JOINT LEGISLATIVE AUDIT AND REVIEW COMMISSION

THE VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION

MEMBERS OF THE JOINT LEGISLATIVE AUDIT & REVIEW COMMISSION

Chairman Senator Omer L. Hirst

Vice Chairman Delegate Richard M. Bagley

Senator Hunter B. Andrews Delegate Robert B. Ball, Sr. Senator Herbert H. Bateman Delegate Vincent F. Callahan, Jr. Delegate L. Cleaves Manning Delegate Theodore V. Morrison, Jr. Delegate Lacey E. Putney Delegate Ford C. Quillen Senator Edward E. Willey Charles K. Trible, Auditor of Public Accounts

> Director Ray D. Pethtel

STAFF OF THE JLARC FOR THIS REPORT

William E. Landsidle, Project Director L. Douglas Bush, Jr. Karen F. Washabau



The Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Extension Division was established by the General Assembly in 1966 to provide a wide variety of educational and informational services. The Division is the Commonwealth's largest investment in university-sponsored continuing education, with \$26 million in State, federal, and local funding support for FY 1978. Virginia's extension program, which ranks among the largest in the country, is one of only six state programs to establish a separate organization within the land grant university for the management of extension resources.

Although the extension concept is highly regarded in Virginia, four actions could improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Division administration and help avoid costly duplication of effort. These are:

• development of a detailed statement of the role and mission of extension in Virginia, and

submission of this statement to the General Assembly for review and approval;

- development of systematic communication between extension and other agencies to avoid duplication of programs;
- clarification of roles and responsibilities within the extension organization; and
- correction of administrative weaknesses to improve program quality and ensure the appropriate use of State funds.



The Extension Division has four principal components: (1) cooperative extension; (2) offcampus credit instruction; (3) non-credit continuing education; and (4) administration of grants and contracts. Funding for the Division comes from State, federal, and local sources as well as from grants, contracts, and program fees. The figure on the next page shows the source and distribution of Extension Division funds for FY 1978.

Cooperative Extension (pp. 5, 18-19)

Cooperative extension is the largest program and the one most often associated with the term "extension." Extension agents have been active in Virginia since 1914 and have played an important role in the modernization of agriculture and the development of rural communities.

The Extension Division's statutory mission, drawn from language in federal legislation, is to "provide...information...in...agriculture, business, industry, home economics, resource development, 4-H club work and subjects relating thereto." This broad mission, coupled with substantial State funding support, has made it possible for Division administration to aggressively expand the scope of cooperative extension programs over the last decade. This expansion, however, has raised questions of appropriateness and duplication of effort within both the legislative and executive branches of State government.

Funding for Cooperative Extension (pp. 12-17)

Virginia's cooperative extension program is the sixth largest in the nation. The State regularly provides VPI&SU with substantially greater funding support than required to earn Virginia's share of federal matching funds.



VPI&SU plans to change the nature of extension funding by doubling local appropriations for extension by 1984, and by increasing grant, contract; and other non-tax sources of income to 20 percent of the total budget. Shifting the distribution of funding sources will have significant implications for State budget decisions, and should be clearly documented in the Division's budget request.

Program Expansion of Cooperative Extension (pp. 19-37)

State funding support has enabled VPI&SU to develop new extension programs oriented toward non-traditional audiences without requiring a corresponding shift of resources from traditional agricultural and rural audiences. In FY 1978 for example, 75 percent of extension's field staff were located in predominantly rural areas containing about 41 percent of the State's population. Agriculture, 4-H, and home economics are still the most common topics for cooperative extension programs.

Despite this continuing focus on traditional audiences, extension is now active in urban areas and includes programs in cultural, recreational, and leisure time activities. Arts and crafts instruction is available from most extension offices. There are also expanded programs in home lawn and garden care, health, mental health, rehabilitation, creative and performing arts, child abuse prevention, energy conservation, and promotion of tourism and industrial development. In terms of intensity and direction, the present scope of extension programs is within the Division's legislative mandate. However, expansion of cooperative extension programs is not governed by an explicit statement of program priorities; instead, local demand is met to the fullest extent possible. A task force, chaired by the Secretary of Education, is presently attempting to clarify budget guidelines for the Division which can address funding for current and expanded programs.

Concern about cooperative extension's proper role is apparent among Division faculty and staff and among local government officials. Surveys found that 34 percent of extension faculty, 23 percent of extension agents, and 24 percent of city and county administrators believe extension programs have expanded too far beyond their traditional areas.

A mission review for the Extension Division is needed to establish workable guidelines within the context of general growth in State and local government programs. The present statutory mission statement for the Division has not been reviewed by the General Assembly since 1966, and may not provide an adequate delineation of the program limits intended by the legislature. The development of budget guidelines would be strengthened by General Assembly involvement in a mission redefinition.

VPI&SU, in conjunction with the State Council of Higher Education, Virginia State University, and the Secretary of Education, should prepare an updated statement of the role and mission of the Extension Division in Virginia. This statement should have explicit objectives for growth and priority-setting. The mission statement should be submitted to the General Assembly for review and approval.

Duplication of Effort by Cooperative Extension (pp. 38-45)

It is imperative that the Extension Division avoid unnecessary duplication of programs and services of other agencies. However, extension programs currently duplicate many programs of community colleges and local government agencies. Specific examples of program duplication were cited by 40 percent of extension agents surveyed. Concern about duplication of effort was also expressed by 47 percent of local officials surveyed.

The principal causes of duplication in local programs have been the growth of the community college system and the development of local government programs at the same time extension was expanding its own scope. In some areas of Virginia, there is strong competition among local agencies, including extension, for audiences interested in educational programs. In some cases, cooperative extension provides, without charge, programs similar to selfsupporting programs of community colleges or other agencies.

In contrast to the local level, extension is not presently duplicating programs provided by State agencies. These agencies tend to serve a clearinghouse function as opposed to extension's emphasis on small group instruction. In cases where State agencies have an instructional role, they do not presently have the staff capacity to meet the full demand for programs. Nevertheless, cooperative extension is on a potential collision course with the mandates and programs of at least 23 State agencies. Recent growth in State government has created new agencies and assigned new and expanded educational missions to existing agencies. As a result, because of overlaps in program responsibility, the potential exists for duplication of effort between extension and State agency programs

The Extension Division needs to become more aggressive in identifying actual and potential duplication and overlap. Two actions are particularly important. First, the Division needs to develop a memorandum of understanding with each State agency that may have an overlapping educational mission. Second, improved communication between extension and local agencies can be achieved by adding extension representation to existing interagency coordinating committees, and initiating coordinating committees where none now exist.

Organization and Staffing (pp. 46-57)

The Extension Division is generally well managed. There are several organizational weaknesses that need to be resolved, and some changes in general administration need to be made to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of program management.

Two supervisory levels in the extension organization should be strengthened, and a third level eliminated.

The program director and unit chairman positions, which do not have adequate authority to carry out the responsibilities assigned to them, should be strengthened and their roles clarified.

The district program leader positions should be abolished, with the exception of those assigned to 4-H activities. There are 23 faculty positions allocated as program leaders at a cost of approximately \$600,000 annually. The program leaders are responsible for most aspects of program management at the local level, and are supposed to serve as a liaison between extension agents and faculty. In practice, the program leaders serve to isolate program directors from extension agents. Only one-third of the field agents surveyed responded that program leaders were essential to effective program delivery, and less than half of the extension faculty feel program leaders effectively bridge the gap between faculty and the field staff.

4-H program leaders, however, are actively involved in local fund raising and recruitment of volunteers and should continue to have regional assignments.

Reviewing the Need for Tenure (pp. 57-58)

According to VPI&SU, granting tenure represents a \$750,000 long-term commitment on the part of the university in salary and benefits. The Extension Division presently has at least 52 faculty positions which carry academic tenure, although the incumbents serve as personnel managers and administrators. Tenure is designed to protect the academic freedom of teachers; however, none of the 52 positions has a teaching responsibility, making tenure unnecessary. In addition, Division staff said able administrative personnel were lost because they did not have the credentials to qualify for an academic tenure-track position. VPI&SU should re-evaluate existing positions in extension administration to determine whether the duties of the position require the protection of academic tenure, and eliminate the tenure requirement wherever possible.

General Administration (pp. 59-80)

Travel Controls. The Extension Division has a \$2.4 million travel budget for approximately 900 field staff and faculty. Existing controls on the expenditure of these funds are not consistently applied. For example, the Division accounting office routinely processes travel reimbursements without the required signatures. Better documentation on faculty travel vouchers and a systematic post-audit to identify areas where travel can be reduced or eliminated are needed.

Conflict of Interest Monitoring. Extension faculty hold offices in many industry and trade organizations. Faculty are also affiliated with outside organizations in other ways. For example, some faculty travel is paid for by trade associations, and academic departments can receive a substantial portion of their income from industry donations. The Division needs to keep better informed of faculty affiliations which could lead to a conflict of interest. Specific policy guidelines regarding affiliations are needed and an annual survey of faculty affiliations should be conducted.

CEC Management. The Continuing Education Center (CEC) provides a focal point for the Division's non-credit instruction. The CEC could reduce general fund support requirements by as much as \$233,000 by properly allocating administrative overhead costs to conference participants. This would also bring the Division in line with a generally accepted State policy that non-credit instruction be self-supporting.

Off-Campus Programs. A Statewide review of off-campus credit instruction is needed.

Although VPI&SU's off-campus enrollment is decreasing, costs are steadily increasing. In fact, costs were 56 percent higher per full-time equivalent student enrolled in the program in FY 1979 than projected by the Division in its budget. The State Council of Higher Education is the appropriate agency to review the policy implications of increasing costs for off-campus instruction, and such a review should be carried out at the Council's earliest opportunity.

Conclusion

The Extension Division is a valuable educational resource with an impressive 60-year record of service to agriculture and rural Virginia. Since 1966, the techniques of extension education have been applied to a greatly expanded range of citizen demands and interests in all parts of the State. It has been the policy of VPI&SU to promote expansion by increasing staff and attempting to meet the full range of demands, including those which have not been part of extension's traditional areas of emphasis.

This expansion has created several problems. The lack of a generally accepted mission statement hinders budget review and coordination between the Extension Division and many State and local agencies. There also appears to be disagreement within the Division about extension's proper role, a situation which could affect morale and program management. Guidelines are necessary to establish priorities for managing resources during a period of funding reductions and increasing costs. Finally, questions raised by legislative and executive officials about the proper role for extension suggest the need for a detailed review of the Division's statutory mission.



Preface

The Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission has a statutory responsibility to carry out operational and performance reviews of State agencies and programs. This program review of the Extension Division of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University was initiated by the Commission at the request of a member of the General Assembly.

Extension offers educational and informational programs in a wide variety of topics. Between its inception in 1914 and World War II, extension focused on agriculture and rural development. In recent years extension has broadened its scope and developed new programs and new audiences. Program expansion accelerated in 1966 with the creation of a separate administrative division at VPI&SU to oversee the extension activities of over 600 field staff and 300 faculty members.

Extension programs are an important component of public education in Virginia. Extension offers a good means of responding to changing demands for information by making the faculty and research resources of the land grant universities accessible to interested parties in all parts of the State. The greatest challenge to extension administrators is to take advantage of extension's flexibility without duplicating the educational programs of other State and local agencies. Formal, periodic mission reviews, program prioritization, and close coordination with other agencies are necessary to prevent wasteful duplication.

The Commission accepted the staff report on the Extension Division on September 10, 1979, and appointed a subcommittee to develop appropriate recommendations based on staff findings. The subcommittee has agreed to the 27 recommendations which are contained in the body of this report.

On behalf of the Commission staff, I wish to acknowledge the cooperation and assistance provided during the course of this review by the Extension Division, extension personnel at Virginia State University, and the administration of VPI&SU.

Ray D. Pethtel Ray D. Pethtel

Director

September 10, 1979

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	MISSION, ORGANIZATION, AND FUNDING	5
	Mission and Organization of the Extension Division	5
	Funding	9
III.	SCOPE AND GROWTH OF COOPERATIVE	
	EXTENSION	18 19
	Program Development and Description Expansion of Cooperative Extension	19 30
	Need for Priorities	36
IV.	DUPLICATION OF EFFORT BY	
1	COOPERATIVE EXTENSION	38
V.	ORGANIZATION OF COOPERATIVE	
	EXTENSION	46
VI.	GENERAL ADMINISTRATION	59
VII.	INCREASING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE	
	EXTENSION DIVISION	81
	APPENDICES	89
	TECHNICAL APPENDIX	93
	RESPONSES	
	VPI&SU Extension Division	96
	Virginia State University	109
	Department of Planning and Budget	110
	State Council of Higher Education	112

I. Introduction

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VPI&SU) administers the sixth largest cooperative extension program in the country. It also has a large, varied "general" extension program to provide continuing education. In total, extension programs at VPI&SU are expected to cost over \$25 million in FY 1979.

There is little doubt that extension education is a valued resource for the Commonwealth. Extension education is flexible and can be highly responsive to changing community priorities. In addition, VPI&SU has a large, highly-motivated staff of extension agents and faculty members. While most individuals appear to support the concept of extension, recent program expansion has led to some concern, both within the program and among State officials and the general public, about the proper mission of extension. This report looks at the growth of extension in Virginia, describes the extension programs, and reviews the efficiency and effectiveness of the administration of extension resources.

Definition of Extension

The term "extension" can have several meanings. Many people are familiar with the extension--or "county"--agent who has played a central role in the economic and social development of rural America. Today, however, extension refers to any university-sponsored education which takes place outside the traditional academic setting. Using this definition, nearly all of Virginia's publicly supported colleges and universities operate and maintain some sort of extension program.

VPI&SU houses its extension programs in one of three university divisions (Figure 1). The other two divisions, Instruction



Figure 1

Source: JLARC.

and Research, have responsibility for graduate and undergraduate education on the Blacksburg campus and for other ongoing research projects.

VPI&SU's Extension Division has four principal assignments: off-campus credit instruction; continuing education programs which do not offer academic credit; the cooperative extension program; and grant and contract services. Off-campus credit instruction and continuing education programs are often collectively referred to as "general extension" because they extend the resources of the university beyond the campus, or provide a variety of less formal types of instruction.

Off-Campus Credit Instruction. Thirteen Virginia colleges and universities have off-campus programs which carry academic credit. Development of these programs is controlled by six regional consortia, which were established by the General Assembly in 1973 to coordinate off-campus programs and prevent duplication of effort.

VPI&SU concentrates its off-campus programs in Northern Virginia at a facility near Dulles airport, but also sponsors programs in all parts of the State. Over 90 percent of VPI&SU's off-campus enrollment is at the graduate level. Between 1972 and 1979, VPI&SU conferred 1,671 graduate degrees through its off-campus program. Three-quarters of the degrees conferred were masters degrees in education.

Continuing Education. VPI&SU also offers a wide range of continuing education programs which do not carry academic credit. The Donaldson Brown Center for Continuing Education on the Blacksburg campus is the focal point for these programs. Programs are requested by business, industry, governments, professional organizations, civic and social clubs, and agricultural commodity groups.

Extension Division staff assist in program development and may arrange for instructors from the VPI&SU faculty, as well as from outside the university. Continuing education programs, held in public schools or other available facilities, are also offered in the community. The direct costs of these programs are to be offset by participant fees, although State appropriations pay for administrative and staff resources available through the Donaldson Brown Center.

Cooperative Extension. Cooperative extension is the function traditionally associated with the term "extension." It is a joint federal/state/local program designed to aid transfer of the information and research capabilities of the land grant universities to the community. Traditionally, the cooperative extension program has focused on agriculture, home economics, 4-H, and rural community development.

Grants and Contracts. About \$1.7 million in grants and contracts are presently administered through the Extension Division. The decision as to whether a grant should be administered by the Extension Division is usually based on the degree to which the grant topic supports the extension mission.

Purpose and Organization of the JLARC Report

This program review of the VPI&SU Extension Division will:

- describe the existing programs of the Extension Division and review them within the context of legislative direction;
- determine whether existing extension programs are duplicating the programs of other State and local agencies;
- determine whether there is a workable policy which governs the development of new and expanded extension programs; and
- review the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization and administration of extension resources.

Data for the review were obtained from a number of sources, including:

- Division documents such as handbooks, budget exhibits, and reports;
- structured interviews with 105 extension agents, local officials, and knowledgeable individuals in 12 selected communities which are believed to be representative of Virginia localities;
- structured interviews with 37 Extension Division staff and faculty;
- a survey of 199 VPI&SU and VSU faculty members with extension responsibilities;
- a survey of 384 extension agents;
- a survey of county and city managers in all localities with extension offices not personally visited by JLARC staff;
- analysis of existing workload and salary data for extension personnel;
- analysis of program records maintained by the Continuing Education Center and the off-campus credit program;
- •selected travel vouchers for FY 1979; and
- structured telephone interviews with directors of extension programs in 18 other states comparable to Virginia.

In all, information about extension programs in Virginia was collected from over 1,000 individuals, as well as the automated information systems and files maintained by VPI&SU.

EXTENSION OFFICES VISITED BY JLARC STAFF



The report is organized in seven chapters. Chapter I has introduced the report. Chapter II provides an overview of the mission, organization, and funding of the Extension Division. Chapter III focuses on the scope and growth of the principal component of the Extension Division--cooperative extension-because it is the largest and most varied program. Chapter IV looks at the question of duplication of effort between the cooperative extension program and other public agencies. Chapter V reviews the organization of cooperative extension, Chapter VI addresses selected aspects of general administration, and Chapter VII summarizes some suggested improvements in the operation and administration of the Extension Division.

II. Mission, Organization, and Funding

The VPI&SU Extension Division is the Commonwealth's largest single investment in university sponsored off-campus and continuing education. Cooperative extension, which is a function of land grant universities, is the reason for VPI&SU's high ranking. The University of Virginia ranks second in total continuing education funding and has a larger "general" extension program of off-campus and continuing education activities. But cooperative extension gives VPI&SU about four and one-half times the resources available to UVA for all types of continuing education.

This chapter reviews the mission, organization, and funding of the Extension Division, with particular emphasis on the large cooperative extension program.

MISSION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE EXTENSION DIVISION

The Extension Division was established by the General Assembly in 1966 as a separate component of VPI&SU. Its mission definition and organizational structure have helped promote the rapid growth of the Division since that time.

Mission of the Extension Division

The VPI&SU Extension Division has an extremely broad mission which is based on language intended for the federal cooperative extension service. Educational and informational programs in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H were traditional responsibilities of cooperative extension. The mission was expanded by the U. S. Congress in 1953 to address agriculture, home economics, "and subjects relating thereto." This expansive language was used by the General Assembly when the VPI&SU Extension Division was established.

The 1966 Act gave the new Extension Division the duty to:

. . . provide the people of the Commonwealth information and knowledge through instruction and practical demonstration in such fields as agriculture, business, industry, home economics, resource development, 4-H Club work, and subjects relating thereto . . .

While general extension programs were also placed in the Extension Division by the Act, they were not separately defined. The Division states in its budget exhibit only that off-campus credit instruction is necessary to allow individuals to remain current in their professions through part-time study; the same objective is used for continuing education workshops, seminars, and conferences. VPI&SU has interpreted language in the 1966 enabling legislation in a number of policy and mission statements that broaden still further the way the extension mission is described. In 1971, for example, a VPI&SU task force concluded that the extension mission made the Division a "key agency for the social and economic development of the State." A recent draft of a Division goal statement added the notion of "cultural" development to social and economic development. Perhaps the broadest mission statement now in use is contained in a 1978 long-range planning report. The report states that the mission of the extension service is "to provide timely, meaningful and useful learning experiences planned to enhance the quality of life of people living in Virginia."

In recent years, concern about the proper mission of extension has been expressed both within government and by the public at large. Specific questions have been raised by the Department of Planning and Budget (DPB) during its budget review for the last two biennia. DPB noted that "budget review (for the Extension Division) has been hampered by the lack of a clear definition of the scope of its role and mission." In late 1977, the Budget Director and the Secretary of Education concurred that a task force should be established to "prepare a report on (the Extension Division's) role and mission, including the applicability of the 1966 legislation, prior to the 1980-82 budget submission." The task force was established in July 1978, but has not yet completed its review.

Extension Organization

The Extension Division carries out its mission through a complex organizational structure (Figure 2). Organizational complexity results from three principal factors: the university-wide concept, administrative policy, and the involvement of Virginia State University.

The University-wide Concept. VPI&SU is one of about six land grant universities in the United States that has adopted a university-wide organizing concept for extension. Under this concept, cooperative extension and the university's general extension programs are combined under a single administrator outside any single academic college.

In those states with more traditional organizations, the cooperative extension program is usually administered through the College of Agriculture, sometimes in conjunction with the College of Home Economics. Academic colleges independently administer their own general extension programs, or they are administered through an office independent of cooperative extension. Figure 3 (see page 8) shows two simplified models which illustrate the kinds of organizations described above.

Figure 2



ORGANIZATION OF THE VPI&SU EXTENSION DIVISION (June 1, 1979)

Note: Solid (--) lines are direct supervision. Broken (--) lines are cooperative relationships.

Source: JLARC.

The principal purpose of the university-wide organizing concept is to facilitate expansion of cooperative extension programs and to consolidate administration of general extension. A separate organization for extension is theoretically better able to draw upon faculty resources in all colleges, aiding development of cooperative extension programs in areas beyond the traditional subjects of agriculture and home economics. When the Extension Division was created in 1966, one of the specific objectives of the reorganization was to "extend the knowledge resources of the entire university to all citizens of the State as rapidly as possible."

Consolidation of general extension administration is viewed by VPI&SU as a way to make program development more efficient. VPI&SU now has staff located in a single facility, the Donaldson Brown Center for Continuing Education, which provides a focal point

Figure 3



TWO MODELS OF EXTENSION ORGANIZATION

Source: JLARC.

and clearinghouse for general extension programs, regardless of which academic college or department actually provides the instruction.

Although the Extension Division has a separate administrative structure, most of the faculty members working in extension programs are located in independent academic departments and are directly accountable to their respective college deans. As a result, there are numerous cooperative linkages in the extension organization. Dependence on cooperative linkages rather than direct hierarchical relationships contributes to organizational complexity.

Administrative Policy. The Extension Division has adopted a policy of encouraging participatory management and multiple channels

of internal communication. Responsibilities are shared among different organizational levels, and there is substantial overlap in program development roles among the Division staff. About 80 individuals routinely participate in program review and supervision. The solid and broken lines in Figure 2 illustrate the multiple communication channels which are used within the Division. The positive and negative aspects of the Extension Division's administrative policies are discussed in Chapters V and VI of this report.

Involvement of VSU. Virginia State University, as one of Virginia's two land grant colleges, participates in cooperative extension programs. In 1972, federal law established separate funding for cooperative extension at 17 predominantly black colleges and universities designated as land grant institutions under the Second Morrill Act of 1890. VSU is Virginia's "1890" institution. Between 1972 and 1978, federal funds earmarked for VSU were channeled through VPI&SU for administrative purposes. The 1977 Federal Food and Agriculture Act required that control of these funds be transferred to VSU by October 1978.

According to VSU officials, the recent change in federal law has had little impact on the cooperative arrangement between VSU and VPI&SU as it has been practiced since 1972. The Administrator of Extension Programs at VSU serves on a Statewide planning committee for cooperative extension, while VSU faculty with cooperative extension responsibilities fulfill the same role as VPI&SU faculty.

The overall organizational approach of the Extension Division appears reasonable given its broad mandate. The university-wide concept, in particular, has facilitated implementation of the mandate. However, funding for the Division has been the major factor in promoting growth.

FUNDING

Although all four components of the Extension Division have benefited from increased funding in recent years, cooperative extension dominates all aspects of Division growth. There appears to be an intent among Division administrators to increase the share of local funding for cooperative extension offices in each community. This would bring Virginia more into line with other large state cooperative extension programs.

