Purpose of the Event:

The Innovation Skill Building Experience was featured during Idaho’s All Staff Annual Conference and the event included 129 employees.

Intended outcomes included:
1. Increased capacity to develop innovative programs and program delivery methods that meet the needs of existing and future clientele
2. Increased capacity to embrace new ideas and spur innovation
3. Plans for implementing collaborative PET programming that will result in meaningful impact at district, state, multi-state, regional and national levels
4. Increased capacity to collaboratively identify and address emerging issues key to building a thriving, prosperous, healthy Idaho

The purpose of the Innovation Skill Building Experiences is to build a culture of creativity and innovation in Cooperative Extension for the ultimate purpose of increasing impact at the local level. In total, twenty-six people participated in the facilitator training including the 18 facilitators, eXtension staff, training facilitators and key resources.

Design:
The event combined some of the elements of previous Innovation Skill Building Experiences and also included a new element, the “Gallery Walk.” The Gallery Walk can best be described as a pop-up academic poster session which included Why Statements, Zen Statements, and components of Choose Your Adventure and the Canvas.
Facilitators/Staff:

University of Idaho Extension facilitators:

- Colette DePhelps, Area Extension Educator, Community Food Systems
- Donna Schwarting, 4-H Volunteer Development Educator
- Nancy Shelstad, Regional 4-H Youth Development Educator

University of Idaho Extension Design Team:

- Mike Howell, Northern District Director
- Allen Taggart, Extension Educator, 4-H Youth Development

Facilitators/coaches from other states:

- Maria Graziani, Farm Financial Management, Penn State Extension
- Ashley Kent, Assoc. Specialist, Local Government Center, Montana
- David Keto, Media Producer and Director, University of Wyoming Extension
- Kurt Mantonya, Community Vitality, University of Nebraska Extension
- John Porter, Urban Agriculture, University of Nebraska Extension
- Bekah Sparks, Extension Center for Tech Outreach, Mississippi State University Extension
- Katie Weaver, Economic & Community Development Agent, Montana State University Ext.
eXtension Staff:

- Tira Adelman, NPSEC, Project Manager, eXtension Foundation
- Dr. Beverly Coberly, Chief Operating Officer, eXtension Foundation (Facilitator, Class of July 2018 Training Cohort)
- Dr. Christine Geith, Chief Executive Officer, eXtension Foundation
- Ashley Griffin, Program Manager, Impact Collaborative, eXtension Foundation
- Molly Immendorf, Design Manager, Impact Collaborative, eXtension Foundation
- Dr. Annie Jones, Impact Collaborative Facilitator Manager, eXtension Foundation
- Aaron Weibe, Communications & Engagement Manager, eXtension Foundation

Event Evaluation:

I will recommend the Impact Collaborative Innovation Skill-Building Experience event to others.

- 68% Yes
- 17% No
- 2% Maybe
- 2% It was frustrating and didn’t seem as organized as I would have hoped. Instructions were not as clear and there was a sense of urgency that made it difficult.

1 In the March 2019 Idaho ISBE Event Instrument with 53 participants
● 2% I think there are some very valuable pieces in the toolkit but the process and pace need continued refinement
● 2% Some of it, not all of it
● 2% Maybe, I think this is time well spent—however the conference format might not be serving the process justice.
● 2% Recommend for groups that do not have well-developed programmatic ideas
● 2% It was an intense experience, but I am also not in recommending position.
● 2% I’m not sure

Please indicate whether the following pre-event activities helped you prepare:

Introduction to Extension 3.0 video
● 65% Yes
● 29% No
● 6% Did not watch/read

Impact Collaborative Story Video
● 69% Yes
● 24% No
● 8% Did not watch/read

The Change Formula & Tipping Point video
● 59% Yes
● 31% No
● 8% Did not watch/read

Change or Die (Article)
● 57% Yes
● 18% No
● 20% Did not watch/read

Design thinking for every endeavor video
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● 69% Yes  
● 24% No  
● 8% Did not watch/read

Purpose and Passion=Innovation (adobe video)  
● 78% Yes  
● 12% No  
● 8% Did not watch/read

Innovation Skill-Building Kit Workbook  
● 71% Yes  
● 14% No  
● 14% Did not watch/read

Please indicate your intention to use any of the information presented in the Innovation Skill-Building Experience event:

● 35.8% I will definitely use the information  
● 41.5% I will probably use the information  
● 15.1% I have not decided if I will use this information  
● 3.8% I probably will not use this information  
● 3.8% I definitely will not use this information

Which aspects of the Impact Collaborative Innovation Skill-Building Experience event did you find most helpful?

