PROCEEDINGS OF THE
2ND ANNUAL
1890 CRD PROGRAM LEADERS WORKSHOP

Birmingham, Alabama
October 9-10, 1983

Southern Rural Development Center
Box 3406
Mississippi State, MS 39762
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A: List of Participants</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: Administrative Overview, Mort H. Neufville</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C: Accountability and Evaluation: Impacts of 1890</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Resource Development Programming, Claude Bennett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D: An 1890 CRD Network, Winfrey S. Clarke</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E: The Importance of Community and Human Resource</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Programming to 1890 Extension Organizations,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Brooks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix F: Community Resource Development In The 80's:</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Prospects and Future Implications, Curtis E. Gear Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix G: Minority Land Loss, Dr. Louis C. Thaxton,</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph F. Brooks and Clyde Chesney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix H: The Farm Foundation Report, R. J. Hildreth</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix I: Southern Rural Development Center Report,</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William W. Linder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix J: Support From Our Federal Partner, Pete Petoskey</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix K: 1890 CRD Leaders Executive Committee Report,</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix L: People Management: Our Most Important Job,</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul D. Warner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix M: Computer Training For 1890 CRD Staff,</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adell Brown, Jr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MINUTES

1890 CRD PROGRAM LEADERS WORKSHOP
Hilton Hotel
Birmingham, Alabama
October 9-10, 1983

Sunday, October 9

2:30 p.m. Dr. Willie Thomas, Vice Chairman, Tuskegee Institute, presided over the afternoon session. He introduced P. W. Brown, Tuskegee Institute, who made welcoming remarks.

A total of 32 persons attended the workshop, with 16 of the 17 1890 schools represented. A complete list of participants can be found in Appendix A.

2:40 Dr. Thomas presented an overview of the workshop, stating the following objectives:

1. To facilitate and enhance a methodology for transfer of relevant CRD information among 1890 Extension organizations.

2. To cultivate a forum in which exemplary 1890 CRD programming endeavors may be present for scrutiny and incorporation by other states.

3. To provide subject matter training for participants on the topics of leadership development, minority land loss, and computer utilization.

2:50 Dr. Mort Neufville, University of Maryland-Eastern Shore, administrative advisor to the 1890 CRD Leaders, addressed the group. He stated that due to his job change he will no longer be the advisor. Dr. Jerome Burton will assume that position. A complete record of his remarks can be found in Appendix B.

3:00 Dr. Claude Bennett, USDA, spoke on the topic of accountability and evaluation: impacts on 1890 CRD Extension programming. His remarks and a copy of the hand-out he distributed during his talk are included as Appendix C. Following Dr. Bennett's remarks a group discussion ensued.

4:00 Dr. Winfrey Clarke, Virginia State University, addressed the topic of an 1890 CRD network, stressing that 1890 schools should come together, pooling their efforts and resources to work on common issues. A copy of his remarks can be found in Appendix D.
5:30

A reception was hosted by the Southern Rural Development Center, followed by dinner. Dr. Henry Brooks, University of Maryland-Eastern Shore, spoke on the importance of community and human resource development programming to 1890 Extension organizations. His speech is included as Appendix E.

Monday, October 10

8:30 a.m.

Dr. Charles Tillman, Alcorn State University, presided over the morning session. He introduced Dr. Curtis Gear, University of Wisconsin, who addressed the issue of CRD in the 80's; present prospects and future implications. Dr. Neufville followed Dr. Gear's address with comments on the implications for 1890 institutions. These remarks on CRD in the 80's are included in Appendix F.

9:15

The topic of minority land loss was addressed by Dr. Louis Thaxton, University of Maryland-Eastern Shore; Dr. Joe Brooks, Emergency Land Fund; Dr. Emery Rann, North Carolina A&T University; and Dr. Clyde Chesney, North Carolina State University. Following their comments Dr. James C. Edwards, Florida A&M University discussed regional project ideas concerning minority land loss. This information as well as a resolution which was passed by the group is located in Appendix G.

10:30

Dr. R. J. Hildreth, Managing Director, Farm Foundation, reported to the group. His comments are included as Appendix H.

10:45

Dr. William W. Linder, Director of the Southern Rural Development Center, spoke on the Center's role in 1890 CRD programs (Appendix I).

11:00

Dr. M. L. "Pete" Petoskey, USDA, reported on the national level and impact with 1890 CRD programs. His remarks are Appendix J.

11:15

Ron Williams, Kentucky State University, presented the Executive Committee report. His remarks are included as Appendix K.

1:00

L. M. Muldrow, South Carolina State University, presided over the afternoon session. He introduced Dr. Paul Warner, University of Kentucky, who spoke on leadership development. Dr. Tillman followed Dr. Warner, presenting regional project ideas in leadership development (Appendix L).

2:00

Dr. Adell Brown, Southern University, discussed computer training for 1890 CRD staff. Dr. Clarence Williams, Fort Valley State College, presented regional project ideas for computer training. This session is covered in Appendix M.
Dr. Jerome Burton, Alcorn State University, conducted the election of new officers. The group decided to retain the same officers for the coming year:

- Mr. Ron Williams - Chairman
- Dr. Willie Thomas - Vice Chairman
- Dr. Louis Thaxton - Secretary/Treasurer

A motion asking administrators to support an 1890 CRD Program Leaders Workshop on an annual basis was made and passed unanimously.
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ADMINISTRATIVE OVERVIEW
Mort H. Neufville

GREETINGS! It is a pleasure for me to meet once again with CRD program leaders. As most of you know, I have had two years of close association with this group and many years of association with most of you professionally. A recent change in location and job responsibilities will limit my future involvement with you. However, I can assure you that you will have my continued support in whatever way possible.

I think it is critical for me at this time to reflect on the development of this group so as to inform those of us who seek justification for its existence.

Soon after assuming an administrative role in extension, I was asked to serve as the 1890 CRD representative on the ECOP-CRD/PA Subcommittee. In making 1890 reports at subsequent meetings, I found myself referencing my own program rather than the 1890 community in total.

Requests for information met with a limited number of responses. In some cases I later learned that messages did not go to the right persons. However, the limited information received pointed out a great need for sharing of information and for us to attach more significance to program emphases.

After a few years with the CRD Subcommittee and my close contacts with USDA, I discerned that CRD as a program area was in trouble in many states. My awareness of the value of CRD as a program area was sufficiently aroused for me to be concerned. I saw the value and usefulness of the 1890 universities organizing themselves to plan for the future if they expected to assist those limited resource communities, as these communities seek avenues of economic development as they assist community organizations and local government, and as they address the policy issues which may affect natural resources.

From our inception as 1890 universities, we have been on the defensive. After integration of schools in 1954, we have found ourselves having to justify our existence. So too is this organization. We have been passing through that cycle. Justification is being asked both from within and without our 1890 community.

My philosophy in life is that I justify my existence and my lifestyle to no one. By my actions and by my deeds you shall know me. My suggestion to you, therefore, is that you develop outstanding programs. Coordinate your efforts so that you may maximize the uses of your resources. Share your knowledge and program ideas. Develop regional projects and don't be afraid
to publicize your good works. If, after you have done all this, you are still asked for justification--then you should ask: "Of what other group are we a part?" So much for that.

For those of you who listened to the report to the Secretary of Agriculture on the loss of land by black farmers in America, you should be aware that you have a glorious opportunity to make some inroads with the Department of Agriculture. Soon after our rural development meeting in Houston, we saw a great need for a viable program in this area. North Carolina picked up the challenge and developed some outstanding programs.

I know most of you have pledged to make this a total 1890 effort, and I commend you for this. I will encourage you, however, that before this meeting is over you should have an organized plan for the future, precisely documenting your future activities. You will receive your recognition through documentation of your successes.

You should identify other regional projects and specifically state your plans for funding, implementation evaluation, and publication. What are you doing for small local governments? computer programs for small businesses? What are the natural resources, public policy issues that you are addressing? These are some of the issues that you should deal with. I challenge you to let this organization live on through your outstanding accomplishments. Do not be on the defensive. You can hardly advance that way; but be on the offensive, and let your actions speak for themselves.

Recently I asked you to identify one of three CRD in the '80s priority thrusts with which you are most closely associated. These are the responses I have received. If you did not identify one of the three indicated--I would suggest that you take a close look at your program emphasis and I am sure it will match one of the emphases listed under the program thrusts. If there are any names to be added to the list, please identify yourself. (See attachment).

At the recent ECOP CRD Subcommittee's meeting there were various issues discussed and you will receive a copy of the minutes, but there are a few points I wish to bring to your attention:

The Regional Committees and the 1890 Committee should:

1. Identify new program impacts based on CRD in the '80s. Identify the projects planned in your four-year plan of work and state how CRD in the '80s impacted these projects.
2. State what follow-up evaluation is planned for these projects.

3. State what the ECOP-CRD/PA Subcommittee might do to support these projects.

We need this in writing from each state. Please forward your responses to Dr. Jerome Burton by January 10, 1984.

Another suggestion we have for you is the involvement of FmHA in your next meeting considering the emphasis of USDA on the Land Loss issue.

A new growing area of program emphasis in Natural Resources is aquaculture. There are many public policy issues to be addressed, and you should retool yourselves in this area.

Another area for involvement is Manpower Programs. I know you have many new innovations, but without documentation and a planned course of action--you will not get the visibility you so richly deserve. I know David Gandy has been involved with training programs for the clergy and other church projects. Others have also been involved. I implore you to coordinate your efforts so that you can become more effective.

In closing, let me assure you that CRD is a viable program area that has made significant contributions to the Cooperative Extension Service. Be aggressive in your program efforts. Work through other program areas to build your audiences. Document your program accomplishments, and make your administrators proud at all times.

SPEECH by:
Mortimer H. Neufville, Dean
SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
University of Maryland Eastern Shore
Princess Anne, MD 21853

10/9/83

Birmingham, Alabama
"Accountability and Evaluation: Impacts of 1890 Community Resource Development Programming"

By
Claude Bennett
PDEMS
ES-USDA

I. Introduction and Overview

A. Functioning in the Accountability Era*

- Increasing competition for Public Funds
- Public officials forced to make hard choices
- Basic information about likely costs and benefits of programs is needed increasingly.

B. Evaluation Studies in Achieving Accountability

- Public officials are demanding better, (broader scoped, more accurate, relevant) information about programs.
- They want to know what is happening and why, and the good and not-so-good aspects of our programs. And what is being done to improve effectiveness. Being accountable is being willing to identify problems and limitations, to do communicate intentions better.

C. Objectives of this Presentation

1. Identify some of the types of accountability questions which are addressed to extension.
2. Describe the nature of evaluative studies needed for extension to achieve accountability.
3. Discuss special requirements for evaluative studies of community resource development in achieving accountability.
4. Suggest extension management policy which is generally needed to produce evaluative studies.

*Notes for Presentation to the 2nd Annual 1890 Community Resource Development Leader Workshop
Oct. 9, 1983
Birmingham, Alabama
II. Some Types of Accountability Questions Addressed to Extension

A. Extent of Unmet Needs, and Extensions' Capacity to Deal With These Needs Relative to Programs of Other Public and Private Organizations

1. How do we determine our program goals?
2. Do our programs duplicate the services of other agencies?
3. Can we demonstrate that the cited problem can be reduced or best reduced through education?

B. Justification of Extensions' Resource Allocations Relative to Identified Needs and Program Goals

1. How do we assign priorities in funding to meet different extension objectives?
2. How do we select program staff and educational strategy?

C. Description of the Actual Role of Extension in Helping Clientele to Learn to Solve Their Problems

1. In what learning activities do we engage clientele?
2. How do we cooperate with other agencies in helping clientele reach their objectives?
3. What is the cost-effectiveness of our modes of information delivery and educational methodology?

D. Description and Evaluation of the Program Products or Results

1. What differences have our programs made regarding clientele economic, social or environmental benefits?
2. Do our programs have the desired effect?
3. Are our programs cost efficient and cost-effective?
III. The Nature of Evaluative Studies Needed for Extension to Achieve Accountability

A. Expectations of the Extension Accountability and Evaluation System

1. Each State CES is expected to design and conduct four to six "impact studies" to address state and local accountability needs.

2. These are to be technically valid in-depth studies to assess:
   - Economic or social consequences of selected programs
   - Other aspects of extension programs including inputs and processes

3. The 1984-87 POW requests that, for each in-depth study proposed, there be provided information on the study's: (A) justification; (B) objectives; (C) resources involved, and; (D) procedures to be used.

B. Identification of Some In-depth Studies in the Southern Region Including Those By or Involving 1890 Institutions

Some Proposed In-depth Studies on CRD

Alabama (1) Business and Economic Development (1862)

(2) Effects of Home-Based Businesses on Net Incomes of Low-Income and/or Unemployed Families (1890)

Arkansas (3) Development and Evaluation of an Arkansas Agricultural and Rural Leadership Development Program

Florida (4) Leadership Development

Georgia (5) Volunteerism

Kentucky (6) Leadership Development (Home Economics)

Louisiana (7) Business Financial Planning and Management

(8) Leadership Effectiveness in Extension Work
IV. Special Requirements For Evaluative Studies of CRD in Achieving Accountability

A. Levels of Evidence Model

1. The chain of events assumed within each of the three phrases in community development.

2. Community development can be evaluated both within and over all of three phases—(I) community planning; (II) organizational planning or specification and (III) implementation. Evaluation within community planning assesses the extent to which, and the means by which, there is selection of widely-shared objectives for improvements in working and living conditions. Evaluation within organizational specification assesses the extent to which, and the means by which, there is acceptance of organizational responsibility for reaching long-range objectives through policies, procedures, staff, and physical facilities. Evaluation within program implementation ascertains the degree to which, and the means by which, there is attainment of the ultimate aims of improving working and living conditions.

3. Methods of obtaining evidence on CRD's contribution to accomplishments in each of the stages.

   - RAP

   - Designing studies of Extension Program Results: A Resource for Program Leaders and Specialists

   - Comparison groups -- Paul Street

B. Other Approaches To Evaluation of CRD

1. Shared process evaluation system

2. Others
V. Extension Management Policy Which is Generally Needed To Produce Evaluative Studies

Each 1890 Institution Should:

A. Consider whether to have at least one formal evaluation relative to its CRD program within the 4-year planning period

B. Develop a document identifying policies regarding
   1. Indepth evaluations identified in the State POW
   2. Other selected program evaluations involving both campus and field staff
   3. County level and individual evaluations

C. Develop written procedures encouraging proposals for in-depth studies

D. Generate and distribute criteria for administrative approval of in-depth studies

E. Determine roles of Extension administrators, department chairs, specialists and county field staff relative to in-depth studies.

F. Set forth a multi-year inservice training strategy for each category of extension personnel, to increase individual and group capability in program evaluation.

