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"Since about 1650 scientific-technological progress has been continuous, cumulative, consistent and irreversible. The leading edge of any technology based on the natural sciences moves inexorably forward." (Caplow 1990:13)

For about 200 years, or until the era of railroad building, this scientific-technological progress accumulated, but with little intellectual or scholarly attention to its impact on changing society. But by the middle 1800s the impact had become too great to ignore and scholars began to direct their attention to the connection between technological "progress" and social change. An obvious possibility was that social, political, economic change occurred in response to technological change, but lagged behind. Social organization was conceptualized by many as adjusting and adapting to the technology, not vice versa. New technologies would appear and society would adjust to them. This idea - technology "causes" social change. Indeed there have been a sufficient number of visible social changes that have been continuous, cumulative, consistent and irreversible to sustain this presumption of causal connection between the technological and the social. Included are such trends as growth in population, increasing size and number of cities, occupational specialization, increase in goods, rising living standards, etc. In general those changes have been linear and are relatively easy to predict. There is no reason to expect that, at least world wide, those trends won't continue.

But as Caplow observes, there have been problems with the general proposition that technology causes social change. Many changes in social organization (attitudes, behavior, etc.) do not occur continuously, cumulatively, consistently or irreversibly and therefore are not as predictable. People and their behavior are not simply dependent variables responding immediately and directly to changes in their environment including technological change. Indeed one of the main points we will stress is that the "benefits" of technological development tend not to be evenly distributed: many people do benefit in terms of improved standards of living, increased leisure time, improved access to health care, education, etc. but many others are "left behind." One of the challenges for educators, researchers, public servants, etc. is to be sensitive to what impact technological change is having on the well-being of society, who is benefitting and who is not.

Unevenness in Social and Technological Change

Only casual observation is needed to realize that the presumed linear and causal connection between technological and social change is murky at best. The organization of class rooms at both elementary-secondary schools and universities and the methods of instruction employed comes to mind as an example of how little technology has affected one very important institutional sector of our society - education. It is not possible to detect very much difference in the physical appearance and educational process in the university classroom of 1900
and the classroom of today - the dress of the students might be the most obvious difference. Conversely today's commercial farm bears little resemblance to the commercial farm of even 30 years ago. A reason for the difference between education and agriculture is that education remains one of the most labor intensive activities in our society (about 90 percent of all expenditures are for labor) while production agriculture has become one of the most capital intensive sectors of the economy. Capital is invested in technology; technology and capital investment go hand in hand and the benefits of technology tend to be unevenly distributed.

This difference is how technology affects different sectors contributes to some mismatching and unevenness in effect. The different utilization of technology in production agriculture and education provide a case in point. In the face of a greatly modified agriculture it becomes pertinent to ask how much our methods of extension education have changed in response and is that relevant? I don't have an unequivocal response but the difference in utilization of technology in those two sectors does make it a pertinent question.

Technological developments generate both benefits and costs. In some cases such as agriculture production technology some of the benefits are widespread, e.g. lower food costs for the entire society, while the brunt of apparent costs may be borne by relatively few, e.g. farmers forced out of agriculture because they don't have the capital to compete or support businesses who have lost their customers. But there has been a general pro-technology bias in American society - we tend to look mostly at the promise of benefits from technology with proportionately less regard for possible costs (both social and economic). Concern for costs often occurs as an afterthought. Again agriculture comes to mind: after 40 years of increasing use of chemicals in agriculture production, concern is now surfacing for possible adverse effects of this practice on consumer and producer health and on the environment. The principal point of course is that people are affected by both the benefits and the costs of technology and proportional attention is needed on both sides of the equation.

The pertinence of weighing social and economic costs and benefits has become especially pertinent in the past year or two as concern for the economic competitiveness of the U.S. economy has escalated. The U.S. has depended greatly on technology as an engine of economic growth. There is little disagreement that production technologies contributed substantially to increased labor productivity and therefore economic growth through the first 3/4 of this century. But during the 1980s technological development has continued to be continuous, cumulative, consistent and irreversible but concurrently in the U.S. the rate of growth in the economy and labor productivity has declined. That is inspiring a search for alternative explanations: among the most prominent has been a focus on education and human capital. That has been and is being widely considered in the southern region. The Southern Growth Policies Board has been among the organizations that have been looking to education and human capital as a development strategy for the region. Important to this strategy is that technology and human capital must be considered together if economic growth and improved well-being of the population are to result.

Economic Growth and Change in the Southern Region

In the context of the nation the southern region has been a success story for the past three decades. Its rate of population, employment and income growth has generally exceeded national rates of growth. During the 1960s and 70s the relocation and expansion of industries, especially from the industrial northeast and midwest, transformed much of the rural south from dependence on farming and other natural resource based employment to
A recent analysis of manufacturing and service employment showed that the region has experienced some clear indications of economic restructuring in the region have produced some clear indications of economic restructuring in the region have not been necessary to move to the region from the South was entitled: "The Unemployment of Effect on People"
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"High Tech, Low Tech, No Tech." (Falk and Lyson 1988). They use high tech and no tech to refer to these two quite different patterns of employment growth in the region. High tech employment, which they label as primary, is characterized by high skills and high pay. It is primary employment which typically provides a return on investment in human capital, education. Throughout the south most of the primary employment growth has occurred in metropolitan regions. But much of the employment growth in the region, especially in rural areas, has been in no tech occupations they refer to as secondary. A significant part of the secondary employment growth has been in routine manufacturing and consumer services. They characterize secondary employment as offering work which is relatively unstable, which may be terminated on short notice, for which work skills are not very transferable and for which there are no career ladders. With more primary employment growth occurring in urban areas and more secondary employment in rural areas a result has been a growing gap between rural and urban income.

Another similar perspective is report by Porterfield (1990) in her analysis of growth in service sector employment in rural areas during the 1980s. She finds also that rural areas have tended to lose primary employment and gain back secondary employment. She identifies the 5 occupations in the nonmetropolitan south which had the greatest decline in employment during the first half of the 1980s and the 5 occupations in the region that experienced the greatest growth in employment. The 5 with the greatest growth were all consumer service based, such as eating and drinking places, grocery stores, department stores, nursing facilities and hospitals. The 5 with the greatest decline including mining and energy extraction, telephone communications and men and boys clothing manufacture. The income problem that is being aggravated in rural areas of the region is reflected in the average wages of the gaining and declining occupations. The five occupations with the greatest decline in employment paid an average of $22,800 per year; the five occupations with the greatest employment gain paid an average of $10,000 per year. Thus, a family losing one of the higher paying jobs would find themselves in a situation where more than two of the lower paying jobs would be necessary to make up for the job lost.

The attached map showing the counties in the region achieving the greatest increase in income during the 1980s shows how four of the states in the region most dependent on energy related employment (Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas and Kentucky) also had the fewest counties with more than a 75 percent increase in per capita income.

3. Education, income and jobs. Although much attention is being devoted to increased education as a means of regional development and improving family well-being, the relationship between education and economic development is neither simple nor direct (Killian and Parker 1991). Increasing education alone is not sufficient for economic development. A part of the complexity is associated with the growth of both primary and secondary types of employment. As indicated above higher levels of education and skill are necessary and rewarded in primary occupations; higher levels of skill and training are generally not required nor rewarded in secondary occupations. This is resulting in an absence of a direct correlation between job growth and education which runs counter to conventional wisdom. In their analysis, Killian and Parker find that during the 1980s the average educational attainment of the population was not associated with job growth during the 1980s than cities or counties having a population with a lower average level of education. What Killian and Parker do find however is that job growth in metropolitan areas during the 1980s was significantly related to the
proportion of college graduates and to the proportion of high school dropouts. A reason (other explanations are possible) for this seemingly anomalous finding is the recent growth in both high tech (primary) and no tech (secondary) kinds of jobs. A review of high school drop-out rates for various states provides some corroboration for this interpretation. The two states with the highest school drop-out rates (Florida and California) also experienced the greatest employment increases during the 1980s while the states with the lowest drop-out rates are found in the upper midwest; states that had high rates of outmigration and low rates of employment growth.

What is important about these findings is that just raising the education level of a population (say for a rural county) is not likely in and of itself to produce job growth. What Killian and others conclude is that education is important but it must be linked directly with economic development activities if it is to produce an impact.

What the above data indicate is that technological developments, particularly in the work place, contribute to an uneven distribution of produce uneven costs and benefits to society. Not only in the region but across the nation there have been some spectacular increases in productivity and income associated with technology, but there has simultaneously been an increase in families who have either fallen below the poverty line or are edging their way toward that level. Increasingly those at that level have become a "working poor" (a recent analysis of census data shows that 70 percent of rural families living below the poverty line hold at least one job and 40 percent hold two or more: Greenstain 1988). Increasing the education level alone of those families will not likely improve their economic status unless there are jobs available that require and reward that additional education.

Some Further Implications for Education and Rural Development

Although we may have overemphasized the different kinds of recent job growth in the region and nation, we have done so in order to emphasize that the kinds of sophisticated information technologies that have become important means of economic production seem to be producing a different distributional effect than the industrial technologies of the previous generation. The gap between the "winners" and "losers" in this transition seems clearly to be growing. Having a job or not having a job no longer separates those who are well off from those who aren't. Indeed an increasing number of families have found they need to hold two or more jobs in order to maintain the same relative economic position they might have had a decade ago. Of particular concern in this change in the technology of production are rural areas where there has been little primary job growth and consequently rural income is falling further behind metropolitan income.

Rural communities, who worked to position themselves for a 1960s kind of growth - attracting industries - now find themselves facing a 1990s kind of growth. The ground rules for economic development have changed and now include a need to link their economic development efforts with a skilled workforce targeted to specific kinds of economic possibilities and to have access to the kinds of communications technologies that are an increasingly necessary part of production and marketing. In order to support those different kinds of strategies for rural development will undoubtedly require those of us in universities and involved in research and extension to work collaboratively with various agencies and organizations to provide the assistance rural regions and localities will need. Our old styles of operation will not likely be any more useful to rural localities than the old styles of economic development.
Conclusion

The kinds of technological developments that have occurred over the past 20 years have changed the ground rules not only for economic activity but for all other aspects of our lives. In enumerating various economic changes occurring on a global scale (such as capital movements more than trade becoming a dominant force in the world economy and lower labor costs becoming less of an advantage) Wishard (1990) contends that development can not long be thought of only in terms of trade and jobs but that development must include a broader concern for human well-being including the social, cultural and environmental along with the economic and technological. He suggests that technology will effect the environment in which development occurs, but that technological change alone will not produce great improvements in the well-being of people.

