

Chapter 5

KSU Cooperative Extension V

The Adaptable Years—1965-1988

Contents

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Changing Role in Changing Times..... 168</p> <p>Office of the Director 168</p> <p>State Staff Adjustments—1970's-80's..... 169</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Department Staff Changes..... 169</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Staffing Patterns 169</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">State Staffing Changes—1970's-80's..... 169</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Degree Upgrading—1962-89..... 170</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Kellogg Foundation..... 171</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Staff Time Distribution—1970's-80's..... 172</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Split Staff Appointments—1980's 172</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Extension Program Assistants—1980's..... 173</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Staff Composition—1986..... 174</p> <p>Establish Area Extension Offices—1970's 174</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">SW Area Extension Office—1969 174</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Establish Five Administrative Areas—1971 175</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Role of Area Extension Directors—1971-88..... 176</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">NW Area Extension Office—1971 176</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">SC Area Extension Office—1972 177</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">NE Area Extension Office—1972 178</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">SE Area Extension Office—1972..... 179</p> <p>Research-Extension Centers—1986-87..... 180</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Northwest Research-Extension Center—1986..... 180</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Southwest Research-Extension Center—1987..... 180</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Responsibilities of Center Administrators..... 180</p> <p>County Staff Adjustments—1970's-80's 180</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">County Agent Role..... 180</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Agent Training 181</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Clientele Short Circuits Agents 181</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Women Administrators—1970's-80's 181</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Staff Downsizing Projection—1988 181</p> <p>Federal Influence on Programs—1970's-80's..... 182</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Federal Guideline Publications—1970's-80's..... 182</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Scope & Responsibility Report—1958 182</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">A People & a Spirit—1968..... 182</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Food & Agriculture Act—1977 182</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Cooperative Extension in Transition—1979..... 183</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Extension in the 80's—1983..... 183</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Catalyst for Change—1983 184</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Extension in Transition—1988 184</p> <p>Kansas Extension's Changing Mission—1970's-80's 185</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Shifting Focus—1950's-70's 185</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Factors for Change—1970's-80's..... 185</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Thrusts for the 70's 185</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Recent Mission Statement—1986 185</p> <p>Finance/Budget Trends—1970's-80's 186</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Sources of Funds—1965-88 186</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Staff Time Spent—1970-88 186</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Earmarked Funding 186</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Budget Trends—1970's-80's..... 187</p> <p>Evaluation & Accountability—1970's-80's 187</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Accountability 187</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">EMIS Reporting System—Late 1960's..... 188</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Congressional Evaluation Mandate—1977 188</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Report Format—1980's..... 188</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Equal Employment Opportunities..... 189</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Program Coordinating Teams—1987 189</p> | <p>County Extension Law Changes—1972-87 190</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">County Extension Law Revision—1972 189</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Revise County Extension Council Law—1987 189</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Extension Advisory Councils—1970's 191</p> <p>Special Program Emphasis—1970's 191</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Wildlife Damage Control Handbook—1970 191</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Emergency Preparedness—1970..... 191</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">USDA Committees for Rural Development..... 191</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Economic Outlook on TV—1971 192</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Great Plains Conservation Emphasis—1971 192</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Full Load Schools—1971 192</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Hazardous Occupations Training—1971..... 192</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Agricultural Banking School—1971 192</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Grass Resource Opportunities—1972 193</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Insect Reporting via Telenet—1972 193</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Cowboy College—1972..... 194</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">K-MAR-105 Electronic Record System—1972..... 194</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Kansas Tax Institutes—1972..... 194</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">EFNEP "Rocket" Mail—1972 195</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Drug Education Program—1972..... 195</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Community Forestry Program—1972 195</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Volunteer Leader Contributions—1977 196</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">4-H Camping Program—1977 196</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Main Street Renovation—1978..... 196</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Reduced Tillage—1978..... 197</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Forum on Families—1978 197</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Feedlot Development—1978..... 197</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Farm Estate Planning—1978 198</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Movement to Urban 4-H—1973-78 198</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Soil Survey Program—1979 198</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Soil Conservation Awards—1979..... 199</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Integrated Pest Management—1979..... 199</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Home Horticulture Programs—1979..... 199</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Big Lakes Council—1979..... 199</p> <p>Special Program Emphasis—1980's 200</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Beef Cattle Programs—1980..... 200</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">PRIDE Community Development—1980 200</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Training for Hort. Professionals—1981 201</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Programmable Calculator Programs—1981 201</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Tree Planting Program—1981 201</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Aerial Application Training—1981..... 202</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Health Programs—1981 202</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Financing Government in Kansas—1982..... 202</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Agricultural Safety and Health—1982..... 202</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Pasture Burning Program—1982 203</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Pesticide Applicator Training—1982 203</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Life Cycle Management—1982..... 203</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Irrigation Water Management—1983 203</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Pesticide Applicator Training—1985 204</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Wildlife Damage Control—1985 204</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Rural Fire Protection—1985 204</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Soybean Production in Kansas—1985..... 204</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Farm Business Organization—1985 204</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Clothing Management—1986 205</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">4-H Ambassador Program—1986..... 205</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Leader Learning Labs—1986..... 206</p> |
|---|---|

| | | | |
|--|-----|---|-----|
| Water Policy Program—1986..... | 206 | Balanced Farming & Family Living—1988 | 209 |
| Farm Mgnt. Assn. Program—1986..... | 206 | DIRECT—1988 | 210 |
| Wheat Variety Selection—1986..... | 207 | Job Search Program—1988..... | 210 |
| Estate Planning—1987 | 207 | Special Comm./Task Forces—1970's-80's..... | 211 |
| Conservation Tillage—1987..... | 207 | Marketing Strategies Committee—1985-86..... | 211 |
| Safety Belt Project—1987 | 207 | 75th Anniversary Committee—1988-89 | 213 |
| Housing Policy Decisions—1987..... | 208 | Program Initiatives—1988 | 215 |
| Family Relations Programs—1987..... | 208 | National Initiatives—1986 | 215 |
| Nutrition & Chronic Health Problems—1987 | 209 | Kansas Initiatives—1988-89 | 215 |
| Master Clothing Leaders—1987..... | 209 | Kansas Extension beyond 1988 | 215 |
| Small Business Assistance—1987 | 209 | | |

Changing Role in Changing Times

In the past two decades (1970-89), the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service has been buffeted by a variety of pressures that caused changes in its mission, its motivation, and its methods.

Numerous national and regional societal trends, shifting financial sources, changing state administrative structures, and expanding clientele demands and expectations have complicated the role and mission of Cooperative Extension.

No longer can the good that Extension does be covered by the time-honored umbrellas of "taking the University

to the people," or "helping people help themselves."

Today's educational information consumers expect more customized help, more personalized attention, and more immediate response to their needs.

That's a tall order for an agency that advocates change, but moves with deliberate speed, and likes to work with a selected clientele rather than trying "to be all things to all people."

Office of the Director

Historically, the Extension's top administrative office first carried the dual title of "Dean and Director" from 1912 to 1956.

This implied a somewhat autonomous sphere of influence that covered all off-campus educational contacts with clientele through informal rather than classroom presentations.

In 1956, with the appointment of Harold Jones, this title became Director of Extension. At the same time, Extension became an administrative division in the College of Agriculture, responsible to the Dean of Agriculture.

This arrangement continued until 1986, when another administrative adjustment was put into place. At this time, the Dean of Agriculture assumed the Director of Extension title and direct responsibilities for administration of the Extension Division.

Another historical reality that has emerged in recent times is the fact that Extension Directors are serving shorter terms of office. Thus, they have had less time to

test their own particular administrative styles.

Probably the time has passed when any Extension Director can match the 28-year tenure of Harry J. C. Umberger (1919-47), who left an indelible mark on the Extension structure and stature in Kansas by his leadership and longevity.

His successors, and their tenures, have been:

Louis C. Williams (1947-55).

Harold E. Jones (1956-68).

Robert A. Bohannon (1968-76).

John O. Dunbar (1976-80).

Fred D. Sobering (1981-86).

Walter R. Woods (1987 to the present).

In the mid 1960's, the Kansas Board of Regents took actions which altered the boundaries for Cooperative Extension operations.

A parallel Division of Academic Extension was established with specific responsibilities for all off-campus credit programs, conferences, and short courses.

Administrative direction for Academic Extension was placed by the Regents at the University of Kansas, with representative units on the campuses at each Regents' institutions.

K-State's Division of Continuing Education—which had formerly been a department within Cooperative Extension—thus became an independently functioning unit with no further direct ties or coordination with

Cooperative Extension.

The Regents also created a Director of Industrial Extension and established this as an independent Extension unit at K-State. However, when the Extension Energy Service was established in 1982, it was incorporated as a unit within Cooperative Extension, and, furthermore, absorbed the former functions of the KIE.

State Staff Adjustments—1970's-80's

Personnel Policy Changes—1970's-80's

The evolving roles, responsibilities, and qualifications of Extension Administrators, County Extension Agents, State and Area Specialists, and Administrators during this period were influenced by an increasing variety of things, including:

- 1) Changing philosophies of Extension's mission.
- 2) Equal Employment Opportunity legislation.
- 3) Closing of the Kellogg Center for Extension Education at the University of Wisconsin.
- 4) More sophisticated demands of agriculture producers and agri-business clientele.

Departmental Staff Changes

In 1963, a structural shift within subject matter departments on the K-State campus was initiated that had far-reaching, decentralization implications for Extension faculty members.

College of Agriculture Department Heads were given responsibility for administration and housing of Extension specialists in the same locations as the teaching and research faculty, in their respective disciplines.

As this evolutionary change progressed through the years, it did have the positive effect of bringing the Extension and research faculty into closer contact. However, it had also contributed to greater fragmentation, from an Extension coordination and esprit de corps point of view.

For Cooperative Extension Specialists, this decentralization resulted in new academic homes in four of the University's colleges—agriculture, veterinary medicine, engineering, and home economics (human ecology).

However, it was not until the early 1980's that Specialists in Home Economics were assigned to the College of Home Economics—in the departments of foods and nutrition, clothing, textiles, and interior design, and hu-

man development and family studies.

Staffing Patterns

Until the late 1960's, State Specialists were recruited generally from the ranks of County Extension Agents who had, or were willing to secure, M.S. degrees in their specialty areas.

Administrators encouraged this upward mobility with rewards of stepped-up positions and salary increases.

But in the 1970's three new pressures contributed to a change in Specialist hiring practices:

- 1) Equal Employment Opportunity legislation called for considering all qualified applicants on the basis of their present qualifications.
- 2) Change in philosophy of Extension administrators toward emphasis on hiring Specialists who were already qualified.
- 3) University emphasis on faculty with terminal (generally doctorate) degrees. Securing "doctorates on-the-job" became much more difficult.

An unexpected result of this policy shift was a growing state staff of Administrators and Specialists with strong research and information dissemination (knowledge transfer) orientation.

Often, there was a corresponding decrease in emphasis for skills on teaching or knowledge application (research results), and the problem solving (decision-making) process to clientele groups and individuals.

Those changing patterns in State Specialist skills also reduced support in the problem-solving (decision-making) process for County Extension Agents.

State Staffing Changes—1970's-80's

The trend toward more specific programs led to focused selection of Specialists to fit the needs.

This is shown quite graphically in the state staff positions listings on the next two pages. The trend is evident in every department.

advanced degrees is reflected a comparison of numbers of staff members in each degree category at various check point dates.

Degree Upgrading—1962-89

The effect of seeking Extension professionals with

The comparisons in the following chart start in 1962, a midway point in Director Harold Jones' emphasis on

| Extension State Staffing Changes—1965-88 | | | | | | | |
|--|------|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| Subject Area | 1965 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 88 | |
| Administration | | | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Adm. Asst. (Finance) | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Personnel Tgn. | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | - |
| Evaluation/Prog. Dev. | | | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Personnel Services | | | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Information | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| News | | | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 |
| Publications | | | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Visuals | | | 2 | 3 | - | - | - |
| Instructional Media | | | - | - | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| Radio | | | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| Television | | | 5 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| Ag Prod. & Mgnt. | | | | | | | |
| Ag Economics | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Farm Mgnt. | | | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Dist/Area Farm Mgnt. Econ. | | | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Farm Mgnt. Assn. | 15 | 21 | 23 | 29 | 25 | 24 | |
| Public Policy | | | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Business Management | | | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Economic Development | | | - | - | - | 2 | 1 |
| Bal. Farming/Family Liv. | | | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Ag Marketing & Util. | | | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Dairy Marketing | | | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Poultry & Egg Marketing | | | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Livestock Marketing | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Retail Marketing | | | 1 | 1 | - | - | - |
| Marketing Information | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Grain Marketing | | | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Consumer Marketing | | | 1 | 1 | - | - | - |
| Area Consumer Ed. | | | - | - | 2 | 2 | - |
| Grain Science & Ind. | | | | | | | |
| Formula Feeds Mkg. | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Formula Feeds Mfg. | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Feeds Quality Control | | | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Crops & Soils | | | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Soil Fertility & Mgt. | | | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Soil & Water Conservation | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Weed Science | | | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Soil Testing | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Pesticidal Safety | | | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Range Pasture Mgnt. | | | - | 1 | - | 1 | 1 |
| Area Crop Protection | | | - | - | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Area Agronomist | | | 2 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Area Agronomist (NE) | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Animal Science | | | | | | | |
| Beef | | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| Live Animal Evaluation | | | | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Swine | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Sheep | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Horses | | | | - | - | - | - |
| Meats | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Area Animal Science | | | | - | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Wildlife Damage Control | | | | - | - | - | - |
| Dairy Science | | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Poultry Science | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Entomology | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Field Crop/Stored | | | | | | | |
| Grain Entomology | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Livestock Entomology | | | | - | - | - | - |
| Entom. Diagnostician | | | | - | - | - | 1 |
| Hort. & Urban Entom. | | | | - | - | - | 1 |
| Pesticide Coordinator | | | | - | - | - | - |
| Area Entomologist | | | | . | . | . | 2 |
| Pesticidal Safety | | | | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Wildlife Damage Control | | | | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Wildlife Management | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Area Wildlife Mgnt. (SW) | | | | - | - | - | 1 |
| Ext. Entomology Asst. | | | | - | - | - | - |
| Horticulture | | | | | | | |
| Area Horticulture | | | | 1 | 2 | - | - |
| Horticultural Marketing | | | | - | - | - | 1 |
| Hort./Fruit & Nuts | | | | . | . | 1 | . |
| Hort. Crop Protection | | | | - | - | - | 1 |
| Hort. Ornamental/ | | | | | | | |
| Turfgrass/Floriculture | | | | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Hort. Vegetable Crops | | | | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Landscape Arch/ Hort | | | | - | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Youth & Therapy | | | | - | - | - | 1 |
| State & Ext. Forestry | | | | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3 |
| Watershed Forestry | | | | 1 | 3 | - | - |
| Marketing Forestry | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Fire Control Forestry | | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Tree Improvement | | | | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Nut Crop Forestry | | | | 1 | - | - | - |
| Environmental Forestry | | | | - | - | 3 | 3 |
| Forest Pest Management | | | | - | - | - | 1 |
| Forest Resource Planning | | | | - | - | - | - |
| Rural Forestry | | | | - | - | - | - |

professional staff development:

| | 1962 | 1969 | 1979 | 1988* |
|---------------|------|------|------|-------|
| B.S. degrees | 259 | 273 | 215 | 150 |
| M.S. degrees | 107 | 135 | 182 | 155 |
| Ph.D. degrees | 16 | 33 | 57 | 87 |

*Year of downsizing, thus smaller staff

Kellogg Foundation

Phasing out of the Kellogg Foundation funded Center for Training Extension Administrators at the University of Wisconsin in the late 1960's had a direct effect on Kansas Extension.

Since many persons in administrative positions during Director Jones' era had training from this Center, there was a shared perception of Extension philosophy and

| Subject Area | 1965 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 88 | Subject Area | 1965 | 70 | 75 | 80 | 85 | 88 |
|---------------------------|------|----|----|----|----|----|-------------------------|------|----|----|----|----|----|
| Environmental Programs | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | Child & Youth Ed | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - |
| District/Area Forestry | 7 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 4 | Outdoor Education | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | - |
| Area Survey Forestry | 5 | 3 | - | - | - | - | Community Develop. | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Plant Pathology | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | Public Affairs | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Pathology Diagnostician | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | Organ. & Ldrship. Dev. | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Area Plant Pathologist | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | Rural Area Dev. | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ext. Vet. Medicine | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | Area Rural Area Dev. | 2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Engineering | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | Area Comm. Res. Dev. | - | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Ag Engineering | 4 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | Ag Development | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ext. Architect | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | Comm. Economic Dev. | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Farm & Comm. Safety | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | Resource Dev. Info | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Irrigation Engineering | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | Resource Development | - | 5 | 2 | 2 | - | - |
| Area Irrigation Engr. | - | - | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | Wildlife & Outdoor Rec. | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Area Ag Engineering | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | DIRECT Assistants | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| Natural Resources | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | Direct Assts. | - | - | - | - | - | 2 |
| Pesticide Application | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | County Operations | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Rural Civil Defense | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | - | Dist. Ag Agent | 5 | 4 | - | - | - | - |
| Home Economics | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | Area Director | - | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| HE Programs | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | Dist. Home Ec. Agent | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - |
| Foods & Nutrition | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | Area Home Economist | - | - | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Clothing & Textiles | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | Coord. Sched. & Reports | - | 1 | - | - | - | - |
| Health & Safety | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Computer Systems Off. | - | - | - | - | 1 | 2 |
| Highway Safety | - | - | - | - | 3 | 2 | Computer Training | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Human Resource Dev. | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | Computer Information | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Household Equip & Safety | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | - | Computer Assistant | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Home Management | 3 | 3 | 1 | - | - | - | Energy | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 |
| Home Furnishings | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Residential Energy | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2 |
| Cultural Resource Dev. | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Small Business Energy | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2 |
| Family Economics | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Energy Information | - | - | - | - | 2 | 2 |
| Housing | - | - | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Continuing Education | 1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Fam Resources/Public Pol. | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | Community Services | 7 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Environmental Programs | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | Conferences | 4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Family Life/Human Dev. | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | Evening Classes | 3 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Area Fam. Life/Human Dev. | - | 1 | 1 | - | - | - | Home Study | 4 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Dist. Home Management | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | FACTS | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| EFNEP | - | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | Family Needs | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 4-H Youth | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | Farm Finance | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| 4-H Club Work | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | Attorney | . | . | . | . | . | 1 |
| Dist. 4-H Club Work | 5 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | Family Therapist | . | . | . | . | . | 1 |
| Volunteer Staff Dev. | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | Rural Family Support | . | . | . | . | . | 1 |
| Statewide Events & Prog. | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| Club/Group Meetings | - | - | - | - | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | |

procedure that pervaded the Kansas System.

With the demise of this important training center, and the evolution of personnel in key administrative slots, the continuity and cohesiveness of Kansas Extension began to change.

Similarly, the Extension Programs, Training and Studies section in Kansas began to adjust to changing emphasis and shifting assignments for the staff members in this area.

The end result was a further decrease of focus and support for in-service professional growth at all levels in program development, and Extension philosophy and procedures.

In the latter part of this two-decade period, the staff had been reduced to one person responsible primarily for staff recruitment and orientation training, and another responsible for reports and accountability.

Thus, during this period in Extension's history:

- 1) Specialists were not hired with county Extension program development experience.
- 2) Extension administrators often did not receive graduate training from Extension-oriented Centers such as the one in Wisconsin.
- 3) County Extension Agents were not provided consistent continuing in-service training in program development, delivery, and evaluation

Decentralization/Centralization

Two different avenues for decentralization and programs were developed between 1970 and 1988.

