

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 604

AC 008 751

AUTHOR Beisdorf, Heinz; And Others
TITLE Community Resource Development.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of
Agriculture at Cornell Univ.; State Univ. of New
York, Ithaca. Coll. of Home Economics at Cornell
Univ.
PUB DATE 5 Apr 68
NOTE 42p.; Report of Task Force
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.25 HC-\$2.20
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization, *Community
Development, *Community Resources, Financial
Support, Natural Resources, Personnel Needs, Problem
Solving, Program Content, Program Effectiveness,
Research Utilization, *Role Perception, *Rural
Extension, Social Change, Staff Improvement
IDENTIFIERS Cooperative Extension Service, Cornell University,
New York State

ABSTRACT

In New York State, Cooperative Extension's principal goal in community resource development is, through education, to increase the effectiveness in making and implementing public decisions concerning improvements in the quality and level of living of all people. Education and adaptive research are the two basic roles Extension will use to achieve that goal. The Task Force recommends, among other things, that: when practical, Extension faculty positions concerned with community resource development also involve research; the scope of Extension's program consist of four main categories--community organization and administration, community functions and services, natural resource utilization, and physical environmental improvement; the primary target clientele for the Cooperative Extension program in community resource development be key individuals and groups of community leaders who influence the community's future; regional specialists be used in identified metropolitan areas. (Author/NL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED0 44604

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE

COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

NEW YORK STATE

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION/1968.

15680

ED0 44604

Task Force Members

Heinz Biesdorf

Harold Capener

Joseph Carreiro

Natalie Crowe, Secretary

James Dewey

Robert Kalter

Ruth Klippstein

Frederick Kunz

James Preston, Chairman

Richard Ragatz

Bruce Wilkins

Task Force
on
Community Resource Development
New York State Cooperative Extension
New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics
Statutory Colleges of the State University of New York
at Cornell University
April 5, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Summary	1
II. Introduction	3
III. The Concept of Community Resource Development	5
IV. Trends and Situation in New York State	6
V. Cooperative Extension's Community Resource Development Program Evolution in New York State	11
VI. The Goal, Roles and Scope of the Cooperative Extension Program in Community Resource Development	13
VII. Cooperative Extension's Clientele in Community Resource Development	19
VIII. Organization and Staff Changes	20
IX. Staffing and Funding Needs	25
X. Cooperative Extension Relations with Other Units Agencies and Organizations	32
 APPENDICES	
Appendix A - Resource People	34
Appendix B - Planning-Programming-Budgeting-Systems	36
Appendix C - Center for Community Resource Development Organization Chart	38
Appendix D - Cooperative Extension and State University of New York	39

I. SUMMARY

Community resource development is a process whereby recognizable groups or individuals concerned with public improvement take action to establish and move toward the achievement of their desired goals and objectives through the recognition and utilization of all relevant resources. (pg.5)

Cooperative Extension's principal goal in community resource development is, through education, to increase group effectiveness in making and implementing public decisions concerning improvements in the quality and level of living of all people. Education and adaptive research are the two basic roles Extension will use to achieve that goal. (pg.13)

The Task Force believes Cooperative Extension has a significant contribution to make in the field under study. Recognition of and implementation of the necessary steps to carry out the following recommendation is deemed necessary if Extension in New York State is to become an influential institution in community resource development.

The Task Force recommends:

1. When practical, Extension faculty positions concerned with community resource development also involve research, with emphasis on adaptive research necessary for effective community resource development programs. (pg.15)
2. The scope of Cooperative Extension's program consist of four main categories -- community organization and administration; community functions and services; natural resource utilization; physical environmental improvement. (pg.16)
3. The primary target clientele for the Cooperative Extension program in community resource development be key individuals and groups of community leaders who influence the community's future. (pg.19)
4. Initially, one regional specialist be assigned to each of the following metropolitan regions -- Utica-Rome, Syracuse, Buffalo, Binghamton and two regional specialists for the New York City, Albany-Schenectady and Rochester regions. (pg.21)

5. The county association board of directors place the major program responsibility for community resource development with a division which has as its primary program, work with public decision makers on public problems. (pg.22)
6. A Center for Community Resource development be established at Cornell University in the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. (pg.23)
7. Special in-service educational programs be conducted for currently employed agents and regional specialists, who have or will assume program responsibility in community resource development. (pg.27)
8. Extension administration responsible for personnel recruitment develop new recruitment information and contacts, and design an active recruitment program appropriate to community resource development. (pg.27)
9. A minimum of 22, 7.5, and 14 man years (at county, regional, and college levels respectively), be added to community resource development efforts by 1972. (pg.30)
10. A minimum increase of 84 per cent in funding for community resource development programs by 1972. (pg.28)
11. Cooperative Extension give high priority to the establishment of working relations with the Continuing Education division of the State University of New York and at the various units throughout the State. (pg.32)
12. Cooperative Extension give high priority to the establishment of working relations with State agencies, including the Office of Planning Coordination. (pg.32)

II. INTRODUCTION

A. A. Johnson, former Director of Cooperative Extension, appointed the Task Force on Community Resource Development and requested that it: (1) Define the scope of community resource development; (2) Establish guidelines for Extension programming in the area; (3) Identify the resources available to Extension workers within the New York State Colleges of Home Economics and Agriculture, and Cornell University; (4) Identify the resources which would need to be acquired with suggestions about how these might be obtained, and (5) Establish guidelines for Extension organization to deal effectively with this area.

This report is the response of the Task Force to that charge. Community resource development is defined in the report and then certain factors in the State of New York which influence this process are cited. A review of Cooperative Extension's past role in this field is presented, followed by recommendations for future program direction. The report concludes with recommendations for changes needed in organizational staff and financial resources so that the Cooperative Extension program may be expanded and effectively related to community resource development.

