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A more thorough review by a non-tenured faculty member’s colleagues is held during the 24 to 36 month period after beginning employment at UI. The candidate creates a professional portfolio (see FSH 3570). A committee is appointed, in accordance with procedures determined by each unit, to consider the progress of each faculty member. The detailed procedures for appointing the committee and conducting the third-year review are developed by the faculty of each unit and made a part of the unit bylaws. In case of a conflict, the below requirements in a. supersede college and unit bylaws.

At a minimum, the candidate must submit the following materials:

- Current curriculum vitae;
- Annual evaluations and other progress reviews from unit administrator(s), dean(s) and center administrator(s) where applicable; in the case of joint appointments and appointments where interdisciplinary activities are part of the faculty member’s position description, or in cases where faculty are located at centers or offsite locations, the secondary unit administrator and dean and/or center administrators’ evaluative comments shall also be included;
- Professional Portfolio (see FSH 3570)
- At the candidate’s discretion, additional material may be prepared and made available to all who are evaluating his/her suitability for tenure and/or promotion. Materials from the following areas, should also be included as appropriate: advancement, interdisciplinary activity, professional development and professional service. [add. 1-10]

The faculty member is given a copy of the committee’s report and is informed in writing by the unit administrator of strong and weak points that are brought out by this review. These materials are submitted to the Provost’s Office in addition to the 3rd year review packet materials listed above.

- Dean analysis, recomme4ndation and narrative
- Unit administrator(s) and where applicable interdisciplinary program administrators and center administrators
- Review committee(s)
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NAME:  DATE:
RANK OR TITLE:
DEPARTMENT:
OFFICE LOCATION AND CAMPUS ZIP:  OFFICE PHONE:
FAX:  EMAIL:  WEB:

DATE OF FIRST EMPLOYMENT AT UI:
DATE OF TENURE:  (Year or untenured)
DATE OF PRESENT RANK OR TITLE:

EDUCATION BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL:

  Degrees: (List most recent degree first: Degree, institution name, city, state, date, major or area of specialization.)
  Certificates and Licenses:

EXPERIENCE:

  Teaching, Extension and Research Appointments: (List position titles and locations since receipt of Bachelor’s degree)

  Academic Administrative Appointments: (List position titles and locations since receipt of Bachelor’s degree)

  Non-Academic Employment including Armed Forces: (List title, brief description, date)

  Consulting: (List company/institute name, title, brief description, date)

TEACHING ACCOMPLISHMENTS: (Academic and Extension teaching)

  Areas of Specialization:
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    Undergraduate Students: (advised to completion of degree, number per year)
    Graduate Students:
      Advised to completion of degree-major professor (student name, degree, and date)
      Served on graduate committee (student name, degree, and date)

  Materials Developed: (non-scholarship activity)

  Courses Developed:

  Non-credit Classes, Workshops, Seminars, Invited Lectures, etc.:
Honors and Awards:

SCHOLARSHIP ACCOMPLISHMENTS: (Including scholarship of teaching and learning, artistic creativity, discovery, and application/integration)

Publications, Exhibitions, Performances, Recitals:

Refereed/Adjudicated: (i.e. books, book chaps., journals, proc., abstr., etc.; provide citations-author, date, title, publisher)

Peer Reviewed/Evaluated: (i.e. journals, articles, proceedings, abstracts, etc.)

Other: (reports, proceedings, papers, citations and references, performances)

Refereed/Adjudicated (currently scheduled or submitted): (provide citations)

Peer Reviewed/Evaluated (currently scheduled or submitted):
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Patents: (provide title/description, patent number and date)

Grants and Contracts Awarded: (provide principal and co investigators, title, sponsor, funding dates, amount)

Honors and Awards:

SERVICE:

Major Committee Assignments: (National, State, District, County, University, College, Departmental and dates)

Professional and Scholarly Organizations (including memberships, committee assignments, editorial services, offices held and dates)

Outreach Service: (Including popular press, interview articles, newspaper articles, workshops-seminars-tours organized, Extension impact statements)

Community Service: (non-academic unrelated to employment)

Honors and Awards:

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: (workshops and seminars attended)

Teaching:

Scholarship:

Outreach:

Administration/Management:
Name: ____________________________  Evaluator(s): ____________________________