   A. Continuing education opportunities: Arizona; Florida; Minnesota; North Carolina. Emphases differ by institution;

   B. People Resources: For example, Clark (Ill.); Krueger, Patton (Minnesota; Deshler (N.Y. - on leave '83-'84); other experts in program evaluation;

   C. Material Resources: M.Q. Patton's books; North Central Regional Guide; materials shared at National Workshop etcetera;

G. Focus evaluation processes, as appropriate, toward user involvement -- i.e., external orientation of studies.

H. Rely on campus academic departments as appropriate and feasible to conduct approved in-depth studies.

I. Cooperate with other 1890 and 1862 Institutions; as advisable in planning, conducting and utilizing in-depth studies.

Some Criteria for Assigning Priorities to Proposed Evaluations

A. Potential Utility of Evaluation Study
1. Clarity of identity of intended users
2. Intended users' strength of need for information
3. Intended users' openness to influence by the evaluation
4. Potential for program funding
5. Potential for program improvement
6. Potential for policy development
7. Risks in not evaluating formally

B. Feasibility of Evaluation Study
1. Cost in staff time and dollars
2. Cost relative to anticipated value
3. Logistical and phasing ease
4. Evaluability of the program
5. Willingness and ability of evaluators and participants
6. Length of time period to completion
7. Risk of lessening human dignity or positive human relations
8. Probability of obtaining defensible findings, conclusions and identified alternatives
9. Probability of objective reporting of findings and conclusions.
AN 1890 CRD NETWORK

Winfrey S. Clarke

In today's society of accountability and more competition for the tax dollar, Extension in general and CRD in particular need to find innovative ways by which they can effectively account for and evaluate their impact on people. In addition, ways need to be determined to use mass resources at the local, state, and regional levels.

At most of the 1890 institutions, CRD leaders and/or specialists number no more than one or two individuals. A number of these have other responsibilities in addition to CRD. Given this notion, it becomes paramount that 1890 CRD leaders pool their limited resources, when appropriate, to maximize their efforts. This can be done by forming functional networks. A functional network will provide an opportunity for 1890 extension educators and researchers (in conjunction with 1862 when appropriate) with similar interests to pool limited resources for greater program efficiency and effectiveness. A network needs to have both extension and research personnel as members, and will provide participants with opportunities for:

- interaction with colleagues and other experts in both extension and research programs

- regional recognition

- publications

- consulting on region-wide problems making a definite contribution to rural development in the South.

At the initial 1890 CRD leaders workshop in Atlanta, Georgia in September 1982, four areas of regional concern were prioritized. These were leadership development, land loss, block grant implementation and small business management. The program for this workshop (1983) in the next day or so will give
a lot of attention to leadership development and land loss. It's now time to begin to determine substantive strategies to develop and implement a functional network to address these concerns.

While many have been working independently on some of these concerns for a long time, it is time to pool efforts. Therefore, some functional network tasks might be:

— the synthesis of pertinent 1890 extension programs for dissemination

— giving attention to areas or sub-areas of high priority of regional significance

— developing and implementing regional workshop(s) and/or training session(s) for program updates and/or newly developed programs.

By the time this workshop is completed, hopefully, networks will have been formed and specific individuals identifying tasks and responsibilities with timetables for completion. By doing this, quality and useful documents can be developed to aid CRD efforts and to help legitimize this group meeting in the future.
THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNITY AND HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMING TO 1890 EXTENSION ORGANIZATIONS

Henry Brooks

I'm honored and delighted to address this second meeting of 1890 Community Resource Development program leaders. Please note that I did not say annual meeting. I recognize the reason I was invited to speak here this evening is related to the comments I made relative to an annual meeting of this type. Most of you who know me realize that I am not a dynamic speaker by any stretch of the imagination. However, I appreciate the opportunity to share with you my views of the importance of community and human resource development to 1890 Extension organizations.

It is also a pleasure to be in Birmingham for this occasion. My roots are tied to Alabama. Not only did I attend undergraduate and graduate school at Tuskegee, but I was born in Tuskegee and worked with the Extension Service in Bullock County, Alabama, for eight years. This is a homecoming for me.

My first order of business this evening is to congratulate you on your foresight. Just over a year ago, you met in Atlanta for the first time. I am not aware of any 1890 program area meeting on a national basis other than the 1890 CRD leaders. I want to tell you that your thinking and timing was right. If you were anticipating close scrutiny of Extension programs nationwide, again you were right.

Because of my personal experiences, I regard CRD as equal to any other program area. These experiences are linked to my first job after graduate school as an 1890 CRD specialist in Kentucky.

To put my presentation together, I used two basic documents that I am sure you are all thoroughly familiar with: Proceedings of the ECOP National CRD Program Leaders Workshop held in Atlanta, January 11-14, 1982; and Extension
in the 80's Surveys.

In the keynote address to the National CRD Leaders, Gorden Guyer, director of Michigan's Extension Service, made several points I consider of utmost importance. He stated that, "Extension administrators have difficulty understanding CRD due to shifting constituency and changing program efforts." He also said that many administrators have trouble seeing how CRD priorities meet the needs of constituency and suggested that CRD deal with concise priority issues and determine how these issues fit both within the mission of Extension and the external needs of Extension. Considering what Dr. Guyer was saying, you can understand why we are here in Birmingham and why the planning committee asked me to address this topic.

Dr. W.E. Lavery, president of VPI, said at the same meeting that in spite of the fact that CRD programming efforts are rooted in the Smith-Lever Act of 1914, "CRD is still the new kid on the block."

In the Executive Summary of the Extension in the 80's Surveys, one of the specific findings indicated that "the Cooperative Extension Service should place first priority on agricultural production and marketing, second priority on 4-H and youth, third priority on home economics, nutrition and family concerns, and the fourth priority on community and economic development and natural and environmental resources." Extension staff and selected public leaders agreed on these rankings of program areas. It was also interesting to note that even though Extension staff from various program areas tended to rank their own program area as highest priority, they ranked agriculture as the next highest priority after their own program area. This suggested a general agreement that agriculture should receive high priority within the Cooperative Extension Service.

Each of the program areas received varying amounts of support from certain
non-Extension groups. Community and economic development programs received the most support from the following groups:

1. Persons not familiar with Extension,
2. State agency administrators,
3. Federal agency administrators,
4. Political organization executives,
5. Civil service organization executives,
6. Persons from counties with populations of 400,000 or more, and
7. Organization executives as a whole.

In addition to setting priorities between program areas, Extension staff and public leaders suggested high priority subjects within program areas. They are:

1. Economic development,
2. Problem solving skills, and

At the meeting in Atlanta last year, there was a lengthy discussion on CRD in the 80's Task Force Report. The 1890 CRD leaders formally adopted the Task Force program thrusts and agreed that the 1890 CRD program emphases were inclusive.

The mission of Extension CRD programs is to provide a conscious and deliberate educational effort to strengthen the abilities of citizens to identify and resolve critical community needs and issues. In order to maintain or achieve a strong economic base, provide facilities and services and foster a process of community decisionmaking which assures citizen participation, the 1890 CRD leaders agreed to work within the framework of three national program thrusts via:

1. Economic development,
2. Local government, and
3. Natural resources.

The conference participants indicated that although they supported the primary program thrusts of the CRD in the 80's Task Force, there were some particular areas of critical concern to the 1890 universities. Those were identified as:
1. Small business management,
2. Career awareness,
3. Land loss by the black farmers,
4. Estate planning,
5. How to canvas community and government support for local initiatives,
6. Training local officials,
7. Training local leaders,
8. Rural transportation,
9. Conceptualization of the block grant philosophy,
10. Water systems,
11. How to keep people motivated,
12. Economic diversification,
13. Rural crime
14. Rural health care, and
15. The clergy and CRD.

Through the use of the Delphi Technique, these items were prioritized in the following order:

1. Leadership development,
2. Land loss by the black farmers,
3. Implementing block grants, and
4. Small business management training.

During the next several years, communities and 1890 Extension programs will likely continue to be concerned with some of the same issues. I would like to quote Doris Rivers from his CRD Heritage in which he said, "CRD, like other units of Extension, has made no loans or grants to communities. We have neither advocated nor determined community priorities. We have served neither as chairman nor director of community development organizations and planning boards. We have not built water systems, industrial parks, hospitals or community centers. What then has been our function and role? We have:

- Helped create or modify community organizations
- Strengthened the community decision-making process
- Outlined and helped appraise alternative courses of community action
- Assisted with the choice and effective use of outside aids
- Helped shape and implement action agendas
- Developed community leadership
- Helped people understand public issues and developmental and problem solving processes"

What is the importance of community and human resource development to the 1890 Extension organization? The answer to this question is rooted in the
importance of CRD not only to the 1890 Extension program but to the Extension program nationwide. It is well documented that Extension workers have carried out educational work, something like CRD, for more than 60 years. However, an Extension study reported that Extension workers are often not well equipped to meet community development demands. They generally have had no specific training in community resource development programming.

At the county level, while a number of Extension agents have responsibilities in CRD, the majority of the county agents doing CRD work have major responsibilities in one of the other Extension program areas. Approximately one-fourth of the total CRD program is conducted by several thousand county agents, each of whom devotes some portion of time to this program area. The majority of county agents engaged in CRD activities received their professional training in an agricultural science or home economics discipline.

These CRD staffing patterns are expected to continue in the decade of the 80's. At the county level, the majority of staff members doing CRD work will continue to have major Extension responsibilities and academic training in areas other than CRD. However, as local leaders and officials are called upon to exercise greater initiative and responsibility, demands will grow for Extension assistance in dealing with community needs and issues. Furthermore, since community needs and issues are related to all areas of Extension work, there will be increasing overlaps between the private and public or community aspects of problems encountered by farms, firms, families and youth.

For these reasons, problems addressed by Extension staffs in the 80's will increasingly require competencies central to the knowledge base of CRD (i.e., identification of public problems, leadership and group process skills, group analysis of issues, alternatives and consequences) and will require increased understanding of public policy issues in the priority thrust areas
of economic development, local government and organizations, and natural resources policy. Few staff members will have received formal training in these concepts before joining Extension. A major in-service education program focusing on these concepts for all Extension staff will be necessary in the 80's, to improve the effectiveness of the total Extension program and to increase the opportunities for staff to address community needs and issues.

As more Extension agents become actively involved in community issues, CRD must strengthen its ties with and support to other Extension program areas through joint programming.

According to "A People and a Spirit," a report of the joint USDA-NASULGC Extension Study Committee published in 1968, community development needs three types of personnel: a generalist residing in the local community, state Extension specialists at the university, and part-time consultative help from specific disciplines.

The generalists in community and institutional development who reside in the community can relate to the people on a continuing basis. In effect, they should be to the community what the traditional county agent has been to farmers. These generalists must be backstopped by experts at the university, just as county agents are backstopped by specialists. They also need to be able to call on resource people from practically every university discipline. Expertise from some disciplines may be needed only half a dozen times a year, but it may be crucial at those times. The consultant or part-time specialist can meet demands of this nature. Expanded resources will be required if Extension fully meets public needs in community resource development.

The CRD program represents about 8.3 percent of Extension's total program effort and budget. All Extension employees share the responsibility for carrying out community programs. CRD specialists and agents account for more
than half the total staff time devoted to this program area. The remaining 40-50 percent of the staff inputs are made by workers whose major assignment is in agriculture, home economics, or 4-H and youth programs, but who do some work on community problems, too.

This is vividly clear if you look at the number of county CRD agents in the United States compared to other program areas. The 1982 figures indicated that there were 376 county CRD agents, which represents 3.6 percent of the total county Extension agents. This number does not include area agents.

Earlier, I alluded to the fact that expanded resources will be required if Extension fully meets public needs in CRD. As I see it, in the years ahead Extension CRD will increasingly tap the expertise and program delivery capability in other community, state, and USDA agencies and organizations to assist in both supporting delivery and providing informational support for programs.

Specific attention will be given to approaches and delivery methods which increasingly use telecommunications and computer-based data banks and analysis as program delivery tools. Also, CRD agents and specialists will increasingly use community volunteers and non-Extension professionals, both private and public, to further expand Extension program delivery capability.

Over the past 20 years, research has provided an expanding base for CRD Extension programs. In the remainder of the 80's, additional attention will be given to synthesizing and applying research to the solution of community problems.

The importance of community and human resource development to the national, state, and local communities can be summarized as significant. Extension CRD programs produce tangible results that can be measured in terms of knowledge gained and attitudes changed, citizens participating effectively in community decision-making, jobs created, incomes increased, community facilities improved and community services provided.
A 1980 study of 74 Extension economic development projects indicated large gains to communities. While credit for results was widespread, Extension education provided key information, linkage to resources, and opportunities for leadership development. Over the five to ten year life of these projects, 50 industrial parks were established, 56 development corporations were created, 609 firms began or expanded production, $477 million of new investments were made, and 20,233 jobs were created or saved.

A 1979 national study of 52 community development projects in 28 states examined program results. Fourteen projects resulted in increased income through new or improved firms, five created new jobs, and 15 had an impact on agricultural incomes through increased production or improved marketing opportunities.

In view of those significant contributions to society and according to a subcommittee's task force on CRD in the 80's, Extension CRD must focus its program direction to assure attention to priority community needs as defined by local citizens. However, while demands for educational help will be increasing, indications are that the current staff resource base will not expand significantly. The evolving forces affecting CRD programs in the 80's will force a new determination among CRD staff while also rekindling conscious productivity improvement efforts. Some changes will be made within CRD to increase program effectiveness. They include:

1. The synthesizing of CRD research base,
2. Development of relevant computer data information and increasing use of telecommunications technology,
3. Multiple-state program material development,
4. Intense comprehensive CRD in-service training programs for all Extension staff conducting CRD programs,
5. Increased attention to evaluating CRD program efforts,
6. Joint programming activities with other Extension programs,
7. Active partnerships with other agencies and organizations at the national, state, and local levels, and
8. Increased expanding of regional and national networks of Extension specialists.
Extension CRD programs have gained acceptance and our clientele await more comprehensive and effective programs in the 80's and beyond. Each state will need to continue to build its CRD programs on the basis of their particular situation. Whatever your involvement may be in implementing your state's CRD program, whether it be community facilities and services, economic development or leadership development, tangible impact results should be evident, especially for the politicians, funding agencies, university administrators and the local community.

In closing, let me emphasize the importance of keeping our CRD programs dynamic and flexible to meet the changing needs of those we are designed to serve. We will continue to be successful to the extent that we:

1. Involve those who should benefit in the process of determining program priorities,
2. Utilize effectively the vast knowledge centers available to us as the primary basis for our educational programs, and
3. Continue our participation in professional improvement opportunities to keep us current, knowledgeable and effective in meeting changing needs.

I do want to express my appreciation to the states that responded to my request for information related to their CRD programs. The planning committee should be commended for the design and quality of this conference and you have demonstrated well your desire and commitment to meet the CRD challenges of today and tomorrow.

Thank you.
COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT IN THE 80'S: 
PRESENT PROSPECTS AND FUTURE IMPLICATIONS 

Curtis E. Gear Jr. 
University of Wisconsin-Madison 

I am pleased that you invited me to participate in your program. I welcome this opportunity to interact with my colleagues whom I believe are truly on the cutting edge of community development in the 1980's. I also believe that you have taken a giant step in establishing these annual workshops to permit regular dialogue among yourselves about what you are doing in community development and where you want to go programmatically. 

