DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 549 RC 004 609

AUTHOR	Ratchford, C. Brice
TITLE	Role of State and Land-Grant University Extension Services in Eliminating Rural Poverty.
INSTITUTION	Missouri Univ., Columbia. Extension Div.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. Federal Extension Service.; National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	MP-73
PUB DATE	Nov 67
NOTE	20p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.10
DESCRIPTORS	*Disadvantaged Groups, *Institutional Role, Land Grant Universities, *Poverty Programs, Program Development, *Rural Extension, State Universities, *University Extension

ABSTRACT

The land-grant universities, through Cooperative Extension Services, have performed the most important university outreach function in America. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 stated that the function of Cooperative Extension was to provide practical instruction in subjects related to agriculture and home economics. Subsequent amendments to the Act and earmarked congressional appropriations have made it clear that the service is to deal with all matters of vital concern to rural Americans. Although the university never serves as an instrument of direct social action, it can be a vital force in bringing about action on the part of individuals, organizations, and institutions through its educational activities. Since the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, General Extension Services have moved more aggressively in developing programs to help fight poverty. With funding under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Title I of the Higher Education Act, University Extension Divisions have assisted public schools and communities to become more effective in dealing with disadvantaged people. Through their Extension Divisions, universities can work in 4 major areas: (1) public affairs education, (2) training leaders to work with the poor, (3) direct work with the poor, and (4) modifying community organizations. (EJ)

by C. BRICE RATCHFORD

VICE-PRESIDENT

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

ROLE OF STATE AND LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICES IN ELIMINATING RURAL POVERTY

MP 73

11/67/1M

University of Missouri

Extension Division

This paper was prepared initially for the National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty.

Issued in furtherance of cooperative extension work, acts of May 8 and June 30, 1914, in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture. C. B. Ratchford, Vice-President for Extension, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo. 65201.

ROLE OF STATE AND LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICES IN ELIMINATING RURAL POVERTY

by C. Brice Ratchford

Vice-President, University of Missouri

I. INTRODUCTION

The land-grant universities, through their Cooperative Extension Services, have been, by all odds, the most important university outreach function in rural America. There is a university extension office in almost every county of the country, usually located in the county seat, and staffed with from one to more than a score of professional workers. The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 stated the function of Cooperative Extension as providing practical instruction in subjects relating to agriculture and home economics. Subsequent amendments to the act and earmarked congressional appropriations have made it clear that the service is to deal with all matters of vital concern to rural Americans. The Cooperative Extension Services of the land-grant universities have not been the only university forces at work in rural America. Most land-grant universities and state universities have General Extension or Continuing Education Services, which often pre-date Cooperative Extension. These enterprises have also had a direct effect in rural America in several ways. Many people have been brought from rural areas to campus to participate in conferences and short courses on a wide range of subjects. The universities have offered both credit and non-credit courses in rural areas designed to help professional and non-professional people keep up-to-date with the changing world. Some have extensive programs in the many facets of community, economic, social and cultural development, with many of the services beamed to non-metropolitan areas.

University extension is by no means the exclusive domain of state and land-grant universities. Indeed much of the pioneering work in extension education has been done by private universities. With, however, the exception that proves the rule, the private universities which have been most active in extension have been in metropolitan areas, while the impact they have had on rural areas has been of a secondary nature. It is for this reason that the paper directs itself to the role of state universities and land-grant colleges in rural America.

II. ORGANIZATION OF UNIVERSITY EXTENSION

There is a Cooperative Extension Service in every state. It has traditionally been administered through the College of Agriculture at one of the land-grant institutions. (Several states have more

than one land-grant institution.) The staff consists of university trained personnel located in the counties who have been known traditionally as county agents, home economics agents, home demonstration agents, agricultural extension agents or 4-H agents. In addition, there are a few administrative and supervisory personnel, and a group of highly trained people called specialists, who are located at the university and are usually part of the regular academic departments of the university. Their function is to provide continuous training for the field staff, prepare educational material, and give leadership to the state-wide educational programs. The program is financed with federal, state, and county funds.[1] The university works with some body at the county level in determining the financing, organization, and administration of the program at the local level. This may be the county governing body, a special legal body created only for this function, or it may be an informally organized group of people. The amount of authority in the hands of the local group varies, but it is fair to say that the university is the dominant force in the administration of service.

Each of the land-grant institutions has a memorandum of understanding with the Federal Extension Service, an agency of the U. S. Department of Agriculture, which sets forth the responsibilities of the university and the U.S. Department of Agriculture and how the program will be administered. The Federal Extension Service is responsible for getting the federal funds to the states, seeing that they are spent legally, and for providing liaison between the Department of Agriculture and the state Cooperative Extension Services. Its greatest service comes from a small staff who provide a great deal of assistance to the states in the several program areas, including the preparation of educational materials.

While each Cooperative Extension Service is independent and has wide leeway in carrying out its federal commitments, considerable national cohesiveness is secured not only through the leadership efforts of the Federal Extension Service, but through the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, which consists of an elected group of extension directors and the administrator of the Federal Extension Service.[2] This committee represents Cooperative Extension at the national level, and while it has no directive powers over the individual institutions, it does exercise tremendous influence with the states.

The General Extension, or Continuing Education Service, is entirely a creature of the university. The head of the service, usually with the title of director, dean or vice-president, is directly responsible to the president of the university or to a vice-president. Most of the staff of the General Extension Services is housed on the campus or in a few centers operated by the university around the

[1] In fiscal year 1966 the proportions were: federal - 38 percent, state or university - 40 percent, local - 22 percent.

[2] This is officially a committee of the National Association of state Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

state. The staff consists of people who are experts in organizing and operating conferences, correspondence work, and teachers in academic disciplines. The latter may or may not be a member of a regular academic department. The General Extension Services achieve a national focus in two places. The General Extension Services of the state universities and land-grant colleges are members of the Extension Council of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. The council has officers and committees and has demonstrated the ability to mount national efforts. The General Extension Services are also members of the National University Extension Association which includes the General Extension Services of private universities and land-grant colleges. This organization has an executive secretary and also has demonstrated its ability to mount a national effort.

Historically, there has been a great deal of difference between the Cooperative and General Extension Services. This was described quite well by Dr. Paul Miller in an article published in 1958.[3] He summarized the major differences in the following manner:

The primary clientele of Cooperative Extension has been farmers and rural people. It was supported by public funds and rendered service to its clients at no charge. While it had a tie to the campus, its main orientation was off-campus. It made extensive use of informal education within the framework of problem-solving. To explain further, its focus was to solve problems and its methods were demonstrations, meetings, individual consultations, the mass media, and maximum involvement of people with the problem in planning educational approaches.

General Extension, on the other hand, has been largely campus-based. Courses were taken off campus, but these were usually the same as taught on campus. Much of the support for General Extension Service came from fees paid by students. The clientele was primarily non-farm people. Instruction was quite formalized and the major goal was to advance the higher education of adults.

Over the years the two services have become more and more similar. Cooperative Extension has broadened its concerns beyond the farmer and the rural homemaker. General Extension's scope, particularly with the passage of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, has been expanded into problem solving. The reasons for these changes are numerous and the result is a logical evolution. The increasing similarity of the two organizations is causing many land-grant universities to reorganize their extension enterprises. This is taking the form of merger or coordination under a single head, responsible to the president of the university. This move is being made, not only to eliminate overlapping and duplication and to increase internal efficiency, but also to more effectively fulfill the

---

[3] Miller, Paul A., "Extension Education in the Land-Grant Universities," Farm Policy Forum, Vol. II, No. 4, 1958-59.

outreach function of the university.[4]

There is one major philosophical difference which continues to exist and will be mentioned here because it applies to the sections that discuss what the universities can do. It is a basic philosophy of most General Extension Services that they are concerned only with "college level" work. This is true even in informal educational efforts of the General Extension Services. Cooperative Extension Service, with the mandate of offering practical instruction in subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, has not been concerned with the academic level. In fact, it has prided itself in offering simultaneously (not by the same staff nor to the same clientele) subject matter from the elementary to the post doctoral levels.

This difference has some effect on what universities feel they can do with rural poor.

III. THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY

The role of the university is usually stated as developing future leaders through its undergraduate, professional and graduate programs, preserving existing knowledge in an orderly and systematic manner, increasing the body of knowledge through research, and enhancing the economic, social and cultural development of the community through its public service or extension program. In this paper we are concerned primarily with the public service or extension function. A university never serves as the instrument of direct social action.[5] It can be a vital force, however, in bringing about action on the part of the individual, organizations, and institutions through its educational activities. New knowledge, either to mankind or to a particular individual, is the greatest single motivation of change in capability, attitudes, and values.

The regular degree programs of the university are designed to turn out an educated person with an inquiring mind, capable of relating to the real world, and generally competent in some profession or occupation.

---

[4]McNeil, Donald R., "The Year of the Merger," The N.U.E.A. Spectator, December, 1966-January, 1967, pp. 4-6.

Ratchford, C. B., "Cooperative and General Extension - Their Integration at Missouri," The N.U.E.A. Spectator, October-November, 1966, pp. 5-10.

Some comments are also made by Prof. James T. Bonnen of Michigan State University in a talk given at the 1966 annual meeting of the Great Plains Agricultural Council, titled "Evaluation of Traditional Roles of Agricultural Institutions," pp. 12-16.

[5]This point is discussed by Chancellor Roger Heyns of the University of California at Berkeley in College and University Business, a McGraw Hill Publication, Jan. 1967, p. 47.