Activities:
● Hands on experience  
● The whole process and manual. Very user friendly.  
● Zen statement  
● Narrowing down ideas  
● Brainstorming
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• I liked the change equation. I think creating a space for big picture thinking is important and I am not trying to dismiss the overall achievements of your efforts. I recognize that I am the worst critic, but they feedback is coming from a place of passion about the subject matter.
• I enjoyed the lay out of the material, the progression to get to the bottom line.
• Experiencing different parts of an innovative process
• Ideate experience
• The poster session
• Putting our priority Extension theme plan into the Impact Collaborative Innovation Canvas: filling in the details, considering the details
• Learning the process so I can duplicate it on my own in the future

Content and Material:

• Thinking as practice
• Starting with ‘why’ and the overall Impact Collaborative Innovation Skill Building Kit
• The information and kit are helpful in and of themselves.
• Formula and idea processing tools
• Page 25 choose your adventure.
• The gallery walk was entertaining and useful.
• Idea generating
• The clarity that comes from developing the "why” statement
• probably the input section, it was fun to see what ideas
• The flow of the program, working through each step of the process

Teamwork:
• Being able to work through things with my colleagues in person.
• working with others
● Team discussions
● I think working in our groups was helpful. But instead of just having us sit at tables kind of in groups it would have been good for us to define each group so we knew what the common goal was going to be.
● Networking with fellow educators/brainstorming ideas
● It served as a great team building workshop with my fellow colleagues. It was wonderful to hear all of the different ideas that were shared.
● Working in teams with people I don’t always work with to come up with innovative ideas

Other:
● Sadly none of it.
● I don’t know if I found any part of it helpful. It was a long and boring workshop.
● Not sure.

Which aspects of the Impact Collaborative Innovation Skill-Building Experience event did you find most challenging?

Timing and Transitions:

● Time was limited with the actually crafting of the why statement and idea stage.
● Nothing
● The timing - sometimes too much time to do activities, sometimes too little time to do activities
● Limited time for idea processing/developing
● The speed at which we were asked to decide things
● Trying to accomplish things in a short amount of time.
● I hated how long it took for our team to get to the finish line, I don’t love working in such large groups because some of the really great ideas never even got looked at.
● Not enough time. At times the flow felt clunky.
● The length, fast pace, speakers talking over each other, some instructions were confusing, and I would have liked more breaks in between to move around.
● The transitions were too short between each exercise.
● Some of the intermediate steps and the dictated pace
● The first day was an information overload in the time frame
● It was very difficult to understand the first day, the directions and objectives were confusing.

Team Exercises:

● Categorizing ideas into themes...not sure we did that correctly
● The connection between level 2 and level 3 was a little tricky to navigate.
● I think it is difficult to maintain the needed focus with such a large group moving. Not everyone moves at the same pace.
● Leaving behind great ideas and working only on one.
● Narrowing down all of the great ideas to one idea to focus on.
● Just the intensity of being hyper-focused on the one idea from the table.
● Choosing only one team to build with.
● Working in teams with people of different thinking styles trying to utilize the workbook and process that wasn’t anything any of us had experienced before.

