

April 18, 2008

Dr. Mary Evans Sias, President
Office of the President
Hume Hall
Kentucky State University
Frankfort, KY 40601

Dear President Sias:

This letter and its attachments are sent you on behalf of the Kentucky State University Regional Advisory Committee (KSU-RAC). I am pleased to inform you that the Committee has completed its assignment to make recommendations for the University's Regional Stewardship Initiatives. We were honored to serve the University in this capacity.

Upon our appointment to the Regional Advisory Committee, we answered your call to action to examine critical issues facing the University's Area of Geographical Responsibility. We met on campus as a committee seven times after the initial meeting in September 2007. In addition, we spent considerable time and effort meeting with community leadership in each of Kentucky State University's Service County Areas. The purpose of these meetings was to seek input from community leaders regarding their perceived needs of their respective communities. In addition, we gathered their thoughts on a series of questions submitted to them prior to our visits. We also listened attentively to their recommendations to the University. The recommendations if implemented should help bring about positive change in several areas of need in each community. I am pleased to inform you that the leadership of each county was appreciative for the opportunity to discuss their needs. They expressed a commitment to work closer with Kentucky State University if given the opportunity.

Enclosed you will find the **KSU-Visions and Recommendations in Section III** of the Strategic Plan for Regional Stewardship. We look forward to supporting and working with you on behalf of the University as it moves forward.

Sincerely,



Mary Smith-Stowe, Ed. D.
Chair, KSU Regional Advisory Committee

Cc: Dr. James Chapman
Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Dr. Anne Butler, Director for Regional Stewardship

Kentucky State University

A Strategic Plan

For

Reaching its Highest Capacity

Through Engagement with the Region

Phase II Funding Request

Regional Stewardship

April 23, 2008

Executive Summary

In response to provisions set forth by the Kentucky Council of Post Secondary Education for the Regional Stewardship Initiative, Kentucky State University respectfully submits this Strategic Plan and Proposal for Phase II Funding.

Section I provides an introduction to the region and how it has developed. This section includes information from a variety of sources about the counties in the geographical area, and includes data analyses of demographic trends and past growth, as well as a snapshot of the education and economic conditions now facing communities within the region. The section is structured by eight themes developed by the Southern Regional Development Board in its analysis of rural communities.

Section II provides an overview of the vision and work of the Regional Stewardship Advisory Committee. This section contains a SWOT analysis – a review of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats to the region. The themes generated during this process were framed by four topical areas developed by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities: Innovative Economy, Livable Communities, Social Inclusion and Collaborative Governance.

Section III contains the Advisory Committee's recommendations. Section IV provides a budget accompanying the proposed strategic plan for the region.

Members of the University's Regional Advisory Committee have focused considerable time, expertise and wisdom in their pursuit to provide substantive recommendations to the University Administration. The Advisory Committee benefited from briefings and presentations by University administrators, faculty and staff during its first two meetings in September and October 2007. During its

orientation, each member was provided a copy of the University's Infrastructure Plan, a history of the University, including its revised mission, organizational structure, academic programs. The second meeting included a tour of the Research Farm.

The Committee has held six monthly meetings following the initial orientation. Sub-committees spent additional time planning and traveling to the various counties for meetings. These meetings helped to provide context for discussions and deliberations of the Advisory Committee. Their work carries the weight of experience that spans disciplines of education and business, science and technology, art and culture, community, civic and faith-based organizations to name a few of the areas included.

The result of the Advisory Committee's work, and the recommendations contained herein, provides a critical foundation as the University moves forward with its strategic initiatives, developing leaders, increasing levels of education, and guiding communities in their efforts to become more viable and sustainable in addressing 21st Century challenges. The following goals are proposed to build capacity for Kentucky State University.

1. Create a Center for Engaged Learning, Workforce and Community Development.
2. Organize an Interdisciplinary Institute for Mathematics, Science, Business, Technology, Journalism and Public Administration; and an Institute for Teaching and Learning.
3. Assist the region in developing livable communities with a focus on Environmental Stewardship.
4. Provide structured leadership development experiences for students and civic organizations, especially non-profit agencies.

I. Geographic Area of Responsibility



Kentucky State University's area of geographic responsibility consists of six historically rural counties located in the Bluegrass Region of Kentucky. Four of these counties are located in the inner Bluegrass section of the state (Anderson, Franklin, Henry and Scott) while the remaining two counties (Shelby and Owen) are located in the outer Bluegrass region. The inner Bluegrass section encircles approximately twenty-five miles around Lexington and central Kentucky. The outer Bluegrass region stretches another forty-five miles to counties in the northern portion of the state.

The cultural, natural and geographical landscape of the Bluegrass Region is unrivaled in its uniqueness. The area is particularly renowned for its unique geological heritage derived from a solid plate of limestone beneath the soil, and limestone palisades that line the waterways. Further, the area's natural heritage includes a wealth of other resources: rivers, streams, creeks, underground springs, wildlife habitats, flora and fauna combined with wooded areas that create unique natural ecological systems.

These natural features were attractive to early settlers to the region and continue to serve the region's citizens in meaningful ways. Minerals from the limestone deposits beneath the soil make the grass particularly fitted to the horse industry, and the quality of minerals found in spring waters helped to shape the Bourbon industry in the state. Also, the soil is conducive for growing tobacco, alfalfa, hay, corn and other small grains. Certainly tobacco and corn production have been major contributors to the state's economy.

The Kentucky River Watershed and some of its major tributaries flow through each of the area counties. The various water sources provided early transportation routes, as well as power for grist mills that enabled the processing of grains. Also, the water provided energy for lumber mills, and enabled the building of homes and other structures.

The river provided for stock watering, irrigation of crops and recreational outlets for the early settlers, as well. Moreover, natural heritage sites now serve as important settings for environmental education, such as the wooded 300- acre Crow-Chase property in Henry County under the management of Kentucky State University. Elkhorn Creek attracts from 50 to 75,000 visitors annually due to its unique fishing environment, and the multiple species of aquatic life found therein. Contemporary uses of these waterways include swimming, boating, camping and other outdoor activities.

Locally owned businesses developed early commercial centers around the waterways. These were designed initially to provide services to residents from the adjoining countryside, as well as travelers passing through the counties. Produce, hemp, tobacco, meat and other products from the area were shipped to markets outside the area, providing important sources of revenue.

Localized river trade eventually gave way to railroads that stretched across the region. For nearly one hundred years, 1850-1950, the region's towns and cities grew in size and economic stature. Vibrant downtown commercial districts flourished. Each of the communities developed a distinct historical character, along with stable economies. Although some physical evidence of once prosperous downtown districts remain in most communities, Main Streets have lost their vitality in these communities, doubtlessly, a reflection of the movement of business and service centers to outlying areas.