First, five Area Offices evolved from a multiplicity of small, off-campus Extension offices.

Each of the five—at Garden City, Colby, Manhattan, Hutchinson, and Chanute—included an Area Director (for County Operations) and a cadre of subject matter Specialists, relevant to the area, in agriculture, home economics, 4-H, and community development.

Second, the fragmenting effect of relocating State agriculture Specialists within their respective subject matter departments became more apparent in terms of Extension identity, cohesiveness, and esprit de corps.

Arguments remained, however, that the plus in the action was bringing research and extension personnel closer together.

That closeness even expanded to off-campus sites as personnel in the Northwest and Southwest areas of the state moved administratively together in Research-Extension Centers.

The working relationships between the Experiment Station Head, the Area Extension Director, and the Area Extension Specialists were still evolving in Colby and Garden City in 1988.

Another area of concern was the after effect of relocating the Area 4-H Specialists into the State Office in 1988. This leaves the County Agents without Area support for their second most time consuming program area, and the program area which agents may be least prepared to handle, by education, as future changes in emphasis occur.

Staff Time Distribution—1970's-80's

The relative proportion of Extension resources, as measured by staff time, expended for each of the four major Extension program areas fluctuated little during this two decade period.

| | 1970 | 1975 | 1980 | 1985 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|
| Agriculture | 37 | 41 | 42 | 45 |
| Home Economics | 33 | 25 | 24 | 23 |
| 4-H Youth | 26 | 27 | 27 | 25 |
| Community Dev. | 4 | 7 | 7 | 7 |

Split Staff Appointments—1980's

As Extension staff members began to associate closer with their research and teaching counterparts, more Extension and resident faculty began to have joint appointments.

Split appointments for Heads of Department in which Specialists were housed accounted for many split appointments.

The Department Head was given a part-time Extension appointment in recognition of his additional Extension responsibilities.

Frequently, Extension program leaders within a department were given part-time resident teaching or research appointments, partially to:

- 1) Offset Extension funds used for Department Head salaries.
- 2) To help integrate Extension functions within the department.
- 3) To bring specialized expertise to bear on specific Extension program issues.

In December, 1988, these split appointments were listed in the Extension personnel roster.

Walter R. Woods, Dean of Agriculture, Director of Agricultural Experiment Station and Director of Extension—(.3)

Hyde S. Jacobs, Assistant to the Dean of Agriculture—(.5)

Marc A. Johnson, Head, Department of Agricultural Economics—(.4)

Barry L. Flinchbaugh, Extension State Leader, Agricultural Economics—(.8)

Larry N. Langemeier, Extension Agricultural Economist, Farm Management Studies—(.5)

James R. Mintert, Extension Agricultural Economist, Marketing—(.9)

Dee W. James, Extension Agricultural Economist, Agricultural Law—(.2)

Stanley J. Clark, Head, Department of Agricultural Engineering (Acting)—(.2)

George E. Ham, Head, Department of Agronomy—(.3)

David A. Whitney, Extension State Leader, Agronomy Program—(.8)

Ray E. Lamond, Extension Specialist, Soil Fertility and Management—(.9)

David L. Regehr, Extension Specialist, Weed Science—(.9)

Paul D. Ohlenbusch, Extension Specialist, Range and Pasture Management—(.9)

Jack G. Riley, Head, Department of Animal Sciences and Industry—(.2)

Larry R. Corah, Extension State Leader, Animal Sciences and Industry—(.8)

Clifford W. Spaeth, Ext. Specialist, Sheep—(.5)

Gerry L. Kuhl, Extension Specialist, Beef Cattle Nutrition and Management—(.8)

Pete G. Gibbs, Extension Specialist, Horses—(.8)

Jim L. Nelssen, Extension Specialist, Swine—(.6)

Albert W. Adams, Extension Specialist, Poultry Sciences—(.5)

Keith O. Zoellner, Extension Specialist, Beef—(.6)

Harold A. Roberts, Extension Specialist, Dairy Technology—(.2)

Theodore L. Hopkins, Head, Department of Entomology (Acting)—(.2)

Randall A. Higgins, Extension Specialist, Entomology—(.6)

James J. Nighswonger, Extension Specialist, Environmental Forestry—(.9)

Keith D. Lynch, Extension Forester, Rural Forestry—(.4)

Charles W. Deyoe, Head, Department of Grain Science and Industry—(.1)

James L. Balding, Extension Specialist, Formula Feeds Manufacturing—(.9)

Paul H. Jennings, Head, Department of Horticulture—(.2)

Frank D. Morrison, Extension State Leader, Horticulture Program—(.9)

Charles W. Marr, Extension Horticulturist, Vegetable Crops—(.9)

Fred W. Schwenke, Head, Department of Plant Pathology—(.1)

Douglas J. Jardine, Extension Specialist, Plant Pathology—(.8)

Ned A. Tisserat, Extension Specialist, Plant Pathology—(.8)

Homer K. Caley, Extension State Leader, Veterinary Medicine—(.8)

Mary Don Peterson, Head, Clothing, Textiles and Interior Design—(.2)

John P. Murray, Head, Human Development and Family Studies—(.2)

Jane R. Bowers, Head, Food and Nutrition—(.2)

Extension Program Assistants—1980's

Extension program units, primarily in agriculture and community development, began to use more Program Assistants during the 1980's.

Program Assistants provided flexibility in providing highly specialized staff competencies to focus on specific problems, or added staff resources for emergency needs and temporary programs

Assistants could be secured to fill specific needs without a permanent commitment of resources to a program area for future years.

Program Assistant positions listed on the Extension Service personnel roster in December, 1988 were:

Mary H. Bonczkowski, Extension Accountant—(.5)

Mary C. Knapp, Extension Assistant, Computer Systems Office—(1.0)

Robert K. Tyrell, Extension Assistant, Computer Programmer—(1.0)

John A. Kramer, Extension Assistant, Agricultural Safety—(.5)

Willard G. Olson, Extension Assistant, Live Animal Evaluation—(1.0)

Kevin A. Shufan, Extension Entomology Diagnostician—(.5)

Ryan D. Hobson, Extension Assistant, Community Development—(1.0)

Charles Johnson, Extension Assistant, DIRECT—(1.0)

Pamela Maier, Extension Assistant, DIRECT—(1.0)

Staff Composition—1986

In a 1986 report, Director Fred Sobering identified the extent of the Extension Professional and volunteer staffs:

| | |
|---|-------|
| 208.7 State and Area Subject Matter Specialists | |
| Ag | 114.9 |
| Forestry | 23.2 |
| Home Economics | 21.6 |
| 4-H | 13.0 |
| CD | 9.0 |
| Info | 20.0 |
| Energy | 7.0 |
| 286 County Staff | |
| Home Ec agents | 123.0 |

| | |
|--|--------|
| Agriculture agents | 113.0 |
| 4-H agents | 37.0 |
| Horticulture agents | 9.0 |
| EFNEP agents | 6.0 |
| 21 County staff in EFNEP (paraprofessionals) | |
| 291 Secretaries & other classified | |
| 37,600 volunteer teachers & leaders | |
| 4-H | 29,300 |
| Home Ec | 5,000 |
| CRD | 1,800 |
| Agriculture | 1,500 |
| 8,035 elected citizen leaders | |
| Co Ext. Councils | 2,835 |
| Co 4-H Councils | 3,400 |
| County Homemaker Councils | 1,800 |

Establish Area Extension Offices—1970's

SW Area Extension Office—1969

The first pilot Area Extension Office with an Area Extension Director and Extension Specialists was established in Garden City in September, 1969.

The Southwest Area Office was located at 1107 Kansas Plaza until August, 1972. From that time to the end of this report (1988), the office was located at 1501 Fulton Terrace, Garden City.

Ray Mann, then District II Extension Supervisor (Northwest), was appointed to establish "a fully independent area office." His title was changed to Area Extension Director.

Mann's responsibilities included programs, budgets, personnel guidance, and office management for the eight member area staff, and supervision of County Extension personnel and activities in the 22 counties.

It was felt that evaluation of the Southwest Area Office at Garden City would give Extension a chance to analyze the area approach from both an administrative and program standpoint.

Until that time, other Districts continued as they had been, listing a District Extension Supervisor, a District Extension Home Economist, and County Agents in each area.

Preliminary plans were made to expand the Area concept in other portions of the state as opportunities for smooth transitions from Districts to Areas became available.

In September, 1969, for the first time, the personnel roster listed the Southwest Area Extension Office staff with the County Extension Agents in that area.

The 22 counties included in the Southwest Area were:

| | | |
|----------|----------|---------|
| Clark | Hamilton | Morton |
| Comanche | Haskell | Pawnee |
| Edwards | Hodgeman | Scott |
| Finney | Kearny | Seward |
| Ford | Kiowa | Stanton |
| Gray | Lane | Stevens |
| Grant | Meade | Wichita |
| Greeley | | |

The Area office staff consisted of:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|-------------------|--|
| Ray Mann | Area Extension Director |
| Dorothy Neufeld | Area Extension Home Economist |
| Dale Edelbute | Area Ext. Spec., Crops & Soils |
| Eugene Francis | Area Ext. Spec., Animal Sc. & Ind. |
| Loren Whipps | District Extension Economist, Farm Mgnt. |
| Ralph Germann | Ext. Economist, Farm Mgnt., Assn. 3 |
| Jon Herod | Ext. Economist, Farm Mgnt., Assn. 3 |

Danny Trayer Ext. Economist, Farm Mgmt., Assn. 3

James W. Sturdevant Ext. Agricultural Economist, FM Assn., SW

By 1975, there were 12 Extension Specialists stationed in the Southwest Area Extension Office in Garden City. The positions were:

Robert G. Lisec Ext. Agricultural Economist, FM Assn., SW (Greensburg)

- Area Extension Director
- Area Extension Home Economist
- Area Extension Specialist, Crops and Soils
- Area Extension Specialist, Animal Science and Industry
- Area Extension Forester
- Area Extension Specialist, 4-H and Youth
- Area Extension Specialist, Economics
- Area Extension Specialist, Community Resource Development
- Area Extension Irrigation Engineer
- Area Extension Specialist, Crop Protection
- Three Area Extension Economists, Farm Mgmt. Assn. 3

Establish Five Administrative Areas—1971

Five area Extension offices were officially established in 1971 by Director Bob Bohannon.

In his report to all Kansas Cooperative Extension Service staff at the Annual Extension Conference that year he announced:

- 1) Kansas would be divided into five administrative areas, each administered by an Area Director responsible to the Director of Extension or his designated representative for all aspects of the Area Extension operation.

- 2) Names, numbers of counties and Area Center locations for these administrative areas were:

| | |
|--------------------|-------------|
| Southwest (22) | Garden City |
| Northwest (21) | Colby |
| South Central (19) | Hutchinson |
| Southeast (21) | Chanute |
| Northeast (22) | Manhattan |

- 3) An Area Director, located at the Area Center, would have full responsibility for:

- a) Recruitment and selection of county staff.
- b) Training programs for county staff.
- c) Operating budgets, including travel and equipment, for the area.
- d) Management of the Area Center.

- 4) The Area Director would have joint responsibility with subject matter Department Heads for:

- a) Recruitment and selection of Area Specialists.
- b) Initial salary recommendations and evaluation of Area Specialists.

- 5) The Area Director would have joint responsibility with the appropriate Assistant Director or State Leader for:

- a) Area program development and implementation.
- b) Area Specialist training programs.
- c) Publications.

- 6) As soon as convenient and practicable, all Area Specialists would be located at the Area Centers.

An additional Area Extension Economist, Farm Management, Assn. 3 was stationed in Greensburg, Kansas.

In 1987, the Southwest Area Extension Office became a part of the Southwest Research-Extension Center. On August 1, 1988, James Schaffer became Head, Southwest Research-Extension Center.

In December, 1988, current staff positions in the Southwest Area Office included:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|-----------------------|---|
| James A. Schaffer | Head |
| Ray H. Mann | Area Extension Director, SW |
| Carol H. Young | Ext. Home Economist, SW |
| Dwight G. Mosier | Ext. Spec., Crops & Soils, SW |
| (vacant) | Ext. Spec., Animal Science, SW |
| (vacant) | Ext. Spec., Community Development, SW |
| Phillip E. Sloderbeck | Ext. Spec., Entomology, SW |
| (vacant) | Ext. Spec., Wildlife Damage Control, SW |
| Kevin C. Dhuyvetter | Ext. Agricultural Economist, SW |
| Ralph N. Germann | Ext. Agricultural Economist, FM Assn, SW |
| Jon G. Herod | Ext. Agricultural Economist, FM Assn., SW |

Role of Area Extension Directors—1971-88

The Area Extension Director served as the official representative for Kansas State University in the respective administrative area, and reported directly to the Director of Extension at Kansas State University.

Regarding County Extension Operations in the area, the Area Extension Director represented the Director of Extension for personnel placement and management for all County Extension Agent positions and for county program motivation.

He represented the Director in budget negotiations, in cooperation with County Extension Executive Boards of the County Extension Councils in the counties.

At the Area Office the Area Extension Director was the representative of the Director of Extension in matters of Area Specialist placement, area program motivation, and budget negotiations. He was to work cooperatively with Department administrators and subject matter Specialists at Kansas State University.

NW Area Extension Office—1971

In the Annual Extension Report, FY 1970 it stated:

The comprehensive planning in Northwest Kansas the last several years by leaders and citizen groups assisted by Extension staff has resulted in large increases in irrigated acreages, the expanded planting of sugar beets, the installation of a sugar plant, the organization of a regional comprehensive planning commission and establishment of other county rural development projects.

These rapid changes created the need for two new Area Specialists in the Northwest District. Plans were completed for placing of two new Specialists during the next fiscal year.

These Specialists will be an Area Extension Irrigation Engineer, and Area Extension Specialist, Rural Development.

The anticipated increase of staff made it necessary to arrange for moving to a much larger office space.

The first official announcement of the Northwest Extension Center was in the December 1971 Personnel booklet. The nine members of that office were listed this way:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Oscar W. Norby | Area Extension Director |

| | |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Mary M. Schroeder | Area Ext. Home Economist |
| Frank L. Overley | Area Extension Economist. |
| Gersilda Guthrie | Area Ext. Specialist, Home Management |
| DeLynn R. Hay | Area Ext. Irrigation Engineer |
| Kenneth E. Urban | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt. Assn. 5 |
| Donald L. Faidley | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt. Assn. 5 |
| Ervin C. Reimer | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt. Assn. 5 |
| Fred D. Atchison | Area Ext. Forester (Hays) |

In that first listing, the address for Norby and Schroeder was listed as Manhattan, which indicated that the transition to an "on site" staff at the 170W. Fourth, Colby, had not been completed

The 21 counties included in the Northwest Area were:

| | | |
|----------|----------|----------|
| Barton | Ness | Russell |
| Cheyenne | Norton | Sheridan |
| Decatur | Osborne | Sherman |
| Ellis | Phillips | Smith |
| Gove | Rawlins | Thomas |
| Logan | Rush | Wallace |

Philip Finley was appointed Northwest Area Extension Director September 1, 1973. He held that position until his retirement September 30, 1987.

Staff members located in the Northwest Area Extension Office, Colby, at that time Finley joined the staff included:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|---------------------|--|
| Philip B. Finley | Area Extension Director, NW |
| Mary M. Schroeder | Area Ext. Home Economist |
| Frank L. Overley | Area Ext. Economist |
| Leslie R. Reinhardt | Area Ext. Spec., Crop Science |
| Harvey E. Goertz | Area Ext. Spec., 4-H & Youth |
| (Vacant) | Area Ext. Spec., Home Mgnt. |
| (Vacant) | Area Ext. Spec., Community Development |
| DeLynn R. Hay | Area Ext. Irrigation Engineer |
| Kenneth E. Urban | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 5 |
| Donald L. Faidley | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 5 |
| Ervin C. Reimer | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 5 |
| Fred D. Atchison | Area Ext. Forester (Hays) |

The Northwest Area Extension Office became a part of the newly-created Research-Extension Center in 1986.

At that time, a new position of Head, Northwest Research-Extension Center was created. Richard S. White was appointed to that position July 1, 1987.

Reba White was appointed Northwest Area Extension Director on January 18, 1988.

In December, 1988, staff members in the Northwest Area included:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Richard S. White | Head, NW Research-Extension Center |
| Reba S. White | Area Extension Director, NW |
| Pauline W. Ferrell | Ext. Home Economist, NW |
| Mark E. Nelson | Ext. Agricultural Econ., NW |
| Patricia L. Houghton | Ext. Spec., Livestock Prod., NW |
| Merrel E. Mikesell | Ext. Spec., Crops & Soils, NW |
| (Vacant) | Ext. Spec., Community Development |
| Richard H. Wahl | Ext. Ag Econ., Farm Mgmt. Assn., NW |
| Mark A. Wood | Ext. Ag Econ., Farm Mgmt. Assn., NW |

James H. Strine Dist. Forester, NW (at Hays)

SC Area Extension Office—1972

On July 1, 1972, the South Central Area Extension Office was officially established. All Specialists and Fieldmen were moved to a new location at 21 East Des Moines Avenue, South Hutchinson.

At that time Dr. Lawrence Cox moved from the State Office at Kansas State University to become its first resident Area Extension Director.

The 19 counties included in the South Central Area were:

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Barber | Kingman | Reno |
| Butler | Lincoln | Rice |
| Cowley | Marion | Saline |
| Dickinson | McPherson | Sedgwick |
| Ellsworth | Ottawa | Stafford |
| Harvey | Pratt | Sumner |
| Harvey | | |

At this location the staff at the Area Office was expanded by several positions.

In 1972 there were 10 Specialist positions in the South Central Area Extension Office:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|--------------------|---|
| Lawrence Cox | Area Extension Director |
| Helen Blackwood | Area Extension Home Economist |
| Kenneth McReynolds | Area Extension Economist |
| Robert Nuttelman | Area Ext. Spec., Crops and Soils |
| (Vacant) | Area Ext. Spec., Home Mgmt. |
| Steven Lindsey | Area Extension Forester |
| Linda Coen | Area Ext. Spec., 4-H Nutrition Prog. (LWOP) |
| HoBart Frederick | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgmt., Assn. 2 |
| Bill Collins | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgmt., Assn. 2 |
| Henry Deutsch | Area Ext. Spec., Resource Conservation and Development (LWOP) |

By July, 1975, five additional positions had been added to the South Central Area Extension Office. They were:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Thomas Orwig | Area Ext. Spec., Livestock Prod. |
| Marsha Goetting | Area Ext. Spec., Consumer Education |
| Thomas Whitson | Area Ext. Spec., 4-H and Youth |
| Stanley Bratcher | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgmt., Assn. 2 |

Earl Van Meter became the second South Central Area Extension Director August 1, 1985, following the retirement of Lawrence Cox.

The South Central Area Extension Office moved again on October 1, 1986, to 1600 North Lorraine, Hutchinson, where it stayed through the time of this report.

