valuable dialogue between the people in the room.
- Good sharing.
- Lots of good ideas.

Session Title: Strategic Planning

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
-	3	10	-

Comments:

- Bob Rich was useful, easy to understand. Anita Deming/Elizabeth Henderson--good examples.
- Bob Rich's presentation was very good (would have liked to do components of search conference). Case studies very interesting.
- Some good points about why some techniques work or don't work. Needed more attention on valuing non-agency people--there was a disparaging comment about volunteers.
- To fight on one more.
- Group gave me good ideas and support to continue on track.

- Similarly prompted a lot of good questioning however we did not structure time in session for valuable discussion and crossing of ideas by the group. Mostly just listening to presenters.
- Similar to opening session but with a specific model to follow.
- Very much enjoyed the strategic planning info.--new to me and I will be able to glean many uses.
- Contrast of 2 systems very valuable.
- The search conference model will be very useful. It was good to have Anita and Elizabeth talk about their experiences.
- Very interesting--would have loved a bibliography RE: group process approaches that work...The case study by Anita Deming was illuminating.
- Liked Bob, Anita, Liz; disliked Harvey's interruptions of Bob. Facilitator should have handled.. Good to learn new participatory planning model.

Session Title: Who Will Farm?

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
-	2	7	-

Comments:

- A little too informal at first--Ran out of time at end. Tracy Ferry is great.
- Economic development and loan fund for agriculture, city/urban youth info--want more on this.
- Met Tracy Ferry.

Session Title: Dairy Industry

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
3	1	8	-

Comments:

- Really built on Focus Session I--Ag and Economic Development. Liked the work we did on a "dairy industrial park" concept.
- In wrong one--no interest in setting up industrial park--rather direct marketing.
- Lots of good ideas and food for thought.
- Wow! Exciting...
- Great insights into primary needs.
- Expansive in its approach but very little that can be done with individual producers.
- Very disappointed in the content. Focused on marketing rather than the available resources and brainstorming.
- Economic ideas which can be used to develop production/distribution enterprise was to review manual.
- I came away with a great idea.

Session Title: Com. Ag Econ Development

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
-	1	-	-

Comments:

-The discussion around the session was more applicable than the presentation though there was some great material handed out and mentioned.

5. Focus Session III - Session Title Addressing Ag Illiteracy

How would you rate the usefulness of this session to you? (circle one)

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
-	14	10	1

Comments:

- An area of considerable concern.
- I liked the sharing of experiences that happened in all sessions.
- This really got me going and there was a good thirty minutes of small group discussion.
- Again it was not my main concern but I learned from it, and was very interested in the subject and the following discussions.
- I was very sleepy, it was my fault.
- Balanced.
- Many good topics discussed.
- Wasn't quite what I had expected.
- Good-but I presented...
- Neat to hear ideas about Ag Education.
- Again some good ideas to be used in our own counties.
- Content was fine. However, the Ag in Classroom would have been more helpful if the concepts for reaching youth--i.e. topics and methods--had been more emphasized.
- Reinforcement rather than anything new.
- Closing discussion could be more focused.

Session Title: Conflict/Building Teams

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
-	-	7	-

Comments:

- Susie Cray's part was well done. Very interactive, very useful. David Deshler spoke too much, lost audience, not useful.
- Good general introduction to topic, more follow up resources.
- Material was good for personal use as well as business.
- Susie gave a very good, interactive presentation.
- I would have loved to attend this session three years ago when I believe I could really have made a difference in our own situation back home. It will be very useful in networking and family issues.
- Mediation and inter organization cooperation very good.
- Susie Craig was excellent.

Session Title: Emerging Markets

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
1	10	5	-

Comments:

- Very informative presentations and good discussion--needed more discussion.
- Livestock and dairy topics were good. should have had someone addressing produce and food markets or at least planned for this topic in facilitating session.
- Hoped for more detail, I think the groups interests were too splintered.
- Too general or specific. Hard to relate to my issues.
- The interaction from diverse segments highlights many needs and opportunities.
- I'm not in field but very interesting anyway.
- Devolved into discussion on production practices.
- The title and description of a workshop so often is broader and somewhat more promising than reality. I did enjoy however, all the speakers--as specific as they were.
- Finally got into the nitty gritty details of marketing/opportunities.
- Conversation only just got started-somehow hard to get at real issues.
- Alan's talk brought up a lot of issues outside his talk.
- Did not address new or opening markets except CADTc presentation ??
A lot of aspects...helped me focus my own specific field of interest by contrast.
- Gave many insights into commercial vs. organic that surprised me. Can't organic be commercial?
- Much too heavy on organic production and marketing. That is an emerging market but did not get at other markets very well.