A decline in downtown areas represents more than just the relocation of business and service centers, however. Newcomers to the communities bring their own identities and cultural values, and they may lack an awareness of the prevailing historical ethos and values steeped in traditionally close-knit communities. Increased mobility, major changes in residential, employment, education and retail patterns, leaves little time for residents to groom newcomers to their communities about "their way of life".

The Southern Rural Development Center has tested and outlined eight thematic areas of challenges facing rural communities. The themes were published in the Center's January 2000 publication, *The Rural South: Preparing for the Challenges of the Millennium*. Since these themes are familiar ones in Kentucky State University's region of geographic responsibility, they serve as a framework for structuring an environmental scan of Kentucky State University's area of geographic responsibility.

An outline of the themes follow: 1) Changing demographics; 2) Agriculture in transition; 3) Managing natural and environmental resources; 4) Education and workforce issues; 5) Diversifying the economy; 6) Family and Child-Well-Being; 7) Health Care Quality and Access; and 8) Building Community in a Time of Policy Changes.

Changing Demographics

Population data reveals past growth rates and estimates. The data presented here is derived from U.S. Census Summary files, while the growth estimates are compiled by the Kentucky State Data Center at the University of Louisville. Based on the 2000 US Population Census, the six-county geographical area represents approximately 4% (N=158,803) of the state's total population. The following chart reflects population changes in the area counties 2000-2006.

Population Change 2000-2006, Kentucky and Area Counties			
	2000	2006	Change 2000-2006
	Total	Total	# %
Kentucky	4,042,285	4,206,074	163,789 4.10%
Anderson	19,111	20,885	1,774 9.30%
Franklin	47,687	48,183	496 1.00%
Henry	15,060	16,025	965 6.40%
Owen	10,547	11,428	881 8.40%
Scott	33,061	41,605	8,544 25.80%
Shelby	33,337	39,717	6,380 19.10%

Source: 2000 U.S. Census Bureau and Kentucky State Data Center

Places are identified as urban or rural by the US Census Bureau. For decades the line of demarcation between urban and rural was based on a singular formula, with a population of at least 2500 people defining urban spaces. All other areas were rural. The urban-rural definition is now used in a variety of ways and the definition continues to evolve. For instance, the United States Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service uses the following size classifications to define non-metro *commuting zones* and *labor market areas*:

- Small town/rural: Population of largest place in the commuting zone labor market area was less than 5,000 in 1990.
- Small urban center: Population of largest place ranged from 5,000 to less than 20,000 in 1990.
- Large urban center: Population of largest place was at least 20,000 in 1990.

Still other government data sources incorporate several different terms in describing urban/rural spatial areas. Some of these are *micropolitan* areas, *metropolitan* statistical area and *non-metro* areas. Micropolitan areas have an average of 43,000-65,000 people in a county. Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSA) includes multiple counties.

Anderson County's population of 19,111 persons was in a land area of 202.67 square miles, an average of 94.3 people per square mile. Anderson County is considered 52% urban and 48% rural. For Franklin County, the population was 47,687, in a land area of 210 square miles. Franklin County is 73% urban and 27% rural. Henry County's population was 15,060, in a land area of 289.32 square miles, an average of 52.1 persons per square mile.

Both Henry and Owen Counties are primarily rural. Owen County's population was 10,547 with a land area of 352.14 square miles, an average of 30.0

people per square mile. Scott County's population of 33,061, in a land area of 284.72 square miles, averages 116.1 people per square mile. Scott County is 57% urban and 43% rural. Finally, Shelby County's population of 33,337 is spread over a land area of 384.19 square miles, averaging 86.8 people per square mile. Shelby County is 40% urban and 60% rural.

Currently, a slight majority, 51%, of Kentucky's residents live in the state's 85 rural counties. Kentucky's population growth is projected to increase by 45% in select counties by 2030. Shelby County and Scott County are among the fastest growing counties in the state, and those populations are expected to double by 2030. According to the Kentucky State Data Center, approximately 17.2% of the population increase in 2000 was attributable to new comers to the state, who were foreign born immigrants.

Franklin County is the only county among the six that fell below the state's average 4% rate of growth. Scott and Shelby Counties reflect the highest rate of growth, with Anderson and Owen each doubling the state average. The percentage increases in Scott and Shelby places those counties among the 10 fastest growing counties in Kentucky since 2000.

Population changes in the geographic area's county seats, and other incorporated sites, are reflected in this chart.

Geographic Area	2000-2006 # change	2000-2006 % change	July 1, 2006 Pop. Est.		Census
Campbellsburg city (Henry Co.)	10	0.014	715	705	705
Eminence city (Henry Co.)	30	0.013	2261	2231	2231
Frankfort city (Franklin Co.)*	-664	-0.025	27077	27722	27741
Georgetown city (Scott)*	2605	0.126	20685	18324	18080
Gratz city (Owen Co.)	6	0.063	95	89	89
Lawrenceburg city (Anderson Co.)*	642	0.066	9656	9074	9014
Monterey city (Owen Co.)	10	0.056	177	167	167
New Castle city (Henry Co.)*	12	0.013	931	919	919
Owenton city (Owen Co.)*	89	0.06	1476	1383	1387
Pleasureville city (Henry Co./Shelby Co.)	23	0.026	892	870	869
Sadieville city (Scott Co.)	41	0.135	304	263	263
Shelbyville city (Shelby Co.)*	909	0.083	10994	10094	10085
Simpsonville city (Shelby Co.)	126	0.09	1407	1283	1281
Smithfield city (Henry Co.)	2	0.019	104	102	102
Stamping Ground city (Scott Co.)	83	0.128	649	566	566
*County Seats					
Annual Estimates of the Population for Incorporated Places in Kentucky. Listed Alphabetically: April 1, 2000-July 1, 2006. Note: Change is calculated from Census 2000-July 1, 2006 estimate. Kentucky State Data Center.					

Sadieville, Stamping Ground and Georgetown, each located in Scott County, experienced growth rates higher than 12.50%. Shelbyville, Gratz, Monterey and Simpsonville also reflect a rate of growth higher than the 4.1% increase in the state's population during the period 2000-2006.

Women and girls represent 51% of Kentucky's population in the 2000 census (N=2,066,401) and they closely approximate 51% percent in the six-county geographic area of responsibility (N=81,198) as well.

Although the increases are small compared to other sections of the country, Kentucky is becoming more racially and ethnically diverse, with the largest increase accounted for among relatively new migrants to the state,

Hispanic and Latinos. Whites, historically and presently, comprise the greatest percentage of the population in both the geographical area of responsibility and throughout the Commonwealth. Kentucky's foreign born-population increased by 33.6% between 2000-2006.