In December, 1988, staff members in the South Central Area include:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Earl L. Van Meter | Area Extension Director, SC |
| Margaret E. Phillips | Ext. Home Economist, SC |
| Kenneth McReynolds | Ext. Agricultural Economist, SC |
| Dale L. Fjell | Ext. Spec., Crops & Soils, SC |
| Robert J. Ritter, III | Ext. Spec., Livestock Production, SC |
| Kenneth B. Albright | Ext. Spec., Community Development, SC |

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Robert J. Bauernfeind | Ext. Spec., Entomology, SC |
| Timothy A. Stucky | Ext. Agricultural Economist, FM Assn., SC |
| Eric B. Allen | Ext. Agricultural Economist, FM Assn., SC |
| Mark Schwartztraub | Ext. Agricultural Economist, FM Assn., SC |
| Bryan L. Manny | Ext. Agricultural Economist, FM Assn, SC |

| | |
|--------------------|---|
| Gerald McMaster | Asst. County Ext. Agent, Hiawatha |
| James Geisler | Area Ext. Forester, Hiawatha |
| Duane Olsen (SL) | Area Ext. Spec., Resource Development |
| Raymond Hackler | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 4, Hiawatha |
| William Dickson | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 4, Hiawatha |
| Leonard Parker | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 4, Wamego |
| Laurenz Greene | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 1, Concordia |
| Ross Olson | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 1, Concordia |
| Kenneth Stielow | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 1, Concordia |
| Vera Ellithorpe | Area Ext. Spec., Home Mgnt., Topeka |
| Paul Kasper (Temp) | Area Ext. Spec., 4-H & Youth, Lawrence |

NE Area Extension Office—1972

The Northeast Area Extension Office was located in the Grain Marketing Research Center, 1515 College Avenue, Manhattan, Kansas from March, 1972 to the end of this report.

Satellite offices were maintained for Farm Management Association fieldmen in Wamego, Hiawatha, Concordia, Lawrence, Baldwin City and Abilene.

The 22 counties included in the Northeast Area were:

| | | |
|----------|-------------|--------------|
| Atchison | Jefferson | Pottawatomie |
| Brown | Jewell | Republic |
| Clay | Johnson | Riley |
| Cloud | Leavenworth | Shawnee |
| Doniphan | Marshall | Wabaunsee |
| Douglas | Mitchell | Washington |
| Geary | Nemaha | Wyandotte |
| Jackson | | |

The First Area Extension Director in the Northeast Area was Richard King, who retired September 21, 1979. He was replaced by Bob Newsome on May 18, 1979. Newsome moved to that position from County Extension Director in Riley County.

Personnel in the Northeast Area Extension Center when it opened were:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| Richard King | Area Extension Director |
| Rosemary Crist | Area Extension Home Economist |
| Dean Dicken | Area Ext. Spec., Crops and Soils |
| Larry Biles | Area Ext. Forester, Watersheds |

Other Area Extension Specialists in the Northeast Area in March, 1972, and their office locations were:

| | |
|--------------|-------------------------------|
| Leo Figurski | Area Ext. Economist, Hiawatha |
|--------------|-------------------------------|

In December, 1988, current staff members in the Northeast Area Office include:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|----------------------|---|
| Bob W. Newsome | Area Extension Director, NE |
| Emily R. Mark | Extension Home Economist, NE |
| D. Leo Figurski | Ext. Agricultural Economist, NE |
| Daniel L. Devlin | Ext. Spec., Crops & Soils, NE |
| Ralph E. Utermoehlen | Ext. Spec., Community Development, NE |
| Larry C. Bonczkowski | Ext. Spec., Crop Protection, NE |
| Barry D. New | Ext. Forester, NE |
| Jerry D. Freeze | Ext. Agricultural Economist, Farm Mgnt. Assn., NE |
| William M. Dickson | Ext. Agricultural Economist, Farm Mgnt. Assn., NE |
| Eugene H. Harter | Ext. Agricultural Economist, Farm Mgnt. Assn., NE |
| Allen W. Janke | Ext. Agricultural Economist, Farm Mgnt. Assn., NE |
| David R. Smith | Ext. Agricultural Economist, Farm Mgnt. Assn., NE |
| Everett K. Everson | Ext. Agricultural Economist, Farm Mgnt. Assn., NC |
| David H. Rempe | Ext. Agricultural Economist, Farm Mgnt. Assn., NC |
| David P. Crawford | Ext. Agricultural Economist, Farm Mgnt. Assn., NC |

SE Area Extension Office—1972

The Southeast Area Office became fully operative July 1, 1972 at Chanute, Kansas located at 20 South Highland.

The first Southeast Area Extension Director was Ray Hoss on November 1, 1971. He retired February 29, 1976 and was replaced by Herman Westmeyer on March 12, 1976.

Following Westmeyer's retirement June 30, 1978, Benny Robbins was appointed Southeast Area Extension Director on April 1, 1978. He continues to served in that position through 1988. The Extension Specialist staff, which was to be stationed at the Chanute Area Office when it opened, included:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Verlin Peterson | Area Ext. Spec., Crops and Soils |
| Jay Treat | Dist. Ext. Economist, Farm Mgnt. |
| (Vacant) | Area Ext. Spec., Home Mgnt. |
| Jack Rowland | Area Ext. Forester, Watershed Project |
| Gerald Bratton | District Extension Forester |
| Mariellen Appleby | District Ext. Home Economist |
| William Guy | Ext. Economist, Farm Mgnt. Assn. 6 |

The 21 counties in the Southeast Area were:

| | | |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| Allen | Crawford | Miami |
| Anderson | Elk | Montgomery |
| Bourbon | Franklin | Morris |
| Chase | Greenwood | Neosho |
| Chautauqua | Labette | Osage |
| Cherokee | Linn | Wilson |
| Coffee | Lyon | Woodson |

By 1976, the County Extension staff in the 21 counties in the Southeast Area included:

- 21 County Extension Agricultural Agents.
- 21 County Extension Home Economists.
- 7 County Extension 4-H Agents.
- 1 County Extension Nutrition Agent.
- 1 Extension Educational Assistant (EFNEP).
- 7 Extension Educational Aides (EFNEP).

The Area Office staff had expanded to 15 positions by 1976, and included:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Positions</u> |
|----------------------|---|
| Herman W. Westmeyer | Area Extension Director |
| Mariellen J. Appleby | Area Ext. Home Economist |
| Gary L. Kilgore | Ext. Spec., Crops & Soils |
| Jay L. Treat | Area Ext. Economist |
| Frank K. Brazle | Area Ext. Spec., Livestock Production. |
| Susan S. Spalding | Area Ext. Spec., Human Dev. & Family Relations |
| Jack J. Rowland | Area Ext. Forester |
| Gerald F. Bratton | Area Ext. Forester |
| Melvin J. Baughman | Area Ext. Forester |
| Benny S. Robbins | Area Ext. Spec., 4-H & Youth |
| Steven G. Bittel | Area Ext. Spec., Community Resource Development |
| Robert E. Dawson | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 6 |
| Thomas E. Appleby | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 6 |
| W. Gale Mullins | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 6 |
| Duane J. Strickler | Area Ext. Econ., Farm Mgnt., Assn. 6 |

In December, 1988, staff members in the Southeast Area Office include:

| <u>Specialist</u> | <u>Position</u> |
|----------------------|--|
| Benny S. Robbins | Extension Area Director, SE |
| Mariellen J. Appleby | Ext. Home Economist, SE |
| Gary L. Kilgore | Ext. Spec., Crops & Soils, SE |
| Marvin R. Fausett | Ext. Agricultural Economist, SE |
| Frank K. Brazle | Ext. Spec., Livestock Prod., SE |
| Jack J. Rowland | Ext. Forester, SE |
| David N. Bruckerhoff | Ext. Forester, SE |
| Steven G. Bittel | Ext. Spec., Community Development, SE |
| George E. Lippert | Ext. Spec., Crop Protection, SE |
| Gerald F. Bratton | Ext. Forester, SE (On Assignment to Great Plains Forester) |
| Robert E. Dawson | Ext. Agricultural Economist, FM Assn., SE |
| Charles P. Wilken | Ext. Agricultural Economist, FM Assn., SE |
| Frederick D. DeLano | Ext. Agricultural Economist, FM Assn., SE (Ottawa) |

Research-Extension Centers—1986-87

The Branch Experiment Stations and Area Extension Offices in the Northwest and Southwest areas were combined into single administrative units, called Research-Extension Centers, in 1986 and 1987, during the administration of Agriculture Dean and Extension Director Walter Woods.

The decision was made to have a Head and Associate Head for each Center.

NW Research-Extension Center—1986

The Colby Branch Experiment Station and Area Extension Office in the Northwest were combined into one administrative units in June, 1986.

Office quarters were remodeled at the Branch Experiment Station for the Area Extension Office and moved into in June, 1987.

Richard S. White was employed as head of that Research-Extension Center on July 1, 1987. As Head of the Center, he was responsible to Dean of Agriculture, Walter Woods, just as were the Heads of Academic Departments on the Kansas State University campus.

In addition, he reported on Extension programs to Associate Dean and Director of Extension, Fred Sobering, and for research programs to Associate Dean and Associate Director of the Experiment Station, Kurt Feltner.

Phil Finley, who had been serving as Area Extension Director in the Northwest Area became Associate Head and Northwest Area Extension Director.

He was the designated representative for county Extension programs, personnel and budgets. Recruit-

ment, evaluation and training programs for county staff were also part of his responsibility.

Reba White became the Northwest Area Extension Director on January 18, 1988, following Phil Finley's retirement on September 30, 1987.

SW Research-Extension Center—1987

The Southwest Kansas Research-Extension Center was established along the same lines in September, 1987.

James A. Schaffer was appointed Head of the Southwest Research-Extension Center on August 1, 1988.

Ray Mann continued in the position as Area Extension Director and Associate Head in that area.

Responsibilities of Center Administrators

Head:

- 1) Provide leadership for planning and conducting research and Extension activities by the Research-Extension Center faculty.
- 2) Responsible for professional improvement, recruitment, development and evaluation of the Center faculty.
- 3) Maintain public relations with clientele and support groups.
- 4) Responsible for facilities, budgets and support staff.

Area Extension Director and Associate Head:

- 1) Responsible for Extension programs and personnel in the counties in the area.
- 2) The Extension Director's designated representative to County Extension Councils and County Commissioners.

County Staff Adjustments—1970's-80's

County Agent Role

Several factors are bringing into focus questions as to the County Extension Agent's role:

- 1) Increased demands on County Agent efforts.
- 2) Orientation of Specialists and administrators to knowledge transfer, in contrast to helping with the application of knowledge to the

decision-making (problem-solving) process.

- 3) Reduction in number of County Extension Agents.

Agents are under pressure to become both generalists and specialists. Agents are expected to be facilitators with access to a variety of sources of information.

Yet they are expected to follow through on problem-solving demands. This involves helping clientele identify cause of problems, providing local information on varied solutions, developing skill at assessing outcomes of varied solutions, and evaluating the program consequences.

How well Agents can handle these expectations is the unanswered agenda in the years ahead.

Agent Training

Specialist efforts and delivery expectations are stemming from Agent needs to provide service for new and expanding audiences.

Yet, there was little provision for specialized training to help Agents adjust to these new educational program demands.

Increasingly, new programs were added and new demands coming from new audiences without cutting or reducing existing program efforts.

But there was little specialized training for Agents, and the new programs were added without cutting or reducing existing demands.

Combine that with the decreased amount of available programming (problem-solving, decision-making) training, and the pressure on County Extension Agents have increased many-fold.

Clientele Short Circuits Agents

As solutions to clientele problems become more complex, there is a tendency for clientele to deal direct with Extension specialists without going through a local Agent.

The more progressive and aggressive commercial farmers have begun turning to consultants and thus bypassing Extension altogether.

This sometimes results in criticism of Agents by clientele for not having the information their clients need.

Women Administrators—1970's-80's

The advent of the Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunities policies in Extension began to change the distribution of staff personnel.

The first change in the traditionally male orientation of the Agricultural Agent position came when Bobbie Wilbur became Lane County's Ag Agent in 1979.

In 1975 the County Director positions were also totally male. By 1979, there were 10 women County Directors:

| | |
|-------------------|-----------------|
| Janet Guthrie | Hamilton County |
| Ocie Neuschwander | Greeley County |

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Connie Bretz | Lane County |
| Elizabeth Curry | Cheyenne County |
| Karen Murphy | Osborne County |
| Ann Domsch | Rawlins County |
| Margaret Hund | Jackson County |
| Janet Stephens | Greenwood County |
| Donna Martinson | Elk County |
| Lois Carlson | Neosho County |

Staff Downsizing Projection—1988

In early 1988, an administrative plan for downsizing the number of Extension positions created a stir of concern among the state and county staff.

This contingency plan had been developed because of projected shortfalls between increasing operating costs and decreasing Federal and State appropriations.

The most dramatic change suggested was the downsizing of 33 County Extension Agent positions, with the end result of leaving 34 one-agent counties, and creating 11 county positions to be shared between counties.

Additionally, vacant or vacated Specialist positions on the State or Area staffs which were frozen in 1987 would continue in that mode.

By the end of 1988, the staff losses were not as dire as had been feared as portions of the downsizing plan were being slowly implemented.

Hardest hit State offices by December, 1988 were the 4-H and Youth Department which had lost five Area positions when they were moved to the State Office, and the Program Development and Evaluation Section that lost two positions.

Losses in faculty positions at that time were:

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| Agricultural Economics | -2.0 |
| 4-H and Youth | -2.0 |
| Staff & Program Development | -2.0 |
| Grain Science & Industry | -1.0 |
| Southwest Area Office | -2.5* |
| Northwest Area Office | -1.0* |
| South Central Area Office | -1.0* |
| Northeast Area Office | -1.0* |
| Southeast Area Office | -1.0* |
| County Agents in SW Area | -7.0 |
| County Agents in SE Area | -1.0 |

* Transferred to State staff

Federal Influence on State Programs—1970's-80's

As State Extension budgets grew larger in recent decades, the proportion of financial support provided by the funding partners—Federal, State, and local—began to shift from the traditional one-third contribution from each source to a larger percentage portion provided by State and local sources.

Even though Federal financial support shrank, percentage wise, the Extension Service-USDA continue to exert considerable influence on direction and scope of many state programs.

This was done, in part, through its frequent guideline and directive documents, self-study reports, detailed directives relating to use of "earmarked" funds for specific purposes, and its stronger insistence on specific evaluation and accountability reports on how funds were spent.

Federal Guideline Publications—1970's-80's

Some of the Federally-initiated documents were instrumental in clarifying the trends that were evolving nationally. Frequently they reflected what was also happening, or would soon be happening, on the Kansas scene.

Brief citations from some of these Extension reports will illustrate what was happening or being advocated.

Scope & Responsibility Report—1958

The 1987 Extension in Transition document summarized the every-ten-year Cooperative Extension Service self-study report, starting in 1958, as follows:

The Scope & Responsibility Report (1958) recognized Extension as the educational arm of the USDA, and the outreach arm of the land-grant university.

It suggested that Extension was an informal educational organization designed to disseminate results of research in agriculture and home economics. The end result was to improve the welfare of those individuals at the grassroot level.

Clientele were identified as farm families. However, a broader audience included urban, non-farm rural residents, related farm organizations, and those who supply services and products to farm people.

Extension needs to be in tune with local needs of its clientele and maximize its efforts with resources avail-

able. Strong emphasis was placed on determining the impact of its programs and services.

A People & a Spirit—1968

A People and a Spirit (1968) emphasized that Extension generated educational programs for action, and promoted organizational and educational leadership.

It also recognized that education is a lifelong learning process and Extension has a unique and effective mechanism for taking knowledge to individuals regardless of race or economic status.

It characterized Extension as a change agent, and a catalyst for bringing about a better quality of life.

The report additionally suggested:

- Quality of living programs in urban as well as rural areas.
- Sharply expanded programs to help the disadvantaged and alienated.
- Emphasis on social and behavioral science disciplines in staffing.
- Cooperation with organizations that can assist in meeting emerging broader human development commitments.
- Considering greater use of contracted services and support of consultants.
- Knowledge should be taken to individuals regardless of race or economic status.
- Extension should conduct educational programs for action and promote educational and educational leadership.
- Concentrate on directing interdisciplinary efforts toward solving existing problems in the complex interrelationship of modern society.
- Strengthening the local Extension office as the public's first point of contact with the land-grant university is extremely important for coping with the many local problems.
- Continued attention to keeping Agents and Specialists at the cutting edge of knowledge and technology.

Food & Agriculture Act of 1977

While the Food & Agricultural Act of 1977 was not an Extension bill, it did include some specific references that had an impact on future Extension programming.

For example, it mandated an evaluation of economic and social consequences of the Cooperative Extension Service.

It also identified two important concepts as being vital in meeting the needs of people at the local level—networking and referral.

In addition, reference was made that there was a need to review Extension's traditional tendencies to:

- 1) Staff county office with traditional agents with degrees only in agriculture or home economics.
- 2) Proved too much emphasis on middle class programs.
- 3) Use local advisory committees in too narrow a spectrum of input.
- 4) Exhibit reactive planning with too little risk-taking.

Cooperative Extension In Transition—1979

Among observations in the 1979 National ECOP report, *The Cooperative Extension in Transition*, about the changing scene for Cooperative Extension were these thoughts:

- Agriculture has grown from the nearly self-sufficient farmer to a complex of interrelated occupations that provide one-fourth of all jobs in city and county.
- The Cooperative Extension Service changed from an educational service primarily for farms and rural homes to one that serves both rural and urban people.
- The world food supply and a basic source of foreign trade are threatened by major losses of prime farmland, growing shortages of water, scarcity of fuels needed for efficient production, and rapidly-growing world populations to feed.
- The programs of the CES have changed in focus from home and agricultural skills training to self-development, citizenship/leadership development, orientation toward problem-solving, and community participations.
- CES programs now go far beyond the traditional homemaking skills to include education in a broad range of family, community, and world concerns.
- Rural communities are being served in their developmental planning, sound community growth, environmental quality improvements, and public affairs education.

CES does not have a national program as such. Rather, it is a continuing process and system of information education in the community, family, home, business, and farm. It's a process of:

- 1) Helping people apply research, information, and resources to improve their lives.
- 2) Leadership development, life enrichment, and individual fulfillment.
- 3) For people to define and learn skills to meet their most urgent, present and future needs.

This is a time for the USDA to provide leadership to expand the system to include education in human health, business and industry, energy, environmental quality, and Extension education to developing countries of the world.

Ten specific goals for CES should be:

- 1) Reduced unemployment and underemployment in rural America.
- 2) Improved income and living conditions for small/lower income farm families.
- 3) Improved housing in rural America.
- 4) Improved environment, community facilities, and services for rural America.
- 5) Improved quality of life for disadvantaged, elderly, minorities.
- 6) Improved health care for rural citizens.
- 7) Improved energy conservation/management for homes, farms, and agribusiness.
- 8) Agricultural efficiency and safe use of chemicals.
- 9) Improved family stability and nutrition.
- 10) Increased access of people to government programs and increased efficiency in delivery of services.

Extension in the 80's—1983

The Extension in the 80's document reaffirmed Extension's mission as education for individuals, families, and communities, but also emphasized the need for development human capital through leadership techniques.

The major area of program emphasis were also re-defined into the categories of agriculture, natural and environmental resources, community and small business development, home economics/family living, 4-H youth education/development, and international concerns.

Other observations included:

- While maintaining the unique partnership between Federal, State, and local levels is essential for a strong Extension system, three other partners have future importance—the private sector, research agencies, and inter-agency partnerships.
- Continued use of volunteers to strengthen programming efforts will remain necessary for reaching multi-faceted audiences.
- Stronger emphasis placed on the need for setting priorities and delineating audiences.
- Because of changes in informational availability and new and innovative information delivery techniques, the importance of accountability and evaluation has increased.
- Need for sound and quality programming through priority setting and program delivery was essential for continued support by decision makers.

Catalyst for Change—1983

The 1983 ECOP document, *A Catalyst for Change*—the Extension Service, reaffirmed Extension's basic mission as:

A system to improve American agriculture and strengthen the Nation's families and communities through dissemination and application of research-generated knowledge and leadership techniques.

The four identified program areas are: improve American agriculture, conserve national resources, strengthen family and community life, and develop leadership capabilities in youth and adults.