The increasing opportunity for Cooperative Extension to contribute to community resource development has been recognized by several groups. A study of the New York State College of Home Economics recommended mission oriented programs including those in community resource development. 1/ A similar study of the New York State College of Agriculture specifically recommended that research and training in the environmental sciences and community resource development be increased to better manage the state's resources and minimize destructive effects on the environment. 2/

1/ The Final Report of the President's Committee to Study the College of Home Economics, New York State College of Home Economics, A Statutory College of the State University at Cornell University, 1966.

2/ The New York State College of Agriculture and the Next Quarter Century, New York State College of Agriculture, A Statutory College of the State University at Cornell University, 1966.

A recent task force report for the College of Agriculture calls for a significant increase in research by 1977 in the related fields of individual change, social psychology, social change, social problems, social organization, social institutions and demography. 1/

Recognizing the need for Cooperative Extension to determine its degree of involvement in community resource development, the Task Force submits this report as an important step forward in the decision to project a major program in this field.

The Task Force is appreciative of the cooperation and ideas provided by consultants (listed in Appendix A) and others who were consulted during the preparation of this report.

1/ A Human Resource and Community Research Program 1967-77, New York State College of Agriculture, Statutory College at Cornell University, July, 1967.

III. THE CONCEPT OF COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

Community resource development is a process whereby recognizable groups or individuals concerned with public improvement take action to establish and move toward the achievement of their desired goals and objectives through the recognition and utilization of all relevant resources. 1/

Community resource development is primarily concerned with group decisions and actions. Usually, it is only indirectly concerned with decisions of individuals regarding their personal and business affairs. The process is concerned with the effect group decisions and the implementation of community, social, economic and institutional programs have upon people and their environment. It is the process by which planned changes and adjustments are made and implemented.

The definition of community resource development derives from the following:

Community - one or more groups of people concerned with public improvement interacting through common interests, concerns, convictions or needs. Group composition will vary depending upon the nature of the problem(s) to be attacked. Such a community may be identified in terms of groups of people, units of government or on a geographic basis.

Resources - input factors (physical, including both natural and man-made; human and institutional) which may be used to fulfill community needs.

Development - the process of moving toward the achievement of community goals and objectives through the reasoned allocation and utilization of resources. The process includes: community self-analysis and definition of problems and potentials; establishment of goals and objectives; ascertaining alternative solutions to problems and means of realizing potentials; taking appropriate action, and evaluating that action.

1/ The concept of community resource development as defined is intended to state the general process as it exists in our society. The relationship of Extension to this process will evolve in the remainder of the report.

IV. TRENDS AND SITUATION IN NEW YORK STATE

A. Introduction

Two major factors affecting our society are urbanization and modernization.

The urbanization process refers not only to the increasing concentration of population in urban agglomerations, but also to the penetration of urban uses and users into rural areas. While the greatest amount of population will continue to be concentrated on a small percentage of the land, more and more urban-working persons will use the open country for a permanent residence on the urban fringe, for a seasonal dwelling, or for periodic recreation. Thus, the rural non-farmer, the absentee property owner, and the tourist-vacationer all increase the urban influence on rural areas. Even persons living in sparsely populated areas of the State will experience greater frequency of direct contact and involvement with the urban society.

The modernization process is the shift from a relative degree of community self-sufficiency and independence to one of relative dependency and loss of self-sufficiency. The typical community was built in an era now technologically outdated. The struggle for communities is to renovate, modernize and keep updated. Another aspect of the problem is the inability of communities to meet the rising expectations of all segments of the population.

Communities in transition may be referred to as being on a continuum depicting the small traditional village on one end and the large cosmopolitan community on the other.

An examination of the general status of New York State communities on this continuum illuminates some rather clear patterns. The advanced stages of urbanization are represented by the seven major metropolitan areas. 1/ Eighty per cent of the population of the State now reside in these areas. 2/ The small hamlets and villages on the other end of the continuum are isolated from the main transportation and communication links. These communities face a severe test of their ability to avoid

1/ Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, Binghamton, Utica-Rome, Albany-Schenectady and New York City.

2/ Demographic Projections for New York Counties, New York State Office of Planning Coordination, Albany, New York, July 1, 1966. (Unless otherwise noted, the following population data were also derived from this source).

obsolescence and maintain viable functions in the future. When working in community resource development, the community's place on the modernization continuum and its urbanization potential must be determined.

The projected doubling of New York State's population in the next half century must also be considered. The prospect of duplicating the present number of houses, cities and services is sobering for those associated with development strategy. The necessity of preparing for future regional growth and urban expansion is evident. Therefore, programs of community resource development are vitally needed.

B. The Changing Distribution of Population

The most evident fact regarding the changing distribution of the State's population is its increasing concentration within and around the seven major metropolitan areas. Growth has occurred not in the central core of these areas, but in the suburbs and the urban-rural fringe. In most cases the cores have experienced a loss of population due to physical decay and the accompanying social and economic problems. The majority of families with growing children seem to prefer a suburban location, but families on either end of their life cycle often prefer the amenities and conveniences of the central city. Also, urban renewal is becoming a positive force in the revitalization of some central cores. However, the vast majority of population growth in New York State will continue to be in the area surrounding the central city. By 1990, it is anticipated that over 20 million of the State's 23.4 million residents will be living within the seven metropolitan regions.

The anticipated rate of population growth may be higher in counties outside the seven formally defined Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas. (48 per cent versus 38 per cent).

Examination of those counties outside the SMSA'S reveals a dicotomy. First, and most important, are the counties adjacent to the SMSA. Not only are thousands of persons migrating from the urban core to the countryside, but thousands more are migrating inward to these areas from the more rural areas to have greater accessibility to urban employment and services. The present urban-fringe will realize a greater proportion of the future growth as the central cities and suburbs approach holding capacity.