Education, research and extension have traditionally played an important role in facilitating the adoption and use of technology and will undoubtedly continue to do so. But it is becoming increasingly clear that there is an increasingly vital role to be played in assessing the prospective costs and benefits of technology and in helping those affected by it to better understand and/or intervene.
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Percent Change in Population 1980–90

SOURCE: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census
RURAL MANUFACTURING DEPENDENT COUNTIES, 1986

Definition: Manufacturing–dependent counties are nonmetro counties in which manufacturing contributed 30 percent or more to total labor and proprietor income for 1986

n = 553
RURAL FARMING DEPENDENT COUNTIES, 1986

Definition: Farming-dependent counties are nonmetro counties in which farming contributed a weighted annual average of 20% or more to total labor and proprietor income for 1981, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1986

n = 512
RURAL PERSISTENT POVERTY COUNTIES

Percent Operators Work 100 Days or More Off the Farm, 1987

SOURCE: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census
Single Family Households as a Percent of Total 1990

SOURCE: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census
NOTE: Single Family = Male/Female Householder, no Spouse Present
GROWTH INDUSTRIES IN RURAL AREAS PAY AVERAGE WAGES HALF THE LEVEL OF LEADING JOB LOSS INDUSTRIES

1981 - 1986

WINNERS (Average $12,305)

- Eating and Drinking Places: $6,665
- Grocery Stores: $9,972
- Nursing and Personal Care Facilities: $8,631
- Department Stores: $9,075
- Offices and Clinics of Medical Doctors: $27,980

Average Annual Pay

LOSERS (Average $24,675)

- Coal Mining: $32,211
- Oil and Gas Field Services: $16,278
- Telephone Communications: $29,577
- Crude Petroleum and Natural Gas: $26,344
- Machinery and Equipment (whst.): $18,864

Average Annual Pay

SOURCE: Rural Development Perspectives, June-Sept. 1990
Per Capita Income, 1980–89: Counties That Increased by Seventy-Five Percent or More

SOURCE: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis
The Southern Region Program Leadership Committee came into being in Birmingham, Alabama, in September 1990, at the annual Joint Southern Region Program Committee Meeting. The action came as a result of the innovative thinking of several people. The Program Leadership Committee resulted from a recommendation in the Report of the Southern Region Task Force on Organization to the Southern Extension Directors in Atlanta in June 1989. This committee report contained only two major recommendations. They were:

1. Strengthen the regional committee structure; and

2. Establish a Southern Region Program Leadership Committee for the purpose of stimulating increased inter-disciplinary programming.

These recommendations were accomplished. Warren McCord became the chair of the "Interim PLC." Warren reported last year on activities of the interim group to the annual meeting.

At the Joint Southern Region Program Committee Meeting in Birmingham last September, the first official PLC was formed, with an elected representative from each of the seven program areas. The present committee is composed of Bill Allen (Agriculture-Virginia), Sara Bagby (Home Economics-South Carolina), Ned Browning (Communications-Mississippi), Sue Fisher (4-H-Florida), Warren McCord (Community Development-Alabama), James McPhail (Middle Management-Mississippi), Roy Bogle (Advisor-Oklahoma), Doss Brodnax and Bonnie Teater (SRDC) and me (Staff Development-Mississippi). The committee members discovered something quite interesting after taking office. We had no official job description.

The situation, however, was soon remedied. The committee met November 6-7, 1990, with a charge from the Southern Extension Directors to develop a 'job description'. The drafted document included five recommendations which were later approved by the Southern Extension Directors. These recommendations are:

1. Provide leadership for development of Southern Region multi-program area proposals that address existing or emerging issues through communication with program committees and/or establishment of ad hoc groups.

2. Receive, review and comment on program committee (Agriculture, Communications, Community Development, 4-H, Home Economics, Middle Management, Staff Development) reports and make recommendations to the Southern Directors. Program reports, with recommendations, should be sent to the chair of the PLC prior to forwarding to the Southern Directors.

3. Establish and monitor all multi-program area regional program activities approved by Southern Directors.
4. Ensure that information related to regional multi-program area activities is distributed to all state program committee representatives and Southern directors. This information will include PLC action and task force reports. (Note: State program committee representatives will distribute to individuals in their state as appropriate.)

5. Coordinate and plan annual Joint Southern Regional Program Committee meetings.

The PLC has attempted to fulfill its responsibilities during this past year. We have drafted and had approved Task Force Proposal Guidelines, a copy of which will be included with this report. We have helped establish an ad hoc group to develop a proposal for Extension Work in Urban Counties, with George Hadley from Georgia as chair. We recommended and had approved the establishment of a Task Force on Working Poor, with Jennie Kitching of Texas as chair. We also established the Literacy ad hoc committee during the past few weeks, with Chris Sieverdes of South Carolina as chair. We have monitored reports from other committees throughout the year. As your program indicates, we will be hearing from several of these groups.

One of the major responsibilities of the PLC committee is to plan the annual Program Committee meeting. We began planning this meeting immediately after the Birmingham meeting last year. This year we tried to implement a study of some of the issues which surfaced last year. If you will study the Proceedings from the 1990 meeting, you will see cultural diversity, waste management, technology trends, and the issues we will be dealing with during the afternoon all emphasized. Identification of these issues was the intent of the 1990 meeting, but little time was allocated to really look at them in depth, as to their impact on Extension in the future. We therefore felt it necessary to provide time this year for more study of the issues and to provide a mechanism to collect the resulting information and provide it to each of you.

I cannot in all honesty report to you that the conceptualized operational procedure for the PLC has worked perfectly all year. It's too young and too new. But with a little more age and experience, this design is going to be a tremendous asset for Extension in the future. The PLC is a tie between the program areas and the Southern Directors. When the PLC is operating as it should, it will free directors of a lot of busy work and let them be directors. The PLC also provides an accessible ear, an open channel to each of the program areas. The PLC will handle a lot of 'traffic' when it operates as it should.

One other thing I would like to say about the PLC. It is an important job and it is a difficult job to add to an already full schedule back at home. It takes a lot of time and effort, but is well worth it. Those elected to this committee, which is a three year assignment, must be aware of the commitment they are making.

I want to say a special thanks to three people who are going off the PLC at this meeting. They are Warren McCord, Sara Bagby, and James McPhail. Their experience and contributions have been invaluable, and we will miss them. Thanks, each of you.

Those returning committee members also deserve a special thanks. Everyone on this committee works. You have done an excellent job selecting members. I look forward to another year working with this group, with Bill Allen as chair.

I also would be sadly remiss if I did not thank a couple of other people for their work and support. One is Dr. Roy Bogle, Director, Oklahoma. Dr. Bogle, it has been a joy working with you, and I have certainly come to appreciate your dedication to Extension during this past year.
The other person is the mover and the shaker. I think all committee members will join me in saying a sincere thanks to Mrs. Bonnie Teater of the Southern Rural Development Center for her untiring dedication to the details of supporting this committee and the Southern Region. Bonnie, thank you.
TASK FORCE ON THE WORKING POOR

Jennie Kitching, Chair
Texas A&M University

A Task Force on the Working Poor was established in the fall of 1990 to bring together individuals from all Southern states to encourage the development of effective educational programs for the working poor. The Task Force was charged to:

1. Encourage the Extension System in the South to set impact goals for improving the quality of life and opportunity for the working poor;

2. Recommend emerging issues that are most significant to the target audience;

3. Design a plan to encourage effective program development for the working poor, which may include a series of regional workshops;

4. Provide a plan for sharing model educational programs and materials; and

5. Encourage the Extension System in the South to develop linkages with other organizations that provide support to poor families.

The Task Force on the Working Poor is one outcome of the Southern Region Workshop on Family and Economic Well Being held in Dallas, Texas, April 30-May 2, 1990. Extension faculty at the meeting were concerned about the needs of families and family support programs that would improve the economic situation of Southern families and communities.

At the September 1990 meeting of the Joint Southern Region Program Committee, Home Economics State Leaders recommended the appointment of a Task Force as an important step in reaching poor families with appropriate Extension programs. The Task Force was appointed later in the Fall 1990 by the Southern Region Program Leadership Committee.

The Task Force held meetings by conference calls throughout the Spring of 1991. They began their work by developing a common point of reference. The group reviewed definitions of the working poor, explored why Extension should be involved in programming on the topic, identified linkages with other organizations, and outlined techniques for accomplishing the five objectives.

Task Force members identified material to form a reference base. The materials and/or references have been distributed to members.

Two sub-committees have been established:

1. The Emerging Issues Committee is focusing on Objective 2. The group reviewed current information on the target audience and compiled a list of issues critical to the working poor. A rank order of issues has been established to guide future planning.

2. The Committee on Sharing Educational Programs and Materials (Objective 4) was charged to
develop a method for gathering and assembling material; identifying criteria for assessing model programs; outlining critical information needed for sharing; and identifying effective models for sharing.

This is a complex assignment and is in process currently. These tasks represent the primary responsibility of the Task Force and need more consideration, planning and coordination with other Extension activities and systems.

The objectives related to setting impact goals (Objective 1), designing effective program development (Objective 3), and encouraging the System to develop linkages (Objective 5) have been considered. Plans for meeting these objectives will be specified as Objectives 2 and 4 are developed.

The Task Force anticipates the following products will be completed:

1. Clarification and dissemination of issues for priorities of educational programs for the working poor (Year 1);

2. Procedure for sharing materials on the working poor (Year 1);

3. Method for sharing model educational programs (Years 1 and 2);

4. Information on linkages and assistance with developing collaborative efforts (Years 1 and 2); and

5. Plan for initiation of effective program development targeted to the working poor in the South.

Assessment of Task Force activities will include evaluation built into each product. Also, Task Force representatives have agreed to keep a listing of activities in their state which address the USDA FY92-95 Plan of Work focused on Limited Resource/Low-Income Individuals and Audiences.

The Final Report of the Task Force will be made to the 1992 meeting of the Southern Region Program Committee.

Task Force members are:

Alabama:  Evelyn Crayton
          Food and Nutrition Specialist
Arkansas:  Billy Herrington
          Farm Management Specialist
Florida:   Nayda Torres
          Family and Consumer Economics Specialist
Georgia:   JoAnn McCloud-Harrison
          EFNEP Coordinator
Kentucky:  Lori Garkovich
          Professor, Rural Sociology
Louisiana: Rosalie Bivin
          Associate Specialist, Family Development and Management
Mississippi: Martha Ray Sartor
           Extension Home Economist
Oklahoma:  Jim Mosley
           Assistant to the Director Program and Staff Development
North Carolina: Ann Frazier
                4-H Specialist
Puerto Rico:  Gloria Torres
South Carolina: Nancy Porter
              Child Development and Family Specialist
Tennessee:  Anna Mae Kobbe
           Assistant Professor, Home Economics and Family Life
Virginia:   Ann Lastovica
           Family Management Specialist
Chair:      Jennie Kitching
           Assistant Director for Home Economics, Texas
Advisor:    Sara Bagby
           Assistant Director of Extension Home Economics, South Carolina
EXTENSION WORK IN URBAN COUNTIES

George Hadley, Chair
University of Georgia

Southern Extension Directors asked the Program Leadership Committee to examine the need for a regional workshop addressing in-service educational needs of Extension personnel involved in the delivery of urban programs.

The Program Leadership Committee had no knowledge of a formal needs assessment ever being conducted in the Southern Region.

A committee was appointed (with no funds) to develop a proposal with justification for in-service training needs for "Extension Work In Urban Counties."

A proposal was developed through correspondence and a phone conference with committee members in late February and sent to the Program Leadership Committee for review.

The proposal emphasized the demographics in the South and how an increasing number of Extension clientele now reside in urban areas.