The public service or extension function of the university can take on three dimensions:

1. Accept the objective of the regular degree programs, as stated above, for adults not enrolled in regular degree programs.
2. Help keep individuals and institutions up-to-date with the current knowledge explosion.
3. Help institutions, organizations, and individuals solve some of the tough problems they face. This latter objective is accomplished by determining possible alternatives, evaluating the alternatives and making this information available to citizens, particularly those responsible for formulation of policy and action programs.

While all three objectives are legitimate, the public service commitment can be fully met only by devoting at least part of the resources available for extension to the third, or problem solving area, particularly at the community level.

As stated above, now restated for emphasis, the university should not become a direct social action agency. At the same time, it should not use the "ivory towers" to avoid attention to some of the pressing problems of the community. As an example, consider its proper role in two current major local, state, and national problems. The first is racial integration. It is not the job of the university to promote integration, except possibly within the institution, but it does have the right and indeed the responsibility to enter into scholarly studies of the effects of segregation, to explore possible solutions, and to make this information generally available. Another example lies in the action slum dwellers may take to get corrective action in housing. It is not the responsibility of the university to organize marches or strikes to correct the problem. It is proper for the university, however, to determine alternative actions the citizens can take to get the situation corrected. It is granted that the university will be criticized by some people for even mentioning such problems. As long as the university operates within the bounds of research and education, it cannot duck the hot issues if it expects to make a maximum impact on society.

There are examples of universities which have participated in the proper manner in important, current, and pressing public issues. The University of California Extension Division conducted a number of seminars or discussions throughout the state on matters that were very much in public controversy. The Cooperative Extension Services have recently participated in nationwide discussions relating to a referendum on control of wheat acreage. Dozens of additional examples could be cited. It is the general consensus that where such efforts are conducted within the bounds of the proper educational role, it has reflected credit to the university, and more light on the problem which has resulted in sounder solutions with a minimum of conflict.

IV. EXTENT TO WHICH UNIVERSITIES HAVE BEEN EFFECTIVE IN ALLEVIATING RURAL POVERTY[6]

This analysis is divided into four sections. The first deals with Cooperative Extension prior to the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, the second with Cooperative Extension subsequent to the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, the third section relates to the contribution of General Extension prior to the Economic Opportunity Act, and the fourth with General Extension subsequent to the Economic Opportunity Act.

In the following paragraphs a brief summary is given of the national picture of Cooperative Extension prior to the Economic Opportunity Act. This is an average situation and, hence, hides very significant deviations. Hathaway indicates that there are important regional differences in the Cooperative Extension Service's commitment to work with poor people.[7] This is verified by Cram. Cram also indicates that there are significant differences within regions, due not only to the commitment of Extension Services but also to services that might be available through other agencies in particular states.

Cooperative Extension has long had a concern for the poor. A sampling of Cooperative Extension annual reports covering 50 years discloses numerous examples of programs that were successful in helping low-income persons improve their lot.[8] There are many examples of farmers who, because of the assistance received from extension, are making substantial incomes and are contributing to the community. Market development, according to case histories, has not only provided employment but given increased income to low-income farmers. There are examples of assistance to families which has resulted in better living and helped families to acquire greater ambition and middle-class values. The youth sections tell of many young people of low-income families who, by virtue of work in the 4-H clubs and contact with extension agents, furthered their education and became extremely successful men. In the field of community and resource development, case studies show how extension has worked with low-income people to help them develop organizations and the means of obtaining better community services. Cram cites examples

[6]One of the best descriptions of the work Cooperative Extension has done with low-income people prior to the Economic Opportunity Act is an unpublished doctoral dissertation by Leo A. Cram, titled, The Cooperative Extension Service and the Lower Socio-Economic Citizenry, University of Wisconsin, 1965. This work is cited often in this section.

[7]Hathaway, Dale E., professor of agricultural economics, Michigan State University, Shifting Political Power in the U.S., a talk made at the 1967 Federal Extension SErvice Annual Staff Conference.

[8]The author is indebted to the program leaders in the Federal Extension Service for pulling together many examples from the reports.

of successful work not only with the low-income rural and farm people, but also with migrants, Indians, and the urban poor.

While many low-income people were benefited by Cooperative Extension, prior to the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, assistance to low-income people was not a primary goal of Cooperative Extension. Cram's survey showed that every Extension Service in the country was interested in poor people, but no service gave this work top priority. One of the ways in which this interest was expressed was by small-scale pilot or experimental projects conducted to directly attack the problem in question. Cram states that such projects were extremely useful, not only for those assisted, but because a store of knowledge was built on Cooperative Extension's effectiveness with poor people.

It was understandable why Cooperative Extension did not make work with low-income people a primary objective. Extension, like the public schools, has a mandate to serve the entire community. Further, through several periods in the life of Cooperative Extension, the country was threatened with a shortage of food and fiber and during these periods the situation dictated that attention be given primarily to the commercial farmers with the potential of increasing food and fiber production.

The situation prior to the Economic Opportunity Act can be summarized in the following manner:

The Cooperative Extension Services have worked with a very large number of disadvantaged people, but have served a much higher percent of middle and upper income and social classes. The approach followed by Cooperative Extension was not as productive as it might have been if specific programs and material had been developed for low-income people. Further, the generalized approach of Cooperative Extension did not usually reach the truly hard-core poor. The most significant weakness of extension in the poverty area was in the field of public policy. The showcase of extension's public work is the National Policy Conference held annually under the sponsorship of the Extension Services and Farm Foundation. A publication results from each conference.[9] Reviews of the publications show that poverty was discussed at only one of the sessions, and then only briefly.

Cooperative Extension was beginning to give increased attention to problems of rural proverty prior to the announcement of a national goal of eliminating poverty. The stimulus came from several sources. There were a few leaders, such as Dr. Theodore W. Schultz of the University of Chicago and Dr. Paul Miller, currently assisting secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, who were pleading for extension to be increasingly concerned about the human resources in rural areas. The Federal Extension Service initiated pilot projects in Alabama, Arkansas, and Oregon to explore how Cooperative Extension could be more effective in working with low-income citizens.

[9]The publications are called Increasing Understanding of Public Problems and Policies 1951, et al to 1966, and is published by the Farm Foundation of Chicago, Illinois. Poverty is discussed briefly in the 1966 edition.

Welfare and housing agency workers in many places asked for extension-type education from home economists to supplement their services to the poor. Schultz has stated, and Cram documents, that extension home economists have been in the forefront in expanding work with poor people.

Another force that helped propel states into the field in a rather extensive manner was a policy established 10 years ago when the Bureau of Indian Affairs contracted with Cooperative Extension to do adult education work with Indians.[10]

One objective of the war on poverty was to have existing agencies focus increased attention on the problem. Statistics compiled by the Federal Extension Service indicate that Cooperative Extension Services are devoting more of their existing resources to working with poor people and are consciously developing programs and material directed to poor people.[11] Cooperative Extension is assisting in many other ways including assistance in organization and program development of many of the community action agencies handling the Office of Economic Opportunity programs.[12] Some Cooperative Extension Services also serve as delegate agencies for local community action organizations. As such, they conduct programs in consumer education, youth development, agricultural development, and community organization and development. There are a number of cases where extension workers provide training for professionals and sub-professionals involved directly in the war on poverty, either as agency or community action organization employees.

Historically, the General Extension Services have done very little with the poor. This relates directly to the fact that most services depend very heavily on fee income. When an activity must pay its

[10]Some clear evidence of change in emphasis is contained in policy statements of 1958-59 and those of the last year. A publication of 1958, titled The Future Scope of Cooperative Extension Work, was a broad policy statement prepared by and accepted by all the Cooperative Extension Services. An elaboration of the policy statement, called A Guide to Future Extension Work, appeared in 1959. Three new policy statements on phases of Cooperative Extension work were approved in 1966. These are: Focus - Extension Home Economics by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy Home Economics Subcommittee, New Dimensions for Youth by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy 4-H Youth Development Subcommittee, and Extension's Responsibility to Farmers and Ranchers with Farm Incomes Less than $10,000 by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy Agricultural Production Subcommittee. The shift in emphasis to more attention to low-income people is unmistakable.

[11]Nationally about 40 percent of Cooperative Extension's resources are now devoted to working with poor people and the ratio is going up 2 to 3 percent annually.

[12]According to statistics compiled by the Federal Extension Service, the Cooperative Extension Services assisted in organizing more than 700 rural community action agencies.

way, it is necessarily directed to those with the ability and willingness to pay. The major exceptions are those universities which have the public funds to mount significant community development programs. In such cases, much as been done to modify community institutions and organizations to give more assistance to poor people. A few General Extension Services have been able to secure grants to perform pilot projects to work directly with the poor. One way in which the General Extension Services have had an indirect impact upon poor people is through their continuing education programs for social workers, school teachers, health workers, and local government officials.

Increased attention to poverty was evident prior to establishment of the national goal of eradication of poverty. A small number of universities received grants from the Ford Foundation to pioneer urban extension work. These funds were usually administered within the university by the General Extension Service. Some of the projects mounted with these funds were aimed either directly to poor people or to the environment which fostered them.

Since the passage of the Economic Opportunity Act, General Extension Services have moved aggressively in developing programs to help fight the war on poverty. Such activities vary from training many types of poverty workers to demonstration projects involving direct work with the poor, to operating Job Corps Centers. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has enabled a number of University Extension Divisions to give increased attention to assisting the public schools in becoming more effective with the disadvantaged. Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 gave the General Extension Services public funds to help solve community problems and a number of the projects thus funded related either directly to poverty programs or to modifying the community environment to benefit poor people.