Scope and Funding of the Division

The VPI&SU Extension Division was appropriated \$25.3 million for FY 1979, about 20 percent of the school's total FY 1979 appropriation of \$127 million. Cooperative extension is the largest component

Figure 4



PROPORTION OF BUDGET FOR EXTENSION DIVISION COMPONENTS¹ (FY 1979)

¹Division administrative and support costs are pro-rated. Figure refers only to State/federal funds included in the State budget. Local funds are not included.

Source: Governor's Budget, FY 1979.

of the VPI&SU Extension Division, with about 81 percent of the total Division budget for FY 1979 (Figure 4).

source of Funds. The State currently provides over 60 percent of Extension Division income as reflected in the Appropriations Act (Column 1 of Table 1). The "income and indirect cost reimbursement" category in Table 1 includes revenue from student fees for off-campus credit instruction and fees charged to participants of continuing education programs.

In addition to State and federal appropriations, city and county governments appropriate local funds to support cooperative extension programs. Local support, which primarily involves funds for agent salaries, is generally provided directly to the extension office in each community and is not included in the State appropriation totals. In FY 1978, \$3.3 million in local funds were provided

Table l

VPI&SU EXTENSION DIVISION SOURCE OF FUNDING (FY 1978)

	. .	Column 1: Percent of State Appropriated	Total		
Appropriated Funds	Amount	Income	Income		
UNRESTRICTED FUNDS					
State General Fund Appropriations Federal Appropriations Income and Indirect Cost	\$13,870,047 3,319,220	61 % 1 5	53 <i>%</i> 13		
Reimbursement	1,768,831	8	7		
RESTRICTED FUNDS					
Federal Nutrition Program Federal 4-H Nutrition Program	\$ 1,141,937 252,680	5 1	4 *		
Federal Smith-Lever Earmarked	252,000	I			
Funds	315,472	1	*		
Federal Rural Development Act Funds	52,231	*	*		
State Title I Funds	122,833	*	*		
State Emergency Job Program	80,632	*	*		
State Discretionary Funds	96,758	*	*		
Surplus Property Disposal	5,987	*	*		
GRANTS AND CONTRACTS	\$ <u>1,688,171</u>	7	6		
TOTAL DIVISION APPROPRIATED INCOME	\$22,714,799	100%			
<u>Other Funds Available</u>					
LOCAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR COOPERATIV EXTENSION	E <u>\$_3,303,349</u>		13		
TOTAL FUNDS AVAILABLE	\$26,018,148		100%		
*Less than 1%.			·		

Source: VPI&SU Board Report.

for cooperative extension, which was 13 percent of the total funds available from all sources (Column 2 of Table 1).

Funds available for extension programs in Virginia have more than tripled in 12 years. In FY 1967, the Extension Division had total funds available of \$7.6 million, including \$3.6 million from the State general fund; another \$933,000 was appropriated by localities. By FY 1978, total income had increased to \$26 million Figure 5



Source: VPI&SU Board Reports and JLARC.

with \$13.9 million coming from the general fund. Figure 5 shows the changes in the major sources of funding over the last decade.

Division Staff. Extension Division funds are used primarily for staff support. Personnel costs, including salaries, wages, and benefits, made up 78 percent of the Division's requested budget for the 1978-1980 biennium. The Division employs 1,350 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff, including almost 300 FTE faculty positions. The distribution of full-time equivalent staff is shown in Table 2.

The staff of the Extension Division has nearly doubled over the last decade. Major sources of staff growth were the addition of 280 extension technicians between 1970 and 1973, and an increase in FTE faculty positions from 129 to 297 between FY 1968 and FY 1979. Extension technician positions were established with federal funds, and have subsequently been cut back to approximately 181 positions as federal funding has become less available. The number of extension agents has been relatively stable during the last decade.

Cooperative Extension Funding

Steadily increased funding has characterized appropriations for the cooperative extension program since 1966 (Figure 6).

Table 2

ALLOCATION	OF FUL	L TIME	EQUIVALENT
EXTENS	SION DI	VISION	STAFF
	(FY	1979)	

	Full Time	Equivalent S	Staff 1
Type of Staff	Cooperative	General	
Resource	Extension	<u>Extension</u>	Total
Academic Faculty			
Academic Faculty	100	1	100
College of Agriculture	102		103
College of Home Economics	13	3	16
College of Education	14	37	51
All Other Colleges	19	29	48
(Subtotal: Academic Faculty)	(148)	(70)	(218)
Faculty with Administrative			
and Staff Functions	70	9	79
Extension Agents	466	0	466
Extension Technicians	181	0	181
Support Staff	381	25	406
Total	1,246	104	1,350

¹All FTE rounded to whole numbers.

Source: VPI&SU Task Force Report and JLARC.

Figure 6

SOURCES OF FUNDING FOR COOPERATIVE EXTENSION (FY 1969 - FY 1978)



Source: JLARC and VPI&SU.

State Appropriations and Growth. Virginia's cooperative extension program is among the largest in the nation (Table 3). This ranking is primarily due to generous State funding which has consistently exceeded the amount required for federal matching purposes. In fact, Virginia's State funding on a per capita basis is the second highest among the ten largest cooperative extension programs.

Table 3

RANKING OF STATE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAMS BY TOTAL FUNDS AND PER CAPITA STATE FUNDS (Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1978)

A		1 Funds	<u>Per Capita </u>	and the second se
State	<u>Rank</u>	Amount	Amount	Rank
Texas	1	\$36,017,704	\$1.56	5
California	2	30,000,180	.87	8
North Carolina	3	26,980,309	2.29	3
New York	4	25,543,460	.27	10
Georgia	5	23,591,664	2.59	1
Virginia	6	21,797,126	2.56	2
Michigan	7	20,069,473	1.04	7
Florida	8	19,257,326	1.08	6
Wisconsin	9	19,046,512	1.67	4
Ohio	10	18,914,581	. 54	9

Source: USDA and 1970 Census.

Figure 7 shows the degree to which State appropriations have been in excess of what was required under the matching requirements of the Smith-Lever formula. In other words, Virginia could have retained its full federal formula allocation with State appropriations that were \$3 million (1969) to \$8 million (1978) less than the amount actually appropriated.

Alternative Sources of Funding. A review of the nature of funds available to the ten largest state extension programs highlights Virginia's present State commitment to funding of cooperative extension (Table 4). Although Virginia ranked relatively low in the proportion of funds coming from federal and local sources, it had the second highest proportion of State funding among the large programs. "Nontax" funding sources shown in Table 4 include such items as levies on agricultural producers or foundation support. Other non-tax funds could be grants, contracts, and private donations.

Figure 7



STATE APPROPRIATIONS COMPARED TO STATE MATCHING REQUIREMENTS (FY 1969-FY 1978, in millions of dollars)

Source: JLARC and VPI&SU.

Table 4

SOURCE OF FUNDS FOR TEN LARGEST COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAMS (Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1978)

State	Federal	State	Local	<u>Non-Tax</u>	<u>Total</u>
Texas California North Carolina New York Georgia	33.5% 23.7 37.5 30.7 31.7	48.4% 57.8 43.2 19.0 50.5	17.6% 14.4 18.5 44.8 13.3	0.5% 4.1 0.8 5.5 4.5	100% 100 100 100 100 100
Virginia	28.6	54,6	16.8	0	100
Michigan Florida Wisconsin Ohio	31.8 24.0 29.0 40.9	46.0 38.0 38.8 30.2	22.2 36.4 30.8 26.5	0 1.6 1.4 2.4	100 100 100 100

Source: USDA.

.....

The Extension Division has committed itself to increasing the funding contributions of local and non-tax sources of income. By 1984, the Division intends to double local appropriations and increase non-tax sources of income until they comprise 20 percent of the extension budget. Increased use of volunteers is also planned. These steps have been proposed by the Division in light of declining federal support and anticipation of a slowing rate of increase for State support.

Shifting the distribution of funding sources for cooperative extension could have significant implications for State budget decisions. For example, an analysis of local appropriations shows that State and federal funds provide between 27 percent and 90 percent of the total support for local extension offices. The average local contribution was about 30 percent of the total funding required in FY 1978. If localities shared equally in the cost of maintaining local offices, State general fund requirements for FY 1979 could have been reduced by \$2.5 million (Table 5).

Table 5

ESTIMATED COST TO BRING LOCAL APPROPRIATIONS TO 50 PERCENT OF ACTUAL OPERATING COST FOR LOCAL OFFICES

Type of Expenditure

Estimated Cost in FY 1979 Funds

\$1,000,000

Agent Salaries Clerical Salaries Agent Travel Office Operation Employee Benefits

378,000 300,000 231,000

648,000

Total Cost

\$2,557,000

Source: VPI&SU personnel data for November 1978, Budget Guidelines Task Force Report, and VPI&SU Budget Exhibit for 1978-1980.

The Division's goals for changing the distribution of extension funding should be brought to the attention of the General Assembly through the Division's budget request documentation. The relative availability of alternative funding sources would be an important consideration in the review of the Division's budget requests. State general funds made available by increases in local or non-tax funds, or increased use of volunteers, could be considered for use to support expanded extension services in new program areas or underserved communities, or could be appropriated by the General Assembly for other purposes.

Conclusion

There is little question that the Extension Division in general. and the cooperative extension program in particular, has benefited from high levels of State funding support. The Division recently noted: "for the past decade, the goals of Virginia institutions of higher education have enjoyed a favorable financial climate and as a result the needed funds have, in most cases, been available." On the basis of per capita State support for large cooperative extension programs, Virginia's support is among the highest in the country.

Funding increases, coupled with legislation which gives program administrators a broad educational mandate, have allowed for aggressive program expansion. All components of the Division have grown, but the cooperative extension program has been the subject of most of the concern about the proper role and mission of extension education in Virginia. For this reason the cooperative extension program is the subject of the next three chapters of this report which look at the questions of scope and growth, duplication of effort, and organization as they pertain to cooperative extension activities.

III. Scope and Growth of Cooperative Extension

The cooperative extension program has been operating in Virginia since 1914. Originally, the program focused on agriculture, assistance to farm families, and rural development. Cooperative extension has been credited with an important role in many of the gains made in rural communities over the last three-quarters of a century.

Most of cooperative extension's resources continue to be focused on the more traditional areas of agriculture, home economics, and the 4-H program. However, in recent years, the scope of cooperative extension programs has broadened substantially. Extension is now active in urban and suburban communities, and offers a wide variety of informational programs. Whereas programs once focused almost exclusively on the practical application of new technology, program topics now include cultural, recreational, and leisure time activities.

This expansion has been justified in terms of responding to demands for information from a broad cross-section of Virginians. The demand-responsive nature of cooperative extension programming is, in fact, a key factor which explains its widespread popular support. Cooperative extension has attempted to satisfy a wide range of new demands in recent years, without losing touch with agriculture and rural communities. To a great extent, the changes that have occurred have mirrored national trends, or reflect changes in the demographic, economic, and social characteristics of the Commonwealth.

Not all participants are satisfied with the manner in which program expansion has occurred. Questions have been raised concerning extension "trying to be all things to all people," particularly when expansion seems to weaken more traditional programs where extension has built an impressive 60-year record in Virginia.

History of Cooperative Extension

.

The cooperative extension program evolved in the United States with the technological changes in agriculture which occurred during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Federal legislation in 1862, 1887, and 1890 established land grant universities and agricultural research stations to promote scientific agriculture. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 created the federal cooperative extension program in an effort to bring the benefits of improved agricultural techniques to the individual farmer.

The Smith-Lever Act provided federal funds to the land grant colleges for the purpose of "diffusing . . . useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics." Smith-Lever funds were made available to states through a formula based primarily on rural population.

Information was transferred from the university to the farm through a network of trained "county agents." Heavy emphasis was placed on individual instruction and demonstration, because rural citizens tended to have little formal education. As a complement to the mostly male county agents, women were employed as "home demonstration" agents to instruct farm housewives in proper techniques of food preparation and preservation. Finally, cooperative extension provided a focus for the youth program commonly known as 4-H (Head, Heart, Hands, Health) which offered social and educational opportunities to rural youth between nine and 19 years of age.

Amendments to the Smith-Lever Act and other federal legislation have steadily broadened the range of programs and audiences for cooperative extension. For example, disadvantaged farm families were identified as a special target group in 1955. In 1968, a major federal initiative created an extension-managed nutrition program for low-income families, bringing extension into a number of urban areas for the first time. Other legislation emphasized programs in rural community development, urban 4-H programs, and urban gardening. Legislative changes were accompanied by a series of national studies which generally concluded that urban residents, and the disadvantaged in both rural and urban areas, should receive greater emphasis from cooperative extension.

Virginia elected to participate in cooperative extension in 1914 through VPI&SU and Hampton Institute, the State's land grant colleges. In 1920, the land grant distinction and cooperative extension responsibilities were transferred from Hampton Institute to Virginia State University (VSU). Between 1920 and 1965, black extension agents were housed at VSU; since 1965 there has been a single field staff and joint management of extension programs.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND DESCRIPTION

This section describes the program development process for cooperative extension, the major categories of programs, and the allocation of staff resources among them. There appears to be general support and substantial demand for cooperative extension programs in Virginia communities. Local priorities have great influence over programming in each city and county office.

Local Perceptions of Cooperative Extension

Two surveys provide some measure of attitude about extension programs in Virginia. Both surveys were of local officials who could bring a broad, community-wide perspective to a rating of extension's effectiveness. The fact that local government must contribute to extension funding suggests that local officials will be critical in their judgments if they are dissatisfied with ongoing programs.

JLARC Survey. JLARC conducted interviews with local officials in 12 representative jurisdictions in Virginia, and used a mailed questionnaire to collect attitudinal data from all other jurisdictions not included in the interviews. The questionnaire asked local officials to rank the contributions of extension on a scale of 1 (low) to 4 (high). The 71 respondents to the survey gave extension an average score of 3.4 on the four-point scale. This high score was supported by the interview results, in which extension received a positive rating in 11 of the 12 jurisdictions visited by JLARC staff.

Virginia Department of Agriculture Survey. Another evaluation of local officials' attitudes toward extension was done as part of the 1978 Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services study of rural areas. Ninety-three officials from eight jurisdictions were interviewed and asked to rate the assistance provided by seven sources of information, of which three sources--community colleges, universities, and extension--were based in educational institutions. Extension was rated favorably by 93 percent of the officials, compared to 65 percent for community colleges and 58 percent for universities.

Program Development

The principal reason for the high ratings given extension by local officials may be the way in which programs are developed. Although federal, State, and local levels each participate in developing programs, local influence is the greatest.

Federal Role. The national office of the Cooperative Extension Service is housed in the U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). USDA monitors federal/state expenditures, ensures compliance with administrative regulations, and reviews state programs for content and priorities. Some federal funds are earmarked for special programs. Otherwise, program review by USDA is primarily advisory with great latitude given to each state in setting its own priority for the distribution of cooperative extension resources.

State Role. The Dean of the VPI&SU Extension Division is the State Extension Director and serves as the focal point of Statewide cooperative extension policy-making. An Administrator of Extension Programs at VSU has administrative control over VSU extension faculty, and serves on a committee which establishes Statewide policy guidelines for extension.

From a legal standpoint, the Dean of the Extension Division has the principal responsibility for establishing program priorities and administrative requirements. Section 3.1-45, *Code of Virginia*, authorizes VPI&SU to supervise the selection of personnel for extension, to supervise all work done in the Commonwealth, and to adopt rules and regulations as required. The Dean has a program staff of approximately 80 people to assist him in supervising and monitoring extension activities in Virginia.

Local Role. In practice, most program decisions are made at the local level. There are five factors which establish the local role in program development.

- Each local extension office has one or more advisory committees made up of local officials and interested citizens. Special interest groups, such as producer or consumer associations, are also invited to participate in program determination.
- 2. The typical extension agent is knowledgeable about local interests. Agents average 11 years with VPI&SU and eight years in their present local office. They tend to view themselves as serving local needs. In many localities, the extension agents exercise considerable influence derived from their personal prestige in the community.
- City and county governments are empowered by legislation to appropriate "such sums as said governing bodies may deem proper" for support of local extension programs.
- 4. City and county governments play an important role in personnel actions regarding extension field staff assigned to their jurisdictions. Although VPI&SU is responsible for hiring agents, local officials are given the opportunity to indicate their priorities in terms of the agent's educational background or experience. Local officials may be given an opportunity to interview the prospective agent, which in some cases may amount to a local veto.
- 5. Local officials have the option to supplement an agent's salary above the maximum step in the State compensation schedule with 100 percent local funds. The supplement can be given if the agent has been at the top of the State salary scale for one year, and the locality already provides at least one-third of the agent's compensation. As of November 1978, 72 of 466 extension agents received salary supplements.

Decentralized program development almost certainly contributes to the generally high ratings given cooperative extension by local officials. Whereas other State programs with community offices such as welfare, public health, and rehabilitative services receive strong central direction and are constrained by federal and State program priorities, local extension offices are generally free to tailor programs to local demands. The demand-based nature of extension programming allows the agent to satisfy current local priorities and shift resources as priorities change. As a result, extension is seen by local officials and community leaders as more responsive to their concerns and, therefore, more effective.

National Comparison of Extension Programs

The decentralized nature of extension programming does not mean that Virginia's allocation of resources is greatly different than in extension programs of other states. Program comparisons between states are based on the four broad program categories used to describe cooperative extension programs nationally:

- agriculture and natural resources;
- home economics and family development;
- 4-H; and
- community resource development.

The allocation of Virginia's resources appears to closely parallel the national average within the four nationally recognized categories (Table 6).

Table 6

DISTRIBUTION OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF-YEARS IN VIRGINIA BY MAJOR AREA OF PROGRAM EMPHASIS

Program Area	Virginia <u>FY 73</u>	Virginia FY 78	US Average 1978
Agriculture & Natural Resources Home Economics and Family	37%	40%	41%
Development 4-H	24 32	22 26	23
Community Resource Development	7	12	28 8
Total	100%	100%	100%

Source: VPI&SU and USDA.

Both the national and Virginia distributions have been relatively stable since 1973. There has been a gradual expansion of community resource development activity, while the proportion of time spent on 4-H has decreased somewhat.

Additional information on the distribution of cooperative extension resources in other states is not generally available. USDA would not release the information to JLARC for this study without individual state authorization. Therefore, JLARC contacted 18 other state extension programs which are comparable to Virginia in size of program or region. Thirteen states provided the requested information (Table 7).

Table 7

COMPARISON OF STAFF-YEARS BY PROGRAM AREA FOR SELECTED STATE EXTENSION PROGRAMS (FY 1978)

	Program Area ¹			
	A	Home	A (1	Community
	<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>Economics</u>	<u>4-H</u>	Development
Virginia	40%	22%	26%	12%
States with Similar Size Programs				
Florida	40	31	23	6
Georgia	41	21	29	9 8
Illinois	40	32	20	
Michigan	45	23	22	10
New York	35	26	29	10
N. Carolina	45	28	21	6
Ohio	30	30	30	10
Texas	41	19	33	7
Other Southern	States			
Alabama	36	25	33	6
Arkansas	45	29	19	7
Maryland	40	28	26	6
S. Carolina	30	30	30	10
Tennessee	30	30	35	5

¹There is evidence of coding variation between state programs. Small differences in percentages within major program categories should not be considered significant.

Source: JLARC.

Description of Virginia's Program Activities

The four categories of cooperative extension programs can be further subdivided for a more detailed analysis of extension activity and resource allocation in Virginia. Extension resources available for program delivery include both the <u>field staff</u>, made up of agents and technicians, and the VPI&SU and VSU <u>faculty</u> with cooperative extension responsibilities.

Extension Field Staff Activities. Table 8 ranks the cooperative extension programs which received the largest allocations of field staff resources in FY 1978. Allocation of staff is measured in two ways: (1) the number of cities and counties with significant programs in each area, and (2) the median number of staff days allocated in those localities with significant programs.

Table 8

ALLOCATION OF EXTENSION FIELD STAFF TIME BY PROGRAM (FY 1978)

Extension Program	Number of Extension Offices with <u>Significant Programs</u> 1	Median Staff Days for Significant Programs
4-H	110	290
Agricultural Production ²	· 108	143
Family Management	99	61
Nutrition	93	52
Housing and Home Furnishing	97	51
Leadership Development	75	34
Family Development	72	28
Community Development	53	29
Public Affairs Education	42	30
Health	39	26
Agricultural Marketing	25	31
Clothing	28	22
Natural Resource Conservation	27	19
Technical or Scientific Informa		28
Pollution Control	8 7	22
Safety	7	10

¹Significant programs are defined as those with at least ten staff days allocated during FY 1978. A total of 112 localities had extension offices in 1978.

²Includes home and commercial horticulture.

Source: VPI&SU and JLARC.

The number of localities with significant programs (ten or more staff-days allocated in FY 1978) reflects the relative scope of each program across the State. The median staff-days is a measure of the resources committed for each program in those localities with a significant commitment.

As illustrated, the first five programs in Table 8 (4-H, agricultural production, family management, nutrition, and housing and home furnishings) represent what might reasonably be considered elements of traditional cooperative extension.

The next four programs (leadership development, family development, community development, and public affairs education) represent related areas which are outgrowths of extension's traditional activities. They are related in the sense that extension has been generally credited with serving as a catalyst for change and development, particularly in rural areas. Extension agents serve as opinion leaders in many communities, and often become involved in broader community development issues and community problems. The remaining programs listed in Table 8 are significant in only a minority of extension offices.

The heavy resource commitment to 4-H shown in Table 8 is due to the fact that most extension offices have one agent whose principal responsibility is 4-H work, with help from the rest of the office staff on a part-time basis. Other extension program areas also tend to be the primary responsibility of one or two agents but without the same degree of cross-participation (Table 9).

Table 9

DISTRIBUTION OF AGENT RESPONSIBILITIES BY MAJOR AREA OF PROGRAM EMPHASIS

	Percent of Agent	ts (Estimated Number	of Agents) ¹ :
Du a sua m Au a a	with Primary Responsibility ²	with Some Responsibility ³	with No
Program Area	Responsibility	Responsibility	<u>Responsibility</u>
Agriculture &			
Natural Resources	29% (135)	29% (135)	42% (196)
Home Economics &			
Family Development	t 24 (112)	38 (177)	38 (177)
Community Resource Development	2 (9)	74 (345)	24 (112)
4-H	22 (103)	74 (345) 67 (312)	24 (112) 11 (51)
		• •	

¹Based on data from 298 agent questionnaires projected for all agents. ³Agents spend 60% or more of their time in this program area. ³Agents spend 1% to 59% of their time in this area.

Source: JLARC.

The variety of programs and services available in cooperative extension offices makes complete cataloging impossible; therefore, rural and urban unit programs have been illustrated in Figure 8 (see pp. 28-29). The types of programs illustrated could be found in typical offices in urban and rural Virginia communities.

It should be noted that, although the "urbanization" of extension is an ongoing trend, rural areas continue to receive substantial allocations of field staff resources. Urban and rural offices also share many of the same programs. For example, there are substantial agricultural activities in some of the State's urban areas.

Nevertheless, Table 10 shows that about 38 percent of the agents, and 39 percent of State and federal expenditures for cooperative extension, are allocated to rural county offices. Another 37 percent of the agents and funds are in offices which serve counties with smaller cities or towns. The rural and mixed rural/ urban areas, which together receive three-quarters of extension's field staff resources, have about 41 percent of the State's population.

Table 10

DISTRIBUTION OF FIELD STAFF RESOURCES BY TYPE OF LOCALITY (FY 1978)

Type of Locality ¹	Number of Extension Offices	Percent of State's Population Served	Number of Extension Agents (%)	State/Federal Funds (%)
Urban Mixed Rural	23 35 54	59% 26 15	111 (25%) 169 (37%) 171 (38%)	\$1,815,625 (24%) 2,739,507 (37%) 2,890,586 (39%)
Total	112	100%	451(100%) ²	\$7,445,718(100%)

¹"Urban" is defined as having over 50% urban population in the 1970 census. The total includes offices serving 15 independent cities and the counties of Fairfax, Arlington, Henrico, Chesterfield, Prince William, Roanoke, Warren and Allegheny. "Mixed" localities are defined as having between 10% and 50% urban population in the 1970 census.