Session Title: Farmer Organizations

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
3	3	-	

Comments:

- Maybe it was me--did not go away as excited as other two--did not feel like I gained ideas I would want to see put in action.
- Kathy was great. The Mohawk project was interesting but I would have liked less general-more specifics.

Session Title: Shared Vision (?)

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
-	1	-	-

6. Project Planning Session

How would you rate the usefulness of this session to you? (circle one)

Not useful	Somewhat useful	Very useful	Did not attend
5	14		8

Comments:

- Already well on our way with our project.
- Somewhat useful as someone really not part of a team.
- Got down to on the ground strategies, pressure points.
- We identified the focus of our project.
- Had no project planned when we arrived.
- Most of group departed before closure.
- We came up with some stuff and some changes for summit.
- My team member had to leave so wasn't completed.
- I was not the primary participant and my level of expertise is different than most, but I enjoyed the people and the knowledge that I gained. I hope I was able to contribute.
- Good with team members for initial contact and planning.
- Lacked focus but useful.
- Was disappointed schedule was changed in order to complete this questionnaire!
- Mainly wanted to work together-get to know each other. Did get a lot accomplished on project too!
- Needed much more time working as a team.
- Session on 28th was very useful--we worked on our biggest barrier.
- I wanted to rotate with other projects to help me learn, get new ideas, network...
- Didn't apply--I was an individual, not a team.
- Found it difficult to concentrate.
- Good connection--most beneficial opportunity to hear in detail what people do.
- Very useful!! Allowed us time to work on our project.
- Did it in the car.
- Time may reveal more benefits.
- Looking forward to the team planning. After all, that was the objective, right? Getting antsy by lunch yesterday to get at it.

Section III

7. Overall, how well did this workshop meet your expectations? (circle one)

Not Well At All	Somewhat Well	Fairly Well	Very Well	Exceeded My Expectations	Not Sure
0	10	14	21	4	1

7a. What did you like the most about the workshop?

- Interaction with other educators with the same goals.
- Sharing ideas. Diversity of participants.
- The chance to work with my team on our project.
- Meeting cooperative agents and Cornell personnel.
- My team. Food.
- Because of a resource person.
- Networking with people. The incredible organization of conference. the effort and creativity in doing the menu. Chef was wonderful.
- Interactive opportunity to share ideas.
- The opportunity to talk to and discuss the challenges facing the people working in agriculture.
- Sharing ideas and programs with other than CCE and academic staff.
- Meet a great diversity of people.
- Meeting people, accommodations.
- Hearing from others.
- The focus groups.
- Was a lot of info about different things. Paul's food.
- Meeting like minded people, the optimism. Real concrete ideas I know I'll use later in my community.
- The contacts.
- Additional story for my ideas and perceptions.
- Networking-meeting other people that care and are doing something about it.
- Meeting with people of like mind in a family atmosphere.
- Dialogue with participants.
- Good human diversity.
- Group process. Peer learning, non-expert approach.
- Meeting the participants and learning about their programs.
- The workshops.
- The info. sharing especially within session groups.
- Being here as a team.
- Good energy-great opening session to get people working together right off the bat. Facilitation style appreciated. Squirt guns very fun.
- The 101 ways walnuts were used for the vegetarian selections at meals and the working/meeting of very well informed literate friendly people in this field.
- Generation of ideas.