The second category are counties distant from the seven metropolitan regions but which contain cities with populations of 20,000 - 50,000. Most of these counties have not shown spectacular growth in recent years, and some have exhibited distinct signs of distress. However, these counties are now influencing, and are likely

to continue influencing growth in areas immediately surrounding them. Influencing forces include new manufacturing, educational institutions, migration from the countryside, and easier commuting.

Counties without a major city or immediate access to one may anticipate only small gains or even losses in population. Over half of these counties can expect less than a 20 per cent population gain by 1990. Stagnation in such counties has complex causes. Communities acting as trade and service centers for surrounding agriculture in an earlier era have declined, along with the neighboring farm population. In some cases, the decline is spurred by farmers, like others, looking to larger centers as transportation improved, and trade and service requirements have become increasingly selective and complex. Other communities have experienced an exodus of a non-agricultural industry on which they depended heavily, such as a paper mill, textile mill, or resort hotel. In summary, the causes of declining growth are many, but they are generally related to lack of local willingness and/or capability to escalate on the modernization continuum.

On the agricultural scene, some 200,000 of New York State's 12 million acres of farmland go out of commercial farm use each year. ^{1/} It has been estimated that 15,000 of these acres are idled because they become interspersed with land chosen for urban uses. The other 185,000 acres of retired rural lands are often technologically obsolete for modern farming. Abandoned farmland is being reforested, allowed to remain idle, or allocated for outdoor recreation. Increases in leisure time, income and mobility has expanded interest in outdoor recreation. The urban dweller, as he seeks outdoor recreation opportunity, brings urban living patterns into many rural areas of New York State.

^{1/} David J. Allee, "Changing Use of Rural Resources", Journal of Farm Economics, Vol. 48, No. 5, (December 1966), p.1297

C. The Resulting Implications

Changes in government, land use patterns, social organization and communications will occur throughout New York State. Unless understood and prepared for, many of these changes will have negative effects on the local community. If local leadership maintains an awareness and appreciation of the changing situation, many potential problems may be transformed into assets for community growth and improvement. Other problems may be adjusted to with fewer stresses. The challenge for community resource development programs, therefore, is to create awareness of these changes and to help community decision leaders prepare and plan for them.

Several forces brought about by changing society can be identified. Competition for land close to urban areas will continue. In many cases, this competition will result in inflated land prices and unnecessary idling of productive agricultural land. Land use conflicts will increase in urban cores due to increasing concentrations of minority groups and the related economic and social problems. The relationship of man to his environment will achieve critical importance as appropriate attention will have to be directed toward the aesthetic and economic conservation of natural and man-made resources. Another force is the increased expectations of the disadvantaged and the slowness or unwillingness of communities to meet these expectations.

Changes and their related problems will effect local governments. Complexities created by the increasingly urbanized society will move many decisions from local to the federal government. Improvements in communication will create a growing awareness and concern about public affairs, resulting in increased interest in adjusting a community's public resources to match its aspirations. Better communication means every organization, agency, and individual associated with making public decisions is more open to public view and judgment.

Continued evaluation along the modernization continuum will require greater public investment and financial support. This support, too, will require public education beyond the usual methods of mass communication.

Finally, the increasing role that women play in society must be recognized. Women are cycling into and out of the labor force leaving unfilled gaps in volunteer services but increasing their knowledge of community structures and need. Women hold great political power potential. Traditionally, women have championed social change and their involvement in community resource development in increasing numbers and effectiveness is anticipated.

There is need in community resource development for a total community effort and involvement to meet the needs of all people.

1. Implications for Community Resource Development

The above has many implications for programs in community resource development. As society becomes more urban-oriented, the process of making decisions concerning a local community's future becomes more complicated. The achievement of desired community goals through the recognition and utilization of all relevant resources, requires an acute awareness and rationality on the part of community decision leaders. Some challenges which local leaders must meet include: (1) Recognition of the signs and symptoms of obsolescence and the need for continuing renewal and modernization, as well as the consequences of delay; (2) Recognition that there are functional and feasible steps that can be taken but that these will vary depending on the position the community occupies or chooses to occupy on the modernization continuum; (3) Distinguishing between the steps toward modernization that can be taken and managed locally, and those that require outside resources and assistance; (4) Drawing distinctions between the appropriate roles of the professional and that of the lay leaders; (5) Capitalizing on the rapid advancement in the planning process and linking this to public awareness, information and understanding of the process; (6) Recognition of social planning as an integral part of the process, and that the people, to be benefited, must be involved in planning; (7) Recognize the effect local decisions have on surrounding areas.

Meeting these challenges requires making decisions within a framework such as the community resource development process; identifying the areas of need and wants of the community and classifying them into categories; translating areas of needs and wants into community goals; developing objectives which reflect the means to achieving the goals; identifying and committing leadership to carrying out the objectives and working toward the goals; and developing community and public understanding, acceptance and support for the goals and objectives.

V. COOPERATIVE EXTENSION'S COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM EVOLUTION IN NEW YORK STATE

As increased emphasis is placed on community resource development, one of Cooperative Extension's major strengths is its past experience in closely related programs. A substantial base of experience exists. During the past 50 years, Cooperative Extension in New York State has expanded its educational efforts beyond technical information relating to agricultural production to include marketing and agricultural businesses, problems relating to general land and water resource planning and use, and problems of families and youth. The program has included educational efforts to answer explicit institutional questions on taxation, the allocation of public monies for human and natural resource development, consumer information, health standards involving food production and processing, air pollution and pesticides. Fifty years ago such problems were not envisioned and many of them would have been considered outside the sphere of an Extension 1/ program.

Cooperative Extension programs related to community resource development have been conducted for many years under a variety of program labels. One of the earliest was the "Land Use and Planning" Programs of the late 1930's and early 1940's. Since 1961, Cooperative Extension in New York State has conducted special educational activities for community leaders. "Operation Advance" and "Decisions: A Study for Leaders", were programs of informal study by leaders, of some current public issues such as education, highways, human resource development, and managing community growth.