In the time I have allotted, I want to develop four interrelated points with you. These are:

1) Review the CRD position in Cooperative Extension 
2) Reflect with you on the present CRD situation in 1890 
3) Review emerging needs and issues in CRD relative to Cooperative Extension, and 
4) Focus on a few critical CRD needs and issues faced by 1890 institutions

Many of you were with me at the 1982 CRD Program Leaders Workshop in Atlanta. If for no other reason, you will recall that conference as one that was impacted by the "great snow storm." Three inches of snow and sheets of ice crippled the Atlanta metropolis. Coming from an area where snow is not uncommon, that is our tradition, I will be able to tell my grandchildren. 

The significance of Atlanta was that it represented the mid-point in our collective efforts to clarify and understand the focus and direction for CRD in the 80's. There was a great need within our institutions for this kind of effort. Now that we have done it, there is equal need for our continued awareness and communication about our respective CRD priority program THRUST and EMPHASIS. These two words are highlighted not to add
confusion, but hopefully to improve our communications.

THRUST represents the macro CRD program goals. In the ECOP, Program Directions for the 80's: Extension Community Resources Development, we concluded, based on the broadest possible input, that however local program activities are labeled, CRD is concerned about three major goals. These are:

1) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

2) LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND ORGANIZATIONAL IMPROVEMENT

3) NATURAL RESOURCES POLICY EDUCATION

Thus, these three represent the critical thrust for CRD in the 80's.

All of us, from state to state, are involved in any number of program emphases. We engage in many activities to help people in communities develop their knowledge, aspirations, skills and aptitudes to tackle their own economic health, improve local government and organizational operations, and understand, as well as influence public policy. One problem we have, however, in understanding each other and in others understanding what we are collectively about, is that we frequently label the same program emphasis or activity, differently. Given the new ES Evaluation and Accountability system, we have yet another opportunity to feed to the uncertainties of those who do not understand or do not want to understand community development. Here we are asked, as part of the POW, to identify "major projects."* You can see how it is possible to label major projects differently from county to county or state to state, while in actuality being concerned about the same overall objectives.

I submit that if we can keep in mind our overall educational objectives or goals (economic, local government/organization, policy education), we can communicate effectively with each other and others within our institu-

*How do you define that? At what level do we pick the topic for our major project?
tional framework. It simply takes a little effort to relate a given program emphasis to the overall thrust.

Let's now examine the CRD situation in the 1890 institutions. I am pleased that you all have done your homework. As a part of the CRD in the 80's process last year you looked at the proposed thrust and identified those emphases that are the greatest concern to the audiences served by the 1890 institutions.

My review of your work suggests that you used your own terms to describe those things that are of priority concern to you. I understand that you identified 15 critical topics and prioritized four of these. However, I believe that what you did and what I am talking about are quite compatible.

Here is what I mean. I understand the CRD program priorities identified for the 1890 audiences are:

1) Leadership development
2) Land loss
3) Block grants
4) Small business management training

I found it interesting to push that breakdown just a little further.

I believe that what you are about in leadership development is important and represents the foundation on which community development is carried out. Another way to look at leadership development is to see all the educational and other activities you undertake to achieve leadership development as permeating community development. Several years ago when we called this "capacity building" we came to understand clearly what we were trying to achieve.

I think that the land loss concern presents an interesting point that we need to recognize in this discussion — few emphases fit exclusively into
any one thrust. In order for any of this thinking about community development to make sense, we have to consider our major goal at a given point in the development process. Translated, I believe that the major goal that drives the present concern with land loss is economic.* Thus, I believe your emphasis on land loss is a critical priority that can be identified as part of the economic development program thrust. Further, as I examined some of the other needs and issues you listed, I see other economic development emphases. These are:

1) Career awareness
2) Estate planning
3) Economic diversification

By the same token, the small business management training priority emphasis is clearly economic development. Even further, although I am not certain, I believe your block grant emphasis could fit this thrust. Is your objective to help the local community access the economic where-with-all to implement specific projects?

On the other hand, you might want to look at the block emphasis as part of the local government thrust. This would apply if your objective is to help your communities improve their government efficiency by understanding how to effectively go about competing for these grants. In the final analysis you will have to determine where the block grant emphasis fits. Also, I do not feel we should be rigid about any of the "fits." The importance is that we do our best to show we are within a commonly understood program stream.

Let me wrap this up quickly. I initially saw your emphasis on rural crime and health care as related to the local government thrust. On further

*Participant comments pointed to the policy aspects of land loss. This should reinforce recognition that land loss is a problem that can be tackled through multiple program emphases.
reflection though, I see these emphases again as ones that demonstrate their "fit" depending upon what the major goal happens to be. I initially tied the topics to government because they both relate to improved community services and facilities. However, when I turned crime and health over I easily saw the private sector dimension in these emphases. This alerted me to remember that the private sector can also contribute to improved community services and facilities.

Finally, your emphasis dealing with the clergy and CRD and the one dealing with motivation, I believe are part of the leadership development or "capacity building" process so important to community development. I saw water systems as a potential public policy question. However, as I explored your concern more deeply, it seems again you are concerned about helping communities obtain a new service or facility. Thus, you are trying to help improve government.

So, where does all of the lead? I believe this approach as reflected by the CRD in the 80's document helps to clarify what we are about. Even though there are few exclusive fits of program emphases to the three CRD program thrusts, it is important that we have a workable framework. The CRD in the 80's framework is not intended to dictate your local program priorities. Rather, it is a very conscious effort to facilitate the application of locally determined needs to an overall set of understood CRD program goals. We believe that this framework will help relate 1890 to 1862 CRD programs from state to state. In so doing it can also help us relate more effectively to each other and our respective administrators. But what about the real world concerns we must be prepared to address? Of course there are many real world concerns at a variety of levels. At the annual Community Development Society meeting in Guelph, Ontario, both the American
and Canadian keynote speakers emphasized that community developers cannot hide from the ever present menace of a nuclear holocaust. This is an important issue that we should not forget as professionals. At the same time, we must recognize that much of our audience is more concerned about here and now "bread and butter" issues. The 1890 institutions are at the heart of these types of issues — JOBS, JOBS, AND MORE JOBS.

Americans are still concerned about building a stronger economic climate and particularly improving their local economy and personal situations. In the 1890 institutions, I believe that 100 percent of the existing resources and more could be devoted to economic development alone. Yet there are other issues needing attention. In many parts of the U.S. water quality and quantity questions are of vital concern. Energy costs are rising. Small farmers need considerably more help to improve their production, management and marketing capabilities. Internal to CES we need to improve the training opportunities for staff to expand their knowledge and skills to more effectively work with groups of people in tackling community needs and issues, while you and I could identify even more needs and issues. I am not sure that would serve any constructive purpose. There is, however, one emerging need that I believe will be affecting all of us the rest of our personal and professional lives. I feel compelled to challenge and support your achievement of computer literacy.

Nothing since Eli Whitney's cotton gin has or is likely to have as much impact on the way we work, live, play and maybe even die, as the computer revolution. Many of us are "old hounds" and we know it's hard to teach an old dog new tricks. This one we have to master though! I am happy to see that you are beginning to tackle it and that you already have the topic on this year's program.
In closing I will simply say that if all of Cooperative Extension does not integrate the computer as a tool into its educational delivery system, adult education and the land-grant system may easily give way to the private sector as a viable resource for information. In that event, I would be most concerned and unsure about what would happen to underserved adults now reached by the 1890 institutions.
CRD IN THE '80s

IMPLICATIONS FOR 1890 UNIVERSITIES


2. Amplification of our individual priority program thrusts.

   Identification of local community's needs and fitting these local community needs within the framework of the priority thrusts identified in the CRD in '80s document.

3. Concentrating our efforts on specific goals so as to eliminate confusion and prevent the label of doing everything without specific focus.

   Identify overall goals.

4. Analysis of our program priorities. Set goals for these priorities and fit these goals and priorities into the program thrusts identified in the CRD in the '80s document.

5. Computer literacy is a must for the '80s. If we want to be competitive, we have to plan a course of action.
Good Morning!...Thank you Charles for the fine introduction!!!

Let me start by reviewing with you some historical perspectives leading to this second annual conference and our minority land loss topic for this conference.

First, let's review the intent of the congressional legislation of the 1970's regarding the Cooperative Extension Program of the 1890 Land-Grant Institutions. It is my belief that the major purpose of this legislation was to enable the Cooperative Extension Service of the Land-Grant Universities in the sixteen southern States and Tuskegee Institute to improve their outreach capabilities in reaching minorities, limited resource and new audiences. One of the methods I believe we could use to accomplish this intent in the CRD Extension program area is to have a forum where 1890 CRD Extension faculty could share program activities, ideas, and do some networking.

At the Community Development Society (CDS) conference in Blacksburg, Virginia in the early seventies I spoke to a number of you that were attending that conference about establishing a forum through which we could share program activities, ideas, and do some networking. We have explored over the years since then the concepts of using the Community Development Society (CDS), the National Public Policy Education Committee (NPPEC), the 1890 Administrators meeting and a conference of our own as the forum through which to accomplish our networking. As you now know, last year we found the resources and support to hold our first 1890 CRD Program Leaders Workshop. This year we are continuing
that effort with this conference in sharing programming regarding
(1) land use, (2) leadership development, and (3) computer
training.

The objectives of our efforts during this presentation will
be four fold. Our first objective will be to get a motion from
this group asking our administrators to support this conference as
an annual affair. Our second objective will be to get your inputs
in helping us to continue our programming efforts with the NPPEC
regarding land use issues and policy education approaches. A
number of us who participate in the NPPEC Annual Conference
were able to develop a program about landownership issues and
policy education approaches dealing with general landownership and
Black landownership issues. That program was presented at the
After that program Joe Brooks, Dick Barrows, John Clark, Clyde
Chesney, David Gandy, Randolph Halsey, and I had a discussion
about other landownership issues and policy education approaches
that would be of interest to the participants of the NPPEC
Conference. A proposal for getting those issues discussed on the
1984 NPPEC Annual Conference program was developed. Here is our
tentative proposal to the NPPEC to continue discussion of landownership
issues and policy education approaches at the 1984 NPPEC Annual
Meeting. Please read the proposal and write your inputs to it on
the space provided on the back of the proposal, and return it to me.

Our third objective will be to get a motion from this group
asking our administrators to support the Regional Landownership
Information Project (LIP) with leadership coming from the North
Carolina A&T University Cooperative Extension Program. The
fourth objective is to get a motion from you acting on Joe Brooks recommendations.

We will use a panel format with questions from you to accomplish our objectives. James Edwards from Florida A&M University will review with us the land use issue, Clyde Chesney from North Carolina State University will review the LIP, Emery Rann from North Carolina A&T University will review the Regional LIP Proposal. We will then take our coffee break. After the coffee break Joe Brooks, President of the Emergency Land Fund will tell us what's happening on the "Hill" regarding the land use issue and his programming recommendations for our cooperative efforts regarding that issue.

(Presentation by the panelist followed, all objectives were accomplished during the luncheon that day).

Presented at the 2nd Annual 1890 Program Leaders Workshop, October 9-10, 1983, Birmingham Hilton, Birmingham, Alabama, by Dr. Louis C. Thaxton.
Proposal To National Public Policy Education (NPPEC) Committee To Continue Discussion Of "Landownership Issues & Policy Education Approaches" At The 1984 NPPEC Annual Meeting

Dick Barrows, Dave Gandy, John Clark, Joe Brooks, Clyde Chesney, Randolph Halsey, and I discussed the above mentioned topic at the 1983 NPPEC Annual Meeting. We developed the following "game plan".

I. The title of the general session will be "Landownership Issues and Policy Education Approaches".

II. We propose that the following subjects be discussed during the general session:

A. The adverse effects of agriculture policy and/or legislation on small farmers and owners of small parcels of land.

B. Alternative management strategies for the utilization of small parcels of land.

1. Heir's property
2. Small farms, et cetera

C. Barriers to markets, land, capital, legal knowledge, public agencies and services, et cetera for small farmers and/or owners of small parcels of land.

III. We would like the presenters to recommend Extension programming, policy and/or legislation changes, deletions, additions, et cetera that they believe would lead to solving the problem.

We would like your input to this proposal. Please send me (1) the names, telephone number, addresses, and a short biography of persons you believe could and would speak on the subjects proposed and (2) programming ideas for presenting the "landownership issues and policy education approaches" topic at the 1984 NPPEC Annual Conference. I would like your input on or before October 17, 1983. I will consolidate your inputs into a working draft proposal and send it to our planning committee. Hopefully, I will be able to send a proposal to the NPPEC by November 4, 1983.

(OVER)
YOUR INPUT

Presented at the 2nd Annual 1890 CRD Program Leaders Workshop.
October 9-10, 1983, Hilton Inn, Birmingham, Alabama. Louis C.
Thaxton
RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the 1890 universities have been resolute in their commitment to serve limited resource audiences in rural communities; and

WHEREAS the Extension Program and, in particular, the CRD/PA Program area is committed to the development and implementation of educational programs to alleviate the loss of land by black landowners; in view, therefore, of the Task Force Report on the land loss by black farmers in America to the Secretary of Agriculture, be it

RESOLVED that: The 1890 CRD/PA program leaders participate with their Extension Administrators in the development of a response on the universities' involvement in the analysis and implementation of the recommendations of the Task Force to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Be it also RESOLVED that these responses be forwarded by the 1890 Extension Administrators to their respective presidents or chancellors to be considered as input into the president's and chancellor's report to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The 1890 CRD program leaders also recommend the formation of a task force by the chancellors and presidents to develop strategies to influence the legislative process so that the problem of land loss by blacks can be effectively addressed, and increasing the black professionals in agriculture can become a reality.

Adopted at the Second Annual 1890 Community Development Program Leaders Workshop

Motion by Mort Neufville and seconded by H. Randy Halsey 10/17/83
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STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In 1940, according to the agriculture census, there were 680,000 black farm operators who either owned or leased 12 million acres of land. The Census of Agriculture for 1974 revealed that the number of black farm operators had been reduced to a mere 53,919 with control or access to only 3.5 million acres. The current estimated annual loss of black farm land in now at 500,000 acres, the equivalent of 200 million dollars of real wealth.

It is important to note that the Census of Agriculture only includes those farm operators that reported at least $1,000 in gross annual sales. Accordingly, there is another group of black landowners that we know very little about because their land is not producing an income of at least $1,000, and apparently suffer from the government's census count policy of "out of sight, out of mind." The Emergency Land Fund (ELF) recently completed a study, contracted by the Farmers Home Administration, entitled "The Impact of Heir Property on Black Rural Land Tenure in the Southeastern Region of the United States." Through field research and the construction of a representative stratified sample, ELF determined in its study that blacks owner or leased, in 1974, 9.5 million acres with as many as 1.6 million individual black owners. If ELF is even close in its estimates, then over two-thirds of the black farm land base, some 6 million acres, receive no policy attention, and most certainly none of the program resources available through public supported agricultural institutions. ELF data on this six million acres of black owned land conclude that the land is often idle, with absentee ownership
in many cases, occupied by elderly individuals who are on welfare or some form of public assistance, who in many cases cannot read or write, encumbered with clouded titles, more regularly loss in tax, partition and foreclosure sales, and prey to land speculators.