²Does not include agents housed in district offices, planning districts and 4-H centers.

Source: VPI&SU and JLARC.

Extension Faculty Activities. VPI&SU and VSU faculty allocated their time among programs in a somewhat different pattern than the extension field staff. Agricultural production receives the majority of faculty resources (Table 11). The VPI&SU College of Agriculture has 70 percent of all extension faculty, which accounts for this concentration of faculty resources.

Table 11

ALLOCATION OF EXTENSION FACULTY TIME BY PROGRAM AREA (FY 1978)

Extension Program	Faculty-Days Allocated to Extension Program
Agricultural Production 4-H Agricultural Marketing Technical or Scientific Information Public Affairs Education Leadership Development Safety Nutrition Family Management Pollution Control Housing and Home Furnishing Family Development Natural Resource Conservation	12,783 2,493 2,050 1,549 1,301 1,230 920 886 778 758 758 731 649 436
Health Clothing Community Development	254 173 111

Source: VPI&SU and JLARC.

Several extension programs appear to be offered primarily with faculty resources. For example, safety, pollution control, agricultural marketing, and technical information programs (Table 11) received proportionately greater attention from faculty than field staff. The difference is reported to be due to the level of technical expertise required. Industrial safety, compliance with federal safety regulations, waste discharge control, large scale energy conservation, and sophisticated agribusiness marketing techinques are types of assistance often provided directly by faculty with little agent involvement, according to VPI&SU.

In summary, the workload data for field staff and faculty indicate that most cooperative extension activity continues to be focused on the traditional areas of 4-H, agriculture, nutrition, and home economics. Thus, available data suggest that the present scope

Figure 8

TYPICAL ACTIVITIES OF AN URBAN EXTENSION UNIT

This urban office serves an inner-city and suburban population. The office is staffed by four agents, five technicians in the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP), and two secretaries.

Two agents are responsible for home economics/family development programs. One agent has been in extension 12 years, has a degree in home economics, and supervises the EFNEP technicians in addition to other responsibilities. The second agent in this area has a degree in human nutrition and has been in extension two years. A third agent, whose degree is in horticulture, is in charge of home horticulture programs and has been in extension for six years. The fourth agent is assigned to 4-H programs, has been in extension for less than a year, and has a degree in adult and continuing education.

Programs reported during a 12-month period included:

HOME HORTICULTURE PROGRAMS

- lawn care seminar presented to 100 professional lawn maintenance workers
- •turf care course presented to 25 country club groundskeepers by VPI&SU faculty
- •windowsill gardening course presented to 200 residents of a retirement complex
- •plant clinic held at shopping mall with 400 people viewing displays
- •landscaping information provided to local parks and recreation department
- •2,000 telephone calls received for lawn and garden advice

HOME ECONOMICS/FAMILY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

- •dietary analysis computer at shopping mall viewed by 1,700 people
- parenting workshop presented to 40 young mothers
- •two-week training program presented to new EFNEP technicians
- •human services coordinating group developed by agent and local leaders
- •gourmet cooking class presented to 40 citizens in cooperation with city schools
- Food Preservation Hotline used by 800 citizens nutrition newsletter sent to 5,000 senior citizens

4-H PROGRAMS

- embryology project presented to 400 youth by agent and VPI&SU faculty
- energy program presented to 1,100 high school youth
- "4-H News" sent to 3,500 4-Hers
- fund-raising strategies for 4-H camp coordinated with local leaders

COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

- list of human service agencies prepared by agent and local officials
- "Youth in Government" day observed by 75 youth and 30 government officials
Figure 8

TYPICAL ACTIVITIES OF A RURAL EXTENSION UNIT

This rural extension office serves a population of 17,000 in a county where agricultural production is a predominant part of the economy. The office is staffed by three agents and one secretary.

One agent specializes in agriculture, has a degree in animal science, and has been in extension 14 years. A second agent is responsible for home economics/family development programs, has been in extension for five years, and has a degree in home economics. The third agent is in charge of 4-H, has been an agent for one year, and has a degree in animal nutrition.

Programs reported during a 12-month period included:

AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS

- one-to-one assistance to dairy farmers provided by agent and faculty from VPI&SU
- pesticide applicator certification classes attended by 300 producers
- program on soybean varieties attended by 20 producers
- 3,000 soil samples processed for analysis at VPI&SU
- financial planning program for 20 young farmers presented by agent and farm management area agent
- monthly newsletter on lawn and shrub care sent to 1,400 homeowners
- hobby beekeeping course attended by 20 people

HOME ECONOMICS/FAMILY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

- •24 extension homemakers trained to present program on dealing with emotions
- decorative stitching class presented to eight extension homemakers
- nutrition workshop conducted for 30 Head Start workers
- •"Start your own Business" workshop presented by VPI&SU faculty to 35 citizens
- food preservation newsletter sent to 30 homemakers
- monthly five-minute radio program presented on food and nutrition

4-H PROGRAMS

- Share-the-Fun talent contest entered by 250 youth
- year-long program in horse and pony care attended by 50 youth
- school clubs organized for 2,000 youth
- dairy judging seminar presented to 20 4-Hers
- leadership training presented to 75 adult 4-H leaders

COMMUNITY RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

- •"Community Clean-up" campaign coordinated by agent and local officials
- two-day Rural Leaders Development School for 21 leaders presented by agent and VPI&SU faculty
- community education program developed with public schools

÷.

of programs, in terms of intensity and direction, is within the broad legislative mandate to "provide. . . information in . . . agriculture, business, industry, home economics, resource development, 4-H club work and subjects relating thereto."

Although most cooperative extension programs are concentrated in traditional areas, expansion has occurred. During field interviews, JLARC staff were told that expansion of extension programs was accomplished with additional resources made available to VPI&SU over the last decade, rather than from cutbacks in traditional programs. The workload analysis would suggest that this statement is accurate.

EXPANSION OF COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

The Extension Division has used its strong base of popular support to expand the scope of programs and services offered. This section documents the kind of program expansion which has occurred.

Program expansion has been questioned in recent years, but there has not been a systematic review of the impact of extension's efforts, particularly in nontraditional areas. Instead, demand has often been the sole justification cited by the Division as evidence of impact.

Expanding Scope of Extension

Expansion has been an implicit goal of the Extension Division since it was created as a separate organization independent of the College of Agriculture. One of the specific purposes of the reorganization was to "extend the resources of the entire university to all residents of the State as rapidly as possible." Although program development has remained essentially a local prerogative, the Division has broadened the range of programs available for adoption by local offices. For example, faculty positions in business, engineering, the sciences, and community development have been added since 1966.

Expansion has taken many forms. Changes have been evolutionary, with each "new" program being an outgrowth of more traditional activities. For example, extension programs in home and commercial horticulture are an outgrowth of VPI&SU's expertise in the plant sciences.

The following paragraphs illustrate what may reasonably be considered activities of cooperative extension which have undergone expansion. The list is not exhaustive (and the appropriateness of individual examples might be debatable) but is intended to highlight the kinds of activities which might be focused on in any future determination of priorities. Instruction in Arts and Crafts. Extension agents frequently sponsor workshops in arts and crafts. The rationale generally given for arts and crafts instruction is to help homemakers save money through developing self-help skills. However, in many cases the instruction appears to be primarily oriented to hobby or leisure time activity. Program examples noted in this area included dried flower arranging, oil painting, antique renovation, rock gardens, a program in genealogy which resulted from the popularity of the television program <u>Roots</u>, book binding, silversmithing, macrame, crochet, pine cone crafts, and a series of workshops entitled "gifts for pleasure and profit."

Home Lawn and Garden Care. Advice on caring for lawns and gardens and landscaping assistance is one of the most rapidly growing areas of public demand for extension, particularly in urban areas. Extension now has three faculty members who specialize specifically in urban soils. Program examples in this area include: professional lawn maintenance seminars, home horticulture field days, plant clinics, horticulture shows, winterizing shrubs, pruning demonstrations, and landscaping advice.

Creative and Performing Arts. Extension requested one faculty position in the fine arts for the 1978-1980 biennium to carry out a 4-H talent contest known as "Share-the-Fun," as well as other programs to develop the arts in Virginia. One agent serves on a local creative arts foundation board and is responsible for sponsoring workshops in the creative arts.

Health and Rehabilitation. Extension agents frequently serve as outreach for public health department clinics or sponsor basic health-related programs. Program examples include "stop smoking" classes, "the proper use of make-up," "self-help for the physically limited," "weight control and behavior modification," "heart-related illnesses," and "alcoholism and drug addiction." Extension agents have also sponsored programs in independent living skills for mentally ill and retarded adults, and in the use of home equipment for the handicapped.

Manpower Development. Extension co-sponsors employment placement programs to place teenagers in summer jobs. The "rent-ateen" program is an example. Extension agents have also been called upon by local officials to help write CETA grant proposals for federal review.

Mental and Emotional Health. Extension sponsors a wide variety of programs relating to mental and emotional health. In one case, extension sponsored a program in "group processes" for the psychiatric nursing staff of a general hospital. Other examples are programs in "coping with tension," "assertiveness training," "self-actualization for women," and "dealing with emotions." Child Care and Development. Extension is a major resource for many day care centers. Extension agents and faculty instruct center staff on child nutrition and child care practices. Extension also counsels abusive parents, some of whom are referred from the local welfare departments. Program examples include "focus on children," "babies lib," "the art of parenting," and "family communication."

Community Beautification. Extension agents are increasingly involved in helping localities implement the State's antilitter law. In some cases, agents write grant proposals for funds available under the law.

Home Management Information. Extension offers a wide variety of home management programs on topics such as: income tax, estate planning, frauds and misrepresentations, consumer rights, the financial and legal aspects of buying or selling a house, planning for retirement, the metric system, and energy conservation.

Development of Tourism and Industry. Agents develop training programs, slide presentations, and other materials to assist local officials in promoting industrial development and tourism.

Community Awareness. Extension participates in a variety of community awareness meetings. For example, extension sponsors a rural leaders development school, energy information centers, and seminars on land use issues and problems, bond referenda, medicaid, social security, and women's rights.

Business Assistance. Three faculty members work full time in developing management training programs for industry and government. Faculty also provide individual consultation to small businesses and minority enterprises. Extension agents also sponsor programs on "start your own business."

Attitudes toward Expanded Scope

Not all extension personnel agree with the changing scope and direction of extension. Concern about the present scope is, not unexpectedly, most concentrated among faculty members in the College of Agriculture and extension agents working primarily in the agriculture and natural resources area. Table 12 shows that a significant number of faculty and field staff responding to a JLARC survey questioned whether "extension programs have expanded too far beyond the traditional areas of agriculture, 4-H, and home economics."

Some local officials also expressed concerned about the scope of extension programs in their communities. Seventeen of the 71 respondents to the JLARC survey of city and county administrators (24 percent) said that cooperative extension had expanded too far beyond its traditional programs. Rural county administrators tended to be most critical of extension's expanded scope.

Table 12

SURVEY RESPONSES REGARDING THE SCOPE OF PROGRAMS

<u>Statement in Survey</u>: Extension programs have expanded too far beyond the traditional areas of agriculture, 4-H, and home economics.

<u>Staff</u>	Percent Who Agreed with Statement	Percent Who Disagreed with Statement	Percent Who were Neutral on Statement	Number of Respondents
All Academic Faculty	34%	50%	16%	143
Agriculture Faculty	43	38	19	102
Other Faculty	10	80	10	41
All Extension Agents	23	58	19	293
Agriculture Agents ¹	41	33	26	85
Other Agents	15	69	16	208

 1 Agents spending at least 60% of their time in agriculture.

Source: JLARC.

Furthermore, even local officials who did not express concern about the present scope of extension do not perceive a need for further expansion of programs. Only eight of the 54 local officials who were in agreement with extension's present scope would expand existing programs if they had the authority to do so. Nor could most local administrators identify community needs which would be appropriate for extension but are not now being addressed. Only eleven of 71 survey respondents said they knew of unmet needs appropriate for extension involvement.

In summary, a significant number of extension staff and local officials question the present scope of extension. Local officials as a group do not see a need for additional expansion. Nevertheless, expansion appears to be a continuing objective of the Extension Division. In its long-range plan, the Extension Division notes that additional sources of funding will be necessary "to insure the continued growth of extension programs in the future."

Some growth may be necessary due to increased workload in traditional areas, or to meet changing social and economic demands for informational programs. Some growth may also be needed to reach underserved communities. However, better performance reporting and impact measurement are essential before anyone, including the Extension Division, can determine whether expansion is having its desired effect.

Reporting and Impact Measurement

The Extension Division has sought to develop measures which are reliable reflections of the impact of extension programs. In addition, the Division has relied heavily on increasing demand as a measure of program impact. For example, in the 1978-1980 budget exhibit, VPI&SU evaluated its effectiveness by assuming that "present extension programs are effective since Virginia citizens and local government officials are requesting more assistance than present staff can deliver." Extension impact measurement could be significantly improved by better reporting.

Extension's Impact Measurement. According to knowledgeable observers, impact measurement for cooperative extension programs is not well developed despite 75 years of attempting to develop such measures within the extension community. To fill the gap, extension programs nationwide have tended to use participant counts, or other measures of demand, to evaluate the success of their programs. Challenges to demand measurement, however, include:

- Extension's services are informational in nature and generally free of charge. It is unlikely that many program participants would criticize extension's efforts even if the impact were marginal.
- 2. Many of extension's informational services are passive. That is, the recipient need take little note or even be interested. Displays in shopping malls and libraries, newspaper columns, television and radio broadcasts and newsletters are examples of passive informational services used extensively in Virginia.
- Measurement of the long-term benefit of educational programs in any form is difficult. Demonstrating a causal relationship between instruction and changes in behavior requires careful design and control of the research project. The necessary controls are not generally present in the loosely structured environment of extension education.

Despite these problems with demand measurement, there is some value in careful recording of program users. VPI&SU claimed 4,862,325 educational "contacts," or program users, in FY 1978. Educational "contacts" can be derived from agent "progress reports" which are prepared annually to describe program objectives, participants, and activities. In its budget exhibit, the Extension Division stated that the "progress reports and purpose summaries form a good basis for supplying the information requested in the benefit effectiveness measure sections of the State budget document." However, JLARC reviewed approximately 2,000 agent progress reports for FY 1978 and found that the information available from them is severely hindered by the quality of the reporting.

Problems with Reporting. There is a tendency for some extension agents to exaggerate program objectives and the number of participants in extension programs. For example:

One agent had an objective for 10,000 people to improve their knowledge and skills relating to family wardrobes. The agent described a series of sewing classes. Twenty-two classes were offered over the course of a year. The narrative described attendance at perhaps 20 per class. Yet the agent's progress report claimed that 4,381 persons participated, an average of 200 per class.

The progress reports emphasize participant counts and activity reporting. There is often little relationship between the stated objective and the content of the report narrative. Specific problems include:

- a number of narratives state that written participant evaluations were to be administered. Either evaluations were not administered or the results were not reported;
- agents state they have observed changes in participant behavior, but do not describe the changes or what suggests the changes were due to extension; and
- agents often simply list programs offered without describing attendance, duration, or results.

JLARC staff concluded that the progress reports are, as a whole, unusable as a means of evaluating the impact of extension programs.

Reporting Improvements. The Extension Division needs to improve its internal reporting system and find better ways to describe program impact. Apparently, the Division recognizes the weaknesses in its program evaluation and audit processes and has made improvement of evaluation and audit among the Division's top priorities in its long-range plan. Based on the field review, five changes to the present system might improve the quality of existing processes.

- Objectives for extension programs should be stated in terms of the number of people agents expect to assist in a significant way. Sweeping objectives, which suggest that everyone who comes in contact with extension will improve knowledge or skills, are not meaningful.
- 2. Narrative descriptions of activity should be more closely related to the achievement of

planned objectives. Extraneous comments, and description not related to the objectives, should be deleted or placed in a separate section of the report.

- The Division should reassess its emphasis on participant counts. Number of participants should be carefully maintained for those programs which require active participation, e.g., workshops, seminars, and meetings. Counts of newsletter mailings and other passive activities should be maintained separately.
- 4. The Division presently conducts "indepth" program reviews in several localities each year. In these reviews, several Division staff serve on a team which spends two to three days interviewing agents, local officials, and interested persons in the community. A recent Division memo noted that these reviews were better designed to address administrative rather than program concerns. The indepth review concept is valuable and should be refined to improve evaluation of programs. A more systematic documentation of objectives and intended results for each local office is necessary. This should then be compared with data gained from interviews and activity reports.
- 5. The Division should explore the availability of grant funds to conduct detailed program evaluations in several representative Virginia localities. These evaluations would be complex and expensive to undertake, but could provide reasonably reliable information on the benefits of different types of extension activity.

NEED FOR PRIORITIES

The cooperative extension program operates without an explicit statement of program priorities. Instead, the demands of local interests are met to the fullest extent possible.

Increased Funding and Priorities

Virginia can anticipate steadily increasing demands for cooperative extension programs both within traditional areas and in expanded activities for several reasons. First, the concept of extension is well entrenched in most communities, and extension agents are knowledgeable about local conditions. Second, extension services are available at little or no cost to the participant, and programs are flexible and responsive compared to other state-sponsored programs. Finally, cooperative extension field staff are well supported by faculty resources funded entirely through State, federal, and grant or contract funds. This makes extension an attractive resource and, at times, an alternative to establishing local programs for local officials and community leaders.

Under present conditions, the Commonwealth can expect that future funding requirements for cooperative extension will continue to increase at least at the same pace as they have in the past decade. At that rate of growth, general funds required in FY 1988 could increase to \$29 million compared to \$11.5 million in FY 1978. Assuming the demand for funding will outstrip available resources, it will become necessary for VPI&SU to establish clear priorities for cooperative extension.

A variety of priorities could be considered. Cooperative extension might focus on particular problems such as energy, conservation, or consumer affairs. Another approach would be to focus on specific types of audiences such as rural residents or low income individuals. Each alternative would offer some cost savings. For example, were cooperative extension to focus primarily on commercial agriculture, approximately \$4.6 million in current personnel costs could be saved by a reduction in staff positions not related to that subject area.

A Mission Review for Cooperative Extension

Each of the participants in the State's program-authorizing process, the General Assembly, the Governor, and VPI&SU, should contribute to the formulation of a more specific mission statement for cooperative extension in Virginia. The present statutory mission statement has not been reviewed since 1966 and may not provide an adequate delineation of the program limits intended by the legislature. The executive budget review process is similarly limited by a lack of budgetary guidelines. And, although a mission review is reported to be under way by a task force chaired by the Secretary of Education, the results of the review are not expected to be submitted to the General Assembly for approval.

VPI&SU, in conjunction with the State Council of Higher Education, VSU, and the Secretary of Education, should prepare a detailed statement of the role and mission of cooperative extension in Virginia. As part of the mission statement, an explicit objective for program growth, based on a rational planning process and a generally accepted system of priorities, needs to be prepared. The mission statement should be submitted as a resolution, statutory statement of purpose, or as an amendment to the statutory mission contained in Section 3.1-41, *Code of Virginia*. Any subsequent changes to the Extension Division mission should be approved by the State Council of Higher Education as called for in Section 23-9.6:1, *Code of Virginia*.

IV. Duplication of Effort by Cooperative Extension

The scope of cooperative extension programs makes it imperative that the Extension Division avoid unnecessary duplication of programs and services of other agencies. Concern about duplication was central to the Department of Planning and Budget's recommendation that the mission of the Extension Division be reviewed by a Statewide task force. The former Budget Director noted his concern about activities of the Division which "relate to the responsibilities of other State agencies." His concern was not limited to the actual duplication of programs, but also to overlapping responsibilities.

In order to determine the degree of existing or potential overlap between cooperative extension and other agencies, JLARC collected and reviewed data from five sources:

- statements of the mandates and responsibilities of State agencies that appeared to have potential for overlap;
- 2,000 narrative progress reports describing the activities of extension agents during FY 1978;
- responses to a survey of local administrators;
- responses to questions regarding program duplication from a survey of extension agents; and
- interviews with the heads of 24 agencies which appeared to have responsibilities in areas of extension activity.

The findings of the review took several directions. First, at the present time there does not appear to be widespread duplication of effort between cooperative extension and the informational programs sponsored by most State agencies. Second, cooperative extension is on a potential collision course with the legislative mandates of approximately two dozen State agencies. Third, some duplication of effort does exist between cooperative extension and local agencies. Finally, there is considerable overlap, and in some cases duplication of offerings, between cooperative extension and the Virginia Community College System.

Duplication in the Community

Duplication of informational programs occurs in a number of communities. A total of 122 agents (40 percent) who replied to the JLARC survey noted duplication in subject matter between their programs and those of community colleges, local agencies, or other public and private groups operating in the community. Local agencies cited most often were departments of parks and recreation, adult education classes sponsored by public schools, and the local offices of health and social service programs. Duplication of effort was found most often in larger urban areas, but was noted in rural counties as well.

Some local officials expressed awareness of duplicated programs in their communities. Thirty-three of 71 respondents to the JLARC survey (47 percent) stated that they would eliminate duplicated programs if they had the authority. Several respondents used open-ended questions to elaborate on their concerns about extension's role in their communities.

A wide variety of programs appeared to be duplicated in some communities. Instruction in sewing, cooking, upholstering, furniture refinishing, home horticulture, consumer education, interior design, macrame, home budgeting, and nutrition and weight control were specific examples of frequently duplicated subjects.

A frequently cited example of duplication of effort in, the community was the community colleges' offerings. Community colleges, through their community service programs, seminars, and workshops, are in direct competition with extension for an educational audience. In FY 1978, about one-third of the over 230,000 VCCS enrollments were in community service programs, many of which have the same subject matter as extension. For example, in the Richmond metropolitan area, extension and local community colleges offered a number of similar special interest programs:

J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College recently offered courses in basic homemaking skills such as cooking, sewing, and home decorating. Crafts classes included macrame and yarn crafts. Horticulture programs were offered on landscape planning, pest control, and vegetable gardening. Course fees ranged from \$12-25.

Extension offices in nearby localities during the same period offered courses in cooking, sewing, home decorating, needlepoint, and macrame. A variety of programs were presented on lawn and garden care for homeowners. Extension courses were free of charge.

John Tyler Community College, which serves the metropolitan area south of the James River, recently offered a variety of homemaking classes on sewing, reupholstery, and home decorating. Special interest programs were presented on home landscaping and house buying. Course fees varied.

Extension offices in the John Tyler service area offered courses in sewing, furniture refinishing, home landscaping, and house buying. Extension courses were free of charge.

The Extension Division staff expressed concern about what they viewed as the proliferation of community college programs in areas which traditionally have been served through cooperative extension. Interestingly, officials of the community college system report little or no duplication. One principal difference does exist--the programs of the community colleges tend to be more structured and longer than similar cooperative extension programs. However, it is apparent that some duplication of effort occurs.

Extension agents offered a number of justifications for duplicating programs in the community. The two most frequently cited were:

- demand for the program was sufficient to occupy the efforts of several agencies; and
- extension programs were more informal and offered at little or no charge.

Neither of these explanations necessarily justifies program duplication. If the justification is simply one of additional demand, then a question must be raised whether a public priority is served by expansion to meet the demand. Nor does the fact that extension programs are free necessarily justify duplication with programs of agencies or organizations which charge for instruction. One agent flatly stated that the "subject matter we offer free, such as upholstering or caning chairs, is offered for a fee by the community college." It seems reasonable to question whether it is in the public interest for one public agency to offer some programs free of charge when another public agency offers comparable instruction for a fee, usually to the same audience. This is particularly true in arts and crafts instruction given to audiences primarily interested in hobbies or leisure time activities.