Starting in 1962, Extension in New York State participated in the U. S. Department of Agriculture's Rural Areas Development Program. The New York State program was called Rural Resource Development. County resource development committees consisting of local leaders were organized in 25 counties. These committees studied their area, its problems and its opportunities, and their recommendations have frequently been acted upon by governmental bodies and others.

1/ Cooperative Extension and Extension is used synonymously throughout the report.

Involvement on Technical Action Panels; with Office of Economic Opportunity programs; with the Manpower Development and Training Act; and the Higher Education Act are further evidence of Extension's commitment to helping people solve social and economic problems.

Community resource development programs have been emphasized in four regions of the State through the appointment of regional specialists. 1/ These programs were established during the past five years.

In its program in community resource development, Cooperative Extension brings years of experience in the organization and conduct of informal adult education activities directed to the solution of problems in relevant fields, state-wide staff and competency for carrying out its educational role.

The expanded and changing nature of programs reflects the research backstopping becoming available to Extension. There has been an expanded emphasis in the Colleges of Home Economics and Agriculture on research in human resource development, social problems, economic development and the management of natural resources.

Cooperative Extension historically has re-evaluated and adjusted its program to maximize its contributions to New York State society. The recommendations contained in the next sections of this report are intended to continue that pattern.

1/ Southwestern Region (Chautauqua, Cattaraugus and Allegany Counties); Southcentral (Steuben, Chemung, Schuyler, Tompkins and Tioga Counties); Southeastern (Chenango, Otsego, Delaware and Schoharie Counties); and MIDNY (Oswego, Onondaga, Madison, Cayuga and Cortland Counties).

VI. THE GOAL, ROLES AND SCOPE OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAM IN COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

What are the implications to Cooperative Extension of the process of community resource development, the situation and trends in New York State, and the existing program nucleus? The answer will be found in the following sections of this report, determining how, and to what extent Cooperative Extension should relate to the process of community resource development.

A. Program Goal

The principal goal of Cooperative Extension in community resource development is through education to increase group effectiveness in making and implementing public decisions concerning improvements in the quality and level of living of all people.

Few would disagree that the broad goal of Cooperative Extension is the development of people themselves so that they, through their own initiative, may effectively identify and solve the various problems directly affecting their welfare. Traditionally, Cooperative Extension has sought to achieve this goal through specific educational activities which interpret and make available research and other information for the people of the State. The goal in the program area of community resource development continues this tradition, but differs in changing the emphasis from work with individuals to work with groups, and from personal decision making to that of public decision making.

B. Cooperative Extension's Roles

1. Educational Role:

The basic role of Cooperative Extension - education - is depicted in its mission. The mission of Cooperative Extension is to interpret and disseminate research information from the Land Grant Institution and other sources to the people in an informal out of school setting for application to the solution and/or prevention of problems. This mission has led to defining the role of Extension as "education for action." This educational role is important in community resource development.

To fulfill this role in community resource development, Cooperative Extension personnel must perform specific duties as educators. The Task Force concurs with the specific roles outlined in the ECOP report on community resource development. These are:

- a. Provide information and educational assistance on technical subjects.
- b. Interpret research and analyze data.
- c. Stimulate group thinking, decision making and action.
- d. Help identify goals, problems and alternative courses of action.
- e. Provide technical support in specific areas of competency in community resource development.
- f. Inform about and refers to other agencies and groups.
- g. Assist the community to organize or to keep an existing organization functioning. ^{1/}

Performing the educational role in community resource development will require significant changes in organization, personnel, financing, program content, and clientele to be effective. These changes become even more important as Cooperative Extension enters areas where new expertise will be needed.

2. Adaptive Research Role:

Conducting adaptive and basic research has long been one of the functions of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. Often adaptive research is carried on in the field by faculty from the two colleges.

Participation and assistance in conducting adaptive research is an appropriate role for field-located Extension personnel. Having Extension personnel undertake adaptive research permits the rapid application of results to the solution of public problems.

There is critical need for adaptive research in the area of community resource development.

^{1/} ECOP Report, Community Resource Development, a report prepared by a special task force for the Sub-Committee on Community and Resource Development and Public Affairs of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, Federal Extension Service, Washington, D. C., 1967.

It is appropriate for a college and municipal agency to enter into agreements for the conduct of specific new research, but a college will need to define its own research interests. Will it be involved only in basic research, the results of which will be applicable in many situations or will it assist in some of the situational surveys needed by the community resource development process? Surely it would appear axiomatic that a college with a foundation of knowledge in an area with continuing interest will need to bolster its knowledge competence with new research. Some of it can be in harmony with the knowledge needs of the community resource development process. 1/

To attract top quality faculty in the various areas concerned with community resource development, the conducting of research needs to be encouraged and promoted.

It is recommended that whenever practical faculty positions in the Colleges of Home Economics and Agriculture having Extension responsibilities concerned with community resource development have appointments involving research with emphasis on adaptive research focused on discovery of knowledge necessary for effective community resource development programs.

C. Scope of the Cooperative Extension Program in Community Resource Development

The Task Force takes the position that if maximum results are to be accomplished with limited resources, Extension must focus its program on areas selected with a view of existing or obtainable knowledge bases, staff competencies, and the needs of communities.

1/ Harrington, C. R., "Views of an Extension Administrator", in Resource Use Issues and the Planning Process, papers presented at a conference of Northeast Region Committees, Boston, Massachusetts, published by Institute for Research on Land and Water Resources, Pennsylvania State University and the Farm Foundation, October 11-13, 1966.

Program emphasis can best be accomplished by classifying areas of program focus in community resource development - either present or projected (recommended) - into a series of output-oriented categories. (See Appendix B for further discussion).