Many of the newcomers are settling in rural areas and are less well educated than those who are migrating out of the areas. According to the 2007 *Kentucky KIDS COUNT Data Book*, an increase among immigrant families, although small at present, is creating a changing demographic picture for the child population in Kentucky. Between 2000 and 2005, the native-born child population, by race and ethnicity, declined for nearly every racial and ethnic group except for among immigrant families.

Population Change 2000-2006, African Americans by County				
	2000 Black	2006 Black	Change 2000-2006	
	Total	Total	#	%
Anderson	449	504	55	12.20%
Franklin	4,507	4,637	130	2.90%
Henry	505	563	58	11.50%
Owen	121	121	0	0%
Scott	1,783	2,240	457	25.60%
Shelby	2,981	3,251	270	9.10%

African Americans account for 7.3% of the State's population (N=259,994).

Hispanics or Latinos, number 59,951, and comprise 1.5% of Kentucky's population compared to 12.5% of the U.S. population. The following table reflects the Hispanic representation in Kentucky State University's geographic region:

Population Change 2000-2006, Hispanics by County				
	2000 Hispanic	2006 Hispanic	Change 2000-2006	
	Total	Total	#	%
Anderson	153	210	57	37.30%
Franklin	531	1,001	470	88.50%
Henry	339	435	96	28.30%
Owen	105	155	50	47.60%
Scott	1,783	2,240	457	25.6%
Shelby	2,981	3,251	270	9.10%

Survey of Population Census 2000 and The Kentucky State Data Center

The age structure of Kentucky's population is expected to shift significantly in the next 20 years due largely to generations of baby boomers reaching retirement age. Based on the 2000 U.S. Census, approximately 2.8 million of Kentuckians fall into the population grouping of age 25 years and older. The Kentucky State Data Center's projections hold that Kentucky will move from 28th to 12th place among states with a proportion of residents aged 60 or older, during the next two decades.

The "baby boomer" population differs greatly from previous retirees in that they either need to remain working to supplement their retirement income or they may choose to start another line of work after retiring, in order to remain active. Those who do not re-enter the workforce may look for volunteer opportunities that enable them to continue serving the community in which they live.

Agriculture in Transition

Agriculture represents a significant industry in Kentucky. According to the Kentucky Department of Agriculture, nearly one fourth of Kentucky's population owes its livelihood to agriculture. Work in agriculture is a draw to many of the Hispanic/Latino migrants to the region.

In 1997, over 91,198 farms were reported by the Department of Agriculture with an average size of about 153 acres. Five years later, 2002, the number of farms was reduced to 86,541. Approximately 47,000 acres of land per year are lost to development. Thus, small family farms are threatened not only by the increasing costs associated with operating a farm, but by residential and commercial development, as well.

A chart showing the number of farms, acres in farms and harvested crop land, for each of the six counties of interest to this report is in Appendix B. In 2002, Anderson had 28 fewer farms than in 1997. A decrease of 47 farms is noted for Franklin County in the same period. Henry County shows a decrease of 139 farms between 1997 and 2002. Owen County shows a decrease of 76 farms during the same period, and Scott County had 82 fewer farms in 2002. On the other hand, Shelby County shows a gain of 24 farms during the 1995-2002 Agricultural Census years.

Managing the Natural and Environmental Resources

Kentucky State University's area of geographic responsibility contains abundant natural resources. Its land and waters are unique geologically; they serve the nearly 158,000 citizens, as well as provide products and services for export to others outside the area, state and country. While these resources remain a Regional asset as a whole, they are not inexhaustible. Current management practices render both land and water resources non-sustainable.

Water is the most significant of these natural assets. It nourishes a thin but productive karst topography. The Kentucky River and a small part of the Salt River basin drain the geographic area and provide most of the drinking water for citizens and livestock. Also, it is habitat for a diverse array of water-based aquatic and related species, offers a variety of tourism and recreational opportunities and businesses, and creates a corridor of green spaces that also

clean the air we breathe of carbon dioxide and other gases that contribute to global warming and resultant climate change.

Water management is at a crossroads. Both supply and quality are currently threatened by poor conservation of usage, detrimental land uses and locations, inadequate attention to implementing best practices for agriculture, construction and mining activities. Shortsightedness in maintaining storage infrastructure in the system of locks and dams on the Kentucky River, built by the Corps of Engineers over the last 175 years, creates a very serious problem, as does growth accompanied by a lack of planning to properly balance growth within a sustainable natural resource base. In short, our 'way of life' needs to change in significant ways.

Land use is a major contributor to the stress on water. Such decisions are rarely made with sufficient consideration given to impacts and sustainability, particularly those beyond the county line. Land is the only natural resource which is subject to management by local government. The state and federal governments have authority over water and air issues; but land is largely a local decision. Yet, the impacts of such decisions are often felt beyond the local area.

For instance, many times a development located within one county preempts, predetermines or even adversely affects the ways land is used across the boundary. Examples are major transportation facilities, large commercial or industrial projects, or others that do not fit well with adjacent lands in another jurisdiction. Thus, current planning is piecemeal at best in this regard.

Natural resource management must become a shared responsibility between the county, local and state entities responsible for conservation. Lack of coordination has led to less than wise decisions on a regional or multi-jurisdictional level. A current example is the question of water supply, treatment and distribution among 14 Central Bluegrass water districts. This decision is

under the purview of local governments if the water vendor is a public agency; it involves the state Public Service Commission if the purveyor is a private firm. We have both involved in this area. With such a fractionalized system, its decisions are cumbersome at best.

The service area counties vary in their capacity to effectively represent the interests of their respective citizens under such a system. It is difficult enough to get similar entities to cooperate when providing services to citizens. In this case, the presence of the state may be a potential complicating factor.

Options to deal with these critical natural resource issues are limited. Either the state needs to provide a bigger share of the revenue stream to local governments, or empower more effective regional planning and implementation vehicles. Clearly, creative and collaborative solutions using existing research from the state’s higher education institutions should be a large focus in solving resource issues.

Education and Workforce Issues

The chart below shows a composite of the level of educational attainment in the geographic area.

	<u>Area Counties</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>US</u>
% with less than a high School diploma or equiv.	19.2%	25.9%	19.6%
% with high school diploma or equivalent	34.8%	33.6%	28.6%
% with some college but no degree	20.5%	18.5%	21.0%
% with associate’s degree	5.0%	4.9%	6.3%
% with bachelor’s degree or above	20.5%	17.1%	24.4%

The population of adults 25 and older with high school diplomas or equivalent, in Anderson, Scott and Shelby Counties, falls at 80% which is the national average. Henry County, with a ranking of 73% is slightly above the state ranking of 72%, and Owen County evidences the lowest rank with only 63% of its population of adults 25 yrs and older with high school diplomas or equivalency.