Department(s): ____________________________  ____________________________

NOTE: Faculty and administrator(s) are to review and address the objectives as stated on the previous year’s position description.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Description (PD) Responsibilities</th>
<th>PD %</th>
<th>Numeric Score*</th>
<th>PD% x score = total</th>
<th>COMMENTS INCLUDING ACCOMPLISHMENTS and IMPACTS WHEN APPLICABLE (Use back if necessary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING AND ADVISING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FSH 1565 C-1; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOLARSHIP and CREATIVE ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FSH 1565 C-2; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTREACH and EXTENSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FSH 1565 C-3, Strategic Action Plan Goal 3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY SERVICE &amp; LEADERSHIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(FSH 1565 C-4 &amp; C-5, Strategic Action Plan Goal 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Scoring Key
5 = Exceptional performance
4 = Above expectations
3 = Meets expectations
2 = Below expectations
1 = Unacceptable performance

Scoring Example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PD%</th>
<th>Numeric Score</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising 50%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.50 x 4 = 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship 35%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.35 x 2 = .7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Extension 10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.10 x 3 = .3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Service &amp; Leadership 5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.05 x 3 = .15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Adm. Score (transfer total to box below)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.15 = 3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit administrators and college deans may extend the weighted score one decimal place.

Rounding: .5 and above round up; .4 and below round down.

(Continued on next page)
Interdisciplinary Activities: The unit administrator is responsible to solicit, discuss and consider evaluative comments from those interdisciplinary/center administrators listed in the faculty narrative attached to the position description used for this evaluation. All solicited comments are to be attached to this form. (FSH 3050 B-2, 3320 A-1 d, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4 c, and 3560 C, E-2d).

Unit Administrator’s Attachment: A narrative on progress towards tenure, promotion, and/or continued satisfactory performance is to be completed by all evaluators for all faculty using separate pages and attach to this form (if there is a disagreement, see FSH 3320 A-1 e&f). Include the following areas, as appropriate: advancement, interdisciplinary activity, professional development and professional service (FSH 1565 B). If the narrative(s) is/are not attached the form will be returned to the unit by the college.

Unit Administrator Signature/DATE

Unit Administrator (joint appointments if applicable)/DATE

Faculty Comments:

Faculty Signature/DATE

Dean Signature/DATE

Dean’s Attachment: If there are any differences in any category of scoring between the department chair and college dean, a narrative shall be attached stating the reasons for these differences. The form with attachments must be returned to the faculty member for a second signature (if there is a disagreement, see FSH 3320 A-1 f). If the narrative is not attached the form will be returned to the College by the provost.

Second Faculty Signature (if applicable)/DATE

FSH 6240 Required Disclosure of Conflicts

You must complete this disclosure annually with your performance evaluation. If you have a conflict to disclose then you also will need to complete Form FSH 6240A. Likewise, if there is any change in your circumstance that may give rise to potential conflicts or eliminate potential conflicts previously disclosed, then you will need to complete Form FSH 6240A within 30 days of the change. University of Idaho FSH Policy 6240 Conflicts of Interest or Commitment is available at http://www.webs.uidaho.edu/fsh/6240.html. If you have any questions about the form or about specific potential or actual conflicts of interest, please contact your unit administrator or the Chair of the university’s Ethical Guidance and Oversight Committee. Disclose outside employment for compensation of more than 20 hours/week by completing FORM 6240 B – Disclosure of Outside Employment or Consulting for Compensation.

□ I have reviewed FSH 6240 and DO NOT have any conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts to report. Please sign and date below.

□ I have reviewed FSH 6240 and DO have conflicts of interest, conflicts of commitment or apparent conflicts to report. Please, sign below, and fill out form FSH 6240A. Submit completed FSH 6240A to your unit administrator along with separate pages describing a plan to manage each conflict or apparent conflict.

Your signature below certifies that you have reviewed FSH 6240 regarding disclosure of conflicts, and that the information that you provide regarding disclosure of any conflict is accurate to the best of your knowledge as of the date of this document, and you commit to providing an update if a material change occurs in the information you have provided.

Faculty Signature/DATE

Unit Administrator/DATE
I. TEACHING AND ADVISING:

1. **Instruction** (FSH 1565 C-1 a; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1):
   a. Courseload:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Course Credits</th>
<th>Credit Responsibility*</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   * Percentage/or credit(s) of responsibility for a team taught course.
   **See summary table on back page.

   b. Describe additional instructional responsibilities (course redesign; introduction of new delivery methods; involvement in course, program, and university level assessment of student learning outcomes; etc.):

   c. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for teaching.