The redirection that has taken place, particularly by Cooperative Extension to give increased attention to rural poverty, has been done in spite of several internal and external forces attempting to block the trend.[13] Cram indicates that one likely external barrier may be groups or agencies, whose primary mission is working with the poor, not welcoming what may appear to be competition. This has in fact happened. Extension workers were seldom invited in and were frequently ignored or by-passed. In some cases, they were rebuffed and fought by local, state, and regional Office of Economic Opportunity agencies and organizations.

The reasons stated for such behavior included Cooperative Extension's history of working on a racially segregated basis and its incompetence to work effectively with the poor. The logic was used, "If you were capable of being effective we would not be needed." The fallacy of the latter argument is obvious for there is a matter of resources as well as mission. An unstated but evident reason for such action was a desire by community action agencies not to use delegate agencies and to perform all programs with their own staffs. University Extension Services were also concerned with the constant

[13]Cram identifies many of these barriers and discusses them in a very enlightened manner.

turnover in the Office of Economic Opportunity staff, whose members considered their proposals and made efforts to try and dictate specific program content, methodology, and even to grant approval of university faculty. An action particularly disturbing to the universities was the awarding of contracts to profit-making firms for clear university functions such as training Head Start teachers. The firms, not having in-house capabilities, either contracted with universities to do the training at a very low price or employed university faculty on a "moonlighting" basis. The latter approach effectively reduced the universities' ability to participate in the war on poverty.

It must be acknowledged that the universities were not without fault. Some extension workers did help block the organization of local community action agencies and still others expressed no interest. The segregated charge was true in places until recently. Many did not have the capability to relate immediately to the war on poverty. Others lacked the flexibility to accommodate to what was planned as a crash program. Certainly a few were opportunistic and saw the Office of Economic Opportunity as just another source of funds to enhance the university.

While specific charges on both sides have validity, it appears that the basic problem was a lack of communication leading to an understanding of respective roles and a development of sound working relationships.

V. HOW TO ELIMINATE OR ALLEVIATE RURAL POVERTY

It is not the purpose of this paper to outline all the means of eliminating rural poverty. A few comments are offered to provide a basis for the sections that follow. The well-documented lag in service to rural areas by both federal and state governments should be corrected.[14] This should result in better schools for youth and adults of all ages, better community planning, and better community facilities and services. There is a need for employment opportunities and training programs to enable people to take advantage of jobs that may be created. Housing of poor people is a major problem in rural areas. The rural poor, like the urban poor, need education in purchasing, improved nutrition, and legal aid. There are undoubtedly credit needs for production and consumption. In short, they need the same sort of things as the urban poor.

Other papers may reveal that there are some significant differences in rural and urban poor. One factor however, which may not be indicated by statistics is the lack of visibility of the poor in rural areas. Poverty is evident in a city slum, but the casual observer may miss completely the existence of a substantial number of poor people in rural areas.

---

[14]This point has been discussed many times in speeches and congressional testimony by Secretary Freeman. A somewhat different aspect of the rural lag is discussed by Paul A. Miller, president, west Virginia University, in an address entitled the Rural Lag, delivered at the 50th annual meeting of the National Association of County Agriculture Agents at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, November, 1965.

The major broad objective of the war on poverty is to put the disadvantaged people into the mainstream of the American economy and culture. There is ample evidence on every hand that simply providing dollars will not accomplish this result. In most cases, additional real income is needed but this must be associated with a change in knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values. The change in these is acquired through some kind of educational experiences. Some will have the experience either by accident or deliberately, without the help of someone serving in a teacher role, but most people require a teacher to achieve significant educational experiences.

Many of the poor obviously need more basic education, training for employment, homemaking, and buying skills, and understanding of the services available to all, such as the public library, and knowing how to participate in and benefit from community action. Much has been said about the bad effects of racial segregation. The poor, regardless of race, tend to be segregated from the rest of society and the effects of segretation are the same, regardless of cause. One of the major educational jobs is to help the poor understand the rest of society and know how to move into it as additional income is received.

Many agencies and institutions have a part in the educational job required to move the poor into the mainstream of society. Specific attention will be given to the role of the university through its extension arm in the remainder of this paper.[15]

---

[15]The question of the educatability of the hard core poor by the traditional educational establishments is flagged here. It is argued by Haggstrom that it is close to impossible for the university, public schools, or federal agencies to conduct meaningful, educational programs for disadvantaged adults. He argues further that poor adults can be educated only if they are part of a social action movement and that much of such education comes about through self-instruction. There is an abundance of evidence that disproves these arguments. Cram and Brown (Cram op cit and Minnie Miller Brown in "Problems and Opportunities Related to Involving Low-Income Adults in Planning Educational Programs, "A term paper submitted to the University of Chicago, Department of Adult Education, August, 1966) state that program development along the philosophical lines of Cooperative Extension can be very effective with the poor. This includes education designed to result in action by the participants, involvement of the students in planning the program and having the instructors become closely identified with the students.

This philosophy is not inconsistent with conditions for education of the poor laid down by Haggstrom. I would agree with Haggstrom that an adult education course designed for the general public would likely not be highly acceptable to or useful to the poor. (Haggstrom, Warren C., "Poverty and Adult Education," (unpublished paper) January, 1965, Syracuse University).

VI. WHAT UNIVERSITY EXTENSION SERVICE CAN DO TO HELP WAGE THE WAR ON POVERTY

In this section suggestions of what the universities can do, through their Extension Division, to help win the war on poverty are given. The final section of the paper will discuss whether they can or will perform these roles and under what conditions they can be expected to perform. The four major areas discussed in this section are: (1) public affairs education, (2) training leaders to work with the poor, (3) direct work with the poor, and (4) modifying community organizations and institutions.

A. PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION

Public affairs education is defined by the university as providing information and promoting discussion on issues or subjects where final action must be taken by a group or a public body. This is in contrast to information that an individual, family, or firm can decide upon using. It also is in contrast to propaganda and advertising by being factual, objective, and not slanted to promote a given course of action. The underlying assumption is that a larger number of better informed citizens will result in sounder public policy. Consultive work with a public decision-making unit is not generally considered public affairs education. The elements of a public affairs educational program include identifying issues or problems that should be of public concern, describing the situation factually, suggesting alternative solutions, and appraising the consequences of alternative solutions.

The target audience in this program is citizens--all of them. The public decisions on action taken to eliminate poverty are necessarily made by representatives of the total citizenry. The only modification suggested in traditional approaches is to make a more conscious effort to reach low-income citizens.

Houle suggested a conceptional framework for a university public affairs program.[16] He divides the public into four categories: the specialist, the actively concerned, the attentive, and the inattentive. Using the public schools as an example, the teachers and school administrators represent the specialist group; the school board and the PTA are the actively concerned; the citizens interested in making the schools better are the attentive; and those who have no interest in the schools are the inattentive.

Houle suggests that from this framework six major objectives can be stated:

"1. To provide the opportunity for specialists, including those on the university faculty, to educate one another.

2. To help actively concerned citizens acquire techniques for discharging their special responsibilities more effectively.

[16]Houle, Cyril, "Conditions for Leadership in the Total Program of Public Affairs in a State," an address to the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, Washington, D.C., November 14, 1966. Dr. Houle is professor of education at the University of Chicago.

3. To serve the continuing needs of actively concerned citizens for basic understanding of the topic about which they are actively concerned.
4. To serve the continuing needs of attentive citizens for background information and understanding.
5. To encourage some of the attentive citizens to become actively concerned.
6. To make the inattentive citizens attentive."

The need for a public affairs program is evident from the many conflicting statements which are supposedly based on facts. Examples include: "There are no poor in my community, even though statistics say otherwise;" "People are poor because of their own action or inaction;" "The poor are happy with their situation;" "More jobs are the total answer;" "More income is the answer;" "More income will be squandered without any long-range benefits."

Some of the areas relating to poverty that fit in the public affairs framework are identified below:

1. Dimensions of the poverty situation--the description should include the income and family living situation; a comparison of income for this group with the balance of the population over a period of years; their physical location; racial, ethnic and age characteristics; and attitudes and aspirations.

2. Causes of poverty--identification of the causes of poverty is the first step toward building sound and acceptable action programs to correct the situation.

3. Alternative courses of action--this includes the probable effect from a given expenditure of time and dollars. Many of the programs which have been mounted are someone's "pet" ideas, or in some rural communities, the only idea that was advanced. There are some evaluations of these programs, but very seldom in terms of comparison to alternative courses of action.

4. The agencies and organizations concerned with poor people--their objectives; the cost of programs; and some projections of what they might do with additional resources.

5. The role that the community and poor people can play--to eliminate poverty and the causes of poverty. One of the possible consequences of establishing a separate agency to wage the war on poverty is everyone else leaving the problem to this agency. If this should happen, the Office of Economic Opportunity would turn into no more than a super welfare agency.

6. The total concerns of low-income people--to include housing, education, human relations, family relations, health, nutrition, and cultural development.

If the objectives of increasing citizen interest and knowledge are to be achieved on a large scale, a number of communication techniques must be used. There should be written information available which discusses the subject in considerable detail. The mass media can be used effectively but should be reinforced with speakers and discussions. One of the newer techniques in public affairs education is self-administered discussions. In this approach material is carefully prepared and key questions are raised. A person with no great knowledge on the subject arranges for a group to meet, go through the material together, raise the pertinent questions, and

answer them as a group. Such discussion groups can be conducted over lunch by businessmen, in the home, in the school, or in any community facility. This is basically the technique which is used by the Foreign Policy Association in its Great Decisions Program. A number of Cooperative Extension Services have used the technique to discuss a variety of topics. Their experiences indicate that great care must be taken in the preparation of the material, it must be available in large quantities, and someone must take the lead in each community to promote the program.