Even with increases in the high school graduation rate Kentuckians still have the challenge of increasing the number of college graduates who remain in the state. Ron Crouch, Director of the Kentucky State Data Center, observed recently at a Conference on Adult Learners in Lexington, KY that “our economy is changing and Kentucky is not prepared for the new knowledge economy.” Crouch is one in a long line of educators and politicians, business and labor experts in the state stressing the critical importance of Kentucky increasing substantially the level of education among the state’s population.

Moreover, these leaders place emphasis on increasing the number of graduates with science, technology, engineering and mathematic degrees. It is from these fields that new and innovative technologies hold the greatest promise for enhancing Kentucky’s economy and creating high paying jobs.

As the chart below reveals, the number of degree holders needed, within the Service county area is estimated at 6,383 for the area to match the national ranking.

Public high school graduates for the area in 2005	1,641
No. of students from this area who entered post-Secondary education in summer or fall 2005	1,412
No. of students from this area who earned An associate degree in 2005-06	169
No. of students from this area who earned a Bachelor's degree in 2005-06	552
No. of students from this area who earned a Bachelor's degree in science, technology, engineering Or mathematics in 2005-06	158
No. of students from this area who earned a graduate Or professional degree in 2005-06	240
Number of additional bachelor's degree holders needed	
<u>In this area for it to be at the US average</u>	<u>6,383</u>

Kentucky Council for Postsecondary Education, 2006-2007 County Profiles

ACT scores serve as an indicator of college readiness for high school students.

The following data reflects student performance on the ACT for 2005-06 in the geographical area.

College Readiness

	<u>Area</u>	<u>State</u>
Average ACT score	21.0	21.2
% under-prepared in:		
One or more subjects	44.1%	45.9%
Mathematics	36.0%	35.4%
<u>English</u>	<u>29.1%</u>	<u>28.6%</u>

Kentucky Council of Postsecondary Education, 2006-2007 County Profiles

Although the composite ACT score is near the state average, the relatively high percentage of students from the region's counties, who will need additional academic assistance in one or more subjects, signals a need for pre-college intervention in order for the students to have successful collegiate experiences in the Mathematics and English subject matter.

Acknowledging these trends, along with other challenges and opportunities posed by the demands of the 21st century for highly educated citizens, and realizing that the changing demographics of Kentucky's population requires that the regional institutions provide opportunities for a wider range of students, Kentucky State University's President began a Summer Academic Bridge Program, in 2005, to help entering freshman build math, reading and writing skills in advance of their first semester of college level course work. From the 2005-2007 cohort groups, persistence rates from the first year to the second year was 85%, so these efforts yield great promise for increasing retention through graduation.

Also, the President initiated a collaborative partnership with Frankfort's Elkhorn Middle School during the summer of 2007 for purposes of increasing student achievement. This initiative will continue in subsequent summers as the students made impressive gains in their reading and verbal skills.

Recent Labor force data suggests strongly that rural Kentucky is still a place of many low-skill, low-wage industries and service providers. A study conducted by Bluegrass Tomorrow in 2006 shows that "retail trade is the primary engine of economic growth" within Central Kentucky. This study points out further that since Toyota located in Georgetown in 1986, the Hamburg Place shopping center in Lexington is the largest new job center.

Diversifying the Rural Economy

Counties such as Anderson, Franklin, Henry, Owen, Scott and Shelby are becoming more socially and economically diverse, and most are trying to find suitable means of diversifying their economic base. Several emerging trends in the geographic area of responsibility point to progress. The three largest cities are located near major metropolitan areas and experienced healthy growth rates over the past two decades. However, population growth that is not balanced by growth in the economy further compounds the challenges these communities face. For instance, they must continue to deliver services such as water and waste management along with emergency services. Yet, their revenue is limited to property and payroll taxes that have remained static for decades. The lack of additional revenue prevents the maintenance of healthy financial reserves and does not allow for investments sufficient to increase service expansion.

Georgetown, Lawrenceburg and Shelbyville are communities that have been major stakeholders in two of the state's most important industries, horses and bourbon. Moreover, these communities are positioning to attract small, knowledge-based companies. Access to good highways has yielded significant advantages to these communities in their efforts to recruit high-tech and similar operations. Yet, a major challenge now facing the elected officials in these communities is a dependency on low property valuation rates and payroll taxes to support the growing demand for municipal services as new residents move into the communities.

As the costs of land and services spiral upwards, the advantages of the areas, relatively low cost land, labor and utilities are disappearing. Economic growth is not keeping pace with increases in the population. Infrastructures, including state of the art technological advances are lagging. Most, indeed, all of

the areas are experiencing leadership voids – that is, they do not have a group of upcoming leaders that range in age from 26 to 55 years.

City and county officials acknowledge a need for help in defining and developing alternative economic strategies. These localities are barely able to maintain the real cost of providing public services to its citizens, as well as those in the county as a whole. This is partially due to the limited sources of revenue that do not keep pace with inflation. Such a reality creates an environment that is non-sustainable for several reasons. Frankfort lost 450 jobs during one month in January 2005, when a couple of automobile suppliers closed. This immediately impacted payroll taxes for the city. The trend towards increasing employment opportunities to a service economy also makes funding basic services an annual challenge.

Family and Child Well Being

In 2000 there were 61,371 households in the six-county area of geographic responsibility. The average household size was 2.3 people. Families made up 71 percent of the households. This figure includes both married-couple families (56 percent) and other families (15 percent). The other families category consisted of a male householder, no wife present (N= 2,380) and a female householder, no husband present (N=6,716).

Non-family households made up 29 percent of all households in the six-county area. Most of the non-family households were people living alone, but some consisted of people living in households in which no one was related to the householder. Approximately eighty percent of the households received job-related earnings while 16 percent received retirement income or Social Security. The average income from Social Security was \$12,962. These income sources are

not mutually exclusive, as some farm households received income from more than one source, including off-farm employment or other businesses.

Poverty rates are spread out among fifteen percent of the people. Approximately 20% of children under 18 yrs. were below the poverty level, compared with 10 percent of people 65 years old and over. Ten percent of all families, and 34 percent of families with a female householder and no husband present, had incomes below the poverty level. The level of children and families eligible for participation in school lunch programs is another high indicator of poverty rates in the region.

Health Care Quality and Access

In September 2007, the Kentucky Institute of Medicine released a new report ranking the health of each Kentucky County. The report, *The Health of Kentucky: a County Assessment*," used a framework consisting of 25 items that were given equal ranking from 1 (best) to 120 (worst) as a measure of the county's health status compared to other counties. The measures were grouped under five categories: Behavioral and Social Factors, Demographics, Health Access, Health Outcomes and Cancer Death Rates.

The report concluded that "in general, Kentucky is a healthy place to live and work" and that "many of the health problems in the state are because of poor lifestyle choices, which lead to otherwise preventable diseases and premature deaths."

