

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAMMING
IN
NINE METROPOLITAN COUNTIES
1980 - 1981

REFERENCE COPY

Dr. Sara M. Steele and Extension Personnel
From Nine Counties and Seven States

University of Wisconsin - Extension

December, 1981

NOTE: For use by participating counties only. Permission must be secured from the county involved before citing any of the data from that county.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| INTRODUCTION TO THE COUNTIES | 4 |
| BUDGET AND FINANCE | 6 |
| RESOURCE ALLOCATION | 14 |
| PERSONNEL | 18 |
| CLIENTELE | 22 |
| PROGRAM EMPHASES | 27 |
| PROGRAM METHODS | 35 |
| PERSONNEL POLICIES | 44 |
| PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES | 50 |
| APPENDIX TABLES | 56 |

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of this document

The main purpose of this document is to provide data in tabular form which will permit the reader to study Cooperative Extension Programming in nine metropolitan counties in 1980-1981. It is a reference document rather than a final analysis or popularized report.

No attempt will be made to make conclusions beyond the following very general ones:

1. There are some similarities among moderate size metropolitan counties in terms of the nature of Cooperative Extension Programming.
2. There also are marked differences both in the programs and in the actual county situations.

Counties Included

The following counties are included:

| | |
|---|----|
| Milwaukee County, Wisconsin (Milwaukee) | MI |
| Hennepin County, Minnesota (Minneapolis) | HE |
| St. Louis County/City, Missouri (St. Louis) | ST |
| Cuyahoga County, Ohio (Cleveland) | CU |
| Franklin County, Ohio (Columbus) | FR |
| Hamilton County, Ohio (Cincinnati) | HA |
| Marion County, Indiana (Indianapolis) | MA |
| King County, Washington (Seattle) | KI |
| Erie County, New York (Buffalo) | ER |

Cautions and Limitations in the Data

This document should only be used to give a general understanding of how Cooperative Extension functions in nine metropolitan counties. Great care should be taken in forming any judgments about individual counties based on this data.

The reader is cautioned about the following limitations in the data:

1. The census data are old. However, it seemed that greater understanding of the Cooperative Extension data could be secured through better understanding some of the basic information about each county and its people.
2. There may be limitations in the data provided by Extension personnel. Counties were free to omit questions and some did. Counties differ greatly on what records are kept. Counties may have interpreted questions differently.
3. Data may be misinterpreted without full understanding of county situations.
4. There is considerable variation in the number of counties answering certain questions. In some instances, the range and midpoint refer to all nine counties; in others, they may refer to only three counties. The number is given in parentheses when fewer than nine counties provided information.

Initiation of This Project

This study was developed as a supplement to a review of Cooperative Extension programming in Milwaukee County, Wisconsin. Extension administrators lacked a basis for comparing Milwaukee county programs with other counties because Milwaukee was so different in demographics.

Selection of the Counties

North Central metropolitan counties were selected under the assumption that programming conditions would be most similar to Wisconsin. Cook County, Illinois, was excluded because it had a substantially greater population than did Milwaukee county. Wayne County, Michigan was invited to participate but could not arrange time to do so. In addition two counties elsewhere which were closest to Milwaukee county on total population in 1975 were selected. One county--King County, Washington was on the west coast and the other, Erie County, New York, was almost on the east coast.

Sources

The information is from three sources:

- a. Census information. Most of the demographic and related information was secured from the County and City Data Book 1977.
- b. a questionnaire filled out by District administrators. However, states differ in terms of who knows most about budget. In some instances, the district director had the county office chairman fill out the shorter questionnaire dealing with such questions.
- c. a questionnaire filled out by the County Extension office chair and/or staff.

Selection of the Information Included

The questions included were developed to cover:

- a. areas the Milwaukee county faculty were especially interested in.
- b. areas Wisconsin Extension administration was interested in.
- c. areas included in the guide for the Milwaukee External review.

In addition, participating counties were offered an opportunity to add questions. One county asked that the question about the duties of the office chairman be included.

The instruments were long and the county office chairmen and staffs are commended for their patience both in providing the information and in reviewing the information in the reference draft.

Organization of This Report

The major sections in this report are:

- Introduction to the Counties, Page 4
- Budget and Finance, Page 6
- Resource Allocation, Page 14
- Personnel, Page 18
- Clientele, Page 22
- Program Emphases, Page 27
- Program Methods, Page 35
- Personnel Policies, Page 44
- Program Development and Evaluation Procedures, Page 50

A brief narrative description at the beginning of each section identifies ranges and a mid-point in the data. The ranges and median will give anchoring points when considering a specific county or looking generally at Cooperative Extension programming in moderately metropolitan counties.

This is a long document. The user is encouraged to scan the Table of Contents before entering the body of the text and to refer frequently both to the Table of Contents and to the List of Tables which is included at the end.

 INTRODUCTION TO THE COUNTIES¹

This is a study of Cooperative Extension programming in moderate-sized metropolitan counties. The nine counties in this study were not the most populated counties in the United States. Seven of them ranked between 21th and 29th.

They were similar in that they had populations of around a million people, but other characteristics differed in ways that might affect programming. Six of the counties lost population as of 1975.

The range and midpoints among the counties are given below.

Population and Land Area (Table 1)

| | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1975 population | 782,139 MA | 960,451 ST | 1,592,613 CU |
| Rank in US population | 38th MA | 26th ST | 9th CU |
| Number of families 1970 | 200,200 MA | 245,300 ST | 439,800 CU |
| Land area, square miles | 237 MI | 499 ST | 2,128 KI |
| Number of people per square mile | 537 KI | 1,925 ST | 4,271 MI |
| Number of farms | 206 MI | 565 ST | 1,487 ER |
| Total population change | -6.8 CU | -2.0 ER | +3.9 FR |
| Net migration | -1.0 FR | -5.1 MI, MA | -9.0 CU |

Cities and SMA's (Table 1)

| | | | |
|---|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| Number of municipalities | 4 MA | 29 KI | 92 ST |
| Number of cities over 25,000 | 2 HA, MA | 3 FR, KI, ER | 13 CU |
| Population within largest city | 378,112 HE | 524,964 ST | 782,139 MA |
| Percent of county population in largest city | 0% ST | 43% KI | 100% MA |
| Population of the SMA | 1,068,000 FR | 1,406,741 KI | 2,010,000 HE |
| Rank SMA | 35 FR | 24 KI | 11 ST |
| Percent of SMA within county | 46% HE | 72% MI-80% FR | 82% ER |

¹ST1 and ST2 pose an unusual situation in that the major city is treated by the Census as a separate entity and not included in the county as in the case in the other counties. However, the CES programming is not easily separated into city and county. Data above includes county data only.

TABLE 1

Selected Descriptive Information from U.S. Census and Similar Sources
Population and Land Area (* = July 1975)

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST1</u> | <u>ST2</u> | <u>CU</u> |
|---------------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|
| Total population* | 1,012,335 | 915,603 | 960,451 | 524,964 | 1,592,613 |
| U.S. rank* | 24 | 27 | 26 | 78 | 9 |
| Number of families, 1970* | 262,500 | 233,900 | 245,300 | 149,800 | 439,800 |
| Land area (sq. mile) | 237 | 567 | 499 | 61 | 456 |
| Population/sq. mile* | 4,271 | 1,615 | 1,925 | 8,606 | 3,493 |
| Number of farms | 206 | 907 | 565 | | 217 |
| % Total population change | -2.0 | -3.6 | 1.3 | -14.2 | -6.8 |
| % Net migration | -5.1 | -6.7 | -2.1 | -15.3 | -9.0 |
| | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
| Total population* | 858,239 | 900,284 | 782,139 | 1,142,544 | 1,089,327 |
| U.S. rank* | 33 | 29 | 38 | 21 | 23 |
| Number of families, 1970* | 203,800 | 229,000 | 200,200 | 291,800 | 277,800 |
| Land area (sq. mile) | 538 | 414 | 392 | 2,128 | 1,058 |
| Population/sq. mile* | 1,595 | 2,175 | 1,995 | 537 | 1,030 |
| Number of farms | 719 | 458 | 471 | 1,022 | 1,487 |
| % Total population change | 3.9 | -2.3.0 | -0.6 | -0.9 | -2.0 |
| % Net migration | -1.0 | -5.4.6 | -5.1 | -3.3 | -3.8 |
| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST1</u> | <u>ST2</u> | <u>CU</u> |
| Number of municipalities (1977) | | | | | |
| total | 19 | 45 | 92 | 1 | 62 |
| 25,000 and over | 4 | 9 | 5 | | 13 |
| 2,500-24,999 | 14 | 19 | 54 | | 31 |
| under 2,500 (extrapolated) | 1 | 17 | 33 | | 12 |
| Size of largest city | 665,796 | 378,112 | | | 635,793 |
| Rank of largest city | 14 | 34 | 24 | | 18 |
| % of county in city | 66% | 41% | | | 40% |
| Size of SMA | 1,409,363 | 2,010,841 | 2,366,542 | | 1,966,725 |
| Rank of SMA | 23 | 15 | 11 | | 17 |
| % of SMA in county | 72% | 46% | | | 81% |
| | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
| Number of municipalities (1977) | | | | | |
| total | 26 | 37 | 4 | 29 | 19 |
| 25,000 and over | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 2,500-24,999 | 14 | 129 | 2 | 15 | 16 |
| under 2,500 (extrapolated) | 9 | 6 | | 11 | |
| Size of largest city | 535,610 | 412,564 | 782,139 | 487,091 | 407,160 |
| Rank of largest city | 23 | 31 | 9 | 25 | 32 |
| % of county in city | 62% | 46% | 100% | 43% | 37% |
| Size of SMSA | 1,068,514 | 1,381,196 | 1,138,753 | 1,406,746 | 1,326,848 |
| Rank of SMSA | 35 | 25 | 32 | 24 | 27 |
| % of SMSA in county | 80% | 65% | 69% | 81% | 82% |

MAJOR SOURCE: County and City Data Book 1977. A Statistical Abstract Supplement. U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. Additional sources: Characteristics of the Population, (1970 Census of Population), Vol. I, Parts 16, 24, 25, 27, 34, 37, 49, 51 (by state). U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Social and Economic Statistics Administration, January 1973. 1977 Census of Governments. Vol I, Governmental Organization. U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, July 1978.

 BUDGET AND FINANCE

Sources of Funds

There was considerable range in the total 1980-81 county Extension budget among the eight counties giving information. The largest budget was almost three times as great as the smallest. There was considerable variation in the amount and percent of funds secured from various sources. Three counties indicated income from fees. Three received funding from the major city.

The range and midpoints in amount of budget from various sources are given below. In instances throughout this document, when data is only available from an even number of counties, two counties will be given under median.

| <u>Dollar Amount of Funding (Table 2)</u> | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|---|----------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Total budget (8 counties) | \$456,500 HE | \$1,067,108 MA -\$1,099,266 MI | \$1,330,055 KI |
| County funding (8 counties) | \$72,347 ST | \$241,100 CU \$301,331 MI | \$471,729 MA |
| State and federal funding (8 counties) | \$52,175 ER | \$139,233 MA \$288,911 MI | \$810,110 KI |
| EFNEP (7 counties) | \$80,150 ER | \$112,940 FR | \$200,000 ST |
| Urban gardening (3 counties) | \$150,000 ST, CU | | \$221,867 MI |
| City funding (3 counties) | \$20,000 MI | \$25,000 FR | \$75,000 ST |
| Limited time grants (7 counties) | \$70,000 HE | \$180,000 KI | \$340,000 MA |
| Fees and charges (3 counties) | \$24,000 FR | \$61,444 ST | \$170,290 ER |
| Penalty mail allotment | \$9,600 HE | \$11,496 HE \$15,000 CU | \$21,000 CU |

Percent of Budget from Various Sources (Table 4)

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|--------|---------------|-----------|
| County | 7% ST | 26% KI-27% MI | 59% ER |
| State and Regular Smith-Lever | 7% ER | 18% HE-26% MI | 61% KI |
| Special Smith-Lever | 0% KI | 18% FR-26% CU | 32% ST |
| City (3 counties) | 2% MI | 4% FR | 7% ST |
| Limited time grants (7 counties) | 0% ER | 15% HE-16% MI | 38% FR |
| Fees and charges (3 counties) | 4% FR | 5% ST | 23% ER |
| Total budget per county resident | 50¢ HE | 72¢ CU-74¢ ST | \$1.41 MA |
| County funding per county resident | 10¢ ST | 16¢ FR-30¢ MI | 65¢ MA |

See Appendix Table 1 for 1970-71 data on other county government finances and expenditures.

Three counties, MI, CU, and KI, indicated bulletin allotments of 9,517, 9,000 and 21,135 respectively.

Counties MI, HE, CU, and MA ranked first in their state on all items asked about--highest budget, most money from various sources, etc. However, the ranking for County ER within its state was from 6th to 53rd.

TABLE 2

Amount of 1980-1981 Funding from Various Sources

| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| TOTAL | \$1,099,266 | \$456,500 | \$1,104,314 | \$1,120,024 | \$601,107 |
| Combined State & Federal | | | | | |
| Smith-Lever | 288,911 | 120,500 | 347,244 | 396,917 | 71,680 |
| State | 149,467 | 46,000 | 116,160 | | |
| Regular Smith-Lever (including Urban 4-MA) | 138,541 | 74,500 | 231,084 | | |
| County | 301,331 | 124,000 | 72,347 | 241,100 | 135,500 |
| City | 20,000 | | 75,000 | | 25,000 |
| Smith-Lever special: | | | | | |
| Smith-Lever EFNEP | 95,200 | 142,000 | 200,000 | 150,100 | 112,940 |
| Urban Gardening | 221,867 | | 150,000 | 150,000 | |
| Other permanent funding | | | 92,379 | | |
| Limited time grants | 172,860 | 70,000 | 105,900 | 181,897 | 231,987 |
| Fees or other charges | -- | | 61,444 | | 24,000 |
| Penalty mail | \$11,496 | \$9,000 | \$15,000 | \$21,400 | \$19,323 |
| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> | |
| TOTAL | | \$1,067,108 | \$1,330,055 | \$730,768 | |
| Combined State & Federal | | | | | |
| Smith-Lever | | 139,233 | 810,110 | 52,175 | |
| State | | 54,924 | | 40,165 | |
| Regular Smith-Lever | | 84,309 | | 12,010 | |
| County | | 471,729 | 339,945 | 428,153 | |
| City | | | | | |
| Smith-Lever special: | | | | | |
| Smith-Lever EFNEP | | 112,705 | NA | 80,150 | |
| Urban Gardening | | | | | |
| Other permanent funding: | | | | | |
| Limited time grants: | | 340,441 | 180,000 | | |
| Fees or other charges: | | | | 170,290 | |
| Penalty mail | | \$11,500 | \$17,379 | \$9,960 | |

NOTE: Giving budget data for a particular period is difficult because most counties deal with at least three different fiscal year spans. Also, in many states, regular Smith-Lever funds and state dollars are "comingled," used interchangeably and applied only to positions. Generally there are not rationally thought out separate state Extension allotments to counties. There is a combined state and federal contribution to the maintenance of agent positions agreed upon with the county.

TABLE 3

Nature of Other Permanent Funding and/or Limited Time GrantsExplanation of "Other permanent funding":

County ST: County indirect appropriations \$24,752; City indirect appropriations \$67,627

Explanation of "Limited time grants":

County MI: Can You Afford It? \$4,257; Credit Bureau \$1,500; Work/Study \$5,000; Zoological Society \$12,500; Young Adult Conservation Corps \$84,321; Traveling Teachers \$40,000; Alliance to Save Energy \$5,000; CETA \$19,282; County Executive \$1,000

County HE: County Nutrition Education \$70,000

County ST: CETA Special Funds \$100,000; H.D.C. Grant \$3,000; Family Energy Grants \$2,900

County CU: CETA PSE \$78,665; CETA Summer Hire \$54,432; Individual counseling \$1,600; CARET \$200; Office on Aging training grant \$750; Women City Club counseling grant \$700; Work study \$7,560; local foundation \$38,000

County FR: CETA \$212,987; Community Development (city and county) \$19,000.

County MA: Title XX, State Welfare Dept. \$192,566; CETA \$147,875.
NOTE: County MI figures for Regular Smith-Lever do not include area expense budget which pays agent training expenses for 8-county areas. Figure for total does not include miscellaneous local contributions and fund raising activities which, due to difficulty in considering them in questions 2, 3, 4, are not included.