- Excellent exposure to knowledge. Wonderful focus sessions.
- Networking, exchange of ideas.
- Interaction with colleagues.
- Anecdotal successes around the state and region.
- The team work and the networking.
- Opportunity to apply learning to specific project with team members pre-recruited and others recruited at meeting.
- Mix of people.
- The discussion groups.
- More on a personal level it was very educating, illuminating and satisfying. Related to our team project it did identify some areas of concern and room for improvement.
- Interactive discussions.
- Meeting and sharing-brainstorming etc.
- The various focus sessions on specific topics were good.
- Interaction; opportunities to exchange ideas.
- Use of exercises to get people out of their "professional persona."
- Meeting other people.
- Had great conversations in the halls and at several meals, some of workshops. Approach was so much better than most conferences.
- Focus sessions.

7b. What did you like the least?

- Some discussion were too short.
- Long day.
- Who we are really and why really here. Creating shared vision.
- The project planning aspect.
- The missing audience--part-time local elected officials who should hear the contents.
- Focus was placed too much on marketing and diversification as ag economic development. Sustainable means large scale farms too!
- The fact that most of us are enthusiastic cheerleaders, but the team (farmers, distributors, etc) are not here.
- Still feel it needs to be pulled together (this is my comment before the project planning session and whole group discussion.
- Disjointed subject matter. I felt the conference lacked continuity. Projects were over emphasized for people who did not come with clear projects in mind. Many people were in that situation.
- Too many lecture formats. Need more interactive stuff. Or ask us (the lecturers ask us) what it is that we want to learn.
- Huntington upstairs room too hot.
- Small group structures first day.
- Pace was rushed.
- Lack of unstructured time/and specific project time.

- Not enough production ag participants.
- Lack of emphasis on turning interest and concerns into policy development to present to state leaders who can make a difference--legislators, economic development, etc.
- The weather--not much else which could not be useful.
- All was ok.
- The snow.
- Lack of time to be together as a team.
- Not enough time to mingle. Reception earlier and longer.
- The project with the mixed bunch (with post-its) was fun because the crowd was new to me, but it was too rushed and general--more mixed workshops.
- Not enough structure for planning in groups.
- Expected more time in small groups.
- Only one notebook per team. Not enough organization. Too much "lecture" on Wednesday.
- The process for coming in with a team and then throwing in with someone. (if one is only in the early stages it can be difficult to get county people to commit to 2 days away on that basis alone).
- That 1st too general small group working. I/We are too focused to appreciate without setting in a framework to see its relevance to us.
- A little too much process time.
- Not being able to attend 2 sessions at once, luckily other team members covered.
- The opening session.
- Lack of time in certain sessions.
- Too much time on introductions. Too much time. How did this workshop help you in preparing your specific project?
- Too much time spent on voting for a tour!
- Overhead presentations.
- Did not care for the processing session the first day.
- The presentation at Focus I on use of statistical information. Duncan seems like a dedicated professional; however, he needed to figure out a way to hone better presented info.
- One resources book. I never got to even look at it.
- Lack of outcome/direction. Program structure was "too elementary."
- Could have been more participatory. Needed more conflict to facilitate learning.
- Intro. sessions.

8. How did this workshop help you in preparing your specific project?

- Helped to focus the project.
- Yes, drafted plan of work.
- Allowed time to concentrate on the project.
- The importance of team building and conflict resolution.
- Well. We realized need to refine.
- Good time to work together and share ideas.
- Not really.

- Helped in building a plan.
- It has given me new ideas and some new perspective.
- Better insight into how networking and partnerships that meet all parties outcomes (goals) are important in project planning.
- Not.
- Gave us an opportunity to work on our project together.
- It was fairly helpful-we had more time to meet to discuss the project we have already started.
- Ideas with how to organize the project and ways to get community commitment.
- It gave us creative work together time but more importantly it helped us look towards the next steps. Ideas on organizing.
- Future ideas.
- Helped identify some unforeseen obstacles.
- Significant addition.
- Forces you to move from thought stage to action.
- We met new people who are very concerned about our goals and will carry on with our work after this conference.
- More ideas generated.
- It gave me energy. It has been done before so it can be done again.
- Idea generation. Support for my concepts.
- It gave me ideas on how to organize myself and prepare for future meetings; I learned some ideas for facilitating meetings and it was helpful to know I will be able to call on some of the workshop participants in the future for assistance.
- It got us thinking to set more specific agendas.
- Gave us some intensive time to work together.
- There are more tools to use in a farmland and ag. protection plan.
- Not enough time or guidance (in teamwork).
- We have never met as team->helped us get to know one another. Will help us as we continue to work together over phone, e-mail, etc.
- Strategic planning sessions taught me some things I will use in my job.
- Provided time and focus.
- Identify or focus upon key ideas.
- So so.
- It was a discipline. It structured things to make for progress.
- Not much.
- It wouldn't have happened otherwise.
- Bonding with team members, broadening of perspective, exposure to information and resources. I might not have discovered on my own.
- Gave good outline in how to have structure to obtain our goals.
- It brought me together with people that will be working on an agritourism project.
- Made me aware that I do not have a well defined productive relationship with my team member.
- Network.