Extension in Transition—1987

Extension in Transition: Bridging the Gap Between Vision and Reality, a 1987 report of the Futures Committee of ECOP, restated that the Cooperative Extension Service, after 75 years, remains a unique achievement in American Education.

Extension retains its place of relevance as a unique educational and developmental institution for solving tomorrow's problems.

There has, however, been broadening of major programs areas to adjust to changing times:

- 1) Agriculture and Related Industries—Helping support farm, forest, or range enterprises, and increase the effectiveness of the farm business management, marketing and distribution system.

- 2) Social and Economic Development—Helping people improve their community organizations, services, and environment; conserve and effectively use their natural resources; and develop as informal leaders for identifying and solving problems in a democratic society. Possible areas of emphasis include public affairs, environment, pollution, land and resource use.
- 3) Quality of Living—Helping youth and adults reach their best development as individuals and as members of the family and community, raise their level of living and achieve their goals through wise resource management.
- 4) International Extension—Assisting with the agricultural development of other countries.

Extension's role as the "educational support arm" needs a broadened support base—from different departments within the Federal Government, from all colleges within the university system, city as well as county governments, and other people-oriented state and local agencies and organizations.

From a staffing point of view, there is a need to further emphasize the social and behavioral science disciplines, increase specialists with joint appointments, experiment with multi-county staffing and specialist teams, and increase in formal and informal staff training and development.

The report also notes the evolutionary role of the County Extension Agent—that indispensable person on the cutting edge of program delivery:

There are three eras in the role of the County Extension Agent—community control, mass society, and the information age.

In the community control era, the Agent was a participant in community affairs and broker of information originating outside the community.

During the mass society era, the Agent remained a teacher, but became an interpreter of information from various sources.

Now in the information age, the Agent most likely helps clientele access databases and learns along with them.

The danger for today's Extension workers, who by design, inattention, or indifference, limit themselves to a traditional focus, is that the scope and influence of their programming may be sharply reduced.

Kansas Extension's Changing Mission—1970's-80's

Shifting Focus—1950's-70's

Historically speaking, Extension was primarily rural oriented until after WWII. Since that time both the mission and clientele have gradually broadened to the point they are difficult to delineate.

Rural, rural transplanted to urban, and urban audiences were all able to benefit from Extension technology transfer in agriculture, food, youth, and family. In an era of rapid growth—the 50's to the 70's—this concept of helping everyone worked well.

However, economic contractions in the 1970's brought widespread stress to the Extension system. Cuts across the board did not take priorities into consideration. Extension began to question its attempt to "be all things to all people."

Many traditionalists began to agitate for a return to the original mission—of serving only rural-oriented agriculture, home economics, and youth audiences.

Factors for Change—1970's-80's

Several factors have contributed to the evolution of the mission for the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service during the past two decades. Some of the influences were reflected in philosophy and program goals:

- 1) National reports, studies, and guideline statements reflecting the forward-looking ideas of Extension leaders.
- 2) National Affirmative Action legislation and directives that changed employment perceptions.
- 3) Broader language in the Kansas Extension Council Law making programs available to all citizens.
- 4) Changes in election representation for County Extension Councils.
- 5) Increased earmarked Federal funds to assure attention to selected program areas.

Thrusts for the 70's

Following up on the National charge for change, Director Robert Bohannon, at the 1969 Annual Extension unveiled his Thrusts for the 70's proposal for future programming. His opening remarks indicated:

Extension has recognized its need to consider several of the social, economic, and human adjustments related to problem solving.

Accordingly, we have initiated efforts in such areas as community resource development, public affairs education, consumer competence, family living, and youth enrichment activities.

Other current problems, which vie for our attention, include proper use of natural resources, outdoor recreation, pollution control, community facilities, and effective local government.

At the same time we must continue to give priority support to food and fiber production through education and research.

Bohannon then proposed future grouping of major Extension efforts into two parallel, and often interacting, program emphasis areas: Natural Resources and Human Resources. Focus in the Natural Resource area are on:

- 1) Animal Production & Utilization.
- 2) Food & Forage Production.
- 3) Service to Agri-Business.
- 4) Management on Commercial Farms.
- 5) Resource Use & Conservation.

Emphasis areas in Human Resources are:

- 1) Focus on the Modern Life.
- 2) Accent on Youth.
- 3) Rural Revitalization
- 4) Serving Urban Audiences.
- 5) Expanding Limited Resources.

Although this master plan was never totally implemented, it did provide many guidelines that were incorporated into shaping new directions for programs in the decade ahead.

Recent Mission Statement—1986

Extension's continuing mission was expressed in a 1986 report by Director Fred Sobering this way:

Cooperative Extension provides practical and useful information to the people of Kansas—to help them meet their needs, problems, and opportunities.

It delivers informal, out-of-school, non-credit educational programs to citizens in every county in Kansas.

It takes scientific knowledge, applied principles, and recommended practices to the people for their use in their daily lives.

It provides Kansans with research results and information they can use to produce and market high quality food profitably, to use natural resources wisely,

to achieve a satisfactory quality of life through sound resource management, and to grow personally as individuals and members of families and communities.

This is a mission statement to which any Ex-tension worker can prescribe. But does it cover all the bases in the shifting sands of today's society?

Finance/Budget Trends—1970's-80's

Sources of Funds—1965-88

Kansas Extension's financial support has changed over the years both in size of budget and in source of educational funds.

The size of the budget has steadily increased over the years, reflecting the expanding scope of educational programs included under the Cooperative Extension umbrella. A rough comparison in millions of dollars during the past two decades are as follows:

| <u>1965</u> | <u>1970</u> | <u>1975</u> | <u>1980</u> | <u>1985</u> | <u>1988</u> |
|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 5.7 | 8.1 | 12.3 | 18.1 | 25.8 | 27.9 |

In regard to source, the following chart show the percentage shift in support from the four major sources:

| | <u>1966</u> | <u>1970</u> | <u>1975</u> | <u>1980</u> | <u>1985</u> | <u>1988</u> |
|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| County | 40.7 | 41.5 | 35.7 | 36.5 | 36.3 | 35.2 |
| State | 23.5 | 28.2 | 26.2 | 29.9 | 29.5 | 33.2 |
| Federal | 22.2 | 25.0 | 24.5 | 21.3 | 22.6 | 22.0 |
| Fees | 11.9 | 5.3 | 13.6 | 12.3 | 11.6 | 9.6 |

Staff Time Spent—1970-88

The percentage of staff time spent in handling the major program areas has remained fairly constant through the years even though the size and scope of the Extension effort has continued to expand.

Earmarked Funding

In recent years, an increasing number of Extension programs are identified and funded by "earmarked"

| <u>Funding Source</u> | <u>1965</u> | <u>1970</u> | <u>1975</u> |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| Smith-Lever Funds: | | | |
| Regular 3(b) & 3(c) | \$1,267,842 | \$1,497,586 | \$2,272,956 |
| Special 3(d)) | | | |
| Nutrition | ----- | 314,828 | ----- |
| Exp. Food & Nutrition: Professional..... | ----- | ----- | 99,113 |
| Exp. Food & Nutrition: Paraprofessional..... | ----- | ----- | 478,976 |
| Farm Safety | ----- | ----- | 4,125 |
| Agricultural Marketing Act (Marketing)..... | 50,891 | 47,186 | 47,282 |
| Resource Conservation & Development | ----- | ----- | 13,382 |
| Rural Civil Defense..... | 31,813 | 28,899 | 16,073 |
| Title V Rural Development | ----- | ----- | 26,375 |
| Rural Development..... | ----- | ----- | 17,733 |
| Pest Management | ----- | ----- | 50,301 |
| Pesticide-Chemical..... | 25,686 | ----- | ----- |
| Special Project Extension Service Fund | ----- | ----- | 10,755 |
| Other Program Funds: | | | |
| State Funds | 1,410,540 | 2,200,608 | 3,089,660 |
| County Funds..... | 2,306,513 | 2,988,301 | 4,546,106 |
| Non-Tax Funds (fees/grants) | 558,020 | 1,059,333 | 1,235,765 |
| Total All Programs..... | \$5,651,305 | \$8,136,741 | \$11,909,102 |

funding. This means that the funding source specifies how funds will be used.

Congressional "earmarked" funding has been made available through ES-USDA sources for expanded programs in urban 4-H, community development, and nutrition education for the disadvantaged reinforced the calls for broader programs stated in Extension position papers.

In addition, continued strong State and National base funding, with added Federal "earmarked" funding for crop protection and insecticide training, ensured continued support for food and fiber production.

Other State funding has been available from sources such as the Kansas Department of Transportation for seat belt safety, the Kansas Corn Commission and Kansas Soybean Commission for agronomy, the Rural Arts

Council for home economics.

Non-tax funds, in the form of grants, have come from various places, such as the Arthur Capper Foundation for economics, the Baughman Foundation for agronomy, and the Dane Hansen Foundation for 4-H.

All of these "earmarked" funds do support worthwhile Extension program emphases, but they tend to limit flexibility in funding.

Budget Trends—1970's-80's

Budgets for the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service programs expanded greatly during the period.

The tables below show the expansion and the shifts in funds from Federal, State and local sources during this era.

Evaluation & Accountability—1970's-80's

Accountability

Accountability effort took three major directions in the period.

- 1) A revised staff time reporting system that relied more heavily on statistical data than narrative reporting.

| Funding Source | 1980 | 1985 | 1988 |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Smith-Lever Funds: | | | |
| Regular 3(b) & 3(c) | \$2,889,364 | \$4,832,247 | \$4,168,819 |
| Expanded 4-H: Urban | 97,648 | 96,400 | 96,400 |
| Expanded 4-H: Rural Development..... | 48,778 | 48,200 | 48,200 |
| Expanded Part-Time Farmer | 58,629 | 19,543 | 19,543 |
| Rural Development | ----- | ----- | 48,503 |
| Exp. Food & Nutrition: Professional..... | 76,468 | 199,773 | 267,077 |
| Exp. Food & Nutrition: Paraprofessional..... | 402,895 | 572,222 | 834,272 |
| Exp. Food & Nutrition: 4-H Professional..... | 66,520 | ----- | ----- |
| Ext. Food & Nutrition: 4-H Paraprofessional..... | 53,396 | ----- | ----- |
| Farm Safety | 20,420 | 41,500 | 48,377 |
| Rural Development..... | 31,033 | ----- | ----- |
| Integrated Pest Management | 207,000 | 224,959 | 189,644 |
| Pesticide Impact Assessment..... | 95,362 | 47,910 | 48,221 |
| Other Program Funds: | | | |
| State Funds | 5,331,594 | 7,554,485 | 9,347,449 |
| County Funds..... | 6,498,602 | 9,296,402 | 9,889,266 |
| Non-Tax Funds (fees/grants)..... | 2,197,730 | 2,964,064 | 2,710,274 |

- 2) An emphasis on Equal Employment Opportunities accompanied by an Affirmative Action process relating to hiring practices.
- 3) An activity reporting system designed to provide a more accurate look at results and impact.

EMIS Reporting System—Late 1960's

A more numerically-oriented report of staff time started in the late 1960's when the Extension Management Information System (EMIS) was introduced nationwide and in Kansas.

The system attempted to qualify, on a uniform basis, Extension efforts, in terms of staff time in specific program areas, clientele contacts, publications, media contacts. This differed from the anecdotal type narrative report used previously.

Frequent revisions of the EMIS forms and information during subsequent years indicate that it still hasn't been perfected to everyone's satisfaction. An interesting trend is the reappearance of abbreviated references to narrative summaries.

A Kansas Extension Specialist with evaluation and research techniques was added to the staff to provide program evaluation leadership.

The Kansas Extension Management Information System (EMIS) was made operative for daily activity reporting and progress.

The "full-blown" operation with Plans of Work, Plans of Work Project, Daily Activity reporting, and annual Progress Reports was started July 1, 1969 for FY1969-70.

The use of an IBM 1230 Optical Reader wired to an automatic keypunch continued to give excellent result for reading coded and marked Daily Activity Reports.

This Progress Report was the first full fiscal year made under this system.

Congressional Evaluation Mandate—1977

In 1977, Congress mandated the use of a stronger evaluation. This occurred because Extension programs seemed to be aimed at traditional (middle class) clientele rather than to newly identified groups in need of services.

Extension had evolved into reactive planning with very little risk taking with a narrow spectrum of clientele.

The Kansas response to the mandated evaluation in Extension took several forms. The most immediate was a comprehensive report of staffing patterns, a

report of private funding support, reports of program accomplishments in each of the four program areas, and case histories representing the cross section of 4-H delivery methods.

The completion of this National Report to Congress led to increased emphasis by Extension on more intensive research design evaluation reports which were implemented with state Plans of Work due in 1983.

At that time, each program area was to have developed specific plans for at least one Impact Study in their program area.

Report Format—1980's

Because of the new expectations from annual reports, the format changed from the simple narrative style to a more descriptive form which included:

- Program description and goals.
- Resources involved.
- Accomplishments.
- Perceived social consequences.
- Ways to measure and evaluate.
- Future implications.

Although there remained considerable variation in report contents developed under this new outline, there was a continuing improvement in "in-depth" reporting over a period of time.

The first Impact Study in Kansas was a five-year study initiated in 1983 to assess the extent to which there was a measurable difference between youth participating in 4-H programs generally, youth participating in selected 4-H programs, and youth not in any 4-H program.

The study focused on nutrition knowledge and these elements of leadership and citizenship—self-concept, decision making, interpersonal relations, and understanding the general and agricultural community.

Among the findings were:

- 1) Trends favored 4-H youth over non-4-H youth on a wide variety of outcome measures and trends.
- 2) Trends favored 4-H youth participating in selected programs—clubs using recommended club planning, officer training materials, and project leader trainers.
- 3) 4-H'ers in the Ambassadors program had significantly better public speaking skills than youth not involved.
- 4) Children in inner-city school classrooms

whose teachers used teaching packets on a variety of agriculture and home economics topics had significantly higher knowledge and understanding of the agricultural community.

5) 4-H'ers involved with using the Economics Decision Making program, "Trade-Offs," had significantly more knowledge of economics and career decision making than youth who did not.

Aside from the meaningfulness of the findings themselves, a positive result of the studies was setting bench mark data on 4-H'ers and non-4-H'ers on a wide variety of instruments adopted, adapted, and created with testing for validity and reliability.

Equal Employment Opportunities

Kansas Cooperative Extension Service programs have few of the problems encountered by many of their counterpart programs in other states emanating from Equal Employment Opportunity legislation.

However, the Kansas Cooperative Extension service has been involved in only one Civil Rights action.

The complaint was filed with the Kansas Commission on Civil Rights in October, 1972, placed on the docket in January, 1973, hearings occurred in 1973, and the results were given in early 1974.

The basis for the action was the apparent inconsistencies in the salaries of County Agents. As a result of this action, starting salaries for all County Extension Agents were equalized.

Within a year after that action, the first female agricultural agent was hired. In 1975, there were no women County Directors. In 1979, there were 10.

Program Coordinating Teams—1987

Program Coordinating Teams have been organized in Extension to assist Agents, Specialists and Program Development Committees in planning, implementing and evaluating major programs, during four-year planning

cycles, that relate to Extension's priority initiatives.

Identified areas include:

- Agricultural Profitability.
- Animal Agriculture— Beef, Swine, Dairy.
- Field Crops—Soybeans, Alfalfa, Wheat, Corn, Sorghum.
- Grazing lands.
- Horticulture—Horticultural Food Crops, Ornamentals and Turf.
- Natural Resources and Environmental Quality—Soil and Water Conservation, Water Quality, Ag Chemicals and Environment.
- Human Health and Well-Being.
- Developing Human Resources.
- Economic Revitalization.
- Community Economic Development.
- Income and Career Program.
- Business Management Program.
- Consumer and Lifestyle Program.

In the forward to the planning statements document, Hyde Jacobs, Asst. Ext. Director for Agricultural Programs, said:

As a first step, each coordinating team prepared a short overview, projected their perception of critical management and technology needs, and suggested possible high-priority education responses for Agents and Specialists.

The Program Coordinating Team statements will provide background and program ideas, which will be modified and supplemented by Agents and Specialists to meet local, area, and statewide clientele needs.

The objective is to provide sound educational programs which will strengthen farms and families and provide producers with a competitive or economic advantage.

Extension professionals are expected to be aggressive in organizing timely, well directed programs to meet the educational needs of agricultural clientele.

County Extension Law Changes—1972-87

County Extension Law Revision—1972

The County Agricultural Extension Council Law received several major revisions in 1972. The bill that was passed repealed and/or amended sections applying to operation, powers, and responsibilities of County Extension Councils.

Two reasons for revising the County Agricultural Extension Council Law in 1972, as given in the Annual Report that year were:

- 1) The election of County Extension Council representatives on the basis of township residence was becoming unrealistic due to popu-

lation shifts and governmental unit consolidation.

2) A growing urban population was getting a decreasing amount of representation on the Council.

Specifically, some of the major changes in this revision of the 1951 law were:

Name Change. In the revised law, the name of the Council was changed from County Agricultural Extension Council to County Extension Council.

Purpose Broadened. The purpose of the Council was changed from: "the giving of instruction in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H club work" to "the giving of instruction in agriculture, marketing, home economics, 4-H youth, and community and resource development."

Election Procedures. The method of electing Council members and the number of Council members were completely changed. Under the revised law, members were elected on the basis of County Commissioner district rather than townships, or cities not part of a township.

There were to be nine representatives from each Commissioner district, three elected each year after the starting year. Elections could be at meetings or by mail ballot. If election meetings were held, they could be by commissioner district or county wide.

Term of Office. The term of office was for three years rather than two as had been the case since 1951. Therefore, one third of the Council was elected each year. Members could serve no more than two consecutive terms.

Executive Board Representation. A nine-member Executive Board was to be elected by the Council members from within its membership, as had been done under the 1951 Council Law.

Under the 1972 law, the Executive Board had to have at least one member from each commissioner district and one from each of the three represented program areas—agriculture, home economics, and 4-H club and youth work.

The 1972 Annual Report further stated:

With this law change it is anticipated that Extension will be able to better reflect the concerns of the local clientele and develop educational programs that meet their specific needs.

For quite some time Extension has been broadening its activities to include areas which are of value to all

citizens. Hopefully, the broad-ening of representation on the County Extension Councils will make it possible to obtain the legitimization and financial support to continue this trend.

Revise County Extension Council Law—1987

Three additional major changes were made in the County Extension Council Law in 1987, relating to:

- 1) The program areas to be represented on the County Extension Council.
- 2) The number of members on the council.
- 3) The process of county Extension budget approval.

Council Composition. Under the law, as revised in 1987, the County Extension Council would consist of 24 members; four each in agriculture, home economics work, 4-H club and youth work and economic development initiatives.

The term of office would be for two years. Each year, a Council member would be elected from each Commissioner district to represent each of the four program areas.

Budget Approval Procedure. The budget approval procedure for county Extension budgets that had been followed since about 1957, and later made law in the revised county Extension law in 1972, was changed.

As a result of the 1987 revisions there was no longer a budget committee consisting of the Board of County Commissioners (3), the Area Extension Director and the Chairman of the County Extension Executive Board.

From 1951 to 1987, such a budget committee in each county had authority to pass on the proposed county Extension budget.

Instead, as a result of the 1987 revisions, the county Extension executive board would now submit a proposed budget to the county commissioners for their consideration.

The budget was to be prepared by the county Extension executive board in cooperation with the director of Extension. (This was assumed to be accomplished with his representative, the Area Extension Director).

Under the new law the County Commissioners became the budget committee and had the authority to approve or reject the budget.

If the County Commissioners did not approve the proposed budget it was to be returned to the county

Extension executive board within ten days.

