Expanding Extension Educational Assistance to People—A Common Mission of the 1862 and 1890 Land-Grant Institutions.

8 Additional funds to land grant colleges were made available by Congress, necessitating a consensus among institution representatives and extension service representatives as to guidelines for its expenditure. It was decided that: the money is for expanding educational assistance to the people by utilizing more effectively the combined resources of both 1862 and 1890 institutions; that there shall continue to be only one cooperative extension program in each of the states, one state cooperative extension service, and one director of extension; that all requirements of the Dept. of Agriculture to meet the provisions of Title VI and equal employment opportunities of the Civil Rights Act apply equally to both 1862 and 1890 institutions; and that funds earmarked for utilizing resources of 1890 institutions and Tuskegee Inst. must be administered through the Land Grant college or colleges designated by the state legislature with other safeguards cited. Additional guidelines were derived based on these four. Five of eight further areas of concern provided to State Extension directors were mentioned by the speaker. (AG)
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I am pleased to extend a warm welcome to you as we participate together in this most significant workshop. Each of you has a vital responsibility in helping to meet our common mission of "expanding Extension educational assistance to people."

This is a most timely workshop. It was just about a year ago when we were assured that Congress would provide an additional $4,000,000 to more adequately utilize the professional resources and other competencies of 1890 Land-Grant Colleges and Tuskegee Institute to more effectively meet the needs of present and potential Extension clientele in the sixteen states. Since the additional appropriation for this purpose was made available by Congress under Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act, it was necessary that the expanded program be jointly planned and procedures be mutually agreed to by both 1862 and 1890 Colleges.

Because of the processes and time involved in developing mutually agreed to programs and operating procedures, most states have had less than six months to be actively engaged in conducting expanded programs. With this less than six months of experience, most of you are at the "teachable moment" when you want fuller understanding and clarification of the given framework -- the requirements which must be met as established by law and U.S. Department of Agriculture regulations which define the appropriate boundaries for which the money may be used. You want to know the extent of flexibility you have in utilizing the available resources within the legal framework of requirements.

I want to commend the planning committee for the design of this workshop which should help you in answering these two very important needs. I would hope that you will feel quite free to participate fully in the discussions, raise questions for clarification, use specific examples of present and potential problem areas to further clarify your needs and to make recommendations as to needed adjustments and improvements.
During last July and August when representatives of both 1890 and 1862 institutions actively participated together with Extension Service representatives of USDA to develop the guidelines for this program, it became apparent at the outset that all concerned must fully understand and accept four basic requirements:

1. That the additional money made available is for the purpose of expanding educational assistance to the people of the various states by utilizing more effectively the combined resources of both the 1862 and 1890 institutions. The enhancement of and "institution building" by the institutions involved is the result of meeting the primary objective of "increased service to people" and is not a valid objective in and of itself.

2. That there shall continue to be one cooperative Extension program in each of the states and one State Cooperative Extension Service with one Director of Extension who is approved by the Secretary of Agriculture and held accountable to the Secretary for administering the total Extension effort in that State.
3. That all requirements of the Department of Agriculture to meet the provisions of Title VI and equal employment opportunities of the Civil Rights Act apply equally to both 1862 and 1890 institutions.

4. That the additional money made available under Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act, earmarked specifically for utilizing the resources of 1890 institutions and Tuskegee Institute, must be administered through the Land-Grant College or colleges as designated by the State Legislature of the State, with the Director of Extension as mutually agreed to by the President of the designated institution and the Secretary of Agriculture being held accountable for proper use of the funds.

These four basic requirements established the framework within which additional guidelines were developed for initiating and conducting the programs. Although details of the various established guidelines will be discussed more specifically throughout the workshop, I want to emphasize and clarify the intent of guideline number 8, which states:
"The 1890 Land-Grant Colleges and Tuskegee Institute will designate a person mutually satisfactory to both 1862 and 1890 and Tuskegee institutions to be responsible for developing and implementing proposals for programs to be funded from this appropriation. This individual will participate as a member of the State Director's staff in the administrative operations concerning programs, projects and procedures mutually agreed to."