   * Est. Instruction Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: ________

2. **Advising and/or Mentoring Students** (FSH 1565 C-1 b; Strategic Action Plan Goal 1):

   a. Advisees (#): Undergraduate (Approx): Major ___ Minor ___ Certificates ___
      Grad (Major Professor): Doctoral ___ Masters Thesis ___ Masters Non-Thesis ___
   Mentees (#): Graduate ___ Undergraduate ___

   b. Other Service to Students (organization/program advisers, masters/doctoral committees as opposed to major professor, etc.):

   b. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for advising and/or mentoring.

   * Est. Advising and/or Mentoring Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: ___ Fall: ___ Summer: ___

   Total Teaching and Advising Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____
   (carry forward to summary table)
II. SCHOLARSHIP AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES (FSH 1565 C-2; Strategic Action Plan Goal 2): [May include Teaching/Learning (FSH 1565 C-2 a), Artistic Creativity (FSH 1565 C-2 b), Discovery (FSH 1565 C-2 c), Integration (FSH C-2 d), and Scholarship of Outreach/Application/Engagement Activities (FSH 1565 C-2 e)]

Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for scholarship and creative activities.

Est. Percentage of Responsibility:                      Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____
                                                         (carry forward to summary table)

III. OUTREACH AND EXTENSION (FSH 1565 C-3, Strategic Action Plan Goal 3): [May include Extension (FSH 1565 C-3 b) Distance Education (FSH 1565 C-3 c) Service Learning (FSH 1565 C-3 d) Cooperative Education (FSH 1565 C-3 e) Technology Transfer (FSH 1565 C-3 f)]

Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for outreach and extension.

Est. Percentage of Responsibility:                      Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____
                                                         (carry forward to summary table)

IV. UNIVERSITY SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP:

1. Intramural Service (See FSH 1565 C-4 a):

   a. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for intramural service.

   Est. Intramural Service Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____

2. Unit Administration (See FSH 1565 C-5):

   a. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for unit administration.

   Est. Unit Administration Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____

3. Other Administration (See FSH 1565 C-4 b):

   a. Provide a statement of your goals and objectives for other administration.

   Est. Other Administration Percentage of Responsibility: Spring: _____ Fall: _____ Summer: _____

Total University Service & Leadership Percentage Responsibility: Spring: ___ Fall: ___ Summer: ___
                                                             (carry forward to summary table)
### Percentage of Responsibility Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Planned Percentage Allocation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Summer*</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship and Creative Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Extension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service &amp; Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (All must equal 100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Summer column should only be completed by faculty members who have a twelve month, fiscal year appointment. Academic year appointments (this includes all appointments less than 12 months) may attach a narrative for evaluation purposes with respect to their plans for additional activities undertaken in the summer that are outside their position description.

#### Example Academic Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising</td>
<td>40% (x.5)</td>
<td>60% (x.5)</td>
<td>= 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship/Creative Act.</td>
<td>45% (x.5)</td>
<td>25% (x.5)</td>
<td>= 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Extension</td>
<td>10% (x.5)</td>
<td>10% (x.5)</td>
<td>= 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>5% (x.5)</td>
<td>5% (x.5)</td>
<td>= 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Example Fiscal Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Annual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Advising</td>
<td>20% (x.375)</td>
<td>14% (x.375)</td>
<td>9% (x.25)</td>
<td>= 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship/Creative Act.</td>
<td>42% (x.375)</td>
<td>40% (x.375)</td>
<td>37% (x.25)</td>
<td>= 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach &amp; Extension</td>
<td>23% (x.375)</td>
<td>33% (x.375)</td>
<td>44% (x.25)</td>
<td>= 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Service &amp; Leadership</td>
<td>15% (x.375)</td>
<td>13% (x.375)</td>
<td>10% (x.25)</td>
<td>= 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interdisciplinary Activities: Attach narrative.**

**If the above box is checked, the unit administrator is responsible to solicit comments from, and discuss with, the interdisciplinary/center administrators listed whether the interdisciplinary activities as stated are accurate. All solicited comments are to be attached to this form. (FSH 3050 B-2, 3520 E-1, G-3, G-4 c, 3560 C, and E-2d, and 3320 A-1 d).