It was indicated earlier that the public affairs program should be directed to all citizens. The limited evaluations available on university public affairs program show that a smaller percent of the poor participate than the total population. This would be expected and it is consistent with what is found in most other programs which are for the general public. Several things can be done to increase the participation of low-income people. Most of the low-income people have radio and television and greater use can be made of these media than has been to date. Also, in most places community action agencies, organized and financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, have identified the poor people and have ways of contacting them. These agencies could alert the poor people that there would be radio or television shows of particular interest to them at a given time and encourage them to listen. The self-administered discussion technique will work with low-income people, but the material must be prepared for those with little formal education. This is possible without doing damage to content.

The university is uniquely qualified to conduct a meaningful public affairs educational program. Knowledge possessed by the faculty and stored in the computers and libraries, and which is constantly being developed through research is the basic resource for identifying issues, for describing them, and listing and evaluating alternative courses. The university is also accepted as an institution which does deal in facts and not fancy or propaganda. The university, through its faculty, publications, radio and television facilities, and the access it has to all commercial media of communication, has adequate channels for getting the information to almost the entire citizenry.

The final section discusses how the university can be properly involved.

B. TRAINING LEADERS IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

There are large training needs among the numerous and diverse personnel involved in the war on poverty. While poverty has always been with us, until quite recently very few people gave serious attention to solving the problem. Most of the well-trained people in society, including poverty warriors, came from the middle or upper-class families. If they came from the lower economic class, they had taken on middle-class values.

There are five main types of personnel involved in the war on poverty:

1. The professional spending full time in the war on poverty.
2. The professional who is involved only on a part-time basis in the war on poverty.
3. The sub-professional.
4. The citizen who serves as a member of the board or an advisory committee to a community action program.
5. The citizen who volunteers to contribute some time to waging the war on poverty.

In this section of the paper each of the groups is described, and training needs are discussed, as are training possibilities.

Full-time Professionals in the War on Poverty

The full-time professionals include the Office of Economic Opportunity employees and the personnel of delegate agencies and organizations, including the community action agencies, who spend full-time in the war on poverty. Most of these workers have considerable formal schooling or experience or both, but there is great diversity in terms of commitment, capability, and background. Some of the personnel were attracted to the work because of a strong commitment to help the poor, others saw opportunity for more rapid advancement than in better established agencies, and for still others this was the only available employment. The great freedom permitted local community action agencies in selecting their own personnel has contributed to the variability in capability and dedication. Few have specific training in their background for working with the poor. Many others have little training for the specific job that they are trying to do, such as community development or direction of a community action agency.

These statements are not critical of the personnel in the war on poverty; it is exactly what always occurs when a new large-scale effort is mounted. Further, there is potential strength in the diversity, background, and training which should lead to some innovative approaches. The situation does present obvious weakness, however, and many of these can be overcome through a well-designed training program.

Some of the almost universal training needs include: (1) an understanding of poor people and how to communicate with them; (2) a knowledge of prior efforts that have been made to eliminate poverty and the extent to which they were successful, including reasons for success or failure; (3) the basic philosophy behind the reasons for the current war on poverty; (4) possible approaches to the war on poverty; (5) how to perform the specific job to which an individual is assigned, such as community development, employment training; and (6) capability to communicate with colleagues, other agencies and organizations, the power structure, and the general public.

Universities have conducted many training programs for this category of personnel. These include most of the possible training situations, varying however, in: length from one-day seminars to twelve weeks of organized classes; scope from specific training in one job to the entire poverty question; participation from personnel with all types of assignments and all levels of preparation to on the job training for one person; homogeneity from all personnel in

one class to classes for personnel with very specialized assignments; and location from on the job to a national center.

Training which the universities have offered has usually been rated as useful by the participants and the employing agency, but several weaknesses can be identified. Often there was tremendous heterogeneity in the participants' knowledge of any single training session and this made it difficult for the training to be useful to all. Programs were usually designed to enable the participants to be more effective in a given job, and not enough attention was devoted to increasing understanding of the culture of the poor and to the basic tools for effectively working with the poor. In most cases there was insufficient communication on objectives, respective roles, and expected results between the employing agency and the university staff. Often the teaching faculty did not have a vivid understanding of poor people or how to be effective in working with them.

It is obvious that universities can play a significant role in training and retraining professionals, but the employing agency has a major role in pre-service and in-service training, and this is the major current training situation. The employing agency must determine the training philosophy, specific training needs and objectives, and the role that training will play in promotion and salary advancement. While the employing agency may make extensive use of educational experts as consultants, the final responsibility rests with the employing agency.

It is suggested that it be a policy for the Office of Economic Opportunity and organizations it funds to enroll all full-time professional personnel in a professional improvement program lasting at least three weeks each year. Participation in such programs should be one criterion for promotion. The training should be shared with the agency, using one week on in-house matters. Then the university would take two weeks to conduct training designed to increase the basic competence of the individual. The latter category should include a variety of approaches, such as in-depth workshops, seminars, and self-instructional techniques, such as correspondence study and reading from an approved list of books and journals. After the first year, training should be divided to provide a basic course for new employees and advanced study for those who have participated in previous sessions. Also the proportion devoted to in-house training should be increased for the experienced.

Professionals Who Spend Part Time in the War on Poverty

Included in this category are the university extension field workers who spend part of their time working with poor people and part with other people in society; public school teachers who may have some low-income children in their classes or who may devote the summer to teaching a Head Start class; public health workers; social workers; juvenile authorities; and many other categories of public employees. There is considerable homogeneity in the background and orientation of a particular group of workers, such as school teachers or Cooperative Extension workers. They have at least minimum com-

petence in their field and know how to perform their job with a cross section of the population.

Such personnel do have substantial training needs in order to be fully effective in the war on poverty. As with the full-time professionals, most of these people have middle or upper-class values and lack an understanding of the poor and how to communicate with the poor. Many of the skills and techniques that are successful in working with the "average" person need to be modified to reach the poor. Sometimes even a new language must be acquired to communicate with the poor. One of the major reasons why public agency efforts to intensify work with the poor have not been more successful is the agency simply issues a directive that more will be done with the poor, but fails to provide the staff with necessary skills and techniques. This can be overcome through training programs.

The universities have conducted many training sessions for such people, the most extensive in terms of members being Head Start teachers for summer programs and adult basic literacy teachers. Training opportunities have also been provided for Cooperative Extension workers, vocational teachers, church groups, and many others. Again, length and method of training have varied widely.

As in the case of the full-time professionals, such training has been useful and has had about the same weaknesses. The training of large numbers on a crash basis and the shortness of the training period precluded adequate discussion of the basic aspects of poverty and the fundamental tools needed to work with the poor. The training experiences were all too often isolated instances in the lives of the participants--designed simply to prepare them to do one job but not part of a carefully prepared professional improvement program. There was lack of common understanding on the part of the university conducting the training, the employing agency, and the funding agency and this tended to confuse trainees. At times the training was not closely related to the goals and procedures of the employing agencies and as a result, trainees returned to their jobs and operated as they had previously. The faculty had the same deficiencies as those teaching the full-time professionals.

The suggestions are about the same as for full-time professionals. Highlights are: (1) the employing agency should take the lead in planning; (2) actual training should be shared by the agency and the university, with the latter concentrating on giving the basic understanding and skills for working with the poor; and (3) a long-range continuous training plan should be developed. Since much of the actual work of this group is part of, or closely related to Office of Economic Opportunity activities, the Office of Economic Opportunity should be involved in training plans and perhaps in the training itself in order to promote coordination and understanding.

Sub-Professionals

Sub-professionals extend the efforts of the professionals. These include nurses aides, teaching assistants, and the many neighborhood workers employed by community action agencies. The concept of the sub-professional is not new and many have been used on a volunteer basis by organizations such as Cooperative Extension and hospitals for many years. The Office of Economic Opportunity has

inserted new dimensions in the use of sub-professionals, using indigenous poor to bridge the communication gap between the professionals and the poor and to provide additional employment opportunities for the poor. Most of these have all the characteristics of the poor, including little formal education and a long history of un- or under-employment. The practice of employing indigenous poor as sub-professionals has generally been quite successful and will likely be a major part in the war on poverty in the future.

The training needs of the sub-professionals are quite different from those of the professionals. They must, of course, learn the details of the job they are expected to perform. Many need additional basic education and instruction in such elementary matters as personal appearance, observing work hours, and other common sense rules of the employing agency. In addition, they need an understanding of the philosophy and approaches of the war on poverty and an understanding of the values and cultures of other people in society.

Cooperative Extension has trained thousands of volunteer sub-professional teachers for many years. It has provided training in specific subjects such as food and nutrition to the paid sub-professionals involved in the war on poverty.[17] Other parts of the university have relatively little experience in such training.

Much of this group's training must be done by the professional who is associated directly with the sub-professionals. In addition to an initial training period, there must be continual training, probably on a weekly basis. It is proper and desirable for the university to continue such training as that currently done by Cooperative Extension, but it should also train the professionals on how to train sub-professionals, help identify training needs and prepare training material. One of the real challenges is to get the training material into language which the sub-professionals can understand. Faculty members interested in communications should find a challenge in such work. An excellent example of the type of material that could be prepared is a bulletin by the Federal Extension Service (PA-681) titled, Training Home Economics Program Assistants to Work with Low Income Families. Perhaps the most significant role of the university will be to continue its investigation and experimentation on the theory and philosophy of using sub-professionals, particularly how they can be trained for jobs of increased responsibility and remuneration.