- Coming up with organizational ideas.
- We have not identified a specific projects-but this gives us some direction.
- Gave me several good ideas and resources.
- Was a forum, a medium for seeing what focus the members of group saw in common for project.
- Yes, structured brainstorming, check lists, etc.
- Gave some ideas on approaches, reaffirmed others.
- Great contacts with new people (and people I know), saw common interests.
- Learned more about agriculture and different associations to gain further information from.

9. What are your thoughts on the peer-learning approach used in this workshop in contrast to an expert-led format?

- Very helpful, some good examples.
- Many experts in the audience.
- I like a combination.
- Peer-learning provides greater participation, builds motivation and offers opportunities to share.
- Like expert led.
- Yes!
- Did not happen as much as could have. Much of time we were being talked at (most).
- Much, much better!! If people call themselves "experts" then they're not participators.
- Keep it-excellent.
- I thought it worked well.
- Peer learning is the tool of choice when the assembled audience all ready has some degree of expertise. "Expertted" format is a preliminary tool for uninformed audience.
- It is a lot harder. I have to get used to it.
- It was good.
- It was good. Built energy and hope, but I think a bit more experts speaking about new research findings, models succeeding elsewhere, etc.
- A little disjointed but I think the peer-learning approach is a good idea.
- Excellent means of learning.
- Was beneficial for discussion and good for problem since many people are at different stages in various projects.
- These sessions were the most useful but one on one where people could either talk with a neighbor or seek out those they'd really like to talk with.
- The best way to learn.
- Liked it.
- Better. Some expertise helps as well but we mostly had what we needed.
- This is perfect--we have been "experted" to death! In my opinion it is the so-called experts that have created the mess we're in. I love the REAL PEOPLE who are doing the hard work!
- Better idea.
- Great.

- Great. that's how things will happen, local people solving their problems.
- I thought it was good method to give us first-hand experiences on issues, rather than theories which may or may not have been tested or which may not work in the "real" world.
- Peers have much to offer and need to be used more often.
- Works well. We can all get better at it as we do it more.
- A #1!
- Very constructive and effective.
- Great!! Relaxed!! Comfortable to participants.
- I would rather see our peers be experts? OK?
- No comparison of two approaches.
- Good.
- Very effective-diverse thoughts=useful exchange.
- Limited effectiveness, but in the right direction.
- This one worked well because of the depth of experience among participants.
- Still quite expert-led, right?
- Good-like it.
- I like the practicality of learning from those who do-who are honest and don't paint a rose-colored picture of unrealistic approach.
- I am not sure that I fully trust experts. Like to hear from those who are trying, doing, or directly involved.
- I felt it was very helpful, the folks are the ones who deal with the issues daily.
- I appreciated it greatly.
- Both have strengths depending on audience.
- This was good but needed more focus at times.
- Would have liked more "lessons learned" experiences relayed rather than just "this is what we did."
- Was well done.
- Very good approach.
- Good, more small groups work.
- I think the facilitator did not facilitate well if this was your objective. Take lessons from Pro-Dairy guys!
- Well appreciated. I love case studies!!
- Excellent.

10. What more would you like to learn about that was not addressed at this workshop?

- What on-line information is out there on these topics.
- Emerging markets.
- Cornell connection, other networks in the state and region dealing with these issues.
- How to work with farmer organizations.
- I would like to know more about the formulation of ag policy.
- More in-depth presentations. Too superficial because of time limit.