Clearly there are benefits the citizens living in the region receive from the small, close knit communities. Within Kentucky State University's geographical area of responsibility, Anderson County received a rank of 4, and was included among the top ten healthiest Kentucky counties. Scott and Shelby County made the top twenty healthiest counties with rankings of 14 and 19 respectively.

Rankings for the remaining three counties varied from Henry County at 26, Franklin at 35 and Owen at 40.

In the area of behavioral and social factors, the report found smoking continues to pose a major risk factor with cancer, diabetes, stroke, cardiovascular and respiratory illness positively correlated to smoking. Obesity and lack of physical activity, oral health, motor vehicle deaths and drug arrests were areas in which Kentucky's rankings are worse than the national average. The same rankings holds true for each of the six counties in Kentucky State's area of geographic responsibility.

Under the demographic measures selected for study, the researchers note that high school graduation rates and per capita income remain formidable challenges for Kentucky. People with higher education levels and higher income levels are likely to be more engaged in preventive healthcare measures.

The counties in this region face the need to attract additional health care providers, as is the case in most rural areas.

Building Community in a Time of Policy Changes

Perhaps the challenges facing the area's small communities are best summarized by Michal Smith-Mello, who, in a paper entitled *Reclaiming Community, Reckoning with Change* (Kentucky Long-Term Policy Research Center, 2002) posits that "Contemporary rural Kentucky is characterized by demographic flux, economic realignment and persistent disparities that complicate and frustrate the pursuit of prosperity." Education and income levels are two of the persistent disparities addressed by Smith-Mello. One of every five rural Kentuckians is poor, compared with one of 8 urban residents.

Doubtlessly, some of the challenges facing rural counties and communities may stretch beyond the capacity of the area communities to control,

such as when a major industry decides to relocate from the area. Yet, other challenges can be successfully addressed by collective action, citizens working and deliberating together on issues and opportunities across county lines.

A regional approach for addressing twenty-first century challenges has been tried, tested and proven to work well for counties in Northern Kentucky. An equally effective and adaptable approach to planning used by the group, Bluegrass Tomorrow, in Central Kentucky has worked equally well. The concept of regional planning can range from small interpersonal relationships to region-wide networks. Such networks can result in partnerships formed between citizens and neighboring towns and may open the door to a regional vision by people in two or more areas who are experiencing many of the same challenges to sustainable development.

II. Regional Stewardship Advisory Committee

A Regional Stewardship Advisory Committee was appointed by President Mary Evans Sias during July 2007. Invitational letters requesting service on the committee were sent to 46 people throughout the region. Affirmative responses were received from 36 individuals (See listing in Appendix A). The Advisory Committee held its first meeting in September 2007 and continues to meet on a monthly basis. The 36-member committee consists of individuals with a wealth of experience in education and business, technology and innovation, civic and state government agencies, faith-based and community organizations, KSU faculty, administrators and staff. The Committee is well balanced along the lines of ethnicity and gender and includes residents of the geographical area of responsibility. The members divided into six-subcommittees, each assigned to one of the six counties. The Committee has as its mission:

To complement the mission and work of Kentucky State University by providing recommendations to the University about the region and its needs; engaging with the communities within the area; and by enhancing increased collaboration between the University and its many stakeholders.

The principles underlying regional stewardship initiatives are important ones both for their intrinsic value, and because they can be leveraged and serve as a launching pad for taking the University to new levels of quality and reputation. With this principle as a guide to facilitate its work, the committee elected and operates with a chair, co-chair and recording secretary. It approved a set of guidelines that provides structure and consistency of membership. To establish continuity, initial members were appointed to a two-year term with staggered appointments made thereafter. Administrative work for the committee is facilitated by the Office of Regional Stewardship and Public Engagement. The Committee's vision is reflected in the following:

The Advisory Committee envisions Kentucky State University as an essential partner in the civic, social and economic well-being of the region it serves. Area stakeholders recognize the University as a major contributor to the local and regional economy, as an employer of personnel from local and surrounding areas, and through retail spending by its faculty, staff and students. Further, the University is recognized for its contributions to the cultural life of the area and for its intellectual capital that benefits the region through applied and basic research and public service activities.

The Advisory Committee envisions that engaged learning complements the creative, analytical, critical thinking and problem solving skills that are intrinsic to strong liberal arts curricula and research-driven instruction. The strengthening and expansion of engaged learning will provide KSU students and faculty with exciting new opportunities for the University and the communities it serves.

Chief among the University's strengths are its proximity to the state capital and the historic district of Frankfort; its diverse enrollment; its reputation for producing successful graduates who stay connected to the campus through the alumni network; its strong advocacy for access and service; and its premise that any student can be successful with a strong work ethic and dedication to their studies. These assets position the university to provide its faculty and students with high-quality experiential learning and civic engagement collaborations. By bringing all our resources to bear, graduates will leave the campus armed as solid academic citizens prepared for life-long, active-learning and leadership in a global economy.

As a framework for gathering information about the geographical area of responsibility, the Advisory Committee conducted a SWOT Analysis to determine what the committee members' value about the area, and their knowledge about the area's strengths, weaknesses, challenges and opportunities. This process was repeated when sub-committee members traveled to their respective counties to meet with local officials. Prior to meeting with officials,

each was sent a survey of 12 Principles for Community Building developed by the NewCities Institute.

County and local educational and elected leaders are responsible for a wide array of duties. For example, they oversee projects as diverse as education and planning functions, maintenance of county roads and tax collections, emergency services and disaster relief, water and sanitation services, zoning and physical growth issues, and the operation of local law enforcement, in addition to numerous other public services.

In recognition of their knowledge of the counties, and their pivotal and significant roles as community leaders, Kentucky State's Regional Advisory Committee made a decision to meet with these leaders, acquire their perception of the need in their counties, and to start discussions about the desire of Kentucky State University to become more engaged in addressing problems confronting the region.

The NewCities Institute principles were to be used to structure the meetings with subcommittees. The results were compiled and used as a basis, along with environmental scans and demographic information, for making recommendations to the University for New Strategic Initiatives, and partnerships in the geographical areas of responsibility. A summary of the SWOT Analysis follows:

SWOT Analysis of Kentucky State University's Area of Geographical Responsibility

Anderson County

Strengths

- Distilleries and Farms

- Subdivision Development

- Highway 127 Corridor – Access, between 2 major highways

- BCTCS – Anderson Co. Technical College expansion

Positive reception to KSU – Big Read efforts
High percentage of students who graduate from high school
High percentage of students who score high on the ACT

Weaknesses

Lack of access to cultural events
Lack of cultural diversity
Lack of human services – residents have to come to Frankfort
Don't appear to embrace diversity

Opportunities

Residential & business growth
Proximity to larger communities
Lower tax rate encourages business and residential growth
Ample Land for development

Threats

Rural flavor – may deter more cultural diversity
Perceived as somewhat territorial

Shelby County

Strengths

Land
Location
Diversity
Public Schools
Growth
Primary care
Community organizations
Transportation infrastructure
Available jobs
Potential KSU students
Community college
Shopping
Above average incomes

Weaknesses

Growing fast, unmanaged
Adequate affordable housing
Inadequate infrastructure
Environmental Management
Inclusion of immigrant children in schools
Pregnant women must travel outside the area for child birth

Opportunities

- Rural nature-natural resource
- Point for development (bridge to metro buffer)
- Economic development opportunities
- Destination for shopping and tourism
- Model community potential (economic development, diversity, etc.)