Duplication of effort is likely to increase due to the expanded role being played by many local governments. Recreation departments and adult education classes are relatively new to many communities. As these programs develop, they often come into competition with extension activities. When this occurs, programs compete for the limited number of local residents who are interested in participating. This situation was described by one agent who said that duplication was expected in his area because there were "many agencies fighting to survive." Another agent noted that "sometimes it looks as if all agencies seem to be competing to see who can look the best."

Four steps could be taken to reduce actual and potential duplication between local agencies and extension:

- Include cooperative extension in the local coordinating committees now used by VCCS, SCHEV, and the Department of Education.
- 2. Expand the use of interagency coordinating bodies in the community.

- 3. Avoid competition with local agency programs.
- 4. Establish clear program priorities.

Coordinating Committees. In 1971, the State Board of Education, SCHEV, and VCCS acknowledged their "obligation to provide educational programs and services for the people of Virginia with maximum efficiency and economy of operation." To this end, 23 local coordinating committees were established, one in each region served by a community college. Representatives from each school division in the region, the community college, and neighboring political subdivisions are on the committees. Cooperative extension was overlooked despite its major role in providing informational programs and services. To correct this oversight, the 23 local coordinating committees should be directed to include representatives of cooperative extension offices in the region.

Interagency Committees. Several communities in Virginia have applied the idea of coordinating committees to a wide variety of local agencies which could come into conflict in program development. Extension should take the lead in encouraging development of interagency committees in communities which do not now have them.

Avoid Competition. A third important step is for individual extension offices to avoid competition with developing local programs--particularly after the local program is established. Extension has long experience in continuing education and can call upon the faculty resources of VPI&SU and VSU. This gives extension a competitive advantage over newly developing local programs, even where the agency was created specifically to provide informational or educational services. In one case, a county administrator told a JLARC interviewer that a county recreation department might be eliminated because extension could, if asked, perform the same service at much less cost to the county. Given the heavy demand on extension resources, the Extension Division cannot afford to supplant programs that local governments are willing and able to provide.

Establish Program Priorities. Finally, individual extension offices should conduct a careful review to avoid becoming involved in programs adequately provided for by other groups. For example, if a particular arts or crafts instruction is offered, free or for a fee, by another organization, it should probably not be duplicated by extension. Extension resources should be conserved for priority programs, especially when charging a fee is not practical, equitable, or desirable.

Overlap with Statewide Programs

Duplication between extension and other Statewide programs is a potential rather than actual problem at the present time. However, at least 23 State agencies (beside VCCS) were identified as sponsoring educational and informational programs in areas which could eventually duplicate extension efforts. These agencies, and the areas of potential overlap, are shown in Table 13. A survey of the agencies indicated that, at the present time:

- with one exception, State officials are satisfied with the cooperation which exists between extension and their agencies;
- although the agencies may have educational or informational mandates, they often do not have the staff capacity to significantly duplicate extension; and
- most agency informational programs are general in nature. They involve a clearinghouse function or Statewide overview, rather than being designed for small group or individual instruction.

Several agencies have effectively cooperated with the Extension Division and have used extension's network of local offices to implement programs. For example, the Statewide disaster reporting system uses extension agents for local disaster assessments. The Commission of Game and Inland Fisheries uses extension's field offices to comply with its legislative mandate to publish and distribute educational material pertaining to wildlife.

There is, however, the potential for duplication of extension programs by State agencies. Many of the affected agencies shown in Table 13 (see pp. 44-45) are new or have experienced recent reorganization. Future expansion of agency programs is likely to bring them into greater competition with extension. The following paragraphs illustrate some areas of potential duplication.

The Council on the Environment. The Council is presently involved in identifying ways Council staff can increase assistance to local governments to upgrade environmental planning. Extension has been very active in the past in helping local governments deal with environmental concerns such as soil and water conservation and strip mine reclamation.

The Division of Labor and Industry. The Division has seven staff who provide on-site consultation and classroom instruction in industrial safety. Extension also conducts training in industrial safety, OSHA regulations, and topics such as noise pollution.

The Department of Personnel and Training. The Department and State-supported universities besides VPI&SU are increasing their programs in local government training. This is a major area of extension activity. There is interest among local governments in establishing a single center to act as a clearinghouse for local programs. This can be viewed as evidence that the present programs are hindered by rapid growth and a lack of coordination.

The Commission on Outdoor Recreation. The Commission provides in-depth assistance to localities in the development of community recreational programs. Extension has conducted assistance programs in recreational development, site design, and usage programming for a large number of local governments. Recreation continues to be a major concern of local governments, particularly in rural areas. However, there is a question as to how much additional assistance is needed in this area, particularly in light of the number of localities with recreation departments.

The Department of Rehabilitative Services. The Department does not presently do much independent-living training for the handicapped. However, it foresees a very large effort in that area as recent amendments to the Federal Rehabilitation Act are funded. Extension is presently active in rehabilitative programs which help the disabled adjust to special equipment and home conditions.

The Department of Housing and Community Development. The Department was created in July 1979 through a consolidation of six existing agencies. The consolidation was designed to increase the effectiveness of State programs, including educational and informational programs, in the areas of housing and community development. Extension is now a major source of assistance to localities in community planning and housing programs, and is active in working with low income residents to upgrade their housing.

While cooperation between the Extension Division and State agencies appears to be generally adequate, in at least two cases problems have occurred. First, extension has not adequately coordinated its tourism development programs with the State Travel Service. The service director said he hasn't been contacted by VPI&SU in several years, although he is aware of extension's activity in the development of tourism promotion programs. Second, there are indications that the rapid expansion of energy conservation programs has created some friction between extension and the Virginia Energy Office, which are both heavily involved in conservation programs. According to the Energy Office, this friction has now been reduced.

The Extension Division needs to become more aggressive in identifying the potential for duplication between its programs and those of other public agencies. As a first step in this direction, the Division could work to develop a memorandum of understanding with each public agency which has educational or informational responsibilities. The memorandum could identify areas of potential overlap and determine how to avoid duplication. Memoranda should be updated as agency missions change in response to legislative or executive direction.

Table 13 STATE AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES WHICH COULD OVERLAP EXTENSION PROGRAMS

State Agency/Responsibility

1. Department of Housing and Community Development

- Assistance to local governments for planning and community development.
- Determination of housing requirements in Virginia.
- Establishment and promotion of public informational and educational programs on housing.

2. Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

- Promotion of consumer education,
- Promotion of agricultural development through informational programs,
- Provision of data and assistance to rural areas on the environment, community development, land use, waste disposal, and other activities and concerns.

3. Office of Emergency Services and Energy

- Disaster reporting and evaluation.
- Development of energy conservation educational programs.
- Consultation with business and industry on energy conservation.
- 4. Department of Conservation and Economic Development
 - Promotion of tourism.
 - Development of community beautification programs.

5. Council on the Environment

 Assistance to local governments for environmental quality planning.

6. Commission on Game and Inland Fisheries

• Development of public educational programs on Virginia wildlife.

7. Commission on Outdoor Recreation

 Provision of technical assistance to local government for outdoor recreational planning and programming.

8. State Water Control Board

- Provision of technical assistance to localities, business, and industry on point sources of pollution.
- Upgrading of management practices for control of non-point pollution

9. Soil and Water Conservation Commission

 Assistance to conservation districts for environmental improvement programs;

Extension Program Examples

- Provides information and technical assistance for localities in developing long-range plans, land use planning, and community development planning.
- · Assists local officials in conducting housing stock surveys.
- Provides educational programs in housing selection, financing, and maintenance, particularly for limited income audiences.
- Conducts numerous programs in consumer education and awareness.
- Provides information and technical assistance in agricultural marketing and merchandising.
- Provides rural communities with assistance in complying with land use, environmental, and waste treatment regulations and requirements. Rural community development is a primary emphasis of extension.
- · Provides the infrastructure for the disaster reporting network.
- Conducts numerous programs on energy conservation, both in the home and for industrial and commercial activities.
- Provides informational programs to local leaders on ways to promote tourism.
- Assists local officials in designing anti-litter programs and applying for community beautification grants.
- Works with local governments in the development of environmental quality planning, particularly in areas such as soil and water conservation and mine land reclamation.
- Provides informational programs on Virginia wildlife through the 4-H program.
- Assists in recreational planning by local governments including site selection, design, and programming.
- Assists local governments and individuals in meeting clean water standards for both point and runoff sources of pollution.
- Agents serve as directors of soil and water conservation districts in several parts of the State.

State Agency/Responsibility

10. Division of Industrial Development

• Assistance to localities for preparation of industrial development programs.

11. Department of Labor and Industry

 Consultation with business and industry on industrial health and safety.

12. Office of Minority Business Enterprise

Provision of technical and management assistance to minority business.

13. Division of Children

- Promotion of education in child abuse, parenting, and family life.
- Provision of training and technical assistance to child service organizations.

14. Department of Health

Provision of health education.

15. Department of Rehabilitative Services

• Provision of training and assistance for handicapped individuals.

16. Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation

• Development of vocational/developmental services for mentally ill or retarded persons in the community.

17. Department of Welfare

· Provision of social services.

18. Office on Aging

- Nutrition education.
- Provision of training and technical assistance tor aging programs.

19. Virginia Employment Commission

- Development of job training and counseling programs for unemployed or underemployed.
- Administration of the CETA program for certain areas of the State.

20. Office of Volunteerism

• Provision of technical assistance for volunteer programs.

21. Commission on the Arts and Humanities

• Promotion of programs in the arts.

22. Department of Personnel and Training

Coordination of State and federal training resources for local governments.

23. Department of Education

• Promotion of continuing education in school systems.

Extension Program Examples

- Provides local officials with programs and assistance in promoting industrial development.
- Provides technical assistance on OSHA regulations and other aspects of industrial safety.
- · Consults with small businesses and minority enterprises.
- Provides programs in child abuse prevention, parenting, and family life education.
- Consults with day care centers and other child care organizations.
- Provides a wide variety of health-related informational programs.
- Works with handicapped individuals in adjusting to disability and in the use of special equipment.
- Provides independent living training to mentally retarded adults in sheltered workshops and to mentally ill persons in day treatment centers. Agents serve on some Chapter X Boards.
- Helps organize programs in crisis intervention for battered spouses and abused children.
- Provides numerous nutrition education programs for senior citizens.
- Provides assistance and training for staffs of homes for adults.
- Co-sponsors job placement programs, particularly for disadvantaged youth.
- Helps local officials prepare CETA grant proposals.
- Recruits and trains volunteers.
- · Serves on committees promoting fine arts and cultural arts.
- · Sponsors numerous training programs for local officials.
- Promotes and serves as staff in local groups involved in developing continuing education in the community.

V. Organization of Cooperative Extension

The Extension Division has conducted a series of detailed self-evaluations between 1966 and the present. A 1977 report by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, which accredits VPI&SU, provided another examination. These studies have consistently reported a need for change in the organizational structure of the Division. The JLARC review confirmed many of the earlier findings, and suggestions are made for changes in administrative organization. No single organizational form is necessarily best, but changes in the existing structure can serve extension and public objectives of efficiency and effectiveness. Each suggestion is based largely on organizational assessments of extension personnel.

Evidence of Organizational Weaknesses

The importance of a well-defined organizational structure is recognized by the Extension Division. The Division administrative handbook states that:

> . . . it is extremely important that each extension worker have a clear understanding of the total organization and of his relationship to other members and component parts of the system.

However, organizational weaknesses have been evident since the Division was established. The following quotes from past internal and external reviews confirm the ongoing nature of the problem.

> It is essential that subject matter specialists and field staff understand their respective areas of responsibility . . One way to accomplish this would be through greater coordination between county and state programs and plans of work. (VPI&SU Self-Study, 1966)

While the University's three missions--instruction, research and extension--seem to be clearly enough understood at the college and department levels, the lines of authority relating to extension apparently are not. (VPI&SU Self-Study, 1975)

. . . the level of participation in the other colleges (other than Agriculture, Home Economics and Education) indicates some uncertainty about the responsibility of individual faculty members for activities in extension and continuing education. (VPI&SU Self-Study, 1975) . . . the questions and concerns about the administration and organization of extension and continuing education were by far the most frequently stated concern. Unclear lines of reporting within the extension organization and lack of clearly defined individual responsibilities are major concerns. (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Report, 1977)

There is no clear-cut delineation and understanding of roles and responsibilities within and between each level of the organization. (Deans and Directors Workshop, 1978)

The Associate Deans' responsibility and authority vis-a-vis the Directors in managing programs remains a confused and frustrating issue for all concerned. (District Staff Workshop, 1979)

VPI&SU faculty with extension appointments and extension agents also expressed concern about the administrative structure of the Division. In response to the JLARC surveys, many agents and faculty felt that the administrative structure of the Division did not have clearly defined supervisory relationships (Table 14).

Table 14

SURVEY RESPONSES REGARDING ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

<u>Statement in Survey</u>: The administrative structure of the Extension Division has clearly defined supervisory relationships.

	Percent Who	Percent Who	Percent Who	Number
	Agreed with	Disagreed with	Were Neutral	of
	Statement	Statement	on Statement	<u>Respondents</u>
Faculty Survey ¹	36%	44%	20%	133
Agent Survey	49%	28%	23%	302

¹Extension faculty other than Extension Division staff.

Source: JLARC.

Organization of Cooperative Extension

Although the past reviews have tended to address the Extension Division organization as a whole, most of the problems

relate to the cooperative extension program which encompasses the great majority of the Division's resources.

The cooperative extension program in Virginia is organized into three levels:

• State Staff are located at VPI&SU, VSU, and research stations;

• District Staff operate in six multi-county districts; and

•Unit Staff are located in 112 counties, towns, and cities.

Staff at each level have unique program and administrative responsibilities.

The organization of cooperative extension is shown in Figure 9. The responsibilities and reporting relationships of each organizational element are described in the supporting detail (Table 15).



Figure 9

ORGANIZATION OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE (June 1, 1979)

Source: JLARC.

Table 15

JOB DESCRIPTIONS AND REPORTING RELATIONSHIPS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAM (June 1, 1979)

State Level

Dean. Serves in both a State and federal capacity. The dean is responsible for the administrative management and leadership of VPI&SU's Extension Division, and reports to the university's Provost. As director of the cooperative extension program in Virginia, the dean reports to the federal administrator of the Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture.

Administrator of Extension Programs at VSU. Represents extension faculty and administers federal "1890" funds at Virginia State University. The administrator works with the Dean in Statewide program development, and reports to the federal administrator of the Extension Service, USDA, on the expenditure of federal "1890" funds.

Associate Deans. Report to the Dean. One serves as deputy director of the program. Responsibility for classified personnel rests with an Associate Dean for Field Services. Two associate deans divide responsibilities for five program areas.

Program Directors. Have broad responsibility for providing Statewide leadership in one of five program areas: agriculture and natural resources, home economics and family development, community resource development, 4-H, and technical assistance programs. They report to the associate deans for programs.

Extension Faculty. Develop extension publications and provide support to agents in planning and implementing local programs. They cooperate with extension program directors in developing programs, but are responsible to the Dean of the Extension Division through their department head and college dean.

District Level

District Program Staff. Guide and coordinate program activities of agents. Each of six multi-county districts is staffed by three to five program leaders who have faculty rank and report to the State director of their program area.

District Agents. Responsible for administrative matters in a district. They are classified State employees and report to the Associate Dean for Field Services.

Unit Level

Extension Agents. Responsible for determining, planning, and conducting educational programs in the community. Most agents are assigned to a single city or county. There are 35 agents with multicounty responsibilities who provide specialized information in farm management and community resource development. Agents receive program direction from district program leaders but report administratively to the district agent.

Technicians. Provide nutrition, housing, and youth development information to citizens on a one-to-one basis. They report to a designated agent.

Based on field interviews, it appears that four actions are particularly necessary to improve the organization of cooperative extension:

- strengthen, by better definition of authority, the unit chairman and program director positions;
- reduce the number of organizational levels with administrative responsibilities;
- •eliminate the extension agent "B" classification; and
- keep to a minimum the number of administrative faculty positions which have or require tenure.

Strengthening Roles

Two positions, the unit chairman and the program director, do not have sufficient authority to carry out their responsibilities (Figure 10).



POSITIONS TO BE STRENGTHENED (June 1, 1979)

Figure 10

50

Source: JLARC.

Unit Chairman. The local extension office is the key "unit" of the cooperative extension program. The unit chairman is a designated agent in each of the 112 local extension offices or "units." The chairman's role is to supervise clerical staff, process office paperwork, and evaluate other agents in terms of their cooperation and work habits. The unit chairman does not have formal program supervision responsibility, and is not an immediate supervisor of other professional staff in any traditional sense. There is no salary differential for unit chairmen.

In practice, the strength of the cooperative extension program in a particular community is closely tied to the personal abilities of the unit chairman. Local officials and community leaders tend to view the unit chairman as a department head with comparable authority. Local officials interviewed by JLARC were virtually unanimous in believing that the unit chairman had greater authority than is actually assigned to the position.

There are some unit chairmen who exercise informal but substantial authority beyond their official capacity, as is illustrated in the following example:

> During field visits, JLARC staff asked agents to name their immediate supervisor. In one office, two of four agents responded that the unit chairman was their immediate supervisor. In a second office, two of three agents said it was the unit chairman. Both of these offices were in rural counties where the unit chairman specialized in agriculture and had been in the office for many years. In both cases, the unit chairman indicated an awareness of his expanded role vis-a-vis the other agents.

District staff, who are the agents' actual immediate supervisors, are not always viewed as such due to physical separation and the fact that some district staff rarely visit unit offices.

Unclear responsibilities for the unit chairman position have led to administrative problems as illustrated in the following case study:

> A candidate for an agent position in a county was referred to the Board of Supervisors by the district staff. The Board members had indicated to the unit chairman that an agent with a degree in animal science was a local priority; however, the unit chairman was not consulted about the referral. Instead, the district staff referred a candidate without the desired background. As a result, the Board deferred a decision to avoid embarrassing the

candidate. The chairman of the Board later indicated his concern about the lack of communication between the unit and district levels of extension administration.

The role of the unit chairman should be strengthened and a salary differential established in recognition of the increased responsibility of the position. In addition to their present administrative duties, the unit chairmen should be responsible for a number of duties now assigned to the district staff. The unit chairman should:

- be assigned primary responsibility for official relationships with local governing bodies (this responsibility now assigned to the district agent);
- complete personnel evaluations on all unit staff (this responsibility now shared by unit chairmen and district staff);
- coordinate program development, including oversight of community needs assessment and annual plans of work (this responsibility now assigned to district staff); and
- determine the professional development needs of unit staff in conjunction with each individual (this responsibility now assigned to district staff).

Program Directors. Program directors at VPI&SU are responsible for general oversight of the quality of cooperative extension programs in each of the four major areas: agriculture and natural resources, home economics and family development, community resource development, and 4-H. A fifth program director is responsible for the technical resource program which provides technical, scientific, and engineering assistance to business, industry, government, and other groups.

Program directors are frequently subject to conflicting organizational pressures which they do not have the authority to resolve. This limits their effectiveness. The administrative policy adopted by the Extension Division emphasizes participatory management and multiple channels of communication. The lack of strong authority relationships is most evident with the program directors. According to the administrative handbook, program directors are expected to "work closely with" the two associate deans for program resources, "work closely with" the district program staff, and "work with" extension faculty through the academic department head. One program director described the relationships as requiring him to work in "four dimensions" in the degree of coordination required. The responsibilities of the program director position need to be clarified. This can be accomplished by reducing the number of faculty positions with administrative and program supervision responsibilities, as is discussed in the next section.

Reduction in Supervisory Levels

In one of the five levels of program supervision, the district program leaders, there appear to be excess positions (Figure 11). An excessive number of supervisory personnel results in inconsistent direction and poorly utilized staff resources. A total of 23 faculty positions with a total annual salary of almost \$600,000 is involved.

Figure 11

LOCATION OF EXCESS SUPERVISORY POSITIONS (June 1, 1979)



i

Program Leader Assessment. There are 23 program leader positions in the Division's six district offices. Program leaders are responsible for program supervision at the unit level in their individual areas of expertise: agriculture, home economics, 4-H, community resource development, or technical assistance. They are also supposed to act as a liaison between agents and faculty members at VPI&SU or VSU. Program leaders hold faculty rank at VPI&SU and are required to earn tenure after a period of time or they become disgualified for their jobs.

Program leaders receive only lukewarm support from the two groups for whom they are supposed to be serving as liaison--faculty members and agents. Only one-third of all extension agents surveyed by JLARC agreed that program leaders are essential to their individual programs (Table 16). Faculty members were slightly more supportive.

Table 16

SURVEY RESPONSES REGARDING DISTRICT PROGRAM LEADERS

<u>Statement on Agent Survey:</u> Program leaders in district offices are essential to the effective delivery of my programs in this community.

	Percent Who	Percent Who	Percent Who	Number
	Agreed with	Disagreed with	Were Neutral	of
	Statement	Statement	<u>on Statement</u>	Respondents
Agents	36%	33%	31 %	300

<u>Statement on Faculty Survey</u>: Extension program leaders in district offices with whom I am familiar serve as an effective bridge between extension specialists and agents in the field.

	Percent Who	Percent Who	Percent Who	Number
	Agreed with	Disagreed with	Were Neutral	of
	<u>Statement</u>	Statement	<u>on Statement</u>	Respondents
Faculty ¹	42%	30%	28%	134

¹Extension faculty other than Extension Division staff.

Source: JLARC.

The lower rating given program leaders by agents is particularly significant when the responses are analyzed by the respondent's experience. The Extension Division has suggested that program leaders are a particularly important resource for new agents who might lack knowledge of the full range of faculty and staff support for extension. The Dean encourages experienced agents to bypass program leaders once they know which faculty member has the necessary expertise. However, agents with relatively limited experience are no more likely to agree that program leaders are essential than are agents with a great deal of experience (Table 17).

Table 17

RATING OF PROGRAM LEADER IMPORTANCE BY EXPERIENCE OF AGENT

Years of Experience	"Program L Agreed	eaders are Disagreed		Number of <u>Respondents</u>
l year or less 2 to 4 years 5 to 9 years 10 to 20 years Over 20 years	32% 33% 46% 35% 32%	28% 38% 21% 37% 34%	40% 29% 33% 28% 34%	25 60 61 95 59
Total	36%	33%	31%	300

Source: JLARC.

The program leader position was specifically criticized by Extension staff during interviews and in comments received on JLARC survey returns. The following quotes were drawn from survey returns:

- From my own experience, few things in my unit would change, for better or worse, if the district staff were abolished.
- . . . frequently when these positions are vacant, there seems to be a continuation of the programs just the same.
- There is a definite lack of communication with program leaders, and what does occur is often not positive.
- I did not know program leaders existed until I had been in extension a year and a half.

The program supervision function of program leaders is especially weak. For example, interviews with agents confirmed that program leaders virtually never alter agent work plans. The inconsistent quality of progress reporting noted in Chapter III is evidence that program leaders give little attention to oversight in this important area. Program Leader Reallocation. The layer of bureaucracy created by the program leaders, intended to expedite communication, actually serves to isolate the program directors from the unit offices in many cases, and creates unnecessary complexity in communication and accountability. The Extension Division should give consideration to eliminating the program leader positions in agriculture, family resources, community resource development, and technical resources. The program oversight functions of the six districts could be centralized at the program director level in Blacksburg.

The program leader positions in 4-H should probably be retained at the district level and housed in the six district 4-H centers. Leaving the 4-H program leaders in the districts is necessary because there are a number of district-wide 4-H competitions which are organized by program leaders. Assigning 4-H program leaders at the district level is also necessary because of important ties between the program leader and community leaders. These ties facilitate the recruitment of adult volunteers and fund raising to support 4-H programs.

The faculty positions now allocated to program leaders other than 4-H could be considered for reallocation in two areas: the State administrative staff and new academic faculty positions. At the State level, program directors may not have sufficient staff to carry out an effective Statewide oversight role. For example, the program director for agriculture and natural resources, who is responsible for coordinating with 13 academic departments and more than 100 faculty members, has no staff assistance.