The Lay Board or Advisory Committee Member

The Office of Economic Opportunity Act calls for maximum citizen involvement in planning and executing programs. As a result, most community action programs are directed by a board of citizens that represents a cross section of the community and includes substantial representation of the poor. Community action agencies have often established advisory committees to deepen citizen participation.

[17] Reports from Federal Extension Service indicate that 10,000 sub-professionals were trained in foods and nutrition in the past year and more than 90 percent of these worked for other agencies.

Many "poverty" programs not associated with community action agencies have established advisory committees of lay citizens.

It is well documented that most board and advisory committees benefit from training.[18] Board members need to understand their roles in relation to the job of administration. This includes an understanding of policy as contrasted to operations, the principles and processes for program development and evaluation, and how to secure coordination. The educational needs of advisory committees are essentially the same. Of course, management needs the same understanding about boards. This suggests that both management and the lay people should participate in the same training sessions. Since most of the war on poverty agencies and organizations are new, the members need orientation on philosophy, purposes, and basic procedures. Also since a number of members must come from the poor, this part of the board will benefit from additional basic education and instruction on how to be a participating board member.

The universities have conducted training for many types of board or advisory committee members. Such training is programmed for the multi-purpose training centers, but to date relatively few of the community action agency board members have received formal training from any source.

It is the university's proper role to be involved directly in the training of board and advisory committee members. Another proper role is advising professionals, who work directly with board and advisory committees on training needs, how to conduct training and how to prepare training materials, keeping in mind that some of the members have relatively little formal education. Again, the best results can probably be secured through a combined effort of the professionals who must work directly with the boards and advisory committees, the Office of Economic Opportunity, including the State Technical Assistance staff, and the university. The university can be most effective in discussing the respective roles of boards and administration, sound personnel policies and procedures, and the processes of program development and evaluation. The personnel, working directly with the boards, can best explain the philosophy, general approaches, and the details of the operations. It would be desirable to involve the public schools and have them offer the basic education needed by some of the members.

Volunteers

Volunteers are the citizens who conduct specific assignments with remuneration. Examples include the mothers who assist in the Head Start Programs, those who assist in surveys and perform a host of additional tasks. The use of volunteer service is not new. It has been used extensively by hospitals, Red Cross, the YMCA, and Coopera tive Extension for many years. It is a basic philosophy of the war on poverty to mobilize all resources. This includes taking full advantage of volunteer service. While many man-years of volunteer service have been contributed to the war on poverty, this has been the weakest part of the formal war on poverty.

[18] Houle, Cyril O., The Effective Board, New York: Association Press 1960.

Most of the people who gave volunteer service to efforts such as the war on poverty are very highly motivated. They usually come from the middle or upper classes, are highly intelligent, and often are very well trained in some field.[19] They generally fall into two categories, one being a housewife or retired person who does not need to work for remuneration, and the other being the full-time employed person who gives some of his leisure time to volunteer service. These people do have some training needs if they are to be effective in working with the poor. Being adequately trained in one area does not mean that they are capable in another field. Hence, they need training for the specific job to be done. Since the vast majority of the volunteers are from the middle and upper classes, they need training in the nature of poverty, and the techniques and communicative skills necessary for working with the poor. This is particularly important since many of the volunteers have a missionary sort of zeal for helping the poor people, which causes them to have an attitude of pity rather than the constructive attitude of helping an equal.

The universities can conduct some of the training for volunteers, but there is a question as to whether this is an efficient way of meeting their training needs. The volunteers usually work a limited number of hours each month and there is a high turnover rate. Most of the training should be conducted by the agency making use of the volunteers. Certainly, training for the specific job and the basic philosophy and approaches of the program must be done by the agency. The university can train the professionals on how to recruit, relate to and train volunteers and provide training material on the physical and communicative skills required to be effective in working with poor people.

C. DIRECT WORK WITH THE POOR

Since the Cooperative Extension Services have and will continue to work directly with the rural poor, this section is cast within the framework of traditional Cooperative Extension programming. The three main sections include work in agriculture, home economics, and youth.

Agriculture[20]

Approximately 70 percent of the 2.4 million farmers with less than

[19] A good discussion on volunteers and their training needs is given in Women's Education, Vol. VI, No. 1, March, 1967 published by the A.A.U.W. Educational Foundation, Washington, D. C.

[20] This section is based on an unpublished document developed by a sub-committee of the Cooperative Extension Committee on Organization and Policy. This report is entitled, "Cooperative Extension's Responsibilities to Farmers and Ranchers with Farm Incomes Less Than $10,000." This report is used not because it is an official document of Cooperative Extension but because the author concurs with the report except in a few minor places.

$10,000 gross income have net incomes insufficient for decent levels of living even in the rural areas. In general, the 30 percent who do have adequate incomes are part-time operators.

The 2.4 million farmers are divided into seven categories: full-time operators in the productive years who lack resources, 15 percent; full-time operators in the productive years who lack motivation, 10 percent; full-time operators nearing retirement, 21 percent; full-time operators mentally or physically handicapped, 8 percent; share operators, 20 percent; part-time operators, 30 percent; and part-retired operators, 16 percent.

It is estimated that from 75 to 80 percent of these operators will find that their best alternative is to remain on the farm. This is especially true for the part-retired, those nearing retirement, those in the productive years of life who want to farm, and the part-time farmer. Further, some of the individuals handicapped by mental or physical disabilities may be better off in rural than in urban situations. Their situaion can be improved in a major way only by direct welfare aid and it is in the interest of society and the families that they remain in the communities they know, rather than moving into the crowded urban centers.

For the remainder, the appropriate adjustment would mean a partial or complete movement out of farming. However, they may not be better off, unless, as they move out of farming, they have an increase in their general knowledge, motivation, specific skills, and self-confidence. One of the major needs is counseling with farmers to determine where <u>in fact</u> their best alternative lies. Much of the off-farm movement has occurred without adequate exploration of either on- or off-farm alternatives. The result all too often has been simply a transfer of location for the individual, with no improvement of his personal situation and perhaps a worsening of the situation for both the community which he left and the community to which he went.

The report suggests four types of educational needs for the target group of farmers. These are:

1. <u>Basic adult education</u> - Teaching practical literacy necessary for communication and understanding of information received through other extension functions. In some cases, this may mean teaching people to read and write.
2. <u>Flow of information</u> - Providing the results of recent research, the experiences of others, specific recommendations, significant situational information, reminders of practice recommendations; encouragement, stimulation, and recruitment of audiences for further educational activities.
3. <u>Consultation</u> - Assisting individuals and groups to apply knowledge to specific situations, relating facts to the situations and problems, helping groups to organize for worthwhile purposes, and perhaps being a party to final decisions. Consultation can be responsive--aiding upon request, or goal oriented--as a means of moving an individual or group to action. This may include counseling the participants into other educational opportunities.

4. Instruction in basic content - Helping people understand principles of physical, biological, and social sciences; helping them know and understand fundamental content in depth.

The degree of emphasis placed on these functions differs considerably from the various audience categories. These needs by category are summarized in the following table:

Educational Needs by Category of Clientele

Classes of Clientele 2.4 Million	Educational Functions to Be Performed: Basic Adult Education	Flow of Information	Consultation	Instruction in Basic Content
1. Full-time operators in productive years but lack resources. 15%		xx	xx	x
2. Full-time operators in productive years but lack motivation. 10%	x	x	xx	
3. Full-time operators nearing retirement. 21% (55 yrs. & over)		xx	x	
4. Full-time operators mentally or physically handicapped. 8%	x	x	x	x
5. Share operators 20%*	x	x	x	x
6. Part-time operators 30%		x		
7. Part retired operators 16%		x		

*Overlap with other categories but considered separately for educational purposes.

All figure estimates based on Census and Economic Research Service data.

Cooperative Extension has always worked with farmers. It knows how to reach them and has been effective with many. It has learned through the years how to relate to and how to refer people to other agencies. Cooperative Extension can perform most of the education needed by the several categories of farmers and can assist with others, provided it accepts the mission and has the resources. Basic adult education should be handled by the public schools. Cooperative Extension workers can help identify those who need basic adult education and help motivate the people to take part in such programs. Maintaining a flow of information and instruction in basic content can be done entirely by the Cooperative Extension Service. The basic part of consultation is exploring alternatives on and off farms. As indicated earlier, achieving the objective of having each of these families in the spot where they can make the most of their potential is dependent upon adequate exploration of alternatives, which, and repeating for emphasis, generally has not been done. Cooperative Extension workers will need to relate to and have assistance from the Employment Service and other manpower agencies in realistically assessing non-farm employment potential. Cooperative Extension workers can appraise on-farm possibilities.

The question has been raised that if Cooperative Extension can do these things, why hasn't it? There are at least three answers to this question:

1. Failure to pinpoint a particular group of people having educational needs different from the successful farmer.
2. The lack of commitment to acquire the attitudes and techniques necessary to be effective with the group.
3. The lack of resources.

Acceptance of the report on which this section is based by all Cooperative Extension Services eliminates the first two reasons. Lack of resources remains as the major barrier.