1. Faculty Member: I agree that this is a reasonable description of my responsibilities to the University of Idaho for the forthcoming calendar year.

   __________________________
   Signature of Faculty Member/Date

2. Unit Administrator(s) (including faculty with joint appointments when appropriate): I agree that this position description is a reasonable reflection of the stated expectations for progress towards tenure, promotion and/or continued satisfactory performance.

   __________________________
   Unit Administrator/Date

   __________________________
   Unit Administrator (joint appointments if applicable)/Date

3. College Dean: I agree that this position description is a reasonable reflection of the stated expectations for progress towards tenure, promotion and/or continued satisfactory performance.

   __________________________
   Signature of Dean/Date
PROFESSIONAL PORTFOLIO
Lorie Higgins
Assistant Professor
Agricultural Economics & Rural Sociology, University of Idaho

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

My position as Assistant Professor of Rural Sociology in the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology began in January 2002 and was initially a two-way split appointment with 60% of time allocated to Extension activities and 40% of time allocated to research. In 2006, my appointment was changed to an 80% allocation to Extension in order to accommodate increasing responsibilities and commitments to Idaho residents and Extension faculty. The delay in applying for Promotion and Tenure is due to the two years off the tenure clock, granted to me by CALS Dean John Hammel and the University, that resulted from the birth of my son in 2004, who has Down Syndrome and required multiple surgeries and therapies in the first three years of his life. My research, including my Hatch project, initially focused on community decision making, primarily related to natural resources. This focus evolved to include the theoretical and empirical implications of community conflict related to natural disasters such as wildfire. My research efforts are currently related to the impact of Extension-based community and economic development programs implemented in Idaho and economic development related to the arts and local foods. The majority of my professional life since 2002 has focused on working to build the capacities of communities and organizations throughout Idaho and providing leadership at the state, regional and national levels in the Extension community development profession.

I. POSITION CONTEXT STATEMENT


Research and Extension. The vacancy announcement for this position stated that “areas of focus include social and economic changes in Idaho’s rural communities in relation to agriculture and natural resources,” and that “responsibilities will include: (1) support of Extension faculty in rural development programming and implementation; and (2) development of applied research and extension programs to address social and community issues in rural Idaho.”

II. PERSONAL PHILOSOPHY STATEMENT

EXTENSION. The dramatic changes experienced by Idaho’s rural communities in recent decades are often related to economic shifts, mostly away from a traditional resource-base such as logging or toward more concentrated ownership of agricultural lands. Economic and technological changes have resulted in new faces in the countryside, resulting in community conflict about issues such as recreation and forest management. In order to target my efforts at the issues most needing to be addressed in Idaho communities I developed my programs in
response to requests from constituencies and county Extension faculty. Most often, requests have come from underserved and low resource organizations, such as community service organizations.

Facilitation and Organizational Development – Building the Capacity of Extension and Communities. One issue that surfaced early on was the need for Extension faculty to increasingly arbitrate controversial issues in their communities. To help address these issues I developed training materials and conducted workshops on facilitation and conflict resolution. Building the capacity of service organizations ultimately benefits the communities they serve. Other organizations, such as economic development associations, weed management groups and Extension Districts, also needed development assistance in the form of strategic planning in order to better align missions and goals with contemporary needs in the communities they serve. In order to provide the most effective processes, I learned new techniques in strategic planning that I have since used with success to assist numerous organizations and efforts.

Leadership Development and Poverty Reduction. Since these early efforts I have also provided guidance and support to a leadership development and poverty reduction program called Horizons. The eight state program is funded by the Northwest Area Foundation and UI Extension is the delivery organization. Since the first phase in 2004 - 2005, nearly 50 communities have participated in the program. I directed Idaho’s program in the first, pilot phase, which involved five communities in north central Idaho. For the subsequent two phases I have provided both Extension and research support to Horizons, conducting trainings with community coaches, participating community groups and leading scholarship efforts among faculty involved in the program.

Water. At the same time, I have become involved with the UI Waters of the West graduate program, participating on a team of faculty and students focused on various aspects of water resource issues on the Nez Perce Reservation. I have been leading a team of graduate students in conducting a “situation assessment,” which involves interviewing the range of stakeholders in the Lapwai Creek Watershed to develop an understanding of perceptions of watershed issues and assess whether there are opportunities for cooperative action on behalf of the watershed. The report that is now being written will be disseminated broadly among various stakeholder groups. Feedback on the report and its recommendations will determine whether UI faculty will be needed to help stakeholders pursue some type of watershed planning process.