Understanding of content/material:

● Day 1 was confusing. I didn’t understand the reasoning behind this method of design thinking. It felt like things were just overly complicated at times.
• Bad ideas
• I was nervous anticipating the experience, but it was better than I expected.
• I think the go slow to go fast concept was lost. People were coming into the room with different definitions of terms such as collaboration, facilitation, meeting management, and innovation (from the top of my head). Also, each team was required to jump right into the performing stage of team dynamics and not all teams were at that level or ability to work with each other. I think awareness of team dynamics could help teams reach the performing stage more quickly or address their dissatisfaction along the way. I want to see the facilitators modeling the experience of information delivery for participants so they can learn not only from the information that is being presented, but in the way in which it is intentionally delivered to participants to keep focus and enthusiasm levels high. I think it appeared like the facilitators were standing around or hanging out and within the Extension field, this is not a good perception to perpetuate. I did not like the workbook "fill out this sheet" format for all activities. It was redundant. I think ALL directions and steps need to be verbally delivered and have a written slide on the projector if people need to reference along the way. Directions should not be repeated over the microphone more than once because it disrupts the process in the small group discussions. If people need to ask clarifying questions, there were enough floating facilitators that this could have taken place on a table by table level. I think doing a mathematical equation to front load the need to honor start and end on time concept is valuable. Come up with a calculation to show how much money is lost when we are not working efficiently. With this being said - build enough breaks (at least every two hours) to allow time for people to mingle and take care of their needs. I think it is extremely important to not keep people in a large windowless room all day, every day.... I think a requirement of doing this type of work at a conference setting would be break out rooms to change scenery and allow for a quieter work environment.
• Separating our PET goals into appropriate areas
• Did not understand (get) the Table of Strategic Extension Elements
• Sense of urgency and picking one project to continue on so quickly especially when we are all so committed already
• Identifying specific project on which to focus
• Using the term "all ideas begin as bad ideas." was challenging. It is a very negative way to address suggestions/thoughts/ponderings. I'm a creative person and string ideas together to create a project. My process may take a few hours or a year. But I don't start off thinking my first concept was "bad."
• Wondering if we would ever use the information we were so painfully learning
• Trying to think of innovative ideas on my own
• innovative canvas
  The beginning. Working through the questions at the beginning seemed very tedious and I didn't see where we were going but eventually we got to a good idea so that was worth it.
• seeing what the end result should look like

Other:
• Unhealthy food choices
• None of it was challenging, it was just completely irrelevant to my daily work in Extension.
• Improve
• The interruptions.

Do you have any additional thoughts, comments, or feedback you would like to share? If so, please share below:

Praises:
• I really like page 25 it was really good information.
• Thank you for your time and guidance!
• Great information! I appreciate the step by step approach...breaking it into manageable parts. Thank you!
• Thank you!
• Thank you for coming to Annual Conference. Dr. Geith's presentation was great.
• Awesome training we could not have gotten to where we are with these ideas without the training. Thank You
• Appreciate the time and effort put in by the organizers and facilitators of the program.
• Seems like a good system with great potential

Recommendations for next time:

• I would love some more background introduction to the "lean experimentation" and "design thinking" that are mentioned in building the tools and the whole experience.
• I highly recommend attending the CISPUS Institute in Randle Washington for their workshop on how to facilitate and work with collaborations. I think this group does an excellent job of modeling and practicing what they preach. Check it out!
• Possibly share more experiences with implementation of the process.
• Spread it out over three days instead of two so it does not seem rushed
• Shorten the workshop if possible and a larger conference room to work in or have each group go to their own conference room.
• If the videos would have been followed and utilized, the training would have been better.
• I was really inspired by the Extension 3.0 video and was anticipating this being more aligned with that message.
• When giving instructions don’t interrupt us to give more instructions. We would just get started then get interrupted.
• I feel that doing the activities as an individual and then doing them again in a group setting is a little overkill...I feel that we could benefit from just doing it as a group unless there is a reason we do it twice (I don’t remember that being explained as to why we do things twice)

Negative Feedback:

• Many of the presenters seemed very unprepared. At some times in the program I felt like presenters were just trying to use up time rather than educate. For such an innovative idea the presentation style is status quo at best. Show me innovative don’t just tell me about it. Use more videos and hands on activities. Powerpoints are the status quo and mediocre at this point. I truly believe we need to be more innovative, but use innovation to present in a way that wows us beyond the content itself. The content is good and strong, but the presentation needs work. Thanks for your time and work to share with us. I hope this feedback is helpful and not taken as critical. Stay with the cause, but work on training your collaborators/presenters to be more engaging. Thanks!
• I personally, did not like it. I see the problems and what needs to be done, we just need people to do them. You can have all the great ideas in the world, but you have to have some staff to do something.
• Your team adjusted for the technical challenges of the mic - Thank you. I guess the spacing of activities seemed fast with not enough time to design a great project. I understand the process and appreciate it, but for my learning style it
was difficult to stay engaged when I felt I was not ready to move onto the next activity.