Because of the change in definition of what constitutes a farm for census purposes, some 14% of all black farms, containing 8% of all reported land held by blacks was excluded: While the change may seem small, an interesting picture is obtained by looking at the percentage of those excluded operators reporting farming as their major occupation and those who reported no off-farm work. While no income data is available for this group, 'because of the exclusion factor,' those who regard themselves principally as farmers and those with no off-farm work may well be considered farmers in some respects, even if the enterprises are of a small scale. Equally important is the factor of racial discrimination in the off-farm employment market, thus, underscoring the importance of black landownership as a principle means of income.

According to the 1974 census, compared to the United States' average farm, the average black farmer is clearly economically worse off. The average black farm contains only 87 acres, one-fifth the size of all U.S. farms, and smaller than any other minority group (American Indian, Hispanics and Orientals). The average value of sales on black farms is only 20% of the U.S. average and less than half as large as the average sales of other minority groups.

Almost two-thirds of all black farms had sales under $2,500 and 94% had less than $20,000 of sales. Both of these percentages are higher than any other minority. Only black farmers are significantly older than the average U.S. farmer. In addition, not only is the percentage of blacks reporting
debt lower than for any other minority, but only for blacks is the percentage less than the national average. These characteristics are reflected in the low farm and farm-related incomes, less than half the national average and lower than other minorities except American Indians, where much higher off-farm income was reported.

In only two respects do black farms appear better off. First, the value of land and building per acre is higher than the U.S. average and second among minorities to Orientals. Secondly, the net farm and farm-related income earned per dollar value of land and buildings is almost 15%, a return which is higher than the U.S. average of 9% and exceeded only by Orientals. While these statistics seem to indicate blacks fare well with the resources they have, it also suggests that their limited resources constitutes a major handicap to increased incomes.

The causes of black land loss are many and include voluntary sales, lack of farm purchase and operating capital, lack of land utilization information and technical assistance, and access to markets. There are also a host of legal, financial and discrimination problems that are contributing to the accelerating loss of black land. Often these problems involve both public and private lending institutions, courts, legal representation and land speculators. Additionally, black landowners generally lack knowledge and awareness of alternative sources of credit, particularly the various federal government loan and technical assistance programs and how to apply for them, and they usually are unable to discern and protect themselves against discriminating or illegal credit practices. Similarly, it has been revealed that black landowners lack functional knowledge about basic rights and
opportunities which can help maximize earnings and promote the growth of small farm and other business opportunities.

Additionally, the average black farm operator has much lower total income and farm-related income than the average farmer. Moreover, a larger number of black operators had sales of less than $2,500 and were thus omitted from the income data. A larger percentage were affected by the 1974 change in the definition of a farm and are no longer even counted as farm operators.

Despite the low farm income and high concentration of black farms in the groups with sales less than $20,000, the typical black operator appears to be heavily dependent on farm and farm-related income. The proportion of black operators reporting off-farm income is lower than for all operators, and lower than expected. While 95% of all black farms in the South had sales of $20,000 or more, off-farm income represented only 1/3 of the total income for the average black operator, compared to 2/3 for all U.S. farms with sales under $20,000. In addition, southern blacks are more likely to report farming as their major occupation and less likely to report working as many as 100 days off the farm, which also suggests a greater dependence on farm income.

Compared with their southern counterparts, black farmers in the North Central more nearly resemble the typical profile of a small farmer: low farm income together with significant off-farm employment. Fewer blacks in the North Central report farming as their principal occupation and relatively more work 100 or more days off the farm. Blacks in the North Central have higher total incomes and higher farm and farm-related incomes than blacks in the South. Compared to the average farm, however, blacks are equally disadvantaged in both the South and North Central regions.
In the South, the typical black farm is engaged in different enterprises than the average farm. Blacks are overall more dependent on crop sales and less dependent on livestock and poultry. In none of the states where poultry constitutes a significant fraction of gross sales for all farms was it important for blacks. Among crops, tobacco appears to be much more significant for blacks than all farms.

Blacks are more heavily concentrated in full owner and tenant categories than all farms, although the importance of tenant farming has declined dramatically. Fewer blacks are part owners, the category where the most successful farms tend to be.

The average black farmer is older than the average farmer, in some states by as much as six years. One-third of all black operators are age 65 or older, compared with only 1/5 of all farmers. Considerably fewer blacks are in the younger age brackets.

The average black farm has a lower debt burden than the average farm. While age may be a factor the debt is lower than expected even when age, tenure, and other characteristics are considered. Whether this reflects risk aversion, less access to credit, or limited expansion opportunities is not clear.

While each of the above are generally true for all areas where black farms exist in significant numbers--and especially in the South--there is some variation of the relative status of blacks across the ten southern states which contain over 90% of all black farms. Blacks are most disadvantaged in terms of relative farm incomes in Arkansas, Louisiana, South Carolina, Mississippi and Texas. Moreover, three of the states where blacks
have a smaller relative disadvantage—Alabama, Tennessee and Virginia—are states where the average farm income for blacks is very low in absolute terms.

Between 1969 and 1974, the number of black farms decreased by 40% while land in black farms in 1974 was 2 1/2 million acres less than in 1969, a drop of 35%. Moreover, the number of black farms fell much faster than the number of all farms in each tenure class and in each sales class with sales under $10,000. Despite the loss of nearly half of all black farms with sales under $5,000, it does not appear that blacks have made much of an improvement in economic status relative to all farms. As measured by relative incomes, relative returns to assets, and the index of integration, the relative status of black farms has made a marginal improvement in a few states, but has worsened in others.

The major explanation for the low farm income of black operators appears to be limited resources, principally land. The value of land and buildings per acre and the value of total assets per acre are both typically greater for black farms. By two measures of efficiency—net farm and farm-related income per acre and per dollar of assets—black farms are of equal or greater efficiency. However, overall as well as in each tenure class, the average size of black farms in acres is considerably smaller than for all farms. While black operators appear to do well with the resources they control, the small quantity of resources controlled places a serious upper limit on farm incomes.

While limited farm resources limit farm incomes, there is some reason to question the general availability or suitability of non-farm employment as an alternative. Explanations for the fact that blacks report less off
farm work and less dependence on off-farm income could include personal preference for farm work and farm income; personal handicaps, such as age or lack of significant off-farm skills and experience; or the fact that much of the recent industrial growth in the non-metropolitan South has been outside the areas with heavy concentrations of blacks. The extent to which these possibilities explain the differences is not clear.

Finally, the relatively advanced age of black operators, the greater concentrations in full owner farms, and the small size of farm assets controlled by blacks are all obviously contributing factors to the lower incomes of black farms. Each of these also raise some serious questions about the long run survival rate of black farms and suggest the equity base of blacks in the rural South will likely continue to fall. However, each of these factors also raise many unanswered questions: Why is the average age of black operators so high? Why are few young blacks entering farming? What will happen to black owned land if the number of black farmers continues to fall? Given that size of farm was seen as the major limit on farm incomes, what is the relative importance of age, low wealth, and lack of access to land and credit in explaining the small size of black farms? Why are so many black farmers full owners when the trend is for expansion through renting or leasing of additional land?

These then are the problems that ELF, and now its sister organization the National Association of Landowners (NAL), have been addressing for over a decade. The demand for land is increasing, and in the Southeast more agricultural land is being converted to other uses than in other regions. This is also a time of high unemployment, an energy crisis and overcrowded cities. It should be a time for a public response that advocates a balanced
landownership structure for America, thus, ensuring individual freedom and
the basis for self-reliant individuals and communities.

It can be stated without exaggeration that all successful farmers in
America have become successful, in part, because of the policies and practices
of the U.S. Government as they relate to agricultural concerns and the
resources and programs that have flowed from the United States Department of
Agriculture benefiting the American farmer.

The programs, benefits and resources afforded U.S. farmers by the govern-
ment are immense and their availability and access plays no small role in the
achievements of all successful farmers. Most farmers are reluctant to admit
that the government plays such a large role in their success, as farmers, but
to deny such is a refusal to face facts.

What are some of these facts? Consider just four: (1) The successful
producers of certain commodities --rice, peanuts, cotton, wheat, feed, grains,
tobacco, etc.-- cannot deny the government's commodity programs (price supports,
supply management, payments as income transfers and now PIK) favorably impact
on their economic status.

(2) The largest industry in the U.S. is the agricultural industry. The
research for this industry is conducted for the most part by the U.S.D.A. and
the land grant colleges. The benefits and findings of this massive research
effort are made available to the U.S. farmer at virtually no cost.

(3) Some of the wealthiest farmers in this nation are the dairy farmers.
Yet, it is widely known that without government mandated price supports for
dairy products, a large number of these "successful" dairy farmers would not
be needed.
(4) The forestry programs, FMHA loan programs, even foreign policy programs (P.L. 480 "Food for Peace") are all designed and implemented to help the American farmer prosper and supposedly to maintain the family farm.

There are some other facts too, that relate to some of the effects of these programs:

It is a documented fact that most of the benefits of the commodity programs have gone to farm families who have incomes larger than the national average family income and almost none has gone to low-income farm families, particularly black ones, whether farm operators or hired farm workers.

The benefits and findings of most of the research are used for the most part by the most efficient and wealthiest of farmers (a class made wealthy by other government programs). It is these farmers who reap the initial rewards of governmental paid for research because it is they who implement it first. It should come as no small surprise that the information delivery system serves larger income farmers far better than it does smaller income ones.

The dairy price support program subsidizes inefficiency, keeps prices high for the consumer, causes more dairy producers to exist than are needed to meet demand, makes several dairy farmers wealthy at a terribly high cost to the American consumer and last, but not least, aids or assists no low-income farmers and at last count, only two black farmers.

In short, what these programs in reality do is to afford an opportunity for a subsidized existence in farming to established farmers or persons with substantial resources who want to become successful farmers. They do virtually nothing for low income farmers or black farmers.
And this brings us to the question at hand: Given the facts that: (1) success in agricultural production is to a great extent dependent on being a beneficiary of certain agricultural programs and that (2) most low income farm families do not benefit from agricultural programs and that (3) most black farm families are low income families; is it any wonder that black farmers, black farms and black owned land are rapidly declining?

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

The Emergency Land Fund is proposing that the U.S.D.A. undertake a vigorous effort to assure that black and low income farmers benefit from agricultural policy and programs.

ELF long ago realized that the loan programs of the FmHA were not serving black farmers to the extent that black farmers needed serving. As a result, of this awareness, ELF created a revolving loan fund and has made loans to farmers that would not have been made by FmHA.

The problem with our revolving loan fund is that our resources are limited and, therefore, our effort minimal at best. But even more important, it is not our responsibility to meet the needs of a certain segment of the population because the government seemingly wants to neglect them. To do such can be construed as a 'tacit' condoning of the behavior of the government. We want to expend our effort in helping the government make agricultural policy and program work for all its citizens.

The Emergency Land Fund is proposing a program in which it, in cooperation with the 1890 land grant institutions, would:

1. ascertain the current needs and problems of blacks farmers.
2. design programs and develop projects that will meet those needs.
3. create a delivery system that will assure that information related to these programs and projects is passed on to the farmers.

DETERMINING THE NEEDS

ELF and the LAND GRANT SCHOOLS will conduct a series of four surveys. The purpose of the surveys is to determine what information needs black farmers have at present.

1. AWARENESS OF CURRENT PROGRAMS

To adequately document what the existing situation is as regards agricultural programs and black farmers, the land-grant colleges and the Emergency Land Fund would conduct a survey in three counties served by each 1890 land grant school.

The survey will consist of interviewing a representative sample of black farmers (landowners) in the three counties served by the school. Each interviewee will have a list of all federal programs that have ever been used in the area. The persons being interviewed will then be asked:

(1) if they know of the programs' existence;
(2) have they ever applied for it;
   a. if not, why not
   b. if so, what were the results;
(3) if they utilized the program, did it serve them well.
II FORESTRY PRODUCTION

In 1978, whites filed 9,684 requests and minorities filed 329 requests for grants under the Forestry Incentive Program (FIP). Eighty point six percent (80.6%) of the white requests and 72.9% of the minority request were granted. When the Hispanic, American/Indian and Asian requests were deducted from the minority request, blacks had less than 1% of the total requests approved.

ELF suggests that the following query be raised: Why is there not more black owned land in tree production? It is proposed that ELF and the 1980 Land Grant Colleges conduct a three county survey in each state where large holdings of black owned idle timber land exist. The survey will be for the purpose of ascertaining:

1. The number of black owned land in the counties.
2. The number of acres suitable for tree production.
3. The actual number of acres in tree production.
4. The owner's awareness of the FIP.
5. Whether or not the owner has ever considered tree production.
6. Whether or not the owner needs assistance to get into tree production.

The survey will be a farm to farm canvas in each county and its results will be used as a basis for explaining why the black participation in forestry is as low as it is and what needs to be done to rectify the situation.

III. LIVESTOCK PRODUCTION

In two states, ELF will conduct a survey in a five county area surrounding a 1890 institution. The survey will be designed such that ELF will
be able to ascertain the number of head of beef cattle on each black landowner's farm where such beef cattle exist.

In addition, with a list of ten key questions (provided by the school) ELF will rate the management efficiency of the beef cattle operations.

1. The 1890 school will send a team of individuals to all those farms with six or more head, beginning with those farms that are the lowest on the management rating. An attempt will be made to explain recommended practices where they are not being utilized.

2. The 1890 school will also write up findings of the ELF study, indicating to what extent farmers fail to follow recommended procedures.

3. The 1890 school will monitor farms continuously and report periodically on progress made in convincing farmers to follow recommended practices.

IV. GENERAL NEEDS

ELF will conduct a survey in two counties in each 1890 school state. ELF will interview low income, marginal and small farmers in an attempt to determine what their most pressing informational needs are, as it relates to their agricultural enterprise, or farm land holdings.

ELF will indicate to the school the needs for each county. The school will design a workshop around that need and prepare relevant literature, working with the staff of ELF.

ELF will arrange conferences and recruit farmers and landowners for a workshop in each county, for an introduction to the newly developed literature.

The information and data obtained from the above surveys will serve as a basis for ELF and the 1890 Land Grant Colleges to design and recommend agricultural programs that can best serve low minority income farmers and landowners.
V. PARTITION SALES

What has been the extent of black land loss due to partition sales in selected states during the period 1975 - 1980?

ELF will survey courthouse records in selected counties of certain states and (1) list all partition sales that have taken place during the above period, (2) indicate acreage involved, (3) identify the name and race of the owners whose property was sold, and (4) the name and race of the person(s) who purchased the land.

From the list of black persons who have lost their land via partition sales in the various counties, four black former sets of owners of heir property will be selected in each of the counties. The relevant 1890 school will prepare case studies on each of these families.