The Task Force recommends that the community resources program structure consist of four main categories.

1. Community Organization and Administration
2. Community Functions and Services
3. Natural Resources Utilization
4. Physical Environmental Improvement

These major program categories are divided into sub-categories with narrower objectives. The sub-categories are divided into program elements which comprise the specific products that contribute to the objectives. The categories or sub-categories suggested below are not listed in order of priority.

The degree of program emphasis at any one time should be expected to vary among the categories. Variations in emphasis will exist both at the state and local levels. Program elements, sub-categories or categories may be added or deleted as experience demonstrates the need.

Outline of Program Scope

I. Community Organization and Administration

A. Comprehensive Planning Process ^{1/}

1. Identification of community problems and potentials
2. Citizen participation in planning
3. Organization for planning
4. Acceptance and implementation of process

B. Governmental Operations

1. Efficiency of operations
2. Inter and intra cooperation and communications
3. Modernization of government structures, processes and functions

^{1/} Includes various aspects of planning i.e.: physical, social, economic, political, etc.

- C. Non-Governmental Organization
 - 1. Efficiency of operation
 - 2. Inter and intra cooperation and communications
 - 3. Modernization of structures, processes and functions
 - 4. Leadership development

- D. Public Investment and Finance
 - 1. Tax policy
 - 2. Economic analysis of alternative governmental programs 1/

II. Community Functions and Services

A. Education

- 1. Manpower needs and mobility
- 2. Occupational training and education programs
- 3. Education for youth
- 4. Continuing education

B. Health and Social Services

- 1. Legislation and regulations
- 2. Social and economic aspects
- 3. Provision for groups with special needs

C. Housing

- 1. Codes and regulations
- 2. Social and Economic aspects
- 3. Housing for disadvantaged

D. Culture and Recreation

- 1. Management of recreation areas
- 2. Effecting greater complementarity of private and public provision of outdoor recreation opportunity
- 3. Problems associated with provision of adequate recreation opportunity

1/ This element is also relevant to categories II, III and IV.

III. Natural Resource Utilization

A. Land

1. Institutional and legal arrangements
2. Public land management

B. Water

1. Institutional and legal arrangements
2. Water resource management

C. Wild Plant and Animal Populations 1/

1. Evaluation of the importance of these resources to the community
2. Management of these resources

IV. Physical Environmental Improvement

A. Visual Environment

B. Water Quality

C. Air Quality

1/ Animal as used here includes mammals, birds and fish.

VII. COOPERATIVE EXTENSION'S CLIENTELE IN COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The Cooperative Extension program in Community Resource Development is problem-oriented. Potential clientele are those to whom the problem takes Cooperative Extension - the particular interest group(s) involved, and others pertinent to the collection, analysis, and use of information for decision making, implementation, and evaluation.

It is recommended that the primary target clientele for the Cooperative Extension program in community resource development be key individuals and groups of community leaders who influence the communities future.

The clientele are the people making and implementing decisions about the community. The target clientele may be the existing "power structure," and/or previously unidentified leaders. Emphasis is placed on providing information on high priority problems to community leaders involved with all age levels who can bring about understanding and make decisions affecting community efforts. Another parallel clientele will be the public affected by the decisions and the action to be carried out.

The clientele will vary depending upon the nature of the relevant problems and stage of development of the program. The leadership group and the concerned public will vary depending upon the problem approached.

VIII. ORGANIZATION AND STAFF CHANGES

To achieve program objectives of community resource development, Extension will have to draw, as a base, upon the knowledge and staff resources of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. Resources will be needed from Cornell University and units of the State University of New York. Arrangements will be needed to provide for an interdisciplinary and inter-college base within Cornell University.

Community resource development should receive increased emphasis as a major program area comparable to the present division programs within Cooperative Extension. An effective program requires assignment of sufficient staff resources to the program to perform the specific roles previously identified.

Administrative leadership will be needed in program development and implementation between the various divisions and/or disciplines involved.

Program leadership within various disciplines is needed. Provision must be made for access to a wide range of University faculty including those with Extension responsibility. In addition, liaison with organizations or groups outside Extension will need to be established and maintained. Some identifiable program development groups are needed at the state level to provide the necessary leadership and focus for the field staff responsible for community resource development. At the same time, the program needs a high degree of flexibility.

A. Organization of Resources

Program development and implementation should be focused through the following organizational components.

1. Field Organization and Staff Changes:

a. Regional Staff

The present role of five regional specialists has proven to be highly successful. That role is primarily one of backstopping county staff and providing program leadership on regional problems. In the future, this may include training or retraining county staff and involvement in potential field station activities.

Complete coverage of the state by regional specialists in community resource development is needed as an initial phase of increased program emphasis. Such positions are needed because of the rapid developments in multi-county nature of community problems and increased institutional arrangements at the regional level.

Two types of regional positions will be needed in the future. The first type of position is similar to those currently existing. The major responsibility will be educational programs related primarily to community organization and administration. The second type of specialist would have major responsibility in subject matter and programs having to do with one or more of the other three major areas of program focus - community functions and services, natural resource utilization or physical environmental improvement.

The Task Force feels that in locating regional staff, attention must be given to major metropolitan areas and their influence on the surrounding region. The evolving patterns of regional organization involved in the governmental structure such as the New York State Office of Planning Coordination need to be recognized. In addition, special geographic areas without major urban centers (i.e. southwestern and northern New York), have special problems of community development which should be considered when locating regional personnel.

The Task Force recommends that initially one regional specialist be assigned to each of the following metropolitan regions - Utica-Rome, Syracuse, Buffalo, Binghamton, and two regional specialists for the New York City, Albany-Schenectady and Rochester regions.

The area included in metropolitan regions should be adjusted so that all counties are covered by one of the regional specialists. The establishment of these positions should receive high priority.