Art, Food, Heritage. My most recent major Extension effort is called Two Degrees Northwest: Where Art Meets the Land, a pilot rural development program in north central Idaho and southeastern Washington focused on building the food, wine and arts economy at a regional level. The program, which I direct, involves extensive work with communities to identify assets, help with economic development planning, and provides technical assistance for artists, such as entrepreneurship training, cooperative marketing, e-commerce and a brick-and-mortar marketplace for hands-on learning in Moscow. Central to the mission of the program is linking
more remote communities, small farmers, artisans and artists of the region to markets and resources in the urbanizing areas of the region as well as to external markets and opportunities. In the near future, a trail guide (formatted as a fold-out map) will help attract visitors who are interested in cultural, heritage and culinary tourism opportunities.

**Professional Leadership.** An important part of an Extension Specialist’s job is to provide statewide leadership in his/her area of expertise. For the past five years I have been co-leader of the Extension Community Development Topic Team. During my tenure, the membership has increased from 8 to 20, due to increasing appointments in community development among Extension Educators (county agents), but also due to increasing interest in community development among non-community development Educators. In 2006, I co-led a strategic planning effort to align our collective focus with a national community development initiative led by USDA.

**RESEARCH.** It took some time for me to figure out that in order to effectively balance an Extension/research split, I needed to develop research components of my Extension projects, which is sometimes more easily said than done. While directing the Horizons program, I was so involved in the day-to-day operations and details that to also think about the empirical and theoretical implications in a research framework was challenging. However, a graduate student in Conservation Social Sciences also worked on the project and he focused on his role as a community coach for his Ph.D. dissertation, and a co-authored article based on his dissertation has recently been published in the Journal of Community Development Society.

**Community Capitals.** After phase I of Horizons concluded, I opted not to continue in a primary leadership role in the program so that I could focus on research in the time remaining before going up for P & T. That is reflected in a greater emphasis on research in my 2008 position description. Thus, for the two subsequent phases of Horizons, I’ve been able to develop a more detailed research project that looks at the impact of the program from a community capitals framework – that is, how activities conducted as part of the program have altered levels of financial, social, political, cultural, environmental, built and human capitals in the community. The research is applied in that data collection involves a capitals mapping process with the participants of the program, where they learn about community capitals and how to think about their community in that context. They also learn how to use the mapping process to evaluate their efforts over time and to strategically plan future efforts (e.g., if they haven’t seen desired changes in a particular kind of capital, they can develop strategies for increasing that capital). Data has been collected in 18 communities so far and another mapping process will be conducted at the end of the Phase III program in the fall of 2009.

**Art, Food, Heritage.** The research component of the Two Degrees Northwest project extends emerging scholarship on rural development that indicates effective economic strategies for the most remote communities are built on the assets unique to these areas, and at a regional scale. This represents a re-emerging approach to economic development that focuses on cultivating entrepreneurs among existing residents, rather than recruiting firms from other places, diversifying an economy, rather than focusing on one industry, and on creating opportunities for more local consumption rather than only on export industries. Having networked with other similar programs in the country, I am working with economist, Phil Watson, and graduate
student, Angie Vanhoozer, to develop a model for evaluating the social and economic impact of rural arts development across the country. In the coming year, we, along with colleagues in Washington State, Missouri and North Carolina, intend to submit a research proposal for expanding the study to other sites.

**Fire.** Social theory is critical to good applied research. It not only advances scientific understanding of social phenomena, but also helps scientists understand how to help people solve problems. Since 2005, I have had the fortune of working with a rural sociologist in Washington state on a long-term project that examines the impact of wildfire events on rural communities. My role in the project has been to develop the theoretical model for understanding the social structural and interactive dynamics in communities struck by disaster. The first paper jointly published in 2005 was reported in the 2007 annual report to be one of the most cited *Society and Natural Resources* journal articles of 2005 and is regularly assigned in the social theory of natural resource management course at the University of Idaho. Our more recent work revisits the communities studied for the 2005 and 2006 articles, to examine long-term impacts to both tribal and non-tribal communities. An article based on this work is forthcoming in *Society and Natural Resources*.