These audiences have educational needs that can be partially met with Extension's current knowledge and research base. New staffing models and partnerships with business, government and community organizations must be developed in order for Extension to continue effective programming.

The committee also felt that our state, district and county Extension staffs appear to have training needs in the following areas:

* Vision and philosophy of Extension in urban areas
* Program marketing and visibility
* Working partnerships with the political environment and other agencies and organizations
* Securing and managing financial and personnel resources
* Program models that are successful in addressing priority urban issues

Our proposal had two major components:

1. To identify current training needs of state, district and county staff who program in urban areas; and

2. To provide leadership for implementing a regional staff development and training plan that would address these training needs

After receiving the green light to continue, our first timeline was to conduct a needs assessment and training resource survey during the Summer of 1991.

After tons of correspondence, our committee developed two needs assessments by phone in July.

One needs assessment was developed for State Directors and one for staff involved in the development and implementation of Extension programs in urban areas. Both surveys were sent to State Directors in early August, and they were asked to return the State Directors survey to me on or before August 23.
The major question on the Director's Survey:

"Given the current budget situation, would you support sending a team to a Southern Region Urban Extension Conference? Yes or No Comments:"

Out of the 10 states that returned the needs assessment, only three felt current budget situations would allow them to participate at this time.

The committee, upon approval from the Program Leadership Committee today, is prepared to send out the needs assessment for county, district, and state staffs to a state contact in each state. This individual would survey co-workers involved in urban programs and send one survey summary back to the committee which would reflect the training needs of that state. We will compile the summaries to develop Part 2 of our proposal— "To offer a conference or teleconference on Extension Work In Urban Counties."

Since there is some question about a conference, I will meet on behalf of the committee with the Program Leadership Committee tonight to talk about a downlink or any other communications tool we can develop to accomplish our goal.

Thank You.

Task Force members are:

Georgia
Virginia
Mississippi
Texas
Georgia
Florida
Mississippi
Florida

George Hadley, Chairperson
Robert Doyle
Janet Lukens
Ellen Ritter
Rose Simmons
Maurice Cole
Jerome Burton
Sue Fisher, Advisor
WASTE MANAGEMENT TASK FORCE

Mike Levi, Chair
North Carolina State University

BACKGROUND

The Southern Region Extension Waste Management Task Force was established in May 1990 by the Southern Region Extension Directors. The charge to the task force was to:

1. Determine the expertise that currently exists in the Southern Region;
2. Determine the major components of an educational program that should be conducted by Extension;
3. Determine what joint efforts can be made to actually develop educational program material; and
4. Determine how to train Extension staff in the Southern Region to use this educational material.

The directors requested a preliminary report by September 1, 1990; and a final report by May 1991.

The task force held a one-day meeting in Atlanta on July 12, a conference call meeting on August 15, and a two-day meeting in Atlanta November 5 and 6. A final meeting was held on May 8, 1991, during the Regional Solid Waste Management Conference in Atlanta. Most of the task force work was accomplished by correspondence and telephone.

This report summarizes the task force’s accomplishments for each of its charges and presents recommendations for future actions.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Components of Extension Waste Management Programs

The preliminary report of the task force recommended the focus of regional efforts be on the development of a comprehensive program for the management of residential and municipal solid waste materials currently going to the landfill. Other aspects of solid waste management including agricultural waste, commercial and industrial non-hazardous waste and food processing waste were not addressed in the materials and recommendations developed by the task force, although they are recognized as being important Extension programs in many states.

Successful programs in solid waste management require interdisciplinary efforts across all program areas and should include technological, economic, financial, environmental, sociological, public policy and regulatory aspects. Program components selected by the task force for education were waste stream analysis, product degradability, source reduction, composting, recycling, small source hazardous waste, incineration, landfills, and financing. Waste collection and transportation was added later.

These components were used as categories in developing directories of Extension expertise and educational resource materials in the Southern Region, and as topics in the Regional Extension Waste Management Conference.
Southern Region Expertise in Solid Waste Management

A "Directory of Extension Expertise in Waste Management in the Southern Region" was developed based on a survey distributed to participants at the Regional Extension Waste Management Conference; and a copy was provided to each state contact. The directory lists, by state, experts in each component of solid waste. It is designed to facilitate communication between states in specific areas of solid waste management, and to encourage sharing of educational materials, training programs and expertise across state lines.

Educational Program Materials

A "1991 Southern Region Resource Directory for Solid Waste Management" was developed based on a survey distributed by Extension State Waste Management Coordinators/Contracts. The directory was distributed to participants at the Regional Extension Waste Management Conference and a camera-ready copy was provided to each state contact. The directory lists both Extension and non-Extension publications, slide sets and videotapes available for each component of solid waste.

The directory was reviewed for fact sheets that could be used regionally. Seventeen fact sheets were selected for regional use and camera ready copies with a space for state identification were printed by Texas and distributed to each state contact. The fact sheets are also available on disc from Texas, and states have been encouraged to adapt the content of the publications as they choose.

The usefulness of these fact sheets is being evaluated by survey; and the task force is prepared to solicit additional fact sheets and also review slide sets, videotapes, and computer software for possible regional use if so requested by the directors (see recommendation 3).

Training Extension Staff

The task force recommended in its preliminary report that a three-day regional conference would be the most cost effective training program that could be offered quickly to support county programs in solid waste management. The conference was held May 8-10, 1991, in Atlanta with an attendance of 90 from 19 states. Approximately 60% of the attendees were state specialists, 30% county/area faculty, and the remainder Extension administrators and non-Extension representatives. Support was provided by Extension Service-USDA, Southern Partnership for Managing Waste (the solid waste program of the Conference of Southern County Associations), Farm Foundation, Chambers Development, Inc., Browning Ferris Industries, Inc., and the Southern Rural Development Center.

The objectives of the conference were:

1. To encourage the implementation of interdisciplinary programs in solid waste management at the state, regional and county levels;
2. To update participants on technical and regulatory developments in solid waste management;
3. To highlight successful county and state extension programs in solid waste management; and
4. To familiarize participants with resource materials available to support solid waste management programs.

Each participant received a notebook including expanded abstracts of presentations, and directories of expertise and resource materials. Informal sharing sessions each night also provided an opportunity for participants to view and exchange state program materials.

A review of conference evaluations indicated that two-thirds of the participants thought the conference helped them understand, to a great extent, the
multidisciplinary approach to solid waste management; found the case examples, sharing sessions and resource materials very helpful; and increased their knowledge of educational programs to a great extent. The responses of state and county/area staff were the same. All states except one either have or are forming a multidisciplinary leadership team for solid waste management.

The regional conference was designed to train trainers who would return to their states to share information on resource materials and programs with other specialists and agents. Other training opportunities which the task force was unable to pursue because of time constraints included video training (AG*SAT has issued an RFP in this area), audio conferences (Texas has planned a series of audio conferences on waste management for 1991), and exchange of management experts across state lines.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Waste management was approved as a National Initiative for Extension shortly after the establishment of the Southern Region Extension Waste Management Task Force. Every state in the South is currently seeking ways to address its solid waste program management problems. In most states, Extension has significantly expanded its commitment to providing waste management educational programs for community leaders and the general public, despite severe budget restrictions. There is the opportunity and need for Extension to play an even greater educational role in the immediate future. This expanded role is strongly endorsed by the Southern Partnership for Managing Waste. If Extension is to take full advantage of this opportunity, cooperation between states will be essential.

The task force offers the following recommendations to facilitate this cooperation.

1. The Southern Region Extension Waste Management Task Force should continue to function as a subcommittee of the proposed Southern Extension and Research Activity (SERA) on Solid Waste. The task force was formed for one year. The task force believes, however, that rapid changes in technology and regulations for solid waste management, and the need for development of additional resource materials and training, warrants continuation of the task force for another year.

2. A second Regional Extension Solid Waste Management Conference should be held in May 1992, possibly in conjunction with a proposed Extension Water Quality Conference. Emphasis should again be placed on providing information that will assist in the delivery of high quality county and state Extension programs in solid waste management. It is recommended that the next conference provide more in-depth training through the use of concurrent sessions in addition to providing opportunities for updates and sharing. It may be appropriate to bring together research and Extension faculty at least for a part of the conference.

3. The task force should develop additional fact sheets and circulate information on slide sets, videotapes and computer programs appropriate for regional use, if there is sufficient interest for Extension State Waste Management Coordinators/Contacts.

A survey is being circulated to state contacts to determine their interest in, and need for such materials.
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Roundtable Reports/Cultural Diversity
CULTURAL DIVERSITY

1. What are the key issues in the South relative to cultural diversity in Extension programming and staffing?

   Philosophy
   -- " Somebody else's job" — commitment? We should work with diversity because its right.
   -- Differences at national and local levels on what Extension should do.
   -- Focus on social issues rather than agriculture.
   -- Redefine mission and role. What do we need to be doing and with whom? Let's not duplicate services.
   -- Acceptance that we must change the way we do business.

   Training Needs
   -- How to work with urban audiences; Extension's role in urban areas?
   -- How to deal with diversity in economics, education, relationships, language, attitudes/values about work and family.
   -- Provide more cultural diverse experiences (ex: Dennard).
   -- Celebrate strengths of other cultures.

   Organizational
   -- Bring public along with changing mission; community acceptance.
   -- Funds needed to provide necessary training.
   -- Developing credibility with diverse audiences.
   -- Organizational structure at county level; with whom do we network?
   -- Politics; some audiences have little political clout!
   -- Use of media/methods that are not relevant to minorities.
   -- Migrant workers and illegal aliens pose a challenge—legal vs. mandate to serve all.

   Staffing
   -- Rethink who we hire— not just race/ethnicity.
   -- Inadequate multi-cultural staffing; start recruitment earlier.
   -- Perception that one must be of the same background to work with diverse audiences.
   -- Language barriers.
   -- Employees are locked into career tracks; difficult to reallocate these resources.

2. What actions are currently being taken in our states to deal with cultural diversity issues?

   Training
   -- To scan community; awareness.
   -- To deal with diverse audiences as learning experience.
   -- Sensitivity training.
   -- Annual conference addresses cultural diversity topics.
   -- Leadership institutes for Extension faculty.
   -- Offer summer internships for minorities.
   -- Training for minority "pool" of applicants.
   -- Institute to deal with language diversity (AID).
Organizational
-- Secure special grants for targeted programs.
-- Reorganize advisory committees to include diverse groups.
-- Interagency cooperation (develop materials together); work with minority organizations.
-- Use EFNEP model
-- Move minority 4-H member into leadership roles
-- University President speaks/stimulates action (recruitment of faculty and students)
-- 1862-1890 joint programming
-- Extension cultural diversity team-identifies problem
-- Increase diversity of staff; recruit at minority colleges; hiring without traditional degrees; hiring of military spouses
-- Materials in different languages
-- Local funding to support local, targeted programs

Programs
-- Leadership training for under-represented populations
-- Work with targeted audiences--housing developments, county officials
-- More community development emphasis
-- Homemaker Clubs target literacy problem with parent reading to children program
-- Employ minorities at 4-H camps
-- "Community Voices" leadership program (NCA&T)
-- Develop strategies to continue their involvement and ensure that empowerments have staying power
-- Nutrition programs for children of migrant workers
-- Literacy plus general education training

3. What additional actions should Extension be taking so cultural diversity truly becomes a resource vs. a problem in our programs?