The personnel employed with additional resources will not be simply more of the same type of workers doing more of the same work as present extension workers. The additional workers will either have or be given thorough training in understanding the low-income farmers, how to reach them, and how to be effective with them. They will have more than average training in social sciences and communications. They will take the initiative in contacting poor people. Individual counseling will be a major thrust. The dependence of low-income farmers on television and radio will be recognized and extensive use made of these media. There will be follow-through to help families achieve goals which they establish. This is important because many of the low-income farmers are frustrated from continued lack of success. Farmers needing services such as credit or additional basic education will not only be told of possibilities for securing these services, but will actually be put in contact with those who can deliver the services. Linkage will be established with other programs directed to poor people and every effort made to direct a package of services to the individuals. The possible role of cooperatives will be explored and explained to the farmers and the cooperatives.

Home Economics

Home economics is one of the three traditional program areas of Cooperative Extension. As indicated in Section IV of this paper, extension home economists have worked with many poor people and have taken the lead in redirecting educational efforts with poor people. Extension home economics work is directed primarily to the family, and, as such, is in touch with one of the basic units of society. This unit not only has a great effect on present conditions, but is the unit which affects values of children, and, as such, has a great impact on the next generation. The Economic Opportunity Act specifically mentions nutrition, home management, housing, and health, and many Office of Economic Opportunity publications mention consumer education. All of these areas, basic to human development, are integral parts of home economics.

Cooperative Extension has recently issued a publication titled, "Extension Home Economics Focus."[21] This is a policy statement which sets forth what Cooperative Extension can do and hopes to do in the field of home economics. The publication reports five areas of national concern and the contributions of extension home economists in improving the situation. In relation to each concern, low-income families are identified as a primary target clientele.

The first concern--family stability--is a major problem with many of the poor. The causes are complex and can seldom be approached directly. Poverty and the environment in which may of the poor live foster family instability. However, this is one problem that additional income will do little to solve, at least in the short-run. Certain educational experiences can help, regardless of income level. Some of the specific areas in which extension home economists have competence that should increase family stability include: understanding the needs of children and ways of fulfilling these needs within the home; understanding the influence of the home on the learning and motivation of family members; understanding the principles and the skills necessary in managing the home; maintaining satisfying relationships within the family; understanding the influence of clothing, housing, and furnishings on personal development and mental health; knowing the adjustments necessary within the home when the homemaker accepts outside employment; establishing and adjusting to new living conditions; and for those facing retirement, accepting reduced family responsibility, finding useful leisure activities, and planning for and adjusting to reduced income. Such information will help families adjust to the different situations they necessarily face, cope with the changing physical and social environment, and build stability into the next generation of families.

The second concern is consumer competence. This is of special significance to the poor because they usually pay more and have

[21] This publication was prepared by a sub-committee of the Cooperative Extension committee on organization and policy and has been accepted by all of the Extension Services. The author uses this publication not because it is an official document but because he agrees with the report.

less income to spend. The extension home economist is particularly competent to provide information leading to: skill in making decisions on use of resources to achieve family goals; ability to substitute manual skills for money resources; skill in consumer buying; acquiring good nutrition at the least cost; skill in family financial management including the use and costs of credit; proper maintenance and use of clothing, household furnishings, and food purchases; knowledge and use of consumer protection services in the community; and understanding and utilizing community resources.

The third concern is family housing, which is probably the most difficult need of the poor to remedy. It represents not only a major financial consideration but is involved with segregation, codes and zoning, utilities available, and protection. In some cases, education can bring about substantial improvement in housing, and in other cases, must accompany direct action to bring about the desired outcomes. The latter point has been proven time and time again in new public housing ventures. The extension home economist can provide information about financial considerations in housing; decorating and furnishing the home to provide maximum livability, convenience, and beauty within existing family resources; simple repairs and maintenance of the family dwelling; the importance of community services such as water and sewage disposal and how to obtain them; and the design of plans for low-cost public and private housing. Extension home economists have worked closely with the Farmers Home Administration in its housing program for low-income families.

The fourth concern is family health. Nutrition, sanitation, and safety in the home are recognized as vital factors in health and have long been major program areas of extension home economists. Some of the specific possibilities include teaching nutritional requirements for all age groups and alternative ways of obtaining them; knowing the link between physical well-being and mental development; improving sanitation and food safety; arranging the house and equipment to conserve energy and to eliminate hazards; acquiring basic homemaking skills essential to clean, attractive homes; handling and care of chemicals in the home; and appreciating the individual's responsibility in emergency preparedness.

The fifth concern is community resource development. The home economist has unique knowledge in helping with the following community services: adequate child care; counseling related to the home and family; community food services; training for professionals in family-oriented organizations; training for home-related salable skills; employment training for women; and expanded cultural resources and opportunities.

The report previously cited suggests that several new approaches will be used in making the potential contribution. These include:

1. Specializing home economists in clientele discipline or program areas, such as those discussed, and have them operate as a team.
2. Involving the people to be served (in this case, poor people) in program planning.
3. Providing training in home economics to professionals who are not home economists, including those in busi-

ness as well as public and private health and welfare agencies.

4. Making extensive use of the paid non-professional. The paid non-professional would be used in addition to volunteer leaders, who have been part of extension home economics work from its very inception.

There are 4.4 million families and 1.6 million unrelated individuals in rural America in the poverty category. Essentially all would benefit from assistance by an extension home economist. In home economics, as in every other program, a more intensive effort must be made to reach and teach the poor people. Experiences to date indicate that personal contacts by someone related to the program are usually necessary to gain participation. These contacts may be made by an employee of the community action agency, but a follow-up contact by a person directly involved in the program is usually necessary. In addition to personal consultation, movement as soon as possible into small group-learning experiences is highly desirable from the standpoint of effectiveness and efficiency. Initial contacts usually relate to one program area, such as foods, and need to pertain to a felt problem, such as use of "surplus" foods, better nutrition for the baby, alteration of clothing for school children. As rapport is established, it is possible to move into more depth in the initial program area and also into other related program areas. This program inter-relates with, and reinforces, other programs with the poor. Evidence reveals that referrals to other agencies and organizations occur.

In rural areas experience indicates that a ratio of ten sub-professionals to one professional home economist is effective in accomplishing the total job of contacting, motivating, teaching, and following through to get a new idea or skill accepted as part of the normal family pattern. The financial requirements for an effective program are discussed in the last section of the paper.

4-H Club Programs for Youth

Some of the very first Cooperative Extension work was with boys and girls in rural areas. Extension-sponsored youth work was labeled "4-H Club Work." The objective throughout the years has been to make better citizens and train future leaders. It has been an out-of-school program which stressed providing real life work, citizenship, and leadership experiences.

Several national committees of Cooperative Extension workers have explored the extent to which the 4-H Club program is reaching low-income youth, ways of reaching more such young people, and being more effective with them. These investigations reveal that many low-income rural youth do participate in 4-H Club work, particularly those in communities with a high concentration of poor people. The record is not as good where poor people are a minority in a community of more affluent people. The data reveal that 9.36 percent of all youth from families with incomes below $3,000 belong to 4-H Clubs, while

only 5.01 percent of all youth from families with income above $3,000 belong to 4-H Clubs. The committees have also suggested several modifications of traditional approaches which could prove more effective in helping disadvantaged young people.

Schools have a major role to play with young people, but out-of-school programs can supplement the regular school programs and can be of great significance to those young people who tend to reject the regular school program. Accomplishments of the out-of-school extension youth program include helping young people explore careers and prepare for jobs; appreciate science, technology, and conservation; develop confidence; experience success; learn good social behavior; use leisure time wisely; prepare for family life; be more physically fit; help with community improvement; see the need for more formal education; and develop leadership ability.

The traditional extension approach to youth work has been the 4-H Clubs which draw members from youngsters between 9 and 19 within a fairly limited geographic area. Volunteer leaders, both adult and youth, who are trained by professional extension workers, are usually responsible for the club. The club provides a chance for group activity which fosters development of leadership and social skills. Individual members carry on projects in many fields. The projects are designed to teach skills and often generate income, but more importantly, they teach young people to accept responsibility and to live in a competitive society. Many activities, such as public speaking and practice in performing arts, are designed to enhance the individual's ability.

The national committees believe that the 4-H Club will continue to be a very useful tool, even with low-income youth. It is suggested, however, that flexibility be built into all phases of the program. This would include new approaches, such as television for special interest groups and for training leaders, simulated learning experiences, and use of the latest self-study and programmed learning methods. New organizational plans, in addition to the 4-H Club, call for special interest groups of many types; working with groups that want the program but want to be labeled differently; and cooperating with school, church, and other youth organizations. The specific programs should be based on local needs; involve the young people in planning organization and program content; utilize the tutorial system of having older youth teach younger youth; and develop specific activities and programs for the different age groups. The youth will participate by doing one or more of the following and usually a combination of several: carry an individual project, such as career exploration, or assist in community beautification; help plan and carry out a conference, tour, rally, or achievement night, give demonstrations, illustrated talks and speeches; attend camps emphasizing conservation, physical fitness, science, and use of leisure time; judge exhibits and practice decision making; exhibit the results of their work; and write reports.

One of the committees has proposed that the job be done through a combined effort of volunteer leaders, paid non-professionals and

professionals.[22] The volunteer leaders will consist of older 4-H'ers, who will serve as junior leaders to motivate and guide younger members and, incidentally, continue their own training, and adult leaders who will supervise the junior leaders, assist the paid non-professionals, and carry a large share of the planning and operations.[23] The paid non-professionals will be of two types. One will be recognized leaders in the neighborhood who will work on a part-time basis and will arrange for participation of disadvantaged youth, parent cooperation, group activities, and do some subject matter teaching. The second category will work on a full-time basis and will deal primarily with organization, leadership development, and public support. The professional will be an extension agent with specific youth work competence. He will have the responsibility for the program, including development programs and training and supervising the volunteers and paid non-professionals.