County KI: Energy Extension \$150,000; CETA \$30,000

TABLE 4

Percent of 1980-1981 Budget from Various Sources; Per Capita Amount

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Government appropriations: | | | | | | | | | |
| County | 27% | 27% | 7% | 18% | 23% | | 44% | 26% | 59% |
| City | 2 | | 7 | | 4 | | | | 7 |
| State & Regular S-L | 26 | 26 | 31 | 40 | 12 | | 13 | 61 | 11 |
| Special Smith-Lever | 29 | 31 | 32 | 26 | 18 | | | 11% | |
| Other permanent funding: | | | 8 | | | | | 23 | |
| Limited time grants: | 16 | 15 | 10 | 16 | 38 | | 14 | 14 | |
| Fees or other charges: | | | 5% | | 4 | | | | 23 |
| TOTAL | 100% | 100% | 101% | 100% | 99% | | 100% | 101% | 100% |
| Total budget per capita | 1.09 | .50 | .74 | .72 | .62 | | 1.41 | 1.16 | .67 |
| County budget per capita | .30 | .14 | .10 | .15 | .16 | | .65 | .30 | .39 |

TABLE 5

Rank of County Among All Counties in the State in Regard to Selected Items

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <u>Rank order based upon:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Total population | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Regular Smith-Lever | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | 13 |
| State dollars | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | 53 |
| Local Appropriations | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 7 | | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Penalty mail allotments | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 28 |
| Bulletin allotments | 1 | -- | 1 | 1 | | | | 1 | |

Charging for Extension Programs and Materials

Three counties, CU, MA, and ER, indicated that they regularly charged for newsletters. The other counties said they never charged for them.

Three counties, ST, FR, and HA, indicated that they regularly charged for workshops, conferences, and other instructional meetings. The other counties said they occasionally charged for them.

None of the counties said that they ever charged for one-to-one assistance.

Three counties, MI, CU, and KI, indicated bulletin allotments of 9,517, 9,000 and 21,135 respectively.

Adequacy of Present Resources (Table 6)

Only two of the counties, MI and ER, felt that the present level of resources was about right. All others indicated present resources were too low.

All counties had clear uses in mind for possible additional resources. The one common thread among counties was that five indicated they would use additional resources to secure help in mass communications.

Seven counties indicated that there had been major budget changes in the past few years. For the most part, these changes had increased the county budget but in the case of County MA, budget restrictions had forced the closing out of five agent positions, two of which were on hard money.

Four counties were foreseeing possible budget changes in the next two years. (MI faced major county reductions in 1981-1982). There was concern about maintaining the county contribution in several instances.

When asked about major problems in maintaining funding, all except one county foresaw problems ahead, but the cause of the problem indicated differed.

TABLE 6

Priorities for Additional Dollars
As Viewed by County Office Chairman/Staff

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| County MI | 1. Ad hoc professional for teaching and horticulture and Home Economics answering service; 2. Assistant to the chair; 3. Paraprofessionals for 4-H and urban gardening; 4. Communication agent. |
| County HE | 1. Computers for office; 2. Media and/or public relations agent; 3. Additional secretarial time; 4. Agricultural agent; 5. Part-time resource persons for Home Extension; 6. 4-H recruitment agents; 7. Summer horticulture assistant; 8. Phone tip messages--horticulture and Home Economics. |
| County ST | 1. Public information and media specialist; 2. continuing education specialists concentrating on programming designed for professional development; 3. Business, industry and labor specialists. |

TABLE 6 (continued)

| | |
|-----------|--|
| County CU | 1. Extension agent Home Economics to relieve chairman. Emphasis should be on economics. Great opportunity with this subject; 2. Equipping a demonstration kitchen, van, meeting room, etc. adequately; 3. Summer help with telephones, 4-H gardens, office. Program assistants to help with Homemaker Clubs, parenting groups, budget counseling program, etc. No more PAs without sufficient agent supervision. |
| County FR | 1. Communications; 2. Energy; 3. Money management; 4. 4-H Horticulture position. |
| County HA | 1. Have consistently been denied funding for additional staff in Energy/Horticulture; 2. Each program area to use program assistant; 3. Computer technology/word processor. |
| County MA | 1. Mass media agent, 4-H TV program; 2. Model Farm Program; 3. Word Processing Equipment |
| County KI | 1. Mass media specialist to assist agents in planning media efforts, maintain liaison with media outlets and promote taped information system ("Dial Extension"); 2. Paraprofessionals to work one-to-one in 4-H programs, limited-resource farms program and others; 3. Volunteer coordinator; 4. Budget for professional artwork; 5. Additional monies for use by agents (e.g. subscriptions, travel, etc.) |
| County ER | 1. Computerized equipment for membership enrollment, personnel records, subject matter questions; 2. Larger Urban Center--established in July of 1979 and at times present space is not adequate; 3. Additional staff for programs not presently being conducted |

TABLE 7

Priority If There Is Additional Money As Viewed by District Director

| | <u>first priority</u> | <u>second priority</u> | <u>third priority</u> |
|-----------|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| County MI | Additional ad hoc or LTE para-professionals to answer phones and follow up on requests for information. | | |
| County HE | Youth program assistants | Program and expense money for volunteers | Home Economics professional |
| County ST | Continuing Education and public info. specialists | Energy/health related areas | Consumer economics |
| County CU | Publication assistant and offset press operator | Communication assistant | Home Economist/ Family Economics |
| County FR | Reinstate Agr. position | strengthen current postns | communications specialist |

TABLE 7 (continued)

| | | | |
|-----------|--|---|--|
| County MA | Mass communication personnel | | |
| County KI | Mass media communications agent | Change jurisdiction of area horticultural position to our county only (is shared) | Assign paraprofessionals to a) non-urban 4-H; b) small farmer education c) family living |
| County ER | Expanded low income efforts across all program areas | Consumer programs for urban families | Programs for urban youth |

TABLE 8

Major Changes in Funding in the Past Five Years

| | | | |
|-----------|---|-------|-----------|
| County MI | Yes. Funding of program for welfare recipients was discontinued. | | |
| County HE | Yes. Univ. budget increased from \$35,000, 1976, to \$60,000, 1981 County budget increased from \$62,000 (1976) to \$194,000 (1981) Total budget increased from \$97,000 (1976) to \$254,000 (1981) | | |
| County ST | No. We are averaging approximately 8% to 10% increase annually. | | |
| County CU | Yes. 1. Increase allocation to city and Urban Gardening. 2. County contribution up 40%. 3. EFNEP budget up 25%. | | |
| County FR | Yes. Regular appropriations from County Commissioners increased from \$77,350 in 1976 to \$119,000 in 1980 but no increase in 1981. Soft funding has increased to over \$200,000 with CETA funds being a major part. These have funded special projects--money management, energy, etc. CETA funding will almost disappear during 1981. Increased agent faculty by two positions. One is a full time chairman position. | | |
| County HA | | | |
| County MA | Yes. Budget restrictions have forced the closing of five Agent positions (of which three were on soft funds). | | |
| County KI | Yes. Both county and state (state and federal) contributions have increased. Three agricultural positions have been added in past three years. All three have the regular county salary contribution, \$5,200 per year plus travel, secretarial support, etc. | | |
| County ER | Yes. Government appropriations: | 1976: | \$338,624 |
| | | 1977: | 113,436 |
| | | 1978: | 358,932 |
| | | 1979: | 376,878 |
| | | 1980: | 399,500 |
| | | 1981: | 428,153 |

TABLE 9

Major Changes in Funding Expected in Next Two Years

- County MI none. I would expect much tighter budgets at the county level.
- County HE none
- County ST none
- County CU 1. Could be reduction in force--particularly program assistants--no major expenses. 2. Private grant support could increase.
- County FR County budget situation very tight. County Commissioners did not increase county budget for 1981 resulting in the loss of a county agent position. State and federal outlook not good.
- County MA none
- County KI County contribution could decrease. The new county executive is not as committed to ag land and ag industry preservation. State contributions are now targeted at lower level. Attitude of former County Executive (now the state governor) toward Extension seems to have been positive. That could influence Extension budget. Federal budget picture unknown.
- County ER There are expanding and continuing needs for educational programs for clientele with limited resources. The ratio of city vs. suburban, rural & farm program participants is a concern. Broad considerations need to be made on the methods of reaching clientele.

TABLE 10

Major Problems Foreseen for Maintaining Funding
or Securing Additional Funding in This County

- County MI Note previous response. Budgets will be subject to much closer scrutiny.
- County HE None foreseen at this time.
- County ST Inflation erodes purchasing power 10% to 12% per year. Eroding tax base in large urban centers due to exodus of big business to exurban areas and the sunbelt. Possible shrinkage of federal and state dollars due to a more conservative governmental stance.
- County CU 1. Competition for tax dollar. 2. Evaluating programs--identifying results and benefits to residents. 3. We will need to justify program.
- County FR The economy in the state and county are not good at this time. Working hard toward alternative sources of local funding.
- County HA
- County MA There is great pressure on local government finance as a result of continuing inflation combined with severe legal restrictions on increasing tax rates.
- County KI (See answer to question on changes in next two years.) Most counties in our state are in difficult financial situations. There is a growing move to identify mandated county functions and give them first priority in funding. Extension is not among the mandated functions.
- County ER City population has decreased 22.9% in last ten years, (1970, 426,768 to 1980, 357,002); while County population has decreased 9.0% during the same period, (1970, 1,113,491 to 1980, 1,013,373). County tax dollars are more difficult to get appropriated to cover the annual inflation rate.

 RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Most of the county extension budgets were spent on salaries and wages. There was considerable variation in terms of the amount and percent spent for agents' salaries and for wages of clerical staff, paraprofessionals, and ad hoc personnel.

There was also considerable variation in allocation of budget among program areas.

Ranges and medians are given below.

| | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|--|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Total number of employees | 14 HA | 40 ER | 124 MA |
| Number of Extension agents | 5 HA | 11 ER | 16 MA |
| <u>Budget allocated to (8 counties) (Table 12)</u> | | | |
| Agent salaries | \$114,100 FR | \$274,160 CU \$288,441 KI | \$429,046 MI |
| Clerical salaries | \$29,500 HE | \$97,915 MA \$102,000 ST | \$147,906 KI |
| Paraprofessional salaries | \$73,000 FR | \$172,244 CU \$186,000 HE | \$331,000 ST |
| Travel Expenses | \$14,800 FR | \$25,300 MI \$25,500 ER | \$30,000 ST |
| Capital equipment | 0 KI | \$4,000 HE \$5,000 ST | \$17,550 MI |

Office Equipment (Table 13)

All counties felt they had good, fast photocopy equipment.

The next most frequently indicated piece of equipment was a computer terminal. A terminal was indicated by all counties except HE and HA.

Four counties, MI, ST, CU, and HA, indicated they had an offset press.

Three, ST, FR, and MA, indicated having videotape playback equipment and two, ST and MA indicated that they also had a videotape camera and recorder.

County KI was the only county that currently had word processing equipment.

Individual counties indicated other special equipment such as reducing/enlarging, ETC conveners, and an electronic stencil cutter.

Budget Allocation Among Program Areas (Table 14)

There was no clear pattern in terms of which program area received the greatest share of the County Extension budget. However, Community Development uniformly received considerably less than any of the other three areas.

There was also considerable variation among program areas as to the amount of permanent funding.

Generally the highest amount of budget going to any one program area ranged from 25% to 52%. No one program area predominated in more than three counties. The program emphasis receiving the greatest share in each county was as follows:

MA--52% 4-H/Youth Development
 HE--45% 4-H/Youth Development
 MI--42% Ag/Horticulture
 ER--38% Home Economics/nutrition
 KI--36% Agriculture/horticulture
 ST--35% Home Economics/nutrition
 CU--34% Agriculture/horticulture
 FR--25% Home Economics/nutrition
 HA--information not provided

Range in Amount of Budget Invested in Program Areas

| | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|------------------------------|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| Administration (7) | 3% ER | 7% CU | 12% HE |
| Agriculture/horticulture (8) | 12% MA | 20% ST,FR-24% ER | 42% MI |
| Home economics/nutrition (8) | 20% HE | 25% FR-31% CU,MA | 38% ER |
| 4-H/youth development (8) | 20% FR | 25% ST,KI-28% CU | 52% MA |
| Community development (4) | 3% FR | 6% ST-8% HE | 9% MI |

Percentage of Budget by Program Area Which Has Regular Funding (Table 15)

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|---------------|------------------|
| Agriculture/horticulture (8) | 25% MI | 85% ER-100% | 100% HE,ST,MA,KI |
| Home economics/nutrition (8) | 20% HE | 82% MA-85% CU | 100% ST,KI |
| 4-H/youth development (8) | 50% MA | 65% HE-70% ER | 100% KI |
| Community development (6) | 90% FR | | 100% HE,ST,MA,KI |

TABLE 14

Division of Budget Among Program Areas

| <u>TOTALS:</u> | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Administration | * | 12% | 4% | 7% | 10% | | 5% | 8% | 3% |
| Agriculture/horticulture | 42% | 15% | 20% | 34% | 20% | | 12% | 36% | 24% |
| Home Economics/nutrition | 25% | 20% | 35% | 31% | 25% | | 31% | 22% | 38% |
| 4-H and Youth Development | 24% | 45% | 25% | 28% | 20% | | 52% | 25% | 35% |
| Community Development | 9% | 8% | 6% | | 3% | | 9% | | |
| Other program area | | | 10% | | 22% | | | | |

Other program area: County ST, Continuing education for professionals; County FR, Energy.

*Allocated to the four areas

**Included in administration

TABLE 15

Percentage of Budget in Each Program Area Which Is Permanent Funding

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Agriculture/horticulture | 25% | 100% | 100% | 51% | 70% | | 100% | 100% | 85.2% |
| Home Economics/nutrition | 63 | 20 | 100 | 85 | 90 | | 82 | 100 | 94.9 |
| 4-H and Youth Development | 77 | 65 | 64 | 93 | 60 | | 50 | 100 | 70.0 |
| Community Development | 91 | 100 | 100 | | 90 | | 100 | 100 | |

 PERSONNEL

There was considerable range in the total number of people employed at each office. There was also a range among program areas. However, there was a much smaller range in the number of agents per office. The greatest difference came in the number of paraprofessionals. Ranges are given below.

| | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|---|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Number of positions (Table 16)</u> | | | |
| All Extension employees | 14 HA | 40 ER | 124 MA |
| Agents | 5 HA | 11 ER | 16 MA |
| Paraprofessionals | 5 HA | 20.25 MI | 41 MA |
| Secretaries | 4 HA | 7.5 CU | 10 MA,ER |
| <u>By Program Area (Tables 17 & 18)</u> | | | |
| 4-H and Youth Development | | | |
| all positions | 2 HA | 8 HE | 78 MA |
| agents | 1 FR,HA | 3 HE,ST,CU | 7 MA |
| Home economics | | | |
| all positions | 2 HA | 5.75 ER | 12.5 MA |
| agents | 1 FR,HA | 2 MI,HE,CU | 4.5 MA |
| EFNEP | | | |
| all positions | 8HA | 12 CU,KI | 25.5 HE |
| agents | .5MA | 1ST,HE,MI,KI,ER | 2 FR,HA |
| Horticulture | | | |
| all positions | 0 HA | 6MA | 23 MI |
| agents (6 counties) | 0 HA | 2 MI,CU,MA,KI,ER | 3ST |
| Other agriculture | | | |
| all positions | 0 MI,ST,CU | 2HA | 5.5 FR |
| agents (6 counties) | 0 MI,ST,CU | 1 HE,FR,HA | 3KI |
| Community development | | | |
| all positions (6 counties) | 0 HE,CU,HA,MA,ER | 0 | 2.5 ST |
| agents | 0 HE,CU,FR,HA,MA,ER | 0 | 2 MI,ST |

[See Appendix Table 2 for more detail]

Tenure of Agents (Table 20)

Tenure of current agents ranged from less than one year to 30 years. There appeared to be considerable range within each program area with no particular position appearing to have greatest tenure.

Over half had been in their position fewer than 5 years.