**Video as a Tool for Research and Community Development.** In 2003 I received a small grant to create a participatory video about family farmers in northern Idaho. My idea was that what we know about the life and plight of the family farmer is determined by the researcher/storyteller, or in this case, the videographer. I wanted to engage in an open-ended process of documentation of the lives of family farmers. I identified three farm families willing to participate and purposely chose three very different types of operations in order to explore the range of experiences of contemporary farmers. After initial on-farm filming and interviews, I brought the three families together for a focus group discussion, which was also filmed and included in the finished product. Later, a rough cut of the video was screened by the participants to ensure their ideas were conveyed accurately. Two comments summarize their review:

> “I like it because no one will feel sorry for us after watching it.”

> “It needs more cows.”

In short, the end result was more a celebration of a rural lifestyle than a cataloguing of the myriad ways in which that lifestyle has changed and been threatened in recent times.
TEACHING. Although I have never had an official teaching appointment at UI, I enjoy working in a classroom environment and interacting with students, which is why for three years I taught a one-credit course on conflict management. Given my interest in community development I focused the course on community conflict and processes for making community decisions. The course was very “hands-on” and required students to observe real-world community decision-making and practice techniques for creating fair and effective group interactions. Many students had never been to a city council meeting or had assumed that Robert’s Rules of Order was the only way to manage meetings.

I have also worked with students in a number of other ways, such as serving on graduate committees, co-authoring papers, consulting on projects and speaking in graduate courses.

III. EVIDENCE OF PERFORMANCE

EXTENSION. It is challenging to capture the number and range of types of services I have provided in a table because the work I have done has almost always been tailored to meet the needs of a specific group or situation. I have very few “canned” workshops and presentations for this reason. I have developed numerous guides or manuals to use in my work, some of which are included in the supplemental materials to this packet, but have created them in a way that allows me to adapt them each time they are used. My ability to create colorful and engaging materials has evolved over time as have my computer design skills. Examples are included in the supplemental materials packet.

Table 1. Workshops and Facilitation; Community and Professional Audiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outreach Category</th>
<th>2002 – 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops organized</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops taught</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings facilitated</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension/University/Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops organized</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops taught</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings facilitated</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Facilitation Skills: Impacts on the Extension Audience

Selected Comments on Evaluations:

“I see lots of places where storyboarding can be an effective way to work with groups, generate priorities, etc.”

What is the most valuable skill or idea that you will take from this training? “How to use ground rules as a more powerful tool.”

Strategic Planning: Impacts on the Community Audience

A notable impact was in Emmett, where conflict and misunderstandings between numerous community groups, including city government, called for a series of facilitated discussions led by me, and with the assistance of staff from the Idaho Department of Commerce. The result was new collaborations, improved working relationships with the city, and monthly roundtable that has involved more than 20 organizations and has been sustained since 2004. Key to the success of the process was an impartial outside facilitator and preceding discussions with a situation assessment, which involve interviewing representatives of each group to understand sources of conflict and gather ideas for moving forward. Results of the assessment were compiled without attribution to individual respondents and framed in constructive terms in order to start the process off on a positive note. The assessment was particularly helpful in clearing up simple misunderstandings before diving into challenging community issues.

Small Business Workshop: Impacts on the Community Audience

Selected Comments on Evaluations:

Overall, what was the best part of the training? “Accessible + available educators + resource people. Chance to meet other entrepreneurs. Snacks + drinks were much appreciated.”

Did offering the training here [in your community], as opposed to Moscow or Lewiston, make a difference to your ability or willingness to attend? “Yes – Moscow or Lewiston is too far away. I have livestock to feed morning and evening. Fuel costs.”