A model staffing plan to serve 5,000 young people of low-income families includes: one extension agent, 10 full-time non-professionals, 200 non-professionals who work on a part-time basis, and 1,000 volunteers. This model has actually been tested and is realistic. The financial resources required are discussed in the last section.

D. MODIFYING COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS

There are many definitions of communities and institutions. For the purpose of this paper, a community is defined as a group of people who organize for a common purpose. While a given citizen may belong to many communities, the frame of reference is usually within a geographic area of not over an hour's drive. An institution is defined as anything involving a group of people where self-perpetuation has become a real goal. Included in this category are universitities, churches, labor unions, farm organizations, and clubs of many types, including 4-H.

In view of the above definitions, the rural community includes a minimum of a town and perhaps a county or several counties and several towns. Basically, it is a geographic area that works together to provide the basic services of education, health, welfare, trade and cultural opportunitites.

---

[22]These recommendations were based to a considerable extent on special pilot projects financed with Cooperative Extension funds in Arkansas, Oregon, West Virginia and Rhode Island. These programs demonstrated, among other things, value of indigenous non-paid leaders and paid sub-professionals. They also demonstrated that a total rural community can be mobilized and that agencies can work together to implement a program which is effective in assisting those in poverty, preventing and curtailing juvenile delinquency, and assisting youth in becoming adjusted to our present urban industrial society.

[23]Cooperative Extension has had relatively little difficulty in securing volunteer leaders to assist with all phases of 4-H Club work. This is well illustrated in the report of a committee previously cited.

The community thus described encompasses many organizations and institutions. It includes official organizations such as city councils, county commissions, school boards, and officially incorporated not-for-profit corporations such as industrial development and community action agencies to wage the war on poverty. It includes institutions such as churches, clubs, farm organizations, labor unions, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and ministerial alliances. These are not official organizations in the same sense as city councils or county commissions, but they do exert tremendous influence on the community. Still another category includes advisory boards to the official agencies and coordinative organizations, such as the U. S. Department of Agriculture Council and the Council of Federal Agencies.

A basic assumption of this paper is that community environment is greatly responsible for the development of a group of people who live continuously in abject poverty. It is the exceptional case where such a situation has been consciously planned. Rather it is the result of not realizing the problem and its cause and accepting such a situation as inevitable or unsolvable.

The typical rural community is faced with some serious problems. It likely is confronted with economic decline, at least in terms of employment opportunities. It has a lower level of community services than the metropolitan communities, particularly in education, health, housing, and cultural opportunities. There has been a loss of the best potential leaders to urban areas. It is well documented that the rural communities have not participated to the extent of urban communities in federal and state assistance programs. Part of the fault is with the agencies as it is easier to deal with the professional personnel and large applications from urban areas than with poorly prepared small applications from rural areas, and administrative convenience is not a satisfactory criterion for federal and state governments to follow. A large part of the fault for the lag lies with the rural community leaders, who are very conservative in their attitudes toward any change. Indeed it appears that the major purpose of many of the rural community organizations and institutions is to preserve the status quo. There is no conscious maliciousness in this attitude. The situation is a product of many events and circumstances, not the least being the relatively advanced age of many of the leaders in rural communities and the reserivorof "rugged individualism."

At this stage of the game, the only solution for upgrading services and eliminating the causes of poverty in rural communities is outside support. The need for outside funds to upgrade services is readily apparent. There is equal need for technical assistance and for programs to develop the indigenous leadership. Unless the communities receive, along with funds, technical assistance, either the funds will not be used or will be spent for less than optimum uses.

There are three clear alternatives for modifying community organizations and institutions. One is by direct legislation. Examples of this are the several civil rights acts and establishment of federal programs in the community without advice or consent of the local citizens. The second alternative is to provide the local community organizations and institutions with information which will

lead to a change of attitude and to acquiring the knowledge and skills that will enable the community to take a more rational approach to the solution of today's problems, including making better use of outside financial and technical assistance. A third alternative, which is probably the best, is a combination of the two. Under this approach funds can be used as an incentive to bring about change--for example, federal aid to elementary and secondary education, along with technical and educational assistance.

Several specific educational activities that are appropriate to the university, which university personnel can do, and which will be helpful to the rural communities in working out of their dilemma are mentioned in the paragraphs that follow. It is a basic assumption of this paper that achieving the goals of modifying community organizations and institutions requires working with all segments of the community and not just the poor.

1. Creating or modifying community organizations and institutions. The rural community has many organizations and institutions, but in many cases existing agencies and organizations either cannot or will not act when a new program arises. This was demonstrated time and again with the advent of the poverty program. The antithesis of this was many organizations competing with each other for the privilege. Even where these extremes do not exist there is often poor communication between officials and the public which leads to frustration on the part of the officials and a loss of confidence on the part of the public. Educational programs can enable many existing organizations and institutions to modify their structure to be consistent with the times and the work to be accomplished, leading to a rational development of new organizations, and to coordination and cooperation among the existing organizations.
2. Improving the community decision-making processes. The decision-making process is the same as that followed by any economic firm, but is more difficult because: (1) the community group often must define its goals, a known condition for other units; (2) the community decision is usually made by a group; and (3) implementation of the decision is partially dependent upon the right people being involved in the right manner and at the right time in the decision-making process.

   The extension worker can increase knowledge of citizens on the decision-making process and its use at the community level, lend encouragement so that the group does not bog down in the middle of the process, and by asking questions insure that sufficient time and thought are devoted to the community decision.
3. Outlining and helping appraise alternative courses of action. There are monuments to bad decisions in most communities. These errors were not made by poorly intentioned or unintelligent people. They are largely the result of not determining or appraising the alternatives. Technology today has as great an impact at the community level as on the farm and in industry. What was best yesterday is likely inappropriate today. The university, with its faculty members covering

most fields of human knowledge, its libraries, laboratories, and computers, is in an ideal position to help community leaders list and appraise the alternative courses of action. Once this information is known, the community leaders with knowledge of their resources and goals should make much better decisions.

4. Using outside aids. There are literally hundreds of aids which a community can use to make decisions and to implement action. The aids may be in the form of funds, consultive services or technical assistance, and are offered by federal and state agencies, private organizations, and private businesses. Many communities have no idea of the assistance that is available to them or how to go about securing it. The educational process of informing community leaders of outside aids is a fairly simple one.

5. Implementing action programs. Extension is usually relatively little involved once the community has embarked upon a course of action. There are several points, however, where consultation can be invaluable, examples being the securing of a competent architect to advise on construction or a consultant to help revise the school curriculum. Some types of community action programs last for months or years and are involved to a considerable extent with intangibles. In such programs, there is constant need for re-evaluating goals and results. One of the major mistakes of organizations is to never change direction, even if it becomes evident that they should have gone some other direction to begin with or new conditions have created the need for redirection. Very skillful education work is needed to help community action programs continue to be effective.

6. Developing leadership. In most rural communities there is a great shortage of leaders who are really adequate to carry out modern-day programs. Extension has demonstrated its ability to train both paid and volunteer leaders for either specific jobs or for broad responsibility.

7. Developing citizen participation. As the community has become larger and more complex, the citizen has found it increasingly difficult to participate in community decision making and action. In many communities no changes will be made until a number of citizens have a better understanding of the community, what it can do, and how they can act individually and collectively to influence community action. Substantial efforts of this sort are underway in some places with disadvantaged citizens. An educational program with the decision makers and citizens, which suggests the need for and know-how of involving citizens, can bring good results and help avoid direct confrontations between groups.

The universities have been experimenting with various organizational frameworks for more effectiveness in the field of community development. This is one of the reasons stated for a number of land-grant universities combining General and Cooperative Extension. Regardless of the organizational structure, experience indicates that in order to be truly effective, the universities need at least three types of personnel.

The first is a generalist in community and institutional development who relates to the communities on a continuing basis. In effect, he is for communities what the traditional county agent has been for farmers. At one stage there was considerable debate as to the relative value of having resident personnel who related to the community as contrasted to personnel who arrived for intensive work and then departed. Experience has indicated rather clearly the advantage of having a person who is resident in the area and who relates continuously with the people.

These generalists, in order to be effective, must be backstopped by experts or specialists at the university. Specialists are needed to train the field personnel, prepare material and assist with problems beyond the ability of the field personnel. This is parallel again to the experience in Cooperative Extension where the county agents were backstopped by a group of sophisticated specialists at the university.

Above and beyond the community development specialists in the university, the field personnel and communities need resource people from practically every university discipline. Expertise from a particular discipline may be needed only a half-dozen times in the course of a year, but it may be crucial that it be available when needed.

A number of administrative arrangements can be developed to provide the three types of personnel. Such a program cannot be undertaken on an overload basis, however. The very essence of such a program is continuity--from personnel who are dedicated to the work.

VII. INVOLVING THE UNIVERSITIES IN THE WAR ON POVERTY

The preceding sections indicate rather clearly that the universities, through their extension arms, can be a powerful force in the war on poverty; but it is also clear that at present they are operating far below potential capability in this area. There is considerable evidence that the University Extension Services want to become more involved and that the Office of Economic Opportunity is anxious for them to do so. This situation suggests that there is a problem of communication as well as funds.

It is therefore recommended that the Office of Economic Opportunity and universities begin conversations designed to open channels of communication to create an understanding of each other and how they can work together to achieve national goals. The Office of Economic Opportunity can well afford several people who devote full time to working with and communicating with the University Extension Services. Fortunately, all universities included within this paper are members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, which has an office and small staff in Washington, D. C. They are also members of the National University Extension Association. The Federal Extension SErvice of the U. S. Department of Agriculture also represents the Cooperative Extension Services at the national level. Within bounds, these three organizations and agencies can speak for the member universities and this alleviates the necessity for the Office of Economic Oppor-

tunity talking with each university.