- More on traditional agriculture.
- I still want to get more info on farmer coops--both buying and marketing.
- Global stuff--how large multi-national are controlling? And visioning--what can we do to get control. And more on adult education--they make quicker/bigger changes.
- More concentration: Skills of facilitator, examples with facts. Less concentration: anecdotal accounts.
- More specific case examples or studies showing us some possibility.
- Affecting agricultural policy at a statewide, local and federal level.
- Regulations--"can we do what we want to legally?"
- How to effectively make an impact on public policy issues that limit or eliminate the creation of and enhancement of small businesses.
- It would be good to have specific break-out sessions for specific groups--i.e. livestock (other than dairy).
- What the state is doing to assist agricultural outreach education with legislation, etc.
- Where do our larger NY cities obtain their food supply? Track the food supply.
- Legislative process-->how to get a product.
- How gov't agencies operate.
- Project planning.
- More info on problem solving techniques.
- More details about specific projects.
- Opportunities and similar programs/projects going on in other states.
- Very specific stuff in my areas of interest: sludge, threats to farm protection boards by overriding large political and economic interests.
- Grant opportunities; more about Cornell's various resources. Any model programs from other states esp. relating to agri-tourism. Perhaps a major ag producer on what products it would sponsor? Taxation issues with a NYS official.
- Probably the sessions I was not able to attend. For the future I would ask that minutes or brief highlights of discussions and questions that arose in each session be typed up and shared so we could benefit from sessions we could not attend.
- Other models-other states, regions, nations.
- More of each of the focus sessions I attended.
- I need to get a project goal-then I'll let you know.
- The political or governmental needs to make innovative ideas work.
- More attention on actual leadership skills.
- Some out of state examples and speakers. Professionals in the fields represented.

11. Do you have specific suggestions for study tour topics or sites?

- Dutchess County (of course). Canada Market near Toronto.
- How to break into established markets.
- Not just farms.
- Visiting some of the success stories presented here.
- Tours of successful small projects and unsuccessful or struggling projects that could lend

- our assistance in improving the operation.
- Dairy processing tour in Dutchess County.
- Great site and food but limited in capacity.
- Integrated farms-i.e.. those that are marketing.
- Ron Stachowski's farm--Country fed Poultry, Madison County. I'd love to go on the NYC t tour.
- Organic dairying and its marketing.
- Only people or business projects that can substantiate position.
- Probably need to do the tour plus this same sort of conference together?
- Come to Livingston County to see what went wrong. I'd like to see Jefferson County's Ag-Economic program.
- Yes, but lets do tours in warm weather.
- Restaurants using local products. Organic dairy farm.
- Again, specific tours to focus on specific aspects of agriculture--vegetable, fruit, dairy, livestock, grazing, etc.
- Rose Valley Farm and organic winery.
- Specific marketing initiatives with value added products and restaurant-grower links.
- Farmer markets--"green" or urban gardens in NYC sound great! Processing dairy for alternative products- Jefferson County planning, Tracy Ferry Program.
- No.
- Wheat growers that started a pasta plant.
- Follow the Seaway trails and have a critique of agritourisms shortcomings.
- SLUDGE! Sewage treatment plant-form fields where used-DEC agency dealing with this permitting-could do this around Syracuse. Organic dairy farm.
- Farmstands. Markets that are totally local. NYC tour.
- A sheep farm, owners name may be Phyllis Hunter, in the Red Hook area. I believe she raises sheep, processes wool/yarn. has an excellent marketing program under her own label.
- No.
- CSA's. Farms that work well with neighbors. Some agritourism tour perhaps.
- Industrial parks with agricultural businesses; innovative agricultural businesses.
- Watersheds.
- Not yet-but may-would be great to visit community/county where lots of particip. planning on ag has occurred.

12. In addition to individual and Team projects, are there any follow-up steps this whole group should take?

- Another conference.
- Progress reports at the end of the year.
- Network communications building.
- More planning before implementation.
- Not sure.
- Share their process of projects between now and next February.
- Annual workshops.