VPI&SU requested 12 new academic faculty positions for the 1978-1980 biennium. These were denied by the Department of Planning and Budget pending a review of the appropriate mission of extension in Virginia. Some of these positions may be warranted, but could be filled by reallocating existing positions rather than by establishing new ones.

Several program leaders are already involved primarily in providing technical advice and consulting assistance directly to organizations and individuals. In this role there is little difference between the program leader and an extension faculty member in an academic department. It may be appropriate for some of these positions to be reallocated to academic departments, following normal budgetary review procedures.

Elimination of Agent "B" Position

The current personnel classification for extension agents does not accurately reflect the equal responsibilities shared by all agents. This has lowered agent morale and contributed to organizational problems. Agent positions are classified three ways:

- Agent "A" a training position that certain agents with no prior extension experience fill for three to six months.
- Agent "B" an intermediate level where agents acquire experience while assisting in program delivery.
- Agent "C" a senior position responsible for directing local programs.

There are currently 13 Agent "A," 121 Agent "B," and 347 Agent "C" positions in the State classified personnel system.

Reasons for the present system are historical. Prior to 1966, each locality had two county agents with leadership roles, one for agricultural programs and the other for home economics. Two "assistant" county agents generally supported the county agents where needed, and were usually assigned to work with the local 4-H programs. The county and assistant county agent roles were assigned "C" and "B" designations, respectively.

Presently, however, there is no difference in responsibilities of extension agents with "B" and "C" classifications. All agents (other than those in temporary "A" positions) have identical job descriptions, employment requirements, and performance expectations. Indeed, some agents in "B" positions are unit chairmen. Agents employed in a "B" position, however, have a \$2,300 difference between the top of their merit salary range and the top of the "C" position range. This difference violates a basic principle of personnel classification.

Either the "B" and "C" positions should be substantially distinguished by duty and performance criteria, or the classifications should be merged in favor of a single salary scale established for all experienced agents. The cost of upgrading the ceiling on the 121 Agent "B" positions could be as much as \$278,000 when all agents who are currently in "B" positions reach the top step in their present salary range. The actual impact, however, will be somewhat less since some "B" position agents apply for and receive a transfer to a "C" position before reaching the top of the scale.

Appropriateness of Tenure

A number of faculty positions in the Extension Division have purely administrative duties but still carry academic tenure. Tenure is intended to promote academic freedom by protecting teachers from unwarranted dismissal. However, the 52 Extension Division positions listed in Table 18 have no teaching responsibility and are not associated with an academic department. Their actual duties are those of personnel managers and program administrators. Although these functions are important to the success of the extension mission, they are different from the educational responsibilities of teaching and research faculty.

Table 18

ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS WITH TENURE (June 1, 1979)

Position Description

Number of Positions

Dean of the Extension Division	1
Associate Deans	4
Program Directors	5
Program Direction Staff	14
District Program Leaders	23
Program Staff for the Continuing Education Center	5
Total	52

Source: VPI&SU and JLARC.

Other land grant universities have distinguished between the administrative and educational functions of extension positions, and have assigned tenure requirements accordingly. Nine of the 18 land grant universities surveyed by JLARC do not require extension administrators to acquire tenure in their administrative positions. This, of course, does not prohibit individuals who have previously attained tenure through service in an academic department from filling these administrative positions.

There are two reasons the Division should reconsider requiring administrators to acquire tenure. First, during interviews Division staff said that several individuals with strong qualifications for extension administrative staff had not been employed, or were dismissed, as a result of not meeting requirements for academic tenure. Second, granting tenure can involve a substantial long-term investment by the university. According to the VPI&SU Provost, every time tenure is granted, the State makes a long-term, \$750,000 commitment in salary and benefits. This kind of a commitment is not necessary unless it is required specifically to protect academic freedom.

The Extension Division should reevaluate each existing administrative faculty position to determine whether the duties of the position require the protection of academic tenure.

VI. General Administration

During the course of this review, a number of administrative practices were studied to test for the efficient and effective use of State funds. Several areas were reviewed as a result of specific legislative request. Brief descriptions of the findings and conclusions are reported in this section. Areas reviewed include: coordination of program plans, training for agents, publications, monitoring conflicts of interest, application of travel controls, grant monitoring, management of the Center for Continuing Education, and off-campus credit program enrollment projections.

Program Planning

Cooperative extension emphasizes program planning to ensure that programs are of high quality and meet local needs. Careful program planning is essential to effectively coordinate resources.

Planning for cooperative extension programs is cyclical (Figure 12). Primary planning occurs at the local level. Local



Figure 12

plans are then forwarded through the district staff to the extension faculty planning units. Each faculty planning unit works in a specific subject area, and determines how faculty members can best support agent programs. Faculty are supposed to use local plans as the basis for their own planning.

Coordination of agents and faculty plans is essential if the cycle is to be completed. Yet effective coordination apparently does not always occur. JLARC's survey of extension faculty found that communication for planning may need attention (Table 19).

Table 19

RESPONSES TO FACULTY SURVEY REGARDING PROGRAM PLANNING

<u>Statement on Survey</u>: Communication between extension specialists, extension agents and extension division administrators is adequate to promote effective planning and program development.

Percent Who Agreed with Statement	Percent Who Disagreed with Statement	Percent Who Were Neutral on Statement	Number of Respondents ¹
48%	30%	22%	134

¹Extension faculty other than Extension Division staff.

Source: JLARC.

A particularly weak point in the existing process is the timing of plan preparation. Agent plans often arrive in Blacksburg too late to be carefully reviewed by faculty prior to development of State plans. In some cases, less than a week is available for faculty review. As a result, some faculty planning is done in a vacuum without adequate knowledge of what agents are anticipating as local needs in the upcoming year. Interviews also disclosed that faculty members in some planning units give agent plans only cursory review.

Extension should continue to emphasize annual program planning, but it needs to ensure that agent plans are received by planning units in time for adequate review. Program directors should ensure that agent plans are used as the foundation of faculty planning.

A further refinement suggested by some faculty would be the addition of pre- and post-planning workshops as a standard part of the planning process. Community resource development faculty presently conduct such workshops. Attendance should be required of program directors, program staff, and selected agents and faculty who represent their districts and academic departments. These workshops could focus attention on fundamental needs of localities. The post-planning workshop could feature strategies and publications planned by specialists to meet agents' needs during the coming year, as well as serve to coordinate forthcoming efforts.

Orientation and In-Service Training

Cooperative extension staff have a variety of opportunities for professional development. Among these are orientation sessions for new agents and in-service training courses for field unit staff. Both types of training are essential in retaining competent personnel and ensuring high quality programs. Orientation and training have been upgraded in recent years, but some improvements can be made.

Orientation Process. Orientation received by new agents is insufficient, and often occurs too late to be of value. The current orientation process is supposed to consist of on-the-job training by unit and district staff within several weeks of employment. Agents also attend a four-day "new workers' conference" that is held twice a year.

Orientation is a concern to both new and experienced staff. Less than half (45 percent) of the agents surveyed by JLARC agreed that new agents receive sufficient orientation. On-site interviews with agents highlighted the fact that some new agents had to wait an excessive amount of time for an orientation conference, and do not always receive adequate guidance from experienced staff. For example:

> An agent assigned to a 4-H program in Central Virginia had been working for five months, but had not yet attended a new workers' conference and had not received any orientation from the program leader for 4-H. Local 4-H groups were having problems that the agent could not solve. Other agents in the unit, unfamiliar with many aspects of the 4-H program, were of little assistance.

The agent finally made a personal request for assistance from faculty in Blacksburg. A faculty member traveled to the local office from Blacksburg to resolve the problem.

The use of faculty to perform basic orientation functions is not efficient.

The Extension Division should design a more comprehensive and timely orientation program for new agents than currently exists. New agents should be provided initial program guidance by the program directors in Blacksburg prior to their first assignment. Program concerns such as extension publications, assistance available from faculty, and a discussion of the planning process should be emphasized. The unit chairman should then assume responsibility for orienting a new agent to the community and to specific local conditions.

In-Service Training. Cooperative extension administration has a liberal in-service training policy which allows agents to take up to 15 days of training per year. Agents are reimbursed from their travel budgets for fees, travel, and lodging costs associated with training. Agents can select from nearly 200 course offerings taught primarily by VPI&SU faculty. Courses are held if they are requested by at least 15 agents.

Agents surveyed by JLARC felt in-service training was important to their effectiveness. However, many expressed a need for improvements in the training. Agents specifically cited lack of visual aids, poorly prepared instructors, and repetition of information as deficiencies in courses. Some commented about discrepancies between the advertised course content and the material actually presented. In some cases, basic and intermediate level courses were combined in the same class, resulting in a course which was repetitious for some and too difficult for others.

To some extent these problems would be overcome if existing procedures for evaluating in-service training courses were followed. The Director for Staff Development currently requires that every course instructor file an instructional plan in the staff development office before a course is taught. The plan must include a provision for agent evaluations of the course and, after the course is completed, evaluations are to be included in the file.

A review of training files disclosed that few files are complete (Table 20). Of the 52 courses held, two-thirds did not contain agent evaluations, and two lacked both plans of instruction

Table 20

STATUS OF IN-SERVICE TRAINING FILES (FY 1978)

File Status	Number	Percent
No evaluations No plans of instruction No plans and evaluations Complete	34 2 2 14	65% 4% <u>27%</u>
Total	52	100%

Source: JLARC.

and evaluations. The quality of evaluations that were on file varied significantly; some were well-structured, others were simply scraps of notepaper.

The quality of in-service programs needs to be systematically monitored to ensure that quality is sufficiently high to justify the investment of money and time. A standard evaluation format could be designed for all in-service programs. Its content could include areas such as quality of subject matter, instructor's performance, and appropriateness of information for local programs. Agents could complete the evaluation with one copy retained by the instructor and one sent to the staff development office. Evaluations could be systematically reviewed by the staff development office, and appropriate action taken by the Director of Staff Development when necessary.

Quality and Management of Publications

Publications account for almost \$1 million of the Extension Division's 1978-1980 biennial budget. Approximately 2,500 titles, developed at the federal and State levels, are listed on current VPI&SU inventories. Federal publications are purchased at cost from the U. S. Department of Agriculture. Publications prepared by State extension faculty are printed by VPI&SU. Individual citizens receive publications free of charge for limited quantities, although distribution of large quantities requires payment of publication costs. In general, extension agents surveyed by JLARC rated publications highly; however, publication availability is sometimes a problem.

Quality. Extension controls the quality of its faculty publications by requiring approval at the department, college, and program director levels. Eighty-three percent of the extension agents responding to JLARC's survey agree that extension publications are generally of high quality and useful to their program audience. The majority of agents also indicated that most publications were upto-date. The favorable survey results indicate that quality controls are effective.

Availability. The inability of the Extension Distribution Center to fill orders for publications was frequently cited by agents as a source of concern. Twenty-five percent of the agents responding to the JLARC survey indicated that they cannot obtain sufficient numbers of publications to meet their program needs.

Publication availability appears to be related to inventory management rather than lack of adequate funding. For the 1978-80 biennium, the Extension Division budgeted \$908,660 for publications, which was 97 percent of the amount requested.

In order to improve publication distribution, the present inventory reporting system needs revision. Agents currently receive an annual catalog containing as many as 2,500 titles, many of which are, in fact, out-of-stock or exist only in nominal quantities. Agents rely on the accuracy of this information, especially right after the catalog is issued, and place their orders accordingly. Often large portions of the orders are unfilled. For example:

> In January 1979, one unit placed an order for 65 titles listed in the 1979 catalog. When the shipment arrived from the distribution center, 33 titles had not been sent. Three were no longer available, 28 were out-of-stock, and two were available in limited quantities only.

Inaccuracies in the catalog cause a waste of time and processing resources; therefore, the catalog should include information on publication availability. Two improvements have been suggested. First, an accurate, up-to-date listing of publications in stock needs to be developed and maintained by the distribution center. Second, agents could be supplied with a monthly exception report which lists new additions and notes any items that are out-of-stock or available in limited quantities. This information will help agents select alternative publications to serve the purpose of an unavailable item.

Conflict of Interest Situations for Extension Faculty

Extension faculty develop working relationships with a variety of organizations as a result of their extension activities. The potential exists for faculty to become involved in relationships, both financial and otherwise, which are self-serving or which place the interests of the organization above those of Virginia's extension mission. Two types of relationships were reviewed: paid consulting and faculty affiliations with outside organizations.

No serious incidents of improper faculty-organization relationships were found by JLARC staff. The Extension Division appears to carefully monitor faculty consulting relationships, but needs to establish a more formal review method and clearer guidelines for faculty affiliated with outside organizations.

Paid Consulting by Extension Faculty. VPI&SU has welldefined guidelines for faculty members engaged in paid consultation with public and private organizations. These guidelines include the following stipulations:

- faculty must request and be granted approval for every consulting relationship;
- private consulting arrangements are approved only when they can be undertaken without interfering with university responsibilities; and
- •consulting services must augment, rather than replace, services that can be provided free to citizens of the Commonwealth by the Extension Division.
The Provost requires that a report of faculty members' consulting activities be submitted annually by each university dean.

Few extension faculty members engaged in consulting activities in 1978. For example, among administrative staff and in the two colleges with most extension faculty, only 27 extension faculty members were found to have engaged in paid consulting work. More than two-thirds of the consulting days were for clients located outside the State.

Faculty Affiliations with Outside Organizations. During 1978, VPI&SU extension faculty served as advisors, officers, or board members for approximately 69 organizations (mostly trade groups and producer associations). The exact number is unknown because the Extension Division has no standard procedure for keeping track of faculty affiliations. A listing was prepared for JLARC by VPI&SU and is included in the Appendix. According to federal quidelines quoted in the administrative handbook for extension, a faculty member should not become involved in the organization's bookkeeping and management functions. However, one individual appeared to have violated the guidelines by serving as president of a producer association.

The need for clearly defined guidelines and an accurate record of faculty affiliations is illustrated by the fact that outside organizations, especially commodity groups, have faculty as advisors or officers, and also provide monetary support for faculty programs and activities. For example, in the first eight months of FY 1979, the dairy industry donated \$26,300 to extension programs in the Department of Dairy Science at VPI&SU. This is approximately one-third of the total operating funds for the department. Two faculty members in the Dairy Science Department serve on the board of the Virginia Dairy Foundation, and another serves on the board of the Virginia Dairyman's Association.

Faculty involvement with outside organizations is also illustrated by the fact that trade groups and producer associations often pay for faculty travel to conferences and meetings. For example, a review of files in the Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics found 57 instances of faculty travel reimbursed by outside organizations in 1978.

Another reason for concern over faculty affiliations with organizations is the potential for involvement in legislative lobbying efforts by such groups. Seven of the 69 organizations with which extension faculty were involved had registered lobbyists at the 1979 Session of the Virginia General Assembly. Many of the remaining 62 groups could have specific commercial interests to promote at future legislative sessions. Although there are prohibitions in federal regulations against lobbying by extension personnel, it is not clear that the guidelines include State legislation.

65

While there have been no suggestions of improprieties, during a faculty workshop in 1979 extension officials cautioned faculty about excessive involvement with outside organizations. Extension administrators should monitor faculty involvement with various organizations. Present guidelines should be clarified in areas such as lobbying, faculty holding policy-making positions with producer associations, and faculty acceptance of travel reimbursement from outside organizations. An annual survey of all faculty members should be completed to identify faculty commitments and affiliations with outside organizations.

Travel Controls

Travel is second only to personnel costs in the Extension Division budget. For FY 1979, the Division budgeted \$2.4 million for travel, \$1.6 million of which was for support of cooperative extension.

Extension faculty travel to support educational programs in all parts of Virginia. Extension agents and technicians travel extensively within the county in which they are employed. The typical annual travel budget alloted to each agent is \$650, while faculty members have a travel budget averaging \$800 annually.

The Extension Division has a number of policies regulating travel. However, some existing controls are not always followed, and additional controls are needed to ensure that travel funds are used efficiently.

Violation of Controls. A potentially serious problem was found regarding approval of travel expenditures. The review found that travel vouchers may be processed even though they do not have the authorized signatures required by Division policy. Extension accounting office personnel indicated that reimbursement vouchers from field personnel are routinely processed without the required approving signature as long as the documentation for expenses is in order. Four of 23 out-of-state travel reimbursements found in the JLARC sample of faculty vouchers did not have the required signature from the administrative officer for the Extension Division. The accounting staff must perform a more thorough review of travel vouchers to ensure that administrative controls already established are properly executed. Improperly executed vouchers should not be paid.

Need for Documentation. Extension Division staff travel is done at the individual's initiative without day-to-day, toplevel supervision. To justify this delegation of authority, Division staff must document the reasons for travel in sufficient detail so that a supervisory post-audit can determine that travel is not abused. However, the Extension Division does not obtain adequate documentation of travel purposes. The lack of clear purpose statements for trips was found throughout a sample of 149 faculty vouchers. Vague statements included:

Met with members of northeast and southeast staffs;

Met with VEC; and

To confer with client regarding housing problem.

Such statements do not indicate what extension programs are being supported by the travel. Nor do they convey why travel was preferable to communication by mail or telephone. One example of a clear purpose statement taken from a voucher is:

> To take part in the work being conducted by the Southern Soil Test Work Group. This group is concerned with the quality and uniformity of soil testing and fertilizer recommendation programs being conducted by the land-grant universities in the Southern Region.

Travel vouchers without adequate documentation should not be processed. The Dean of the Extension Division should also conduct a post-audit review of a sample of travel vouchers annually. Information developed from this review can be used to identify areas in which travel can be reduced or eliminated.

Grant Monitoring

The Extension Division considers gifts, grants, and contracts as "an area of funds which has not been fully cultivated and utilized in extension in the past." As a result, increasing the number and amount of special funded grants and contracts is the top fiscal priority of the Division. Grant and contract revenue rose from \$1.3 million in FY 1974 to \$1.7 million in FY 1977.

There are two problems inherent in increased dependence on grants and contracts. First, there is a need for close review to determine whether a commitment of extension resources is appropriate given extension's mission. This review does not always take place. For example:

> A VPI&SU faculty member, whose salary is paid totally from extension funds, submitted two grant proposals to agricultural research foundations in early 1979. The Extension Division does not review all proposals involving extension personnel or resources under current procedures. In this case, the proposal was not reviewed by the Extension Division

despite the fact that the faculty member was to be a principal investigator, which certainly would have committed some of his time.

Better procedures for reviewing grant and contract proposals are needed. In the future, all commitments of Extension Division resources should be reviewed by the Dean.

VPI&SU now has an office of contract and grant administration which serves a central review role for all agreements entered into by the university. This office could also be assigned the responsibility of ensuring that grants and contracts are reviewed by the proper division dean, or deans when more than one division is involved.

A second concern about the increased use of grants and contracts is the possibility that new programs will have hidden longterm implications for State funding. For example:

> The Extension Division recently developed a proposal for a Center for Volunteer Response to be funded jointly over five years by VPI&SU and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The proposal calls for total expenditures of \$1.3 million from the foundation and \$3.6 million from VPI&SU.

The VPI&SU contribution is projected to be 64 percent of the total the first year, increasing to 89 percent of the total the fifth year. The proposal also calls for six staff positions to be totally funded by Kellogg the first year, 80 percent the second year, etc., until VPI&SU assumes 100 percent of the cost in the sixth year.

Because the Center is intended as a permanent resource, the Extension Division must be prepared to assume its total \$1 million annual cost by 1984, to be funded from State, federal, local, or other grant funds.

The Extension Division must continue to ensure that all staff employed as a result of grant or contract funding are informed in writing that their employment is subject to the conditions and duration of the grant or contract. This is an established State policy which protects both the individual and the State agency or institution involved in the project.

Management of the Continuing Education Center

The Continuing Education Center (CEC) is housed in the Donaldson Brown building on the VPI&SU campus. The CEC's function

is to provide general extension education through conferences and meetings that do not carry academic credit. JLARC's review of the CEC focused on oversight of the cost and quality of these activities. Several areas relating to matters of billing, cost recovery, payment of instruction costs, and maintenance of program quality deserve particular attention.

CEC activity has increased steadily, both in terms of the number of conferences held (Figure 13) and the number of participants (Figure 14). There were 365 conferences held in 1978. A variety of organizations, groups, and associations use the CEC facilities and staff for programs (Figure 15). Over half of all conferences use the Donaldson Brown building, with the remaining conferences scheduled in other locations in Blacksburg or other parts of Virginia. The CEC staff of five faculty and 16 classified positions offer program development assistance, general coordination, and operation of food service and lodging facilities in the Donaldson Brown building.







Source: CEC records and JLARC.

Billing for Conferences. Of the 365 conferences held in FY 1978, the files for 349 were "closed," meaning that all revenues had been collected and charges paid, when JLARC staff completed the



Source: CEC records.

file review on March 30, 1979. Sixteen FY 1978 files_were still open at that time, 13 had been open for at least nine months, and three had been open for 16 months.

Basically, files are open because billings for activities have not been completed. Fourteen of the 16 open files had accounts receivable from participant fees and sponsor's funding, or had not received charges for materials or services (Table 21). The CEC

Table 21

REASONS FOR OPEN STATUS OF FY 1978 CONFERENCE FILES (AS OF 3/30/79)

<u>Reason for Open Status</u>	Number	of	Files
Participant or sponsor payments not received		7	
Charges for publications or other services not received		4	
Charges for materials not receiv	/ed	3	
Internal paperwork not completed	i _	2	
Total		16	

Source: JLARC analysis of CEC files.

Figure 15

EXAMPLES OF CONTINUING EDUCATION CENTER PROGRAMS

Sponsor	Audience	Topic
Western Electric	Engineers & engineering managers	Introduction to Micro- computers
Accountants Society of Virginia	Accountants	Annual Accounting Update Workshop
State Board of Education	Guidance counselors	Career Guidance & Counseling Workshop
Extension Division	Purchasing managers	Strengthening Procurement Concepts for the Purchasing Executive
American Chemical Society	Scientists, engineers, chemists, physicists, medical clinicians, etc.	<i>Microprocessors & Mini- computers - Interfacing & Applications</i>
CEC (Extension Division)	Women managers	Women in Management
Southern States Cooperative, Inc.	Cooperative managers	Southern States Manager - Employee Relations Workshop
Naval Aviation Executive Institute	Naval Air Systems Command	Overview - Aircraft Design & Development
United Steel Workers of America	Local labor leaders	1977 USWA District 35 Labor Institute
Virginia Association of Plumbing, Heating & Cooling Contractors	Plumbing, heating & cooling contractors	Doubling Your Idea Power
Department of Corrections	Food service managers	Professional Development of Food Service Managers - Phase X

should place special emphasis on billing for overdue accounts. Conference accounts which remain open beyond six months should be brought to the attention of the Dean.

Cost Recovery. Significant salary costs for operation of the CEC and the Donaldson Brown facility are borne by the State's general fund. General fund support of conferences and meetings is contrary to an unwritten but generally held State policy as it is applied to the majority of state-supported colleges and universities.

Table 22 provides a summary of general fund support for the CEC's operations in FY 1978. The amount of general fund support required to operate the CEC during that year was \$233,375.55.

Table 22

SUMMARY OF GENERAL FUND SUPPORT REQUIRED, CONTINUING EDUCATION CENTER, VPI&SU FY 1978

Expenditures		
Administrative Expenses:		
Salaries		\$251,511.83
General Operations		60,940.08
Capital Expenditures		27,732.83
Utilities (Donaldson Brown)		16,178.00
		\$356,362.74
Conformer Burgeree		4000 240 00
Conference Expenses:	•	\$800,340.09
Total Expenses:		\$1,156,702.83
Revenue		
Conference Fees:		(\$923,327.28)
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Remainder to be Supported by General Fund \$233,375.55

Source: JLARC analysis of CEC records.

Most of the general fund support was used to offset administrative salaries. The salary expenditures for the CEC staff are broken down in four budget programs. Table 23 shows the number of positions and the salary amounts for each budget program used by the CEC.