- It was difficult for me that the audience talked over the presenters and vice versa. Some of the material from the presenters wasn't always clear but we got turned loose then tried to get pulled back together and my table was in the back so it often was just a really loud, competitive ball of confusion. But we got through it and I think it all worked out okay. Thank you!
- While very valuable for some groups who struggle to find and develop program ideas, it was simply not the correct process for our group, who already had multiple programmatic ideas, goals, objectives, and structure developed. My group was ready to go beyond developing a project to forward for funding, and instead, develop funding mechanisms for the holistic, systems-approach to our already-robust programs. Not knocking the process... it was good for some, just not good for us. I felt like we were the advanced kids in a remedial class.
- I didn’t like starting in PET groups. The audio wasn’t very good. The presentations were wordy and far from concise. And the instructions were confusing much of the time.
- This training was by far the longest training i have ever attended. The information was good, but I stopped listening about 4:00 the second day. I could not sit any longer. And the training did not have any fun moments, it was all work. it was also very annoying to have someone talking loudly in the microphone that we had 2 minutes left. Although I am sure we will use this process, I did not have a good experience learning it.
- The whole experience was hard work and will have value if the teams have time to work together on the ideas. The challenge with exercises like this one is great
ideas are shared and then they die because we don't have the time or the resources to fully develop.

- It was frustrating to be told we were not actually working on a real project, just practice, then find out in the end we were moving forward on some projects.

Facilitator/Coach Reflections:

Day 1:

I Like…

- how the Idaho administration is invested and participating.
- The willingness of the Idaho Extension faculty to commit a day and a half to experience this process together.
- Focus on current program area vs. party. Made all of the activities more relevant.
- how participants were excited to share their work and that administration and eXtension provided support for implementation of some of the ideas.
- the gallery walk. I feel like the sharing of ideas is one of the most inspiring pieces of the process.
- The explanation of the Canvas was great! Made it very approachable! The Gallery Walk was also really helpful and informative.

I wish…

- we would take time at the beginning to explain design thinking and how the process should be end-user focused.
- We had more time for the first two levels. Even though it should still be a rapid-fire style activity sequence, people did not get to discuss all of their ideas.
- We had done some of the funnier Brain Breaks
• all facilitators were prepared and had good presence to control the room. all coaches or floating facilitators were as engaged as others.
• We had given some guiding questions for Gallery Walk participants and timed the team changes.

I wonder…

• if the process would have been better if the PET focus hadn't happened first, or if the instruction/facilitation process for the process would have been clearer.
  Participants didn't like being stopped for clarification after they started.
• How different the experience would have been if we hadn't spent the first morning focused on their PETs.
• how we could use technology to streamline some of the processes like voting or capturing ideas.
• if there is a different way to present the canvas activity. I find it invaluable, but have done extensive work with the tool so I understand the purpose for each section and the canvas as a whole. I felt like some of our teams did not find real value in it as a tool and just completed it to "check the box" on the activity.
• What would have engaged Extension Specialists more. I heard from a couple people that the specialists didn't participate in / appreciate the ISBE workshop process.

Any additional comments or feedback?
• I learned so much from this event and hope to be involved in more Impact Collaborative work in the future.
• All the facilitators and coaches were GREAT!

Day 2:
I like…

- how participants were excited to share their work and that administration and eXtension provided support for implementation of some of the ideas.
- the gallery walk. I feel like the sharing of ideas is one of the most inspiring pieces of the process.
- The explanation of the Canvas was great! Made it very approachable! The Gallery Walk was also really helpful and informative.

I wish…

- all facilitators were prepared and had good presence to control the room. all coaches or floating facilitators were as engaged as others.
- We had given some guiding questions for Gallery Walk participants and timed the team changes.