Existing and/or additional staff may be required for selected geographic areas and specific areas of program emphasis. As the total community resource development program grows, the need for, and the opportunity to utilize, Cooperative Extension regional specialists of the second type described above will increase. Such personnel could be added to the initial regional staff as warranted to supplement both the regional and county programs. These regional specialists may cover sub-regions, cross regions or new metropolitan

regions depending upon their area of program and source of funds. Teams of regional specialists may move with the problem.

b. County Staff

County based staff can be a major asset in conducting a program in community resource development. Some counties are conducting extension programs in community resource development. In other counties no real commitment has been made to conduct such a program. The Task Force assumes community resource development has potential application in each county.

Just as community resource development is an interdisciplinary inter-college program at the state level, it will need to be an inter-divisional program at the county level. Program responsibility for community resource development may be placed with staff from two or more divisions. However, there would be only one county program in community resource development.

It is recommended that the county association board of directors place the major program responsibility for community resource development with a division which has as its primary program, work with public decision makers on public problems.

This recommendation may be accomplished under the present Extension organization by the establishment of a new division for the community resource development program or may replace an existing division program. In either case, overall staff program leadership should be provided by a division leader.

2. Organization and Staff Changes in Cooperative Extension within Cornell University

a. Center for Community Resource Development

A center is needed to lead and coordinate the community resource development program; provide an effective means of access to subject matter specialists in the different colleges within Cornell University; maintain liaison with other agencies and groups working in this area. It would provide a vehicle to attract funding for adaptive research and Extension work. Because of the large number of disciplines involved, effective administrative coordination and leadership is essential. The center would be a means of giving leadership to program development and implementation.

It is recommended that a center for community resource development be established at Cornell University in the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics.

1. Center Advisory Council

The Center should have a top level advisory council to function as consultants on general policy for this field of education. This council should be comprised of leaders at Cornell University and the State and be appointed by the Deans of the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics. (See Appendix C for Center Organization Chart).

2. Center Administration

- a. The Center will require two full time administrative program leaders. The director of the Center should enlist the interest and support of top leadership in the State, and of faculty and leaders from relevant institutions and groups whose assistance and/or cooperation is needed in this educational effort. The assistant director should be responsible for the involvement of off-campus Extension staff in the community resource development program. This would include securing and coordinating appropriate program backstopping for local program development and implementation.
- b. An administrative assistant should be attached to the center who would follow new legislation and provide administrative assistance to department and field staff 1/ developing project proposals.

3. Center Subject Matter Faculty

The Center would appoint no subject-matter faculty. Individual faculty members would keep their appointment and identity in a department but be associated with community resource development programs through the Center. Provisions for financial support would need to be made between the departments and the Center.

The program budget of the Center should permit paying for the services of resource people outside of the contract colleges on a temporary or specific project basis.

1/ Field staff refers to both county and regional staff.

4. Center Program Development

a. Center Program Committee

A Center program committee should be established. It would consider the direction of the total community resource development program; resources needed for the program; relate program needs to administration and, as needed, establish or discontinue interdisciplinary teams.

This committee would be composed of interdisciplinary team chairman, the two administrative program leaders, and other staff members as appropriate. The committee chairman would be appointed from among the departmental staff members.

b. Interdisciplinary Teams

It is recommended that interdisciplinary teams be established for the identified areas of program focus. The team would consist of appropriate staff members concerned with these categories. The chairman of an interdisciplinary team would assume major responsibility for the team's functioning in the development and implementation of a program and would devote a major proportion of his time to the team effort. The team chairman should be relieved of other responsibilities as necessary to provide adequate time for this responsibility.

Staff in Cornell departments, (or from other campuses), in addition to agriculture and Home Economics, should be sought as members of an interdisciplinary team where appropriate.

5. Communications Staff

Community resource development will require substantial additional support from the field of communication arts. Adequate technical communications services should be provided. This may be done through existing channels or by the establishment of such services within the Center. What is needed is an overall communications service unit. Such a unit could service the total Extension program.

IX. STAFFING AND FUNDING NEEDS

A. General Consideration

Personnel to staff the community resource development program must come from employment of new staff as well as reorientation of existing staff desiring and qualified to work in this program area. Consultants should be used to provide portions of the training programs and for expertise on specific field problems to minimize the costs and time needed to accomplish designated tasks.

B. Resources at Hand

Extension field staff and individual departments within varied colleges of Cornell University have had Extension commitments to community resource development.

1. Field Staff

Extension's field staff provides one of the main rationales for its deep involvement in community resource development. In 1966-67, county staffs provided 34 man years toward programs in this field. Regional specialists provided an additional 4 1/2 man years. The 34 man years were accumulated by the involvement of a relatively large number of staff devoting a small percentage of their time to this program. There were no county staff members reporting 100 per cent of their time (the equivalent of 1 man year) on community resource development. Regional specialists devote full time to the program although together they cover only 17 counties.

Field staff have traditionally been recruited with little emphasis on community development concerns. Recent years have seen some change in this as county boards of directors and division committees have sought staff having identifiable community resource development abilities. While employing new staff with such identified skills may be the major means of staffing new positions, Extension agents have developed abilities in this area while on the job. In the past, such abilities have been obtained through individual efforts, in-service education opportunities, or sabbatic leave study. The present agent and regional specialist staff, then, is one of the major resources at hand.

2. Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics

Staff commitment at Cornell is clearly seen in College of Agriculture departments such as Agricultural Economics, Conservation and Rural Sociology -- all of which have been carrying out educational programs related to community resource development. In more recent years the Agronomy, Floriculture and Ornamental Horticulture, and Agricultural Engineering Departments have added, or redirected staff efforts to specifically include community resource development fields. In the College of Home Economics, community resource development has been identified as an area of emphasis in the Department of Housing and Design.

