

NASULGC National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges**M E M O R A N D U M**

TO: Lu Harper, Chair
Program and Organizational
Development Committees

FROM: Gail L. Imig, Chair
Extension Committee on
Organization and Policy

DATE: April 24, 1995

SUBJECT: PODC Subcommittee on Diversity

At the February 20-21, 1995 ECOP meeting you raised the question whether the PODC Subcommittee on Diversity should become an ECOP committee. I indicated at the time that this would be discussed by the ECOP Executive Committee. At a recent Executive Committee meeting it was decided that the Diversity Subcommittee should not become an ECOP committee. However, we encourage PODC to continue its significant attention to diversity, and assure that effective linkages to the National Center for Diversity Advisory Board are maintained. ECOP

would also appreciate it if PODC would recommend possible actions to address the diversity issues identified in the Strategic Framework report. We are asking the Program Leadership Committee to do the same.

Perhaps not all PODC members are aware of a special task force that completed an analysis of and recommendations for addressing some of the diversity issues raised by your Committee. You will note this task force was commissioned by Myron Johnsrud when he was Extension Service administrator and was co-chaired by Leodrey Williams and Zerle Carpenter. ECOP and the federal partner have taken action on the report recommendations. For example, the recommendation to modify the Farm Bill to enable the 1890 institutions to participate in the Extension Service 3d federal funds. This recommended change is currently being worked on in the process of Congress writing the 1995 Farm Bill. The recommendation to establish a staff position to the Extension Service administrator was acted upon immediately by Myron Johnsrud; he appointed Leodrey Williams to that position. Leodrey was in that position until becoming acting administrator. Also enclosed is a copy of the Strategic Framework report.

Lu, my comments are not meant to convey that there are no diversity issues needing attention. That is not the case. However, I felt it was important that all of us have the same background on what has been done or is in progress. Thanks for your leadership and continuing attention to issues important to the success of our System.

Enclosure

cc: ECOP Members

FINAL REPORT

8/10/92

1890/1862 TASK FORCE

(The 1890/1862 task force composed of Leodrey Williams, Zerle Carpenter, Harold Benson, Dan Godfrey, Fred Harrison, Jr., Craig Oliver, Byron K. Webb, and John Woeste met in Atlanta, Georgia, on March 17-18, 1992.)

The 1890/1862 Task Force was “charged with the responsibility of providing a set of recommendations regarding program and budget issues related to 1890 institutions.” The Task Force discussed a number of issues/concerns of the Extension System. The Task Force strongly embraces the philosophy of “one Extension System” and “one Extension program in individual states.” It was within this philosophy that the Task Force formulated their report. Further, it was concluded that the current “System” is not in a state of disorder, but is in fact functioning in a manner to effectively serve the people. However, we believe there are opportunities to improve the “System” and to assure greater effectiveness in the future.

Following are items identified for actions and/or recommendations to the System:

1. The Task Force will develop a position paper (Strengthening The Partnership) targeted to the philosophy of the Extension System in supporting the complementary, but supportive missions of the 1890/1862 programs.
2. Orientation of Land-Grant University (1890/1862) Presidents/Chancellors.
3. Establishment of Special Assistant/Omnibudsman position in ES-USDA.
4. Budgeting and Funding.

STRENGTHENING THE PARTNERSHTP

The Cooperative Extension Service with its system of 74 Land-Grant colleges and universities which operate in the 50 states and territories is a unique achievement in American education. It is an agency for change and for problem solving, a catalyst for individual and group action with a history of providing extended education. Extension brings the rewards of higher education into the lives of all segments of our extraordinarily diverse population. At first, the Land-Grant universities established under the provisions of the first and second Morrill Acts in 1862 and 1890 provided an opportunity for children of the working man to secure a higher education. Then came the concept of Cooperative Extension which embodied the concept of taking the Land-Grant University to the people of the state.

The Smith-Lever Act of 1914 formally established the Cooperative Extension System. This legislation was in some respects only an affirmation to what was already being done. Farmers institutes were first proposed by Oddment Hitchcock at a meeting of the Massachusetts State Board of Agriculture in 1852. Shortly after these efforts began, the Board of Regents directed the Kansas Agricultural College to set up a series of lectures to

help farmers learn correct agricultural practices. Tuskegee and Hampton Institutes were also teaching neighboring farmers outside of the classroom shortly after the establishment of the second Morrill Act in 1890. Booker T. Washington had implemented the critical components of Extension work, and convened the first annual farmers' conference in 1892.