The Board was to consider amendments or modifications. Consultation with the commissioners was possible.

The board could then re-submit the budget to the Commissioners for their reconsideration. The County Commissioners then had full authority to approve, amend or modify the proposed budget.

Extension Advisory Councils—1970's

The last minutes under the old format of the State Extension Advisory Council were recorded in 1967.

After an absence of five years, it was reformed in 1973, with representation of four members from each of the five Extension administrative areas. The chairman of the Council can also appoint four additional at-large members as needed.

The stated purpose of the Advisory Council is:

The State Extension Advisory Council will serve as a consultative group to the Director of Extension on concerns relating to Extension.

Under the present structure, the State Extension Advisory Council is the middle layer for input from lay persons.

In each Area there is an Area Extension Advisory Council, composed of the current chairman of the County Executive Boards in each of the five Extension Areas, namely Southwest, Northwest, South Central, Northeast, and Southeast.

By tradition, the Extension Director meets annually with each Area Extension Advisory Council to share update information about Extension concerns, and to seek input from these local lay leaders.

Five members of the State Extension Advisory Committee—one from each Extension Area—also serve on the Kansas State University Agricultural Council. This Council serves as a sounding board for the Dean of Agriculture at its annual meetings.

Special Program Emphasis—1970's

An increasing variety of Extension educational programs were offered by Specialists to meet specific needs of various audiences.

Here are a few representative samples of some programs offered during this decade to reach a variety of audiences.

Wildlife Damage Control Handbook—1970

As a means of providing county Extension offices with a handy reference to wildlife damage control problems, a two-volume handbook was prepared and distributed.

The handbooks included information on each kind of wild mammal in Kansas, plus helpful information on several species of pest birds.

The handbook will save time in getting up-to-date control procedures to individuals requesting information and will serve as a reference of background information for County Agents.

Emergency Preparedness—1970

To provide information and incentive that will interest the public in learning about survival in a nuclear or natural disaster, the third annual Kansas Emergency Preparedness Week was conducted in April.

Sixty-eight counties reported activities during this week including meetings, talks, radio, television and news stories.

While the emphasis was on natural disasters, the County Agents and Civil Defense Directors had a free choice of bulletins. Over 80,000 bulletins were ordered and distributed from the State office, 28 percent on nuclear disaster survival.

A Disaster Handbook for Extension Agents was developed covering natural and nuclear disaster procedures which Extension agents should accomplish to develop effective disaster information programs.

USDA Committees for Rural Develop.—1970

A state committee for rural development was organized and named the "Kansas USDA Committee for Rural Development."

The membership included:

Robert A. Bohannon, Cooperative Extension, Chairman.

Paul W. Griffith, Cooperative Extension, Secretary.

Morrie A. Bolline, Soil Conservation Service.

E. Morgan Williams, Farmers Home Administration

Ervin C. Vogel, Rural Electrification Administration.

Walter Fillmore, State & Private Forestry, Denver.

Harold G. Gallaher, State Extension Forester.

Frank A. Mosier, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

A set of objectives and an outline of operational procedures were developed as guidelines for the State Committee and County Committees.

County committees were organized in each of the 105 Kansas counties, under the name of County USDA Committee for Rural Development.

Official membership of these county committees included: County Extension Director, County Extension Agricultural Agent, County Extension Home Economist, County Soil Conservationist, County FmHA Supervisor, County ASCS Executive Director.

Economic Outlook on TV—1971

For the third year, a television broadcast was used to present agricultural outlook to a statewide Kansas audience.

The hour-long program, entitled "Outlook 70-71," featured four KSU Extension Economists presenting current and predicated information on general situations as related to farm management, livestock marketing, and grain marketing.

The program originated and videotaped in Wichita for broadcast over the Wichita TV stations, an in Topeka, Pittsburg, and Kearney, NE.

The program was well promoted through county personnel and received an exceptional response. This approach has set the pattern for future presentations of outlook material.

Great Plains Conservation Emphasis—1971

A Great Plains Conservation Tillage Task Force, with Frank Bieberly as chairman, was established by the Great Plains Agricultural Council.

The Task Force's charge was to develop an educational program on conservation tillage in the Great Plains, including a Conservation Tillage Handbook for use by Extension Specialists and County Agents.

The handbook contained information on the history and philosophy of conservation tillage, terminology, erosion conditions, conservation needs, research information, equipment, cultural practices, economics of conservation tillage, new developments, resumes of conferences, and teaching aids and techniques.

Full Load Schools—1971

High level management is necessary in farming as the result of continued increases in production costs without corresponding increases in process of major agricultural commodities.

An integrated educational program on principles and practices of production of a crop has been used for several years to help farmers maximize returns in production of a crop.

The "Full Load" program presented by a team of specialists has been requested most frequently for sorghum, corn, and soybeans.

This integrated program includes information on selection of a hybrid and/or variety, growth and development (crop physiology so that farmers can know when and why to apply appropriate management practices), cultural practices, soil fertility and weed control.

Other topics sometimes includes insect control, disease control, and/or irrigation. The continued heavy demand for this type of program indicates the effectiveness of this method of education.

Hazardous Occupations Training—1971

Special emphasis has been placed on developing effecting teaching materials to help prepare rural use for handling power equipment.

The Hazardous Occupations training program now has new teaching materials prepared by the Farm Machinery Specialists. These included two new slide sets, a Farm Machinery Safety Manual, and a packet of pictures for developing teaching transparencies.

About 3,000 Kansas youth were certified to work under this program during 1970-71. In the three previous years, 8,410 youth were certified.

During this time, none of the youth have been involved in a fatal accident, and only three have incurred temporary disabling injuries.

Agricultural Banking School—1971

Fifty-three Kansas bankers from 43 Kansas counties completed the first "Kansas School of Agricultural Banking" course in June.

The school was designed to provide Kansas bankers with information to help them better serve Kansas agricultural producers.

The program, planned by the Kansas Association of Bank Agricultural Representatives (KABAR) and Extension economists at K-State, consisted of three parts:

- 1) Basic Farm Business Management, presented by Wilton Thomas and four Farm Management Association fieldmen.
- 2) Farm Financial Planning and Financial Management, staffed by John Schlender and Leo Figurski, Area Farm Management Specialist.
- 3) Topics unique to the banking industry, staffed by experienced agricultural bankers in Kansas and Orlo Sorenson.

The success of the school led to scheduling an advanced workshop the following year, plus a new beginning school for another set of bank representatives.

Grass Resource Opportunities—1972

Grass Resource Opportunities (GRO) was developed to help livestock producers in eastern Kansas increase their tame pasture acreage and improve management.

Eastern Kansas has 1,450,000 acres of tame pasture and could increase this amount by another one million acres. But proper pasture management and balanced livestock forage programs need additional emphasis.

GRO was designed to:

- 1) Increase interest in proper tame pasture management.
- 2) Demonstrate pasture renovation and establishment.
- 3) Obtain costs and return information based on weigh-in, weigh-out results from different management treatments.
- 4) Suggested pasture improvement practices, including the proper grass species selection, weed, brush, and tree control, proper pasture fertility, proper grazing management, and sound livestock programs.

County Agent farm visits, demonstrations, tours, and mass media are the primary methods utilized in the GRO program.

Sound, well-planned demonstrations carried out by County Agricultural Agents and Area Agronomists have been the backbone of GRO. Several demonstrations have been established in nearly all of the 26 eastern Kansas GRO counties.

Kinds of demonstration established include:

- Rate of gain studies on tall fescue, smooth brome, and bermuda grass.
- Weed, brush, and undesirable tree control on established pastures.
- Pre-emergence weed control on newly sprigged bermuda grass.

- 2,4-D effects on stimulated grass growth.
- Broomsedge control with fertilizer.
- Numerous N-P-K studies on established tame pasture and native range.

Pasture renovation, better fertility, weed and brush control, and new pasture establishment are all increasing rapidly as a result of the GRO program.

Improved range management is primarily in the area of proper stocking, season of use, improved grazing distribution, weed and brush control, and proper range burning.

A GRO newsletter, featuring at least one county result demonstration in each issue, has been developed.

Insect Reporting Via Telenet—1972

A weekly insect report has been provided as a service to County Agents, insecticide dealers and manufacturers, and producers during the growing season since the early 1950's.

An attempt to deliver this information in a more timely fashion led to the use of a telenet conference in 1972, each Friday from 8 to 9 a.m.

The survey entomologist of the State Board of Agriculture in Topeka had the major responsibility of assembling and reporting the data. But there were many other participants at various locations across the state.

Included were Board of Ag district survey entomologists at Great Bend, El Dorado, and Manhattan, an Area Extension agronomist at Garden City, and a KSU research entomologist, Extension entomologists, and Extension plant pathologists at Manhattan.

During the hour conversation, the survey information from all areas was presented and there was an opportunity for further discussion of the severity of problems and potential problems.

Written summaries of the discussions are also prepared for the newsletter, duplicated, and mailed the same day. That way cooperators across the state have the report information to help them make individual decisions at the first of the next week.

Timely utilization of control measures have increased a great deal as a result of the telenet and newsletter program.

Cowboy College—1972

The actual working cowboy, who is associated with feedlots and cattle ranches, has little opportunity to attend educational meetings that pertain to his specific job. He gets most of his information from advertisements or salesmen.

Cowboy Colleges were implemented to provide factual research-supported information to these working cowboys. The major objective was to increase the cowboys' knowledge of animal disease and medication.

These Colleges were held at three locations in the state where research reports and practical information was presented by Extension veterinarians, practicing local veterinarians, and KSU Animal scientists.

The Director of the Veterinary Diagnostic Lab explained the lab's function. Extension veterinarians reported on extensive field trials and application of results.

In 1972, over 100 cowboys, representing feedlots with an annual head capacity of over 1.5 million head, attended this concentrated eight-hour session. This represented about half of the total feedlot industry in the state.

K-MAR-105 Electronic Record System—1972

A total of 155 Farm Management Association members enrolled in a completely computerized management system in order to obtain in-depth management information on a timely basis.

The participants could tailor the farm record systems to fit their operations in regard to financial analysis, cash flow reports, management analysis, and enterprise records.

The K-MAR-105 System, handled through the Kansas Farm Management Associations, provided four basic programs to the farmer:

- 1) Periodic Report.
- 2) Depreciation Schedule.
- 3) Year-End Business Analysis.
- 4) Monthly Cash Flow Report.

The Periodic Report provides the farmer with management information that he needs on a monthly basis. This contains: transaction journal, cash flow, loan and accounts receivable summary, net worth analysis, payroll summary, total business summary, non-farm accounts, and enterprise analysis.

The Year-End Business analysis provided for in-depth analysis through its income and expense summary, de-

preciation analysis, net worth, financial factors, livestock production, crop production, farm typing, detailed cost analysis, income and expense analysis, management analysis, and enterprise analysis.

Newly developed programs, such as a tax management estimate, income statement, and purchase-resale table, allows the farmer to more uniquely develop the type of records he requires for management of his farm operation.

Since the start of the K-MAR-105 project in 1968, continuous educational programs have been held with private firms on the advantages of computerized management systems in agriculture, and on the methodology of handling such systems.

The computer programs of the K-MAR-105 system have been released for use by qualified Kansas firms with their clientele.

Kansas Tax Institutes—1972

Income tax practitioners are faced with numerous changes in tax reporting each year. Sizable numbers of new people enter the income tax preparation field each year, either as employees of a tax firm or as individual tax consultants.

Since income tax preparation requires increased training and skills each year, Extension Tax Institutes have been offered for many years to inform practitioners of new regulations and reporting methods, and to improve their skills in other phases of income tax reporting.

The two-day Tax Institutes were conducted on a workshop basis in nine Kansas locations. The schools were conducted by the KSU Extension Economists with the cooperation with personnel of the Internal Revenue Service, Kansas Department of Revenue, and Social Security Administration.

A set of eight problems, designed to bring out new changes and other problem areas of tax reporting, was prepared and sent out to participants prior to the Institutes.

Total registration in 1972 was 2,284. The registrants were responsible for preparing returns for approximately 300,000 taxpayers.

Many of the professional people attending the Tax Institutes do not traditionally participate in Extension educational programs. These include accountants, attorneys, bankers, real estate and insurance brokers, clerks, secretaries, and Federal and State agency personnel.

EFNEP "Rocket" Mail—1972

Helping the hard-to-reach family, especially children, often is expensive in time and resources.

Since everyone likes to get good news in the mail, this method of carrying educational messages to large numbers of low-income youth was tried in 1972.

The main objective of this direct mail piece, featuring the Kansas-originated "super hero Rip Rocket" was to help youth learn and practice improved food habits.

Six single-sheet lessons, in comic strip format, were prepared.

Thirty-six counties responded to the invitation to develop mailing lists for target audiences, and ordered supplies for 12,000 correspondents.

Response to county offices included many letters addressed to "Rip Rocket," asking to put new people on the mailing list, for autographed pictures, for recipes, and to express love for Rip.

Evaluation of the project with five-to-ten year old low-income youth showed that this group delighted in having their own mail, parents honored this right, and it is possible to learn from a mailed source of information.

This project pointed the way for further use of the direct contact with low-income audiences. The methods appeared successful, and subject matter almost limitless.

The problem areas appeared to be keeping an up-to-date mailing list for the highly mobile low-income audience, and coping with the time-consuming nature of handling large mailings on a regular schedule.

Drug Education Program—1972

Parents want to be informed about drugs. This was proven when over 1,000 Kansas parents attended drug education meetings in six counties this spring.

A multi-media program was aimed at informing parents about drugs, why youth turn to drugs, and the specific drugs they were abusing. The package was developed by Ralf Graham and Wilber Ringler, members of the Drug Task Force.

Three slide projects, a movie projector, and a tape recorded were synchronized to provide a fast-moving presentation. At each meeting, a panel of local people representing law, health, and school officials described the local drug situation and answered questions from the audience.

Timeliness of the topic to a local scene, involvement of local committees to promote attendance, and a panel of people knowledgeable and credible about the local drug situation were the ingredients needed to make educational impact.

Initially, the county Extension staff, alert to the local situation, asked the community 4-H Council members to sponsor the program for parents. Promotion through schools, newspapers, radio, personal contact, and direct mail was accomplished by the local committee.

Follow-up conferences in two communities indicated that a drug education curriculum was needed for school and church programs.

Local need dictated flexibility in arranging the future program information, promotional techniques, resource panels, and follow-up conferences.

Community Forestry Program—1972

Kansas has three forests—the native woodlands in the east, the planted windbreaks and shelter belts in the central and west, and the urban forests in every town and city in the state.

This third forest—the urban forest—is the largest of the three, totaling nearly three million acres. Until recent years, this forest had been largely taken for granted. However, with the increase of Dutch elm disease and other problems, attention is being focused on the urban forest as never before.

This attention resulted in a greatly increased number of requests to State forestry personnel in recent years. Many requests related to Dutch elm disease, but others were for help in developing vegetation management plans for city reservoirs, parks, and other municipally-owned woodlands.

Kansas State and Extension Forestry was not funded nor staffed to give more than token service to these requests until the recent funding of a "Rural Town Forestry Assistance" project by the U.S. Forestry Service.

In its initial year, the project has shown remarkable acceptance. Comprehensive community forestry programs have been developed and are being implemented in 10 pilot towns, and information gained or tested in these towns is being applied in 65 other towns.

The program involves, as a first step, the creation of a City Tree Board to be responsible for development and administration.

The development of a program then requires an analysis of the present situation—a physical inventory of public trees, and review of the governmental and sociological situation of the town.

The next step is to determine future needs, set long-range goals, and assign priorities. Annual work plans are then developed, including where relevant, specific project such as small parks, central business districts, city squares, and highway entrances, and other areas.

This is followed by a written community forestry program that contains plans, prescriptions, and relevant reference materials. These programs and projects are prepared by State and Extension Forestry personnel, and are intended to guide in the development of annual plans of work by the local tree boards.

An analysis of the program at the end of the first year indicated:

- 1) The necessity of a local legal body to develop and administer the program in year-to-year continuity.
- 2) Need for training city tree crews and private arborists.
- 3) Tremendous opportunity to provide a vital environmental service.

Perhaps in no other area of forestry today is there such an eager acceptance of sound, technical information.

KSU forestry needs to follow-up and continue contact, and expand its landscape design and recreation planning capability.

Volunteer Leader Contributions—1977

Kansas became interested in a Michigan Extension study, "Private Support of Michigan 4-H Programs," reported at an April, 1977 North Central Regional meeting.

Kansas and Illinois replicated the study in their respective states. The Kansas study was made in August, 1977 with results that showed surprising reinforcement and justification of the original findings in Michigan.

A summary of those findings showed:

| | |
|--|------------|
| Private Support To Counties | \$ 420,179 |
| (Leader banquets, awards, trips, Citizenship Short Course, fair facilities, county foundations, etc.) | |
| Value of Volunteer Contributions | 12,079,891 |
| (hours of labor @ \$3.50 per hour, telephone calls @ 10c each, refreshment served, supplies, miles driven @ 12c per mile, other) | |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Statewide Private Support | 485,525 |
| (Contributions made to 4-H other than through county) | |
| Total | \$12,985,595 |

One of the most interesting findings when the three-state study was analyzed was the close similarity of average dollar value of contributions, per person, of adult volunteer leaders in the three states—\$1,013 in Kansas, \$1,056 in Illinois, and \$1,307 in Michigan.

4-H Camping Program—1977

Camping experiences were offered to several Kansas youth in a little different way by 4-H in 1977.

A group of 131 youth from low income urban areas were exposed to the personal development aspects of a wilderness camping experience at Lake Perry 4-H Outdoor Center in 1977.

Through this experience the youth learned to participate in group support activities and problem solving, learned to understand and appreciate nature more, and gained greater self-confidence and responsibility.

An additional 700 4-H youth participated in the Pioneer, Discovery, and Threshold camping experiences at Lake Perry.

Here emphasis was placed upon personal growth and development, group interaction skills, environmental awareness, and outdoor skills and activities.

County-based 4-H Day Camping was also used to reach 7- to 10-year-old youth. In the two year period, 1976-77, over 2,000 youth were involved in 27 county day camps. Programs, ranging from one to five days, provided educational experiences in food and nutrition, environmental awareness, arts and crafts, career exploration, camping skills, and recreational activities.

Main Street Renovation—1978

As a follow up to a series of Extension-sponsored Community Development seminars in Decatur County, the Decatur County Chamber of Commerce and the merchants in Oberlin identified their concern about the deterioration of their main street.

Local residents and youth were habitually traveling to adjacent trade centers for more and more of their business and services.

Working with Extension representatives in the area and the Department of Regional and Community Planning at Kansas State University, they renovated the main street in Oberlin.

This, coupled with improved store displays and merchandise selection caused a noticed improvement in the local situation.

Perceived economic consequences were:

- 1) People from the farms, ranches, and nearby towns in the Oberlin-Hoxie trade area are now purchasing many more of their goods and services locally.
- 2) A recent retail trade survey verifies an increase in customer participation is up 37 percent in the area since Extension professionals implemented the program.
- 3) Retail sales are up an average of seven percent per year from 1972 to 1977.
- 4) The rotating inventory value of goods and customer services has increased 14 percent according to local records.

Reduced Tillage—1978

Demonstrations of crop production with reduced tillage were conducted in 1978 in six sites in six counties in northeast Kansas.

The demonstrations are being used to gain firsthand practical experience in reduced tillage cropping under farm conditions. A reduced tillage workshop between research and Extension faculty was held in October, 1978.

Conservation tillage saves time in planting a crop and reducing soil erosion. Less sure are questions about savings in expenses, energy and other inputs, weed, disease and insect control.