In 1966-67, approximately 12 man years (10 per cent of the Agricultural College's Extension effort), were devoted to community and public affairs by staff members in seven departments. Two man years were devoted to community resource development areas by departments in the College of Home Economics, representing four per cent of that College's Extension effort.

However, resources available for Extension programs in community resource development are not limited to the traditional sources. The Department of City and Regional Planning in the College of Architecture, Art and Planning, the College of Engineering, the Schools of Industrial and Labor Relations and Hotel Administration, Center for Housing and Environmental Studies, the Water Resources Center, and the Center for Aerial Photographic Studies are portions of Cornell University having resources relevant to community resource development. However, cross linkage between Extension and these units of the total University have not been adequately developed.

C. Resources Needed

1. Field Staff Needs

The potential for using the extensive experience and expertise of county Extension personnel in a community resource development program is a major strength. This localization of personnel provides a strong traditional ability to respond to pressing local questions. The need for regional staffing was stated in the previous section.

Development of present staff capabilities among those with interests and expertise in phases of community resource development is imperative. Such expertise can be strengthened or created through in-service education.

a. In-Service Education for Existing Field Staff

Staff assuming program responsibility in community resource development at the county and regional level will probably require additional training, particularly in social and behavioral sciences. A background of social awareness is needed in addition to specialized technical competency.

A phasing-in period during which staff would receive intensive in-service education, would facilitate development of a county program in community resource development and/or expansion of the present program.

It is recommended that special in-service educational programs be conducted for currently employed agents and regional specialists who have or will assume program responsibility in community resource development.

Continuing in-service education should be planned for the field staff following the "phase-in" period. The training program should:

1. Be oriented toward problems encountered in the field;
2. Draw on relevant theory;
3. Spend most of the teaching-learning effort on solving community problems likely to be encountered;
4. Stress the application of information on achieving effective decision making.

b. Field Staff Recruitment

Recruitment of new staff with competencies in community resource development will need to be a major means of staffing the program. Where new field staff are required, selection should be based on competency and training in community resource development subject matter areas relevant to the Cooperative Extension program. In addition to a general background in social awareness, new staff members should have specialized training in a field included under program scope.

It is recommended that Extension administration concerned with personnel recruitment develop and implement an active recruitment program appropriate for selecting persons to work in community resource development.

2. Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics

Educational programs in the areas noted would utilize direct inputs from a majority of the departments in the two colleges. Implementation of a full scale program in community resource development would immediately increase demands far beyond the present 14 man years provided. In the next five years, the amount of staff time devoted to community resource development should double. New personnel at both the academic and Extension associate level will be needed. Priority for new staff should be given to the program categories as shown in Table I.

3. Communication Innovations

Emphasis should be given to the efficient use of staff resource. The Task Force suggests that one means of accomplishing this is for Extension to take full advantage of new technology and methods, particularly in the fields of communication and transportation. Provision should be made for increased use of such innovations as the telewriter system, telelecture equipment, television, and air transportation with fleet cars located at strategic airports or arrangements made in advance for rental cars. Knowledge exists in people; efficient transportation of knowledge is essential.

4. Funding Needs

The Task Force recommends a minimum increase of 84 per cent in funding for community resource development programs by 1972.

The recommended changes increase the total funding as shown in Table II, from an estimated \$1,245,500 in 1966-67 to \$2,292,000 by 1972. These costs were calculated on the basis of \$18,500 per county staff man year, \$23,000 per regional staff man year and \$35,000 per University staff and program expense. The increase of \$1,046,500 is needed to provide the minimum program staffing and support recommended in this report. Total costs could go much higher as justified by the program.

a. Sources of Funds

A major portion of the funds needed should continue to be sought from county government and from state and federal formula dollars. However, an increasing amount of supplemental support should be encouraged and obtained through special program proposals from federal and state agencies. At the federal level the departments to be approached for funding might include Health, Education and Welfare, Housing and Urban Development, Commerce, Interior, Agriculture and agencies such

as the Office of Economic Opportunity and the National Science Foundation. At the state level, agencies to be considered as possible sources for supplemental funding might include Office of Planning Coordination, Department of Commerce, Department of Education, State University of New York, Department of Conservation, Department of Agriculture and Markets and the State Water Resources Commission.

Special program support should be sought from major foundations interested in program areas related to community resource development. These include Ford, Rockefeller and Resources for the Future, and the fund for the advancement of education.

TABLE I

1966 Man Years and the Recommended Minimum

Man Years to be Devoted to Community Resource Development by 1972

Program Categories	Reported 1966			Projections 1972		
	County	Regional	Univ.	County	Regional	Univ.
I. Community Organization and Administration	34.0*	4.5*	4.0	56.0*	7.0	9.0
II. Community Functions and Services			3.5		2.0	8.0
III. Natural Resource Utilization			4.0		2.0	5.0
IV. Physical Environmental Improvement			1.5		1.0	3.0
Administration			1.0			3.0
Total	34.0	4.5	14.0	56.0	12.0	28.0

* Some of the county and regional staff time should be reported under the other three categories. However, the amount of time could not be determined.

TABLE II

Estimated Minimum Funding Needs

By 1972

Program Categories	1966-67 (1966)				1971-72			
	County	Regional	Univ.	total	County	Regional	Univ.	Total
I. Community Organization and Administration	\$629,000*	\$126,500*	\$140,000	\$895,500	\$1,036,000*	\$161,000	\$315,000	\$1,512,000
II. Community Functions and Services			122,500	122,500		45,000	280,000	326,000
III. Natural Resource Utilization			140,000	140,000		46,000	175,000	221,000
IV. Physical Environmental Improvements			52,500	52,500		23,000	105,000	128,000
Administration			35,000	35,000			105,000	105,000
Total	\$629,000	\$126,500	\$490,000	\$1,245,500	\$1,036,000	\$276,000	\$980,000	\$2,292,000

* These figures cover costs for all four categories

X. COOPERATIVE EXTENSION RELATIONS WITH OTHER UNITS, AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS

The range and complexity of problems in community resource development previously cited in this paper, makes it obvious that information or new knowledge applicable to their solution will not be found in one place. Cooperative Extension is only one of many organizations, institutions and agencies which have a role to fulfill in community resource development. Cooperative Extension should relate to the educational or service programs of other organizations in fostering community resource development.