- Possibly have a follow-up one day conference on updating projects that were undertaken or will be undertaken.
- Probably more preparation on our side before we meet on methods of reaching our goals.
- Lobbying at the state level for more technical and financial support and farmland protection.
- We need lobbying in Albany to remove regulations that hinder diversifying.
- Continued networking, writing grants as a group is a good idea-there are similar concerns.
- Regional conference of projects.
- Send follow-up "survey" asking about progress being made-will serve to help continue the effort.
- Updates on people's success/or failure of their individual problems/projects.
- Hope responses from project work can be pulled together and summarized to tie whole thing together and share with everyone.
- Public policy with state legislators addressing barriers to small and family business development and enhancement (i.e. taxes, workman's comp., utility costs, etc.).
- Maybe a follow-up on how the projects are progressing-project updates-it could benefit us all.
- Can't think of any.
- Sharing experience on on-going basis.
- There should be a follow-up meeting in approx. 1 year.
- Probably none---contacts as needed by individuals.
- Probably, but I don't have any specific suggestions at this time.
- Reconvene and hear progress that groups made, successes and problems.
- Maybe a follow-up survey or sharing of actions taken or progress since workshop.
- Keep the linkages that were started.
- Compilation of all the printed resources from the county.
- A similar meet in 1 or 2 years.
- Work on legislation. Advertise each others events.
- Letters f reminder-encouragement to keep teams aware of a project needing attention. Feb. '97 conference will be good follow-up.
- Make a bulletin board on the internet or a server to post new ideas.
- We never really did unify behind priorities of action. It was asked and individuals spoke ideas but there was no analysis of these priorities, ranking or voting (except related to tours. (I wrote this before discussion was done, more discussion did occur.)
- Tours.
- Meet again at a later date...1 or 2 years.
- Some form of "status of projects" communication.
- More sessions with exercises on various stages of planning, analysis, evaluation, etc. How to figure out next step.
- Some "task forces" could be established in a number of areas...e.g.. Ag illiteracy, ag-tourism promotion, etc.

13. Do you have any other comments, questions, suggestions or concerns you would like to share with us as we plan for future workshops and follow up?

- We must tap into state and regional economic development groups and tourism agencies. Regional promotion of agriculture is key in NYS (i.e. Hudson Valley, Catskill).
- How can the regulations be modified to promote small farming growth?
- Good job overall.
- Thank you.
- Keep plugging at these outreach opportunities.
- To have a conference (seminar) inviting projects under current active status that can be used as case studies involving site visits and follow-up by interested conference participants.
- Needed more farmers here.
- It was useful to talk to others about what works elsewhere in NY. but at some point, I began to lust for more successes. Maybe widen your net to bring in farmers and others from elsewhere? (I know that runs up against NY bias, but what the heck--useful info/models are useful--that's the point) Maybe the presenters could provide info. from research done elsewhere.
- There was a very diverse group of philosophies represented (i.e. organic->conventional). The issues of what is sustainable ag practices was respectfully omitted from discussions. but the people present were mostly Agency people.
- Where were representatives from SWCD, NRCS and Ag and Markets.
- A book for everyone as opposed to different rates.
- Thanks for bringing us together! More time to interact would be good.
- Keep up the good work! Maybe we could mount mass letter writing/faxing campaigns to focus on each project. Ask how support can really make a difference in many issues. A regional, statewide united front can work wonders!
- Following this format works well-I would suggest you use it again.
- To be congratulated. Great job, Judy. How about a basic grant writing (obtaining successes). Handouts, if not in notebook should be circulated to all.
- Let's do something hands-on.
- Nice place to meet. Appreciate hotel accommodations.
- Keep this thing going. Its a great start. Need more applied conferences like this.
- I enjoyed the conference site and appreciate the low cost of the workshop but had difficulty sleeping due to a snoring roommate.
- More organization and planning.
- Always appreciate lists of participants for networking.
- Lots of good work! Thank you.
- Thank you. Thornfield was a nice setting. Something like I Love New York Farms could unite a lot of efforts statewide. Let us know more. Also if a study tour will stop in a Seaway Trail community, e.g. small food processing in Rochester, we could offer some tourism materials for self-drivers or other ag stops of interest list.
- Farm worker tour. We hear a lot about migrant and farm worker housing, health, jobs. To show the influence of farm jobs.