-- Identify culturally diverse groups in each state. Set a good example.
  -- hiring (active recruiting),
  -- training program for Extension professionals to work with cultural diversity,
  -- link with key groups/leaders in community groups, and
  -- focus on Issues.
-- Cultural exchanges:
  -- among regions in a state,
  -- among sections of the city, and
  -- across neighborhoods.
-- Redefine the vision.
-- Identify why people become involved in the community. What are their
  -- jobs/economics,
  -- education, and
  -- politics?
-- Make positions available for visiting minority staff
-- Increase representation on advisory committees
-- Expand efforts to help youth understand diversity
-- Link with the public school systems to help minorities identify and progress toward an Extension career track
-- Maintain flexibility in our requirements for employment with Extension
-- Public policy involvement in all decision making processes
-- Sensitize the leadership of Extension System to cultural diversity.
-- Encourage and pay for alternative language training for field staff and specialists.
-- Identify and emulate model programs.
-- Create rewards for persons who have success in dealing with diverse audiences.

4. What regional activities would be useful to states as they continue their efforts in this area?

-- Develop workshop to train Extension leadership, specialists and Extension agents on specific cultural diversity issues.
-- Examine strengths of each state. Develop regional concepts.
-- Sharing within and between states. What is going on with training, staffing and funding?
-- Identification of "regional" expertise in the area of cultural diversity.
-- Develop a short-course on two issues: Philosophical Change and Technological Change.
-- Southern regional establish committee to study issues related to cultural diversity:
   -- programmatic,
   -- staffing, and
   -- training.
-- Suggest a regional task force to network with multicultural groups, i.e., urban league, NAACP, LeReza Unida, LULAC.
-- Encourage 4-H ethnic appreciation programs by sharing curriculum materials.
-- Encourage internships while potential employees are being educated.
-- Improve contacts to better share language translated materials.
-- Establish a regional circuit-riding team that demonstrates and explains cultural diversity.
-- Designate staff development (or other individual) to communicate educational programs across the South on cultural diversity.
-- Ask directors, university presidents, Farm Bureau representative to discuss this issue with us next year.
-- Prepare a Kellogg grant request for a 3-year training program. Extension directors and vice presidents to be the faculty.
-- Work with industry to identify how industry can work with diversity.
Roundtable Report

Making Issues Programming Effective
STAFFING

1. What specific problems/opportunities do you see for Extension in this area?

-- Some expertise doesn’t match new needs.
-- Do we want just ag/home ec degreed county agents?
-- Hire expertise, then needs change. What do we do with existing staff?
-- What professional development is needed?
   -- How much can be done to re-train, retool?
   -- Go to short term employment?
-- Need a disciplinary base before you can address interdisciplinary issue. Program strength depends on strong disciplines "at the table."
-- When will Extension find the source of expertise to retool agent staff? Specialists? Who will retool them?
-- Scared to give up (potentially) your political base.
-- We’re letting 15-20% of (county budget) drive our staffing pattern.
   -- We’re still working with the original model.
   -- Who’s complaining? Our own change-oriented employees.
   -- Also employees who don’t want to change.
-- Concerned about how new committee structure will impact on work previously done. Who will tend to concerns tended to by previous committees?
-- Dallying around, trying to avoid the inevitable.

2. What are some of the current actions/program models that are helping address this situation?

-- Downsizing, yet trying to staff all counties, as much the same as possible.
-- Strategic planning.
-- Tennessee is moving toward a point system to determine staffing. Counties must fund part of staff beyond basic staff.
-- Kentucky has had an average increase in county funds of 8% per year, earmarked mill rate in tax base. Important to stay close to people. (Factors include physiology, funding, politics, local problems)

3. What further actions are needed? At what level should the actions take place? By whom? What actions, if any, should be taken in the Southern Region?

-- Go to shorter term appointments.
-- Program development people come together for regional training and networking sessions.
-- Provide more training.
-- The ideal county agent needs good interpersonal skills as #1 priority.
-- Pool ideas about what transitions are taking place - the history, the staffing, procedures, pros/cons.
-- Need to know what has worked, is working. We don’t want to walk into known problems.
-- Share staff across state lines for short periods of time, especially when exploring strategies, giving specialized training.
   -- You borrow the person, you pay expenses, including materials.
   -- Excellent for short-term needs.
   -- Objective analysis.
-- Region-wide development of materials. Task force for this and inservice education.
- Clarify how "old" and "new" program strategies interrelate. Single discipline and multidisciplinary & interdisciplinary.
- Need for possible "certification of agents by inservice training, will tie-in to performance approval system, salary compensation, etc."
NETWORKING INTERNALLY

1. What specific problems/opportunities do you see for Extension in this area?

   -- Haven't had all the expertise needed in Schools of Agriculture. Had to use other departments.
   -- Value of attitudes of department heads toward Extension work is important. Does Extension work serve their career goals and needs. Some will do this for a fee. Perceptions of other departments as ivory tower types.
   -- Working with other faculty--in other departments provides enhanced attraction to programs. Some departments have their own agenda and therefore may not be willing to release their resources for Extension without added funds being supplied. These faculty have release time available for special funding--especially if they are not on 12-month appointment.
   -- Perception that networking is not truly supported by administrators in performance appraisals, salaries and allocation of resources.
   -- Causes more time to be spent in committee meeting.
   -- Job descriptions have not been revised to include networking.
   -- Some issue committees have been allocated funds.
   -- May not speed tenure and promotion tracks.
   -- In dealing with public policy issues a broad base of expertise is required.
   -- Many people like the opportunity to get out and work in the real world.
   -- Networking is dependent on communication.
   -- Will force us to go to the computer for more rapid communication.

2. What are some of the current actions/program models that are helping address this situation?

   -- Adjunct appointments from other departments with common interests to support Extension programs.
   -- Joint committees and programs with 1890 institutions.
   -- Legislatures and granting agencies support these efforts.
   -- Need support for these from senior administrators with a shared vision for programs to clientele.
   -- Issue committees.
   -- Soft county lines.
   -- Proposal and grant request requirements are making networking essential.
   -- Agriculture has several integrated approaches to program management.
   -- Networking often based on internal needs.
   -- Meeting the needs:
     -- Need to focus on how we can structure organizationally to meet the clientele needs.
     -- Networking between (among) counties, among specialists and administrators.
     -- Need to look at networking at all levels of the organization and including all of higher education.
   -- Failed to include the 1890 institutions here--often think they are doing better at networking than we actually are.
   -- End result of networking might be coalition building.
   -- How do we initiate networking where it is not requested or desired
   -- 10%-30% of counties were estimated to be networking across disciplines.
   -- Issues are forcing networking.
3. What further actions are needed? At what level should the actions take place? By whom? What actions, if any, should be taken in the Southern region?

-- Extension should be encouraged to improve communications with other departments. Additional interaction will improve the image of both efforts (Extension and department).
-- Share ideas between institutions with similar goals.
-- Extension can facilitate program packages from other departments.
-- Share training opportunities and materials across states.
-- Form regional linkages for publication development.
-- Use of AgSat.
-- Teleconferencing.
NETWORKING EXTERNALLY

1. What specific problems/opportunities do you see for Extension in this area?
   -- There is always concern for "who gets the credit."
   -- Most organizations feel the need to maintain their identify in any coalition.
   -- It takes time to network.
   -- We often lose complete control or have to compromise in order to accomodate the needs or desires of other agencies involved in the network.
   -- In networking, there should be not be a hierarchy: all participants should be equal.
   -- Extension staff lack skills in networking.
   -- To be successful in networking, Extension needs to understand the culture and needs of the other agencies.
   -- Extension can gain additional resources, and sometimes visibility, through networking.
   -- Successful networking requires specific agreements be developed early in the planning of joint projects.

2. What are some of the current actions/program models that are helping address this situation?
   -- Agrimedicine programs.
   -- Coalitions with youth services agencies.
   -- Military programs.
   -- Joint programs with ETV.
   -- FCL.
   -- EPNEP.

3. What further actions are needed? At what level should the actions take place? By whom? What actions, if any should be taken in the Southern Region?
   -- Three-year core training program for new employees to include networking is needed. This would augment the "Working With Extension's Publics" materials. This can be done at the regional level.
   -- State administration and program leaders should lay the ground work with many agencies for networking by specialists and agents.
   -- A catalog of productive networking examples should be compiled. Again this should be done at the regional level.
   -- Choose coalitions based on critical issues, and joint programs should be directed toward an Extension objectives.
   -- USDA, SRDC, and other regional organizations including regional committees can form networks with other organizations on behalf of states.
BUILDING EXPANDED SUPPORT BASE

1. What specific problems/opportunities do you see for Extension in this area?
   -- Support base does not want to expand.
   -- Have not wisely chosen our advisory committees.
   -- Identifying private support bases.
   -- Identity of the CES organization with general public.
   -- Prioritize time to accomplish objectives.
   -- Keep support base informed and involved in programs.
   -- Expand long-term support groups.
   -- Increase grassroots support of users of CES to insure funding.
   -- Do not need to simply service other agencies. We're the middle man and could be eliminated. Often we get credit only during joint meetings.
   -- Guard against being in too many things--some things we shouldn't be involved in.
   -- How do you take new "issues" and fold into our existing base program? Need to remember "who brought us to the dance."
   -- Be sure those who control dollars (from the governor on down) understand what you're all about.
   -- Be sure key elected officials and leaders know what we're doing. We must do a better job of marketing.
   -- We need to reach a higher percentage of our existing clientele base.
   -- Look at how we get the resources to fit the job that needs to be done.
   -- Must adapt our delivery--Times meetings are held, etc.
   -- Need to expand agri- beyond production agri--be sure key individuals understand.
   -- Hard to reach urban legislators.
   -- Lot of people coming to use to access our delivery system.
   -- Community development network to involve more community leaders. We have expertise and county network. Many other groups have resources.
   -- Multimillion dollar greenhouse industry--Atlanta--20 units trained by Extension.

2. What are some of the current actions/program models that are helping address this situation?
   -- Strong advisory groups (grassroots--state--national).
   -- Accountability reports to governing bodies.
   -- Youth at Risk programs to expand support.
   -- EFNEP operating in urban situations.
   -- Networking with other agencies working on same or similar problems.
   -- Issues programming.