The Smith-Lever Act established the Cooperative Extension System as a joint effort of the U. S. Department of Agriculture and Land-Grant institutions in the states. It also provided for county-level participation. Additionally, the act designated that the 1890 schools should work in cooperation with the other Land-Grant institutions to extend the benefits of the Cooperative Extension System to the black population of their respective states. This arrangement lasted 50 years, until it was found unconstitutional in the mid 1960's. Beginning in 1972 funds were made available in 1890 Land-Grant institutions under the 3d provision of the Smith-Lever Act. However, because of the provisions of Section I of the Act these 3d funds, even though earmarked for 1890 institutions, had to be administered through the 1862 schools.

Extension programs at 1890 schools currently function within guidelines established by the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977. Section 1444 of this act was considered to be the 1890 counterpart to the Smith-Lever Act. It originally provided that an amount equivalent to no less than 4 percent of the Smith-Lever Act appropriation would be appropriated under Section 1444 for the 1890 schools. Subsequent legislation enacted in the 1981 Farm Bill increased the percentage to not less than 6 percent and relates to all funds appropriated for Extension rather than restricting funds to only 3b and 3c of the Smith-Lever Act.

Even prior to the passage of the 1977 Farm Bill, Congress saw fit to appropriate monies for specialized programs carried out by the 1890's but still under the auspices of the 1862 colleges and universities. For example, efforts focused on small farms enabled these schools to start what continue to be rather significant educational programs geared to the sustainability and survivability of small farms. There were also special programs funded in the area of youth as well as land ownership particularly for minority farmers.

As we enter a new era in Extension, the 1862 and 1890 counterparts work closely together to achieve a common mission. Each focuses on important initiatives and emerging issues that are important to the Extension System and the clientele being served.

A memorandum of understanding between 1890 and 1862 counterparts exists in each state to frame the standards for cooperation. But, the magnitude of synergism between the institutional relationship exceeds the written document. This is embodied in a common philosophy of educational service to the people which is reflected in the actions of faculty and staff as they work together. This relationship extends from common management in co-located offices to mutually sponsored programs utilizing knowledge and skills from each organizational entity.

There are many examples of in-state collaborative efforts from the 16 states with both 1890 and 1862 institutions that have resulted in very successful models of information delivery and the enhanced transfer of knowledge to major segments of both rural as well as urban society. The concern of developing effective management systems and initiative programming transcends the individual organization. It is the cooperative spirit and educational needs of the clientele that motivate the actions of the administration and faculty of the respective 1862 and 1890 counterparts. A relationship born with separatism and skepticism has now emerged

into a partnership of interdependence that is serving the people of the states through a new and formative relationship wherein 1862 and 1890 institutions exist.

Even though a variety of administrative structural models exists throughout the 16 states, each represents a sense and spirit of collaboration and functions to the betterment of Extension educational delivery from a state and national Extension System perspective. There still remains a major challenge for Extension to be more widely understood within the framework of the total university community. To create this understanding a formalized process and continued effort are necessary. Notably, the Land-Grant model remains an excellent one for extending the university to a diverse clientele. To exploit and optimize this potential requires careful nurturing and an understanding by the highest administrative levels within the university setting.

New approaches to strengthen the partnership between 1890 and 1862 institutions are needed in the 90's. These approaches should maximize programmatic opportunities and enhance relationships in the future. This may take the form of expanding joint management and program delivery functions that already exist in most states. In addition, significant effort is needed in joint strategic planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs in a contemporary society. These changes will offer opportunities for future funding and will influence a new spirit of cooperation and cost effectiveness for the people being served. The recommendations listed are designed to meet the contemporary needs which Extension faces in the future.

ORIENTATION OF LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY (1890/1862) PRESIDENTS/CHANCELLORS

I. Background

Each Land-Grant University has ongoing cooperative program relationships with USDA. The Cooperative Extension program and the Cooperative Research program function with formal agreements. Special agreements provide the framework for collaborative research programs including Agricultural Research Service (ARS) and Economic Research Service (ERS). Units of USDA fund domestic and international research, training, extension and resident instruction enhancement programs in Land-Grant Universities.

II. Strategy

1. The Secretary of Agriculture will host all newly appointed Land-Grant University presidents/chancellors in a two-day orientation session conducted on an annual basis.
2. The Assistant Secretary for Science and Education, USDA, will provide leadership for implementation of the Secretary's symposium.
3. The endorsement and involvement of the CEO of the National Association of State Colleges and Land-Grant Universities should be solicited.
4. Beyond the communications building activities and the overview of the U.S. Department of Agriculture mission and activities, special attention should be given to the standing memoranda and agreements between USDA and the Land-Grant institutions. The content of the documents, the legal framework, and the points of accountability should be clearly reviewed.