Ideally, two of the families will be families wherein a family member purchased the land at the partition sale and two will be families whose land was purchased by a non-family member.

The case studies will, among other elements, contain:

1. A history of the black landownership prior to the partition sale (how it was obtained, when, by whom and the utilization thereof).
2. A family tree of the heirs at the time of the partition sale and their whereabouts.
3. Circumstances that gave rise to the partition sale.
4. Feelings of heirs regarding sale before it took place.
5. Feelings of heirs after partition sale took place.
6. Present use of land.
7. Estimated value of land at sale vs. partition sale price.
In the area surrounding the school, ELF will conduct a survey with the objective in mind of obtaining an inventory of heir property owned by blacks in each of the counties. The survey will reveal the amount of black owned heir property in the counties, its location, the heirs (a family tree), their domiciles and the land's present use.

From the listing of heir property in each county, one tract of land will be incorporated by the family members.

1. The 1890 school will develop a farm plan for the land.

2. The 1890 school, working with the family, will implement the farm plan through its extension program.

3. The school's extension program will serve as a management consultant on a continuing basis.

VI. CONCLUSION

Assuming that the above recommendations are implemented, the extension services of the 1890 schools involved will work with ELF on the design and implementation of a permanent delivery and information system that will be cooperatively maintained by the 1890 schools and ELF.
APPENDICES
WHEREAS, the continuing loss of ownership and control of agricultural land by Black Americans has reduced their ability to achieve economic viability and financial independence, and

WHEREAS, this loss has been accelerated by the Black landowner's lack of access to capital, technical information and legal resources needed to retain and develop agricultural land holdings into stable, income-producing and self-sustaining operations, and

WHEREAS, land development promotes community stabilization, creates opportunities for profitable investments and benefits local and national economies by strengthening the economic independence of farmers and creating profitable markets for goods and services.

NOW, THEREFORE, by the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution of the United States of America, in order to assist Blacks to retain ownership of agricultural land, to reverse the loss of such land which is presently occurring at the rate of 500,000 acres per year, to overcome the effects of discriminatory treatment and lack of access to information which has led to such loss, and to stimulate private sector initiatives and policies to insure that black ownership of agricultural land, now estimated at 9 million acres with a current worth of $10 billion, will remain as the community's most valuable financial asset. It is hereby ordered as follows:
Section 1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall supervise annually the development of a Federal program designed to decrease the loss of ownership of agricultural land by Black Americans; to assist Black Americans to acquire such land or to expand present holdings; and to achieve a significant increase in the participation of Black American owners of agricultural land in appropriated Federally sponsored programs. The Secretary's program shall (a) seek to identify, reduce and eliminate barriers which may have unfairly resulted in reduced participation in, and reduced benefits from, Federally sponsored programs, (b) provide technical assistance to Black Americans who seek to develop or upgrade land for agricultural purposes, (c) identify Black Americans who may wish to acquire land for agricultural purposes and to target appropriate existing Federal programs to assist in such acquisition, and (d) to encourage the development of private sector initiatives directed toward the achievement of these objectives.

Section 2. Annually, each Executive Department and those Executive agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture shall establish (annual) plans to increase the ability of Black owners of agricultural land and Blacks who may wish to own such land to participate in Federally sponsored programs. These plans shall consist of measurable objectives of proposed agency actions to fulfill this order and shall be submitted at such time and in such form as the Secretary of Agriculture shall designate. In consultation with participating Executive agencies, the Secretary of Agriculture shall undertake a review of these plans and develop an integrated Annual Federal Plan to Assist Blacks to Retain or Acquire or Develop Agricultural Land for consideration by the President, the Secretary of Commerce and the
Cabinet Council on Human Resources (composed of the Vice President, the Secretaries of Health and Human Services, Agriculture, Labor, Housing and Urban Development, and Education, the Attorney General, the Counsellor to the President, and the White House Chief of Staff).

Section 3. Each participating agency shall submit to the Secretary of Agriculture a mid-year progress report of its achievement of its plan and at the end of the year an Annual Performance Report which shall specify agency performance of its measurable objectives.

Section 4. Prior to the development of the First Annual Federal Plan, the Secretary of Agriculture shall supervise a special review by every Executive agency of its programs to determine the extent to which Black owners of agricultural land or Blacks who may wish to acquire and/or develop such land are given an equal opportunity to participate in Federally sponsored programs. This review will examine unintended regulatory barriers, the adequacy of programmatic opportunities of interest to such Black Americans, and identify ways of eliminating inequities and disadvantages.

Section 5. The Secretary of Agriculture shall ensure that representative Public Interest Non-Profit organizations involved in the issue of Black ownership of agricultural land, Black Farmers Associations, Black owned Farm Cooperatives, and Presidents of historically Black colleges with Agricultural Divisions are notified of and given the opportunity to comment on the proposed Annual Federal Plan prior to its consideration by the President and the Cabinet Council on Human Resources.
Section 6. The Secretary of Agriculture, to the extent permitted by law, shall stimulate initiatives by private sector businesses and institutions to strengthen the tradition of Black ownership of agricultural land, improve the management and financial structure of such land, and to provide for research related to increasing its productivity and agricultural yield.

Section 7. The Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the President and the Cabinet Council on Human Resources an Annual Federal Performance Report on Executive Agency Actions to Assist Blacks who own agricultural land or who wish to acquire such land. The report shall include the performance appraisals of agency actions with respect to such assistance during the preceding year. The report will also include any appropriate recommendations for improving the Federal response directed by this Order. The special review provided for in Section 4 shall take place no later than ______. Participating Executive agencies shall submit their annual plans to the Secretary of Agriculture no later than __________________. The first Annual Federal Plan for Assistance to Blacks who own agricultural land or who wish to acquire such land developed by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be ready for consideration by the President and the Cabinet Council on Human Resources not later than __________________.
POLICY EDUCATION APPROACHES TO MINORITY LANDOWNERSHIP ISSUES

Rather than rehash the statistics on the decline of minority landownership or the need for innovative programs, let me just say that if we are to make a difference and stem the tide of land loss, the time is now. In September, at the National Public Policy Education Conference, we presented several policy education approaches for addressing the landownership issue. As a succinct way of introducing the regional project concept, let me briefly summarize those recommendations:

1. **Establish a Multidisciplinary Advisory Committee** - a multidisciplinary advisory committee can insure inputs and expertise from several related groups such as the legal, business or political community. Additionally, it serves to legitimize the project among various publics; e.g., Extension Administration, NAACP, the church.

2. **Organize Local Support Groups** - How do you respond to a land-loss crisis—a situation where loss of property is imminent if some action is not take? While we have stressed the educational aspects of our program (long-range impacts), there must be a mechanism for responding to crisis situations; e.g., after all major publicity, we usually received a half dozen telephone calls about specific landownership problems.

   What we are suggesting is a local support group composed of similar kinds of groups and organizations as the state advisory committee. This support group could be a separate organization or could function as a specialized committee within the Extension Advisory Leadership System. The names and telephone numbers of these members should be publicized because it is extremely important to have a local contact for problem resolution. With either approach, Extension needs to be involved and visible.

3. **Develop Legal Support** - While the legal dimension is only one of several aspects of the land-loss issue, it is important to have cooperation

---

and support from the legal community. In North Carolina we have been fortunate to have the North Carolina Association of Black Lawyers to rally around this issue. They have organized a Land-Loss Taka’s Force, secured funding for a Land-Loss project and are otherwise supportive of our efforts.

4. **Consider Alternative Land Enterprises** - (Economic Development Strategies) - Why save land if you can not farm and make a living? Where traditional farming operations are not feasible, other strategies must be developed to make it attractive to retain land—short term, intermediate and long term. For example, investment in timber production might be one long-term possibility. Another alternative may be formation of Economic Development Coalitions or to use land to create equity capital for other ventures. However, to initiate such projects, you need support and information from many other groups and organizations.

5. **Maintain Regional Networks** - Land-loss projects may generate publicity in short term, but the complexity of the problem requires a well organized long-term commitment. I think the 1890 institutions are in a position to provide this commitment. With the support of the legal community, business, private organizations and others, they can begin to make a difference. In North Carolina, we have received a one-year Title V grant and a two-year USDA special needs grant to develop the LIP. However, along with other organizations such as NAL, ELF and Legal Services, we have only built the basement or foundation to retaining landownership.

Now, in order to successfully build the first and second floors, some type of regional networking must be organized and support generated to continue the work of the LIP and coordinate efforts with Emergency Land Fund, or of Legal Services. I think it is extremely important for 1890 institutions—Agricultural Extension Programs in particular—to have a leadership role in this endeavor. But they must get out front and maintain their leadership with supportive teaching, research and Extension programs. And, as Community and Rural Development Specialists, you should and must be involved with these teaching, research and Extension efforts. We hope you respond to this challenge.
The Farm Foundation was established in 1933 to do things that other private firms or individuals and public agencies were not doing. The founders saw a need for an organization with a program designed to consider the balance between economic and social aspects of public policy problems confronting agriculture and rural people. One approach to seeking that balance is to increase understanding of agriculture and rural life in order to remedy existing economic and social problems. It involves a slow process requiring careful research and sound education to stimulate self-help, encourage sound economic and social thinking, promote application of sound business practices to farm operations, and develop general understanding of the mutual interdependence of agriculture and the rest of the economy within the U.S., and between the United States and the rest of the world.

The founders envisioned supplementing and helping to coordinate the research and education work in agriculture, and initiating and demonstrating the value of projects which might later be carried on by firms or institutions with greater resources. This basic approach has been the focus of Farm Foundation's program during its first 50 years.

Faced with limited funding which would not allow substantial direct humanitarian assistance of benefit recipients immediately, the Farm Foundation concentrates on institution building and human capital development. That is, Farm Foundation seeks to create or strengthen the internal capacity of the nation's agricultural and rural community for economic and social growth in such a fashion that leads to an ongoing and self-sustaining improvement. Institution building requires an intermediate to long term
perspective. In order for rural citizens to successfully initiate programs of self-improvement and self-help, human capital is needed along with institutions. It takes people with skills and competencies to utilize opportunities presented by new knowledge. It requires scientists trained for research, extension specialists trained to convey knowledge to those who can use it, and rural citizens who can effectively use new practices, techniques, and knowledge.

The initial Board of Trustees of Farm Foundation reached the conclusion that the Foundation could be most effective by encouraging coordination of the work of existing agencies and by stimulating them to initiate new lines of work. The Foundation thus seeks to serve as a catalytic agent with the organizations and agencies whose efforts lead to the development of new knowledge and improvement of human capital in agriculture and rural life. In this role, Farm Foundation acts as a coordinator, innovator, and educator, as it helps recognize emerging problems and opportunities and redirect programs to fill the continuing need for knowledge to keep ahead of the dynamic developments in agriculture and rural life.

Farm Foundation activities or programs include:

- Develop ideas or projects for research or extension
- Facilitate application of existing knowledge
- Expand leadership capacity in the institutions dealing with agriculture and rural people
- Reach larger audiences through regional or national efforts
- Organize seminars for agricultural and agribusiness leaders participating in the Foundation for American Agriculture program
- Conduct special staff activities

These activities are carried out in the areas of:

- Public policy
- Commercial agriculture
- Natural resources
- Human and community development
- Leadership development
Farm Foundation sponsors seminars on the economics of agriculture and rural areas to explore new research or extension ideas or areas needing attention. Ad hoc groups meet to explore innovative areas for research; to initiate new regional or national research, extension, or professional interchanges; and to explore opportunities to expand participation of professionals in ongoing research and education efforts. In exploring new ideas or areas of work, Farm Foundation emphasizes the economic and social aspects of agricultural and food policy, commercial agriculture, resources, and community development.

These activities are normally organized by individuals from university or government agencies in conjunction with Farm Foundation and perhaps other organizations. Such activities frequently produce proceedings which may be of use in stimulating research and extension ideas or activities among a larger number of people than actually participate in the formal seminar. A number of regional research projects have evolved from ideas initially developed in Farm Foundation sponsored seminars.

Farm Foundation funding is used to encourage synthesis of existing knowledge into regional or national extension programs dealing with economic problems, opportunities, and policy issues. Cooperation across state and regional lines is promoted through support of standing regional extension committees to expand the quantity, increase the quality, and facilitate borrowing of and stimulate new ideas for extension programs used in individual states. These communities identify emerging problems, conduct training, and develop educational materials for regional use. Currently sponsored committees include:

National — Public Policy
Southern — Public Affairs
Farm Management
Farm Foundation sponsors a number of activities designed to improve the leadership capacity of members of the research and the extension community, rural religious leaders, and community leaders. Facilitating interchanges among leaders in the various institutions improves the leadership capability of the system, and the farm and rural clientele of those groups will eventually receive the benefits.

Widespread availability of information and programs expands the impact of state funds expended for research, extension, and education programs. Most of the information distributed as a result of Farm Foundation efforts takes the form of workshop proceedings or regional extension publications growing out of regional extension committees. In addition, Farm Foundation occasionally supports publications prepared by a number of authors in order to facilitate dissemination of information regionally or nationally.

The Foundation for American Agriculture Program of Farm Foundation sponsors an interchange between farmers, agribusiness leaders, and academic personnel interested in agriculture. Its activity is centered primarily in semi-annual seminars focused around selected topics.

Farm Foundation staff stimulates ideas, facilitates project development, and encourages cooperation among states and regions by participating in sponsored activities and extension committee meetings. Assistance is provided in identifying program participants and sometimes in arranging other funding
sources. In addition, special staff activities engaged in by the Managing Director and Associate Managing Director include selected professional activities.
In a few months the Southern Rural Development Center will celebrate a 10-year anniversary. The center started in 1974 when there was a renewed interest in rebuilding and reshaping our rural areas...when we began to fear what could happen when country people came to town and stayed. Suddenly we needed all the information we could get about rural health care, rural industrialization, rural education, rural water systems, and all things rural. You will remember that it was at that point that the Center began to form research and extension teams — we called them networks — to pull together the state-of-the-art about rural issues you identified as critical. These networks synthesized this information and sent it to you in the form of bibliographies and syntheses. As the years passed, this type of information gathering became less necessary as a wealth of subject matter material on most issues became available. But one need did not pass with time...and that is your need to know what others are doing with the information they have. Who has a program that works? How do you get it, pay for it, transfer it, use it? For years the Southern Rural Development Center has served as a central information gathering point for our region in terms of community development. When Oklahoma State University had a new idea in budgeting for community services, one extension worker and one research specialist from each state gathered in Mississippi for "hands on" experience in developing a computerized budget system for predicting the cost of health care clinics, ambulance services and other vital community services. When Georgia, Mississippi and Oklahoma began to break ground in helping county governments select, buy and use computer systems for better government efficiency, this information was compiled into
a notebook format with sample letters and contracts for local officials to use in negotiating with computer vendors. When Florida, Kentucky, Oklahoma, Texas and South Carolina began to have success in developing and using impact analysis models to project impacts of growth and decline on rural communities, the Center, with several of you serving as faculty, worked to bring this information together and distribute it throughout the South. Through the Kentucky workshop and subsequent publications, each of these states shared its approach with all of you. In all of these efforts and more, the center has served as the link between states in transferring programs and promoting communication.