Since launching a Main Street marketplace for locally produced goods as part of the Two Degrees Northwest program in the spring of 2009, 45 artists and artisans have a new venue for sales, an opportunity to network with other artists, participate in marketing efforts, training and services, and over $10,000 in sales means $7,000 has gone directly to artists and to the local economy in a difficult financial environment. We have been able to leverage the program’s limited funds by working with students and faculty at three universities to deliver services. For instance, a Moscow sculptor intending to become a professional artist worked with a marketing student we recruited to develop a business name, card and logo in July, 2009. In this way, we can keep our services at low to no-cost and continue to deliver services to underserved and non-traditional audiences.
Leadership Development: Impacts on Communities

The Horizons Program has been providing leadership and poverty reduction training to Idaho communities has had numerous impacts at the local and regional level. My role in Horizons has been as follows:

- Phase 1; 2004 – 2005: Co-PI (w/ P. Salant), Program Director and Leadership Trainer
- Phase 2; 2006 – 2008: Consultation with Director (M. Schmidt), coaches, communities and lead on scholarship development with coaches/educators
- Phase 3; 2008 – present: Consultation with Director (B. Petty) and coaches and lead on scholarship development with coaches/educators.

One year following the first phase of Horizons I returned to those communities to conduct focus groups with participants. These groups reported improved relationships and more productive networks in and between communities and groups. New leaders emerged too: “The study tour – Angie went and came back and gave a report and is now the president of UCCF [the Horizons group].” The program funded childcare so parents could attend training. “The Horizons babysitter – a young, single mom, is now working and engaged in community efforts.” In addition, the way communities think about and address poverty changed in numerous ways. First, communities came to understand poverty as more than a financial issue, but also as a quality of life issue that is especially relevant to youth development: “In early study circles, kids wanted to leave town. Now they are more hopeful – want to go away for an education and then come back. They have projects they are working on – a fountain. Conversations about poverty and how to address areas where people are lacking resources, relationships, and opportunities for things such as cultural enrichment, led to proactive attitudes: “We looked at our resources and realized there’s lots here.”

All of my work in underserved, rural communities has had probably the most important impact that required the least skill on my part. That is, the simple act of leaving campus and investing time and resources into people and communities helps bolster community identity. I have been told on numerous occasions that the fact that the University believed in the community enough to make those investments made people see their community in a new, more positive light. The simple act of creating opportunities for people to come together also facilitates community development. A woman who attended a series of non-profit workshops I organized during phase 1 of Horizons came up to me at an event a year or so later and thanked me for the workshops and said how much they impacted her work in youth development. I asked what it was about the workshops that was so helpful and she said it was the opportunity to meet other people from her community who are interested in similar issues. She was able to gain enough support and made the right contacts to get her program up and running. Participants in our spring, 2008 business trainings said the same thing – knowing that there were so many other people in their community wanting to start businesses bolstered their confidence to move forward with their plans. Moreover, they felt the workshops helped establish a local support network of entrepreneurs.

Grants and Contracts for Extension Work
It is challenging to accurately quantify the dollars acquired, leveraged and spent in support of the outreach and extension activities reported here. More often than not, rather than securing an actual grant or contract, expenses associated with a project were paid by a client or students were paid from grant dollars for interdisciplinary or other programs. For example, small business workshops implemented in northern Idaho in 2008 were partly funded by Horizons, Phase II, grant dollars. This was not my grant, but the funding was leveraged as a partnership to provide needed training in Horizons communities, while incorporating art and small food business training needed by clients of the Two Degrees Northwest Program. Nevertheless, total actual grant funding for my extension programs since 2002 totals close to half a million dollars.

Table 2. Grants for Extension Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants for Extension Programs since 2002</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Higgins portion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horizons, Phase I</td>
<td>$439,000</td>
<td>$216,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other</td>
<td>$35,690</td>
<td>$29,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$474,000</td>
<td>$248,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Publications and Presentations related to Extension Programs. As noted before, much of the written work I produce for Extension programming is not formally published because I prefer to adapt my materials for each group with which I work. For example, my facilitation skills manual exists in at least four different versions. Similarly, some of the applied research work results in lengthy reports created for and distributed to a select audience. This is the case with the situation and needs assessments that I have produced, a number of which are based on intensive face-to-face and telephone interviews. Formal publications directly related to my Extension programs includes one refereed publication, a peer reviewed publication, a 30 minute video documentary and two Impact Statements.