3. What further actions are needed? At what level should the actions take place? By whom? What actions, if any, should be taken in the Southern region?
   -- Identify critical issues design programs and execute them in the appropriate environment and overtly make governing bodies aware of the accomplishments.
   -- Improve identity (visibility) with support groups.
   -- A sharing of successful activities to increase or improve support bases within the region.
   -- Staff development to enhance acceptance of change by Faculty members (CES) (Issues, 4H, Ag, HE).
-- States consider an associate director or administrative assistant to the director for public relations to work early on with legislators.
-- Agents organize to support themselves, political action groups.
-- Support each other—every state is unique.
-- Sharing of problems—this type of meeting—sharing of solutions and opportunities.
-- Regional training for Extension lobbyist.
-- Involve politicians (key leaders) in agenda setting of Extension.
-- Program must have impact on the clientele served by the political leaders.
-- Key federal legislators involved in programs also.
-- Should we try to be more effective in Southern region in earmarking legislation? Need to market with legislators in entire region. Is a regional publication a possibility to help market Extension capabilities on certain issues (the staff and opportunities)?
-- Continue to improve communication among states.
UTILIZING THE TOTAL UNIVERSITY

1. What specific problems/opportunities do you see for Extension in this area?

-- Education of Extension people about the land-grant concept.
-- Education of the rest of the university about the land-grant concept and what it means.
-- We are not the sole provider of information to client groups. Other outreach groups are available and growing.
-- University Extension—offering continuing education courses off campus is often in conflict with Cooperative Extension.
-- Competition for top quality educators and ability for CES to compete for these people. Better rewards being offered from other colleges, etc.
-- Units of the land-grant university and the CES, philosophically different, goals differ. Not concerned with public service mission.
-- How serious the land-grant institutions take their role for all three parts—Research/Extension/Institution.
-- Different perceptions of community service. Some colleges view one Extension course per year as service.
-- Lack of clear understanding of land-grant concept by faculty and administration.
-- Clear disregard for land-grant mission in favor of recruiting elite students.
-- We want to protect our identity, so we're reluctant to be folded into a broader university system.
-- We have to buy the time of non-Extension faculty to get assistance.
-- Junior faculty don't get tenure credit for work they do for Extension.
-- Sometimes we act like the land-grant is the only source of information. We need to take a broader look at sources of information.

2. What are some of the current actions/program models that are helping address this situation?

-- Finding a definition that has common interest with Extension programs.
-- Identifying common issues of interest and working together towards achieving those issues.
-- Governor’s conference on Rural Business (Oklahoma) Teamwork Oklahoma and conference for Business leaders in Oklahoma.
-- Sharing partial ownership of people who have specific talents etc., for specific programs.
-- University study to look at who is doing what in outreach.
-- Literacy education programs involving Extension, several departments plus several branches of state government to establish strategies for literacy education in Texas.
-- Working jointly with departments for recruiting of students for specific industries (North Carolina).
-- Changing logos and names to reflect stronger connection with university (several states).
-- Series of 3 tapes on land-grant university system by G. L. Carter, North Carolina.
-- Involving university faculty on initiative themes for Extension.
-- Kentucky (State tour organized through chancellor’s office for new faculty, including Extension staff to familiarize university faculty with the states.
-- South Carolina Rural leadership Program (Kellogg) involving top faculty in community leadership development programs.
-- Texas AgSAT. University departments have had to buy into our technology. This has created new partnerships among faculty.
-- Mississippi Teleconference Network is jointly run by Extension, athletics and other.
Kentucky College of Agriculture has taken the lead to raise money for a new library.

Florida sometimes get help from other state institutions that want to cooperate with Extension, especially in issue programs.

Oklahoma Ag in the Classroom is creating partnerships across campus.

Georgia Extension has become an active participant in recruiting for College of Agriculture.

3. What further actions are needed? At what level should the actions take place? By whom? What actions, if any, should be taken in the Southern region?

-- Strategy setting by the directors of the Southern region on how to uniformly approach universities on Extension's role in the land-grant system.
-- Share the G. L. Center tapes with each state.
-- Sharing success stories among states that have a good relationship within the university.
-- Work through NASULGC to emphasize Extension's role in the land-grant university.
-- Extension should take the initiative to bring the land-grant university along with us in this important area of Extension education.
-- Orientation for land-grant administrators and faculty on the purpose and mission of land-grant universities.
-- Recommend completion of final module of "Working with our Publics." Unit was intended to be able to orient university administrators to the mission of the land-grant university (being done at North Carolina State University).
UTILIZING TECHNOLOGY

1. What specific problems/opportunities do you see for Extension in this area?

- Cost (more sharing will help this).
- Tradition—resistance to change.
- Technology enables changes.
- Maintaining "high touch" along with high tech.
- Must balance what we pay with what we get.
- We must adjust what we do to match people's needs at the time.
- Lots of dollars going into the technology (AgSat, etc.) but little impact being seen.
- More up front thought is needed in advance of purchasing the technology and how it will be used.
- Specialist faculty often intimidated by the technology.
- Perception that high tech systems threaten the concept of a local office. Structure may not be built by best use of high technology.
- Must recognize the cultural diversity of clientel group and utilize appropriate technology.

2. What are some of the current actions/program models that are helping address this situation?

- Virginia uses interactive CD rom at mall to reach new audiences with limited resources.
- North Carolina uses technology to retrain personnel i.e., training 80 livestock agents in waste management.
- Florida technology enables agents/specialists to quickly shape provide/evaluate and revise more effective programs.
- Virginia provides rapid sharing of information between professionals.
- Virginia Kellogg Grant; electronic information delivery with interactive video combined with CD rom technology.
- Florida publications can go into CD rom format. Desk top publishing, downloaded to counties that later print sections/all of the publications.
- Make more use of distance learning techniques to facilitate inservice training.
- North Carolina to use compressed video to teach courses.
- Virginia, Kentucky, Florida entire POW reporting on computer for quick access by agents, specialists and administrators.
- Alabama downlink capabilities in every county. Also, developing own production studio.
- Local cable system has been effective with low income (Hispanic in Texas).
- Oklahoma found best use of high tech has been in staff development. Virginia has had similar experiences.
- Several states are using far more effective communications.
- Communications within the system—Virginia has every office hooked up electronically

3. What further actions are needed? At what level should the actions take place? By whom? What actions, if any, should be taken in the Southern region?

- Survey states as to what states are doing and what is working. What made it work!
- Should we invite/involve/recommend the annual technology conference meet with us in the future?
- Technology will enable Extension to be a better knowledge broker
Program Committee Feedback
PROGRAM COMMITTEE FEEDBACK
Roundtable Discussions

Agriculture—Bill Allen

Cultural Diversity

Actions This Program Area Will Initiate
1. State reports focusing on success in cultural diversity in ANR programming will be summarized midyear and shared with ANR program leaders.
2. A group will be formed to look at diversity in agriculture.

Recommended Multi-Program Area Regional Actions
1. ANR recommends that a task force be formed to guide and train Extension professionals in cultural diversity.
2. Strengthen program ties with 1890 institutions.

Issues Programming Topics
Actions This Program Area Will Initiate
1. To network internally ANR will share successes to raise visibility and capabilities that could position us for regional funding.
2. To interact with the total university, each state ANR Program will plan an "event sharing" experience on cultural diversity to influence and enhance support by the total university.
3. ANR will catalogue educational materials that have been used to support cultural diversity.

Recommended Multi-Program Area Regional Actions
1. Each state should sponsor an "event sharing" experience at their university on cultural diversity to influence and enhance support by the total university.
2. Re-evaluate job vacancies and staffing strategies to reflect and readjust staffing composition.
3. Share resources by cataloging educational materials.

Communications—Ned Browning

Cultural Diversity

Actions This Program Area Will Initiate
1. Develop standards, procedures and advice on ways to develop/tailor media to the specific needs of diverse audiences.
2. Develop staffing strategies to ensure sensitivity to diverse audience interests.

Recommended Multi-Program Area Regional Actions
1. Develop a regional training program for raising consciousness of audience diversity. Communication group recommends a multi-media approach for greatest flexibility.

Issues Programming Topics
Actions This Program Area Will Initiate
1. Take a more active role in familiarizing administrators, agents and specialists with appropriate use of communications technologies. Maintain a workable mix of developing and traditional media.
2. Maintain and enhance organizational identity within appropriate contexts. Each state is organized differently. Identity emphases fall into three basic areas: a) Extension
standing alone; b) Extension within a unit with Experiment Station; or, c) Extension with a comprehensive university structure.

3. Encourage better use of communications departments' contacts with commodity and trade groups to improve overall networking.

Recommended Multi-Program Area Regional Actions

1. Staffing standards should not be limited to traditional programming areas. Staff should have appropriate communication skills to deal with emerging technologies and to better deal with clients.

2. Ensure involvement of communication specialists on all task forces and planning activities.

Community Development—Warren McCord

Cultural Diversity

Actions This Program Area Will Initiate

1. Develop a paper on using community development methodology to involve people from different cultures in Extension programs.

Issues Programming Topics

Actions This Program Area Will Initiate

1. CRD can and is willing to take the lead in some multiprogram area project to develop recommended methods of developing linkages with units within and without the university.

Recommended Multi-Program Area Regional Actions

1. Recommend a panel of directors on program next year to discuss their philosophy toward staff working with other units across the University and within the states. Do they support it, do they encourage it, under what conditions, and is it rewarded—are staff given credit?

2. Regional task force is needed or PLC should examine ways of developing and maintaining contacts with regional groups and organizations such as NACo and Southern Legislative Conference.

4-H Youth Development—Sue Fisher

Cultural Diversity

Actions This Program Area Will Initiate

1. Cultural diversity be a topic of 93 Southern Region Planning Conference and 92 Southern Region Leader Forum.

2. Southern Region 4-H Curriculum Committee survey, catalog, and communicate diversity 4-H programs and materials.

3. Southern region 4-H Youth Program support the development of a center for coalition building to enhance cultural diversity for Extension.

4. 4-H Program (conference, congress, summer camps, etc.) highlight cultural diversity in program content, materials and personnel.

Recommended Multi-Program Area Regional Actions

1. Share staff through joint appointments in 1890 and 1862 staffing structures.

2. Scholarships and internships for potential culturally diverse staff and interns

3. Staff in 4-H and Youth Development not necessarily limited to those with Ag and HE degrees.
Issues Programming Topics

Actions This Program Area Will Initiate

1. Share staff expertise across state lines—specifically focusing on short term knowledge sharing assignments.
2. Continue the current regional publication development work but explore improved means of sharing curricula in ways other than the print media.
3. Work together to identify a regional corporation (such as Coke) to use their printing presses for a day to print 4-H publications for regional usage.

Recommended Multi-Program Area Regional Actions

1. Don’t restrict the hiring of 4-H staff to the disciplines of Ag and HE.
2. Incorporate into the specialist hiring process the detailing of responsibilities for youth development as a part of their responsibilities.
3. Communicate the existence of "working with our publics" and encourage regional usage. Complete the final segment designed to orient university administration to land-grant mission.
4. Help us understand what support is available to help us make better decisions about the selection of appropriate technology for implementation and how we might network more effectively.

Middle Management--James McPhail

Cultural Diversity

Actions This Program Area Will Initiate

1. Staffing—use of internships, contractual hiring to address emerging issues. Training programs for present and future employees in working with cultural diversity. Use of grassroots advisory groups.
2. Educate public to changing mission and support agents.

Recommended Multi-Program Area Regional Actions

1. Establish regional circuit-riding concept that demonstrates and explains cultural diversity.
2. Examine strengths of each state and develop regional concepts.

Issues Programming Topics

Actions This Program Area Will Initiate

1. Train county Extension workers in dealing with county and state political figures to make them aware of accomplishments.
2. Ensure proper inservice training for agents to deal with emerging issues.