While serving as a linking mechanism, the Center has at the same time provided staff training for CRD personnel. Our involvement in this Birmingham conference is one example of continued efforts in staff training. We appreciate your letting us be a part of this. Another example is the Atlanta meeting last May when 43 persons attended a two-day intensive manpower training program using materials developed by a national manpower task force. The workshop staff included those who helped write the national materials as well as those who have successful programs at the local level. When it has been possible, we have tried not only to transfer the information and program ideas to you but also to provide training for you in implementing these ideas.

In 10 years time a wealth of knowledge about many familiar problems associated with rural life has been accumulated, yet new concerns continue to rise to the top. As the threat of localized water shortages began to seem real across the South, the Center joined hands with three extension and research committees to host a regional conference in Memphis to focus on the need for developing state water management plans and laws. When the market for municipal bonds virtually disappeared and created a financial
crisis for many communities, a bibliography and state-of-the-art synthesis summarized the problem. Training materials for local officials who needed more information were also prepared. When a national cry rose up about the poor condition of our public infrastructure, a research report summarized the deteriorating conditions of rural roads and bridges in the South and described Southern efforts to cope with this problem state-by-state.

In addition to the efforts in staff training and information dissemination, the Center serves as a funding source for research projects or extension programming with widespread regional application. A research project with Oklahoma State to improve planning procedures for existing rural water services was recently funded. Dr. Sandra Batie at Virginia Tech is the principal investigator in another project to determine the impact of agricultural districts on the retention of agricultural land and property tax distribution.

At the heart of all our efforts, however, is an almost constant publication effort. Information dissemination has become the name of the game for us. We provide this support through workshops and meetings such as this one, but mostly we keep the presses rolling. We're not naive enough to think you have the time to read everything we send across your desk, but it will be there as a resource when that subject or that problem becomes critical for you in your state. Many of you will find our newsletter, Capsules, on your desk when you return home from this conference. You will discover that Clyde Chesney is a new district program leader in community development at North Carolina State University and that Charles Laughlin at Mississippi State has now gone to Georgia as associate director of the experiment station. You will read about a feeder pig co-op in Arkansas that may be the most successful bi-racial project in the region, and you will find out that Oklahoma State has published a guidebook with a systematic approach to bringing a new doctor to a rural
The Southern Rural Development Center is a
organization-gathering mechanism, a training mechanism
Through your regional center, you are able to reach
the research and programming successes of others who
are frustrated but who are bound by state boundaries
for an opportunity to communicate. We like being your regional
partner and look forward to a continuing relationship.
Development and Testing of a Working Model for Transfer of Computer Technology to County Officials: In January the SRDC completed publication of a three-ring notebook entitled "How to Select and Use Computers in Local Government." This guidebook was prepared under the direction of Dr. Gerald Doeksen of Oklahoma State University as a means of helping local government officials select, purchase and use computers in order to provide more efficient and expedient services to county residents. This project combined personnel from three land-grant universities in an effort to develop and test a working model for transfer of computer technology to county officials. The guidebook explains the model and illustrates how it can be used by local officials throughout the South. Computers in Local Government is a companion publication to the guidebook. It was prepared by Ms. Mary Ball of Mississippi State University and includes an annotated bibliography and a synthesis of literature related to the use of computer technology in local government.

The Impact of Conditions in the Municipal Bond Market on Community Services and Facilities: In July the Center completed publication of a training packet for local officials or any individual seeking a simple introduction to the Municipal Securities Market. Prepared by SRDC research analyst Gerry H. Williams, the packet contains three information fact sheets entitled "Municipal Securities: Fact Sheet," "Helping Communities Improve Their Access to the Bond Market," and "Industrial Development Bonds: Minor Miracle or Major Menace." In addition, the packet includes a primer on municipal bonds and reprints of recent magazine articles dealing with the bond market. The training packet is a companion piece to an earlier publication by Ms. Williams. Released in 1982, this publication included an annotated bibliography and a synthesis of collected data regarding unstable conditions in the municipal bond market and the subsequent impact on community services and facilities.

Rural Roads and Bridges in the South: In July the SRDC completed publication of an annotated bibliography and synthesis of recent publications relating to rural roads and bridges in the South. Prepared by SRDC research analyst Pamela H. Cosby, the publication emphasizes state and county efforts to cope with deteriorating conditions and limited revenues.

Use/Value Assessment of Agricultural Lands in the South—Policies and Problems: In April the Center completed a research report identifying Southern policies relating to property tax and agricultural land. In addition, the report tried to determine the impact of these policies on slowing the conversion of agricultural land. The use/value research report was prepared by Pamela H. Rodgers, SRDC research associate, and Gerry H. Williams, SRDC research analyst.
Dimensions of Regional Community Water Policy: Dr. Roy Carriker of the University of Florida is directing the SRDC effort to develop an annotated bibliography of selected literature on dimensions of regional and community water policy issues in the Southern region. This bibliography is intended to serve as a time saver for individuals who have not had training in law and need information about law as it pertains to state and regional water policy issues. A preliminary copy of this bibliography was completed for distribution at the Water Policy in the South conference in November. A final version of the bibliography and a synthesis summarizing the selected literature is being completed now.

Impact of Population and Economic Growth on the Demand for and Costs of Public Education in Rural America: Dr. Brady J. Deaton of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University is directing this SRDC project to provide an annotated bibliography and synthesis regarding the determinants of and attempts to model the supply and demand of primary and secondary public education in rural areas of the United States. Dr. Deaton and his research team have completed a review of journal articles, conference proceedings, books, and edited compilations on the economic aspects of education. This review encompassed a wide range of literature focusing on those aspects of the supply and demand of education that are most relevant to rural communities, particularly population and economic growth. Both the bibliography and synthesis are undergoing peer review from educators and economists in other states before being printed in the fall.

Electronic Feasibility Study: In FY 1982 the SRDC received funding for a feasibility study to determine the need for a regional research-extension electronic technology center. The two objectives of this study included (1) determining if there is a need for sharing information and expertise through a regional research-extension technology center and (2) designing an organizational strategy and prototype procedures for collaboration through a regional center jointly sponsored by the 1890 and 1862 research and extension associations. As an initial step in developing a plan for regional cooperation, the Center prepared a preliminary organizational strategy for a computer software clearinghouse and began attending meetings of the Southern Research Development Committee on Computer Software Development. As a committee of the Southern Association of Experiment Station Directors, this group was charged with the task of deciding what — if any — regional cooperation is necessary in software development with Southern land-grant universities. SRDC staff members participated in each meeting of the committee and prepared a complete proceedings of all presentations at the July 1982 and October 1982 meetings in Atlanta. These proceedings were distributed throughout the Southern land-grant system. A final meeting was held in January 1983 of both extension and research directors to determine an appropriate course of action for regional sharing, review, and development of software programs.
The Center is preparing a complete proceedings of this meeting as a companion piece to another publication summarizing the computer capabilities and programming efforts of each land-grant institution in the South. The information for this latter publication is being compiled from a questionnaire sent to each dean and director of research, extension and resident instruction. The questionnaire has allowed the SRDC staff to determine what software programs have been developed by each institution, how many faculty members have responsibilities for software development, what types of equipment are in use, what types of training and workshop opportunities are being offered, etc. Both publications are expected to be published in early fall.

Differential Assessment of Agricultural Lands in the South: This one-year project is under the direction of Dr. John R. Stoll of Texas A&M University working cooperatively with Dr. Rod F. Ziemer of Texas A&M and Dr. Fred C. White of the University of Georgia. The first objective of the project is to assess the impact of differential assessment upon the availability of agricultural land in the Southern region. The second objective is to identify the costs of differential (use-value) assessment programs and determine who bears this tax burden. In the first quarter of this study (1982), the research team prepared a paper assessing the effectiveness of land taxation policies aimed at preserving farmland in the South. This paper was presented at the 1983 meeting of the Southern Agricultural Economics Association in Atlanta. Since then, the research team has developed and estimated a land use model for Texas. During completion of this model development stage, they initiated collection of data for all the Southern states in the project region and are completing analysis of this data. The researchers completed a survey of tax assessors in order to estimate the added costs of differential assessment programs. Thirty-four percent of the questionnaires were returned after mailing 300 surveys to a stratified random sample of tax assessors in 14 Southern states. In these questionnaires, tax assessors were asked how much additional cost their office had incurred as a result of differential assessment programs and the proportion of the tax digest that was eligible for differential assessment. The results of the study will be completed in August.

The Effects of Taxation and Financial Management Policies on the Delivery of Community Services in Rural Areas of the Southern States: SRDC research analyst Gerry H. Williams expanded on the work already prepared by Pamela H. Rodgers, a former research associate at the Center. In FY 1982, Ms. Rodgers prepared a report analyzing the top ten technical assistance needs of local officials in the area of financial management. The information was obtained from a mail survey of a representative sample of city and county officials in the South. Ms. Williams completed revision of this report for distribution in September. The report was accompanied by a series of 10 information sheets reproduced with
permission of the Government Finance Center of the Municipal Finance Officers Association. These information sheets are entitled "Elements of Financial Management" and generally overlap with the major areas of technical assistance needs revealed by the SRDC survey.

Rural Crime in Florida — A Victimization Study of the Rural Nonfarm Population: This research study will comprehensively examine the extent and pattern of criminal victimization occurring in rural Florida and use this analysis in developing rural crime prevention programs. Dr. Keith A. Carter of the University of Florida directs this project. After distributing a questionnaire to 6,024 residents in 33 rural, small-population counties in Florida, Carter and his research team received a 66.6 percent response rate. More than 3,100 households are included in the sample. Coding of the data for storage on computer tape is two-thirds complete, and Carter expects to complete his analysis of the information during the fall.

Southern Rural and Agricultural Crime Education Network: Dr. J. Douglas McAllister of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University directed the efforts of this network. Since the initial funding in 1981, the network grew to include extension staff members from 23 land-grant universities in the South. Each network member served as the contact person for that institution in order that the results of the network could be disseminated throughout the region. In FY 1982, the network conducted a vandalism workshop as a prototype for other states seeking an educational approach to the problem of vandalism in rural areas. A second conference emphasizing personal protection was conducted October 27–29, 1983, in Bristol, Tennessee. CRD staffs in North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia served as conference organizers on behalf of the network and the Bristol Police Department assisted as hosts. The SRDC director opened the conference with a presentation overviewing rural crime in the Southern states. As a result of these efforts in the area of crime education, Dr. McAllister will lead a 9-hour training session on rural crime education at the triennial meeting of Southern CRD staffs in Birmingham this October.

Southern Region Business Management Network: This network was formed to complement the efforts of the North Central Region Business Management Interest Network. Both networks share the basic purpose of developing and/or sharing business management extension programming materials. The Southern network is directed by Dr. Dennis U. Fisher of Texas A&M University. In FY 1982, the network developed a list of extension business management training materials used in other states. The network also obtained approval and funding for development of a video tape designed to stimulate interest in business management programming. The video tape and accompanying materials highlighting successful business management programs in various states will be part of a 9-hour small business training session led by Dr. Fisher in October at the triennial meeting of Southern CRD staffs.
Impact of Deregulation on Rural Banking and Credit: In January the SRDC printed and distributed a research report entitled "Regulatory Reform Impact on Rural Banking and Credit." Written by Dr. J. C. O. Nyankori of Clemson University, this report evaluated the impact of the Depository Institutions Deregulations and Monetary Control Act (1980) on rural banking and credit. Using survey data and FDIC Income and Report data, Nyankori examined the following three areas of interest: (1) the expectation of bankers on changes in the structure and conduct of financial intermediation, (2) prediction of planned loan investment structure; and (3) interregional flow of funds through the financial activities of preselected financial institutions.

Estimating the Effects of Community Resource Development upon County Quality of Life: Under the direction of Dr. Donald E. Voth of the University of Arkansas, this project is designed to provide more quantifiable and/or more comparative data on which rural development programs can be evaluated and supported. Although data collection was limited to CRD programs in Arkansas, this project is an initial attempt by Dr. Voth to refine both the theory and the methodology of rural development evaluation. Dr. Voth has attempted to develop measures of county quality of life which are susceptible to change by CRD efforts, develop measures of CRD inputs on a county-by-county basis, and estimate the efforts that CRD inputs have had upon county quality of life over time. He completed his summary report in May, and it is being prepared for printing and distribution.

Southern Manpower Workshop: Forty-three persons participated in the Southern Manpower Workshop held in Atlanta on May 10-11, 1983. Dr. David Ruesink of Texas A&M University coordinated the two-day intensive manpower training program using materials developed by a national manpower task force. The workshop staff included those who helped write the national materials as well as those who have conducted successful programs at the local level.

Tri-State Workshop for Rural Clergy: The SRDC participated in two planning sessions for a tri-state workshop for rural clergy. Tentatively scheduled for fall 1983 at the Shelby County Extension Auditorium in Memphis, the workshop will involve ministers in Arkansas, Tennessee, and Mississippi. Dr. Joseph W. Morris of Tennessee State University is coordinator of the planning committee. Other committee members in addition to SRDC staff include Dr. Ray Sollie and George Berry representing Mississippi State University; Dr. Jerome Burton, Alcorn State University; and Dr. John L. Leinhardt, University of Arkansas. In order to plan a program that would meet the needs of rural ministers, the committee prepared a survey questionnaire that was mailed to selected ministers in Arkansas and Mississippi. The results of the survey have been tabulated and will serve as a guide in formulating the workshop program.
Southern Rural Development Symposium — Success Southern Style:
The SRDC cooperated with Memphis State University and the Institute of Cultural Affairs in hosting a regional rural development symposium May 11-13, 1983, in Memphis. The symposium brought nearly 150 persons from 11 Southern states together to share their solutions to common problems faced throughout the South. Seventy-three organizations and/or community-based projects attended the three-day meeting. The Southern symposium was one of five regional symposiums conducted throughout the nation in order to achieve regional and national cooperation among community development efforts.

Southern CRD Triennial Meeting: The SRDC director serves on the training subcommittee of the Southern Community Development Committee. As a result, he helped plan the program for the upcoming triennial meeting of the Southern Regional CRD Training Program. In addition to providing some financial support for the meeting, the Center designed and printed advance brochures, programs for the meeting, nametags, materials for notebooks, registration forms, etc. Dr. Linder will participate on the program of several mini-workshops being offered at the meeting, and the SRDC staff will coordinate registration.

Special Needs Grant: The Center continues to fund a three-year project to design a system through which a comprehensive and continuing program of CD in-service training for extension personnel can be developed and initiated. The SRDC cooperated with the other rural development centers and with ES-USDA in this effort. Each center provides travel expenses for two regional representatives to meet periodically as part of a team to design a program of in-service training.