Reduced tillage together with residue management should increase the water availability to crops which should increase yields.

Reduced tillage can cut in half the number of trips over the field required to establish, care for, and harvest a crop.

The demonstrations begun this year should start a dramatic movement in tillage practices for a growing number of producers.

Forum on Families—1978

"The Kansas Forum on Families," a major statewide program development process, was initiated in 1977-78.

The in-service training workshops were held in September and December, 1977 for Extension and College of Home Economics faculty.

These were followed by 12 Area Forums on Families across the state, attended by over 1,000 leaders, to develop interest and leadership for subsequent community and county Forums on Families.

These well-received efforts were followed and complemented by several related activities:

- 1) A Governor's Proclamation of 1978 as the Year of the Family in Kansas.
- 2) Community and County Forums on Families, planned and implemented.
- 3) Planning and development of many support materials including slide sets, Source Book on Families, concern identification, needs assessment strategies.
- 4) Four area-wide training sessions relating to aging.
- 5) Development of an audio-visual resource packet on aging.
- 6) Co-hosting the Governor's Conference on Aging.
- 7) Additional program thrusts focused on value development, aged shut-ins and reassurance.

There has been an increase in not only the number of requests for family life programs and materials, but a higher degree of specificity in those requests.

The County Plans of Work show an average about nine percent of time projected toward Family Life programming, an increase over the previous year.

Feedlot Development—1978

Many of the sparsely populated, lower valuation counties in Kansas have been seeking ways to provide job opportunities and bring about growth and development in their areas.

Title V, Rural Development Act (1972) funds helped provide the necessary impetus to organize and build feed yards in two of the Northwest Kansas counties involved in the program.

The Area Extension Community Resource Development Specialist provided much expertise in activating the projects.

Extension agents and specialists developed a feasibility study for each yard, helped develop the articles of incorporation, helped select the sites, and work with the board of directors on sources of credit.

Perceived economic consequences of this effort include:

- 1) A county wide economic development organization was established in each county.
- 2) Their search for new industry led to the development of a large commercial feed yard in each county.
- 3) The one time capacity of the two yards is in excess of 40,000 head.

- 4) The yards provide employment for 60 persons, and generate employment for related industries, such as trucking and feed processing.
- 5) Total cattle and commodity purchases locally in excess of \$40 million annually are a direct marketing benefit to Northwest Kansas cattle, grain, and forage producers.

Farm Estate Planning—1978

Teams of Area Extension Economist, Farm Management Fieldmen, and State Specialists conducted 15 Estate Planning Workshops during the 1977-78 program year.

These two-day workshops included 295 individuals representing 165 farm families. In addition, 70 individuals, representing 30 families, had consultations at the University with State Specialists.

The 1291 families, with an estimated savings of \$35,000 each, combine for a potential savings of \$6,685,000.

Movement to Urban 4-H—1973-78

With a total urban youth enrollment of less than 6,000 in 1973, it was obvious that Kansas 4-H had an untapped audience upon which to focus. And focus it did!

Five years later it could boast that:

- 1) 4-H urban membership had risen 237 percent.
- 2) 4-H racial minority membership had increased nearly 500 percent.
- 3) Extension staff attitudes toward urban 4-H expansion and outreach programs were more positive and enthusiastic.

This redirection toward the urban audiences was enhanced by at least two factors:

- 1) Addition of new staff members.
- 2) Introduction of EFNEP 4-H youth programs.

The core objectives for the urban 4-H thrusts were three-fold—foster good mental and physical health, encourage positive relationships with others, and develop a concern for the community.

The subject matter areas most popular in implementing such programs included nutrition, environmental studies (conservation, biology, nature), animals, and urban gardening.

Some specific program examples include:

- 1) Sunflower Express. A bi-weekly single sheet flyer of nutrition information and exercises

for 10,000 grade school youth distributed to the public schools, and used by EFNEP program aides.

- 2) School Enrichment Programs. Nearly 20,000 public school youth are participating in a wide variety of 4-H learn-by-doing projects, such as growing irradiated seeds, growing and exhibiting home garden products, completing exercises related to nutrition, studying "Youth and the Law," and observing the stages of chick embryology.
- 3) Bicycle safety programs, conducted with local law enforcement officials, attracted 524 youth.
- 4) Hunter Safety education programs, conducted cooperatively with the Kansas Fish and Game Commission, National Rifle Association, and local gun clubs, attracted 443 youth.
- 5) Fishing, fur harvesting, Acres for Wildlife, and conservation camp programs, in cooperation with the Kansas Fish and Game Commission and the Kansas Wildlife Association, involved 1,557 youth.
- 6) Urban gardens involved 749 youth.
- 7) Day Camps. More than 1,800 youth in 25 counties were involved in day camp program activities of educational demonstrations, games, project talks, learn-by-doing activities, food and nutrition, cultural heritage, sports, fitness, and hobbies.
- 8) Apart from the EFNEP program, 4,157 youth were involved in nutrition education efforts.

Soil Survey Program—1979

Newly published soil surveys have been introduced in 53 Kansas counties. During the 1978-79 program year, planning for educational meetings has been accomplished in Allen, Gove, Stafford, Johnson, Smith, Pawnee, Sedgwick, Sumner and Jackson counties.

County wide educational meetings are held in each county. Attendance at the meetings range from 100 to 500 citizens.

Agriculturally, the introduction of a county soil survey reports enables all farmers to more precisely manage their crop and range production enterprises. Additionally, it leads toward management of every acre according to its best usage thus lessening the adverse effects of soil and water erosion.

Soil survey educational programs will be held in from five to 12 counties per year for the next five years. The goal is to have detailed soil surveys completed for all Kansas counties by 1985.

Soil Conservation Awards—1979

This award program is jointly sponsored by the Kansas Bankers Association, the Soil Conservation Service, the County Soil Conservation Districts, and the County Extension Councils

Each year a county committee reviews candidates for award recognition. A maximum of five award are presented each year—usually at the County Soil Conservation District Annual Meeting.

The awardees exemplify the best soil conservation work in the county. Their explanations about the soil and water conservation work they have done provides a motivating influence on other operators to renew their effort to be better conservation farmers.

Each year a maximum of 525 individuals are eligible for conservation recognition. Since the program started, 17,850 Kansas farm operators have been recognized for outstanding soil and water conservation work.

Integrated Pest Management—1979

Crop production levels and quality can be increased by integrated pest management. Proper management of farm stored products and proper application of chemicals to avoid waste, ineffectiveness or damage are important concepts.

A major goal of increasing the effectiveness of agricultural chemicals by informing users of proper application techniques was approached by interdepartmental work with Specialists to provide information through public meetings, bulletins and demonstrations.

Demonstrations having significant impact included sprayer operation workshops, insect control demonstrations on both corn and grain sorghum, and herbicide application plots for wheat-fallow rotations.

Work within this area will continue in future years, concentrating on proper fertilizer application, sprayer operation, insecticide application and herbicide application.

Numerous demonstrations are planned in these areas to supplement county meetings.

Home Horticulture Programs—1979

The full Horticulture staff supports programs to assist Kansans in their home horticulture interests, including flower, fruit and vegetable gardens, lawns, house plants, landscaping, home orchards, and woody ornamentals.

Some sample programs efforts include:

Horticulture Hints

A series of two to three minute radio tapes on timely topics relating to home horticulture plants and problems, aired over KSAC and other radio Kansas stations.

Problems on Horticultural Plants

A weekly newsletter to nurserymen, garden store operators, other horticulture businesses and Extension Agents—with a 2,200 copy distribution. It is prepared throughout the growing season, March through October.

Landscape, Lawns, and Gardens.

A weekly column featured in the KSU Extension news packet distributed to Kansas newspapers. It has a variety of authors and is carried throughout the year.

Television Programs

Two programs a month are made by horticulture staff during the growing season, and aired over two Wichita TV stations. These emphasize utilizing plant materials or other appropriate aids.

Spring Horticulture Series

Five consecutive programs for airing in March and April over Wichita TV stations.

New Gardening Series

Ten spring horticultural programs aired as part of "In Your Own Back Yard" program over WIBW-TV. Topeka.

Spring Gardening Packet

Packet of approximately 25 gardening news features prepared by horticulture and Information specialists for distribution to Kansas newspapers in late winter. Usage is extensive.

Spring Garden Shows

Spring Lawn and Garden Shows have been held for several years in Kansas City and Wichita, and more recently in Topeka and Hutchinson. Horticulture Specialists and County Agents were in demand to present seminars to audiences of 25 to 200 persons.

The Green Scene

A special eight-week summer TV series of 30-minute programs aired over Wichita stations. This featured summer problems using live specimens.

Big Lakes Council—1979

The Big Lakes Regional Council is the only regional association in Kansas with a formal agreement coordinating the technical services and information program of the Cooperative Extension Service with the programs and services of an association of local governments.

The Big Lakes Regional Council of Regional Governments is a voluntary association of governmental jurisdictions in a five-county area including Clay, Geary, Marshall, Riley and Pottawatomie counties.

Basic funding is provided by the perspective county commissions and each city or town in the region is a member of the association.

A function of the Council is to serve as a clearinghouse for the review of applications for Federal funding assistance.

Program areas receiving emphasis now include:

- 1) Housing Rehabilitation and Weatherization. Utilizes weatherization grant funds in conjunction with housing rehabilitation and housing improvement assistance to homeowners in approximately 30 communities.
- 2) Medical Communications. Provides radio communication capability between all hospitals and ambulances in the region.
- 3) Management assistance. Assist smaller cities in budget preparation, personnel policies, accounting procedures, and general management procedures.

Special Program Emphasis—1980's

A continuing array of innovative programs evolved during this decade to meet changing clientele needs. These are some representative examples:

Beef Cattle Programs—1980

Fluctuating cattle prices and feed costs continue to create both opportunities and challenges for the beef cattle industry in Kansas—consisting of 1.8 million head of beef cows, two million stockers, and three million head of fat cattle.

Extension's program brings the latest information on cattle management to more than 100 beef cattle schools, meetings and tours conducted in various areas of Kansas.

Sale barns have become an effective meeting location, with attendance often in excess of 100 people at these location. Special conferences, such as the O-K Cattle Conference in Hutchinson, attract over 200.

Newsletters, such as "Beef Tips" and "Focus on Feedlots," now reach in excess of 2,000 cattle producers on a monthly basis. Beef cattle demonstrations continue to be an effective method of bring new information to producers on such topics as:

- 1) New methods of controlling flies with grazing cattle.
- 2) Studies on how methods of storage influence hay quality.
- 3) New methodology on making more effective use of growth promotants.
- 4) Methods of feeding additives and antibiotics to grazing cattle.
- 5) Using starch analysis as an indication of ration utilization.

Supervision of the Kansas Bull Test Station is also an integral part of the Extension beef cattle program. In 1980, 760 bulls, representing 153 herds were tested.

In addition, Steer Futurities has become an effective way of evaluating the genetic potential of commercial cattle. Seven tests involving 666 steers in 196 herds were completed this year.

PRIDE Community Development—1980

PRIDE is the community self-help program initiated by Extension but supported by several private and public agencies in Kansas.

Over 300 of the 625 incorporated cities in Kansas have enrolled in the program during the first 10 years. In 1980, 105 were enrolled.

Communities participate by identifying their problems and opportunities, setting goals and striving to make their communities better places to live and work.

Participants may earn state-wide recognition in two ways—blue ribbon recognition or competitive cash awards.

In the cash awards program, communities in five size categories compete for cash award of \$100 to \$500 on the basis of their total over-all accomplishments in community improvements.

In the blue ribbon programs, communities work on improvements in eight categories—community planning, economic development, community services, utilities, transportation, housing, education, and enrichment. There are 22 sub-categories of emphasis identified under these broader areas.

When they achieve their goals a blue ribbon for the

appropriate achievements attached to the PRIDE sign at the entrance to the community. Outside evaluators do the judging.

When a community has completed all of its blue ribbons, it earns the designation as a Pacemaker City.

Cash award winners in 1980 were Alden, 0-300 population; Grinnell, 301-800; Ashland, 801-2,000; Marion, 2,001-6,000; Arkansas City, 6,000-Up. In all, 40 cash awards were presented by the Governor at the Annual PRIDE Awards Banquet in Salina.

In 1980, 52 Kansas communities participated in the community improvement evaluation, with evaluations in 347 areas.

Four Kansas communities—Halstead, Alden, Arkansas City, and Newton—attained State Pacemaker status this year.

Training for Hort. Professionals—1981

Professional and paraprofessional horticulturists have one-to-one contact with home horticulturists, and some professionals maintain horticultural areas such as parks, school grounds, and cemeteries.

During this year, the following Extension horticulture programs emphasized training for professional and paraprofessional horticulturists:

Turf Fertilization.

Over 75 percent of the Kansas nurserymen, plus many other horticulturists who answer questions about turf care, heard research information discussed at the Turf research field days and conferences.

Eight different "Horticulture Fact Sheets" about lawn management were written or revised to supply turf resource information throughout the state.

Groundskeeper Schools.

Establishment and maintenance on public grounds was discussed in 12 different locations. Approximately 350 individuals with groundskeeping responsibilities attended the training session and receive information packets for their reference in turf, shrub, and tree care.

Landscape Design Training.

Thirty-five Kansas nurserymen attended a landscape design school developed to present information on site development, plant material selection and landscaping consultation.

Nurserymen Update.

Chemicals for pest control on horticultural plants, selection of adapted fruit and vegetable varieties and research update on adaptability of new orna-

mental shrub and tree information was presented at meetings with nurserymen and garden store operators.

The distribution of the 200 attendees provided a potential to reach well over one-half of the home horticulturists in Kansas.

Programmable Calculator Programs—1981

Advancing technology in hand-held programmable calculators makes computer assistance available to all Kansas livestock producers.

The KSU Computer Task Force was assigned the responsibility for developing agricultural programs using a portable programmable calculator.

Among the grain science programs developed were :

Feedlot Cattle Rations.

Beef Feed Calculation.

Adjust Cow Wean Weight

Dairy Cow Lactation Rations

Dry Dairy Cow Rations.

Calculate Payments and Interest

Calculate Feed Prices and Analyses

Lamb Grower Finisher Rations

Swine Grower Finisher Rations

Stored Grain Inventory

Bulk Feed Inventory

Moisture-Correction Grain Weights

Bulk-Blend 1-Fertilizer

Liquid Blend Fertilizer

These programs were sent to over 270 owners of programmable calculators to aid them in meeting nutritional requirements, enterprise planning, and better utilization of time, feed and other assets.

Tree Planting Program—1981

Last year, the 25th year of the Kansas Tree Planting Program, the number of tree and shrub seedlings distributed was down due to the drought which extended into the early part of the planting season.

Although the number of plants was less, the number of orders increased seven percent over the previous year and was the largest number processed in the history of the program.

A total of 1,332,000 trees and shrubs were distributed to 7,835 Kansans. The production of container grown seedlings was increased 37 percent for a total of 283,000 seedlings.

Since 1957, 90,539 orders and 25,110,000 seedlings have been distributed through this program.

Aerial Application Training—1981

Large amounts of agricultural chemicals are applied using aerial application methods. Kansas aerial applicators spray an average of 15,000-20,000 acres per aircraft per year.

An Aerial Application Handbook for pilots has been completed and distributed to Kansas pilots. The handbook was prepared under a USDA-SEA grant and will be available nationwide in the near future.

During 1981, five fly-in clinics were held in locations in Kansas and Oklahoma, where 127 aircraft from four states were tested. In addition, many other pilots observed the fly-in activities and benefited from the educational effort.

The cost/benefit ratio of this program has been estimated at 3.82, or a return of \$3.82 for every dollar of cost in direct economic benefits. Other invalidated benefits include reduced environmental damage, increased pesticide effectiveness, and increased safety.

Based on the effectiveness of this educational effort, the National Agricultural Aviation Association has incorporated the educational fly-in clinic concept as a basic requirement in its new "Operation Safe" program.

Health Programs—1981

In 1981, a number of programs and health activities provided Kansans with opportunities to understand how they can influence their own health now and for 10, 15, and 20 years to come.

Aerobic Exercise Classes

County Home Economists organized aerobic exercise classes with emphasis on dancing, walking and running. Others organized fun runs during county fairs, or weight-reduction exercise programs. Total attendance to such programs was 26,500.

Feeling Great—Exercise for All

This bulletin was given to 28,900 persons. A leader's guide for teaching exercise lesson was used by 2,181 county Home Economics unit leaders and teachers.

Self Care Classes.

There was an on-going effort to organize and promote 10-week, five-week, and one-day Self Care classes. These classes provided emphasis on recognizing common illnesses of family members, ways

to care for those illnesses at home, and when to seek help from a professional. Materials included 10 Self-care video tapes.

Colon and Rectal Cancer.

This completed a two-year education effort to make Kansans aware of colon and rectal cancer. Over 14,000 people attended the meetings. Over half of these have returned hemocult slides for analysis.

Total audiences for Extension-sponsored health lectures, lessons, and workshops in 1981 was 35,653.

Financing Government in Kansas—1982

The tax mix to finance state and local government in Kansas is a perennial issue before the leadership of the state.

The goal of Extension's public policy education program—ongoing since 1971—is to increase the understanding of the issues, the alternative options and their probable consequences.

This year, the program took on particular significance since a new tax on minerals was proposed and the Legislature considered an amendment to the Constitution to classify property for tax purposes. This was designed to prevent a massive shift when the state's out-of-date appraisal system was updated.

A resource bulletin containing a wealth of data pertinent to developing changes in the tax mix was updated and distributed to 4,500 local leaders, legislators and interested citizens. Over 50,000 copies have been distributed since the program started.

Seminars were held in 25 of the state's 105 counties. In the past decade, seminars have been held in every county, with many repeats.

Numerous press releases were written and distributed to Kansas dailies and weeklies.

In addition, Barry Flinchbaugh, Extension Public Policy Economist, appeared on numerous radio and TV interviews and talk shows.

Expert testimony was requested by the Legislature and material and knowledge gained from this program was frequently mentioned by the decision makers during debate and discussion.

Agricultural Safety and Health—1982

The agricultural industry has the highest fatal accident rate of all industries in Kansas. The Extension program in safety and health was designed to fill a need for training and educational materials relating to this problem.

A series of three-hour agricultural accident and rescue procedure programs were presented across the state to employers, employees, farm wives and emergency medical personnel. Over 330 people attended these programs, and more than 2,000 others attended speeches and conference presentations across the state.

Twenty-two publications and 11 slide sets were developed and distributed to more than 5,000 persons.

A special hazardous occupations program for youth workers in agriculture was developed as training for youth wishing to become employed as tractor or machinery operators.

Although tractor and machinery safety was the major thrust of the program, there was also emphasis placed on the safety aspects of chemicals, fertilizers and farm storage.

Pasture Burning Program—1982

Fire has been a major tool in managing eastern Kansas rangeland for over a century. In the past five years, the use of prescribed burning has spread into central Kansas, due in part to its low cost.

As the use of this practice has increased, the need for educational programs, demonstrations and printed materials for rangeland owners/operators has increased.

This program helps acquaint the prescribed burning user with a basic understanding of fire control, burning techniques and safety regulations.

A four to five hour program of classroom instruction is combined with demonstrations of burning techniques on tours.

To date, prescribed burning has moved west over 100 miles. The program has resulted in prescribed burning being more readily accepted by both the users and the general public. Rancher relations with volunteer fire department is also much better.

Pesticide Applicator Training—1982

Federal law requires that anyone using "restricted-use" pesticides must be certified applicators.

The certification training program for private and commercial applicators is based on written autotutorial manuals prepared by the KSU Extension Service. Training manuals and examinations are available on a year around basis.

County Agents conduct training meetings on a needs basis for private applicators, followed by examination for certification.