Threats

- “Unbridled exuberance”
- People who do not want change/to go out of comfort zone
- Not addressing immigrant issue as a community development issue, public safety, etc.
- Look west at Louisville, not east at Frankfort

Scott County

Strengths

- Location
- Vicinity to UK, Georgetown, Capital
- Toyota
- History and museums
- Tobacco and horse industry
- Local leadership
- Population
- School system
- Local recreational infrastructure
- Diversity and Tolerance
- Strong private sector
- Educational foundation – early childhood, continuing adult ed., vocational, language/culture, environmental
- Natural resources
- Underground Railroad Institute
- Youth programs/center
- Pool of Volunteers

Weaknesses

- Water supply inadequate
- Single source industry
- Reliance on payroll and property taxes
- Encroachment of urban sprawl
- Few affordable housing units, and less low income housing
- Too many chain fast-food and retail stores
- Tend to be parochial thinking

Poverty
Ethnic neighborhoods need restoring

Opportunities

Potential for balanced growth
International outreach
Elkhorn Creek facilities access
Small satellite communities vs. sprawl
Willingness to partner
Community college offerings

Threats

Water crisis
Sprawl
Less disposable income
Traffic
Pollution – habitat loss
Dependency on Toyota
Sustainability
Non-regional perspective
Labor force too small
Energy inadequate

Franklin County

Strengths

Kentucky State University
State government
Diverse community
High/Medium Income, full-employment
Cultural community
Kentucky River
Variety of Religious institutions

Weaknesses

Separation between KSU and local community
Communication around the region
Disconnect between KSU and the community
State Capital overshadows many of local educational resources
Commuter community of non-resident, state employees who use and require services but do not take an interest or investment in the city
Loss of talent, money, and time – as local residents move to the urban cities, invest in their resources

Need for balanced news media – more news outlets/more balanced coverage

Opportunities

Grant Funding – Federal sources, KSU, state government expertise

Better marketing of KSU and Franklin County

Expansion – population base/economy

Strengthen/Improve environment

To minister to incarcerated youth and help them to become good citizens/local residents

Partnership between business community and KSU centered around stewardship

Partnership possibilities with United Way, Non-profit sector, etc. offer great promise

Threats

External forces will change the historic mission of KSU from 4-year land grant and perceived fear of becoming a 2- year community college

Environmental – to our natural resources

Loss of or lack of sufficient state funding for stewardship

Henry County

Strengths

Good living conditions

Lake Jericho – potential for tourism

Crowe Chase Natural Reserve (KSU – environmental education center)

Potential for Growth – low population

Proximity to Highway 71 – Transportation Dept

Great elementary and high school systems

Good nursing homes in New Castle and Eminence

Weaknesses

Lack of higher educational facility – no nearby community college in the region

Lower employment opportunities – larger employer state and dept. of transportation

Median income is \$37, 263 per household in the county

Average household size is 2.57 and average family size is 2.97

Opportunities

Water resource – Lake Jericho

Tourism – an extension of General Butler

Technical education; basic education

Medical facilities

Cattle and Horse industry growth
Proximity to Jefferson Co. Louisville could influence regional growth
Growth of cottage industries: grapes, winery, llamas, cattle and horses,
moles and goats

Threats

Population (low) 15, 060, 5,844 households, 4,330 families, 6,381 housing
units
Health and medical facilities
Agricultural collapse
Weak economic base
Weak employment opportunities
Weak agricultural production due to emphasis on tobacco production

Owen County

Strengths

“Outside” Money Sources (Winery)
Land for new development
Recently completed community visions study
Recently completed highway improvements
Attractions in adjoining county bringing traffic through Owen County
Growth in organic farming interest

Weaknesses

Resistance to change
Lack of high speed internet
Isolation
Low education attainment
Most workers are employed outside of the community

Opportunities

Potential for alternative agricultural business
Potential for growth of cottage industries
Encourage 1st generation college education

Threats

Loss of rural land to development
Natural disaster (flooding)
Gap between educated/employed and uneducated/un-employed is
widening
Lack of employment opportunities
Environmental stewardship
High teen pregnancy rate

What we heard from the Community Leaders

- A need exists for benchmarking costs of public services with comparable size counties; finding sources of revenue to subsidize services.
- Generate information to help with decision making with respect to land use and the development of a growth strategy; the University would be seen as a neutral party and could help with having difficult conversations with the various constituents; KSU could develop data and help explain the threat of over-reliance on a single industry and what would happen to the community if the doors were to close.
- Need help in identifying better ways to communicate with community residents regarding the economic plight of the community; and for involving newcomers into the life of the community. These residences live in Georgetown but leave the city for work, shopping, etc.
- Need help developing strategies for curbing waste and with management of natural resources;
- Expand access to capital; need for diversifying the economy; attracting small industries and moving away from over concentration of low-paying retail services and fast-food establishments.
- Increase education and financial literacy among k-12 populations; Need greater presence of KSU in the counties; offer classes in the counties. Help develop civics education and leadership development experiences for all age groups.
- Help to increase basic skills at all levels, including increasing adult literacy and at-risk students; these students need college preparation and advice; math and reading are common problems facing employers and retarding entrance to college.
- Recruit, retain and develop young leaders to stay in the region.
- Need University help in providing arts and cultural education; Create a regional arts center; arts are under-funded in the area.

- Downtown areas are dying out; these need to be rejuvenated to attract more of the newcomers to the communities;
- Need energy audit assistance and assistance with pollution issues;
- Search for clean industries to locate in the area. Need another Industrial development area for expansion and recruitment of high tech industries.
- Need recreation outlets developed; bike and walk trails to help with obesity and other health issues; Consider a wellness coalition.
- Need infrastructure repairs in building housing community education programs;
- Stop the brain drain by encouraging K-State students to stay in the area;
- Help bring KSU a more positive image by retaining stability in the presidency;
- Identify and share KSU untapped resources for the area; local governments can use information and assistance with proposal writing for grants;
- Offer KSU courses in communities; offer training for professional development to companies wanting to upgrade their employees skill levels.
- Help with small farm development and diversifying agricultural base;
- Workforce development issues including English training and improving basic skills in math and communications;
- Get more students involved in communities through internships. Create programs to help students learn about running a city, getting involved with state government agencies, etc.