Recommended Multi-Program Area Regional Actions

1. Catalog of products networking examples

Home Economics--Sara Bagby

Cultural Diversity

Actions This Program Area Will Initiate

1. Address cultural diversity with Extension Homemakers/other groups with whom we work.
2. Identify 1) person with expertise and 2) sources of available resources in the area of cultural diversity.

Recommended multi-program area regional actions
1. Increase acceptance of cultural diversity within the Cooperative Extension system.
2. Develop comprehensive staff development plan
3. Conduct awareness/sensitivity training to increase acceptance of cultural differences, using experts outside the Extension organization.

Issues Programming Topics
Actions This Program Area Will Initiate
1. Continue to move toward issues based programs, carefully selecting issues of high priority to decision makers; develop and implement effective programs addressing these issues; and improve communications with decision makers about these programs.
2. Explore models and alternatives for expanding support base for Extension Home Economics including:
   - advisory groups
   - total university
   - external linkages/networks
3. Encourage Extension participation in University affairs (including government, committees, task forces, etc.), work to remove barriers to integrating Extension faculty and programs into the University community; communicate with central University administration about Extension functions into the land grant systems.

Issues Programming Topics
Actions This Program Area Will Initiate
1. Expanding support base.
3. Utilizing total university.

Staff and Program Development—Shirley Gerken
Cultural Diversity
Actions This Program Area Will Initiate
1. Identify resources—both people and material such as videos and publications to support development and program development.
2. Develop an agenda item for next year’s conference to involve exemplary practices and resource persons.

Recommended Multi-Program Area Regional Actions
1. The actions noted above will enhance regional efforts in cultural diversity.

Issues Programming Topics
Actions This Program Area Will Initiate
1. Advocate the completion of Module 8—"The Land-Grant System" in the Working with our Pu Series.
2. Develop fact sheets on networking.
3. Develop a process to inform and involve support base.

Recommended Multi-Program Area Regional Actions
1. The actions noted above will enhance regional efforts in the areas of networking with the subject bases, and providing education related to the land-grant system.
Program Committee Reports
The Southern Region Agriculture and Natural Resources Program Committee met in Atlanta, Georgia, September 4-6, 1991, in conjunction with the Southern Region Program Leadership Committee. Elwyn Deal (SC), chaired the group. Billy Caldwell (NC) served as vice-chair and Ray Campbell (OK) as secretary. Each of the thirteen states in the region were represented. In addition, Bud Webb (SC) met with the group as administrative advisor for the Southern Region Directors.

Vivan Jennings, agriculture Program leader ES/USDA, presented an update report on the sustainable agriculture/integrated systems initiative. He reiterated the message society in general is saying via the 1990 Farm Bill regarding a sustainable/environmentally sound agriculture. An outgrowth of this has been the formation of the Sustainable Agriculture Coalition representing over thirty special interest groups including commercial production agriculture, consumer, and environmental awareness groups. All groups are getting together and positioning themselves with the sustainable agriculture approach. Cooperative Extension Service should do the same.

The general consensus of the ANR group was that this was of a high enough priority that we in the Southern Region need to position ourselves on what Extension's roles and responsibilities in the Southern should be regarding program priorities in this area. An ad hoc committee consisting of Joe Waldrum (AR), chairman; Billy Caldwell (NC); Curt Absher (KY), John Wilson (TN); Ray Campbell (OK); Elwyn Deal (SC); Bill Allen (VA) and others as the chairman deems necessary was appointed to prepare a positioning document to recommend how the Southern Region Extension programming effort should be address this issue.

Bud Webb reported on the recommendations of the Southern Region Extension and Experiment Station Directors meeting regarding Southern Extension and Research Activity (SERA) task forces, workshops, and information exchange groups. As these new groups begin to form and function, the ANR group may need to link at the Extension working committees across the region of a regional EPA/Extension liaison position to be jointly funded with EPA/ES/USDA, and participating states in the region.

A number of issues regarding programming priorities were discussed by the entire group at the request of the Program Leadership Committee.

A compendia of methods that each state is using to address multicultural diversity within ANR programs will be compiled. This issue will be a focus of discussion on the 1992 ANR Program Leaders meeting agenda.

M.K. (Curly) Cook (GA) reviewed problems and concerns that the Georgia Cooperative Extension Service had recently experienced regarding extreme budget reductions and how states could prepare themselves in advance to respond to proposed budget cutbacks as they affect
program delivery (copy attached).

A discussion was held by Billy Caldwell, (NC) concerning regional ANR groups. Advisor appointments and meeting updates were reviewed. Caldwell recommended we take a close look at all committees that will be formed as a result of SERA to consider where there is duplication and what committees could possibly be consolidated or dropped. Elwyn Deal (SC) will work with Bud Webb (SC), chairman of the Southern Directors, to review and clarify all ANR related groups in the coming year. This activity will include a list of accomplishments, justification to continue, and a plan of work for the next three years. A "Job Description" for ANR Advisors was approved (copy attached).

ANR Leaders all participated in Roundtable discussions.

Joint meetings with Rural and Community Development were continued with presentations being made to the entire group from the ES/USDA staff and others. This included an update and current status of the Rural Development Titles of the 1990 Farm Bill by John Vance NR/CRD Program Leader ES/USDA and Joe Brown of the U.S. Forest Service.

Two proposals from the Southern Region Plan Exchange group were presented by Ray Campbell (OK). After discussions, the first proposal to call for reestablishment of a National Plan Exchange was unanimously accepted by the group and will be submitted to the Southern Region Directors (copy attached). The second proposal to establish and coordinate a Southern Region Structure and Structural Environment Clearing House was unanimously approved in concept with a request for more detail in the proposal and budget.

New officers elected were: Chairman, Billy Caldwell (NC); Vice-Chair, Ray Campbell (OK); and Secretary, John Beverly (TX). Bill Allen (VA) remains as representative to Southern Region PLC.

Ray Campbell (OK), Secretary
Billy Caldwell (NC), Vice-Chairman
Elwyn Deal (SC), Chairman
PREPARING EXTENSION TO DEAL WITH UNEXPECTED PROGRAM AND BUDGET PRESSURES

The following recommendations are offered to help Extension Services prepare for the inevitable pressures for program changes that are caused by societal changes and budget shortfalls.

1. Implement a deliberate systematic plan for informing key individuals and groups about Extension programs and needs, including:
   a. State officials--Governor, Lt. Governor and budget and planning staff
   b. Legislature members and staff--focus effort between, not during legislative sessions
   c. University officials--President, vice presidents, deans and budget and planning staff
   d. Extension advisory groups and key individuals
   e. Extension user groups--traditional and new
   f. Extension retirees
   g. Extension employees

2. Utilize Extension users to inform elected and appointed officials about program impacts.

3. Acquaint state and county leaders, including legislators, with the importance of the formal state county federal partnerships for funding and program delivery.

4. Develop a clear understanding about the Extension system with current and new user groups, especially as new programs are implemented.

5. Foster internal discussion and debate about Extension program and budget priorities and needs.

6. Extension employees must be positive, unified and mutually supportive about the Extension system and its programs, activities and needs.

7. Utilize existing and/or develop county and statewide general university support groups such as alumni clubs, (Auburn Club, Clemson Club, etc.)

8. Prominently display Extension and/or university identification on material such as pocket calendars, folios, caps and shirts. Discourage or disallow display of private product or service identifications such as labels, logos and trade names.

9. Use field days, meetings and other events to inform Extension users about key issues Extension is facing.

11. Improve the image of the "County Agent." Emphasize professionalism in all aspects of Extension work.

12. "Work" at politics but don't "Play" politics.

High quality relevant educational programs that have a significant positive economic, social, and environmental impact are a prerequisite for these actions to be effective.

Recommendations developed at a joint meeting of Southern Region Extension ANR and CRD Program Directors, Atlanta, Georgia, September 1991.
COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE

Ned Browning, Chair
Mississippi State University

Communications department heads are pleased to be part of this joint Southern region activity. We have much to offer, and the sooner we are involved in planning and program efforts, the more effective those efforts will be.

Cultural Diversity

Emphasis on cultural diversity sparked very constructive discussion. The communications department heads arrived at several suggestions for regional activities related to the topic:

1. We will be focusing on ways to make media and methods more usable by diverse cultural and language groups. Several states already are translating publications and videos into other languages. During next year's meeting of this committee, a special emphasis on dealing with diversity through proper media development will be presented by Barry Jones (TX) and Conrad Reinhardt (TN).

2. The group agrees when rare hiring opportunities occur, we will seek to recruit more diverse staffs to encourage cross-cultural communication.

3. Communications departments stand ready to work with others to produce multi-media packages to raise staff awareness of cultural diversity.

Multi-Disciplinary Work

Out of this week's discussion we have identified a need to work more closely with the Southern Region Staff Development Committee. Consequently, we recommend that our two groups meet in a joint session at this conference next year.

In the meantime, we are working with the staff development group to choose the best media for equipping and sensitizing staffs to ways to deal with controversial issues. Dave Jenkins (NC) serves as the initial contact person for our group. When a specific project is targeted, production leadership will move to the communications department in the state from which the staff development representative is named. All states will provide production support.

Appropriate Uses of Communications Technologies

In terms of region-wide programming, we wish to counsel caution in adopting communication technologies for the sake of using something new. What the organization should be doing is seeking the most effective mix of developing and new media. In other words, let's not do a videoconference for the sake of doing one.

We will be happy to advise regional task forces and committees on the selection of media. To that end we also reiterate our earlier position that a communication specialist be included on any groups established regionally.
Videoconferencing: Right and Wrong

We have agreed to provide a program on the right and wrong approaches to videoconferencing during this meeting next year. Barry Jones (TX) and Kevin Hayes (OK) will develop the program.

Regional Videoconferencing

Earlier this year, the PLC asked us to provide a report on the status of videoconferencing in the region. Copies of that report were presented to the committee. Communications heads have copies for their reference and to give their respective directors.

Regional Video Exchange

The communications department heads’ perennial challenge is in the video area—whether it’s video production, broadcast, or videoconferencing.

We are continuing support for a regional exchange group made up of our states’ video producers. Their latest effort is a catalog of videos that are available for exchange at no cost across the region. Unfortunately, we have become aware that some videos listed in the catalog cannot be made available free. Those of you who have received a copy of the catalog should note this fact. We will have a revised policy statement later.

Reaction to FACT Report

The communications department heads wish to express apprehension about the FACT report. Our greatest concern is that the report places such great emphasis on the AG*SAT system. We question whether dependence for videoconferencing should be limited to this channel.

We recognize that the concept of this medium is valid and is a valuable developing technology. However, our producers have to meet with a wide range of problems in using the system. In brief, the group wishes to express these concerns:

- quality of programming,
- relevance of programming,
- hidden costs of participation, and
- difficulties in getting program service.

Our further concern with the FACT report is its indiscriminant mixing of topics in information processing, communications processes, and organizational marketing approaches. The result is technobabble in which good ideas are not well connected with the actual situations in which we must work each day.

By our own actions, we endorse the use of computer networks. During this past year, we have moved most of our group’s business correspondence to the Internet.

What we take issue with is the fact that this appears to be another example of top-down agenda setting with little consideration of the realities that face us in day-to-day work.