The positions under the program "academic administration" are filled by individuals whose daily activities for the most part involve the management and operation of the food service and lodging

Table 23

		l-Time nt Positions	
Budget Program	Faculty	Classified	Salary Amounts
Academic Administration Community Education Community Services Cooperative Extension	1.0 1.8 1.3 <u>0.8</u> 4.9	5.0 4.5 4.3 <u>2.0</u> 15.8	\$ 78,662.57 75,367.38 60,274.41 <u>37,207.47</u> \$251,511.83

POSITIONS AND SALARY AMOUNTS BY STATE BUDGET PROGRAM, CONTINUING EDUCATION CENTER, FY 1978

Source: VPI&SU Extension Division accounting records.

enterprises at the Donaldson Brown building. The faculty position is assigned to an individual whose duties have been described to JLARC staff as paralleling those of a general manager for a large hotel. Another individual in a classified position spends approximately 75 percent of his time managing the lodging functions at Donaldson Brown.

Because these personnel are primarily involved in the provision of food service and lodging, their salaries, and salaries of persons reporting to them, should be paid from revenues of the facility in proportion to the amount of their time spent on those functions. JLARC staff estimate that this arrangement would have reduced the amount of general funds required by the CEC in FY 1978 by \$50,000, to approximately \$183,000 instead of the \$233,375 shown in Table 22.

The salary amounts shown in Table 23 under the budget programs of community education, community services, and cooperative extension support positions involved primarily in scheduling and conducting conferences. Although VPI&SU has been excepted in the past, the general policy of the Department of Planning and Budget, the General Assembly, and the State Council of Higher Education is to require state-supported colleges and universities to recover costs for holding conferences. This would mean that conference participants and sponsors, rather than taxpayers, support the full cost of conference activities.

VPI&SU should increase the administrative charge to conference participants so that the operation of the CEC, including the administrative services for scheduling and conducting conferences, becomes essentially self-supporting. In FY 1978, the value of unrecovered administrative costs was approximately \$183,000. Most of this amount can be properly charged to conference participants rather than using general funds. Some limited exceptions may be warranted for utilities and other costs associated with the use of the Donaldson Brown building for public meetings and community service activities for which there is no charge.

Instruction Costs. A minority of CEC conferences incur instruction costs; that is, faculty members or their departments are compensated for their participation. In some circumstances, the procedure through which the CEC pays for instruction time circumvents State policy regarding the mixing of salary and non-salary funds.

Table 24 shows the number of FY 1978 conferences which had instruction costs and the amounts paid for instruction. As the table indicates, about two-thirds (235) of the conferences did not have instruction costs. These conferences used faculty with Extension Division appointments or faculty paid from grant or contract funds. As a result, there was no additional cost for their time. Some faculty time is also donated because of professional interest in the conference topic.

Table 24

CONFERENCE INSTRUCTION COSTS BY BUDGET PROGRAM (FY 1978)

Budget Program	Total <u>Conferences</u>	Conferences with Instruction Costs	Paid for	Amount Paid for Non-VPI&SU Faculty	Total Instruction Costs Paid
Community Education	228	93	\$84,797	\$50,963	\$135,760
Cooperative Extension	116	21	468	14,217	14,685
Community Service	5	0	0	0	0
Total	349	114	\$85,265	\$65,180	\$150,445

Note: Does not include 16 conferences for which files were not closed as of 3/30/79.

Source: JLARC analysis of CEC conference files.

Of the conferences which required instruction expenditures, a total of \$85,265 was paid for VPI&SU faculty in FY 1978. If faculty members are on a current academic appointment when the conference is held, funds paid for their time are transferred to their academic department. If faculty members are on part-time (nine or ten month) appointments, they retain the payment as compensation.

The procedure for reimbursing academic departments for the CEC's use of their faculty circumvents Directive No. 6 issued June 1,

1978, by the Secretary of Administration and Finance. The directive states:

No funds encumbered for personal services or employee benefits can be used for any other purpose without written concurrence from the appropriate Secretary and DPB (Department of Planning and Budget).

The reimbursement made by the CEC reaches the academic department as an increase to the department's allotment for non-salary expenditures. Thus, funds originally encumbered for personal services are effectively shifted to an account where they can be used to pay for such items as travel and equipment.

The university needs to revise its procedure so that CEC reimbursements for instruction time by an academic department are applied as an increase to personal services. This action will bring the CEC and VPI&SU into compliance with Directive No. 6.

Quality Oversight. Virtually all CEC conferences meet the basic requirements for awarding continuing education units (CEUs). CEUs are formal permanent recognition of an individual's participation in an educational program. The basic requirement for a CEU-awarding program is pre-planning which includes identified clientele, identified goals, and qualified instruction. An additional requirement is the use of participant evaluations of the program content and instruction.

JLARC staff attempted to review the evaluations of the 146 CEU-awarding conferences held by the CEC in FY 1978. Evaluations for 115 of the 146 conferences were found in the Donaldson Brown building, although they were stored somewhat haphazardly in two different locations rather than as a permanent part of each conference file. Twenty evaluations were found in other locations. The remaining 11 conferences have no evidence of having been evaluated as required to meet CEU-awarding requirements.

The lack of attention given to the collection and storage of evaluations suggests that the CEC staff do not do all they can to provide meaningful quality oversight of the conferences under their control. Evaluations by participants can provide important information necessary for improving the quality and success of future conferences.

The CEC needs to establish a routine procedure for collecting, filing, and reviewing participant evaluations, and for using this information in the planning of new conferences. This procedure should be used for all types of conferences which might benefit from information gained from participant evaluations, whether or not the conference actually awards CEUs.

Off-Campus Credit Instruction

VPI&SU offers credit instruction at many locations outside of Blacksburg. The administration of off-campus courses is handled by the Extension Division's Office of Off-Campus Credit Programs. Courses are designed to parallel on-campus courses and are taught by faculty from the Instruction Division.

The off-campus credit program has reached a critical stage in its development. While VPI&SU forecasts moderate growth for its off-campus enrollment, figures show that enrollments are declining. At the same time, costs for the off-campus program have risen dramatically.

Profile of Off-Campus Instruction Activity. VPI&SU conducts off-campus credit courses within all the higher education consortium regions of the State. Approximately 93 percent of the courses are conducted at the graduate level, with most students enrolled in a degree program.

Table 25 shows the course enrollments and number of degree programs within each consortium region for FY 1978. The Northern Virginia Consortium accounts for 56 percent of the course enrollments and half of the degree programs. This predominance is due to the fact that the area is served by VPI&SU's Dulles Graduate Center, which has permanently assigned faculty and staff.

Table 25

NUMBER OF COURSE ENROLLMENTS AND GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAMS BY CONSORTIUM VPI&SU OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAM (FY 1978)

Consortium Region	Course <u>Enrollment</u>	Number of Graduate Degree Programs Offered
Capitol	509	7
Central	382	8
Northern	4,302	26
Tidewater	468 190	4 3
Valley Western	1,449	4
Other	353	
Total	7,653	

Source: VPI&SU.

Table 26 lists the number of graduate degrees granted by VPI&SU through the off-campus program. The College of Education has granted the largest number of degrees, followed by Engineering. Over 81 percent (1,357) of the degrees awarded to off-campus students as of June 1979 have been in education.

Table 26

VPI&SU OFF-CAMPUS DEGREES AWARDED (1972-1979)

College	Degrees Awarded
Education Engineering Home Economics Business Arts & Sciences	1,357 110 23 92 33
Architecture & Urban Affairs	56
Total	1,671

Source: VPI&SU.

Enrollment and Costs. Costs for VPI&SU's off-campus credit program have increased significantly, while enrollment has steadily declined. In fact, enrollments have fallen far below projections submitted to the General Assembly (Figure 16).

Figure 16





Source: JLARC and VPI&SU.

As the figure shows, the most serious deviation occurred in the 1976-78 biennium. In recognition of the decline in enrollment, the 1977 General Assembly reduced VPI&SU's FY 1978 general fund appropriation for the off-campus program by \$113,610.

Although the enrollments have been below projections, VPI&SU expenditures have shown a generally upward trend. Figure 17 shows actual expenditures for FY 1975 through FY 1979, and identifies the source of the funds. The portion of total expenditures identified as "other" in Figure 17 is a combination of general and special funds which can be shifted between programs within the same line item of the Appropriations Act. For example, in FY 1979 \$383,246 was channeled from other extension programs into the offcampus program. It should be noted that the figure does not include space rental costs for the Dulles Graduate Center. The expense was budgeted separately as a general fund item and amounted to \$171,220 in FY 1979.

Figure 17

EXPENDITURES FOR THE VPI&SU OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAM (FY 1975-FY 1979)



Source: JLARC and VPI&SU.

The combined effect of lower than expected enrollments and higher expenditures is a serious discrepancy between planned for and actual expenditures per FTE student. Table 27 links actual expenditures with the amount projected for the program by the Department of Planning and Budget. As can be seen, VPI&SU has expended up to 56 percent more per student than planned. In 1979, \$1,420 more per FTE was spent than originally was projected.

Table 27

PROJECTED VS. ACTUAL EXPENDITURES PER FTE STUDENT FOR THE OFF-CAMPUS CREDIT PROGRAM (FY 1975-FY 1979)

Expenditures/FTE					
<u>Fiscal Year</u>	Projected	Actual	<pre>% Difference</pre>		
1 97 5	\$1,690	\$2,171	+28		
1976	1,689	2,215	+31		
1977	2,205	2,180	- 1		
1978 (original)	2,111	2,737	+30		
1978 (revised)*	2,706	2,737	+ 1		
1979	2,517	3,937	+56		

*Based on reduced FTE enrollment projection of 830 submitted to 1977 Session of General Assembly and subsequent reduced appropriation.

Source: Budget Documents, State Council of Higher Education, and VPI&SU.

VPI&SU extension faculty responsible for the off-campus credit program have cited several reasons for the increasing costs and decreasing enrollments. Some of these reasons are:

- start-up costs for initiating new degree programs before students are enrolled;
- increased number of post masters and specialized degree programs which involve high instruction and support costs, but low enrollments; and
- reluctance to cancel courses with low enrollments when the course fits into a degree program sequence.

If costs are to be controlled, a comprehensive assessment needs to be made of the types of costs associated with offering credit courses off-campus, and the factors affecting stability of enrollments. The study should determine to what extent it is in the interest of the Commonwealth to support off-campus credit programs, and should propose additional funding guidelines if appropriate. Because 12 other State-supported colleges currently operate off-campus programs, the study should not be limited to the VPI&SU program.

The State Council of Higher Education, which is uniquely equipped with the staff resources and information base necessary, should perform this study. The Council has already recognized offcampus credit programs as an important and developing issue area on which the Commonwealth needs to focus attention. Therefore, a study of off-campus credit programs would address a concern already expressed by the Council.

VII. Increasing the Effectiveness of the Extension Division

The Extension Division of VPI&SU is the Commonwealth's largest investment in continuing education. The Division's wide range of educational and informational resources includes cooperative extension programs, off-campus credit programs, non-credit continuing education programs, and the administration of grants and contracts related to the extension mission.

The Extension Division is an important educational resource for Virginia. Extension's principal strengths are its flexible and responsive program development process, and its highlymotivated staff of extension agents and faculty. These strengths, in addition to generous State funding support and a broad mission definition, have enabled the Extension Division to promote aggressive program expansion in recent years. Although most extension resources continue to be focused on rural areas and the traditional programs of agriculture, 4-H, nutrition, and home economics, the Division has become active in urban and suburban areas and has expanded traditional programs to include cultural, recreational, and leisure time activities.

The expansion of extension programs has not been fully supported by all members of the Division staff, and has been questioned by State officials because of the potential for duplication and overlap of other State-supported educational and informational programs. Continued expansion at past rates of growth will require substantial increases in State funding, in conjunction with maximizing other funding support such as local appropriations and nontax sources of revenue. It will be necessary for VPI&SU to develop clear priorities for the future development of extension programs.

The Division's field staff and faculty function through a complex organization. Organizational weaknesses and the need for several administrative improvements have affected the delivery of some Division programs.

The following recommendations are suggested to enhance the efficient and effective use of resources available to the VPI&SU Extension Division.

Funding (pp. 9-17)

The growth in extension programs since 1966 has been accomplished primarily with increases in State general fund support. The Division has proposed to increase local appropriations and the use of grants and contracts as high priority goals for funding extension programs in the future. Increased use of volunteers is also planned. These steps are proposed by the Division to "insure the continued growth of extension programs in the future," despite declining federal support for cooperative extension and anticipation of a slowing in the rate of increase for State funding support.

The changing nature of extension funding, and the strategies adopted by VPI&SU to deal with funding shifts, could have significant impact on future budgetary decisions.

Recommendation (1). The Division's goals for changing the distribution of extension funding should be brought to the attention of the General Assembly through the Division's budget request document or other appropriate means. The relative availability of alternative funding options is an important consideration in legislative review. State general funds made available by increases in local or non-tax funds, or increased use of volunteers, could be considered for use to support expanded extension services in new program areas or underserved communities, or could be appropriated by the General Assembly for other purposes.

Mission Definition (pp. 5-6, 37)

The present scope of extension programs, in terms of intensity and direction, is within the broad legislative mandate assigned to the Division by the General Assembly in 1966. However, extension administrators do not have the benefit of clearly defined program priorities. Furthermore, the present statutory mission statement of the Extension Division has not been reviewed by the General Assembly since 1966 and may not provide an adequate delineation of the program limits intended for cooperative extension by the legislature.

The executive budget review process is similarly limited by a lack of budgetary guidelines. Although a mission review is reported to be underway by a task force chaired by the Secretary of Education, the result of this review is not expected to be submitted to the General Assembly for approval.

Recommendation (2). VPI&SU, in conjunction with the State Council of Higher Education, VSU, and the Secretary of Education, should prepare a detailed statement of the role and mission of cooperative extension in Virginia. As part of the mission statement, an explicit objective for program growth, based on a rational planning process and a generally accepted system of priorities, needs to be prepared.

The mission statement should be submitted to the General Assembly for review and approval. The mission statement might be submitted as a resolution, a statutory statement of purpose, or as an amendment to the statutory mission contained in Section 3.1-41, *Code of Virginia*. Subsequent changes to the Extension Division mission statement following General Assembly review should be approved by the State Council of Higher Education as called for in Section 23-9.6:1, *Code of Virginia*.

Duplication and Overlap of Programs (pp. 38-45)

Duplication of effort is a fact in many communities, and a potential problem with the educational and informational programs of a large number of State agencies. Forty percent of the extension agents responding to a JLARC survey were able to cite specific examples of duplication between their programs and those of other local agencies and groups.

Although there does not appear to be widespread duplication of effort at the present time between cooperation extension and the informational programs of State agencies, extension is on a potential collision course with the mandates of at least 23 State agencies. A substantial amount of duplication and overlap currently exists between extension offices and the course offerings of community colleges. In order to avoid duplication of effort, systematic communication between the Extension Division and other agencies and organizations is needed.

Recommendation (3). The membership of the 23 local coordinating committees now used by VCCS and the State Board of Education in areas served by a community college should be broadened to include representatives of cooperative extension offices in the region. This should be done in conjunction with close consultation between the Board of VCCS and VPI&SU on the proper role of each agency in the provision of continuing education services in the community.

Recommendation (4). Cooperative extension agents should take the lead in encouraging the development of interagency coordinating committees in communities which do not now have one.

Recommendation (5). The Extension Division should adopt an explicit policy that program development at the unit level avoid competition with other programs offered in the community, particularly those with a specific mandate to provide informational or educational services. The fact that other agencies may charge a fee for their programs should not be a factor in extension programming unless the charges of the other agencies can be clearly shown to be undesirable for the program audience extension is trying to reach.

Recommendation (6). The Extension Division should develop a memorandum of understanding with each State agency which has the potential for overlapping responsibilities and duplicated effort. Specific areas of overlap should be identified and a determination made of how duplication can be avoided. Memoranda should be updated as agency missions change in response to legislative or executive direction. Implementation of the memoranda should be monitored by both parties on a periodic basis.

Coordination of agency activities for agencies operating within one of the several secretarial areas should continue to be

the responsibility of the appropriate secretary, as specified in the *Code of Virginia* (see, for example, Section 2.1-51-20).

Reporting and Evaluation (pp. 34-36)

Program management of cooperative extension is hindered by instances of poor reporting of individual agent activities. Agent reports emphasized activity descriptions and participant counts rather than assessments of how extension programs assisted individuals in improving their knowledge and skills. The participant counts were often of little value because some agents tended to overstate the number of individuals who attended their programs. Administrators are not able to fully use the present reporting procedures to evaluate program appropriateness or impact.

Recommendation (7). The program reporting procedures of the cooperative extension program should be improved through more realistic statements of objectives, use of narrative descriptions closely related to achievement of objectives, and a reduction in emphasis on participant counts as the basis for evaluation. The in-depth program reviews of local offices presently conducted by division staff should focus to a greater extent on program reporting.

Recommendation (8). The Division should explore the availability of grant funds to conduct detailed program evaluations in several representative Virginia localities. These evaluations would be complex and expensive to undertake, but could provide reasonably reliable information on the benefits of different types of extension activity.

Travel Controls (pp. 66-67)

The Extension Division has a \$2.4 million travel budget to support the travel requirements of faculty, staff, and extension agents. Some existing controls on the expenditure of these funds are not always followed and additional controls are needed. For example, the Division accounting office routinely processed travel reimbursement requests without the authorizing signatures required by Division policy. In addition, travel reimbursement requests did not contain sufficient documentation about the purpose and need for travel.

The Division does not routinely post-audit agent and faculty travel vouchers to determine the appropriateness of travel or identify areas where travel can be reduced or eliminated.

Recommendation (9). The Division accounting staff must perform a more thorough review of travel reimbursement requests to ensure that administrative controls already established are properly executed. Reimbursement requests without the required signatures or adequate documentation and narrative should not be processed. Recommendation (10). The Dean of the Extension Division should post-audit a sample of travel vouchers annually to determine whether some travel can be reduced or eliminated.

Conflict of Interest Monitoring (pp. 64-66)

Extension faculty serve as advisors, officers, or board members of numerous private groups and organizations. Close relationships often exist between faculty and these organizations. For example, the Dairy Science department at VPI&SU receives about a third of its operating funds from donations by the dairy industry. Three of the department's faculty serve on boards of dairy associations. Faculty also often have their travel expenses paid for by private groups and organizations.

Although VPI&SU has developed policies governing the appropriateness of faculty affiliations and commitments to outside organizations, the Division has no adequate means for monitoring these affiliations and commitments.

Recommendation (11). Division administrators should develop a better method of monitoring potential conflicts of interest which result from faculty involvement with various organizations. A survey of all faculty members should be completed annually to identify faculty commitments and affiliations with other organizations. Present guidelines should be clarified as they pertain to lobbying, faculty holding policy-making positions in producer associations, and faculty acceptance of travel reimbursement from outside organizations.

Tenure Requirements (pp. 57-58)

As many as 52 faculty positions in the Extension Division have purely administrative duties and carry academic tenure. Tenure is intended to promote academic freedom by protecting teachers from unwarranted dismissal. However, tenure may be inappropriate for Division administrative staff who have no teaching responsibilities.

Recommendation (12). The Extension Division should reevaluate each existing administrative faculty position to determine whether the duties of the position require the protection of academic tenure.

Off-Campus Credit Instruction Costs (pp. 75-80)

The costs for VPI&SU's off-campus credit program have been increasing while actual enrollments have consistently fallen below projections. As a result, expenditures per student have been above projections in three of the last five years. For example, in FY 1979, actual expenditures were nearly \$4,000 per FTE student compared to the projected amount of \$2,517. Recommendation (13). The State Council of Higher Education should conduct a Statewide study of the costs associated with offering credit courses off-campus, the factors affecting stability of enrollments, and the extent to which it is in the best interest of the Commonwealth to support off-campus programs. Additional funding guidelines should be proposed as necessary. All Statesupported colleges and universities operating off-campus programs should be included in the study.

Organization and Staffing (pp. 46-57)

The Extension Division has been aware of organizational deficiencies for a number of years. Although steps have been taken to correct weaknesses, some deficiencies remain.

Two supervisory positions, the unit chairman at the local level and the program director at the State level, do not have sufficient authority to effectively discharge their responsibilities. The district program leader position, which is intended to serve as liaison between faculty and field staff, has proved ineffective. Another problem is the fact that, although there are two grades in the job classification for extension agents, all agents perform essentially the same duties and are judged on the same performance criteria. This violates a basic principle of personnel management.

Recommendation (14). The unit chairman should be assigned primary responsibility for four functions now assigned to the district staff. The unit chairman should (1) maintain official relationships with local governing bodies; (2) be responsible for personnel evaluations for all unit staff and recommendations for promotion; (3) coordinate program development, including oversight of community needs assessment and the annual plans of work; and (4) determine the professional development needs of unit staff. A separate merit salary scale or other appropriate form of incentive and compensation for unit chairmen should be established.

Recommendation (15). The program director position should be confirmed as having primary supervisory authority over all aspects of program development and monitoring in each of the five areas of program emphasis.

Recommendation (16). The Extension Division should consider eliminating all program leader positions now housed in district offices with the exception of program leaders for 4-H. The incumbents should be considered for transfer to administrative faculty positions or new or reallocated faculty positions in academic colleges.

Recommendation (17). The "B" and "C" personnel classifications presently used for extension agents should either be substantially distinguished by duty or performance criteria or the two classifications should be merged in favor of a single salary scale for all experienced agents.

Management of the Continuing Education Center (pp. 68-75)

The Continuing Education Center (CEC) serves as the focal point for VPI&SU's non-credit continuing education seminars and conferences. The management of the CEC can be improved to ensure that all expenditures related to each conference and seminar are properly charged to participants. This would reduce the general fund support required for the CEC by as much as \$233,000, and would bring VPI&SU in line with the general State policy that participants, rather than taxpayers, support the cost of non-credit educational programs.

More timely billing and proper accounting of personnel reimbursement for CEC programs are also needed.

Recommendation (18). The CEC should become essentially self-supporting by charging the cost of administrative overhead to the appropriate revenue-generating activity. General fund support of the CEC should be limited to those costs which cannot be properly charged to conference participants.

Recommendation (19). Reimbursements to academic departments for instruction provided by non-extension faculty on a full time appointment should be credited to personal service accounts as required by State policy.

Recommendation (20). The CEC should establish suspense dates to improve its billing process. Conference accounts which remain open beyond six months should be brought to the attention of the Dean.

General Administration (pp. 59-88)

Selected aspects of the Division's general administration were examined during the course of the program review. Administrative improvements in a number of areas would help promote the effective and efficient use of State funds. These areas include planning and publications for cooperative extension, agent orientation and training, conference evaluations, and administration of grants and contracts.

Recommendation (21). Agent plans-of-work should be timed to arrive in Blacksburg well before faculty plans are prepared. Program directors should ensure that agent plans are used as the foundation of faculty planning. Workshops involving agents, faculty, and administrators should be used to enhance the use and value of written plans. Recommendation (22). An accurate, up-to-date listing of extension publications in stock should be developed and maintained by the Division distribution center. Agents should be supplied with a monthly exception report which lists new additions and notes any items that are out-of-stock or available in limited quantities.

Recommendation (23). The Extension Division should design a more comprehensive and timely orientation program for new agents than currently exists. All new agents should receive an indepth orientation on the Blacksburg campus prior to assignment. The orientation should be overseen by the appropriate program director and include both administrative and subject-matter briefings. Orientation to local conditions would be the responsibility of the unit chairman.

Recommendation (24). Participant evaluations for inservice training courses should use a standard format. Content should include such things as quality of subject matter, instructor performance, and appropriateness of information for local programs. All evaluations for each course should be systematically reviewed by the staff development office with appropriate action taken by the Director of Staff Development when necessary.