III. Recommendations

The counties in Kentucky State University's geographic area of responsibility are confronting difficult challenges. To structure its recommendations, the advisory committee drew upon the four principles developed by The American Association of State Colleges and Universities' Framework for Regional Stewardship. These four principles helped the Committee to narrow down themes from the SWOT Analyses. The four principles are: Innovative Economy (preparing people and places to succeed); Livable Communities (Preserving and creating places to live and work); Social Inclusion (Ensuring that everyone participates and shares responsibility); and Collaborative Governance (Finding Creative Ways to Govern.)

Also, the Committee's recommendations are based on contributions from community leaders, regional stakeholders, and the best of the best practices for institutionalizing the public engagement mission as defined by the Kellogg Commission, the Association of American Colleges and University, and Kentucky's Council for Postsecondary Education, to name a few.

Best practices include the development of centers and institutes that organize knowledge around problems rather than around disciplines; apply research to help better understand problems, and develop pilot or demonstration projects to test new methods for addressing challenges; provide area-wide public educational programs designed to deepen public understanding of 21st century challenges that communities and educational institutions face; draw upon the

University's status to help build coalitions of community stakeholders in support of regional issues; provide a safe place for difficult public conversations and provide incentives and rewards to support public engagement and stewardship initiatives.

It is recommended that the University continue to build on its considerable strengths to challenge and support students and faculty to engage with the region in ways that encourage open dialogue and collaboration. The Advisory Council recommends new partnerships to support University, Regional and Commonwealth initiatives. By partnering with other institutions and organizations, the University can strengthen its own presence and leadership position within the region and provide new and expanded opportunities and resources for students in pre- K-12 levels.

It is strongly recommended that the University aggressively market its academic programs and resources widely within the geographical area. Also, we urge that the placements for student teachers be increased throughout the six county service area. This provides an opportunity to demonstrate the quality of teachers produced by the University, and it may help stem brain drain if students are hired within the area schools. Such will reflect positively on the University.

At a time when county, municipal and state budgets and resources are under severe duress, these locales can benefit from the University's intellectual capacity through new collaborative partnerships and by strengthening numerous, long-term partnerships. The following strategic initiatives are recommended as priorities to enhance University and Regional Stewardship practices. The recommendations are listed in order of priority:

A. Establish a Center for Engaged Learning, Workforce and Community Development.

This Center, housed within the Regional Stewardship Office, will serve as a coordinating body for the strategic initiatives that follow. The initiatives are designed to engage each part of the University.

1. Innovative Economy –preparing people and places to succeed

Establish a pilot Workforce Development Technical Assistance Institute to assist Regional Businesses in increasing skill levels of their employees, and to apply for the American Council on Education (ACE) College Credit Recommendation Service (CREDIT). This initiative includes assisting businesses in the process of transferring organizational training requisites into college bearing credits and help to raise educational attainment in the region. This activity will be carried out by the Director, Office of Regional Stewardship and Associate Provost, Outreach and Expanded Programs. Contacts with businesses will be made in person and through surveys to determine interest and to set up a collaborative partnership to get the project started.

Provide workshops and seminars designed to prepare students for the workforce. Increase engaged learning and internship experiences for students. This activity will be undertaken with faculty and graduate student participation.

At the county level, encourage the formation of networks of community leaders, educators, elected officials, business owners and service providers to facilitate entrepreneurship education, create incubators and to identify funding sources for start-up businesses.

Provide seminars and public forums designed to acquaint communities with the advantages of using a collaborative, regional approach to development;

Continue to build on STEM area programs. Develop an interdisciplinary institute, formed through the departments of mathematics, science, business, technology, journalism and public

administration. This Institute would have a two prong focus: 1) an aggressive agenda for increasing the numbers of area students who enter and graduate in these disciplines. 2) Provide consultation services for local city and county municipalities in areas that will help them increase efficiency in the delivery of public services; make informed decisions on land use practices and develop strategies for growing their economies.

2. Education and Engaged Learning. Develop a pilot partnership with regional school districts to assist in preparing students at the pre-college level to live and compete in a global society. This includes offering site-based AP classes for students in the high schools where such a service is requested. It is also recommended that site based instruction be extended to other locales in the region.

Develop an Institute on Teaching and Learning where Education faculty, Liberal Studies students, and staff in Academic Support Services, as well as KSU students in other disciplines, work with a designated liaison officer, such as curriculum coordinators, to identify teachers and students in need of academic support. Create academic teams to assist local schools with increasing student performance at the Pre-K-12 levels.

3. Livable Communities. Capitalize on Environmental Stewardship. Maximize the existing Environmental Education initiatives through the schools. Through its Environmental education courses and centers, and the strengths of faculty and staff engaged in an array of sustainable agriculture and research, the University is well positioned to address natural resource and stewardship issues articulated by city and local officials. This provides an opportunity for the University to develop an innovative niche in Environmental Studies, and thereby extend its scope and impact in the region. Therefore, we recommend and support the on-going work in the area along with the development of a graduate program in Environmental Education.
4. Collaborative Governance. Based on studies that show people with some leadership training tend to earn higher incomes, we recommend that the University create more structured leadership development courses, workshops and programs for students, as well as communities in need of professional development activities for staff in non-profit organizations.

Activities under this area will provide students with engagement in American Democracy and other Civic Engagement Projects.

5. Social Inclusion is incorporated through each of the recommendations. The University has extensive resources in the area of diversity that can help address issues communities may face in this area of concern.

There is recognition that the University has a long history of student teacher placements in schools around the region and success with its graduates. However, many students from the region enter colleges and universities without the requisite skills in reading, writing, math, science and intercultural interactions. The recommended Institutes could provide professional development activities, as well as serve as academic coaches in helping to increase student performance. The partnership could provide opportunities for faculty and students to engage, along with the schools, in the latest approaches in pedagogy, conduct research on curriculum and other topics, such as test-taking, time-management and related skill development. Helping students generate new knowledge and publishing the works could extend the University's reach in an area where it has considerable strengths.

Expand marketing efforts in the region as the Committee perceives poor marketing as a major weakness of the University. It is recommended that the University begin to see the region as an extension of its campus. By providing broad exposure and profiling the University and alumni contributions to the region, the University can capture wider recognition across the region. Kentucky State University is in an ideal location for area students looking for an affordable, high quality education.

As a part of this process, we recommend that recruiting in the regional schools become a high profile activity and that the University engage in partnerships with local groups and organizations around the region to

increase its visibility in these areas. This could include participating in festivals, school activities and other annual events in each of the counties.