If we are to most effectively utilize the combined resources of 1890 and 1862 institutions in "expanding Extension educational assistance to the people" of the State and maintain one State Cooperative Extension system, it is obvious that the staffs of the respective institutions must be actively involved jointly in planning and conducting the various phases of the total program. It is for this reason that the guidelines require that the coordinator of Extension programs at the 1890 Institutions "will participate as a member of the State Director's staff in the
administrative operations concerning programs, projects, and procedures mutually agreed to."

Based on our experiences to date in meeting the four basic requirements which I have discussed previously, we may need to restructure some of our patterns of operation to overcome some of the weaknesses which may be inherent in our present patterns. As you use this workshop as an opportunity to evaluate what you are now doing and determine needed adjustments to further improve your efforts, let me review with you five of the eight areas of concern provided to State Extension directors in a letter from my office dated May 5, 1972. I will comment briefly on each area for further clarification.

1. **Relationships and use of specialists from 1890 and 1862 institutions regarding program expertise.**

It is essential, if not already done, that plans be made for the development of cooperative working relations between the 1862 and 1890 subject matter specialists in the processes of program development, staff training, backstopping support and assistance,
and other aspects of resource support for new or expanded program efforts.

2. **Relationships of added 1890 staff to county or regional levels.** Continuous efforts should be made to maintain and strengthen a "one program concept" for a county or region. New programs planned and implemented with 1890 resources should be coordinated with current county staff through working relationships with that staff and the existing planning groups, e.g., county planning committees or advisory groups, lay leadership, and other planning groups. Through such coordination, other private and public organizations most directly involved with new program thrusts can become a part of the support and advisory function. In addition, it is essential that effort be increased to further legitimize the added program efforts of 1890 institutions, using regular channels of operations, with local governing bodies, various governmental agencies, public and private organizations, and the general public.
3. **Housing facilities and patterns at county and regional offices.** Staff housing facilities for the expanded number of staff members from 1890 institutions assigned to the county or multi-county areas must meet the requirements of the USDA regulations and "Supplemental Instructions for Administration of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in the Cooperative Extension Service."

The intent of this document is to prohibit the operation of independent, dual, or separate Extension office facilities in a county or area. However, if a satellite office facility is established in a county, it should be established in concert with the existing county office. Under no circumstances should there be policies or procedures which allow the 1862 or 1890 colleges to establish additional offices independent of existing county Extension offices. This includes the provision for the administrative and coordinating functions of county and/or area offices to be vested in a single line of supervision. Race of
staff or clientele must not be a basis for maintaining separate offices.

4. Relationships of supervisory staff to additional 1890 staff added to county or regional operations. A review of present supervisory systems in relation to 1890 institutions would indicate that in some states supervision may be separate from the present statewide system. Where this is the case, a supervisory system should be devised which will provide for the elimination of a dual system and for the coordination of expanded programs of the 1890 institution with the statewide system of supervision and State program efforts.

5. Relationships to current EEO regulations regarding expanded employment plans. All provisions of the State EEO plan, when approved by the Secretary of Agriculture, apply equally to both 1890 and 1862 institutions. This same requirement applies to the "Affirmative Action Plan for Meeting Nondiscriminatory Legal Standards in Employment and the Conduct of All Programs by State Cooperative Extension Services."
Summary

It is essential that the Extension Coordinator for the 1890 Land-Grant Institution and for Tuskegee Institute be directly and regularly involved with the director's administrative staff as priorities are considered and decisions are made in planning and conducting the total Extension program for the State. Close working relations and planning opportunities need to be maintained between program leaders and specialist staff of both institutions in planning and conducting programs in agriculture, home economics, 4-H, and community resource development. It is essential that one administrative and supervisory system be maintained on State, area, and county levels.

We urge that all possible effort be made to eliminating procedures in the expansion of Extension programs and staffing assignments which may tend to give the impression of two separate Extension programs.

Best wishes to you for an informative and productive workshop.

* * * * *
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