TABLE 16

Total Number of Positions by Type Administered Through County Extension Office

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Agents | 13.75 | 8 | 14 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 16 | 14 | 11* |
| Paraprofessionals | 20.25 | 24 | 38 | 17.3 | 16 | 5 | 41 | 10 | 19.25 |
| Ad hoc | 2.6 | 1 | 3 | | 10 | | 4 | 8.75 | |
| Secretaries | 8 | 3.5 | 9.5 | 7.5 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 7 | 10 |
| other | 10 | 22.25 | | 3 | | | 53 | 8 | |
| Total | 54.85 | 55.25 | 64.5 | 37.8 | 39 | 14 | 124 | 47.75 | 40.25 |

*eight agents employed by county plus regional agents

^bBreakdown of "other position:

County MI: 10 FTEs in Young Adult Conservation Corps (Horticulture).

County HE: Within 4-H/Youth: 1/4 Urban Corps; 3 at 3/4 Summer Art in Park assistants (3 mos); 5 at 1/4 4-H Club organizers; 2 at 1/5 CETA trainees; 1 at 1/4 college student intern on 4-H. Within EFNEP: 10 at 1/32 special food stamp pilot program; 1 at 1/5 college student intern with EFNEP.

County MA: part time summer programs/agent assistants

Comments or explanations:

County HA: Current budget situation has brought about holding a secretary position and the CEA 4-H position open until further notice. Both positions became vacant voluntarily. Both positions are "counted" above.

TABLE 17

Number of Extension Positions by Program Area Administered Through the County Extension Office

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 4-H & youth development | 9.5 | 8 | 17 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 78 | 4.5 | 8.35 |
| Home economics | 5.25 | 3 | 6.5 | 4.3 | 4 | 2 | 12.5 | 6.5 | 5.75 |
| EFNEP | 10 | 25.5 | 19 | 12 | 11 | 8 | 23.5 | 12 | 14 |
| Horticulture | 23 | 1.5 | 17 | 11 | 3.5 | | 6 | 3.75 | 4.25 |
| Other agriculture | | .5 | | | 5.5 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3.5 |
| Community development | 3 | | 2.5 | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Business | 2 | | 2.5 | | | | | | .4 |
| Other | 2.1* | 1* | | 3.5+ | 9++ | | 4* | 12 | |
| TOTAL | 54.85 | 48.75 | 64.5 | 34.8 | 39 | 14 | 124 | 31.35 | 40.25 |

*=administration ; **county nutrition education, public relations and media coordinator; + general office; ++=energy; Sea Grant +++.

^aBreakdown of "other area":

County MI: 1 agent FTE is Chair; 1/10 ad hoc and 1 secretary are assigned to the Chair; 3/4 agent FTE is Academic Staff, Home Economics

County HE: 1/4 ad hoc FTE is Public Relations and Media Coordinator; 9 FTE paraprofessionals work in County Nutrition Education (3/4 time)

County CU: 6 FTE paraprofessionals, 1 secretary and 2 Asst. Agents are Urban Gardening; 3.5 FTE secretaries are general office (including one CETA)

County FR: 1 FTE agent, 1 FTE ad hoc, and 1 FTE secretary are Administration; 2 FTE paraprofessionals, 3 FTE ad hoc, and 1 FTE secretary are Energy.

County KI: 1 FTE agent is Chairperson; 6 FTEs are in Support Services (see footnote B)

County ER: 1 FTE agent and 1/2 secretary are Regional Sea Grant

TABLE 18

Summary of Number of Agent Positions According to Program Area and

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <u>AGENTS:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | 13.75 | 8 | 14 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 16 | 14 | 11 |
| 4-H & Youth Dev. | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 2.6 |
| Home Economics | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4.5 | 3 | 2 |
| EFNEP | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 2 | .5 | 1 | 1 |
| Horticulture | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Other Agriculture | 0 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Community Dev. | 2 | | 2 | | | | | 1 | |
| Business | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | .4 |
| Other | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 |
| Administrator | .75 | | | | | | 1 | 1 | |

TABLE 19

Total Number of Positions Other than Agent
Administered Through County Extension Office

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Paraprofessionals | 20.25 | 24 | 38 | 17.3 | 16 | 5 | 41 | 10.75 | 19.25 |
| Ad hoc | 2.6 | 1 | 3 | | 10 | | 4 | 3 | |
| secretaries | 8 | 3.5 | 9.5 | 7.5 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 10 |
| other | 10 | 22.25 | | 3 | | | 53 | 2 | |
| Total | 54.85 | 58.75 | 64.5 | 34.8 | 39 | 14 | 124 | 31.35 | 40.25 |

*eight agents employed by county plus regional agents

^bBreakdown of "other position:

County MI: 10 FTEs in Young Adult Conservation Corps (Horticulture).

County HE: Within 4-H & Youth: 1/4 Urban Corps; three at 3/4 Summer Art in Park assistants (3 months); five at 1/4 4-H Club organizers; two at 1/5 CETA trainees; one at 1/4 college student intern on 4-H. Within EFNEP: ten at 1/32 special food stamp pilot program; one at 1/5 college student intern with EFNEP.

County MA: part time summer programs/agent assistants

Comments or explanations:

County HA: Current budget situation has brought about holding a secretary position and the CEA 4-H position open until further notice. Both positions became vacant voluntarily. Both positions are "counted" above.

TABLE 20

Tenure of Current Agents in Positions in the Respective Counties

Number of years agent has held position

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Agriculture/Horticulture: | 6 | 2.75 | 14 | 7 | 1 | 10 | 19 | 15 | 3 |
| | 4 | 4.5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | | 10 | 4 | 4 |
| | | | | .75 | | | 1 | 7 | |
| | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| Community Development: | 5 | | 2 | | | | 10 | .5 | |
| | 3 | | 5 | | | | | | |
| 4-H & Youth Development: | 21 | 10.5 | 7 | 30 | 10 | Vac. | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| | 4 | 1.75 | 8 | 2.5 | | | 7 | 1.5 | 11 |
| | 9 | 4 | 3 | 1 | | | 8 | | 25 |
| | 5 | | | | | | 6 | | |
| | | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | | | | 11 | | |
| Home Economics: | 21 | 10.5 | 5 | 20 | 4 | 7 | 13 | 5 | 19 |
| | 16 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 12 | .25 | 6.5 |
| | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1.5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 1mo. |
| | | | 1 | .75 | | | 1 | 8 | |
| Business | 9 | | 7 | | | | | | |
| | | | 6 | | | | | | |
| County Office Chair | 23 | | | 20d | 17 | | | 2 | |

 CLIENTELE

There were extensive differences among counties both in the characteristics of the clientele in the county and the extent to which agents were working with special clientele groups.

Within the same county there were differences among program areas and there were extensive ranges within the same program areas among the nine counties.

Ethnic Background of Clientele

Ranges and medians are given below:

| <u>Ethnic population 1975 census</u> | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|--|----------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| % blacks | 2.1% HE | 10.1% | 19.1% CU |
| % Spanish-speaking | 0.3% HE,HA | 0.5% MA | 1.3% MI |
| <u>Estimated Percentage of Extension Clientele Who Are:</u> (see Table 21) | | | |
| Blacks | | | |
| total clientele (6) | 12% FR | 18% HE-38% CU | 40% MI,ST |
| agriculture (8) | 3% ER | 8% HE-14% FR | 24% CU |
| home economics (8) | 10% FR | 22% FR-25% MI,ST | 61% ST |
| 4-H/youth development (8) | 2% FR | 14% ER-24% CU | 35% ST |
| community development (5) | 0.5% HE | 2.5% MI | 50% MA |
| Spanish speaking | | | |
| total clientele (6) | 2% HE,CU,FR,ER | 2% | 4% MI |
| agriculture (5) | 0.5% MI | 1% ST,ER | 2% CU,FR |
| home economics (6) | 1% HE,ST,CU,MA | 1% | 5% ER |
| 4-H/youth development (7) | 1% ST,FR,MA,ER | 1% | 3% MI |
| community development (5) | 0% ST | 1% MA | 2% FR |
| Other ethnic minorities* | | | |
| total clientele (6) | 0.5% CU | 2% MI,ST,ER | 10% HE |
| agriculture (5) | .5% CU | 1% ST,ER | 2% FR |
| home economics (5) | 0% CU | 1% MI,ST | 12% HE |
| 4-H/youth development (6) | 0% FR | 1% ST,HA,MA | 8% HE |
| community development (4) | 0% ST | .4% MI | 1% FR,MA |
| General public (not special ethnic) | | | |
| total clientele (7) | 54% MI | 70% HE | 85% FR |
| agriculture (9) | 73.5% CU | 92% HE | 95% HA,ER |
| home economics (9) | 38% CU | 72% MI,ER | 90% FR |
| 4-H/youth development (9) | 63% ST | 74% CU | 91% FR |
| community development (6) | 48% MA | 93% KI-97% MI | 99% HE |

TABLE 21

Ethnic Minorities

| <u>Percent of Population</u> <u>(1979 Census Data)</u> | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST1</u> | <u>ST2</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|---|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| % Black | 10.1 | 2.1 | 4.8 | 40.9 | 19.1 | 12.5 | 15.9 | 17.0 | 3.5 | 8.9 |
| % Spanish-language | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1 | 0.8 |

Total Programming Done
with Ethnic Minorities

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Blacks | 40% | 18% | 40% | 38% | 12% | | | | 13% |
| Spanish-speaking | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | | | | 2 |
| Other ethnic minorities | 2 | 10 | 2 | .5 | 1 | | | | 2 |
| General population | 54 | 70 | 55 | 59.5 | 85 | | | 84 | 83 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Agriculture/Horticulture:

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|----|------|
| Blacks | 6 | 8 | 20 | 24 | 14 | 5 | 20 | | 3 |
| Spanish-speaking | .5 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | | | | 1 |
| Other ethnic minorities | .5 | | 1 | .5 | 2 | | | | 1 |
| General population | 93 | 92 | 78 | 73.5 | 82 | 95 | 80 | 94 | 95 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | | 100% |

Home Economics:

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Blacks | 25 | 22 | 25 | 61 | 10 | 20 | 50 | | 20 |
| Spanish-speaking | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | 5 |
| Other ethnic minorities | 1 | 12 | 1 | 0 | | | | | 3 |
| General population | 72 | 65 | 73 | 38 | 90 | 80 | 49 | 75 | 72 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

4-H & Youth Development:

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|----|------|
| Blacks | 14 | 10 | 35 | 24 | 2 | 28 | 30 | | 14 |
| Spanish-speaking | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| Other ethnic minorities | | 8 | 1 | | 0 | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| General population | 83 | 80 | 63 | 74 | 91 | 70 | 68 | 68 | 83 |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 99% | 100% | | 100% |

Community Development:

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|--|------|----|------|
| Blacks | 2.5 | .5 | 2 | | 13 | | 50 | | |
| Spanish-speaking | .1 | .5 | 0 | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| Other ethnic minorities | .4 | | 0 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| General population | 97 | 99 | 98 | | 84 | | 48 | 93 | |
| | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | | 100% | | 100% |

Range and median related to working with low income clientele is given below.

Low Income Clientele

| | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|--|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| 1969 census % of families below poverty level | 3.6% ST | 6.8% MA | 8.3% HA |

| <u>Estimated percentage of low income clientele</u> (see Table 22) | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|--|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Agriculture/horticulture (9) | 1% HE | 17% ER | 50% CU |
| Home economics (9) | 20% ST | 45% KI | 75% CU |
| 4-H/youth development (9) | 5% HE | 25% FR | 50% MI |
| Community development (5) | 0% HE,ST | 6% KI | 50% MA |

The range and median related to amount of work in various areas of the county were as follows:

| <u>Amount of Work in Selected Areas of the County</u> (see Table 23) | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|--|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| Depressed area of largest city | | | |
| combined county program (5) | 0% FR | 30% ST | 50% HE |
| agriculture (9) | 2% HE | 5% FR,HA,KI,ER | 35% MI |
| home economics (9) | 10% FR | 35% MI | 75% CU |
| youth development (9) | 10% FR | 30% MA | 75% CU |
| community development (5) | 0% HE | 25% ST | 50% MA |
| Other areas of largest city | | | |
| combined county program (5) | 10% MI | 20% HE,ST | 27% FR |
| agriculture (9) | 2% ER | 10% HA | 60% MA |
| home economics (9) | 5% HE | 25% CU | 55% FR |
| youth development (9) | 5% ER | 10% ST,CU,HA,KI | 70% MA |
| community development (5) | 0% HE | 25% ST | 50% MA |
| Immediate suburbs | | | |
| combined county program (5) | 13% HE | 17% ER | 40% MI |
| agriculture (8) | 0% MA | 20% ST,CU | 50% HA |
| home economics (9) | 0% MA | 15% CU,FR | 35% ER |
| youth development (9) | 0% MA | 20% FR,ER | 50% HA |
| community development (5) | 0% MA | 23% ST | 50% HE |
| Villages and cities not contiguous | | | |
| combined county program (5) | 13% HE | 17% ER | 21% FR,ER |
| agriculture (8) | 0% MA | 15% ST | 35% FR |
| home economics (9) | 0% MA | 10% FR | 30% MI,KI |
| youth development (9) | 0% MA | 10% HA,KI | 35% ER |
| community development (5) | 0% MA | 20% FR | 50% HE |
| Open country residents (non-farm) | | | |
| combined county program (5) | 0% MI | 8% ER | 11% FR |
| agriculture (8) | 0% MI,CU,MA | 7% KI | 10% HA,ST |
| home economics (9) | 0% MI,MA,KI | 5% HE,ST,FR,ER | 15% HA |
| youth development (9) | 0% MI,CU,MA | 5% ST,HA | 15% KI,ER |
| community development (5) | 0% MI,HE,MA | 0% | 15% FR |
| Farm | | | |
| combined county program (5) | 0% MI | 5% ST | 30% ER |
| agriculture (9) | 0% MI | 10% MA,ST | 75% ER |
| home economics (8) | 0% MI,CU,MA,KI | 5% | 5% HE,ST,FR,ER |
| youth development (9) | 0% MI,CU,MA | 5% HE,ST,HA,KI | 10% FR,ER |
| community development (5) | 0% MI,HE,ST,MA | 0% | 10% FR |

TABLE 22

Low-Income Clientele

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU1</u> | <u>CU2</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <u>Low-Income Population</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| Families with money income, 1969 | | | | | | | | | | |
| % below poverty level | 6.4 | 4.7 | 3.6 | 14.4 | 7.4 | 7.6 | 8.3 | 6.8 | 5.0 | 7.0 |
| % \$15,000 and over | 24.0 | 30.3 | 33.2 | 12.9 | 28.1 | 23.7 | 24.1 | 25.0 | 31.4 | 21.6 |

| <u>% of Extension Programming Done w/Low-Income Clientele</u> | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Agriculture/Horticulture | 35% | 1% | 25% | 50% | 10% | 10% | 25% | 5% | 17% |
| Home Economics | 50 | 60 | 20 | 75 | 25 | 35 | 50 | 45 | 25 |
| 4-H & Youth Development | 50 | 5 | 25 | 75 | 10 | 15 | 30 | 34 | 9 |
| Community Development | 35 | 0 | 0 | | | | 50 | 6 | |

Location of the Extension Office

Five of the nine counties indicated that Extension agents were housed in more than one location within the county. The range was from 1, CU, FR, HA, KI, ER, to 5, MI.

The location of the main Extension office showed considerable variation. In four counties, ST, CU, KI, and ER, the office was in the heart of the largest city. In two it was toward the outskirts of the largest city, FR, MA. In three it was in an adjacent city, MI, HE, and HA.

Most counties did not try to estimate the number of different locations where meetings were usually held and simply said many. Among the three which did give estimates, County KI said 10-20, MI said 25 plus, and County HE said from 100 to 200.