Cooperative Extension needs to develop working relationships with several offices and centers at Cornell University concerned with community resource development.

Newly developing educational programs on community problems sponsored by the continuing education division of other institutions of higher education are of particular significance. For example, both Cooperative Extension and the State University of New York are involved state-wide, (see map, Appendix D).

It is recommended that Cooperative Extension give high priority to the establishment of working relations with the Continuing Education division of the State University of New York and at the various units throughout the State.

Several other public and private agencies, and organizations are involved in community resource development. These include professional educational organizations, special interest groups, fraternal service organizations, and various state and federal governmental agencies. It is particularly significant that Extension work with such state agencies as the Office of Planning Coordination.

It is recommended that Cooperative Extension give high priority to the establishment of working relations with state agencies including the Office of Planning Coordination.

APPENDICES

Resource People Appendix A

Planning-Programming-Budgeting Systems Appendix B

Center for Community Resource Development
Organization Chart Appendix C

Cooperative Extension and State
University of New York Appendix D

APPENDIX A

RESOURCE PEOPLE

The Task Force has been privileged to have had the cooperation, reaction, suggestions and new ideas from a number of resource people. A broad program perspective was obtained by the Task Force through consultation with the following people.

Agents Ad Hoc Council to the Task Force:

Phyllis W. Barlow	Linda W. Clark	Kenneth H. MacLaury
H. Ira Blixt	Patricia M. Coolican	Leslie J. Rollins
Richard C. Bornholdt	Norman E. Fuller	Donald Y. Stiles
Mary J. Burgess	Cornelius F. Handy	Bill S. Wilson

Cooperative Extension Specialist - Community Resource Development:

Martin G. Anderson	Donald J. White
Kenneth V. Gardner	Stewart K. Wright

Faculty:

C. W. Baumgartner	Textiles and Clothing
S. Blackwell	Home Economics Education
M. K. Bloetjes	Institution Management
G. J. Cummings	Rural Sociology
E. C. Devereux	Child Development and Family Relations
E. E. Hester	Food and Nutrition
A. S. Lieberman	Floriculture and Ornamental Horticulture
E. A. Lutz	Agricultural Economics
M. A. Rollins	Household Economics and Management

Outside Consultants:

Emory Brown	Rural Sociologist, Penn State University
Alexander Charters	Vice President for Continuing Education, Syracuse University
Harry Cosgriffe	Community Resource Development Program Leader, University of Washington
Gary King	Rural Sociologist, Penn State University
Ernest Nesius	Vice President, University of West Virginia

Earl Pettyjohn -----Director, Community Resource Development
Division, Federal Extension Service, United
States Department of Agriculture
C. B. Ratchford -----Vice President for Extension, University
of Missouri
Gale Vandeberg -----Dean of Division of Economic and Environmental
Development, University Extension, University
of Wisconsin

Additional individual personal reactions to this report were obtained from some other staff and from some members of the advisory council.

APPENDIX B

PLANNING-PROGRAMMING-BUDGETING-SYSTEMS

Successful budgeting and planning stress "setting goals, defining objectives, and developing planned programs for achieving these objectives, ... under present practices, however, program review for decision making has frequently been concentrated within too short a period; objectives of agency programs and activities have too often not been specified with enough clarity and concreteness; accomplishments have not always been specified succinctly, alternatives have been insufficiently presented for consideration of top management; in a number of cases the future year cost of present decisions have not been laid out systematically enough; and formalized planning and systems analysis have had too little effect on budget systems decisions." 1/ PPBS is designed to make needed improvement possible. Within the Federal Extension Service, four states are presently serving as pilot projects to develop a somewhat modified system of PPBS which will be discussed below.

Basic to this system is "an output oriented program structure which presents data on all of the operations and activities of the agency in categories which reflect the agency's end purpose and objectives." The central focus of such a classification is to present information in a way which permits analysis of possible alternative agency objectives and of alternative programs for reaching these objectives, as well as an evaluation of the performance of those programs undertaken. The chief effect of the system is to facilitate choices among alternatives and assessment of priorities to be made at a time when unlimited resources - both financial and human - cannot be provided to the government or any agency of it.

Thus, rather than a simple listing of topics of concern, interest, and capability, the basic criterion for segregating operations would be to discover a quantitative measure of the effectiveness of the efforts of the operations and to permit the comparisons of alternative policies and programs. To obtain maximum effectiveness, such a system of classification should strive for consistency within an agency, with the agency's parent organization in government, between the various departments, and, when programs are operated on a multi-governmental level, between levels of government. Thus, responsibility for any one program category may cross agency lines. Hopefully, such an information system will prevent wasteful duplication and conflicting objectives.

1/ U. S. Bureau of the Budget, Bulletin 66-3, Mimeograph, Washington, D. C., October 12, 1965.

The modified system of PPBS presently being developed for the Federal Extension Service is known as a Management Information System and is designed to obtain desired information more effectively at all levels. This type of approach differs from PPBS only in that it recognizes that at this stage, quantification of the output of certain programs is difficult or impossible using present analytical capabilities. Although output oriented program categories must still be developed, their purpose is aimed more at providing a total information system for decision maker than to apply immediately a rigorous and, therefore, constrained form of economic analysis (such as benefit-cost analysis). Such analysis will develop as the system matures.

APPENDIX C

Center for Community Resource Development
Organization Chart