I wonder…

- how we could use technology to streamline some of the processes like voting or capturing ideas.
- if there is a different way to present the canvas activity. I find it invaluable, but have done extensive work with the tool so I understand the purpose for each section and the canvas as a whole. I felt like some of our teams did not find real value in it as a tool and just completed it to "check the box" on the activity.
- What would have engaged Extension Specialists more. I heard from a couple people that the specialists didn't participate in / appreciate the ISBE workshop process.

Any additional comments or feedback?

- All the facilitators and coaches were GREAT!
Idaho Facilitator/Coach After Action Review Notes 3/27/2019

Idaho-specific

- In Idaho, the 80-minutes up front may not have been needed. They may have underestimated the development of the PET understanding. This could have been reduced possibly.
- This group had very good Why statements - this was thought to be a result of the pre-work in the PETs.

How focus going forward to have the PETS use the skills again? I.e. PET meetings?

ISBE Kit and Process

- Somehow track where teams are going and how use their skills.
- Try a tool like poll everywhere to use fewer dot voting methods - to provide better feedback and possibly speed things up.
- Add a funnel metaphor for the ideation section to represent the process of creating a wide variety of ideas and narrowing it down to a few.
- Create a visual map of the skill building journey so participants can see where they are at any point in time.
- Identify the divergent and the convergent thinking processes within the skill building journey.
- Consider deleting any “practice” activities and make it all the real thing.
- Store unselected ideas in a “parking lot” to more easily keep track of runners up.
- Gallery Walk was more effective for feedback than the Pitchfest format.
- Try using a digital feedback mechanism to collect ideas in the Gallery Walk.
- Try using a digital tool to collect the dots during the Gallery Walk.
- There was some confusion about the meaning of Time, Treasure, Ties.
• Try digitizing more of the tools in the toolkit - i.e. scorecard, doblin, canvas.
• Try Slido to capture input and to vote.
• To increase the generation of novel ideas, try starting with identifying a problem or issue to work on, and then ideate around solving that problem. Ask - what problem are you trying to solve and be clear about that before ideating.
• Create more novel ideas. For example, UNL started with a list of key problems, both internal and external they developed from a survey, then that was narrowed down.

Facilitation/Coaching

• Coaching needed less on Day 2 - except for the Canvas exercise
• Model collaboration with the actual facilitation. Our facilitators are presenting - how can we model collaboration/co-creation?
• Facilitators want to know who their team members are ahead of time. It would also help for teams to know about their facilitators. Try sending bios ahead of time to each other.
• Spend more time up front so the team knows they are picking an idea to work on the entire time - not practice, but real. Ensure they really own the idea they select.
• A technique shared for strengthening why statements was to say that Who and Why is the Why Statement; How and What is out.
• Did ideas come from dominant people who walked in with an idea, or was it co-created as a team? How do we know?
• Next, might be fueling creative collaboration with new issues.
• Need more play, laughter, music - playful experiences for people to let their guard down.
• Try incorporating more improvisation and the arts (more modes than talk and writing).
• Better identify the facilitators - Annie will consider lanyards, name tags and business cards and make recommendations.
Other

- Positive to link to national initiatives with the “umbrella” invitation from eXtension.
- Share the “Extension Song” at future events.
- Set up the invitation to the skill building experience to be special. Invitation only, for example.
- How track which projects move forward? I.e. project charter?
- Being bound by time and place is a positive for the creative process even if feels like there isn’t enough time.
Teams:

Gut Gurus

Team members:
- Jackie Amende, jamende@uidaho.edu
- Julie Buck, jhbuck@uidaho.edu
- Surine Greenway, surineg@uidaho.edu
- Jang Ho Kim, janghok@uidaho.edu
- Sendy Martinez, smartinez@uidaho.edu
- Bridget Morrisroe-Aman, bridgeta@uidaho.edu
- Joey Peutz, joeyp@uidaho.edu
- Laura Sant, lsant@uidaho.edu
- Lorie Vermaas, hneiblin@uidaho.edu
4-H Community and Volunteer Development

Team members:
Timothy Ewers, tewers@uidaho.edu
Nancy Shelstad, shelstad@uidaho.edu
Sharla Wilson, swilson@uidaho.edu