- I just hope as I come to more conferences over the years, I will be able to contribute more than I take away. I am taking away a lot of insight today.
- Thank you. Suggestion for Judy Green: when recording ideas from audience if you don't write down a person's contribution, give them a clue why. You might ask person who is giving idea you are not writing if they think a version of his/her idea is already on sheet.
- Time spent introducing teams and projects was very interesting. I would have liked to hear how other groups planning was advanced by this workshop and in future be able to check on progress to perhaps do some problem solving brainstorm.
- Should have more focus session and repeat more popular ones. Found it difficult to choose which session to go to knowing that I had only one choice.

Thank You!!!

Workshop Evaluation 1997

Comments on the facilitators

- Very positive and helpful, easy to work with_____
- Very good gave us some new ideals to work with___
- Good___
- Excellent conference--far superior to Casanova (location, facilities), although the food was better at Casanova. Facilitators did a great job time management-wise keeping questions down until after the panelist gave their presentations_____
- Summaries and discussions were valuable___
- Judy was great___
- Mostly okay, sometimes overstep boundaries and inserted too much of their own agenda into the format_
- Good job-kept on schedule
- All were very good except Ill.____
- Judy Saul is a lively and enthusiastic, and organized presenter. Judy Green is a "top shelf" leader. Duncan Hilchey is a clear thinker and excellent leader._
- Kept things moving , good mediators, good job on the brainstorming sessions_____
- Well organized, open_____
- Good job_____
- Good!___
- Agritourism workshop presenters were very good-involved participants were dynamic_____
- You do well considering the "grey areas" and the tendency for the dissociation to move away from the theme
- Although I found the almost four hours of process discussion very disappointing use of time (and it wasn't even mentioned in the conference flyer or schedule), the presenters were knowledgeable and capable, especially at the workshops.____
- Very helpful and knowledgeable
- All did a good job moving sessions along, not allowing monopoly on time, keeping dissociation relevant
- Most were very good and knowledgeable, but the Fast Trak was less so.____
- Informative
- Good, but they sometimes stopped just when I was learning the most (I know why, but it was sometimes frustrating).__
- Session 1. needed more intro., good summary 2. good intro., good staying on trade, good summary, good decision 3. more intro., more context, good summary_____
- Kathy Castania and Wilson Augusta were very powerful and informative. Judy Sauls training on globalization was very helpful_____

What are one or two most important things that your team got out of the workshop ?

- Generally, everyone here is headed in the same direction, individuals are at different stages_____
- The realization that we have been conducting our organizational meetings the way it has been presented at this seminar__
- 1. The food incubator for canning products_2. Some new ideal on growing different kinds of vegetables
- Ideas and resources on mobilizing the community, ag dev., tourism__
- Time for team building; collaborative principles
- Network outreach, increasing consumer awareness through media formats_____
- Contacts/resources_____
- We presented our program and had a very productive team meeting to discuss and continue our program__
- Confirmation of common problems and common opportunities-access to other info resources_____
- Connection with other alternative agriculture advocates and the opportunity to exchange ideas_____
- Need to educate farmers with new products
- Communication to public of ag importance
- Networking_____
- Coloration with stakeholders in agritourism_____
- Information and contacts_____
- Not with a team, networking for me__
- Conformation of collaborative process. Contacts and networking info.____
- networking__
- 1.Value of an established, staffed office to promote and develop local agriculture 2.Contacts with relevant programs and experience
- Collaboration time with learning time, idea exchange, exposure to other teams and projects__
- Our team did not meet to any significant extent, however, we learned from the presenters and individuals.____
- Collaboration_____
- 1. Clearer sense of planning (process planning) 2. Networking, sharing of experiences and information__

What is the next step for your team ?