In an effort to provide more input into the FACT process, the southern communication department heads unanimously agree that Ron Dahlgren (OK) should be nominated to the newly formed Distance Education Committee.
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

J. Douglas McAlister, Chair
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

The Southern Community Development Committee visited multi-agenda items, some of which are similar to other regional committees. As such, the Community Development Committee will focus its response on several different action items.

Information Items

The CD Committee was fortunate to have had input from three (3) key USDA staff members; John Vance, Bob Lovan and Randy Williams. In addition to ES staff, Jim Hildreth of the Farm Foundation and Doss Brodnax of the Southern Rural Development Center, were also presenters and active participants with the committee.

Action Items

Action items dealt with by the Community Development Committee can be summarized into three areas of concentration:

1. Rural Development,
2. Funding, and
3. External Perception.

Rural Development

Rural Development discussion centered on President Bush's Presidential Initiative on "Rural Economic Development for the 90s." The President has instructed the Secretary of Agriculture to implement six (6) proposals designed to improve the coordination of rural development programs and serve as a catalyst for future initiatives. The CD Committee reviewed contents of each of the six:

1. President's Council on Rural America;
2. State Rural Development Councils;
3. Rural Development Demonstration Program;
4. Rural Development Technical Assistance Centers;
5. Target Federal Rural Development Programs; and

The CD Committee advises all program emphasis groups to be aware of the Presidential Initiatives, old and new agencies becoming more active, and the potential for hundreds of millions of dollars to be distributed. State Extension Directors and staff are further challenged to review the actions of their Governor's offices as players in the "New" Rural Development.

Funding

An extensive discussion of funding, both current challenges and future actions, consumed a majority of the CD Committee's allotted time. The somewhat fragile nature of state funding was discussed in light of the problem brought about by the severe Georgia reductions.

The CD and ANR committees met both in joint and individual session to discuss potential policy implications. The CD committee expresses appreciation to the Georgia representatives for their open and honest
review of their budget problems.

Each conference participant and reader of these proceedings is encouraged to visit with their states ANR or CD representative to review the eighteen (18) point discussion piece developed to guide future action.

External Perception

The committee dealt with the critical area of external perception. It must be stated at the outset, the committee did not feel adequate time was available to bring closure on this agenda item.

The committee was extremely fortunate to have had the Farm Foundation and USDA-ES as a part of this discussion. Points of consideration included but were not limited to:

WHAT OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE AGENCIES;
WHAT PRIVATE SUPPORT GROUP;
WHAT LEGISLATIVE STAFF IN DC;
WHAT YOUR CONGREGATIONAL DELEGATION; AND
OTHERS REALLY SAY WHEN YOU ARE NOT PRESENT?

Serious questions were generated and analyzed as to why Extension’s image has slipped or lessened in prestige in recent years. The committee recommends additional discussion and time be devoted to this critical concern.

Organizational Items

The Community Development Committee, even though in existence for over 20 years, continues to modify and improve its infrastructure workings. This effort included the funeral for some activities and implementation based on more contemporary needs.

Officers for the coming year:

Texas Greg Taylor, Chairman
Mississippi Larry Graves, Vice Chairman
North Carolina Michael Levi, Secretary
4-H YOUTH DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Ben Powell, Chair
University of Tennessee

Overview of Program Committee Structure in Southern Region

4-H program leaders have been meeting and working together in Southern Region since 1957.

4-H programs in the Southern Region present 40% of all 4-H participation in the nation. Thus, Southern Region 4-H program leaders often play a key role in 4-H’s national endeavors.

Four committees have been formed to guide and direct regional initiatives. The Executive Program Development Committee is the overall coordinating and leadership group.

The other three committees are: educational materials, volunteer leader forum and staff development.

Section Items Developed at this Meeting

Educational Materials Committee
- Communications project curriculum to include speaking and writing tracts is being developed.
- The development of an issue based on 4-H health curriculum has been approved by the Southern Region Program Leadership Committee.

Volunteer Leader Forum Committee

Plans were presented for our highly successful Southern Region 4-H Volunteer Leader Forum to be held in October at Rock Eagle 4-H Center in Georgia. About 400 volunteers will be in attendance. One of the topics to be presented at the forum will be cultural diversity.

Staff Development Committee

Preliminary plans for our 1993 Triennial Conference were discussed. We plan to meet in South Carolina and learn about their unique VISIONS for Youth program. Cultural Diversity, Youth Development research and Extension initiative successes will highlight the program.

We were pleased to have our national 4-H program leader visit with us on Thursday. Dr. Leah Hooper’s strategy for integrating the 4-H Base Program Curriculum with present and potential national initiatives received a positive reception by our group.
HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Sara Ayers Bagby, Chair
Clemson University

The Southern Region Home Economics Program Committee met in conjunction with the Southern Region Program Leadership Committee meeting, September 4-6, 1991.

The meeting focused on updates from the Southern states; report from Dr. Zerle Carpenter, advisor to the group; a discussion with the HEHN Deputy Administrator, Dr. Shirley Baugher; reports on white papers, workshops, committees/tasks forces, programming/funding opportunities; and development of strategies for 1991-92.

Operational decisions included the designation of officers, including welcoming Martha Johnson as the 1992 chair and electing Jennie Kitching as chair-elect for 1992, chair for 1993, and Deloris Ellis as chair-elect 1993 and chair 1994. Martha Johnson will represent this group on the Southern Region Program Leadership Committee.

4. Commitment to sharing information on aspects of Extension programming, especially funding opportunities.

5. Exploration of, and begin development of, materials on a major emerging issue for Extension.

6. Identification and consideration of an appropriate content workshop in an area of home economics.

Committee members participated in roundtable discussions on cultural diversity and issues in program. As follow-up for the roundtable discussions, the group selected the following actions:

Cultural Diversity

1. Survey the Southern Region to obtain a listing of people with expertise (both inside and external to Extension) and resources for cultural diversity.

2. Establish a conference call focused on Extension Homemakers and the incorporation of cultural diversity issues in programming.

3. Coordinate effort with other Southern region groups on a workshop and/or session on the next annual meeting program (working through our representative to the Program Leadership Committee).

Foci for 1992 include:

1. Continued support of the Aging Society and Plight of America's Children white papers/action plans.

2. Support of the Nutrition Workshop proposal sent to the National Program Leadership Committee.

Issues in Program

1. Approach the topic of "Total University" individually with sharing of techniques for addressing this opportunity.

2. Plan one to two hour session at the 1992 meeting on techniques for involving the "Total University" in Extension.

3. Plan training on networking and negotiating skills as well as systematically share information on how to develop and nurture support bases.

Additional responsibilities were accepted for 1991-1992:

1. Jennie Kitching and Sue Badenhop--develop a proposal on the Roles of State Leader.

2. Alva Youngner--survey the Southern region on salaries.

3. Sara Bagby--address joint appointments.

4. Invite the North Central Region to join the Southern region at a future date.

5. Hold a teleconference on January 15, 1992, 2:30 p.m. EST. The topic to be discussed--"Extension Homemakers and Cultural Diversity."

The group considered opportunities for meeting and discussing ideas. These future meetings include: 1) breakfast prior to the National Assistant Directors meeting scheduled on Sunday, October 6, in coordination with the National Association of Extension Home Economists, 2) during Land-Grant annual meeting, and 3) a planning conference in early 1992. Additionally, a commitment was made to utilize the federal electronic communication system and share Internet numbers to enhance communications.
PROGRAM AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Shirley H. Gerken, Chair
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

New officers were elected for 1991-1992. They include Howard Ladewig, chair; Roy Lessly, vice chair; and Cliff Taylor, secretary. The committee voted to have officers rotate up to chair in the following order: secretary to vice chair, vice chair to chair.

In response to the Program Leadership Committee's request that we address cultural diversity and major issues in our plans and work for the coming year, the Program and Staff Development Committee agreed to carry out the following plans. Sub-committees were determined to assume specific responsibilities.

Cultural Diversity

Sub-Committee: Howard Ladewig, chair; Roy Lessly; Angela Neilan

* Identify resources, both people and materials, to support staff development and program development.
* Develop a proposal to PLC to provide an informative, educational component for the 1991 conference.

Programming in a Controversial Climate, Phase 2

Sub-Committee: Satish Verma, chair; Ron Shearon; James Smith

* Contact states a second time for input on examples of programming in a controversial climate.

* Compile findings and send to directors by January 1992.
* Each committee member will provide videotaped Focus Group Interviews using standard questions provided by sub-committee.
* Production of the video will be coordinated with Southern Region Communications Committee

Issues

The P&SD Committee identified the issues noted here and agreed to take action as stated.

TOTAL UNIVERSITY INVOLVEMENT:
The committee advocates the completion of Module 8, "The Land-Grant System" in the Working With Our Public Series. Ron Shearon

NETWORKING: Fact sheets will be prepared. Sub-Committee: Paul Warner, chair, Bill Shimel, Earl Johnson and Shirley Gerken

BUILDING SUPPORT BASE: A process to involve and inform support base will be developed. Sub-Committee: Howard Ladewig, Cliff Taylor, Randy Barnett
INDIVIDUAL COMMITTEE OFFICERS

Agriculture and Natural Resources

Chair
Billy Caldwell
ANR/CRD, Ag. Extension
North Carolina State University
Box 7602
Raleigh, NC 27695
(919) 737-3252
FAX (919) 737-3135

Vice Chair
Larry Graves
Mississippi Cooperative Ext. Service
P.O. Box 5446
Mississippi State, MS 39762
(601) 325-3141
FAX (601) 325-8407

Secretary
Michael Levi
North Carolina State University
Agriculture Extension Service
Box 7602
Raleigh, NC 27695
(919) 737-3252
FAX (919) 515-3135

4-H

Chair
Ben Powell
Agricultural Extension Service
University of Tennessee
Box 1071
Knoxville, TN 37901-1071
(615) 974-7434
FAX (615) 974-7448

Home Economics

Chair
Martha Johnson
North Carolina State University
Box 7605
Raleigh, NC 27695
(919) 737-2781
FAX (919) 737-3135

Vice Chair
Jennie Kitching
Texas Agriculture Extension Service
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-7101
(409) 845-7982

Community Development

Chair
Greg Taylor
Texas Agricultural Ext. Service
Dairy Science Bldg., Room 110
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-4445
FAX (409) 847-8744

Communications

Chair
Ned Browning
Information Services
Division of Agriculture, Forestry and Veterinary Medicine
Box 5446
Mississippi State, MS 39762
(601) 325-1736
FAX (601) 325-8407
Middle Management

Chair
Jan Montgomery
District Extension Director
P.O. Box 1378
Ada, OK 74820
(405) 332-4100
FAX (405) 332-8716

Secretary
Mason Morrison
District Director
Research and Education Center
Robinson Substation
Quicksand, KY 41363
(606) 666-2438
FAX (606) 666-2215

Program and Staff Development

Chair
Howard Ladewig
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-2141
(409) 845-7210
FAX (409) 845-6496

Chair-Elect
Roy Lessly
Agriculture Extension Service
University of Tennessee
P.O. Box 1071
Knoxville, TN 37901-1071
(615) 974-7308