Recommendation (25). Participant evaluations should be required of all conferences and made part of the permanent file. Evaluations should be periodically reviewed by CEC staff as a means of providing quality oversight.

Recommendation (26). The VPI&SU Office of Grant and Contract Administration should be responsible for ensuring that the appropriate division dean(s) is aware of all grant proposals affecting division faculty or staff.

Recommendation (27). The Division should continue to ensure that individuals employed on grant funds are informed in writing that under State policy their employment is subject to the conditions and duration of the grant or contract.

Appendices

Positions	Held with	Outside	Organizations	•	•	• •	•	•	•	•	•	91
Technical	Appendix			•				•				93

Agency Response

JLARC policy provides that each State agency involved in a program review be given the opportunity to comment on an exposure draft. This process is one part of an extensive data validation process.

Appropriate corrections resulting from the written comments have been made in the final report. It should be noted that page references in the responses relate to the draft report and do not necessarily correspond to page numbers in the final report.

.*

VPI&SU						96
Virginia State University						
Department of Planning and Budget						
State Council of Higher Education	•			•	•	112

Appendix

POSITIONS HELD WITH OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS BY VPI&SU FACULTY (1979)

Group

Capacity (Number)

1.	Virginia Commercial Pork Producers	
	Association	Educational Advisor (1)
2.	Virginia Purebred Swine Breeders	
n	Association Vincinia Dank Ecdemation	Educational Advisor (1) Advisor (1)
3.	Virginia Pork Federation	Educational Advisor (1)
4. 5.	Virginia Feeder Pig Association	Technical Advisor (2)
5. 6.	Virginia Pork Commission Virginia Wool Marketing Association	Educational Advisor (1)
7.	Virginia Purebred Sheep Breeders	
· ·	Association	Educational Advisor (1)
8.	Virginia Sheep Federation	Educational Advisor (1)
9.	Eastern Lamb Producers Cooperative	Advisor (1)
10.	Virginia Horse Council	Educational Advisor (1)
11.	Virginia Cattle Feeders Association	Educational Advisor (1)
12.	Virginia Simmental Association	Educational Advisor (1)
13.	Virginia Charolias Association	Educational Advisor (1)
14.	Virginia Polled Hereford Association	Educational Advisor (1)
15.	Virginia Beef Cattle Improvement	
	Association	Educational Advisor (1)
16.	Virginia Beef Cattle Association	Educational Advisor (1)
17.	Virginia Dairy Products Association	Advisor (1)
18.	Virginia Holstein Cattle Club	Advisor (1)
19.	Virginia Guernsey Cattle Club	Advisor (1)
20.	Virginia Federation of Dairy Herd	
	Improvement Associations	Advisor (1)
21.	Youth Committee of Virginia State	
00	Dairymans Association	Advisor (1)
22.	Virginia State Dairymans Association	Board of Directors (1), Advisor (1)
23.	Virginia Dairy Foundation	Board of Directors (2)
24.	Virginia Mastitis Prevention and Control	
67.	Committee	Advisor (3)
25.	Virginia Feed Association	Board of Directors (1)
26.	Virginia Purebred Livestock International	Advisor (3)
27.	Virginia Slaughter Marketing Association	Educational Advisor (1)
28.	Virginia Meat Packers Association	Secretary
29.	Virginia Poultry Processors Education	
	Committee	Advisor (1)
30.	Virginia Egg Council	Advisor (1)
31.	Virginia Broiler Association	Advisor (1)
32.	Virginia Turkey Association	Board of Directors (1)
33.	Virginia Poultry Federation	Board of Directors,
		(non-voting) (2)
34.	Virginia Poultry Industry Laboratory	Board of Directors (1)

Group

35.	Virginia Seafood Council
	National Marine Fisheries Service
36.	
37.	
	Development
38.	Chesapeake Bay Citizens Council
39.	Virginia State Horticultural Society
	..
40.	Virginia Nurserymans Association
41.	Virginia Federation of Garden Clubs
42.	Frederick and Clarke Fruit Growers
42.	
40	Association
43.	Virginia Vegetable and Potato Growers
	Association
44.	Mens Garden Club of Norfolk
45.	Keep America Beautiful
46.	National Therapy Association
47.	Virginia Christmas Tree Growers
	Association
48.	Mountain Lake Right-a-Way Council
49.	Virginia Corn Growers Association
	Vinginia Corn drowers Association
50.	Virginia Soybean Association
51.	Virginia Turfgrass Council
52.	Virginia Seedmens Association
53.	Virginia Soil Fertility Association
54.	Virginia Forage and Grassland Council
55.	Virginia Forestry Association
56.	Lumber Manufacturers Association of
	Virginia
57.	Virginia Food Dealers Association
58.	Mid-Atlantic Food Processors
	Association
59.	Central Atlantic States Association of
59.	
<u> </u>	Food and Drug Officers
60.	Virginia Pesticide Association
61.	American Association of Poison Control
	Centers
62.	Virginia Land Farmers Association
63.	Virginia Farm Managers and Rural
	Appraisers Society
64.	Virginia Farm Machinery and Industrial
01.	Dealers Association
6 E	Agricultural Committee of Virginia
65.	
~ ~	Bankers Association
66.	Farm Bureau Marketing Association
67.	Virginia Agribusiness Management
	Association
68.	Mental Health Association of Montgomery
- • •	County
69	Virginia Motel Association

69. Virginia Motel Association

Capacity (Number) Advisor (1) Advisor (1) Advisor (1) Advisor (1) Board of Directors (1), Advisor (1) Educational Advisor (1) Advisor (1) Advisor (1) Advisor (1) Advisor (1) Advisor (1) Educational Advisor (1) President Technical Advisor (1) Advisor (1) Secretary Advisor (2) Advisor (1) Board of Directors (3) Educational Advisor (1) Board of Directors (1) Advisor (1) Advisor (1) Secretary Advisor (1) Advisor (7) Advisor (1) Technical Advisor (1) Board of Directors (1) Advisor (1) Advisor (1) Board of Directors (1) Board of Directors (1) Board of Directors (1) Advisor (1)

TECHNICAL APPENDIX (Available on Request)

JLARC policy requires an explanation of the research methodology used in each study. A technical appendix was prepared for this report and is available on request from JLARC, 910 Capitol Street, Suite 1100, Richmond, Virginia 23219.

Three mailed surveys, a structured telephone interview with 18 state extension directors, and field interviews in 12 representative Virginia localities provided data for this study. Each of the methodologies is outlined below. An example of the type of questionnaire used for the surveys is shown on pages 92-93.

1. <u>Faculty Survey</u>. Questionnaires were mailed to 199 faculty and staff of the VPI&SU and VSU extension programs. Faculty and staff were surveyed if they received at least 50% of their salaries from extension funds. Responses were received from 172 individuals (86%). The survey provided information on the allocation of faculty time among principal extension activities, as well as a range of attitudinal data about Division administration and extension program management.

2. <u>Agency Survey</u>. Extension agents in all local offices except those visited by JLARC staff were surveyed. A total of 384 questionnaires were sent and 337 returned (88%). Thirty-four questionnaires were received after data had been keypunched and were not included in the analysis. The 303 responses provided information on agent workload, duplication of effort, and agents' attitudes regarding Division administration and extension program management.

3. Local Official Survey. Each city or county administrator not interviewed by JLARC staff was sent a short questionnaire. Ninetyseven questionnaires were mailed and 77 responses received (79%). Six respondents indicated that they did not have an adequate knowledge of extension to comment. The 71 usable responses provided information on duplication of effort, program management, and a rating of extension's overall contribution to the community.

4. <u>Telephone Interviews</u>. JLARC staff contacted 18 states with extension programs comparable in some aspect to Virginia's. Nine states were comparable in the size of the cooperative extension budget, seven others were located in the southeastern region of the country, and two have similar organizational structures. Information was provided by each state on its workload and organization.

5. <u>JLARC Field Interviews</u>. JLARC staff conducted a series of interviews in 12 localities during February 1979. The localities are shown in the map on page 4 and were selected by JLARC based on geographic location, size, and urban/rural characteristics. The 12 localities were then reviewed by the Dean of the Extension Division to ensure their general representativeness. Interviews were conducted with extension agents, extension technicians, city or county administrators, elected officials, and other citizens with a knowledge of extension activities in the community. Information was obtained on the details of extension program development and management, and on local opinions and attitudes toward extension programs.



SURVEY OF EXTENSION SPECIALISTS

The information obtained from this survey will be used for the JLARC program review of the Extension Division of VPISSU. Individual survey responses will be treated as confidential data, and will not be reported except in aggregate statistical form.

- 1. How many years have you been an extension specialist in Virginia? years
- Please apportion your time spent in extension work for the past year among the following program areas.

Agriculture and Natural Resources	L
Family Resources	ĩ
Community Resource Development	ĩ
4-H	¥
Technical Resources	<u> </u>
Other	¥
(specify)	100 %

- 3. What is your academic rank?
- 4. In which academic department is your appointment?
- 5. Please apportion your total time among the following areas.



6. Do you presently have tenure at VPI&SU?

Yes No

.

- What percentage of your salary was paid with extension funds during the 1977-78 academic year?
 - ×_____X

- 8a. Does this percentage accorately reflect the proportion of your total professional time that your spent on extension activities?
 - Yes, the percentage is about right Nu, I spent more than that on extension activities and less on other activities Ro, I spent less than that on extension activities and more on other activities
- 85. If you answered no, what percentage would be more accurate? 5
- Please estimate to the best of your ability the number of hours you spent on <u>extension-related</u> activities in a typical work week for the 1977-78 academic year. hours
- 10. The following list contains frequently mentioned activities of extension specialists. Please apportion your <u>extension-related</u> time (i.e., the percent of your total time identified in question 6) for the past year among the following activities.

Teaching continuing education and/or in-service training	
courses	z
Assisting or advising agent(s) directly (either in	
person, by letter, or by phone)	Ľ
Presenting programs in the community, in conjunction with	
an extension agent	Ľ
Consulting with or presenting programs to citizens,	
without agent participation	*
Program planning and development	ĩ
Oeveloping and writing extension publications and	
other educational materials	z
Extension sponsored research under grant or contract	Ľ
Other	7
(specify)	100%

Vec

Μ.,

Ila. In your opinion, is there effective communication between extension specialists and the following individuals?

	res	NO
Chairman of faculty planning units for		
extension		
Extension program directors District program leaders		
Local extension agents		
Other extension specialists		

11b. Please explain any "no" answers given above.



12. Do you feel that, in your field, extension status helps, inhibits, or does not affect a faculty member's chances for being granted tenure at VP1&SU?

Helps		
Inhibits		
Does not	a ffec t	

Do you agree or disagree with the following statements about the cooperative extension program? Circle the number on the scale which best indicates your response. Please use the space at the end of the questionnaire for clarification of unity of your responses, or for additional comments gou may wish to make.

		Agree Strongly				Disagree Strongly	
13.	The types of programs that exten- sion offers are determined primari- ly at the local unit level.	l	2	3	4	5	
14.	The plans-of-work prepared by planning units I serve on are not adequately coordinated with those of extension agents.	l	2	3	4	5	
15.	Almost all extension agents with whom I have worked are skilled in the effective presentation of programs.	l	2	3	4	5	
16.	The staff of the Continuing Educa- tion Center should provide advice to faculty on the teaching metho- dologies to use in developing continuing education programs.	l	2	3	4	5	
17.	Too many programs are delivered by extension agents without adequate inservice training, professional experience, or academic preparation.	1	2	3	4	5	
18.	Community resource development programs offered by extension need to be expanded in many localities.	I	2	3	4	5	
19.	Extension programs have expanded too far beyoud the traditional areas of agriculture, 4-H and home economics.	l	2	3	4	5	
20.	Program directors and their staffs on the VPI&SU campus should have an appointment to an academic college,	l	2	3	4	5	

3

		Agree Strongly				Disagree Strongly		
21.	All program leaders at the district level should have an appointment to an academic college.	ı	2	3	4	5		
22.	The administrative structure of the extension division has clearly defined supervisory relationships.	i I	2	3	4	5		
23.	The administrative structure of the extension division promotes effective planning and program development.	1	2	3	4	5		
24.	Extension activities carry less weight than research and instruction when promotium, tenure and salary decisions are made.	1	2	3	4	5		
25.	Extension program leaders in district offices with whom 1 am familiar serve as an effective bridge between exten- sion specialists and agents in the field.	l	2	3	4	5		
26.	Extension agents are effective at determining the program needs of the cummunity.	۱	2	3	4	5		
27.	The in-service training programs that I am familiar with are well designed and presented.	1	2	3	4	5		
28.	Conmunication between extension specialists, extension agents and extension division administrators is adequate to promote effective planning and program development.	1	2	3	4	5		
29.	Travel funds are adequate to meet my needs in performing my extension responsibilities.	l	2	3	4	5		
30.	My extension work is an important part of my professional life.	1	2	3	4	5		
31.	The technological changes which have occurred in my field in recent years are adequately reflected in extension programs and educational materials.	١	2	3	4	5		

4



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061

OFFICE OF THE DEAN

August 24, 1979

Mr. Ray D. Pethtel, Director Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission Suite 1100 910 Capitol Street Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Mr. Pethtel:

Our response to the July 20 JLARC Exposure Draft and the August 15 Preliminary Findings and Recommendations is enclosed.

There are three sections to the response:

- 1. Our general reaction to the review
- 2. Comments on specific issues
- 3. A detailed response to the Preliminary Findings and Recommendations

As was discussed in the August 15th meeting with the review team, we have included a detailed response to some points or recommendations that might possibly change in the JLARC final report. If this occurs, we agreed that you would delete from our response those areas that no longer apply. It was also agreed that you would inform us of the changes.

We have not included those minor changes we discussed in the August 15 meeting, such as title changes, etc. It was our understanding you would make these changes.

An area in which we have had second thoughts is the portion on mission definition. As you will note in our response, we believe there is an appropriate role for both branches of state government--the legislative branch giving broad direction and the executive branch dealing with the details. In our discussions with you we had not directly made this point. While it is not a major issue, I wanted you to know we recognized we had not discussed it before. Mr. Ray D. Pethtel

- 2 -

If we have not been explicit enough or if you have questions concerning our response, please call.

Again, its been a pleasure to work with the high-quality professional staff of the Commission.

Sincerely, A W. R. Van Dresser, Dean

ah

Enclosure

cc: Dr. W. E. Lavery

RESPONSE TO JULY 20, 1979, JLARC EXPOSURE DRAFT PROGRAM REVIEW VPI&SU EXTENSION DIVISION

INTRODUCTION

The working draft of the Commission program review of the Virginia Tech Extension Division taken as a whole is an excellent overview of Extension programs. While some statements, conclusions, and recommendations are included in the report with which the Division cannot concur, the report in its entirety is extremely valuable to the Extension Division as it seeks to strengthen its effectiveness and efficiency in serving the Commonwealth.

The program review by the Commission staff was exhaustive. Every Extension program area appears to have been examined thoroughly. The scope of the review, the commitment and highly professional approach of the review team, and the quality of the draft report are to be commended. With a few minor exceptions the report is factually accurate, and the statements and conclusions based on its contents appear to be objective.

The task assigned to the review team was formidable. As the report states, the Extension Division and the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service are complex organizations. They have a program history and tradition which span many years of economic and social development of the Commonwealth. The organization and its programs have evolved through generations of social and economic change in Virginia. They reflect many of the traditions and approaches of an earlier era, blended with those which have evolved since World War II. Such complexities make it difficult for those unfamiliar with Extension to easily understand what it involves. The review team, however, in a relatively short time became thoroughly familiar with the philosophy of the program and gained an accurate understanding of the structure and function of the system, as the draft report readily demonstrates.

AN ASSESSMENT OF THE REVIEW

General Evaluation

The program review was prompted by several concerns expressed publicly and privately by members of the state government's executive and legislative branches. Their concerns included a number of pertinent questions: Has the Extension Division gone beyond the intent of its legislative mandate? Is the organizational structure of the Division appropriate for effective delivery of programs? Is there duplication with other state agency programs? Does the professional staff engage in activities which may be so construed as a conflict of interest? Has the traditional service to rural Virginia and to agriculture been neglected to favor growth of programs in suburban and urban Virginia? Specific questions also were related to travel expenditures and the appropriateness of certain local programs or activities. Collectively they are summarized in one basic question: Does the Extension Division, which includes the Virginia Cooperative Extension Service, provide effective and needed educational and informational services to the people of Virginia?

The impressions and conclusions of the review team with respect to the concerns which prompted the program review were heartening. The evaluation provided by the report should alleviate such concerns. The suggestions and recommendations regarding other aspects of Extension's programs and organizational structure also are quite helpful. Each of the areas of concern was addressed by the report.

Legislative Intent. The review team's conclusion that "the present scope of (Extension) programs in terms of intensity and direction is within the broad legislative mandate" speaks for itself.

Organizational Structure. Questions regarding the appropriateness of the organizational structure appear to be placed in proper perspective by the report. "The overall organizational approach," the review team concluded, "appears reasonable given its broad mandate. The university-wide concept, in particular, has facilitated the implementation of the mandate."

<u>Program Duplication</u>. The report states that "there does not appear to be widespread dup!ication of effort at the present time between Cooperative Extension and the informational programs sponsored by most State agencies." It does warn of "potential" duplication with the programs of a number of other agencies and finds some existing duplication of effort with the community college system. Many of the suggestions and recommendations in the draft report are intended to resolve or prevent problems of program duplication and are quite helpful.

<u>Conflict of Interest</u>. The report found "no serious incidents of faculty engaging in improper relationships with (other) organizations" and "no suggestions of improprieties." It did recommend that more formal methods of review for faculty serving as advisors and officers of other organizations be instituted. The recommendation is appropriate.

<u>Rural Virginia and Agriculture</u>. Suggestions that rural Virginia and Extension's traditional programs have been neglected were not substantiated by the program review. "Extension has attempted to satisfy a wide range of new demands in recent years, without losing touch with agriculture and rural communities," the report noted. "To a great extent, the changes that have occurred have mirrored national trends, or are a reflection of changes in the demographic, economic and social characteristics of the Commonwealth." And at another point: "Although the 'urbanization' of Extension is an ongoing trend, rural areas continue to receive substantial allocations of field staff resources."

<u>Travel</u>. The appropriateness of specific examples of travel expenditures which were questioned in the press prior to the program review was not directly addressed by the report. A number of suggestions and recommendations for ensuring written justification for travel, postaudit of travel expenditures, and greater emphasis on rules and procedures governing travel expenditures are appropriate and helpful.

Local Program Activities. Questions about the appropriateness of specific local programs and activities cannot be considered in isolation. The report correctly observes that a clear system of priorities must be established. At the same time, the report noted that "Extension is seen by local officials and community leaders as more responsive to their concerns, and therefore, more effective." Efforts should be made to protect and preserve such programs that are found to be responsive and effective.

The Value of Extension. "There is little doubt that extension education is a valued resource for the Commonwealth," the draft report concluded. "Extension education is flexible and can be highly responsive to changing community priorities." The conclusion thus is responsive to larger questions of Extension Division contributions to the Commonwealth. The University's "large, highly-motivated staff of extension agents and faculty members" indeed is responsive to local community priorities.

Comments on Specific Issues

Generally the report details quite well problem areas that may be in need of correction, in need of procedural change, or in need of additional study. Many of the recommendations can and should be implemented, and corrective action already was in progress in many cases prior to the Commission program review. There are, however, several major issues which require further consideration.

Partnership. The program review was conducted under the 1. auspices of the state, and the report is oriented toward the state perspective. Extension programs, however, are a cooperative effort between federal, state, and local governments. Recommendations involving unilateral action by one partner without regard to its impact upon the others can be counterproductive. Basic to the success of the cooperative effort is trust among all members of the partnership. The review team, while gaining excellent understanding of the Extension structure and function, may not sufficiently appreciate the uniqueness of the partnership, and the need for all members to be involved in policy determination. These considerations apply especially to its recommendations concerning mission definition, funding, program duplication, and organizational structure. Each of these recommendations involves decisions that are perceived somewhat differently at national, state, and local levels. Thus it is important in Cooperative Extension programs that all three levels of government be involved in changes which may affect the basic relationship.

2. <u>Mission Review</u>. The basic purpose and mission of the Extension Division is broadly outlined in the 1966 statutes which created the Division. The General Assembly can and should revise its delineation of Extension Division responsibilities in broad outline in the light of changing needs. However, the review team recommendation
that a mission statement including "explicit objective for program growth, based on a rational planning process and a generally accepted system of priorities," might be a function of the executive branch rather than the legislative branch. Accordingly, a better approach may be to proceed with the definition of a broad mission statement by Virginia Tech, Virginia State University, the Secretary of Education, and the State Council of Higher Education, in conjunction with representatives of the local and federal governments and clientele groups. The mission statement would be transmitted to the General Assembly for its consideration. Legislation should articulate general public policy, rather than enunciating specific planning processes and priorities which are subject to change. The detailed or "explicit objective for program growth" should be defined with executive branch involvement.

3. <u>Duplication of Effort</u>. The draft report concluded that "duplication between extension and other Statewide programs is a potential problem rather than actual at the present time," and indicated that other state agencies "are satisfied with the cooperation which exists between extension and their agencies." There is no disagreement that duplication and competition should be avoided in developing local programs. It is important to note, however, that what appears to be duplication in one county may not be duplication in another. The cooperative partnership allows for program determination on a local basis, and the state should avoid unilateral actions that might jeopardize local program determination.

The recommendations for Extension membership on the 23 local coordinating committees for the community colleges, and Extension leadership in developing interagency coordinating committees, would strengthen the present relationships with other agencies and organizations. The General Assembly, of course, also should be sensitive to problems of duplication in educational and informational programs when proposed legislation involving various state agencies is considered. The proposed program and mission statement for Extension would be helpful in this context. The recommendation that memoranda of understandings be developed with other state agencies will be given serious consideration. In the few cases where serious duplication of programs may develop, such memoranda would be extremely useful. However, costly and time consuming analyses for the purpose of developing such memoranda involving agencies where the potential for duplicating programs is not great may not be a wise investment of resources.

4. <u>Funding Alternatives</u>. The report suggests that legislative review of the budget requests of Extension Division include review of funding alternatives. The report also suggests that the General Assembly consider alternative uses of funds made available by increased support from localities, private sources, and volunteers. The rationale for these suggestions is understood and it is recognized that the legislature has the responsibility to do this. However, unilateral action by the state to reduce funds for local Extension programs without recognition of the impact on the local appropriating bodies would be a break in the existing good faith partnership. Thus, it is strongly suggested that each of the governments having interest in the program should be aware of and involved in the review of future funding goals. An additional concern is the statement that Virginia has the highest per capita state support among the 10 largest cooperative extension programs in the nation. This ranking does not reflect the total situation. When Virginia's state funding is compared with thirteen southern states of comparable philosophy, resources, and population, Virginia ranks 7th in per capita amount. If a total of federal, state, local dollars per capita are compared within southern states, Virginia ranks 9th.

5. Organization and Staffing. Of the changes suggested in the chapter on organization and staffing, the most significant change involves the unit and district level. Extensive changes in the organizational structure of the Extension Division at the district and local level are recommended. These recommendations involve a major conceptual change, and would have a major impact on the Extension staff. Over 150 positions could be involved in a redefinition of responsibilities. The Extension Division believes that before any action is taken, additional study and analysis must be done. There is, however, agreement with the concept that program and administrative authority must be consolidated.

The suggested changes in the organizational structure must be viewed in the context of organizational theory. There is not necessarily one ideal organizational structure. Changes made to correct one structural weakness may, in fact, create another.

RESPONSE TO JLARC PROGRAM REVIEW OF THE VPI&SU EXTENSION DIVISION PRELIMINARY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS¹

In response to the first paragraph of the Preliminary Findings and Recommendations, the draft report's statements concerning the Extension Division's wide range of services, importance as a resource to the state, local acceptance, responsiveness, and highly-motivated staff already have been noted. These strengths all have contributed to what the report describes as "generous" state funding. Another important factor in past state funding is the philosophy of taxation and centralization of support generally followed in the South, where Cooperative Extension has been funded more heavily from state tax dollars than from local funds.