RESEARCH. My most fruitful research endeavors to date have been those that provide me with opportunities to develop theories that explain what we observe in the social world. As a graduate student I developed the theoretical concept of “ceremonial equity,” which refers to public programs that give the appearance of creating equity among economic classes in society, but that in reality are appropriated in a piecemeal fashion over a period of time. More recently, my work with colleagues on community conflict in the aftermath of wildfire resulted in a better understanding of the roles of external forces, such as federal firefighting systems, and local community capacity in community conflict. I have co-authored another article on this topic, which is forthcoming in Society and Natural Resources. In all cases, my primary role has been to develop the theoretical analysis for each article. Some representative comments by reviewers about the theoretical elements of the work include:

*The theoretical structure you establish for the paper is excellent, and welcome in a field where most researchers have been forced into "social science lite," writing at a level*
everyone can understand – and one at which there is absolutely not hope of conveying the complexities and ambiguities of human social behavior. The theory you employ has the great advantage of being transparent enough that even those having their first exposure to communicative rationality can take something useful from the paper.

The subject is well within the areas of interest of large numbers of SNR readers. Many will find the results useful as a contribution to emerging theory on human social response to disturbance. I hope we will soon be able to organize our knowledge in this area and communicate it to line officers in resource management agencies and fire managers.

The 2005 publication I co-authored in Society and Natural Resources is one of the most cited articles from that year and is being regularly assigned in social theory courses related to natural resources. The impact factor of SNR in 2005 was 1.339 and ranked among other journals as follows:

Environmental Studies: 10/51
Planning & Development: 4/38
Sociology: 13/94

Other current work is focused in two directions: understanding the dynamics of change in communities engaging in community development programs and understanding the role and impact of “place-based,” entrepreneurial businesses and cooperative marketing in regional economic development. Both efforts are currently in the data collection phase. Next year I will collaborate with colleagues across the nation to submit a USDA AFRI proposal to evaluate place-based rural development efforts nationally (the 2010 cycle has a rural development emphasis).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Grant Funding since 2002</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Higgins Portion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008 – 2010. Art and Economic Development (Western Rural Development Center)</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 – 2007. Local Food Systems (Bureau of Public Affairs)</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 – 2004. Public Involvement in Water Quality Programs in Idaho and Montana (University of Idaho Seed Grant)</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003. Participatory video project with family farmers (Western Rural Development Center)</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
<td>$5,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the near future, I anticipate numerous publications in partnership with Extension faculty who have been working on the Horizons project in Phases 2 and 3. I am currently working on a manuscript with phase 2 faculty about how the coaching role impacts their traditional roles as educators and anticipate submission in early 2010. I also anticipate preparing two additional
manuscripts in the coming year that focus on the community capitals framework as a tool for research and evaluation of community development programs. Phase 2 communities prepared capitals maps at the end of their program, but Phase 3 communities created baseline maps early in their program and will map program impacts in the spring of 2010.

The spider graph illustrates the result of capitals mapping – in this case, the impact of the Horizons program in a Phase 2 community. The method allows comparison across communities and programs and can reveal whether a program is having its intended impact or not. In the case of Phase 2 programs Horizons had a great deal of impact on social and human capital – building relationships and skills, but less immediate impact on financial capital. Introduction of the concept of community capitals and mapping impacts benefitted communities in that they were able to “see” how much had been accomplished and many participants observed that even though financial capital goals had not yet been met, they felt they now had the foundation and capacity to bring about additional changes. The purpose of mapping desired future changes (outer circle – lighter text) is to provide a way for communities to continue to use the mapping process to set goals, measure success and link past and current achievements with a desired future.

**TEACHING.** Though I have not had a formal teaching appointment, I have been fortunate to have the opportunity to teach in the classroom during my tenure at the University of Idaho. My one credit, community conflict management course was well received by students. They seemed to particularly like the format of the course, which involved a great deal of learning by doing.
They had numerous opportunities to role-play and practice techniques for effective group process and discuss their experiences with real-world decision-making processes. The following are comments from student evaluations about in-class exercises and discussions:

“Great! These made class fun.”

“Good discussion, the group was able to contribute all of their ideas, and reach conclusions.”


“This was very beneficial. I learned the most from this part of class.”

Students even seemed to enjoy the writing assignments:

“The writings were good because they helped us reflect on what we had learned.”

“Good opportunity to explore some of the topics.”

“The writing assignments helped me understand the readings better.”

Due to Extension and research commitments I’ve had to give up my own classes for the time being but continue to work closely with students in the Waters of the West program where I can provide them with a critical set of community engagement skills they need to effectively work with communities as natural resource management professionals. I also continue to work with college students outside the classroom and UI. Marketing students from LCSC, art students from WSU, and design and public relations students from UI are currently working on a range of projects in the Two Degrees Northwest program.