Private applicators currently certificated 16,064—490 certified in 1982—who represent about one-third of the Kansas farm.

Statewide training for commercial applicators is conducted by Extension. Three day training meeting of all 10 categories and seven sub-categories are held as needed.

Recertification training—required every five years—consisted of six hours of training.

Life Cycle Management—1982

The Financial and Resource Management programs emphasize the extended management skills appropriate to individuals and families at various stages of the life cycle in order to assure economic stability and security.

Skills emphasized include planning, family communication, budgeting, savings and investments, and estate planning.

Educational efforts make combined use of other agencies, educational departments and institutions, the private sector and Extension Homemaker Unit women.

As a result, program skills were learned, decision making skills expanded, leadership skills increased and attitudes change.

Programs addressed financial management skills, such as net worth, budget, spending plan, tax law changes, investment, and estate planning.

The participating audience includes 1,228 young families, 360 youth, 3,231 general audience, 613 elderly, and 922 Extension Homemakers.

Irrigation Water Management—1983

There are nearly 3.5 million acres of irrigated land in Kansas, and over 90 percent of the water is pumped from wells.

Increasing energy costs, relatively low crop prices, concern about future water supplies for irrigation and increasing pumping lives in many areas are causing irrigators to attempt to reduce water needs.

This program involves sharing information about practices that can reduce water needs—irrigation scheduling, improving field efficiency, improving pumping plant efficiency, changing cropping and using limited irrigation.

Workshops, tours, farm visits, field trips, radio talks, in-depth training schools, specialty crop meetings and literature are all utilized to explain the program.

The individual contacts this year have exceeded 1,000 persons, primarily active irrigators.

Pesticide Applicator Training—1985

Fully 10 million acres of Kansas croplands are treated with herbicides, and four million acres treated with insecticides.

State and Federal laws require private and commercial pesticide applicators be certified to buy or apply restricted use pesticides.

Kansas State University provides training manuals and educational programs for private and commercial pesticide applicators which incorporates the latest technology in pesticide application, storage, safety, and environmental protection.

Since inception of the program in 1977, over 46,000 individuals have been certified to apply restricted use pesticides. Individual training manuals have been prepared so individuals can be certified in 20 different categories.

In 1985, 850 private and commercial applicators received training for initial certification. Recertification materials were prepared for 14,500 private and 678 commercial applicators.

Wildlife Damage Control—1985

The Extension Wildlife Damage Control Program was created and financed by the Kansas Legislature in 1968.

Extension efforts focus on control of the offending animal while emphasizing the value of predators not involved in damage to livestock, crops, or poultry.

Educational training provided self-help instruction to farmers and ranchers in effective ways to control measures.

The KSU program has been expanded to include ways to resolve game and fur-bearing related conflicts with coyotes, deer, beaver, and birds.

Specialist Bob Henderson's self-help damage control program annually save Kansans an estimated \$250,000 in agriculturally related incidents, and another \$210,000 in non-agriculturally related incidents.

In addition, it is estimated that County Extension Agents handle an estimated 5,000 cases involving wildlife

damage. About 54 percent of these problems were of the nuisance type, 36 percent of minor economic loss (less than \$300), and 10 of major economic loss.

Rural Fire Protection—1985

Currently Extension's rural fire protection program is working with 500 rural fire districts that protect nearly 94 percent of the rural lands in Kansas.

These rural fire districts are budgeted from local funds of more than \$10 million annually.

During 1985, program accomplishments included:

- 1) Expanded rural fire protection by 199,052 acres.
- 2) Issued 8 excess vehicles, and 6 slip-in units.
- 3) Trained 752 fire fighters in basic firemanship, and 575 in advanced firemanship.
- 4) Provided 400 teacher kits on fire prevention.

Future emphasis will be on to expand rural fire protection to the nearly 3 million acres not having any organized fire protection, and encouraging further consolidation and coordination of existing rural fire districts.

Soybean Production in Kansas—1985

Soybeans are grown on 1.65 million acres, and have a farm value of \$183 million. Yet this crop offers many advantages as an alternative to wheat and corn production.

The advantage of soybeans when grown in a regular rotation or as an alternative crop are emphasized annually in a series of full load soybean schools, in-depth weed and herbicide schools, and agronomy field days.

Industry cooperates in sponsoring soybean yield contests because their crushing capacity in the state exceeds production.

The Kansas Soybean Association and the Kansas Soybean Commission cooperates with Extension in organizing and hosting an annual series of Soybean Profit Seminars.

As a result of this procedure Kansas acreages and yields have steadily increased. Yields increased from 20.5 bushels per acre in 1974-78 to 23.3 bushels per acre in 1979-83.

These educational programs directly influence over 1,000 farmers each year, and increased yields have added \$70 million to the Kansas economy.

Farm Business Organization—1985

The stressful times for farmers in 1983—when farm

income reached a 13-year low and farm debt reached a new high—prompted Extension economists to develop a program that would help regain profitability in agriculture.

Starting in December, 1984, 56 "Managing Your Farm Future" workshops were conducted for producers from 94 counties. Farm families, individually or in groups of five to 15, were assisted in organizing their farm data for computer entry.

FINPAK, a farm financial management package, developed in Minnesota but fitted with Kansas data banks, was utilized.

Subsequently, 900 farm families obtained long term, total farm budgets via computer. In the process they tested the profitability of nearly 6,750 different farm production systems.

If the changes found using the computer were initiated, cash flow would increase nearly \$6,000 per family.

Extension assistants were hired using ES-USDA grant funds so more farm families could use the computer analysis.

Grant funds were also being utilized to develop grain and livestock software programs to analyze and compare futures, options, contracts, and cash marketing programs. Benefits of the marketing programs are estimated at three percent of the farm income per participating family.

Two-day schools were also held for FmHA, farm credit, and commercial banks on interpreting farm plans and computer output.

The 1985 Legislature established a Farm Assistance Counseling and Training System (FACTS) referral program to assist financially distressed farmers. About 80 farmers call FACTS for assistance weekly. Nearly 70 percent of those calling ask for financial/legal assistance and, where appropriate, are referred to Extension.

Clothing Management—1986

The clothing budget is a challenge to manage effectively because of higher clothing prices and because other household expenditures are often taken from dollars planned for family clothing.

The overall Extension clothing program in Kansas has helped consumers manage and determine strategies in the area of clothing selection, buying, use care, recycling, altering and construction.

Workshops, sewing fairs and mass media are popular methods for consumers to receive information on

wardrobe planning, clothing acquisition, design elements, sewing special fabric, equipment, grooming and fashion.

In 1986, County Extension Home Economist reported having 16,000 contacts in meetings and workshops.

Of the 7,000 enrolled in clothing construction workshops, approximately \$200,000 was extended to the income of the participant families (at \$25 saved by each participant).

Media contacts, although hard to estimate, are important in helping people make decisions about stretching the family clothing dollar.

Through their columns and articles for the media, Extension Home Economists communicated most frequently about sewing special fabrics, dressing to keep warm, fashion, laundry, dry cleaning and stain removal techniques, mending and construction techniques, buying ready-to-wear, sewing machines and equipment, grooming, psychology of clothing, design elements, textiles, fibers and finishes and wardrobe planning.

Over 40 video tapes in the Extension film library offered suggestions about clothing acquisition. A computer-assisted program, "Fashion Options," was used by 27 counties to reach nearly 7,000 persons.

4-H Ambassador Program—1986

Now in its fifth year of operation, this program was first implemented in 1982 with 18 counties, with 18 advisors and 67 Ambassadors.

To date, the program has involved 376 counties, 50 advisers, and 298 Ambassadors, with six to eight new counties entering the program each year.

Basically this is a public relations program designed to identify individuals that know and understand the 4-H program, train them in communication skills, and charge them to tell the 4-H story.

The Kansas 4-H Ambassador program has a two-fold purpose:

- 1) A program designed specifically for teens which encourages complete ownership as local youth tell the 4-H Story to key audiences in the respective areas of the state.
- 2) A program vehicle based on the premise that the true 4-H Story can best be told by 4-H's best sales people—the 4-H members themselves.

Each county Ambassador team consists of one or two advisers and four to eight youth. Each team completes a "County Plan of Action," outlines plans for the year, then carry them out.

Program support from the State 4-H office includes:

- 1) A comprehensive guide for both Advisers and Ambassadors.
- 2) A program guide for Extension Agents.
- 3) Promotional brochures for counties.
- 4) Mail-outs each quarter for update and program ideas.
- 5) Area Retreats in six Cluster Groups.
- 6) A state training workshop each year during Discovery Days.

Leader Learning Labs—1986

It is important that Kansas youth are educated in effective skills in identifying values, determining goals based upon these values and making decisions based upon those goals.

4-H clubs offer practice grounds for teaching these skills in a situation that does not have life-threatening consequences.

Leader have requested help in involving their members in the decision-making process in order to increase member enthusiasm in club work.

Consequently, the following strategies have been implemented:

- 1) Leader Learning Laboratories have been designed to deal with decision-making and goal setting, identifying and clarifying values, and measuring and celebrating with groups.
- 2) Materials for club leaders have been designed to involve club members.
- 3) Reporting forms were changed to reflect group process needs.
- 4) Officer training materials and training structures were printed to facilitate new ways of working with groups.
- 5) An organizational leaders' club management handbook was developed.
- 6) Leader trainees were trained to implement organizational leader training.

By 1985, 98 volunteer leaders had completed all four LLL workshops and were implementing activities in their respective clubs.

LLL trainers began teaching the labs in single counties in 1985.

In 1986-87, as a result of completing a club management handbook, LLL workshops can be offered in combina-

tion with the club management training.

This training, entitled "Organizational Leader Training," will be offered across the state, utilizing 12 LLL trainers who have been given additional instruction in the management material and who have helped in the design of the expanded training.

Water Policy Program—1986

Because water resource issues involved agricultural, industrial and municipal users, a major educational thrust was implemented.

Base books delineating water resource supply, water quality, competing needs and policy issues was developed.

About 9,000 copies of the basebook were distributed on request or at meetings attended by almost 2,500 water resource leaders.

Information adapted to the water resource needs of western Kansas (with emphasis on water management) was presented in 1983, and in eastern Kansas (with emphasis on surface runoff and storage management) in 1984.

Extension meetings were directed toward policy and water resource issues and their consequences, coordinated with meetings conducted by the Kansas Water Office, in an attempt to inform citizens about actual provisions in the State Water Plan.

The following year Extension again presented a public policy series on water resources concerning the changes in the draft document.

The coordination approach was so successful in informing citizens and leaders concerning water resource issues, adapting the plan to citizen needs and providing a forum to achieve consensus that the State Water Plan was adopted almost unanimously by the Kansas Legislature.

In 1986, similar procedures were used in presenting information, discussing issues and adapting plans for the 12 basins.

Farm Mgmt. Association Program—1986

Commercial farmers in Kansas have an increased need for forward financial planning for profit.

The Farm Management Association Program can help participants by:

- 1) Demonstrating efficient methods of keeping farm records.
- 2) Demonstrating the effective use of records in farm planning, decision making and farm operation.

- 3) Providing a data base from actual farm businesses for use by the Cooperative Extension for program design and implementation.
- 4) Improving net returns on Kansas farms.

In 1986, there were 3,520 individual commercial farm operators that demonstrated the results of effective decision making and planning their farm operation. Extension Economists have estimated the cost savings and value of their records to the participants at \$5.4 million.

Detailed forward planning was completed on 1,191 of these farms by Association Fieldmen. Economists estimated the total value of this activity at about \$9.5 million.

This planning was done on 470 farms with the FINPAK computer series, on 27 farms with the K-FARM computer program, and on 694 farms using more traditional planning forms.

Marketing plans and tax management planning are significant parts of this program and many Extension Agents, fieldmen, and commercial farmers regard these two components of equal value to business records and forward planning.

Wheat Variety Selection—1986

Wheat is the major crop grown in Kansas, with approximately 11 of the 30 million crop acres in the state devoted to its production.

Farmers can often increase profitability more rapidly by adopting improved varieties than by any other single crop production practice.

For example, the yield difference in the top 10 varieties of wheat is currently more than 15 bushels, or \$33 per acre.

Consequently, Extension Specialists have established wheat variety plots in 75 of the 105 counties, developed wheat production handbooks, held winter crop schools, and focused attention on the use of superior varieties from the standpoint of yield, standability, and insect and disease resistance.

This year, 2,800 farmers toured the wheat plots. These educational programs have paid dividends in farmer adoption of improved varieties.

The five-year average wheat yield in Kansas has increased from 31 bushels per acre in 1977-81 to 38 bushels per acre in 1983-86. Thus, the rolling average wheat yield has increased 20 percent in five years, or 1.4 million bushels each year for five years.

In the future, this Extension program will seek to reach an extended audience, continue Agent updates, and provide resource information for county and area personnel.

Estate Planning—1987

This program was designed to help families and individuals have an increased awareness and understanding of the objectives, problems and tools involved in estate planning. Estate tax minimization is a very important part of estate planning.

During the four-year period of 1984-87, 60 four-hour awareness sessions and 21 two-day in-depth farm estate planning workshops were conducted across Kansas.

Total attendance was 2,200 at the awareness sessions, and 460 at the workshops. Approximately two-thirds of the couples that attended had potentially "serious" Federal estate tax problems.

If workshop guidelines for estate tax minimization were followed, around \$22.2 million in Federal estate taxes would have been saved.

Conservation Tillage—1987

Kansas has an estimated 10.5 million acres of highly erodible cropland. Conservation tillage is a practice that could help reduce soil losses to acceptable levels, maintain eligibility for USDA farm programs, and lower production costs.

Extension educational methods in calling attention to this practice include meetings and workshops, demonstrations, helping establish local conservation tillage committees, individual farm visits, and tours.

County conservation tillage committees have provided 3,700 hours of volunteer assistance in 22 counties. They have assisted with 122 demonstration plots, 23 drill demonstrations, 44 seminars/workshops, and education to 5,750 people.

An estimated 30 percent of the cropland in Kansas uses conservation tillage. Assuming a 70 percent reduction in erosion by using this practice, soil loss is being reduced by 34 million tons a year in Kansas. These erosion savings have an estimated dollar benefit of \$34 million a year (\$1/ton).

Safety Belt Project—1987

Since 1982, the Kansas Department of Transportation has provided over \$1 million in grants to the Extension Home Economics statewide safety belt education effort, "Get It Together, Kansas."

Objectives of the program were:

- 1) Increase seat belt use by both Extension clientele and the general public.
- 2) Reduce death and injuries from traffic accidents.
- 3) Reduce health insurance costs.
- 4) Affect seat belt policies among businesses and industries.

About 24,000 members of the 12,800 Extension Homemaker Units learned about safety belts from lessons presented to their clubs during the first two years of the grant.

Approximately 30,000 youngsters, belonging to Kansas 4-H clubs, have participated in safety belt education programs.

Safety belt material was distributed to elementary and secondary schools across the state. Follow-up reports indicate wide use.

The project staff also administers infant seat loaner programs in nearly every county in Kansas.

Field coordinators have reached more than 14,000 workers across the state with slide shows, films and videos, printed materials, safety belt surveys, and incentive programs.

The first three years of effort by Extension saw driver usage more than double and passenger usage nearly triple. Some companies report increased use rates of 50-60 percent.

The Kansas Department of Transportation estimates a yearly reduction of four deaths and 43 serious injuries per thousand accidents.

Housing Policy Decisions—1987

The Extension Housing Program was designed to create awareness of housing alternatives available to house today's and assist community decision makers to study attitudes toward policy issues and needed changes that can improve housing.

The program was introduced to county Extension through planned teaching programs and special materials in all counties designed to call attention to such issues that affect housing.

Included were such issues as land use, unavailable or unsuitable available housing, possible need for changes in housing ordinances, and new way to adapt or replace existing housing.

Some of the specific activities relating to this program were:

- 1) Co-sponsored, with the Kansas Department of Economic Development, community improvement programs in 12 communities through the PRIDE program.
- 2) Assisted with a major statewide conference on housing, underwritten by 54 co-sponsors, including Home Builders, League of Kansas Municipalities, and the Dept. of Aging.
- 3) Trained 65 percent of county Agents in remodeling and home repair who in turn trained 2,000 local leaders, who held 102 local workshops and small group meetings for an additional 24,266 participants.
- 4) Prepared manufactured housing materials that reached 5,000 people through individual contacts, workshops, and tours.
- 5) Developed special housing educational material including 3 slide-tape sets addressing housing needs of families, five publications with 25,000 distribution, and two video tapes reaching 2,000 participants.
- 6) Shared housing alternatives information through newsletters, newspapers, radio, and TV.
- 7) Assisted community decision makers study their attitudes toward policy issues and need for changes that could improve local housing situations.

Family Relations Programs—1987

Successful management and resolving everyday tensions that arise in families is of continuing concern for families and the individuals within them.

Some of the Extension programs relating to these situations included:

Growing Together. These audiocassette programs were distributed to County Extension offices. At least 760 parents learned to relax and deal more effectively with stress of child rearing through their use.

Course on Helping. 16,000 copies of this course were distributed. Returns on surveys indicated about 12,000 of those taking the course strengthened their ability to help others respond to adversity.

Friends InDeed Seminars. Over 1,000 individuals participated in 18 full-day leader seminars. The follow-up survey showed that 95 percent of the participants had strengthened their ability to provide emotional support to someone in distress, and were reaching about 9,700 more people each week.

A third of them had conducted their own "Friends" meetings for approximately 3,500 additional individuals.

Heartache in the Heartland. A faltering rural economy, time constraints on family togetherness, and social changes in roles and expectations of family members led to a national satellite teleconference broadcast.

More than half of the Kansas counties were organized sites for the broadcast. Surveys taken at these sites following the broadcast reflected a 90 percent approval rate.

Nutrition & Chronic Health Problems—1987

Extension programs focused on chronic health problems that are related to or affected by food and nutrition, including cardiovascular disease and hypertension, diabetes, osteoporosis, obesity, and cancer.

In three years, over 13,000 people attended meetings and workshops on various chronic disease problems which focused on fat and cholesterol, salt and sodium, and calcium and other minerals.

In the same time frame, 2,245 volunteer leaders taught an additional 16,900 homemakers about these problems, and distributed 61,150 publications.

Extension professionals conducted New Dimensions weight control program. Approximately 500 participants in classes of 10 each.

Reports from 230 participants showed an average loss of 8 1/2 pounds each over a 10-week period. Most reported they changed at least 5 out of 15 behaviors as a result of the program.

This program was often followed up with the new Keeping on Track program at 8 monthly meetings. This emphasized additional information on dietary guidelines, relapse prevention, and exercise.

In addition, Specialists and County Extension Home Economists conducted meetings and prepared media releases and radio and TV programs concerning weight control.

Master Clothing Leaders—1987

This program provides training for Master Clothing Leaders who can assist families to effectively manage their clothing resources through knowledge of clothing construction and consumer buying skills.

This program is now in its ninth year with approximately 6,425 leaders reaching adult and youth audiences.

The dollar value of their time contribution is \$214,518 over the last four years.

The County Home Economists and Clothing Leaders made 73,915 contacts in meetings and workshops. An estimated \$1,295,451 has been extended to Kansas families by improving their clothing construction skills.

Small Business Assistance—1987

Extension's Small Business Assistance program is designed to provide educational assistance to small businesses and rural communities to retain and revitalize existing businesses and attracting new ones.