IV. Budget Narrative

In consideration of the University's current capacity, and a desire to expand stewardship activities where they may serve the best good, the

accompanying budget allows for: One full time Coordinator position for the Center for Engaged Learning, Workforce and Community Development. This position will be responsible for working with faculty to develop expanded service learning courses, and to place students in partnership activities around the region. The position will be housed in the Regional Stewardship Office and will work closely with the Associate Provost, Outreach and Expanded Programs in developing specific professional development experiences for businesses, non-profits and other agencies seeking to upgrade skills of their employees.

Two-half time positions are designated for development and coordination of an Institute in Mathematics, Science and Technology, and an Institute in Education for Teaching and Learning. In addition to working with their faculty colleagues, both positions will serve as coaches for activities developed in the region K-12 schools and will occupy a split appointment between their academic department and the Regional Stewardship Office. These positions will be responsible for collecting data related to their work in K-12 schools for assessment and evaluation purposes.

Four graduate Assistant positions are included to work with the Office of Regional Stewardship and the Center for Engaged Learning, Workforce and Community Development. Working under the supervision of their major professors, these assistants will help provide technical services requested by communities. A small work-study budget is incorporated to engage students with work needed to support these activities.

The general operating funds will allow coverage of basic costs for service delivery and the use of honorariums for workshops and public programs.

Budget Summary

ORGANIZATION:	Kentucky State University
PROJECT TITLE:	Regional Stewardship -Phase II
PROJECT DIRECTOR:	Dr. Anne Butler
BUDGET PERIOD:	July 1,2008- June 30, 2009

SALARIES:

Coordinator/Center for Engaged Learning	75,000.00
Half-time Educ. Faculty	30,000.00
Half-time coor. Institute Math/Science	30,000.00
Admin Asst	20,000.00
Salaries	155,000.00
Benefits -28% total salaries	43,400.00
Total Salaries	198,400.00
* Graduate Assistantships 2 - MBA Program @ 10k each	20,000.00
1-GA Envir. Stewardship	10,000.00
1 GA Computer Technology	10,000.00
Student Hourly Wages	5,000.00
Total Personnel	<u>243,400.00</u>

*StudentWages/Grad assistantships are not charged benefits

GENERAL OPERATING

STEWARDSHIP ACTIVITIES	56,600
TRAVEL	15,000.00
COMMUNICATION	5,000.00
FOOD	3,000.00

Services	33,600.00
-----------------	------------------

Grand Total	300,000.00
--------------------	-------------------

Appendix A

Regional Advisory Committee Members

Regional Stewardship Advisory Committee

Dr. Patricia Bacon
Retired Education Administrator
Frankfort, KY

Mr. Doug Bates
Realtor/Broker/former Mayor
Eminence, KY

Mr. Gary Brown
Retired Vice President (IBM)
Versailles, KY

Ms. Harrie L. Buecker
Superintendent
Franklin County Schools

Ms. Maria Bush
Retired Technology Specialist
Frankfort, KY

Ms. Eileen Cackowski, Director
Community Volunteer & Services
Cabinet for Health & Family Services
Frankfort, KY

Mr. Nathaniel Carter
Retired Teacher
Versailles, KY

Kimberly Clay
Director of Cultural Heritage
KY Department of Tourism
Frankfort, KY

Ms. Deborah Clayton, Commissioner
Dept. of Commercialization &
Innovation
Cabinet for Economic Development
Frankfort, KY

Mr. Ed Council
Owner Canoe Kentucky
Frankfort, KY

Mr. Roland Dale
Farmer
Shelbyville, KY 40065

Ms. Mary Ellen Garrison
Extension
New Castle, KY

Dr. Robert (Sandy) Goodlet
City Councilman
Lawrenceburg, KY

Mr. Tommy Haynes
Retired Teacher
Frankfort, KY

Mr. John Higginbotham, Superintendent
Cable/Telecommunications
Frankfort Plant Board

Ms. Carmen Inman, Executive Director
Frankfort Area Chamber/Commerce

Mrs. Joy Jeffries, Executive Director
Franklin County Tourism

Mr. David Neville
Farmer/Partner, Neville Technologies
Pleasureville, KY

Ms. Misty Seitz
Director, the King Center
Frankfort, KY

Ms. Kim Lady Smith
Former Director, KY Oral History
Commission
Frankfort, KY

Dr. Mary L. Smith-Stowe
Retired Education Administrator
Frankfort, KY

Rev. Dr. Robert A. Strode
Pastor, St. John AME Church
Frankfort, KY

Mr. Wendell Thomas, Alumnus
Retired Human Resources
Smithfield, KY

Mrs. Lori Meadows
Executive Director KY Arts Council
Frankfort, KY

Dr. Marilyn K. Troupe
Division Director
Education Preparation, EPSB
Frankfort, KY

Mr. James Wallace
Executive Director
KY Historical Society Foundation
Frankfort, KY

Mr. Michael D. Dailey
Educational Administrator
KY Department of Education
Frankfort, KY

Mrs. Patricia Vasant
Executive Director
Frankfort Arts Council

Campus Members:

Dr. Charles Bennett, Dean
College of Math, Science, Tech. & Health

Dr. Harold R. Benson
Director, Land Grant Program

Ms. Gae Broadwater
Land Grant Program

Dr. Kazi Javed, Professor & Director
Environmental Education

Ms. Irma Johnson
Educational Outreach

Dr. Gashaw Lake, Dean
College of Professional Studies

Dr. Sam Oleka, Dean
College of Arts, Social Sciences &
Interdisciplinary Studies (CASSIS)

Ms. Sue Stamper
Communications Skills Center

Appendix B

Farms in the Region

**Kentucky Department of Agriculture
Kentucky Agricultural Statistics and Annual Report**

Anderson

Census	Farms	Acres in Farms	Harvested Cropland
1997	776	89,736	20,457
2002	748	83,857	21,927

Frankfort

Census	Farms	Acres in Farms	Harvested Cropland
1997	736	85,050	21,005
2002	689	82,056	20,671

Henry

Census	Farms	Acres in Farms	Harvested Cropland
1997	1,022	150,585	45,037
2002	883	141,592	47,967

Owen

Census	Farms	Acres in Farms	Harvested Cropland
1997	864	153,880	31,168
2002	788	154,787	34,653

Scott

Census	Farms	Acres in Farms	Harvested Cropland
1997	930	148,264	39,138
2002	848	137,356	37,115

Shelby

Census	Farms	Acres in Farms	Harvested Cropland
1997	1,533	204,292	79,705
2002	1,557	201,667	89,373

Kentucky Data – Rank in the United States

Census	Farms	Acres in Farms	Harvested Cropland
1997	91,198	13,940,180	4,853,500
2002	86,541	13,843,706	4,978,994

Appendix C

American Association of Colleges and Universities

Regional Stewardship Graphic