TABLE 23

Percent of Programming Done with
Clientele from Various Areas of the County

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <u>Total program</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| depressed areas of largest city | 40 | 50 | 30 | | 8 | | | | 13 |
| other areas of largest city | 10 | 20 | 20 | | 27 | | | | 11 |
| immediate suburbs | 40 | 13 | 15 | | 23 | | | | 17 |
| villages and cities not contiguous | 10 | 13 | 20 | | 21 | | | | 21 |
| open country residents (non-farm) | 0 | 2 | 10 | | 11 | | | | 8 |
| farm | 0 | 2 | 5 | | 10 | | | | 30 |

Percent by Program Area of Programming Done With Various Areas of the County

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI*</u> | <u>KI**</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|-----------|
| <u>Agriculture/Horticulture:</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| depressed areas of largest city | 35 | 2 | 25 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| other areas of largest city | 5 | 8 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 10 | 60 | 3 | 45 | 2 |
| immediate suburbs | 40 | 30 | 20 | 20 | 35 | 50 | | 7 | 30 | 5 |
| villages and cities not contiguous | 20 | 30 | 15 | 20 | 35 | 20 | | 5 | 10 | 10 |
| open country residents (non-farm) | 0 | 5 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 10 | | 5 | 10 | 3 |
| farm | 0 | 25 | 10 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 75 | 0 | 75 |
| <u>Community Development:</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| depressed areas of largest city | 35 | | 25 | | 10 | | 50 | | | |
| other areas of largest city | 30 | | 25 | | 20 | | 50 | | | |
| immediate suburbs | 30 | 50 | 23 | | 20 | | | | | |
| villages and cities not contiguous | 5 | 50 | 25 | | 20 | | | | | |
| open country residents (non-farm) | 0 | | 2 | | 15 | | | | | |
| farm | 0 | | | | 15 | | | | | |
| <u>4-H & Youth Development:</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| depressed areas of largest city | 35 | 35 | 20 | 75 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 50 | | 15 |
| other areas of largest city | 25 | 35 | 10 | 10 | 30 | 10 | 70 | 10 | | 5 |
| immediate suburbs | 25 | 9 | 40 | 10 | 20 | 50 | | 10 | | 20 |
| villages and cities not contiguous | 15 | 9 | 20 | 5 | 20 | 10 | | 10 | | 35 |
| open country residents (non-farm) | 0 | 7 | 5 | | 10 | 5 | | 15 | | 15 |
| farm | 0 | 5 | 5 | | 10 | 5 | | 5 | | 10 |
| <u>Home Economics:</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| depressed areas of largest city | 35 | 75 | 30 | 50 | 10 | 50 | 50 | 10 | | 20 |
| other areas of largest city | 10 | 5 | 20 | 25 | 55 | 25 | 50 | 20 | | 35 |
| immediate suburbs | 25 | 5 | 20 | 15 | 15 | 5 | | 30 | | 35 |
| villages and cities not contiguous | 30 | 5 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 2 | | 30 | | 20 |
| open country residents (non-farm) | 0 | 5 | 5 | | 5 | 15 | | 10 | | 5 |
| farm | 0 | 5 | 5 | | 5 | 3 | | | | 5 |

 PROGRAM EMPHASES

There was considerable variation in the extent to which each of the program areas was emphasized and in emphases within program areas.

Most counties indicated several program changes in the past five years and expected to make changes in the next two years.

There were differences in the number of people reached through selected programs and selected program methods.

Program emphases and changes

There were some similarities and several differences among the program content priorities indicated. (See Table 23)

A variety of changes were reported over the last five years with considerable emphasis on new audiences and increased use of technology. (See Table 24)

TABLE 24

Main Areas of Emphasis This Year (1980-1981)

Agriculture/Horticulture

| <u>County</u> | <u>Priority 1</u> | <u>Priority 2</u> | <u>Priority 3</u> |
|---------------|---|---|----------------------|
| MI | Home hort. 66% | Commercial hort. 34% | |
| HE | Home garden 65% | commercial garden 10% | livestck, dairy 8% |
| ST | Ms. garden cert 30% | program maintenance 40% | urban grdn, ntrn 30% |
| CU | Home veg. prodctn 33% | MA.owner hort. 33% | Hort. industry 33% |
| FR | Crop prodctn 40% | Hous./home environ 40% | Energy conserv. 15% |
| HA | Home hort. 50% | Nursery landscape, grounds maintenance 25% | Flower growers 25% |
| MA | urban gardening 30% | plant pest control 30% | |
| KI | Ag.Marketing 25% | Ag. production 50% | Farm management 25% |
| ER | Market management/ merchandising 10% | Energy 10% | Pest control 20% |

Community Development

| | <u>Priority 1</u> | <u>Priority 2</u> | <u>Priority 3</u> |
|----|-------------------------|---|------------------------|
| MI | Small business 50% | Govmnt & Comm. Dev. 32% | Nat./env. res. 17 |
| HE | School cooperation 60% | estate planning 30% | |
| ST | energy, mass transt 35% | industrial dev 25% | reassessment, 25% |
| | | | housing 15% |
| CU | Energy ed. (small %) | centr.leaf compost proj. | |
| FR | Thermography/energy 80% | | |
| MA | career developemnt 10% | | |
| KI | Ag. cit. task force 80% | Coop. small ag. prdcers 20% | |
| ER | Leg. internship 25% | Ag. districting, equalztn assessment 15% | Farm bus.-taxation 15% |

TABLE 24 (continued)

4-H & Youth Development

| <u>County</u> | <u>Priority 1</u> | <u>Priority 2</u> | <u>Priority 3</u> |
|---------------|---|---|----------------------------------|
| MI | Trad. clubs 30% | Spec. int. groups 70% | |
| HE | 4-H expansion 20% | Urban 4-H 20% | life skills 10% |
| ST | career dev 25% | leader dev trng 50% | prog. maintenance 25% |
| CU | New club org. 25% | Project instr. 48% | Leader devel. 27% |
| FR | New advisor training 25% | Leadership devel. of older youth 25% | |
| HA | Life skills, nutrition, other subject matter 50% | Leader. skills 30% | 4-H compttn. 20% |
| MA | leader development 20% | organization dev. 30% | special audiences 20% |
| KI | Leadership devel. 35% | Org. devel 35% | Subjct coord. 30% |
| ER | Junior & adult leader training 25% | Mid. managent 20% | 4-H for urban programming 25% |

Home Economics

| <u>County</u> | <u>Priority 1</u> | <u>Priority 2</u> | <u>Priority 3</u> |
|---------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| MI | EFNEP 40% | Homemakers 40% | Money man. 20% |
| HE | Nutrition, foods, food preparation 50% | Housing & energy conservation 20% | Strengthn families 10% |
| ST | Housing 20% | inflation 20% | energy 25% |
| CU | Parent education 35% | Family economics & consumer education 15% | nutrition 35% |
| FR | Parent ed./child safety/ sexual abuse 15% | Food and nutrition/food preservation 35% | Foods/nutrition 50% |
| HA | Clothing 35% | Financial management, budgeting 35% | Res. man./budgtng/ credit 15% |
| MA | energy 10% | food/nutrition 35% | Foods 30% |
| KI | Leader devel. 50% | Inflatn, cons issues 30% | family ed 35% |
| ER | Consumer education 35% | Nutrition & foods 35% | Bsc liv skills, nutr. 20% |
| | | | Energy 10% |

Other

| <u>County</u> | <u>Priority 1</u> | <u>Priority 2</u> | <u>Priority 3</u> |
|---------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| MI | Traveling teachers 100% | | |
| HE | Energy conservation 5% | | |
| ST | computers 25% | basic supervision 35% | start own business 40% |
| KI | Suburban/urban home hort. 60% | Nursery/trade groups 10% | Pest. ed./ pest man. 30% |

TABLE 25

Program ChangesOccurring during past 5 years

- County MI Development special interest 4-H clubs; energy education; urban gardening program; "4-H Goes to School"; youth education Milwaukee County Zoo.
- County HE Expansion of urban 4-H; major series on housing topics; food issues; added a horticulturist to staff; broadened interest in horticulture; more 4-H leaders and participants are employed.
- County ST Tremendous move to more general audiences instead of standard Extension groups, e.g. Homemaker Clubs, etc. Greater emphasis on mass media: computers, TV, radio and conveners. Program shifts to energy, housing, family related areas.
- County CU Greater recruitment & training of leaders in all programs; more participation by older people, minorities and lower income; more emphasis on economics and social concepts and less on skills teaching; more training of professionals, etc., in other organizations.
- County FR Increased media usage, leadership development program for volunteers, cooperative agency programs, utilization of more (soft) money, CETA programs, etc. to reach more people (especially minorities).
- County HA Established new EFNEP target areas. Decrease in number of nutrition aides. Shift in 4-H membership from farm areas to suburbs. More emphasis on small animal projects and other projects that can be done in limited space. Less emphasis on commercial farm producers since that segment of population is decreasing.
- County MA Energy conservation, urban gardening, disadvantaged youth, Spanish speaking, unemployed.
- County KI Increased involvement with volunteers (leadership development); Home Economics programs issue-based; increased emphasis on limited-resource farming; increased use of mass media.
- County ER Have reached a higher percentage of urban population (opened urban satellite office); middle management--greater use of program assistants and key volunteers.

TABLE 25 (continued)

Program Changes Anticipated in next 2-3 years

- County MI Continued interest in energy; education (nutrition, consumer issues) for handicapped; coping with inflation/recession.
- County HE Searching for energy efficient means to present programs; money management; use computers for educational programming; seek programs to reach more youth; staff is aware of trend that more people are wanting to do things themselves--gardening, remodeling, etc.
- County ST Continue above emphasis with greater use of media tools to teach and reach larger audiences.
- County CU More media work; fewer people attending programs; utilization of such devices as VTR; telephone pre-recorded messages; home study courses; telephone and office consultations; fewer group meetings and workshops; high cost of travel and large percentage of working women are affecting meeting turnouts everywhere; more reliance on trained volunteers for outreach into local communities.
- County FR More emphasis on growing own food and preservation. More cooperative programs with other agencies. Doing a better job with fewer resources.
- County HA Emphasis on conserving all resources. Continued decline in large animal projects. Increased cooperation with other community units such as Boys Clubs, YMCA. Increased recruitment of 4-H alumni as 4-H advisors to groups inside city limits. More use of media and less individual visits. More use of telephone.
- County MA More audiences through mass media, computer programs, inflation, coping with unemployment, changes in our delivery system--correspondence courses and newsletters, population shifts, transportation, energy.
- County KI Continued development of mass media as a method; programming in agricultural development; programming for low-income clientele; work with volunteers--new opportunities for growth and development.
- County ER Conduct programs emphasizing ways to live with the increased cost of living (energy conservation, simple home repairs, clothing construction, etc.); increased use of "key" volunteers.

There was considerable range in the number of participants in programs which require some degree of sustained participation. The ranges and median are given below.

Range in number of program participants (See Table 26)

| | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|
| EFNEP (8) | 225 ER | 485 KI-500 HE | 5,479 CU |
| Urban gardening (6) | 35 HE | 2,000 ST-2,500 MI | 23,000 CU |
| Extension Homemaker Clubs (7) | | | |
| number of clubs | 15 HA | 24 ST | 140 HE |
| number of members | 242 HA | 482 MI | 1,950 HE |
| number of leaders (6) | 35 HA | 82 FR-396 MI | 1,710 HE |
| Community 4-H Clubs | | | |
| number of clubs (8) | 5 KI | 99 ST-113 HA | 509 CU |
| number of members (8) | 95 KI | 2,802 HA-3,302 ER | 9,974 CU |
| number of leaders (7) | 18 KI | 380 HE | 1016 ER |
| Special interest groups | | | |
| number of groups (5) | 79 MA | 150 KI | 649 MI |
| number of participants (7) | 2,476 KI | 11,053 CU | 31,651 MI |
| number of leaders (3) | 182 MA | 206 MI | 583 KI |

There was considerable variation in terms of how counties recorded number of people reached through various methods as well as the number of people reached by particular method.

Number of people reached through selected methods in fiscal year 1980

Counties were most apt to be able to respond to the number of people reached through meetings. However, responses to large events such as presentations at large community affairs, demonstrations at shopping malls, programs at fairs and similar activities are apt to be estimated.

The ranges and medians are given below. (For information by program areas see Appendix Tables 4, 7, 10, and 13.)

Total reached through group sessions. (Table 27)

| | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| meetings (all types) (7) | 12,159 FR | 32,322 HE | 298,464 MI |
| large events (6) | 2,300 ST | 72,608 CU-117,750 ER | 1,030,000 MI |
| Total (8) | 13,426 HA | 37,255 FR-122,367 CU | 1,328,493 MI |

TABLE 26

Number of People Reached Through Special Programs

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| EFNEP | | | | | | | | |
| # of enrollees | 377 | 510 | 500 | 5,479 | 483 | 1,151 | 485 | 225 |
| Urban gardening: | | | | | | | | |
| # of enrollees | 2,500 | 35 | 2,000 | 23,000 | | 10,000 | | 150 |
| Extension Homemaker Clubs | | | | | | | | |
| # of clubs | 43 | 140 | 24 | 21 | 15 | 96 | 19 | |
| # of members | 482 | 1,950 | 355 | 900 | 242 | 1,334 | 280 | |
| # of leaders | 396 | 1,710 | 48 | 82 | 35 | 192 | | |
| Community 4-H Clubs | | | | | | | | |
| # of clubs | 49 | 85 | 99 | 509 | 113 | 240 | 5 | 165 |
| # of members | 3,310 | 1,226 | 1,341 | 9,974 | 2,802 | 7,716 | 95 | 3,302 |
| # of leaders | 403 | 380 | 200 | * | 211 | 511 | 18 | 1,016 |
| 4-H Special interest groups | | | | | | | | |
| # of groups | 649 | | 200 | 140 | | 79 | 150 | |
| # of participants | 31,651 | 4,945 | 15,545 | 11,053 | | 13,100 | 2,476 | 11,562 |
| # of leaders | 206 | | | * | | 182 | 583 | |

*County ST: 911 4-H advisors not divided between community club and special interest.
County FR did not give information for this table.

TABLE 27

Number of People Reached Through Meetings and Large Events

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| meetings | 298,463 | 32,322 | 19,100 | 49,759 | 12,159 |
| large events | 1,030,000 | 4,396 | 2,300 | 72,608 | 164,003 |
| Total | 1,328,493 | 36,718 | 21,400 | 122,367 | 37,255 |
| | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> | |
| meetings | 13,462 | | | 35,392 | |
| large events | | | | 117,750 | |
| Total | 13,462 | | 131,667 | 130,481 | |

Total Reached Through Specific Methods (Table 28)

There was also considerable variation in the number of counties able to report number of people reached through other selected means. Because a county did not provide information does not necessarily mean that none of the agents were using that particular method. It means that there was not a recorded number easily available at the time the questionnaire was received.

See the next section for the number of times these methods were used during the 1980-1981 fiscal year. The ranges and numbers of counties providing information are given below.

| | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Types of meetings</u> | | | |
| leader training (7) | 652 FR | 1,679 ER | 5,012 CU |
| other Extension initiated (6) | 6,495 HA | 7,911 ER-15,410 HE | 44,747 CU |
| sessions initiated by other groups (4) | 4,222 HA | 4,463 FR-13,805 HE | 25,802 ER |
| <u>Special media</u> | | | |
| newsletters (6) | 5,000 ST | 5,754 HA-7,400 ER | 13,694 CU |
| taped messages (3) | 20,000 ER | 32,016 MI | 54,725 CU |
| computer analyses (5) | 158 CU | 3,100 MI | 4,678 FR |
| <u>Counseling assistance</u> | | | |
| to individuals (5) | 21,064 HE | 44,222 FR | 113,020 CU |
| to groups/organizations (5) | 36 FR | 231 MI | 350 KI |

TABLE 28

Number of People Reached Through Various Methods in Fiscal Year 1980:
County Totals

Group instruction:

| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| leader training | 1,447 | 3,107 | 1,100 | 5,012 | 652 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | | 15,410 | 18,000 | 44,747 | 7,044 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | 297,016 * | 13,805 | | | 4,463 |

*includes both other Extension initiated meetings and sessions initiated by other groups. County MI was not included when range and medians were calculated for these two items.

| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> |
|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| leader training | 2,720 | | | 1,679 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 6,494 | | | 7,911 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | 4,222 | | | 25,802 |

Media:

| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| receiving newsletters | | 10,795 | 5,000 | 13,946 | 5,300 |
| dialing a taped message | 32,016 | | | 54,725 | |
| receiving a computer analysis | 3,100 | 350 | | 158 | 4,678 |

| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| receiving newsletters | 5,754 | | | 7400 |
| dialing a taped message | | | | 20,004 |
| receiving a computer analysis | | | | 2000 |

Other

| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| One-to-one assistance: | | | | | |
| total number of people assisted | | 21,064 | | 113,020 | 44,222 |
| Number of small groups or organizations advised or assisted | 231 | 217 | | | 36 |

| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> |
|---|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| One-to-one assistance | | | | |
| total number of people assisted | | | 56,231 | 38,456 |
| Number of small groups or organizations advised or assisted | | | 350 | 329 |

 PROGRAM METHODS

There was also considerable variation in the number of times selected methods were used in the nine metropolitan counties. Again, not all counties were able to provide information on each method asked about.