Deci$ion Team/Beef PET - Decision Trees for Farmers (eXtension Umbrella follow-up team)
Team members:

- Ben Eborn, bebore@uidaho.edu
- Benton Glaze, bglaze@uidaho.edu
- Danielle Gunn, dgunn@uidaho.edu
- John Hall, jbhall@uidaho.edu
- Scott Jensen, Scottj@uidaho.edu
- Cindy Kinder, ckindet@uidaho.edu
- Les Nunn, lnunn@uidaho.edu
- Meranda Small, msmall@uidaho.edu
- Jim Sprinkle, sprinkle@uidaho.edu
- Ashlee Westerhold, ashleew@uidaho.edu
- Shannon Williams, shannonw@uidaho.edu

eXtension Umbrella follow-up: Chris will connect them with the AI advisory group.
Forestry and Natural Resources PET

Team members:
Randy Brooks, rbrooks@uidaho.edu
April Hulet, aprilh@uidaho.edu
Jacob Rickman, jacobr@uidaho.edu
Chris Schnepf, cschnepf@uidaho.edu
Glenn Shewmaker, gshew@uidaho.edu
Bill Warren, williamw@uidaho.edu
Food Production and Systems (6a)

A project addressing robotic systems in ID dairies for dairy producers and stakeholders that identifies critical factors of adoption enabling improved financial outcomes and quality of life unlike traditional milking systems.

Table 6a
Food Production Systems

Mireille Chahine, mchahine@uidaho.edu
Xiaoxue Du, xiaoxuedu@uidaho.edu
Rick Novell
Hernan Tejeda, htejeda@uidaho.edu
The Collaborators (Umbrella follow-up team)

Team members:

Andrew Bingham, abingham@uidaho.edu
Luke Erickson, erickson@uidaho.edu
Laura Foist, laurafoist@uidaho.edu
Lance Hansen, lancehansen@uidaho.edu  
Becky Hutchings, bhutchings@uidaho.edu  
Siew Guan Lee, siewguanl@uidaho.edu

eXtension “Umbrella” follow-up: Aaron is already inviting them to try out LumApps as a sandbox to inform their idea. Aaron, we need to put the conditions of their use of LumApps for this test in writing. Please propose the following: how many users, the process for getting new users on, the length of time for their sandbox testing, the evaluation process - we want to see their results and recommendations for their project.

Teen Leadership

![Teen Leadership Zen Statement]

A 4-H build project for teens in the Leadership Academy that teaches them how to address community needs, develop plans, and implement building projects, enabling continued 4-H involvement unlike one-off events or other youth leadership programs.

Shana Codr, scodr@uidaho.edu  
Suzann Dolecheck, sdolecheck@uidaho.edu  
Shaina Nomee, snomee@uidaho.edu  
Gail Silkwood, gsilkwood@uidaho.edu  
Allen Taggart, taggart@uidaho.edu  
Grace Wittman, gwittman@uidaho.edu  
Chandra Vaughan, cvaughan@uidaho.edu
Rapid Fire Ag

Team members:
Reed Findlay, rfindlay@uidaho.edu
Justin Hatch, jlhatch@uidaho.edu
Jon Hogge, jhogge@uidaho.edu
Pamels Hutchinson, phutch@uidaho.edu
Joel Packham, jpackham@uidaho.edu
Samantha Roberts, sroberts@uidaho.edu
Tyanne Roland, tyanne@uidaho.edu
Joseph Sagers, jsagers@uidaho.edu
Brad Stokes, elmore@uidaho.edu
LEXI

Design communication solutions for external and internal audiences that build relationships, inform, and strengthen networks enabling lives to be changed unlike the status quo.

Team members:
- Nav Ghimire, nghimire@uidaho.edu
- Lyle Hansen, lhansen@uidaho.edu
- Mike Howell, mhowell@uidaho.edu
- James Lindstrom, jlindstrom@uidaho.edu
- Patrick Momont, pmomont@uidaho.edu
- Barbara Petty, bpetty@uidaho.edu
- Debbie Rigby, drigby@uidaho.edu
- Marnie Spencer, marniers@uidaho.edu

4-H Tech Team
An innovative project app for 4-H youth that excites and enhances 4-H learning experiences, enabling youth to gain more skills interactively unlike traditional methods.