New Grants Pending Washington Approval: The SRDC has submitted two new research grants to Washington for approval. They are as follows:

1. IMPACT OF AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS ON THE RETENTION OF AGRICULTURAL LAND AND PROPERTY TAX DISTRIBUTION: A CASE STUDY IN VIRGINIA -- This grant names Dr. Sandra S. Batie of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University as principal investigator. The project objectives include (1) development of a definition of 'prime agricultural land which includes economic as well as physical attributes that can be related to agricultural land retention goals; (2) identification of the economic factors influencing agricultural land conversion; and (3) analysis of the effectiveness of agricultural districts in terms of changes in property values, tax revenues and tax incidence.
2. RURAL COMMUNITY WATER RESOURCES MANAGEMENT UNDER CONDITIONS OF PRICE-SENSITIVE DEMAND -- This grant names Dr. Dean F. Schreiner of Oklahoma State University as principal investigator. The general objective of this study is to improve existing rural water services planning procedures. Specific objectives include the following: (1) identify existing procedures used in planning water services for rural areas; (2) develop and estimate residential, business, industrial and municipal demand functions for water in rural areas; (3) develop and estimate investment, operations and maintenance cost functions for water services in rural areas; (4) examine the effects of alternative water pricing policies (including grants and subsidies) on the use and conservation of water in rural areas; and (5) propose modifications to improve existing water services planning procedures based on results of the above objectives.

Requests for Proposals: Researchers from throughout the South submitted proposals in response to the Center's request for proposals in August. Final determination of research projects funded by the Center will be made by the Board of Directors.

Center Directors' Meeting: The SRDC director attended a meeting of all regional rural development center directors September 7-8 in Washington.

Regional Conference: Water Policy in the South: More than 130 persons attended this regional conference November 18-19 in Memphis. The conference was sponsored by the Southern Natural Resource Economics Committee, the Southern Extension Public Affairs Committee and the Southern Community Development Committee in cooperation with the SRDC and others. Acting on behalf of these three extension and research committees, the SRDC coordinated the conference and provided all the printing for pre-conference publicity and for conference materials. The conference emphasized the need for state water laws and management plans as an initial step in avoiding future water shortages. A tabloid proceedings was published soon after the conference and distributed throughout the South. A complete proceedings was published in August.

INFORMATION DISSEMINATION

Recording and disseminating what is taking place and what is being established in rural development throughout the region is one of the priorities of the Center. One way this task is accomplished is through a constant publishing effort including the following:
1. **SRDC Newsletter - Capsules:** Capsules is a monthly newsletter designed to disseminate information in brief form throughout the region. Each issue of the newsletter is sent to more than 1,600 persons involved in community development, civic improvement, recreation, planning, government, education and a variety of organizations and agencies working in rural development.

2. **Conference Materials:** Since the SRDC uses workshops and conferences as an integral part of its program, some staff time must be devoted to preparation and printing of such conference materials as pre-conference advertising brochures, programs, name tags, banquet tickets, folders, press packets, etc. A good example of this work is the preparations necessary for the November 1982 conference on Water Policy in the South. The Center prepared extensive publicity pieces for mailing prior to the conference and coordinated publicity efforts with the media.

3. **Reprints:** The Center constantly monitors publications of interest to rural development professionals. In order to help both researchers and extension specialists stay current in the area of rural development, the Center forwards copies of articles and publications dealing with rural issues.

4. **Conference Proceedings:** The Center has published the following proceedings during the 1983 fiscal year:
   a. Tabloid proceedings summarizing the Water Policy in the South,
   b. Proceedings of a Conference on Water Policy in the South, Nov. 1982
   c. Proceedings of the ECOP National CRD Program Leaders Workshop
   e. Proceedings of the First Annual 1890 CRD Program Leaders, Sept. 1982
   f. Proceedings of a Workshop on Community Impact Analysis, May 1982
   g. Proceedings of the Public Use Sample and Rural Labor Markets Conference, May 1982
   h. Proceedings of the Southern Regional Recreation Workshop, Sept. 1982
   i. Water Law and Rights in the Southeast (SNREC Proceedings)

5. **Other Publications:**
   a. Six-Month Evaluation of the 1892 CRD Leaders Workshop
   b. 1982 SRDC Progress Report
   c. A Survey of Use-Value Assessment Laws in the South
   d. Regulatory Reform Impact on Rural Banking and Credit
e. How to Select and Use Computers in Local Government (Training Notebook)


g. Rural Roads and Bridges in the South: A Bibliography and Synthesis

h. Municipal Bonds Training Packet

i. 1983 SRDC Progress Report

j. Survey of Financial Management Technical Assistance Needs for Selected Local Governments in Thirteen Southern States

k. Water Law and Water Rights in the South: A Bibliography and Synthesis (In Progress)

l. Estimating the Effects of Community Resource Development upon County Quality of Life (In Progress)
I have only been involved closely with rural development since October of last year. I appreciate the guidance that Curt Gear and Ron Williams have given me on rural development activities.

The Farm Foundation was established 50 years ago. I came into being 60 years ago. I've only been in the Extension Service four and a half years. Most of my professional career was with the Michigan Department of Natural Resources in the fields of forestry, wildlife and natural resources management. I have always had great respect for the Cooperative Extension system in program delivery whether it was in natural resources management or any other program. We were very closely associated in the Natural Resources Department in Michigan with the Extension Service. Hence, my interest in being employed in the Extension Service during the past four and a half years.

Marv Konyha is our representative to this group. He could not come because of personal reasons. I felt it was my duty to represent the unit down here. I'm very, very glad I did. I'm learning about rural development, as you can see. About a year ago, Dr. Greenwood transferred the rural development activities into what was then known as the Natural Resources Unit. About a year ago, we were facing a serious RIF (reduction in force) situation. The original plan was to take one person from the Rural Development Unit in the Federal office in the area of Public Policy and transfer that person to the Natural Resources Unit. The rest of the unit was to have been integrated with Agriculture. Rural development needs identity at the Federal level as well as the state level. Consequently the entire rural development function was transferred into what is now known as the Natural Resources and Rural Development Unit. We have seven major programs represented: Forestland
Management, Rangeland Management, Management and Conservation of Soil and Water, Local Government and Community Organizations, Economic Development, Natural Resources Policy and Fish and Wildlife Management. If you look at those programs carefully, you can find every reason for logical integration of rural development with the natural resources area. I think integrated programs are much stronger than a program standing all by itself.

I'll reinforce a bit what Ron just said about 1862 and 1890 being separate programs in rural development in the South. I don't like separate programs but I think I understand the reason for the direction that you've taken during the past couple of years. I think I have some understanding for this separation. It's not quite as personal as the ones that you have but it is a reason. If you represent the field of natural resources, in its broad interpretation, in the commodity-oriented organizations, you need identity for natural resources and rural development. You have to stand up and be counted so these kinds of programs, which are important to the future of agriculture, receive recognition. Consequently, I understand the move in the South for an 1890 rural development committee but I would remind you of Ron's closing comments, the necessity of working together as a system and not as a separate entity.

I'd like to reinforce the remarks of Dr. Winfrey Clarke, those with similar interests should pool resources for better program efficiency and effectiveness.

I don't pretend to have enough background to be able to choose priorities for the activities that you folks should address. I firmly believe that leadership development is one of them. I'm very, very certain that loss of land by minorities is another extremely important issue.

On this latter point, I'll give you my own situation as an example. I come from Michigan. I've been with the department for four and a half years...
but the loss of land by blacks was not a priority I had even heard of. I
didn't even realize the loss of land by blacks was a problem until I attended
the Public Policy Program Committee Meeting last year when it was a discussion
item. I found out a lot more about the problem when I attended the Public
Policy Meeting sponsored by the Farm Foundation in August. I'm a fairly high
official in the Department of Agriculture. Now I understand and will devote
some of my time to bring it to the attention of others. You have to get this
problem across to a lot of other people besides yourselves.

Computer technology must be integrated in program planning, delivery and
evaluation. It's a new tool. We must learn to use it intelligently. I was
born about the time the telephone was invented. I learned how to use it. I
am also beginning to learn how to use a computer.

I'd like to reiterate more of Dr. Clarke's comments from yesterday. What
are you going to do when you leave here? Frankly, the land loss by minorities
is a paramount issue in your minds. I suggest that you use the news reporter's
outline when you start thinking about what you are going to do. That's who
you're going to do it to. What are you going to do? Why are you going to
do it? When are you going to do it? Where are you going to do it? And
how are you going to do it? Then be sure that you follow up.

Too many people go home from meetings like this highly motivated. Then
they get into Monday morning's business and forget about all their motivation.
I would encourage you, do not forget about these issues because they are
extremely important. Don't choose too many. Choose a few, two or three.
Then do them well.

I would reiterate Jim Hildreth's comments of yesterday. Choose topics
of general interest because if you choose something that is not of current
and specific interest to you, it won't get done!
On behalf of the Executive Committee — Dr. Willie Thomas, Vice-Chairman; and Dr. Louis Thaxton, Secretary/Treasurer — I offer our sincere appreciation for the confidence you placed in us to conduct business relative to our 1890 Extension Community Resource Development Organization. I was fortunate to have working with me objective and pragmatic personalities which created the ideal environment for collective decision-making. I emphasize that my tasks as chairman were considerably reduced due to the contributions of Drs. Thomas and Thaxton; may the record reflect a formal acknowledgement of the excellence of their contributions, freely given for the benefit of all.

Several others deserve recognition for this Second Annual 1890 Community Resource Development Leaders Workshop. Each of the following have contributed greatly to our group, and this workshop:

Dr. Mort Neufville, I am certain that I speak for the total of 1890 Extension CRD professionals as I express the utmost appreciation for the seed which you planted and nurtured so carefully. I refer to the foresight, planning and preparation for our First Annual 1890 CRD Leaders Workshop, and to the administrative guidance you so freely provided. You sir have designed the model — I assure you that we will strive in the years to come to exhibit the quality of program design, program implementation and program evaluation as evidence that your idea was truly a seed worthy of the effort. We applaud you, and wish you success in your new and challenging position.

It has been said that often, those who do the most on a daily basis are the least remembered in the final analysis. Today, this will not be the case.
A second salute is extended to our 1890 Extension Administrators. Will those administrators present please stand and be recognized? Administrators of our respective 1890 Extension programs, we are aware of the fact that without your support, in our home states and in the collective, our service delivery would be all but impossible. We salute not just the financial support you provide, but of equal importance is the mental sharing which is so crucial to development and maintenance of our CRD programs. The team approach which most of us employ is clearly the most effective, and I think our programs reflect this fact. Dr. Harold Benson, I recognize your contributions to and support of Community Resource Development in Kentucky; I am certain that each of my colleagues recognizes the contributions of their respective administrators as well. We thank you for the occasion to demonstrate our professional abilities.

Few people have the capacity to enter a situation and immediately grasp a concept and function as if they had been there all along. Dr. Jerome Burton, you are one of those rare individuals. Your ability to instantly provide support and advice to 1890 Extension Community Resource Development was one crucial ingredient to our success, and we look forward to your continued interactions. I assure you that your efforts were not in vain and that we will continue to strive for excellence.

Two entities are worthy of mention this morning, for without their support and advice this meeting and our prior meeting would not be possible. Financial, planning, and other assistance which included speakers' travel, printing and publication expenses, have been graciously donated by both the Farm Foundation and the Southern Rural Development Center. Dr. Jim Hildreth, Director of the Farm Foundation; and Dr. Bill Linder, Director of the Southern Rural Development Center, deserve our applause. Gentlemen, we look forward to
your continued participation and support.

Last, but not least, we acknowledge the increased involvement and developing relationship with our Federal partner — Extension Service/USDA — represented here by Pete Petoskey and Dr. Claude Bennett. The support from the Federal level is essential and we look forward to even greater, more dynamic associations in the years to come.

As your elected representatives we have directed many of our energies toward the perpetuation of this conference. I hasten to add that perpetuation for its own sake was not the goal. We individually and collectively have sought to illustrate the many positive and non-duplicative efforts derived from 1890 CRD programs. The minutes of the previous conference provide excellent examples of our work and its importance.

We have initiated the process of building meaningful and pragmatic relationships with, among others, Extension Service/USDA, Southern Rural Development Center, Farm Foundation, 1890 Extension Administrators, 1890 Research Directors, and our 1862 colleagues. We have on all occasions sought to create an awareness, in all regions of this nation, of the existence, purpose, and contributions of the 1890 land-grant CRD programs. These processes are by no means completed, and it is a task which all of us should pursue. A foundation has been developed; the mold may be subjected to change, but at least we have a base on which to build.

For future direction we suggest the formation of a task force with the purpose of developing relevant goals, procedures, and policies as a guide for our growth and future activities. Specific infrastructures must be established to provide both purpose and methodology as we strive to provide an improved service delivery to our clientele. The implementation of the above will greatly enhance future leadership capabilities and defray some of the procedural
hurdles this administration has confronted. We believe that long range 
funding resources in support of regional educational efforts must be developed. 
Such funding resources must be in addition to the generous support provided 
by our Extension administration, Southern Rural Development Center and Farm 
Foundation. Regional thrust is a priority and financial support is crucial 
to regional project development.

In closing, we urge each of you to continue to seek perfection in our 
programs, and to unselfishly contribute to the enhancement of our neighbors' 
program delivery. We all realize that 1862 and 1890 Extension organizations 
must retain their individuality, but such individual identity must not occur 
and perpetuate at the expense of alienation and antagonism between sister 
land-grant universities. The shrewd mind easily acknowledges that the task 
before Extension is too great to be handled alone. Each university — be it 
of 1890 or 1862 origin — has unique and valuable resources, the energies of 
which can and should be combined for optimal service delivery, as the 
situation arises. Recent criticisms of Extension — from the Office of 
Management and Budget and others — leaves no doubt that we must create 
 Improved coordination as both 1890 and 1862 universities seek to meet the 
challenges from outside. Each institution owes its sister unit respect as 
an individual entity; we also owe our clientele the best service possible. 
I propose that the best CRD programs can only be derived from conscious 
realization and complete utilization of respective abilities.

It has been a pleasure to serve on your behalf.

Thank you.
PEOPLE MANAGEMENT: OUR MOST IMPORTANT JOB*

Paul D. Warner

The focus of this portion of the program is leadership development. Even though you have identified this topic as being of high priority, I have to wonder what each of you mean by the words leader and leadership development. Most of us have been exposed to training on this topic many times before.

As Curtis Gear said this morning, leadership development is the very foundation of all CRD programs. I would say it is fundamental for three reasons:

1. Leadership suggests groups, and the use of groups and organizations is consistent with the nature of the problems being addressed in CRD. The unit of community problems is the group, not the individual. It could be contrasted with assistance that focuses on the individual farm, firm or family.

2. The process of leadership and organizational development is a form of skill development and personal development that is transferable to other situations. So the impact of the leader is not limited to the problem being addressed at that moment.

3. From an Extension standpoint, it is an efficient way to get the job done. It has more spread effect, more people can be reached. Without leaders and volunteers our programs are only as large as our time and efforts permit. But with leaders, the expansion is without limits. They also remain after we leave and continue to apply the same skills to new problems.