The range and medians are given below. (See Table 29 for total county response and Appendix Tables 4-14 for response according to program areas.)

| | <u>Lowest County</u> | <u>Median</u> | <u>Highest County</u> |
|--|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <u>Meetings</u> | | | |
| leader training (6) | 10 ST | 62 MI, ER | 94 HE |
| other Extension initiated (5) | 40 FR | 316 HA | 1,101 HE |
| sessions initiated by other groups (4) | 87 ER | 91 FR-230 HA | 611 HE |
| large events (4) | 8 ST | 21 FR-27 HE | 42 ER |
| <u>Media</u> | | | |
| feature stories in newspapers (5) | 19 ST | 36 HE | 53 ER |
| news releases (7) | 66 ER | 165 ST | 260 KI |
| radio broadcasts (8) | 6 HA | 59 MI-77 FR | 683 ER |
| TV broadcasts (8) | 5 HA | 80 ST-82 ER | 164 CU |
| number of different newsletters (8) | 5 HE, CU | 12 FR, KI | 168 HA |
| bulletins/fact sheets (8) | 16,500 HE | 41,753 HA-59,268 MI | 158,447 ?? |
| computer analyses available (5) | 1 HE | 5 ER | 9 FR |
| <u>One-to-one assistance</u> | | | |
| telephone (4) | 9,790 HE | 17,073 FR-17,731 HA | 28,950 ER |
| office visits (3) | 356 HE | 917 FR | 6,000 ER |
| mail (3) | 4,929 HE | 7,400 FR | 19,150 ER |
| at client's home or business (3) | 380 FR | 4,056 ER | 4,704 HE |
| at exhibits or large events (5) | 1,285 HE | 18,470 FR | 50,000 MI |

TABLE 29

Number of Times Various Methods Were Used in Fiscal Year 1980: County Totals

| <u>Group instruction:</u> | | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
| leader training | 62 | 94 | 10 | | 34 |
| other EXT-initiated sessions | 11,610* | 1,101 | 750 | | 40 |
| initiated by other groups | | 611 | | | 91 |
| large events | | 27 | 8 | | 21 |
| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> | |
| leader training | 76 | | | 62 | |
| other EXT-initiated sessions | 316 | | | | |
| initiated by other groups | 230 | | | 87 | |
| large events | | | | 42 | |

*includes both other Extension initiated meetings and sessions initiated by other groups. County MI was not included when range and medians were calculated for these two items.

| <u>Media:</u> | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
| feature stories by newspapers | 20 | 36 | 19 | | 46 |
| news releases | 173 | 67 | 165 | 123 | 237 |
| radio broadcasts | 59 | 11 | 172 | 58 | 77 |
| TV broadcasts | 127 | 7 | 80 | 164 | 104 |
| newsletters: | | | | | |
| # of different ones | 60 | 5 | 86 | 5 | 12 |
| total # of issues | 16,823 | 36 | | 138 | 98 |
| bulletins/fact sheets | 59,268 | 16,550 | 25,000 | 158,447 | 38,000 |
| taped messages available | 816 | | | | 3 |
| computer-assisted programs | 2 | 1 | | | 9 |
| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> | |
| feature stories by newspapers | | | | 53 | |
| news releases | | | 260 | 66 | |
| radio broadcasts | 6 | | 92 | 683 | |
| TV broadcasts | 5 | | 12 | 82 | |
| newsletters: | | | | | |
| # of different ones | 168 | | 12 | 8 | |
| total # of issues | 41,753 | | 140 | 64 | |
| bulletins/fact sheets | 37,931 | | 200,000 | 60,000 | |
| taped messages available | | | 418 | | |
| computer-assisted programs | | | 6 | 5 | |

| <u>One-to-one assistance</u> | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
| by telephone | | 9,790 | | | 17,073 |
| by office visit | | 356 | | | 917 |
| by mail | | 4,929 | | | 7,400 |
| at client's home or business | | 4,704 | | | 380 |
| exhibit, etc. at a large event | 50,000 | 1,285 | | | 18,470 |
| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> | |
| by telephone | 17,731 | | | 28,950 | |
| by office visit | | | | 6,000 | |
| by mail | | | | 19,150 | |
| at client's home or business | | | | 4,056 | |
| exhibit, etc. at a large event | | | 43,618 | 10,300 | |

Frequency of Appearing on Media (Tables 30 & 31)

Only two counties, MA and KI, said that they were able to get material in major daily papers every two or three days. Two other counties, MI and FR, indicated weekly. The remainder said monthly.

Only three counties, MI, CU, and HA, indicated that they only got material into community papers monthly. Two, HE and FR, said bi-weekly; three said weekly, ST, FR, and MA. County KI indicated information in community papers every 2 or 3 days.

Two counties indicated that someone from their staff appeared on commercial television less frequently than once monthly, HE and HA. At the other extreme, two counties, ST and FR, indicated someone was on every 2 or 3 days. The other counties said weekly, MI, CU, MA, ER.

Relatively few of the counties were using cable television to any great extent. Five said seldom, MI, HE, HA, KI, ER. County ST said less than once a month. County FR, however, indicated that someone from their office was on weekly.

Public television appearances were somewhat more apt to be occurring than were cable appearances. However, the counties were less apt to be on public television than they were on commercial stations.

Four counties, HE, CU, HA, and ER, said they were seldom on public television. Three said they were on monthly, MI, FR, KI. County ST indicated less than monthly and county MA indicated bi-weekly.

There was considerable range in use of radio spots and features. Counties ST and ER indicated someone was on radio every 2 or 3 days. At the other extreme, county HE said monthly and county HA, less than once a month. The most prevalent response was weekly, CU, FR, MA, and KI.

The majority of respondents said that someone from their office was on a radio call in show monthly, MI, CU, MA, KI, or less than once a month, HE, HA, ER. County HA said seldom and county ST said every 2 or 3 days.

TABLE 30

Frequency of Appearing in Media

| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| major daily papers | weekly | less mo. | monthly | monthly | weekly |
| community papers | monthly | bi-weekly | weekly | monthly | weekly |
| television stations | weekly | less mo. | 2-3days | weekly | 2-3days |
| cable television | seldom | seldom | less mo. | | weekly |
| public television | less mo. | seldom | less mo. | seldom | monthly |
| radio spots/features | bi-weekly | monthly | 2-3days | weekly | weekly |
| radio call-in shows | monthly | less mo. | 2-3days | monthly | less mo. |
| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> | |
| major daily papers | monthly | 2-3 days | 2-3 days | less mo. | |
| community papers | monthly | weekly | 2-3 days | bi-weekly | |
| television stations | less mo. | weekly | monthly | weekly | |
| cable television | seldom | | seldom | seldom | |
| public television | seldom | bi-weekly | less mo. | seldom | |
| radio spots/features | less mo. | weekly | weekly | 2-3 days | |
| radio call-in shows | seldom | monthly | monthly | less mo. | |

TABLE 31

Use of Radio or TV by Program Area

Number of stations on which agents make regularly scheduled presentations

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|--------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <u>Radio:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture/Horticulture | 1 | | x | 1 | 11 | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Community Development | | | x | | 4 | | | | |
| 4-H & Youth Development | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Home Economics | | | x | 1 | 2 | | | 1 | 1 |
| <u>Television:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture/Horticulture | 1 | | x | 1 | 4 | | 1 | | |
| Community Development | 1 | | x | | 2 | | | | |
| 4-H & Youth Development | | | x | | | | | | 1 |
| Home Economics | 1 | | x | 1 | 1 | | | | 2 |

There was considerable variation from county to county in the extent to which individual program areas used radio. 4-H/Youth development and community development appeared not to be making much use of radio for regularly scheduled presentations. (See Table 31)

Agriculture/horticulture. Seven counties (all except HE and HA) indicated that ag/horticulture agents had regularly scheduled presentations on radio. Most indicated a regular schedule on only one radio station, but county FR indicated a regular schedule with 11 stations.

Community Development. Only counties ST and FR indicated regular radio presentations. County ST did not give the number of stations. County FR indicated four stations.

4-H/Youth Development. Only one county, ER, indicated a regularly scheduled radio broadcast.

Home Economics. Counties ST, CU, FR, KI, and ER indicated regularly scheduled broadcasts. All indicated only one station, except FR, which indicated two stations and ST, which did not give a number.

There also was variation in the use of TV for regularly scheduled presentations. Home Economists and Agriculture/horticulture appeared to be using TV most.

Agriculture/horticulture. Five counties, MI, ST, CU, FR, and MA indicated regularly scheduled TV presentations. Most counties indicated only one station; however, FR indicated four.

Community Development. Three counties indicated regular television appearances, MI, ST, and FR.

4-H/Youth Development. Two counties, ST and ER, indicated regularly scheduled television presentations.

Home Economics. Five counties, MI, ST, CU, FR, and ER, indicated regularly scheduled television presentations. County ER indicated two stations; MI, CU, and FR indicated one station.

Only three counties, ST, FR and ER, had special media assistance from a paraprofessional in initiating work with media in counties ST and FR, and in preparing news releases, visuals, and promotional material in all three counties. Several counties assigned such assistance high priority for future dollars. Counties ST and ER indicated they had an agent assigned to oversee contacts with county media.

Delivery Method With Greatest Amount of Educational Impact
According to Program Area (Table 32)

There was a tendency for 4-H Youth Development personnel to rank leader training first when asked to rank six methods in order of the amount of educational impact during the past year. Among other program areas, other group instruction was most often listed as the method believed to have had most educational impact.

The areas receiving a first place ranking were as follows:

Agriculture/horticulture: group instruction other than leader training, 5 counties; newspapers, CU and MA; leader training, I; TV, MI.

Community Development: group instruction other than leader training, 4 counties; large events, MI; TV, FR.

4-H Youth Development: leader training, 6 counties; large events, CU and FR.

Home Economics: group instruction other than leader training, 4 counties; leader training, CU and KI; newspapers, FR; TV, MI.

There was very little consistency in the methods which program areas in the counties which ranked all six indicated as having had the least educational impact. The range was as follows:

Agriculture/horticulture: TV, HA and KI; radio, ST and FR; leader training, MI and MA; newspaper, ER; large events, CU.

Community Development: TV, ST and ER; leader training, FR; other group instruction, MI.

4-H Youth Development: TV, HA, KI, ER; radio, ST and FR; newspapers, CU; large events, MI.

Home Economics: leader training, ST and ER; other group instruction, MI and FR; newspapers, CU; TV, HA and KI.

There was little consistency in the program area which showed the greatest number of people reached through selected means.

TABLE 32

Rank Ordering of Delivery Methods by Program Areas
According to Amount of Perceived Impact

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI*</u> | <u>KI**</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|-----------|
| <u>Agriculture/Horticulture:</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| leader training | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| other group instruction | 5 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| large events | 4 | | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| newspapers | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| radio | 2 | | 6 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| TV | 1 | | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4 |
| <u>Community Development:</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| leader training | 5 | | 4 | | 6 | | | | | 3 |
| other group instruction | 6 | 1 | 1 | | 4 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| large events | 1 | | 3 | | 2 | | | 2 | | 2 |
| newspapers | 3 | | 2 | | 3 | | | 3 | | 4 |
| radio | 4 | | 5 | | 5 | | | | | 5 |
| TV | 2 | | 6 | | 1 | | | 4 | | 6 |
| <u>4-H & Youth Development:</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| leader training | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| other group instruction | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | | 2 | | 3 |
| large events | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | 2 |
| newspapers | 3 | | 4 | 6 | 4 | 4 | | 4 | | 4 |
| radio | 4 | | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | | 5 | | 5 |
| TV | 5 | | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 6 | | 6 |
| <u>Home Economics:</u> | | | | | | | | | | |
| leader training | 5 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1 | | 6 |
| other group instruction | 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 1 | | 2 | | 1 |
| large events | 4 | | 5 | 3 | 5 | 2 | | 4 | | 2 |
| newspapers | 3 | | 3 | 6 | 1 | 4 | | 3 | | 4 |
| radio | 2 | | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | | 5 | | 5 |
| TV | 1 | | 2 | 5 | 2 | 6 | | 6 | | 3 |

*Horticulture agent **Other agricultural agent

TABLE 33

Program Area Showing Largest Number of People Reached Through Selected Means

| <u>Group instruction:</u> | | | | | |
|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
| leader training | 4-H 1040 | HEC 1535 | HEC 500 | | 4-H 400 |
| other Extension initiated sessions | CDv 229,290 | HEC 10,046 | A/Hort 300 | | AgH 4,100 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | | 4-H 11,655 | | | AgH 3,200 |
| large events | CDv 1,030,000 | HEC 1461 | 4-H 4 | | CDv 140,000 |
| total | | 4-H 18,790 | 4-H 8,000 | | 4-H 14,390 |
| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> | |
| leader training | AgH 1510 | | | 4-H 1170 | |
| other Extension- initiated sessions | 4-H 216 | | | 4-H 3957 | |
| sessions initiated by other groups | HEC 1949 | | | HEC 2538 | |
| large events | | | | 4-H 47,750 | |
| total | 4-H 4,746 | | AgH 94,117 | 4-H 52,895 | |
| <u>Media:</u> | | | | | |
| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
| receiving newsletters | 4-H 6550 | HEC 8950 | AgH/HEC 7,500 | 9,084 | AgH 3,000 |
| dialing a taped message | HEC 17,174 | | | AgH 48,000 | |
| receiving computer analysis | HEC 3100 | HEC 350 | | HEC 158 | CDv 4,623 |
| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> | |
| receiving newsletters | 4-H 3,025 | | AgH 1,776 | AgH 2,800 | |
| dialing a taped message | | | AgH 11,502 | | |
| receiving computer analysis | | | | AgH 2000 | |

TABLE 33 continued

Program Area Showing Largest Number of People Reached Through Selected Means

| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| One-to-one assistance | | | | | |
| total # of people assisted | CDv 25,000 | 4-H 8795 | | | CDv 21,455 |
| # of small groups/organizations | | | | | |
| advised or assisted | 4-H 111 | 4-H 98 | | | CDv 15 |

One-to-One Assistance

| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| One-to-one assistance | | | | |
| total # of people assisted | | | AgH AgH | HEc 24,900 |
| # of small groups/organizations | | | | |
| advised or assisted | | | AgH 200 | HEc 150 |

PERSONNEL POLICIES

Form of Job Security

All counties except MA indicated that agents had some form of job security. Counties MI, FR, HA, and KI indicated that agents held faculty rank and tenure with the Land Grant University. County HE said they held rank but not tenure. County CU indicated agents held rank and tenure but assistant agents did not.

Requirements For Employment (Table 34)

Only two of the counties, ST and KI, indicated that hiring requirements for urban counties differed from those for other counties in the state.

Very few of the qualifications asked about were required in any county. Most were preferred in many of the counties.

Two counties, MI and KI, said PhD degrees were preferred. Five, ST, CU, FR, HA, and KI, said that Masters degrees were required. MI, HE, and MA said they were preferred. ER did not indicate that advanced degrees were required or preferred.

County FR required previous Extension experience. All other counties indicated that such experience was preferred.

Eight of the nine counties preferred that candidates had prior urban extension experience and/or had previously lived or worked in a metropolitan area. (MA did not indicate that this was either required or preferred.)

Five counties, MI, HE, ST, CU, and KI indicated that prior work experience in an urban area was preferred.

Five counties, MI, ST, CU, HA, and MA indicated that coursework related to urban sociology or urban problems was preferred.

Evaluation of Agent Performance (Table 35)

The number of sources contributing to evaluation of agent performance varies greatly from county to county. County ER indicated that all five of the sources asked about were utilized. In County FR and County MA only one source was utilized (office chair and district supervisor respectively.) County ST only utilized state staff impressions--district supervisor and specialists--while counties CU and KI only used administrative input--district director and county office chairman.

In all counties except FR, the district director/supervisor contributed information when agent performance for annual salary adjustment is evaluated.

In HE, FR, MI, CU, KI and ER the office chairman also is involved.

Specialists were consulted in counties MI, ST, and ER.

Other agents and clientele had input in county ER.

Six counties, HE, ST, CU, FR, KI, and ER, indicated that they were using self appraisal procedures.