As these conversations proceed, the universities must recognize that the Office of Economic Opportunity and related agencies have a specific mission to accomplish. There is a need for quick results and maximum flexibility has been a deliberate policy. The Office of Economic Opportunity must recognize that universities have all their staff and resources fully, indeed, over-committed. Additional emphasis to work with or related to the poor will require a redirection of existing staff or adding new staff and both will take time. Since universities employ faculty with the expectation of continued employment, continuity of programs becomes a major concern. The universities recognize that continuation depends upon appropriations and that programs need to be modified and even stopped. They do find a change in signals for no apparent reason other than someone's whim very disturbing.

The Office of Economic Opportunity would improve relations with universities immensely if it would stop several of its current practices. The first is contracting for a clear university function, such as training Head Start teachers, with a profit-making firm, which in turn tries to sub-contract with the universities at a cut-rate price or employs university faculty on a "moonlighting" basis. The latter badly hurts the university and prevents it from developing continuing capability. The second is contracting with a profit-making firm to provide consultants. Again, the firm gets most of its consultants from the universities on a "moonlighting" basis. Such contracts with the universities would enable them to build continuing capability, whereas the present method destroys it. The third is what amounts to interfering with internal university affairs by seeking to approve personnel, compensation, and even curricula and methodology. The fourth is duplicating services of Cooperative Extension. If community action programs in agriculture and home economics are developed, Cooperative Extension should at least have the opportunity to serve as a delegate agency.

Every university is faced with bulging enrollment and rapidly rising costs. Each has certain traditional commitments which cannot and should not be abandoned. As indicated in previous sections, the University Extension Services have committed more resources to working with the poor and will commit more in time. If the universities are to fill their potential role, however, there must be new resources from the federal level. It will probably result in additional university or local funds being devoted to the effort. It makes no difference to the universities whether the funds come by allocation from the Office of Economic Opportunity or by direct appropriation to the universities through the framework of Cooperative Extension, Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965, or by an ammendment to the Economic Opportunity Act. Regardless of the source, the university programs should be coordinated with other Office of Economic Opportunity programs and the State Technical Assistance staff. This is consistent with the basic concept of a coordinated but multi-pronged attack on poverty.

While a number of universities should be involved, the funds available should not be spread so thinly that no one can accomplish anything. A number of types of university activities have been

suggested. Perhaps the number of universities to be involved can be enlarged, and there is merit in having a number involved, to divide the functions or activities among universities. Any university which does receive funds should show a commitment to the work and the willingness and capability to conduct the specific programs in question.

Some specific recommendations for each of the major program areas are offered in the following paragraphs.

A. PUBLIC AFFAIRS EDUCATION

A program such as that described in Section VI-A should be national in scope. The difficult job is assembling and preparing material for presentation in the form of publications, films, and radio and television tapes. It is suggested that either the Federal Extension Service or the National University Extension Association coordinate the effort nationally and that they select not more than one university in a coordinated manner to develop the format and program material. The universities would maintain liaison with the regional offices. In addition there should be at least one, and in larger states several, staff members assigned to one university in each state with a history and commitment to public affiars work. These persons would be responsible for dissemination of the information developed by the universities and would coordinate the program with university faculty, with the State Technical Assistance staff, and local community action agencies. A format similar to that described exists with the Agricultural Policy Institutes which were started with a Kellogg Foundation grant at Iowa State University and North Carolina State University. While primary areas of concern should be stated by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the universities must be free to maintain their integrity, including criticizing the Office of Economic Opportunity. A comprehensive program can be mounted for $5 million.

B. TRAINING

Section VI-B outlines the training needs of the five classes of employees. The university can and should play a major role in training the full-time professionals and the professionals who spend part-time in the war on poverty. While the universities can train the other types, it will be more efficient for the university to concentrate on indicating training needs, preparing training material and training the Office of Economic Opportunity and State Technical Assistance personnel to actually do most of the training of sub-professionals, board members, and volunteers.

The multi-purpose training centers which have been established in each Office of Economic Opportunity region provide a good framework for training the full-time professionals and preparing the professionals to train the sub-professionals, board members, and volunteers. These should be continued and strengthened. Since training must be a shared responsibility, with the employing agency

taking the lead, it is recommended that the Office of Economic Opportunity develop a long-range comprehensive training program for its employees, that this be made available to the training centers, and that there be understanding between the Office of Economic Opportunity and the centers on the respective responsibilities. The centers should make extensive use of advisory committees.

The VISTA personnel are a special category of full-time professionals. Universities have been used to train these people and it is recommended that this be continued with the Office of Economic Opportunity developing continuing programs with a sufficient number of universities to handle the job. If the Office of Economic Opportunity desires to work through a single contact, the National University Extension Association would be a good organization to coordinate university efforts.

The training of professionals working part-time on poverty programs poses a special problem because of the large number and the involvement of the Office of Economic Opportunity as well as the employing agency. The two large groups currently being trained are Head Start teachers and instructors in adult basic education. It is proposed that a sufficient number of universities be selected for such training and that a continuing training program be developed with them. This will enable the selected universities to develop real competence, to solve scheduling problems, and to do a better job. A pattern of this type seems to be emerging for training some of the personnel involved in the adult basic education program with the National University Extension Association serving as the national contracting agency. This pattern should be continued and expanded to other phases. The training provided by the universities should be part of a comprehensive training program of the employing agency which has cleared it with the Office of Economic Opportunity, if necessary. There should be a clear understanding of their respective roles by the university and employing agency.

The U. S. Department of Agriculture has accepted the responsibility to assist with the war on poverty in rural areas as part of its outreach function. It is suggested that U. S. Department of Agriculture field personnel, Cooperative Extension agents, and local community action directors participate together in training programs which would not only provide solid information for working with the poor but also develop working relations. Such a training program should be conducted with selected universities but the program should be built jointly by the participating agencies and universities. This effort could be coordinated by the Federal Extension Service.

C. DIRECT WORK WITH THE POOR

Section VI-C discusses the role that Cooperative Extension can fill with the poor. This includes work with low-income farmers, rural homemakers, and rural youth. These programs should help move many families out of the poverty class and help the others who have little hope of increasing income, to live better with what they do have.

Of the 2.4 million non-commercial farmers, 1.7 million have incomes below any reasonable poverty guideline. It is estimated that working with this group on the basis previously described within a period of five years will require an annual budget of $27 million. This includes the cost of agents, sub-professionals, and backup specialists at the university level. This would be a ratio of three sub-professionals and one-sixth backup specialist at the university for each field agent. This amounts to an expenditure of only about $80 per family reached annually, or about $16 for each low-income farm family.

There are 17.4 million rural low-income residents, representing 4.4 million families and 1.6 million unrelated individuals. To work with this group, within a period of five years, on the basis previously described in the home economics section, $36 million will be required.[24] This would cover the cost of 510 home economics agents, 5,100 sub-professionals, and 102 university specialists. This amounts to a cost of $35 per family reached, or a cost of $7 per rural low-income family.

There are over 4 million youth from low-income rural families between the ages of 9 and 19. With an appropriation of $25 million annually, a very significant percent could be reached and benefited. The cost per youth reached, using the model suggested in Section VI-C, amounts to $74.

The funds for direct work with the poor should be made available through the Federal Extension Service, with the source being a direct appropriation to the Federal Extension Service by Congress or an allocation to the Federal Extension Service by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The funds should be allocated to state Cooperative Extension Services on a project basis. While the obvious measures of need, effectiveness, and local commitment should be part of the list of criteria used in allocation of funds, it should be a requirement that these projects be coordinated with other local and state poverty programs. As an example, if some local community action agency is stressing manpower projects, the extension projects should dovetail with these efforts. Also the agricultural, home economics, and youth projects should be mutually reinforcing. These projects should also make maximum use of indigenous poor as sub-professionals. It is further suggested that the normal Office of Economic Opportunity matching requirements for community action programs be required.

D. MODIFYING COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS AND INSTITUTIONS

The work to be done is described in Section VI-D. It is recognized that local community action agencies are doing a great deal of community organization work. Much of this is directed to giving the poor a voice and visability. The work of university extension will be directed to the entire community and will attempt to bring about a change in community attitudes and the social and economic

[24] Every two unrelated individuals were considered the equivalent of one family in computing budget figures.

environment. It is complementary to the work of Office of Economic Opportunity agencies and organizations, but must be coordinated with their efforts and the work of the State Technical Assistance staff.

It is estimated that for $12 million annually, a comprehensive job as described can be done. These funds can be appropriated to Cooperative Extension or the Office of Education through Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 or allocated to the National University Extension Association by the Office of Economic Opportunity. Since the program involves field agents or staff as well as university-based backup specialists, the funds should go to a single university in each state or to a consortium of universities in a state which presents a coordinated plan. Before allocations are made to a university or universities in a state, plans for coordinating efforts with local community action agencies, the State Technical Assistance staff and the Technical Action Panels should be developed.

The Office of Economic Opportunity apparently has need for consultants in many parts of its operation. Many consultants come from universities although they are currently being scheduled through a profit-making corporation. If such consultative services will be needed in the future, it is recommended that the Office of Economic Opportunity contract with selected universities, perhaps one per region, to do the selection and scheduling. The contracting universities can develop arrangements with other universities in the region. This will enable the universities to provide the consultants and at the same time strengthen their capability to assist in the war on poverty.