One of the first things I did when I got to Kentucky was to work on a comprehensive system of leader development and utilization in the 4-H program. I was new on the job, green as grass, with all of my newfound knowledge that I was going to apply to Extension. We worked on the effort most of a year and ended up with a document about two inches thick. I was really proud of our accomplishment. Then one day one of our Area Administrators who was

*Presentation at the Second Annual 1890 CRD Program Leaders Workshop, Birmingham, Alabama, October 9-10, 1983
nearing retirement age took me in his office and pulled a document out of his
time that was dated 1958. It was about two inches thick and except for some
language differences, it was almost identical to what we had developed. That
takes the wind out of your sails in a hurry. That Area Administrator was
trying to teach that greenhorn a thing or two. And he sure did get my atten-
tion. Leadership is not a new subject to Extension.

So my first question is, what can I say today that you haven't heard many
times before? And secondly, what can I contribute that will make even an ounce
of difference back in your home state? You see, I'm convinced that even though
every agent, every specialist and every administrator claims to know all
about leadership development and use it in their programs, we are really
doing a very poor job of it. Look at the evidence. County-level development
organizations struggle along, many are inactive or exist only on paper. 4-H
and homemaker clubs lack effective leaders and have high rates of turnover.
Agricultural commodity groups are dependent upon the agricultural agent or
specialist to keep them alive. For being an organization that prides itself
in its large cadre of volunteer leaders, its structure and functioning is
fragile and highly dependent upon Extension's paid staff. So I ask you, have
we been successful at leadership development?

You know, it may be helpful to throw out the terms leadership and leader-
ship development and start over. Everyone uses the words as something sacred
but we don't really know how to truly develop leadership.

I am realistic enough to know that we aren't going to really do leader-
ship development training here today. All I can expect to do is to convince
you of a perspective and direct you to where the content can be found.

Now that we've thrown out the term leadership development, let's start
fresh. What I really want us to focus on is people management, getting things
done with and through people. I'm convinced that many (maybe most) of Extension staff would rather be doers than managers. They want to be paid leaders. Our training is in a subject matter and that is what we feel comfortable doing. Part of the problem, no doubt, arises from not having a clear idea of what people management is really all about; we can't offer a formula or recipe for success. People management in a volunteer setting relates closely to the literature on personnel management in a business or corporate setting. And whether people are doing it for pay or not, the principles are largely the same. What I'm suggesting is that leadership development is a skill or set of skills that can be taught.

An organization like Extension is not that much different from a voluntary association. We operate by consensus and influence, not by coercion. We learn management principles in the Extension organization and we can apply them to voluntary organizations. There are five main functions of management. They are:

1. Planning
2. Organizing
3. Staffing
4. Directing
5. Controlling.

Planning involves deciding what is to be done, who, how, and when it will be done. Organizing is the bringing together of people, money, materials, space and time. Order is made out of chaos. Staffing is choosing the right people for the right job. It includes orienting, advancement schemes, and opportunities for growth. Directing guides the actions of group members. It involves motivation and communication. Controlling is checking the progress, redirecting if necessary, and choosing other alternative courses of action.

All of these functions are important to the performance of the task, the operation of the group, and the satisfaction of the individual. For example,
I have organized crafts at a 4-H camp with 100 kids at a time. Believe me, that is a challenge in management.

Plan — I have everything ready when they walk in the door. What they're going to make and how they're going to do it has already been decided.

Organize — I select teen and adult leaders to work with small groups.

Staff — These key helpers are identified and oriented.

Direct — Clear instructions, visual steps to follow are given.

Control — I lead them through the steps and don't let them get out of hand.

Any part can break down and end in a disaster. There can be a shortage of materials, the teens might not show up, or the task may be too difficult for the kids. However, at all times I have to remain the manager. If I stop to help one child complete his or her project, 99 others go astray and complete nothing. At that time, managing is a full time job and the most important job I have to do. And in performing the role as manager, I am in turn training others to manage.

Maybe if we quit saying we're developing leaders and just do it by applying these management principles, we'll be more successful in the end. If we focus on the skills needed, leaders will result. That way we won't be so confused about what leadership development is all about. We apply many of these five functions to our work role with other professionals, but we forget that the same principles apply with volunteers. The leader, in turn, needs to develop these competencies in group members.

Let me say a few words about the life cycle of groups. Generally we conclude that a leader or manager is supposed to help the group complete some project or program. We tend to be task oriented. And yet if we are working through groups, this bunch of individuals has to develop a working relationship.

From our study of CD organizations in Kentucky, I've concluded that groups need
a certain amount of time to shake out as a group, to work out the social relations. At some later date they may then be ready to take on a task.

In Eastern Kentucky we studied the process of group formation in 54 communities. These were small communities with 50 to 200 families in each, what are often referred to as stringtowns. Appalachians are generally described as individualistic and noncooperative, and yet they formed CD organizations (called clubs in this case) that built community centers, ball fields, fire stations, and brought about road and bridge repairs. But more than that, they developed personal confidence and skills.

If we try to diagram the group formation process, it would look something like this:

![Diagram of group formation process]

They start with social relationships and progress on to tasks and projects. Without the people-oriented functions, they don't move on to task accomplishments. Furthermore, people-focused functions continue on as tasks are performed. We often view this initial socio-emotional period as a waste of time before we get on with the task. In reality, it is an essential step in group formation
and continues to be so throughout the life of the organization.

There has been a lot written on leadership styles. The traditional categories are: autocratic, laisse-faire, and democratic. Jerry Robinson defined five styles: activator, controller, martyr, cavalier, abdicator. What these discussions do is explain the relationship between the leader and the groups, whether participation in decisionmaking is encouraged or not. Since we are dealing with voluntary educational programs, we have to focus on democratic methods, though other styles will be used from time to time. However, in the use of a democratic style, our success depends upon our ability to influence others, not coerce or enforce. People participate in the group decisionmaking process because they want to. This relationship of the balance between leader and group freedom can be illustrated as follows:

CONTINUUM OF LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

USE OF AUTHORITY BY LEADER

AREA OF FREEDOM BY GROUP


The continuum of leadership behavior suggests that someone using an autocratic-type leader style would fall to the left of the continuum and a democratic style would be toward the right side.

Group decisionmaking contains the same ingredients as does individual
decisionmaking.

1. Define the problem
2. Gather the information
3. Develop the alternatives
4. Analyze the alternatives
5. Make the decision

The challenge is to bring the group through the thought process. James Thompson says decisions are judgments about two things:

1. Cause-effect relationships
2. Outcome preferences

We can be certain or uncertain about either. The following decisionmaking framework presents four possible situations as a grid pattern:

DECISIONMAKING FRAMEWORK

Outcome Preference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CERTAIN</th>
<th>UNCERTAIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>+ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPUTATION</td>
<td>COMPROMISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- +</td>
<td>- -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGMENT</td>
<td>INSPIRATION</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we find ourselves in the upper left corner of the grid, we know what we want to accomplish and how to go about it. Therefore there is total certainty (computational). If we are in the lower left quadrant, we know
where we want to go but not how to get there. As a result, we use judgment in choosing the best alternative course of action. In the right upper corner, we know what to expect if we change things, but the desired outcome is uncertain. If group members cannot agree on what they want to accomplish, a compromise may ensue. Finally in the lower right hand square, we know neither what we want to accomplish nor how to accomplish it. We operate on faith that it will come out all right.

Let me end with a few words about motivation. Some people think that the only way to motivate people is with money. Beyond money, motivation is seen as a mystery. I think the best explanation of motivational factors can be found in Herzberg's scheme of job satisfaction. He says there is a group of factors that cause a person to be satisfied with a job and another set that causes dissatisfaction. Dissatisfiers are found in the job environment — how you're treated by your superiors, pay, physical conditions, policy restrictions. In other words, the constraints we place on people. Satisfiers, on the other hand, are found in achievement, recognition, responsibility, and participation. These are the factors internal to the individual. Now think about this same scheme for leaders. Don't most of the same ideas apply to the motivation of leaders? If we maximize the satisfiers and minimize the obstructions, we are motivating. Interestingly, most satisfiers don't cost money. They are tools available to us if we will just make use of them. We can be effective at developing leaders, but first we have to acquire and use the proper skills. Leadership development (or people management) can be taught, and we can teach it.
The purpose of this paper is twofold:

1) to make CRD leaders aware of the basic components and buzzwords of a computer system, and

2) to outline areas where computer technology is being applied or can be applied to solve problems in CRD (educational tool).

Computer Technology

Computer technology has advanced dramatically in the last decade. Advancements in both hardware and software technology have made relatively low cost services and facilities readily available to small businesses, governments, and homeowners.

There is mass confusion about the difference between a computer and a computer system.

1) Computer — Brains of the outfit, it just computes. It cannot tell you anything about what it is doing.

2) Computer System — A computer system starts with the basic computer. Combining it with other devices allows the computer to talk to you and you to it. The various devices that make up the computer system will be discussed later in this paper. A computer system must be able to read instructions, remember the problem being solved and the data to use, perform calculation on the data, print the results, and control the entire operation.

Types of Computers

The next section deals with types of computers: super computers, large-scale computers, medium-scale computers, small-scale business computers, mini-computers, microcomputers, microprocessors and special purpose computer systems. There are many types of computers, but this paper is concerned with microcomputers and their application to CRD work. It now appears that few fields of human endeavor will remain untouched by this rapidly advancing
technology and some social historians are suggesting that the inexpensive microcomputer may well rank as the third major invention of the 20th century, following the automobile and the television. Microcomputers are the way of the future. In 1980 over 300,000 microcomputers were sold. By 1985 an estimated three million systems will be used, and by 1990 that figure will have more than tripled (based on Bud Stolker's survey).

The microcomputer is a computer, consisting of a microprocessor and associated memory which is fabricated as a single circuit.

Components of a Computer System

1) Computer — (hardware, mainframe) Computers are made up of many tiny memory areas called bytes. Each byte can be thought of as a single character. The memory of a computer system is called RAM (Random Access Memory). The more RAM a computer has, the more efficient it is. It can hold bigger programs and more data at one time.

2) Input/Output Units — (typewriter, visual display device, card reader, line printer, digital plotter) The only point that will be made about input/output units is that there are many different types of printers, keyboards, etc., and the person must take care in selecting the types that best fit his/her needs.

3) Storage Devices — The storage system of a computer has the same function as your office filing system. Two common ways of storing data for microcomputers are:
   A) Floppy Disk
   B) Hard Disk — Made of metal instead of plastic, it holds astonishing amounts of information. The hard disk is awkward, if not impossible, to carry around. It costs a lot more than floppies, but if you need to store a great deal of information and need high speed access to that information, hard disks are the way to go.

Software

One of the most important parts of any computer system is the software, a term used to refer to all the various programs that are used in a computer system. Software is like a road map for the computer. It instructs the computer what to do with the data you enter from the keyboard, how to send it out to the printer, and how to perform all those tricks you bought a computer
for in the first place.

Software Applications

1) Word Processing — (canned software) This replaces the typewriter and hundreds of bottles of correction fluids (example: spelling checkers).

2) Database Management — Any collection of data, or more usually groups of data, is called a database. Database management probably is one of the more important software programs for the Extension Service because of vast amounts of clientele listed by commodity or subject matter areas. For example, all the names, addresses and phone numbers of your CRD clientele would be a database. The database management system would allow sorting through all this data, looking for those clientele that meet certain criteria.

3) Communication — Talking to your computer or having your computer talk to other computers over the telephone lines is popular. The device that allows your computer to send and receive information over the phone lines is called a modem (short for modulator). It translates computer data into tones, which may then be sent and received over the phone lines. Through the use of modems your microcomputer can become a terminal to access larger computers and databases (example: electronic mail), where you pay a fee to get into the system.

Computer Programming

Programming is an educational activity that teaches logic and structure, and provides a strong foundation in problem solving. All computer programs are written in a programming language, which contains a set of instructions that tells the computer what to do. Common programming languages are:

1) Basic
2) Fortran
3) Pascal
4) Cobol
5) PL-1
6) APL
7) RPG
8) Pilot

Probably the most common computer language used by microcomputers is Basic (beginners all-purpose symbolic instruction code). Basic uses English language commands and is fairly easy to pick up. Mastering Basic takes time and disciplined study, however. Also, brands of computers have their own form of Basic. The other languages are of a higher level.
Now I would like to focus on incorporating a computer system into an on-going CRD program. Previously identified problems of small communities centered around economic development, where economic development is defined as increasing the community's base, expanding job opportunities, increasing per capita incomes and the output of goods and services.

As Extension workers begin to develop educational programs to enhance economic development there is a need to establish socio-economic trends, identify specialty areas in economic development by collecting background information on what institutions provide what services, clientele needs, population trends, resources available, and more.

Also, as Extension workers assist local governments with requests for management aids (budgeting tools), current information regarding Federal and state programs, and current information regarding new technologies, they must be in a position to respond rapidly, but in an effective manner. Computers can help you respond in a timely fashion by developing a management information system (MIS), which is the process of developing a database consisting of the information you deem important. A database management system can consist of census data on some specialty group, socio-economics of black landowners, black forest land owners, etc. Computer programs can be designed to answer questions on budgeting, steps to be taken in developing particular projects, and much more.

Earlier I identified some important computer services available for CRD Extension workers. Previously mentioned possibilities were word processing and electronic mail. Additional communication services available to assist with solving community problems are:

1) LOGIN (Local Government Information Network) — This is an important network resource specifically designed for the local government professionals. Login can provide information on how other cities
solved problems in economic development, emergency medical services, employment funding sources, housing, etc. These are examples of problems you have and will encounter in your CRD programs. All that is required for login services is a standard terminal which can be connected to an ordinary telephone. It has an annual subscription package of $3,000, but the USDA (Extension CRD) has a subscription and will make this service available to those with a need.

2) FAPRS (Federal Assistant Programs Retrieval System) — This is a program that has been available for several years and we find it very useful in Louisiana. FAPRS is a computerized information delivery system that can be used as an educational tool or research aid to community leaders and development groups.

If your situation is similar to ours in Louisiana, then you are just getting into computers, have limited knowledge in computer use, and limited funds. An investigation was conducted on available software programs and a publication by Robert Strain, University of Florida, titled "Undated Inventory of Agricultural Computer Programs," was found. Computer programming is a dynamic process, constantly changing, and this publication is now being revised.

**Summary**

Computer systems are tools of managers.

Computer systems are comprised of hardware and software.

You must know, in detail, what jobs you want the system to do.

You must find software to fit the jobs.

You must find hardware that can use the software.

Software is usually specific to a model of hardware.

Computer systems are fast, accurate, repetitive and demanding.

The operator must be patient and willing to work hard.

Purchase hardware from knowledgeable, reliable and convenient dealers.

Software is composed of instructions and documentations.

Insist on demonstration of software functions.

Good documentation is critical.

Anything a computer system can do, can be done by hand methods.

Computer systems are most useful where large amounts of information must be handled swiftly, accurately and repetitively.

The usefulness of computer systems to individuals depends upon their situation.

Though many of the programs presented in this paper were not designed for particular situations of 1890, they provide a starting place to begin formulating ideals, contacting people and modifying programs to fit our needs. The computer age is now — it provides opportunities for us all.
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