TABLE 34

Requirements for New Employees

| (R=required; P=preferred) | <u>A</u> | <u>B</u> | ST | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|--|----------|----------|----|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| PhD | P | | | | | | | P | |
| masters degree | P | P | R | R | R | R | P | R | |
| Extension experience | P | P | P | P | R | P | P | P | P |
| urban Extension experience | P | P | P | P | P | P | | P | P |
| having previously lived or worked in a metropolitan area | P | P | P | P | P | P | | P | P |
| other prior urban work experience | P | P | P | P | | | | P | |
| coursework related to urban sociology or urban problems | P | | P | P | | P | | P | |

TABLE 35

Evaluation of Agent Performance

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Contributing to evaluation of agent performance: | | | | | | | | | |
| district director/supervisor | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X | X |
| office chairman/director | X | X | | X | X | | | X | X |
| specialist | X | | X | | | | | | X |
| other agents | | | | | | | | | X |
| clientele | | | | | | | | | X |
| county committee | | X | | | | | | | |
| Self-appraisal system used | | X | X | X | X | | | X | X |

Administration (Table 36)

There was considerable variation in the amount of time the office chair spent on administration. However, there was a movement toward full time office chairmanships with little or no expectation that the chair carry on programs.

Two counties, FR and KI, had a full time agent administrator and a third county, MI, indicated that the office chair spent 98% of her time on administration. At the other extreme only 40% of an agent's time was devoted to administration in County ER and 50% in County HA.

In all counties, the program chair was responsible for preparing budget, monitoring expenditure and liaison with CES administration. In eight of the nine, the chair was responsible for liaison with county supervisors. In seven of the nine, the chair was also responsible for counseling Extension Agents and observing/evaluating performance. Other responsibilities were grantmanship, developing funding sources, hiring and supervising secretaries.

In all counties the agent chair was assisted by a secretarial office manager. In three counties, CU, MA, and KI, there was additional assistance.

TABLE 36

| | <u>Office Administration</u> | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|
| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> | |
| Time distribution | | | | | | | | | | |
| % administration | 98 | 60 | * | 60 | 100 | 50 | 70 | 100 | 40 | |
| % program | 2 | 30 | | 40 | | 50 | 20 | | 60 | |
| % other responsibilities | | 10 | | | | | 10 | | | |
| Nature of responsibility | | | | | | | | | | |
| preparing budget | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| monitoring expenditure | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| liaison with county government | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| liaison with CES administration | X | some | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| counseling Extension agents | X | X | | X&N | X | | X | X | X | |
| observing/evaluating performance | X | X | | X | X | | X | X | X | |
| other: | | | | | | | | | | |
| developing funding sources | | | | X | | | | | | |
| hiring, supervising secretaries | | | X | X | | | | | | |
| all admin. support functions | | | X | X | | | | X | | |
| program leadership | | | | X | | | | | | |
| total supervision | | | | X | X | | | | | |
| proposal writing | | | | X | | X | | | | |
| administering contracts | | | | X | | X | X | | | |
| | | X | | X | | | | X | X | |
| Assistance available from: | | | | | | | | | | |
| office manager (secretarial) | X | X | | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| office manager (other) | | | X | | | | | | | |
| assistant administrator | | | | | | | | | | |
| agent | | | | | | | | | | |
| other | | | | | X | | X | X | | |

*Do not have office chairmen positions as such in county offices filled by professional staff. Office managers are hired from local funds who coordinate administrative support functions of each office.

In-service Training (Table 37)

Only two counties, FR and ER, felt that there was quite a bit of in-service preparation for metropolitan work. Counties HE and KI said there was very little available. The other countries all indicated some in-service assistance.

TABLE 37

Most Helpful of In-Service Training For Metropolitan Work

- County MI Most valuable professional development experiences:
Professional association meetings; Regional/urban conferences; SEA conferences (urban gardening); Professional development provided by our Extension Service
- County HE Most valuable professional development experiences:
1.National Urban Horticulture Conference, Washington, D.C.; 2.National Urban Home Economics Conference, St. Louis. 3.Scott's Horticulture Workshop, Ohio. 4.National Urban 4-H Conference, Mich. 5.ON THE JOB!
- County ST by visiting other urban centers and observing operations

TABLE 37 continued

- County FR Most valuable professional development experiences:
meetings and visits with other urban agents.
- County HA Most valuable professional development experiences:
previous work in an urban county; informal discussions with other agents
working in urban counties.
- County MA Most valuable professional development experiences:
Urban workshop Chicago; proposal workshop Chicago; Natl. Gardens Mtg.,
Washington D.C.; Food and Nutrition workshops; national association
seminars; Community Education workshops Flint, San Diego, St. Louis,
New Orleans, Milwaukee, Cleveland, Indianapolis, Louisville
- County KI Most valuable professional development experiences:
professional associations; association with other urban Extension
people; on-the-job work experience; travel and reading.
- County ER Most valuable professional development experiences:
exposure to successful urban programs in other urban areas; serving on
committees which relate to urban Extension work

Adequacy of Help from State Staff in Relation to Urban Programming (Table 38)

Respondents were most apt to feel that help from state Home Economics staff related to urban programming was adequate. County MI indicated that such help was very adequate. Counties HE, ST, FR, MA, and ER indicated it was adequate. Counties CU and KI felt it inadequate and HA did not respond.

Counties MI, MA, KI, and ER felt that Community development help related to urban programming was adequate. Counties HE, ST, CU, and FR rated it as not adequate.

Counties MI, MA and ER felt that state staff 4-H help related to urban programming was adequate. Counties HE, ST, CU, FR, and HA rated it as not adequate.

Counties were least apt to feel that agricultural state staff help related to urban programming was adequate. Only three counties, FR, HA, and MA rated it as adequate.

Although county staff felt that state staff help was adequate in several program areas, in only one instance was it rated as very adequate.

None of the counties felt that state staff was giving them adequate help related to program organization and expansion in urban areas.

Only one of the counties felt that their state staff was giving them sufficient help related to media.

However, five counties, MI, ST, FR, HA, MA, indicated that bulletins/fact sheets for urban areas were adequate; County ER rated them as very adequate.

Two counties, MI and HA, felt that state staff help with instructional materials was adequate and one, ER, felt it was very adequate.

Counties MI and HE felt they were getting adequate help from state staff on evaluating urban programs.

Six counties, MI, HE, FR, MA, KI, ER, felt that state staff was giving them adequate help on program policy and direction.

County CU was the least satisfied with the quality of help state staff personnel was giving to programming in their metropolitan situation. None of the program areas or other types of help were rated as adequate.

County ER was most satisfied with state staff members' ability to help in metropolitan programming situation. Three areas were rated as very adequate and four as adequate. However, the staff felt that help was not currently adequate in terms of program evaluation and program organization and expansion. Counties MI and MA were the next most apt to be satisfied.

Understanding of State Staff in Relation to Urban Programming (Table 38)

Metropolitan CES staffs were more apt to feel that District Supervisors understood urban work than they were to feel that specialists and administrators did.

Two counties, MI and ST, rated the understanding of their district supervisor as very well. Three others, HE, CU, and KI, rated fairly well. Counties FR, HA, and ER felt that their district supervisors only partially understood urban work.

Two counties, MI and HE, felt that state administrators understood urban programming fairly well. The others all indicated partially.

Only one county, ER, indicated that state specialists understood urban programming fairly well.

Counties FR, HA, and MA gave low ratings to all three kinds of state staff personnel in regard to their understanding of urban Extension work.

TABLE 38

Understanding and Adequacy of Help from State Staff
in Relation to Urban Programming

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <u>Adequacy of help:</u> (N=not adequate; A=adequate; V=very adequate) | | | | | | | | | |
| a. subject matter content in: | | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture/horticulture | N | N | N | N | A | A | A | N | A |
| Community Development | A | N | N | N | N | | A | A | A |
| 4-H/Youth Development | A | N | N | N | N | N | A | | A |
| Home economics | V | A | A | N | A | | A | N | A |
| b. program, policy & direction | A | A | N | N | A | | A | A | A |
| c. program organization and expansion | N | N | N | N | N | | N | N | N |
| d. Program evaluation | A | A | N | N | N | | N | N | N |
| e. media assistance | N | N | N | N | N | | N | N | V |
| f. instructional materials | A | N | N | N | N | A | N | N | V |
| g. bulletins/fact sheets | A | N | A | N | A | A | A | N | V |
| <u>Understanding of urban work by:</u> (P=partially; F=fairly well; V=very well) | | | | | | | | | |
| district supervisors | V | F | V | F | P | P | P | F | P |
| state specialists | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | P | F |
| state administrators | F | F | P | P | P | P | P | P | P |

Comments (Table 37):

County HE Two weeks ago we offered two "Kitchen Remodeling" two-part series. One could handle 50; the other 60. The news release just hit the daily paper. Both have been filled for several days. We have over 100 on a waiting list. The phones ring constantly about the course. This is part of our dilemma--we can't get additional specialist time, we can't get enough bulletins; so our choice next time will be to not promote such an event or some other undesirable alternative

County ST Extension in urban areas is fairly new. We have an image problem. Also there is a need to design programs, materials and methods which identify with large masses of urban people. It is a different ball game.

County CU It is a sad commentary that few in administration in this Extension had meaningful urban county experience. State resources are balanced overwhelmingly in favor of production ag, specifically corn and soybeans. The home economics people try; the others don't try with a few exceptions. Many administrators have had little or no county experience and that which they have had was in the far distant past. The views of county personnel are seldom considered in policy making.

County FR Our area and state administration are all trained under the rural concept. Most of our urban programs have been developed by using special funds instead of hard monies from regular sources. We do not have the back up and support from the state and federal levels needed to do the appropriate job.

County KI Extension administration in our state recognizes the need for urban agents to have access to specialized development opportunities--to this end we are sending 16 field faculty to participate in Urban Conference in San Diego.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Most counties were using planning or advisory groups and finding them helpful. Most were using a range of evaluative activities.

Locally Mandated Programs

Five counties, MI, HE, CU, FR, and KI, indicated they were working with programs specifically requested by the county governing agency. Only nutrition education showed any similarity among counties.

TABLE 39

Programs Specifically Requested by County Governing Agency

| | |
|-----------|---|
| County MI | County rental garden program. |
| County HE | Nutrition Education expansion program (2 grants) |
| County CU | CETA worksite, food service training for Title VII nutrition sites, cooperation with Youth Services Coordinating Co. |
| County FR | Thermography--Energy Education outreach |
| County KI | 1.Agricultural development as support to Ag Lands Preservation program (purchase of development rights). 2.Programming for senior citizens. |

Program Planning Procedures (Table 40)

All counties except HA indicated that there was a systematic priority setting process functioning within program areas. All counties except MI, HA, and KI indicated that such a process functioned across program areas. All counties except HE, CU, and HA, indicated that individual agents had systematic priority setting procedures.

All counties except MI and KI indicated using a countywide advisory group. Among those using such a group, all rated it as being very helpful except county ST, which rated it as being of some help.

All counties indicated using either planning or advisory groups or both for specific programs and projects. County MI indicated having used both. Counties HE, FR, and MA, indicated advisory committees and counties ST, CU, FR, MA and ER indicated planning committees. For the most part, the group was rated as being very helpful. Ratings of some help came only in the cases of county HE, CU, and FR.

There was more variation in terms of both use and ratings where use of citizen committees by programs was examined.

TABLE 40

Use of Planning or Advisory Groups

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| A. Systematic priority setting process | | | | | | | | | |
| individual agent | X | | X | | X | | X | X | X |
| program area | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X | X |
| across program areas | | X | X | X | X | | X | | X |
| B. Type of planning, advisory groups used | | | | | | | | | |
| Countywide: | | | | | | | | | |
| planning committee | | | | | | | | | |
| advisory committee | | V | S | V | V | V | V | | V |
| Agriculture/horticulture: | | | | | | | | | |
| planning committee | | V | V | | V | | | | |
| advisory committee | | V | V | | | | V | | V |
| Community Development: | | | | | | | | | |
| planning committee | | | V | | S | | | | |
| advisory committee | | | | | | | | | |
| 4-H & Youth Development: | | | | | | | | | |
| planning committee | V | V | V | | S | V | | | |
| advisory committee | | V | V | | | V | V | V | V |
| Home Economics: | | | | | | | | | |
| planning committee | | V | S | S | V | V | | | |
| advisory committee | | V | | | | | V | V | V |
| C. Specific programs or projects: | | | | | | | | | |
| planning committee | V | | V | S | S | | V | | V |
| advisory committee | V | S | | | | V | | V | |

Program Evaluation (Tables 41-43)

The urban counties appeared to be extensively involved in evaluative activities. Almost all at least sometimes examined the ten aspects asked about.

All counties said they frequently evaluated clientele reactions and all except HA said they frequently evaluated the extent to which objectives were attained. (HA said occasionally).

All except HE and HA said they frequently evaluated whether or not the need causing the program was met. HE and HA said occasionally.

All except MI and ST indicated that they frequently evaluated the degree to which a program was valued. MI and ST said occasionally.

All except counties ST, FR, and HA said they frequently examined whether they were offering the right activities. ST, FR, and HA said occasionally.

Counties HE, CU, HA, KI and ER said they frequently examined the overall value/benefit of their programs. All of the others except MA said occasionally.

Counties HE, FR, MA and KI said they frequently checked on practices used. The others, with the exception of ST (sometimes), said they occasionally did so.

Counties MI, FR, MA and KI said they frequently evaluated behavioral changes brought about through programming. All of the others, except HA (sometimes), said occasionally.

Counties MI, MA, and KI said they frequently examined the cost of programs. The others except for HE and CU (sometimes) said they occasionally did so.

Counties FR, MA, and KI said they frequently examined whether their programs were worth the cost. The others said occasionally except HE and ST who said sometimes. FR and MA said they computed the cost per participant and ST said that they sometimes did so.

Four counties, HE, CU, FR, KI, said they used a common system for evaluating programs. Three, CU, FR, and KI, said they used a common system for examining reactions to programs.

Only two counties, ST and FR, said they used a common system for examining costs and productivity and only two, MI and KI, used a common system for evaluating individual teaching performance.

One county, ER, said that their local supervisory committee played a very active role in program evaluation. Two, ST and MA, said the committee played a fairly active role. The other counties indicated not very or not applicable.

Although some counties, MI and ST, indicated that all program areas were apt to use the various methods of getting evaluative information, in many counties some program areas used one means, and some another.

TABLE 41

Characteristics of Completed Programs Examined

(S=seldom; O=occasionally; F=frequently)

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| need met | F | O | F | F | F | O | F | F | F |
| objective met | F | F | F | F | F | O | F | F | F |
| cost | F | S | O | S | O | O | F | F | O |
| right activities | F | F | O | F | O | O | F | F | F |
| clientele reactions | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F |
| behavioral change | F | O | O | O | F | S | F | F | O |
| practices used | O | F | S | O | F | O | F | F | O |
| overall value/benefit | O | F | O | F | O | F | | F | F |
| degree program valued | O | F | O | F | F | F | F | F | F |
| worth cost | O | S | S | O | F | O | F | F | O |
| <hr/> | | | | | | | | | |
| cost per participant computed | no | no | smts | no | yes | no | yes | no | no |

TABLE 42

Means of Formally Evaluating Programs Used Fairly Often

| | <u>County MI</u> | <u>County HE</u> | <u>County ST</u> | <u>County CU</u> | <u>County FR</u> |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| reaction sheets | all 4 | all4 | all | HEc&AgH | all4 |
| planning groups | all 4 | 4-H&AgH | | 4-H, HEc, AgH | |
| studies learning/doing | | HEc | HEc AGH CD | 4-H | HEc, AgH, CDv |
| tests | | HEc | HEc AgH | HEc, AgH | all4 |
| exhibits | all 4 | 4-H | all | 4-H, AgH | 4-H, AgH |
| clientele review panel | | | all | HEc | 4-H, AgH, HEc |
| External review panel | | | all | | 4-H, AG |
| community leader panel | 4-H | AgH | | 4-H, HEc, AgH | 4-H, AgH, CDv |
| # of enrollees | all 4 | | all | | AgH |
| # of people reached | all 4 | HEc&AgH | all | 4-H, HEc, AgH | HEc, AgH |
| cost of effect | all 4 | | HEcAgH O | | all4 |
| | <u>County HA</u> | <u>County MA</u> | <u>County KI</u> | <u>County ER</u> | |
| reaction sheets | 4-H, AgH | all | HEc, AgH, CDv | 4-H, HEc, AgH | |
| planning groups | | | | AgH | |
| studies learning/doing | | HEc | 4-H, HEc | | |
| tests | HEc | AgH | HEc | 4-H, HEc | |
| exhibits | 4-H, HEc, AgH | 4-H/AgH | | 4-H, HEc, AgH | |
| clientele review panel | 4-H | | | | |
| External review panel | | 4-H, HEc, AH | | 4-H, HEc, AgH | |
| community leader panel | | 4-H | CDv | 4-H, HEc, AgH | |
| # of enrollees | AgH | 4H, HEc, AH | HEc, AgH, CDv | 4-H, HEc, AgH | |
| # of people reached | 4-H, HEc, AgH | 4-H, HEc, Ah | AgH, CDv | 4-H, HEc, AgH | |
| cost of effect | | HEc | | 4-H, HEc, AgH | |

KEY:

4-H=4-H & Youth Development; HEc=Home Economics; AgH=Agriculture/Horticulture; CDv=Community Development

Comments:

County HE Home Extension has monthly report cards from each club to the office --tells how leader training material was used.