The report lists Virginia as having the highest state support per capita among the ten largest Cooperative Extension programs. A computation by the Extension Division reveals that Georgia has the highest state support per capita among these ten; the difference, however, is less than three pennies per person. The point needs to be

¹Submitted to Dr. W. R. Van Dresser, August 15, 1979.

SOUTHERN AND SELECTED STATE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAMS BY PER CAPITA STATE, STATE AND COUNTY, AND GRAND TOTAL FUNDS (Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1979)

		Estimated	Estimated	
Southern	1970	State	State/County	Grand Total
States	Population	Per Capita	Per Capita	Per Capita
Alabama	3,444,165	2,59	3.07	5,22
Arkansas	1,923,295	3,64	4,09	6,85
			2,11	
Florida	6,789,443	1.08		2.84
Georgia	4,589,575	2,59	3.28	5.14
Kentucky	3,219,311	1.95	2,85	5,08
Louisiana	3,643,180	2.71	2.85	4.36
Mississippi	2,216,912	3.83	4.46	7.59
No. Carolina	5,082,059	2.29	3.28	5,31
Oklahoma	2,559,253	2,00	2,89	4.91
So. Carolina	2,590,516	3.26	3.29	5.38
Tennessee	3,924,164	1,58	1,98	3.97
Texas	11,196,730	1.56	2,12	3.22
Virginia	4,648,494	2.56	3,35	4.69
Other States				
Californía	19,953,134	0.87	1.08	1,50
lowa	2,825,041	2,40	3.90	5.96
Kansas	2,249,071	2,20	4.96	7.38
Michlgan	8.875,083	1.04	1.54	2.26
Missouri	4,677,399	1.75	2.16	3.86
New York	18,246,266	0.27	0.89	1.40
Ohio	10,632,017	0,54	1.01	1.78
Wisconsin	4,417,933	1.67	3.00	4.31
1112001211	4,417,333	1.07	5.00	÷.31

Source: USDA and 1970 Census Figures.

made, however, that support from local and state tax dollars within the states should also be considered. Comparable states in the southern region, Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, Mississippi, Arkansas and Louisiana, exceed Virginia in total support per capita, as shown in the previous Table.

These comparisons suggest that while Extension in Virginia has been treated very well by the state legislature, county boards of supervisors and city councils, the level of support is consistent with states comparable in philosophy, resources, and population. Generally, this support reflects the success and popularity of Extension programs in these states. This is another reason for Virginia's 6th ranking and "generous" support.

In response to the second paragraph of the Preliminary Findings and Recommendations, the Extension Division acknowledges the magnitude of expansion of its urban and suburban programs. This is not at the neglect of traditional program areas. Activity in urban and suburban areas is not necessarily the result of establishing new programs, but reflects growth and change of the once rural area of the state. Two examples of this change are Fairfax County and the City of Virginia Beach, where Extension agents began work in 1911 and 1918 respectively. The programs have continued to be effective and well-received as they kept pace with changing needs. It also should be acknowledged that new programs in urban areas have been added, as in the Cities of Danville and Norfolk.

A variety of cultural, recreational and leisure time activities are offered, including such activities as home gardening or, to cite a seemingly unusual example, chairseat caning. While these may be leisure time activities to many people, they constitute a necessary activity for low-income groups, with whom Extension works, who must produce a portion of their food in gardens or earn additional income by handskills. Viewed in context, the cultural, recreational and leisure activities may well be vocational outlets essential to local citizens. The decision as to whether these programs should be offered should not be made unilaterally at the state level, but should be made in terms of state, local, and federal considerations.

In response to the third paragraph of the Preliminary Findings and Recommendations it is noted that Extension Division staff members who believe program expansion is "too far beyond the traditional areas" are concentrated most heavily in the University's College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, where 43% agreed with this point. Of those faculty not within that college, however, 80% disagreed. It is not surprising nor should it be construed as criticism that staff members with an agricultural background would feel this way. Their concern might be alleviated by the Exposure Draft sections on <u>National Comparison of Extension Programs</u> and <u>Description of Virginia's Program Activities</u> which reinforce the fact that Virginia Extension efforts in agriculture are equal to or greater than those of comparable states. Extension efforts in rural Virginia have not been neglected, but rather have been intensified during the past decade.

The statement that "continued expansion at past rates of growth will require substantial increases in state funding" does not accurately reflect the future development of the Extension Division. As noted in the six-year goals and twelve-year projections of the Division, state funds are not expected to increase as in the past, and "new growth" is to come from other sources of funding.

There is agreement that clear priorities for future development are necessary; however, it should be recognized that program strengths evolve from local priorities set in conjunction with guidelines and directives from the federal government, the state, and the localities.

I Mission Definition

Recommendation 1 - In concept and theory, a periodic review of the mission definition is important for any organization. While

such revisions have not been customary for most public agencies, it may be appropriate for the Extension Division, inasmuch as the legislature originally defined the mission in 1966 and has not reviewed it since then. If such a legislative mission review should take place, it is believed that the State Council of Higher Education could provide the leadership in structuring a committee for this purpose. Those to be involved in this effort should include representatives of Virginia Tech, Virginia State University, the office of the Secretary of Education, U. S. Department of Agriculture, local governments, and representatives of clientele groups served. Involvement of all groups which participate in this cooperative federal, state and local venture is essential. As noted earlier in this response, the legislative review should be limited to broad mission review.

II Reporting and Evaluation

Recommendations 2 and 3 - The recommendations for program reporting procedures and detailed program evaluations are sound and will be implemented as soon as possible. It should be recognized that many reporting requirements are imposed by the U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). However, improvement in the use of the USDA system can be made.

Evaluation will be given even more emphasis as a result of the JLARC review. Plans to improve evaluation will include development of outside funding and possible realignment of present resources.

III Duplication of Effort

Recommendation 4 - The Extension Division concurs with the recommendation for Extension staff to serve on local community college coordinating committees and agrees that discussions should be held with the Board of the Virginia Community College System. Membership on the twenty-three local coordinating committees will promote improved communication and help avoid non-essential duplication.

Recommendation 5 - The Division concurs in this recommendation to encourage development of interagency coordination committees and will begin its implementation immediately.

Recommendation 6 - There is general agreement with the intent of this recommendation to adopt a policy to avoid program competition. Certainly competition must and will be avoided. Careful study should be given to the Commission's statements regarding fees. A clarification of this recommendation of the Commission is needed, and a fuller response to it can be given when that clarification has been made.

Recommendation 7 - The implementation of this recommendation, to develop memoranda of agreement with other state agencies, would parallel similar agreements that already have been made at the federal level. The recommendation can be helpful, although implementation will require substantial time and effort, and it should be evaluated with respect to specific agencies. An initial effort will be undertaken in those areas judged to be most critical.

IV Organization and Staffing

Recent discussion with the Commission staff indicated the phrase "excessive administrative personnel," which appeared in the Preliminary Findings and Recommendations, is not appropriate and would be changed. If so, there is general concurrence with the introductory paragraph on this subject. The Division does not possess authority to correct some of the deficiencies and weaknesses cited, such as the changes recommended in the personnel classification system.

Recommendation 8 - The authority recommended in the report for unit chairman would be a major change in organizational concept, although the change may be appropriate. However, the responsibilities assigned unit chairmen were delineated when Extension staffs were racially integrated in 1965-66 to facilitate more effective utilization of majority and minority staff members than might have been the case.

Good progress has been made in Extension Division CR/EEO/AA programs with the present organizational arrangement. Presently, there are eleven black unit chairmen (8 female and 3 male), 32 female unit chairmen (of both races) and 80 white male chairmen. It is apparent that the extent of minority and female leadership at the local level could not have been achieved without the present organizational concept.

The implications of the recommendation to assign full program and administrative authority in the unit chairman positions must be carefully considered to determine if this is the appropriate time to make this change. The recommended change would require additional administrative positions rather than reduce levels of supervisory staff, as recommended in the report.

The four proposed functions for the unit chairman appear to be appropriate, although liaison with local officials in financial and salary matters must be maintained by district staff.

Recommendation 9 - The intent of this recommendation concerning program directors is appropriate, but the exact responsibilities assigned at this level of organization will depend upon action taken in response to other recommendations relating to unit chairmen and program leaders.

Recommendation 10 - The Division has made two recent studies on program leader positions in addition to the Commission review. It was announced in March 1979 that the responsibilities and authority of the program leader were under review. A doctoral thesis, "Role of the District Program Leader in the VCES as Perceived by Selected Extension Personnel," and an administrative study were completed. Discussion of the matter also has been held at various levels of the organization. These studies and comments along with the Commission study will be used to determine the most effective use of these faculty resources. Recommendation 11 - The merging of personnel classifications parallels the Extension Division's proposed change in the present classification system. The proposal will soon be submitted to the Division of Personnel and Training.

Recommendation 12 - The Division will reevaluate tenure of administrative faculty positions as recommended.

V General Administration

Recommendation 13 - Agent plans-of-work, as recommended, will be used for faculty planning.

Recommendation 14 – Planning for an improved orientation program already has begun. Orientation for new employees will be given increased emphasis with additional resources devoted to this area.

Recommendation 15 - The recommendation for standard inservice training evaluations will be implemented.

Recommendation 16 - The Extension Division has recognized inaccuracies in publication listings, and action has been taken to correct them, as recommended.

Recommendation 17 - The Division concurs in the recommendation to develop a better method of monitoring potential conflict of interest and to survey faculty affiliations with other organizations.

Present guidelines are clear, however, with respect to lobbying; it is not permissible as stated in the Administrative Handbook. The question of faculty holding policy positions in outside organizations and faculty acceptance of travel funds from outside sources will be given further consideration and more explicit guidelines developed.

Recommendation 18 - Travel vouchers will continue to receive stringent review as recommended. Suggestions on more explicit justification for travel will be followed.

Recommendation 19 - A post audit and if possible, a limited pre-audit of travel vouchers will be instituted.

Recommendation 20 - The recommendation for informing deans of grant proposals affecting their faculty or staff has merit and will be explored. The Division supports the recommendation.

Recommendation 21 - The Division concurs that individuals employed with grant funds should be informed in writing of the conditions of their employment.

Recommendation 22 - The Division agrees with and will implement the recommendation for establishing suspense dates to improve the billing process of the Continuing Education Center (CEC).

Recommendation 23 - As discussed on August 15, the term CEC needs to be clarified in terms of budget program area, and a clear definition of conference participants is needed.

Recommendation 24 - The Division will observe recently revised state policy in handling reimbursements of personnel service costs.

Recommendation 25 - Division concurs with this recommendation to improve CEC evaluation procedures, and implementation will begin as soon as possible.

Recommendation 26 - The University and Division agree that a state-wide review of off-campus instruction by State Council of Higher Education could be helpful.

Recommendation 27 - A review of agency goals to alter present percentages of support is acceptable to the Division provided consideration is given to the reservations and concerns expressed about the importance of the partnership relation between federal, state and local governments.

As indicated earlier, the statement regarding financial support for Virginia Extension programs is misleading; when Virginia's state funding is compared to that of other southern states, Virginia ranks seventh on a per capita basis, and when total federal, state and local funds are considered, Virginia ranks ninth among the thirteen southern states.

Present goals of the Division include a significant increase in volunteers, who can aid in the expanded workload anticipated in the years ahead. Volunteer workers also will help in some under-served areas. However, volunteers will not reduce the need for professional staff.

New program areas necessarily must be determined by emerging needs of the Commonwealth and nation to which University resources and expertise can be applied.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY AND VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE COOPERATING

August 21, 1979

Petersburg, Virginia 23803

Mr. Ray D. Pethtel Director Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission Suite 1100, 910 Capitol St. Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Mr. Pethtel:

I have reviewed the July 20, 1979 draft copy of the VPI&SU Extension Division Program Review. Today I telephoned certain suggestions for editorial changes to clarify some points of reference as they pertain to Virginia State Universities' relationship.

Based on information available to me, I believe the draft represents a fairly objective appraisal of the status and addresses issues of major concern. I am especially sensitive to the need to define our mission and refine our program development, implementation and evaluation process so that we can adequately document our effectiveness and accountability. We have, in fact, initiated efforts to accomplish this.

There are administrative items addressed in the recommendations which are peculiar to VPI&SU and would involve us at VSU indirectly until and unless changes were made that altered our joint program operational model. I have every reason to believe that we will be provided opportunity for input where the ultimate decision would impact our cooperative efforts.

Sincerely,

M. C. Harding, Sr. () Administrator 1890 Extension Program

ΡP



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Department of Planning and Budget

Stuart W. Connock Director

August 29, 1979

Post Office Box 1422 Richmond 23211 (804) 786-3154

Mr. Ray D. Pethtel, Director Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission General Assembly Building, Eleventh Floor Richmond, Virginia

Dear Ray:

Thank you for your letter of August 13, 1979, transmitting a copy of the exposure draft of the Commission's program review of the VPI&SU Extension Division, a copy of the preliminary list of staff findings and recommendations and inviting the comments of this Department.

The report is obviously the product of a well-planned and comprehensive effort and addresses matters which, as you know, have been of major interest to this office for several years. Among them are the need for program priorities, better reporting and impact statements and elimination, to the extent possible, of duplication between the work of the Extension Division and that of other agencies.

I have noted your comment with regard to budget guidelines. This has also been a principal concern to us for some time. Development of such guidelines must, however, be preceded by a system of defining and measuring the agency's workload and output. In turn, this cannot be done unless a statement of the agency's mission and purpose and of its program priorities is developed. To do this would require a substantial expenditure of time and effort by a group which could focus on the problem. For this reason, we recommended the task force approach in 1977. We are therefore pleased to note that Recommendations (1), (2) and (3) address this matter. The Secretary of Education established the task force in August 1978, and he has advised us that he is writing you concerning the work of that group.

Your Recommendations (4), (5), (6) and (7) deal with duplication of effort between the Extension Division and other State and local agencies. One of the functions of the Governor's Secretaries is to resolve jurisdictional questions of this kind; see § 2.1-51.20, Mr. Ray D. Pethtel Page 2 August 29, 1979

<u>Code of Virginia</u>, concerning the duties of the Secretary of Education. You may want to consider a reference to the role of the Secretaries in the preparation of the final report.

Recommendation (26), regarding a study of the off-campus offerings, and Recommendation (27), concerning alternate sources of funding, are likewise of major interest to us. We trust that active consideration will be given to both of these proposals.

Sincerely,

Sugar

Stuart W. Connock



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Gordon K. Davies

COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION 700 Fidelity Bldg., 9th & Main Streets, Richmond, Va. 23219

August 23, 1979

(804) 786-2143

Mr. Ray D. Pethtel, Director Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission Suite 1100 910 Capitol Street Richmond, Virginia 23219

Dear Ray:

Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on your program review of the VPI&SU Extension Division. I think the report contains much useful information and appropriate recommendations. I have only a few comments which may be helpful.

Page 14. The figure 4 appears to me to confuse the sources and the uses of funds. I have in mind particularly the funds from "grants and contracts." As I understand it, this is a source of funds, while the remainder of the pie shows uses of funds.

Page 42. I assume that the "instruction in arts and crafts" is non-credit. While I agree with the report's concern for unnecessary duplication, I wonder if instruction of this sort is not appropriate (if not duplicative) provided fees collected for it cover its full cost.

Page 49. I agree that the "Extension Division needs to . . . find better ways to describe program impact." However, this seems to me to be a pervasive problem. Actually, the Extension Division probably describes program impact better than most other parts of higher education. This is a concern of the Council of Higher Education and, indeed, of the higher education community in general. I offer this comment simply to point out that the Extension Division is not by any means alone here.

Pages <u>51-52</u>. I agree that the mission of cooperative extension should be clarified. I think that Virginia State University should be included in the discussion, since it has indicated on several occasions during the past few years its intention to reemphasize its land grant mission. In view of the Council of Higher Education's statutory responsibility to approve changes in institutional mission (§23-9.6:1(b)), the Council might also play a role in developing the statement of mission for cooperative extension in Virginia. Mr. Ray D. Pethtel August 23, 1979 Page two

Page 55. With reference particularly to the third paragraph, two issues need to be considered. If the instruction offered by the Extension Division is non-credit, the Division should recover full cost for it from fees. Second, some activity which is offered as non-credit by the Extension Division is offered for credit within the Virginia Community College System. We are currently beginning work on the question of defining which courses should be offered for credit and which should not. Generally speaking, I believe that those which are non-credit should be offered at no cost to the state; at present, I do not think this is done.

Page 57. You should be aware that the Secretary of Education appointed a task force to study the problem of duplication between community colleges and vocational education schools. The report of that task force, in draft form at present, recommends abolishing the 23 local coordinating committees to which you refer. The task force apparently found these committees ineffective.

Page 58. As program priorities are established, I think it is also important that the VCCS mission be carefully reevaluated, along with that of the Extension Division. The mission of the secondary schools in adult and vocational education should also be reevaluated.

Page 104. As I understand the middle paragraph on this page, there needs to be a procedure through which recoveries can be broken down into personal and non-personal objects of expenditure. I may be mistaken about this, but I am not sure there is any such procedure available in CARS.

Page 106. VPI&SU has recently changed its forecast for offcampus enrollment, to reflect recent enrollment trends. A copy of Dr. Lavery's letter to me is attached.

Page 107. I am not sure what time period is covered by Table 25. The degrees awarded look much too high to be for one academic year; you may wish to clarify the text or the table.

Page 109. Off-campus instruction is a sub-program under the program Instruction. At two institutions (VPI&SU and the University of Virginia) this sub-program is not included within the main agency of the university. The Council of Higher Education has suggested before, and continues to suggest, that it would be sensible to move this sub-program into the agency in which the major activities in the program Instruction are housed; for VPI&SU, this would be the Instructional Division.

Page 111. I think this a good recommendation (there is a typographical error on line 6), and the Council of Higher Education will be pleased to cooperate if it is JLARC's pleasure to request that the study be done. Mr. Ray D. Pethtel August 23, 1979 Page three

I notice now, in looking at the document entitled "Preliminary Findings and Recommendations," that the recommendation on "Mission Definition" includes the Council of Higher Education. I think this is appropriate; you might wish to modify the main text of the report (page 52).

With regard to Recommendation 26 in the same document, the study referred to is somewhat more narrow than that referred to on page 111 of the full review. Recommendation 26 refers to credit courses offered off campus; page 111 does not refer to credit courses only. The Council's main concern is with credit courses, especially if we are able to come up with a workable definition of what should and should not be offered for credit. Again, you might with to modify page 111 to conform with Recommendation 26.

I do appreciate the opportunity to comment on the document, and hope that this letter will be useful to you and members of your staff. I am, of course, available to discuss my comments with you at your convenience.

hcerely, Gordon K. Davies

GKD:mh Attachment



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

Gordon K. Davies Director COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION 700 Fidelity Bldg., 9th & Main Streets, Richmond, Va. 23219

(804) 786-2143

August 30, 1979

Mr. Ray D. Pethtel, Director Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission Suite 1100 910 Capitol Street Richmond, Virginia 23219

Dear Ray:

My letter of August 23 is not clear or accurate in its comment on page 42 of the program review of the VPI&SU Extension Division. I do not think fees must cover the full costs of noncredit "instruction in arts and crafts," but I do think that such instruction should be paid for with other than General Funds. Perhaps federal and local funds make fees unnecessary; I do not think fees have to be charged.

Acerea Gordon K.Davies

GKD:mh



VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Blacksburg, Virginia 24061 July 17, 1979

Dr. Gordon K. Davies Director State Council of Higher Education 700 Fidelity Building Ninth & Main Streets Richmond, VA 23219

Dear Gordon:

We have found it necessary to revise downward our projected student FTE targets in the Off-Campus Credit Program at Virginia Tech for the 1980-82 biennium. Instead of 805 and 830 FTE's for 80-81 and 81-82, respectively, we are expecting to produce 650 student FTE's each year. This does not include contract courses which should produce another 30-35 FTE's per year.

For your reference, I have attached a brief summary and comparison by student level of our current FTE targets and the proposed revisions. Complete data as presented in DPB Forms 2-B and 2-Bs are being submitted to your office under separate cover.

We feel this revision is necessary because:

- 1. The current year's FTE enrollment was slightly under 600 FTE's. We suspect this to have been an aberration in our normal pattern and not indicative of a future trend. Nevertheless, enrollments have been gradually declining for several years and we felt an adjustment in projections was necessary.
- 2. As a state-wide, comprehensive university, the magnitude of our off-campus program is controlled, to some extent, by the increased development of masters level work and some doctoral programs at the regional institutions. Expanded programming on the part of the regional institutions has necessitated our phasing down some degree efforts.
- 3. The issue papers currently being developed by State Council staff for the revised Virginia Plan indicate clearly (particularly those dealing with off-campus credit work and the urban institutions) that Virginia Tech will be expected to concentrate upon doctoral level work and those unique masters programs which it is capable of delivering off campus. This type of specialization prohibits rapid growth and expansion, but should be expected to generate a reasonably stable number of enrollments which we feel will be at least 650 FTE's per year for the 1980-82 biennium.

Dr. Gordon K. Davies July 17, 1979 Page 2

Even with this reduction in FTE targets, I feel it absolutely necessary that Virginia Tech be continued at its present level of general fund support and faculty positions. At the reduced student FTE rate, these faculty positions more nearly parallel the number which would be generated by the funding formula for on-campus instruction. A reduction in positions and general fund support would severely hamper post masters and doctoral level work in the off-campus program. To help insure quality in off-campus instruction at the graduate level, parity in funding between on and off campus must be realized.

I will be happy to discuss this action in more detail at your convenience.

Sincerely,

W. E. Lavery President

bmc

cc: Dr. John D. Wilson, Provost

Dr. W. R. Van Dresser, Dean, Extension Division

Mr. Minnis E. Ridenour, Vice President for Finance

Dr. James Montgomery, Director, Institutional Research

ALTERNATIVE ENROLLMENT ESTIMATES FOR VIRGINIA TECH'S OFF-CAMPUS CREDIT PROGRAM

1. Based on enrollment reports and the current DPB Form 2-B, the following information has been provided to SCHEV for off-campus FTE students:

Student Level	1976-77	<u>1977-78</u> *	<u>1978-79</u> *	<u> 1979-80</u>	<u>1980-81</u>	<u> 1981-82</u>
Lower UG	.14	.23	.07			
Upper UG	1.75	1.61	6.19			
First G	518.43	511.74	450.95	594.00	620.00	640.00
Adv. G	105.57	132.79	98.29	150.00	155.00	160.00
Uncl. UG	23.65	28.33	21.36	29.60	29.60	29.60
Uncl. G	-	.42	14.24	.40	.40	.40
Total	649.54	675.12	591.10	774.00	805.00	830.00

*Actual

2. The following revision for 1979-82 is proposed:

Student Level	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
Lower UG Upper UG First G Adv. G Uncl. UG Uncl. G Total	5 415 150 21 <u>19</u> 610	5 380 220 21 24 650	5 355 240 21 <u>29</u> 650

JOINT LEGISLATIVE AUDIT AND REVIEW COMMISSION

Professional Staff

F. Daniel Ahern John M. Bennett L. Douglas Bush, Jr. Lucretia S. Farago Mark S. Fleming Carol M. Hayes Kent S. Jamison Kirk Jonas William E. Landsidle Philip A. Leone Joseph H. Maroon Ray D. Pethtel Walter L. Smiley Patricia G. Smyth Ronald L. Tillett Glen S. Tittermary Susan L. Urofsky Karen F. Washabau Mark D. Willis William E. Wilson Michael J. Wriston

Administrative Staff

Phyllis M. Dyer Brenda L. Hubbard Betsy M. Jackson Pamela R. Prentice Sandra C. Saunders Brenda B. Stockdale 910 CAPITOL STREET - SUITE 1100 - RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23219 - (804) 786-1258