- Digest what we have learned and present it to our community____
- Getting some new focus on our ideals
- Working towards grant proposal --ag econ development (regional)--also to deal with regional promo for ag____
- Team dev./expand stakeholders etc.____
- Land use discussions in community (18 planned).____
- To go ahead with the next stage of the program and keep in touch to help maintain progress____
- Regroup, think through ideas generated by the session____
- Include some testimony from practitioners____
- Complete organization and begin planning for specific projects
- Carry on____
- **Just do it**____
- Continue action initiative implementation and seek funding____
- Assimilate info. into protection planning__
- Develop collaborators__
- Use all of this info. to start a farmers market____
- Define our objectives and get to work!____
- Continue educating ourselves, continue networking with regional small farmers and national advocates_____
- Conduct this years study groups and implement actions_

What would you do to improve the program the next time ?

- Keep the farmland preservation program____
- More details_____
- Not to schedule it the same time as another conference. I know you are scheduled way in advance. Need to announce date when you reserved facility, if this was done then perhaps the Conn. conference would have chosen a different time frame. As you know we lost some good speakers to the Hartford Conference _____
- The presenters should use some form of visual aid at some point in their presentations. Some presenters were too informal and lost the "focus" of their presentations_____
- Work out the schedule to allow more leapfrogging into the focus groups_____
- Use three workshop trainers per session rather than single program-describes diversity, stimulates discussion_____
- Follow through on assignments, see work plan for agritourism_____
- The sessions are too long. Have them just 60 minutes _____ in length or have more of them
- More info. sharing, people were yearning for much more_____
- Try for a more regional mix of panelists_____
- First day too long_____

**What would you do to improve the program the next time ?
(continued)**

- Too hard to continue working after dinner-better to just have a social/networking period
- Great job!___
- Restricting the number of non-team people mixing with an established team. Since local zoning has prohibited the simple introduction of an ice cream machine in a farm market, some attention needs to be added to the discussion of many of these issues___
- Have participants come with a clear set of project goals in mind___
- A.M. swimming___
- Do only two concurrent sessions, not three__

Summary of Workshop Evaluation 1997

	answered			
	Not Useful	-----Extremely		
	1	2	3	4
Wednesday AM				
Discussion of collaborative principles	1 4%	4 17%	14 58%	5 21%
Discussion of stakeholder analysis	2 8%	4 16%	15 60%	4 16%
Collaborative process design exercise	3 12%	11 42%	8 31%	4 15%
Evening team planning session	3 19%	2 13%	6 38%	5 30%
FOCUS SESSIONS				
I. Wed PM which topic ?				
__Agritourism_____	0 0	3 25%	5 42%	4 33%
__Urban connections and food security__	1 10%	0 0	5 50%	4 40%
__Farm workers_____	0 0	0 0	1 50%	1 50%

II. Thurs. AM which topic?

answered
Not Useful -----Extremely

___Power of cooperation, coops___	0	0	2	1
	0	0	67%	33%
___Regional prod. identity___	0	0	6	3
	0	0	67%	33%
___Mobilizing community___	0	0	1	4
	0	0	20%	80%
___Financing Community ag and dev. ___	0	4	1	0
	0	80%	20%	0

III. Thurs. PM which topic?

___Financing comm. ag. ___	0	1	0	1
	0	50%	0	50%
___Entrepreneurism/ Fast trak___	1	2	0	0
	33%	67%	0	0
___Ag. dev. specialists___	0	1	4	4
	0	12%	44%	44%
___Fostering food and ag entrepreneurship___	0	0	2	4
	0	0	33%	67%
___Value Added	0	4	4	2
	0	40%	40%	20%
___Fast trak___	0	1	1	0
	0	50%	50%	0
___Local wholesale___	0	0	0	1
	0	0	0	100%

What are your needs over the next year for

Training - entrepreneurial training, business training
models-publish, exchange; promote the success stories (and/or failures)

Training on how to do this ag development

Training - continued

low (1)

high (1)

yes (5)

Information- as much as possible
list of resources and publications
Research
agritourism
tourism/entrepreneurship

Networking- with the to be formed NECC FS & AD
as much as possible
list of resources
Keeping in contact with people that have done the things we want to do

Other-attracting participants

Other- The training becomes almost secondary to the networking. Is it possible to really encourage teams formed last year and those formed and continuing this year to come back...to. The gathering serves as an "annual meeting" to check progress and make new contacts.

NOTES: The workshop was very enjoyable, informative, organized, and inspiring. The networking is invaluable. Thank you Judy, Joan et al.

THE END