TABLE 43

Common System Used by All Agents for Various Types of Evaluation and Activeness of Local Supervisory Group in Evaluating Programs

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <u>Is there a common system for evaluating:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| results of programs | N | Y | N | Y | Y | Y | N | Y | N |
| reactions to programs | N | N | N | Y | Y | N | N | Y | N |
| costs and productivity | N | N | Y | N | Y | N | N | | N |
| individual teaching performance | Y | N | N | N | N | N | N | Y | N |
| <u>How active a role does local supervisory committee play?</u> | NV | NV | F | NV | NV | NV | F | NA | V |

KEY: NV=not very; F=fairly; V=very; NA=not applicable

Relationship with Other Colleges and Universities

Most of the respondents indicated there were colleges and universities located in their county. The range was from 4 in County HA to 28 in County HE. The range in state-supported colleges was from none in County FR to 7 in County KI. The range in private colleges and universities was from 1 in County HA to 22 in County HE.

All except County MA indicated that they drew on these colleges and universities for resource people. Counties MI and ST indicated that it was necessary to pay such resource people.

MI and ST also indicated that there was a formal working agreement with one or more of the institutions.

All of the counties indicated that students from the various colleges and universities use Cooperative Extension programs as a learning laboratory.

All except counties CU and ER said that they used the colleges' and universities' libraries.

Counties MI, HE, CU, and KI indicated some degree of duplication of effort.

Counties, MI, HE, CU and KI also indicated some difficulty in getting assistance from local colleges and universities.

TABLE 44

Relationships with Colleges and Universities Located in the County

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <u>Number of:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| state-supported | 2 | 6 | 4 | 2 | | 3 | 2 | 7 | 3 |
| private | 6 | 22 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| <u>Type of working relationships:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| draw resource people from: | | | | | | | | | |
| without pay | X | | | X | X | X | | X | X |
| paid | X | | X | | | | | | |
| no potential | | | | | | | | | |
| official working agreement | X | | X | | | | | | |
| students use CE programs as | | | | | | | | | |
| learning laboratory | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| we use their library(ies) | X | X | X | | X | | X | X | |
| other ways | | | X | X | | | | X | |
| <u>Problems of:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| duplication of effort | Y | Y | N | Y | N | N | | Y&N | N |
| getting assistance from them | Y | Y | N | Y | N | N | | Y&N | N |

Relationship with Agencies and Groups (Table 45)

The number of county and city agencies that Cooperative Extension agents felt they had good working relationships with ranged from about 10 to more than 350.

Most counties stressed good communication for avoiding duplication.

TABLE 45

Relationship with County and/or City Agencies and Groups

| <u>Number have good working relationships with</u> | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 350-500 | 335 | 10 | 100+ | 15 | 15 | 50 | 150+ | 20 |

How duplications avoided

- County MI We communicate with Milwaukee Area Technical College and University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
- County HE We try to specialize and publicize what our expertise areas are.
- County ST Constant communications. Staff from agencies & Extension share ideas and assist each other in planning.
- County CU We don't. We have our constituencies and they have theirs. We try not to duplicate but they often duplicate us and then claim we are duplicating them. NO solution to this problem except survival of the fittest when possible.
- County FR Agencies are involved with the program planning proper coordination and effective communications.
- County HA By preplanning with other agencies' leaders and by working in other geographical areas of the county.
- County MA Interagency cooperation, Mayor's youth council, Parks and Recreation Department, Farm Organizations
- County KI Actively developing awareness and communication with other agencies. Size of county yields audience for both.
- County ER By being familiar with programs of other agencies--through newsletters, personal contact, meetings, etc.

APPENDIX TABLES

APPENDIX TABLE 1

Local Government Finances and Expenditures 1971-71

| <u>GENERAL REVENUE</u> | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST1</u> | <u>ST2</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>HA</u> |
|--|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| Total (millions) | \$736.5 | \$657.9 | \$353.8 | \$352.7 | \$846.1 | \$336.7 |
| Intergovernmental--% from federal government | 6.9 | 8.0 | 4.5 | 38.2 | 15.3 | 17.0 |
| Taxes | | | | | | |
| total (millions) | \$370.4 | \$286.5 | \$241.9 | \$194.7 | \$522.1 | \$190.8 |
| property, per capita | \$348 | \$288 | \$218 | \$172 | \$246 | \$176 |
| | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> | | |
| Total (millions) | \$556.8 | \$389.4 | \$674.6 | \$766.7 | | |
| Intergovernmental--% from federal government | 22.2 | 18.2 | 17.7 | 5.5 | | |
| Taxes | | | | | | |
| total (millions) | \$260.0 | \$221.1 | \$283.7 | \$348.5 | | |
| property, per capita | \$204 | \$276 | \$200 | \$258 | | |
| <u>DIRECT GENERAL EXPENDITURE</u> | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST1</u> | <u>ST2</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> |
| Total (million dollars) | \$730.9 | \$647.1 | \$360.2 | \$337.7 | \$921.3 | \$341.3 |
| Per capita--excl. capital outlay | \$597 | \$560 | \$315 | \$490 | \$438 | \$334 |
| % education | 34.5 | 38.5 | 63.2 | 35.6 | 42.6 | 42.4 |
| % highways | 7.6 | 7.1 | 6.7 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 5.7 |
| % public welfare | 12.4 | 17.9 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 5.1 | 4.3 |
| % health and hospitals | 9.0 | 5.0 | 3.2 | 12.9 | 8.5 | 4.2 |
| | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> | | |
| Total (million dollars) | \$532.1 | \$401.2 | \$732.6 | \$789.5 | | |
| Per capita--excl. capital outlay | \$494 | \$415 | \$458 | \$626 | | |
| % education | 47.8 | 44.6 | 37.9 | 41.1 | | |
| % highways | 4.5 | 5.9 | 6.1 | 4.7 | | |
| % public welfare | 4.0 | 6.1 | -.05 | 15.9 | | |
| % health and hospitals | 10.1 | 12.8 | 4.2 | 6.5 | | |
| <u>GENERAL DEBT OUTSTANDING</u> | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST1</u> | <u>ST2</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> |
| Total (million dollars) | \$572.0 | \$735.5 | \$349.6 | \$396.6 | \$879.6 | \$506.7 |
| Per capita (dollars) | \$543 | \$766 | \$367 | \$637 | \$511 | \$608 |
| | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> | | |
| Total (million dollars) | \$553.6 | \$349.7 | \$1010.5 | \$663.5 | | |
| Per capita (dollars) | \$600 | \$441 | \$872 | \$596 | | |

APPENDIX TABLE 2

Number of Extension Positions Administered Through the County Extension Office
By Type and Program Area

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <u>4-H & Youth Development:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Agents | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 2.6 |
| Paraprofessionals | 2.5 | 3 | 8 | | 2 | | 14 | .75 | 4 |
| Ad hoc | | | 3 | | 1 | | 2 | .75 | |
| Secretaries | 3 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1.75 |
| <u>Other</u> | | <u>1.75</u> | | | | | <u>50</u> | 7.5 | |
| Total | 9.5 | 7.2 | 17 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 78 | 4.5 | 8.4 |
| <u>Home Economics:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Agents | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4.5 | 3 | 2 |
| Paraprofessionals | | | 1 | | | | 5 | | 2 |
| Ad hoc | 1.5 | .25 | | | 2 | | 1 | .5 | |
| Secretaries | 1 | .75 | 2.5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1.75 |
| <u>Other</u> | .75 | | | <u>1.3</u> | | | | <u>2</u> | |
| Total | 5.25 | 2.25 | 6.5 | 4.3 | 4 | 1 | 12.5 | 6.5 | 5.75 |
| <u>EFNEP:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Agents | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | .5 | 1 | 1 |
| Paraprofessionals | 9 | 12 | 17 | 10 | 7 | 5 | 21 | 9.25 | 12 |
| Ad hoc | | .5 | | | 1 | | | .75 | |
| Secretaries | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| <u>Other</u> | | <u>.5</u> | | <u>1</u> | | | <u>2</u> | | |
| Total | 10 | 14 | 19 | 12 | 11 | 8 | 23.5 | 12 | 14 |
| <u>Horticulture:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Agents | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Paraprofessionals | 9 | | 12 | 6 | 3 | | 1 | | 1.25 |
| Ad hoc | 1 | | | | 1 | | 1 | .75 | |
| Secretaries | 1 | .5 | 2 | 1 | .5 | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| <u>Other</u> | 10 | | | 2 | | | 1 | | |
| Total | 23 | 1 | 17 | 11 | 5.5 | | 6 | 3.75 | 4.25 |
| <u>Other agriculture:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Agents | | 1.25 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| Paraprofessionals | | | | | 3 | | | | |
| Ad hoc | | | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| Secretaries | | .25 | | | .5 | 1 | | 1 | 1.5 |
| <u>Other</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | | 1 | | | 5.5 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3.5 |
| <u>Community Development:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Agents | 2 | | 2 | | | | | 1 | |
| Paraprofessionals | | | | | 1 | | | | |
| Ad hoc | | | | | | | | | |
| Secretaries | 1 | | .5 | | | | | | |
| <u>Other</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 3 | | 2.5 | | 1 | | | 1 | |

APPENDIX TABLE 2 (continued)

Number of Extension Positions Administered Through the County Extension Office
By Type and Program Area

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| <u>Business:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Agents | 1 | | 2 | | | | | | .4 |
| Paraprofessionals | | | | | | | | | |
| Ad hoc | | | | | | | | | |
| Secretaries | 1 | | .5 | | | | | | 2.5 |
| Other | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 2 | | 2.5 | | | | | | |
| <u>Other:</u> | | | | | | | | | |
| Agents | 1 * | .75* | | | 1 * | | 1 * | | 1 +++ |
| Paraprofessionals | | 9** | | | 2 ++ | | | | |
| Ad hoc | | .25*** | | | 3 ++ | | | | |
| Secretaries | | .24* | 3.50+ | | 1 ++ | | | | .25++ |
| + | | | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 1 | 9.25 | 3.50 | | 7 | | 1 | | |

*=administration; **=county nutrition education; ***=public relations and media coordinator; +=general office; ++=energy; +++=Sea Grant.

APPENDIX TABLE 3

Sex and Age Statistics

| | <u>Sex</u> | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST1</u> | <u>ST2</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> |
| # male (1970) | 505,169 | 457,738 | 459,837 | 283,467 | 821,576 | 402,732 |
| % male (1970) | 47.9 | 47.7 | 48.3 | 45.6 | 47.7 | 48.3 |
| # female (1970) | 548,894 | 502,342 | 491,516 | 338,769 | 899,724 | 430,517 |
| % female (1970) | 52.1 | 52.3 | 51.7 | 54.4 | 52.3 | 51.7 |
| | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> | | |
| # male (1970) | 438,807 | 379,655 | 565,427 | 533,104 | | |
| % male (1970) | 47.5 | 47.9 | 48.9 | 47.9 | | |
| # female (1970) | 485,211 | 412,644 | 591,206 | 580,387 | | |
| % female (1970) | 52.5 | 52.1 | 51.1 | 52.1 | | |
| <u>Age</u> | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST1</u> | <u>ST2</u> | <u>CU</u> | <u>FR</u> |
| # 65 yrs and over* | 111,338 | 92,953 | 73,361 | 91,240 | 168,888 | 64,114 |
| % 65 yrs and over* | 11.5 | 10.7 | 9.2 | 16.6 | 11.1 | 8.1 |
| 4-H age (1970) | | | | | | |
| 10-14 yrs | 104,010 | 95,339 | 106,430 | 59,333 | 172,886 | 84,792 |
| 15-19 yrs | 94,579 | 89,834 | 87,859 | 54,530 | 153,299 | 80,715 |
| | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> | | |
| # 65 yrs and over* | 93,858 | 63,138 | 101,707 | 112,656 | | |
| % 65 yrs and over* | 11.1 | 9.5 | 10.0 | 10.8 | | |
| 4-H age (1970) | | | | | | |
| 10-14 yrs | 95,996 | 84,150 | 114,122 | 116,003 | | |
| 15-19 yrs | 84,188 | 71,508 | 102,464 | 102,113 | | |

APPENDIX TABLE 4

Agriculture/Horticulture--Group InstructionNumber of Times Used in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>FR</u> |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| leader training | 20 | 13 | 4 | 15 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 208* | 12 | 300 | 31 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | | 33 | | 31 |
| large events | 6 | 5 | 2 | 5 |
| | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
| leader training | 25 | 18 | | 13 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 47 | 100 | | 39 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | 28 | 50 | | 14 |
| large events | | 3 | | 2 |

Number of People Reached in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>MI</u> | <u>HE</u> | <u>ST</u> | <u>FR</u> |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| leader training | 200 | 350 | 250 | 42 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 9556* | 476 | 5,000 | 4,100 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | | 945 | | 3,200 |
| large events | | 650 | 700 | 10,000 |
| total | 9556 | 2421 | 5,950 | 10,732 |
| | <u>HA</u> | <u>MA</u> | <u>KI</u> | <u>ER</u> |
| leader training | 1,510 | 125 | | 509 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 1,820 | 5,000 | | 2757 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | 1,324 | 2,000 | | 403 |
| large events | | 10,000 | | 30,000 |
| total | 4,654 | | 94,117 | 33,669 |

*includes both other Extension initiated meetings and sessions initiated by other groups.

County MI was not included when ranges and medians were figured on these two items.

APPENDIX TABLE 5

Agriculture/Horticulture--MediaNumber of Times Used in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty CU</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| feature stories by newspapers | 4 | 18 | 2 | | 5 |
| news releases | 16 | 15 | 10 | | 52 |
| radio broadcasts | 25 | 3 | 52 | | 52 |
| TV broadcasts | 57 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 43 |
| newsletters: | | | | | |
| # of different ones | 13 | 5 | 12 | 118 | 5 |
| total # of issues | 3,773 | 36 | | | 36 |
| bulletins/fact sheets | 35,063 | 6050 | 25,000 | | 30,000 |
| taped messages available | 105 | | | 365 | |
| computer-assisted programs | | | | | 8 |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> | |
| feature stories by newspapers | | | | 13 | |
| news releases | | 120 | | 26 | |
| radio broadcasts | 6 | 25 | | 40 | |
| TV broadcasts | 1 | 120 | | 17 | |
| newsletters: | | | | | |
| # of different ones | 24 | | 8 | 6 | |
| total # of issues | 4,978 | | 96 | 42 | |
| bulletins/fact sheets | 21,201 | 25,000 | | 20,000 | |
| taped messages available | | | 198 | | |
| computer-assisted programs | | | 3 | 5 | |

Number of People Reached in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty CU</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| receiving newsletters | ? | 945 | 5,000 | 9084 | 3,000 |
| dialing a taped message | 2224 | | | 4800 | |
| receiving a computer analysis | | | | | 55 |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> | |
| receiving newsletters | 207 | 850 | 1776 | 2800 | |
| dialing a taped message | | | 11,502 | | |
| receiving a computer analysis | | 4,600 | | 2000 | |

APPENDIX TABLE 6

Agriculture/Horticulture--One-to-One AssistanceNumber of Times Used in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| by telephone | 11,063 | 3850 | | 10,250 |
| by office visit | 650 | 35 | | 170 |
| by mail | 150 | 32 | | 7,000 |
| at client's home or business | 200 | 142 | | 330 |
| at exhibit, booth, at a large event | 15,000 | | | 1,500 |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| by telephone | 9,436 | 12,000 | | 10,000 |
| by office visit | | 1,000 | | 240 |
| by mail | | 3,900 | | 7200 |
| at client's home or business | | 500 | | 1500 |
| at exhibit, booth, at a large event | | | | 2000 |

Number of People Reached in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| One-to-one assistance | | | | |
| total number of people assisted | | 4059 | | 15,335 |
| Number of small groups or | | | | |
| organizations advised or assisted | 18 | 34 | | 12 |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| One-to-one assistance | | | | |
| total number of people assisted | | 2,500 | 30,227 | 23,100 |
| Number of small groups or | | | | |
| organizations advised or assisted | | | 2000 | 30 |

APPENDIX TABLE 7

Community Development--Group InstructionNumber of Times Used in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| leader training | | | 0 | 5 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 8126* | 4 | 25 | 15 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | | | | 23 |
| large events | 5 | | 0 | 8 |

| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| leader training | | | | |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | | | | |
| sessions initiated by other groups | | | | |
| large events | | | | |

Number of People Reached in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| leader training | | | 0 | 150 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 229,900* | 60 | 500 | 2,050 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | | | | 690 |
| large events | 1,030,000 | | | 140,000 |
| total | 229,290 | 60 | 500 | 9,763 |

| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| leader training | | | | |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | | | | |
| sessions initiated by other groups | | | | |
| large events | | | | |
| total | | | | |

*includes both other Extension initiated meetings and sessions initiated by other groups.
County MI was not included when ranges and medians were figured on these two items.