During the past two years the following accomplishments occurred:

- 1) An economic development newsletter was sent quarterly to 1,200 persons.
- 2) Developed a computerized economic data base.
- 3) Put several economic analysis programs on microcomputer, and trained development staff members on their use.
- 4) Conducted 124 economic development programs in 62 counties.
- 5) Offered 38 business management programs in 32 counties.
- 6) Established a single-point of contact telephone line for economic and business development assistance that handles about 200 calls a year.
- 7) Added a job creation emphasis to the PRIDE community improvement program with 20 communities.
- 8) Developed uniform survey instruments to study consumer buying patterns, and completed 21 community economic development surveys.
- 9) Developed a trainer's and participant's manual for job search education, with training offered to 65 County Agents.
- 10) An estimated 42 new or expanded enterprises resulted from educational programs, with 140 new jobs created.

Balanced Farming & Family Living—1988

The Balanced Farming and Family Living Program has enrolled 132 farm families from 12 counties. Each family has:

- 1) Participated in a goal session workshop.

- 2) Completed a Farm Financial Analysis review (FINPAK).
- 3) Developed a marketing plan for their farm or ranch.

With integrated support from agricultural economics, family living, animal science, and agronomy Specialists working together with County Agents, the farm families are experiencing some very favorable outcomes.

These families are now keeping better records, doing feed analysis and soil testing, meeting some of their farm and family goals, and better understanding the function of the Extension Service.

The monthly newsletter which goes to these families has been extremely helpful. These people are using the up-to-date information from the newsletter.

The type of support offered by Extension Specialists include:

- 1) Agronomy—soil testing, fertilizer recommendations, variety selection, herbicide and pesticide suggestions, farm visits.
- 2) Agricultural Economics—farm analysis, record keeping, livestock and crop enterprise budgeting, farm visits.
- 3) Animal Science BEEFpro series, cowherd management, feed analysis, stock/grower program, livestock facilities, swine and sheep enterprises, farm visits.
- 4) Family Living—family budgeting, housing, child care, nutrition, goal setting, marketing, farm and family visits.
- 5) Ag and Home Ec. Agents—details pertaining to meetings, farm and family visits.

This pilot program (a revival of an integrated Extension program idea originally used in the 1940's) is expected to expand into additional counties as funding becomes available.

DIRECT—1988

DIRECT (Development Information: Referral, Coordination, and Training) is an Extension economic development tool established in May, 1987 for use by all Kansans.

The program was established because many communities and individuals across Kansas were looking for a single source of resource information, or ways to develop a product or idea.

There is a great deal of assistance available to them through State and Federal agencies, Board of Regents

institutions, community colleges, and private enterprise. The problem has been who to ask.

DIRECT fills this void by finding the information or making a referral to a knowledgeable person. Teams of experts have been identified to meet the demand for some of the more complex problems.

Extension-sponsored educational workshops have recently been conducted on such topics as home-based business, food-based business, and bed & breakfast business.

Job Search Program—1988

The recently depressed farm economy and its impacts on rural communities has led many rural families to seek supplementary income or to seek new employment.

The job search education program was implemented to:

- 1) Improve skills of rural people in assessing personal skills.
- 2) Completing employment applications.
- 3) Writing resumes.
- 4) Identifying potential jobs and careers.
- 5) Preparing for and participating in job interviews.

During the first year, 65 Extension professionals and volunteers from 50 counties were trained in job search education.

This training increased their knowledge of skills needed to seek and gain employment, and to develop and enhance their skills in working with people who are seeking employment.

Participants in the program:

- 1) Attended an intensive two-day workshop.
- 2) Received an in-depth facilitator's manual.
- 3) Viewed video taped interview scenarios.
- 4) Received a newsletter to keep them informed about new ideas for local implementation.

Though training was the major goal for the first year, at least 900 local clients have been provided educational assistance as a result of the program. About 20 percent found employment immediately.

More than 100 resumes have been prepared through the resume service.

Special Committees/Task Forces—1970's-80's

When the problems that inter-disciplinary teams were assigned had broad implications for Extension, the group was usually called a "task force" type jobs, even though they may have had a "committee" designation.

The number of these programs involving two or more departments were most evident in agriculture.

Agronomy, entomology, and plant pathology often worked together on complex problems, such as chemical use, and pest management. Economic implications often caused an alliance of agricultural economics with animal science or plant science groups on such projects as least-cost rations, integrated pest management, community development, and farm enterprise management.

Home economics joined forces with other Extension departments in joint efforts on meat residues, drug education, and housing.

A couple mixed subject matter groups are cited here as examples:

Marketing Strategies Committee—1985-86

As the state and Extension grew more diverse in the 80's, the audience-program "fit" became less exact and less encompassing.

Extension administration decided in the mid-80's to take a closer look at the Kansas delivery system.

The first step was to send Hyde Jacobs, C. R. Salmon, and Kathleen Ward to a marketing initiative session in Washington, D.C. in 1985. Following that, under Ward's leadership, the first in-depth marketing session was offered as part of that year's Annual Conference.

Choosing from the pool of Extension staff members who attended that popular Conference session, Director Fred Sobering appointed a Kansas Extension Marketing Strategies Committee to begin work in December.

Members of that group, representing a cross-section of personnel, were:

Kathleen Ward, chairman, Communications Specialist.

Bill Cox, Sedgwick County Director.

Barry Flinchbaugh, Ag Economics Public Policy Specialist.

Ralf Graham, Instructional Media Coordinator.

Chuck Marr, Horticulture Specialist.

Chuck Otte, Geary County Agricultural Agent.

Lois Redman, 4-H Specialist.

Sandy Shields, Ottawa County Home Economist.

Cindy Siemens, Harvey County 4-H Agent.

Zoe Slinkman, Home Economics Specialist.

The Committee's charge was to begin developing a marketing plan for the entire organization. This basically involved audience research and development of a "corporate identity" which could help Kansans learn to recognize and appreciate the availability of and relationships between Extension's programs.

The committee also was to train the organization in how each worker, office, and subject matter could develop in-depth plans, such as:

- Access and segment target audiences.
- Develop/adapt programs to meet target's needs.
- Find how to deliver program in ways that hit targets.
- Let clientele know about available services.

To build awareness within Extension about marketing and the Committee's potential, Ward started a busy schedule of providing in-house talks and/or training.

Soon after Annual Conference, however, proposed Federal budget cuts threatened the nation's entire Extension Service. So, Ward also helped administration plan a response that was widely copied in other states.

It included a press conference, mobilization of influentials to call influentials, press releases, and an ever-broadening letter writing campaign that sent more mail to Washington D.C. than all other pending legislation combined.

In early 1986, the entire committee conducted one-on-one interviews with 100 Kansas leaders about Extension's present and future. The "market intelligence" gathering consisted of in-depth, confidential talks with such leaders as the Governor, state agency and farm organization heads, University administrators, County Commissioners, business persons, and Extension volunteers.

This activity gave clear indications of the strong, yet highly individualized "ownership" many Kansans have for Extension.

Administration hired a sociologist/demographer to collect data about Kansas that could help Extension market its products more effectively. This data was summarized and distributed through several colorful, widely requested publications.

The committee also developed an in-house survey to measure Extension's readiness for the change inherent in more scientific marketing, and to provide a subtle review of the marketing process.

The respondents' strongest opinions included:

- 1) Working across subject and Extension levels to address complex modern program needs.
- 2) Need for organizational, motivational, and communications skills for dealing with clientele.
- 3) Need for on-going training in many areas.
- 4) Support for all staff members having access to counseling help.
- 5) Worry about Extension workers' success too dependent on evaluators definition of success.
- 6) Need for more program identification at all levels.
- 7) Favorable reaction to current county staffing patterns.
- 8) Need for better statewide identify for Extension.

Chuck Marr led the Committee's efforts in designing/selecting overall identity tools: logo, official name, slogan. With extensive staff input, a bold new logo was designed; the official name became the Kansas State University (or KSU) Cooperative Extension Service; and the slogan "Extending the university to the people" was adopted.

Barry Flinchbaugh and Bill Cox headed the committee's effort to hold three summertime focus group meetings (Hays, Wichita, Topeka) for Kansas influentials invited by the Director.

Among the most frequently mentioned opinions were:

- 1) Extension needs better PR and/or advertising.
- 2) Need more work in urban areas.
- 3) Status quo on funding desirable, but further budget cuts likely.
- 4) Look to user fees, especially for videotape use and/or special programs.
- 5) Carefully determine local people's educational needs.

Future program areas identified were:

- 1) Farm/financial management.
- 2) Farm marketing.
- 3) Natural resources conservation, especially soil and water.
- 4) Economic alternatives/value-added processing.
- 5) 4-H expansion.
- 6) Nutrition education.
- 7) Family development programs.

To get a statewide, more scientific survey, patterned on the national assessment of Extension, the Committee enlisted the aid of Jim Lindquist, a Ph.D. candidate at that time.

He, using trained telephone callers, completed a random sampling of Kansans in August, 1986. When the data was reviewed in general it showed:

People being aware of programs rarely made them more supportive of those programs, or of Extension as a whole. But, the greater their perceived need for programs, the more likely respondents were to support those programs and Extension, and the greater was the likelihood that they were aware of the programs.

The Committee requested, and were granted two days for required training on marketing during the 1986 Annual Conference.

Each committee member researched and oversaw development of a session. The committee wanted to cover all of marketing, but mainly limited their scope to awareness-building and beginning skills transmission.

Program sessions/topics includes:

- The Committee's activities.
- Need for marketing
- Kansas demographics.
- Overview of the marketing process.
- Analytical data gathering.
- Identifying influentials and power structures.
- Program life cycles.
- Extension's image and identity.
- Personal image.
- Program promotion.

Evaluations showed the training as a whole to be the best received in recent history.

To allow the Committee to wind up its "corporate identity" charge and provide more specific "how to" training, the program was given a half day during the 1987 Spring Planning Conferences.

The Committee delivered a preliminary stylebook on identity, a stack of clip art possibilities using the new logo, a mini-text on marketing, more research results, and handouts on subjects from Kansas agriculture to national power structures.

The Committee members led sessions on personal/office applications of the marketing process, on using Lindquist's data, the importance of personal attitude, use of the new identity tools, and "rules of thumb" for working with officials/influentials.

The committee had several clear ideas on how to use identity tools, but 1987 budget restraints made it impossible to carrying these ideas into action programs..

Even a relatively inexpensive campaign to help Kansans recognize Extension's organization name and organizational relationships to its many office and program areas was a victim of budget limitations.

75th Anniversary Committee—1988-89

With the approaching 75th anniversary date for the signing of the Smith-Lever Act—May 8, 1914—Kansas joined with ES-USDA and the other States in a special celebration of the event.

The Kansas approach, as orchestrated by a Special Celebration Committee, involved several months of special activities.

Chairman Dale Apel in an early issue of Celebrate, a special monthly tabloid, explained the plans this way:

It was on May 8, 1914, that the Smith-Lever Act was signed into law, creating the Cooperative Extension Service—the largest adult education program in the world—one that's been given lots of credit for improving the decision-making capabilities and quality of life for those involved in its programs—and specifically for helping American farmers become the most efficient of the world's food and fiber producers.

This 75th Anniversary year for Extension provides an opportunity to look at ourselves, take stock of accomplishments and the spirit of Extension, enthusiastically support colleagues, involve and recognize publics, plan for the future, and have some fun.

Kansas Extension Anniversary Committee members have identified—and administrators have pledged their support for—four major goals for the year's activities:

- 1) Highlight the 75-year accomplishments and spirit of Extension.
- 2) Regenerate pride, enthusiasm, and esprit de corps of the whole staff.
- 3) Involve cooperators, volunteers, and supporters in every county.
- 4) Reach out to others in telling Extension's story.

The Committee assigned to head up this year-long celebration included:

- Dale Apel, 4-H Specialist, Chairman.
- Christine Buchanan, Communications Specialist.
- Sheila Gains, Wyandotte County 4-H Agent.
- Clarene Goodheart, Rooks County Home Economist.
- Ralf Graham, Communications Specialist.
- Joyce Jones, Home Economics Specialist.
- Milton Krainbill, Lincoln County Agricultural Agent.
- Dale Ladd, McPherson County Agricultural Agent.
- Bob Newsome, Northeast Area Director.
- Ralph Utermoehlen, NE Area Community Development Specialist.
- Bill Willis, Plant Pathology Specialist.
- Doris Welch, Kearny County Home Economist.

Highlight of the activities, by months, are as follows:

■ October, 1988

The Kansas Extension was welcomed to Extension's 75th year at the Awards Luncheon concluding Annual Conference on Oct 21.

Balloons, 75th place mats, the first of 12 monthly newsletters, and a clown created a festive mood for the year-long observance.

■ November, 1988

Counties and departments received an order form for specially designed anniversary supplies, including place mats, styrofoam cups, commemorative pins, banners and napkins, along with clip art sheets of the Kansas 75th logo.

■ December, 1988

County agents on the Anniversary Committee produced a calendar of events to spark ideas for celebrating the 75th.

The first news releases in a series of 18 histori-

cal stories and columns of Historical Notes by the Extension news staff appeared in the Communicator and Celebrate.

■ January, 1989

The 75th was the focus of a Legislative Breakfast hosted by the Kansas Extension Agents, with 62 legislators and 34 Extension representatives attending.

A slide/tape set, Great Days of Opportunity, was developed by instructional media Specialists for use at the breakfast, and later put in video format for use by counties.

Bob Johnson and Ralf Graham started updating the history of Kansas Cooperative Extension, building on a history compiled by Earl Teagarden 25 years earlier.

Department and county newsletters began using the 75th logo and historical stories.

■ February, 1989

A statewide banquet brought 350 staff, legislators, University administrators, volunteers, and spouses to a brightly decorated Houston Street Ballroom.

The program featured an anniversary medley by the Lindquist Brothers, representatives from the Extension program areas, and Herbert Grover, Wisconsin state superintendent of public instruction.

Gold and white 75th lapel pins were distributed at the conclusion of the event.

■ March, 1989

Counties continued to share their plans, and the Kansas press, radio, television stations continued to use special historical features about Extension.

Preprinted covers in purple and black with the 75th logo and the "celebrate" theme were designed for Extension Homemaker Unit district meetings and teas, beginning in April and running through May.

■ April, 1988.

Area Spring Planning Conferences provided an anniversary celebration on opening night. Doyle D. Rahjes, president, Kansas Farm Bureau, brought greetings, symbolizing the historic Extension/Farm Bureau connection.

Rosemary Crist wrote a skit especially for the five area events. Cutting the birthday cake was part of the festivities.

Gov. Mike Hayden signed a proclamation praising Extension and denoting May 8, 1989 as CES Anniversary Day.

Director Walter Woods, Associate Director Stan Farlin, and Shawnee County Director

Margaret Hund presented the Governor a commemorative paperweight and a copy of the book, Taking the University to the People: Seventy-five Years of Cooperative Extension.

■ May, 1989

Because the signing of the Smith-Lever Act establishing Extension was signed May 8, 1914, many counties:

- Held open houses.
- Recognized county commissioners and other supporters.
- Solicited proclamations.
- Held banquets and dinners.
- Planted trees.
- Produced special issues.
- Wrote columns.
- Sent balloon bouquets.
- Appeared on radio and television.
- Entered floats in parades.
- Contacted past agents.
- Made displays.
- Featured longtime participants.
- Gave away balloons.
- Promoted Extension at county and area events.

■ June, 1989

Made available 25,000 preprinted 75th covers in purple and black on white.

■ July, 1989

Fairs and many other county and area events continued to provide opportunities for promoting Extension.

■ August, 1989

Northwest Area Research-Extension Center had a full day of events, bringing in special speakers on the 26th.

Several counties planned Fair promotions.

■ September, 1989.

The 75th theme showed up at the Kansas State Fair.

■ October, 1989

At AES-CES Annual Conference, Oct. 16-20, the Epsilon Sigma Phi Banquet had a birthday party theme.

A special historical video, Kansas Extension: A Chronicle of Continuing Concern, was premiered at the Wednesday night banquet, and copies were later sent to each county.

Two four-color matching promotional brochures were displayed, and distributed to the counties.

Changing Lives through Changing Times explained the history and organization of Kansas Extension.

Responding to Issues—Extension's Team Approach explained the seven Kansas priority programs.

A display of state and county memorabilia from the past year was displayed on the second floor concourse of the Student Union throughout the conference

Program Initiatives—1988

Program Initiatives

In the late 1980's, programming by initiative became a buzzword in Extension, nationally and in Kansas. This involved efforts to measure the impact of Extension programs on pre-determined priority issues.

National Initiatives—1986

In January, 1988, ES-USDA advanced a new approach designed to spotlight National Initiatives Focus on Issues

This new focus on national initiatives were expected to "trickle down" to State Extension Services for implementation in ways that best fitted their respective clientele.

These national initiatives included:

- Alternative Agricultural Opportunities.
- Building Human Capital.
- Competitiveness and Profitability of American Agriculture.
- Conservation and Management of Natural Resources.
- Family and Economic Well-Being
- Improving Nutrition, Diet and Health.
- Revitalizing Rural America.
- Water Quality
- Youth at Risk.

This document further emphasized that Extension's efficiency, accountability, clarity of public mission, and resources must continue to be concentrated on issues important to its public's economic, social, and environmental progress.

Kansas Initiatives—1988-89

The Kansas response to the National Initiatives was summarized in the publication, Responding to the Issues—Extension's Team Approach.

That document states:

The future of Kansas depends, in part, on its people being well prepared to face critical social, economic and environmental issues.

Cooperative Extension as implemented statewide program planning that focuses on critical educational needs. Extension's agenda for the coming decade targets seven key initiatives.

- 1) Agricultural profitability and competitiveness.
- 2) Economic revitalization.
- 3) Water quality.
- 4) Conservation of natural resources.
- 5) Human health and well-being
- 6) Youth at risk.
- 7) Developing human resources.

Nineteen multi-disciplinary program development teams, comprised of professionals from all program areas, are creating educational programs related to these initiatives.

Using means as diverse as computer analyses, workshops and satellite television broadcasts, Extension brings the resources of Kansas State University to people throughout the state.

People—their needs and concerns—will remain central to Extension's program planning process as we move toward the 21st century.

Kansas Extension Beyond 1988

In these changing times for the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service, there is a continuing need for self-examination and making desirable adjustments in its educational course.

Perhaps one appropriate place to look for guidance is in the Extension in Transition: Bridging the Gap Between Vision & Reality, the 1987 report by the Futures Task Force of ECOP.

Among other things, it suggests that in the future Cooperative Extension must:

- 1) Focus on delivery rather than content of its programs.
- 2) Review the need for organizational and structural changes.
- 3) Review the Federal, State, and county partnership where such action is undertaken.

- 4) Restate your mission.
- 5) Develop a vision for the future.
- 6) Formulate plans for the necessary transition to achieve the desired changes.
- 7) Improve your ability to "deliver" with better trained and/or more highly specialized staff, including some qualified 'futurists.'
- 8) Strengthen and support staff development components to achieve the necessary specialization in staff training.
- 9) Develop strong ties with other public agencies and private firms.
- 10) Review alternative funding sources, such as grants, subcontracting with other agencies, and users' fees.
- 11) Access and utilize all appropriate expertise related to relevant issues from all available sources within the Land-Grant University.
- 12) Establish high tech research/Extension centers to accomplish three goals—problem

solving, education of producers, education of professionals.

The most pointed piece of advice to State Extension Services, like Kansas, seems to be:

Become more concerned with doing the right thing, rather than doing things right. Decide to lead and then do it with vision and boldness!

That's the challenge that faces the Kansas Extension Service professionals as they move ahead into the 1990's and onward toward a century of service to the people of Kansas.

Contributing Authors. The primary contributing authors to this overview summary of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service organization, administration, and program emphasis for the 1970-88 era were J. Dale Apel, Extension 4-H Youth Specialist, and Ralf O. Graham, Instructional Media Coordinator.