Sec-Treas.
Cliff Taylor
University of Florida
311 Rolfs Hall
Gainesville, FL 32611
(904) 392-0386
SOUTHERN REGION PROGRAM LEADERSHIP COMMITTEE  
1991-1992

Ag & Natural Resources  
2 years
William A. Allen, Chair  
Virginia Cooperative Extension Service  
College of Agriculture and Natural Resources  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State Univ.  
(703) 231-5299, FAX (703) 231-4163

Communications  
1 year
Ned Browning, Head  
Information Services  
Division of Agriculture, Forestry & Vet. Medicine  
Box 5446  
Mississippi State, MS 39762  
(601) 325-2262, FAX (601) 325-8407

Community Development  
3 years
Horace Hudson, Head  
Community Development Department  
University of Georgia  
Hoke Smith Annex  
Athens, GA 30602  
(404) 542-8935, FAX (404) 542-8845

4-H Youth Development  
2 years
Sue Fisher, Assistant Dean & Department Chair  
University of Florida  
111 Rolfs Hall  
Gainesville, FL 32611  
(904) 392-1744, FAX (904) 392-3583

Home Economics  
3 years
Martha Johnson  
North Carolina State University  
Box 7605  
Raleigh, NC 27695  
(919) 737-2781, FAX (919) 737-3135

Middle Management  
2 years
Meatra Harrison  
Texas Agricultural Extension Service  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX 77843-7101  
(409) 845-7897

Staff Development  
1 year
Jimmy G. Richardson  
Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service  
Box 5446  
Mississippi State, MS 39762  
(601) 325-3462, FAX (601) 325-8407
PARTICIPANTS BY STATE

ALABAMA
A. Ray Cavender
Warren McCord
James L. Smith
Willie L. Strain
Ann E. Thompson

ARKANSAS
Joseph D. Waldrum
Mike Hedges
Frank Plafcan
Betty Youngman
Charles Johnston
Dorothy Rodgers

FLORIDA
James L. App
Joseph Joyce
Susanne G. Fisher
Doris A. Tichenor
C. L. Taylor
Donald W. Poucher
Maurice F. Cole

GEORGIA
M. K. Cook
Tom Rodgers
Alva Youngner
Jerry Whiteside
Randall Cofer
Charles Roland
Jim Neal

KENTUCKY
Curtis Absher
Rick Maurer
Anna Lucas
Suzanne Badenhop
Paul Warner
Logan Louderback
Mason Morrison
Randall Barnett
Walter J. Walla

LOUISIANA
W. H. Waters
Robert Soileau
Norma O. Roberts
Carolyn G. Carter
Earl C. Johnson
Satish Verma
Mike Futrell
Stanley Lamendola
Bobby Fletcher

MISSISSIPPI
John C. Wilson
Larry Graves
Susan Holder
Norine Barnes
Jimmy G. Richardson
Ned Browning
James McPhail

NORTH CAROLINA
B. E. Caldwell
Roger Crickenberger
M. P. Levi
D. R. Proctor
Martha R. Johnson
Ronald W. Shearon
David M. Jenkins
Paul E. Dew
R. C. Wells

OKLAHOMA
Ray Campbell
Jim Rutledge
Lynda Harriman
Jim Mosley
Kevin Hayes
Jan Montgomery
T. Roy Bogle

 PUERTO RICO
Leticia Colon Orona

SOUTH CAROLINA
Elwyn Deal
Chris Sieverdes
Glen Krohn
Sara Bagby
Bill Shimel
B. K. Webb

TENNESSEE
Ray Humberd
Clark D. Garland
Ben T. Powell
Patricia M. Ganter
Roy R. Lessley
Conrad A. Reinhardt
James W. McKee

TEXAS
John R. Beverly
Don Stebbins
Lynne Thibodeaux
Jennie C. Kitching
Howard Ladewig
Barry Jones
Chester Fehlis
Meatra Harrison
Zerle Carpenter

VIRGINIA
Bill Allen
Doug McAlister
Dave Barrett
Deloris Ellis
Shirley Gerken
Angela Neilan
Jim Gardner
PARTICIPANTS BY COMMITTEE

AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES
Alabama--A. Ray Cavender
Arkansas--Joseph D. Waldrum
Florida--James L. App/Joseph Joyce
Georgia--M. K. Cook
Kentucky--Curtis Absher
Louisiana--W. H. Waters
Mississippi--John C. Wilson
North Carolina--B. E. Caldwell/Roger Crickenberger
Oklahoma--Ray Campbell
South Carolina--Elwyn Deal
Tennessee--D. Ray Humberd
Texas--John R. Beverly
Virginia--Bill Allen

HOME ECONOMICS
Alabama--
Arkansas--Betty Youngman
Florida--Doris A. Tichenor
Georgia--Alva Youngner
Kentucky--Suzanne Badenhop
Louisiana--Carolyn G. Carter
Mississippi--Norine Barnes
North Carolina--Martha R. Johnson
Oklahoma--Lynda Harriman
South Carolina--Sara Bagby
Tennessee--Patricia M. Ganter
Texas--Jennie C. Kitching
Virginia--Deloris Ellis

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Alabama--Warren McCord
Arkansas--Mike Hedges
Florida--James L. App
Georgia--M. K. Cook
Kentucky--Rick Maurer
Louisiana--Robert Soileau
Mississippi--Larry Graves
North Carolina--M. P. Levi
Oklahoma--Ray Campbell
South Carolina--Elwyn Deal/Chris Sieverdes
Tennessee--Clark D. Garland
Texas--Donald Stebbins
Virginia--Doug McAlister

PROGRAM AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT
Alabama--James L. Smith
Arkansas--
Florida--C. L. Taylor
Georgia--Jerry Whiteside
Kentucky--Paul Warner
Louisiana--Earl C. Johnson/Satish Verma
Mississippi--Jimmy G. Richardson
North Carolina--Ronald W. Shearon
Oklahoma--Jim Mosley
South Carolina--Bill Shimel
Tennessee--Roy R. Lessly
Texas--Howard Ladewig
Virginia--Shirley Gerken/Angela Neilan

YOUTH DEVELOPMENT
Alabama--
Arkansas--Frank Plafcan
Florida--Susanne G. Fisher
Georgia--Tom Rodgers
Kentucky--Anna Lucas
Louisiana--Norma O. Roberts
Mississippi--Susan Holder
North Carolina--D. R. Proctor
Oklahoma--Jim Rutledge
South Carolina--Glen Krohn
Tennessee--Ben T. Powell
Texas--Lynne Thibodeaux
Virginia--Dave Barrett

COMMUNICATIONS
Alabama--Willie L. Strain
Arkansas--Charles Johnston
Florida--Donald W. Poucher
Georgia--Randall Cofer
Kentucky--Logan Louderback
Louisiana--Mike Futrell
Mississippi--Ned Browning
North Carolina--David M. Jenkins
Oklahoma--Kevin Hayes
South Carolina--
Tennessee--Kevin Hayes
Texas--Barry Jones
Virginia--
MIDDLE MANAGEMENT/FIELD OPERATIONS
Alabama--Dorothy Rodgers
Arkansas--Maurice F. Cole
Georgia--Charles Roland
Kentucky--Mason Morrison
Louisiana--Stanley Lamendola/Bobby Fletcher
Mississippi--James McPhail
North Carolina--Paul E. Dew
Oklahoma--Jan Montgomery
South Carolina--
Tennessee--James W. McKee
Texas--Chester Fehlis/Meatra Harrison
Virginia--Jim Gardner

ES-USDA--Myron Johnsrud
Connie McKenna
Janet Poley
Leah Hoopfer
John Vance
Randy Williams
Bob Lovan
Shirley Baugher

Forest Service Representative

Speakers--Cleveland Dennard
Daryl Hobbs
William F. Winter

Farm Foundation--R. James Hildreth

Southern Rural Development Center
Doss Brodax
Bonnie P. Teater

OTHERS
Alabama--Ann E. Thompson
Georgia--Jim Neal
Kentucky--Randall Barnett/Walter J. Walla
North Carolina--R. C. Wells
Oklahoma--T. Roy Bogle
Puerto Rico--Leticia Colon Orona
South Carolina--B. K. Webb
Texas--Zerle Carpenter
SOUTHERN REGION PROGRAM LEADERSHIP COMMITTEE REPORT

William A. Allen, 1992 Chair
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Welcome to the final session of the 1991 Southern Region Program Leaders meeting. We have one hour to complete our work. Please take a moment to complete the evaluation form and turn it in as you leave. This will help us in preparing for next year’s meeting.

We are going to have program committee reports during this hour. Reporters will be limited to 5 minutes and will include an overview of what they accomplished with an emphasis on items that have interest to other program areas. Those reports will be given as follows:

ANR
Home Economics  Elwyn Deal, Clemson
Sara Bagby, Clemson
CRD
Doug McAlister, VaTech
4-H
Ben Powell, Tennessee
Middle Mgt.
Jan Montgomery, Oklahoma
Communications
Ned Browning, Miss. State
Program/Staff
Development
Shirley Gerkin, VaTech

The results of our roundtable exercise have been summarized and outlined in this proceedings. Other areas that are obvious by preliminary examination are as follows:

We will look carefully at forming a task force on cultural diversity to guide us in

-- analysis of current staffing trends and development of strategies to broaden the cultural diversity of state staffs.

There has been some discussion regarding the responsibilities of the Program Leadership Committee. Jimmy Richardson on Wednesday read 5 areas of responsibility approved by the Directors. One of the five areas has caused confusion. The item to which I am referring is as follows:

Receive, review and comment on program committee (Agriculture, Communications, Community Development, 4-H, Home Economics, Middle Management and Staff Development) reports and make recommendations to Southern Directors. Program reports, with recommendations, should be sent to the chair of the PLC prior to forwarding to the Southern Directors.

The perception of the Program Leadership Committee is that we need all reports for information purposes only. The PLC might suggest ways to broaden impact of selected activities. The PLC will not deal with approval or disapproval. I would like to suggest that each committee send reports to both the appropriate director and to me with a copy to Bonnie Teater at the SRDC. We should note that program areas will continue to have approval of single program activities.

Please join me in thanking Jimmy Richardson leading the group through PLC’s first full year of operation. Also, we need to thank Bonnie Teater and Doss Brodnax for their support.
We also must recognize three retiring members of the first Program Leadership Committee. They are Sara Bagby, Clemson University; James McPhail, Mississippi State University; and Warren McCord, Auburn for their service on the Program Leadership Committee.

We are welcoming new members as follows: Martha Johnson, Auburn, representing Home Economics; Horace Hudson, Georgia, representing CRD; and Meatra Harrison (2 years), Texas, representing Middle Management.

Next year's meeting is scheduled for September 1-3, 1992, (Tuesday through Thursday) in Nashville, Tennessee, at the Stouffer Hotel. The Extension and Research directors will again join us at that meeting. We look forward to seeing you at that time.
The SRDC is one of four regional rural development centers in the nation. It coordinates cooperation between the Research (Experiment Station) and Extension (Cooperative Extension Service) staffs at land-grant institutions in the South to provide technical consultation, research, training, and evaluation services for rural development. For more information about SRDC activities and publications, write to the Director.
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