APPENDIX TABLE 8

Community Development--MediaNumber of Times Used in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| feature stories by newspapers | 4 | | 1 | 4 |
| news releases | 19 | | 10 | 30 |
| radio broadcasts | 4 | 1 | 52 | 20 |
| TV broadcasts | 24 | | 0 | 38 |
| newsletters: | | | | |
| # of different ones | | | 0 | 1 |
| total # of issues | | | | 12 |
| bulletins/fact sheets | | 125 | 100 | 60,000 |
| taped messages available | 16 | | | |
| computer-assisted programs | | | | 1 |

| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| feature stories by newspapers | | | | |
| news releases | | | | |
| radio broadcasts | | | | |
| TV broadcasts | | | | |
| newsletters: | | | | |
| # of different ones | | | | |
| total # of issues | | | | |
| bulletins/fact sheets | | | | |
| taped messages available | | | | |
| computer-assisted programs | | | | |

Number of People Reached in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| receiving newsletters | | 945 | | 2,000 |
| dialing a taped message | 400 | | | |
| receiving a computer analysis | | | | 4,623 |

| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| receiving newsletters | | | | |
| dialing a taped message | | | 4301 | |
| receiving a computer analysis | | | | |

Media:

APPENDIX TABLE 9

Community Development--One-to-One AssistanceNumber of Times Used in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| by telephone | 1375 | 85 | | |
| by office visit | 150 | | | |
| by mail | 3000 | 5 | | |
| at client's home or business | 900 | | | |
| at exhibit, booth, at a large event | 25,000 | | | 15,670 |

| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| by telephone | | | | |
| by office visit | | | | |
| by mail | | | | |
| at client's home or business | | | | |
| at exhibit, booth, at a large event | | | | |

Number of People Reached in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| One-to-one assistance | | | | |
| total number of people assisted | | 90 | | 21,455 |

| | | | | |
|---|----|--|--|----|
| Number of small groups or organizations advised or assisted | 20 | | | 15 |
|---|----|--|--|----|

| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| One-to-one assistance | | | | |
| total number of people assisted | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Number of small groups or organizations advised or assisted | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|

APPENDIX TABLE 10

4-H/Youth Development--Group InstructionNumber of Times Used in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| leader training | 52 | 39 | 4 | 8 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 574* | 129 | 150 | 4 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | | 467 | | 35 |
| large events | 12 | 5 | 4 | 6 |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| leader training | 10 | | | 49 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 216 | | | 120 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | 53 | | | 1 |
| large events | | | | 12 |

Number of People Reached Through Various Methods in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| leader training | 1040 | 1222 | 350 | 400 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 14,654* | 4828 | 2,500 | 600 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | | 11,655 | | 540 |
| large events | | 1085 | 600 | 12,850 |
| total | 14,654 | 18,790 | 3,450 | 14,390 |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| leader training | 118 | | | 1170 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 3,679 | | | 3957 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | 949 | | | 18 |
| large events | | | | 47,750 |
| total | 4,746 | | 32,255 | 52,895 |

*includes both other Extension initiated meetings and sessions initiated by other groups.

County MI was not included when ranges and medians were figured on these two items.

APPENDIX TABLE 11

4-H/Youth Development--MediaNumber of Times Used in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| feature stories by newspapers | 8 | 8 | 4 | 15 |
| news releases | 19 | 26 | 25 | 150 |
| radio broadcasts | 24 | 3 | 10 | 5 |
| TV broadcasts | 15 | 4 | 25 | 3 |
| newsletters: | | | | |
| # of different ones | 30 | 1 | 24 | 4 |
| total # of issues | 6550 | 12 | | 50 |
| bulletins/fact sheets | 3000 | 2075 | 10,000 | |
| taped messages available | 3 | | | 3 |
| computer-assisted programs | | | | |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| feature stories by newspapers | | | | 30 |
| news releases | | | | 10 |
| radio broadcasts | | | | 96 |
| TV broadcasts | | | | 5 |
| newsletters: | | | | |
| # of different ones | 126 | | 1 | 1 |
| total # of issues | 24,865 | | 12 | 10 |
| bulletins/fact sheets | 9,760 | | | 20,000 |
| taped messages available | | | 9 | |
| computer-assisted programs | | | 1 | |

Number of People Reached Through Various Methods in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| receiving newsletters | | 900 | 5,000 | 969 |
| 600 | | | | |
| dialing a taped message | 48 | | | |
| receiving a computer analysis | | | | |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| <u>Media:</u> | | | | |
| receiving newsletters | 3,025 | | 599 | 1500 |
| dialing a taped message | | | 200 | |
| receiving a computer analysis | | | | |

APPENDIX TABLE 12

4-H/Youth Development--One-to-One AssistanceNumber of Times Used in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| One-to-one assistance | | | | |
| by telephone | 2515 | 3855 | | 3,735 |
| by office visit | 350 | 220 | | 747 |
| by mail | 3600 | 4780 | | 400 |
| at client's home or business | 900 | 355 | | 50 |
| at exhibit, booth, at a large event | 5000 | 585 | | 700 |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| One-to-one assistance | | | | |
| by telephone | 3,041 | | | 6950 |
| by office visit | | | | 2600 |
| by mail | | | | 6450 |
| at client's home or business | | | | 156 |
| at exhibit, booth, at a large event | | | | 4300 |

Number of People Reached Through Various Methods in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| One-to-one assistance | | | | |
| total number of people assisted | | 8795 | | 5,632 |
| Number of small groups or organizations advised or assisted | 111 | 98 | | 6 |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| One-to-one assistance | | | | |
| total number of people assisted | | | 3946 | 20,456 |
| Number of small groups or organizations advised or assisted | | | 50 | 149 |

APPENDIX TABLE 13

Home Economics--Group InstructionNumber of Times-Used in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| leader training | 22 | 422 | 2 | 6 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 1526* | 956 | 275 | 20 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | | 111 | | 2 |
| large events | 5 | 16 | 1 | 2 |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| leader training | 41 | 33 | | |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 53 | 49 | | 82 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | 149 | 32 | | 72 |
| large events | | | | 18 |

Number of People Reached in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| leader training | 488 | 1535 | 500 | 60 |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 24,232 | 10,046 | 8,000 | 294 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | | 1205 | | 33 |
| large events | | 1461 | 500 | 1,153 |
| total | 24,323 | 14,247 | 9,000 | 2,379 |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| leader training | 1,092 | 1543 | | |
| other Extension-initiated sessions | 995 | 6281 | | 1379 |
| sessions initiated by other groups | 1,949 | 4795 | | 2538 |
| large events | | | | 40,000 |
| total | 4,036 | | 32,255 | 43,917 |

*includes both other Extension initiated meetings and sessions initiated by other groups.

County MI was not included when range and median were calculated for these two items.

APPENDIX TABLE 14

Home Economics--MediaNumber of Times Used in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| feature stories by newspapers | 4 | 10 | 12 | 22 |
| news releases | 19 | 26 | 100 | 5 |
| radio broadcasts | 6 | 4 | 50 | |
| TV broadcasts | 31 | 1 | 45 | 20 |
| newsletters: | | | | |
| # of different ones | 17 | 2 | 50 | 2 |
| total # of issues | 6,500 | 12 | | |
| bulletins/fact sheets | 21,205 | 300 | 20,000 | 2,000 |
| taped messages available | 277 | | | |
| computer-assisted programs | 2 | 1 | | |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| feature stories by newspapers | | 33 | | 10 |
| news releases | | | | 30 |
| radio broadcasts | | 20 | | 27 |
| TV broadcasts | 4 | 12 | | 60 |
| newsletters: | | | | |
| # of different ones | 18 | 55 | 3 | 1 |
| total # of issues | 11,910 | | 32 | 12 |
| bulletins/fact sheets | 6,970 | 7410 | | 20,000 |
| taped messages available | | | 116 | |
| computer-assisted programs | | 10 | 2 | |

Number of People Reached in Fiscal Year 1980

| | <u>Cnty MI</u> | <u>Cnty HE</u> | <u>Cnty ST</u> | <u>Cnty FR</u> |
|-------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| receiving newsletters | | 8950 | 7,500 | |
| dialing a taped message | 17,174 | | | |
| receiving a computer analysis | 3,100 | 350 | | |
| | <u>Cnty HA</u> | <u>Cnty MA</u> | <u>Cnty KI</u> | <u>Cnty ER</u> |
| receiving newsletters | 2,522 | 2070 | 840 | 1500 |
| dialing a taped message | | | 3201 | |
| receiving a computer analysis | | | | |

LIST OF TABLES

| NO. | TABLE TITLE | PAGE |
|-----|---|------|
| 1 | <u>Selected Descriptive Information from US Census and Similar Sources</u> | 5 |
| 2 | <u>Amount of 1980-1981 Funding from Various Sources</u> | 7 |
| 3 | <u>Nature of Other Permanent Funding and/or Limited Time Grants</u> | 8 |
| 4 | <u>Percent of 1980-1981 Budget from Various Sources; Per Capita Amount</u> | 9 |
| 5 | <u>Rank of County in Its State in Regard to Selected Items</u> | 9 |
| 6 | <u>Priorities for Additional Dollars As Viewed by County Office Chairman/Staff</u> | 10 |
| 7 | <u>Priority If There Is Additional Money As Viewed by District Director</u> | 11 |
| 8 | <u>Major Changes in Funding in the Past Five Years</u> | 12 |
| 9 | <u>Major Changes in Funding Expected in Next Two Years</u> | 13 |
| 10 | <u>Major Problems Foreseen for Maintaining Funding or Securing Additional Funding in This County</u> | 13 |
| 11 | <u>Total Number of Positions and of Agent Positions Administered Through County Extension Office</u> | 15 |
| 12 | <u>Dollar Amounts Invested in Salaries and Other Categories, 1980-1981</u> | 15 |
| 13 | <u>Special Equipment Available at the County Extension Office</u> | 15 |
| 14 | <u>Division of Budget Among Program Areas</u> | 17 |
| 15 | <u>Percentage of Budget in Each Program Area Which Is Permanent Funding</u> | 17 |
| 16 | <u>Total Number of Positions by Type Administered Through County Extension Office</u> | 19 |
| 17 | <u>Number of Extension Positions by Program Area Administered Through the County Extension Office</u> | 19 |
| 18 | <u>Summary of Number of Agent Positions According to Program Area and</u> | 20 |
| 19 | <u>Total Number of Positions Other than Agent Administered Through County Extension Office</u> | 20 |
| 20 | <u>Tenure of Current Agents in Positions in the Respective Counties</u> | 21 |
| 21 | <u>Percent of Programming Done with Ethnic Minorities</u> | 23 |
| 22 | <u>Percentage of Extension Programming Done with Low-Income Clientele</u> | 25 |

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

| NO. | TABLE TITLE | PAGE |
|-----|---|------|
| 23 | <u>Percent of Total Programming Done with Clientele from Various Areas of the County</u> | 26 |
| 24 | <u>Main Areas of Emphasis This Year (1980-1981)</u> | 27 |
| 25 | <u>Program Changes</u> | 29 |
| 26 | <u>Number of People Reached Through Special Programs</u> | 32 |
| 27 | <u>Number of People Reached Through Meetings and Large Events</u> | 32 |
| 28 | <u>Number of People Reached Through Various Methods in Fiscal Year 1980</u> | 34 |
| 29 | <u>Number of Times Various Methods Were Used in Fiscal Year 1980:</u> | 35 |
| 30 | <u>Frequency of Appearing in Media</u> | 38 |
| 31 | <u>Use of Radio or TV by Program Area</u> | 38 |
| 32 | <u>Rank Ordering of Delivery Methods by Program Areas According to Amount of Perceived Impact</u> | 41 |
| 33 | <u>Program Area Showing Largest Number of People Reached Through Selected Means</u> | 42 |
| 34 | <u>Requirements for New Employees</u> | 45 |
| 35 | <u>Evaluation of Agent Performance</u> | 45 |
| 36 | <u>Office Administration</u> | 46 |
| 37 | <u>Most Helpful of In-Service Training For Metropolitan Work</u> | 46 |
| 38 | <u>Understanding and Adequacy of Help from State Staff in Relation to Urban Programming</u> | 49 |
| 39 | <u>Programs Specifically Requested by County Governing Agency</u> | 50 |
| 40 | <u>Use of Planning or Advisory Groups</u> | 51 |
| 41 | <u>Characteristics of Completed Programs Examined</u> | 52 |
| 42 | <u>Means of Formally Evaluating Programs Used Fairly Often</u> | 53 |
| 43 | <u>Common System Used by All Agents for Various Types of Evaluation</u> | 53 |
| 44 | <u>Relationships with Colleges and Universities Located in the County</u> | 54 |
| 45 | <u>Relationship with County and/or City Agencies and Groups</u> | 55 |

LIST OF TABLES--APPENDIX TABLES

| NO. | TABLE TITLE | PAGE |
|-----|--|------|
| 1 | <u>Local Government Finances and Expenditures 1971-71</u> | 56 |
| 2 | <u>Number of Extension Positions Administered Through the County Extension Office By Type and Program Area</u> | 57 |
| 3 | <u>Sex and Age Statistics</u> | 59 |
| 4 | <u>Agriculture/Horticulture--Group Instruction</u> | 60 |
| 5 | <u>Agriculture/Horticulture--Media</u> | 61 |
| 6 | <u>Agriculture/Horticulture--One-to-One Assistance</u> | 62 |
| 7 | <u>Community Development--Group Instruction</u> | 63 |
| 8 | <u>Community Development--Media</u> | 64 |
| 9 | <u>Community Development--One-to-One Assistance</u> | 65 |
| 10 | <u>4-H/Youth Development--Group Instruction</u> | 66 |
| 11 | <u>4-H/Youth Development--Media</u> | 67 |
| 12 | <u>4-H/Youth Development--One-to-One Assistance</u> | 68 |
| 13 | <u>Home Economics--Group Instruction</u> | 69 |
| 14 | <u>Home Economics--Media</u> | 70 |

WLEX COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAMS
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-EXTENSION

432 NORTH LAKE STREET MADISON, WISCONSIN 53706 262-9940 • AREA CODE 608

JAN 26 1981

PROGRAM AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

January 22, 1981

Mr. Thomas J. McNutt
1945 Frebis Avenue
Columbus OH 43206

Dear Mr. McNutt:

Enclosed is the questionnaire for the study of Extension programming in Moderate Sized Metropolitan Areas. Could you please return it by February 10?

Could you scan it by February 1 to see if you have any questions about it? If so, let me know when I should call you.

About the Questionnaire

1. Please do the best you can with it but don't spend enormous amounts of time on it. I hope it won't take more than an hour or two.
2. Give the information you have readily at hand that fits your county. Don't feel you have to do the very difficult or impossible if you find some of the questions really troublesome. It is hard to fit several quite different counties into one meaningful set of questions.
3. Most of the questions require numbers or a check mark. However, the following questions ask for a narrative response:

Question A.11.b, page 5
Question B.1, page 5
Question B.10, page 9
Question C.5, page 16

Handle them in which ever of the following ways is most convenient:

- dictate to your secretary and append the typescript with responses separated by an indication of question number.
- call me and dictate the answer directly to me. (Or call and have me call you back so we pay for the call.)
- write in your response on the questionnaire.

Don't worry about neatness. Save yourself time and choose which ever is easiest for you.