**TECH Why:**
Youth will be prepared for a changing world that is technology driven.
Walk & Talk Saturday Group

Team members:
- Siew Guan Lee, siewguanl@uidaho.edu
- Leslee Blanch, lblanch@uidaho.edu
- Kirstin Jensen, kdjensen@uidaho.edu
- Gretchen Manker, gretchenm@uidaho.edu
- Amy Robertson, amrobertson@uidaho.edu
- Maureen Toomey, mtoomey@uidaho.edu

Digital Garden Hort and Small Farms PET digital (eXtenison Umbrella follow-up team)
Team members:

Lance Ellis, ellis@uidaho.edu
Patrick Hatzenbuehler, phatzenbuehler@uidaho.edu
Bracken Henderson, brackenh@uidaho.edu
Ron Patterson, Bonneville@uidaho.edu
Kimberly Tate, ktate@uidaho.edu
Andy West, andywest@uidaho.edu
Stephen Love, slove@uidaho.edu

eXtension Umbrella follow-up: Chris will connect them with the AI ad hoc advisory group being formed now.
Community Development PET (eXtension Umbrella follow-up team)

Team members:

Colette DePhelps, cdephelps@uidaho.edu
Lorie Dye, ldye@uidaho.edu
eXtension Umbrella follow-up: Chris will connect with NACDEP eFieldbook work. Chris will connect them with the Collective Impact partnership via the partnership team.

3:00 Down and Outers”/4-H Ask me anything (eXtension Umbrella follow-up team)
Team members:
Robin Baumgartner, rbaumgartner@uidaho.edu
Sara Fluer, sfluer@uidaho.edu
Donna Gillespie, donna@uidaho.edu
Scott Nash, snash@uidaho.edu
Alaena Ruth, Bonneville@uidaho.edu

eXtension Umbrella follow-up: Chris will introduce them to some additional possibilities - connect them with AI or possibly LumAPPS.

Dirty Peeps/Hort and Small Farms PET analog (eXtension Umbrella follow-up team)
**Team members:**

- Ariel Agenbroad, ariel@uidaho.edu
- Ken Hart, khart@uidaho.edu
- Jennifer Jensen, jenjensen@uidaho.edu
- Stephen Love, slove@uidaho.edu
- Iris Mayes, imayes@uidaho.edu
- Rebecca Mills, rmills@uidaho.edu
Jennifer Werlin, jwerlin@uidaho.edu

eXtension Umbrella follow-up: Chris will connect them with the partnership team’s Collective Impact partnership.

Water PET

Team members:
- Lide Chen, lchen@uidaho.edu
- Mario de Haro Martí, mdeharo@uidaho.edu
- James Ekins, jekins@uidaho.edu
- Gary Fornshell, gfornsh@uidaho.edu
- Howard Niebling, hnieblin@uidaho.edu
- Linda Schott, lschott@uidaho.edu
- Terrell Sorensen, tsorensen@uidaho.edu

Unknown Team Members
- Sarah Baker, SDBaker@uidaho.edu
- Kasia Duellman, kduellman@uidaho.edu
- Melinda Ellison, ellison@uidaho.edu
- Doug Finkelnburg, dougf@uidaho.edu
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Conclusion

As with all of the Innovation Skill Building Events, this event included a mixture of positive feedback and areas needed for improvement. In the last several sessions, there has been some consistency among the negative comments. Some portions of the event seem too rushed while others are repetitive areas described as “overkill.” We will need to do a thorough sifting and winnowing of the feedback for all events and develop instructional design strategies to minimize the portions that receive negative feedback and build upon those portions that receive positive feedback. Participants report not having enough time to fully develop their ideas once they get into the “performing” stage. Perhaps we can spend a little less time with the Level 0 Innovation basics in the future. Also facilitators, who are our greatest asset in the design of the Innovation Skill Building and the Impact Collaborative, bring differing skill-levels and lived professional experiences to each event. We will need to take a closer look at facilitator role assignments and develop strategies for increasing their coaching and facilitation competencies.