III. Anticipated Outcomes

Land-Grant University Presidents/Chancellors will:

1. Have an increased understanding of the nature and scope of programmatic relationships between USDA and their university.
2. Increase the profile of the Land-Grant University element of the university program with Land-Grant University presidents/chancellors.

The Secretary of Agriculture will:

1. Strengthen communications channel with the Land-Grant University presidents/chancellors.
2. Achieve and enhance the attention of universities to the Department of Agriculture (USDA) information, education, and manpower needs.

Mutually:

1. There will be a greater “shared vision” of expectations among the cooperating parties leading to fewer operational problems with agreements and memoranda.
2. A shared vision for program implementation arrangements and outcomes should lead to a more consistent and congruent policy framework for program managers within the Land-Grant Universities.

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL ASSISTANT

It is recommended that the Extension Service-USDA establish a position of responsibility to assist the department and the Land-Grant Extension System communicate and understand more fully functions pertaining to legislation, funding, program participation, policy, and cooperating entities within the National Extension System.

It is the intent that the person represent the 1890 program as a part of the total “System”. Hopefully, this person can interact with other committees within “the department”--be a special assistant directly responsible to the Administrator, ES-USDA.

BUDGETING AND FUNDING

- Background

Section I of the Smith-Lever Act provides that “in any State, Territory, or possession in which two or more such (land-grant) colleges have been or hereafter may be established, the appropriations hereinafter made to such State, Territory, or possession shall be administered by such college or colleges as the legislature of such State, Territory, or possession may direct”. In those States having both 1862 and 1890 land-grant institutions, the State legislatures, in each case, designated the 1862 institution to receive and administer all

Smith-Lever funds. The USDA Office of General Council has consistently ruled that USDA must abide by that legal arrangement.

The definition of all Smith-Lever funds includes formula funds under Section 3(b) and (c) and all earmarked funds under Section 3(d). EFNEP, Water Quality, IPM, Youth at Risk, PIA, Urban Gardening, Farm Safety, Farm Financial Management, and Food Safety are all appropriated under Section 3(d). The terms Smith-Lever funds or Smith-Lever appropriations refer to all 3(b) and (c) formula funds plus the 3(d) earmarked funds. Funds appropriated for Extension under authorizations other than the Smith-Lever Act include RREA and Dislocated Farmer Assistant Grants (Section 1440 of the Rural Crisis Recovery Act).

From the very beginning of the Extension program, there have been Black county agents and Extension specialists. In fact, some of the very first county agents employed in the south were Black. These Black agents and specialists were, prior to 1972, all employees of the 1862 institutions. Until 1965, however, almost all Black specialists in the south were located on the 1890 campuses even though they were on the payrolls of the 1862 institutions. In 1965, as a result of a Federal Executive Order, all previously segregated Extension offices had to be consolidated. This meant that the Black Extension specialists located on the 1890 campuses had to be withdrawn and located on the 1862 campuses. This, of course, immediately deprived the 1890 institutions of a large cadre of professional staff.

Within a few years, the 1890 institutions petitioned USDA to seek ways to restore the professional expertise to the 1890 campuses. A review of existing legislative authorities by the Office of General Counsel and others revealed that the only feasible way at that time to provide Extension funds to the 1890 institutions was through a special Smith-Lever 3(d) appropriation. However, because of the provisions of Section 1 of the Act referred to earlier, these 3(d) funds, even though earmarked for 1890 institutions, had to be administered through the 1862 schools.

Starting in FY 1972, funds were appropriated in this manner and made available to the 1890 institutions for Extension purposes. A similar situation existed with the cooperative research program administered by CSRS. However, a research authority outside the Hatch Act was found in order to fund the 1890 institutions directly for research. The arrangement under Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act provided welcome funding to the 1890 institutions but was obviously an awkward arrangement with the funds going first to the 1862 schools.

In a few years, the 1890 schools again requested the Department to explore ways to fund them direct for Extension programs. It was determined that the best solution to this situation was to develop provisions in the 1977 Farm Bill to authorize appropriations for the 1890 schools. Section 1444 of the 1977 Farm Bill was written for this purpose. A companion provision (Section 1445) was written to authorize 1890 funding for cooperative research.

Section 1444 was considered to be the 1890 counterpart to the Smith-Lever Act. It originally provided that an amount equivalent to no less than 4 percent of the Smith-Lever appropriation would be appropriated under Section 1444 for the 1890 schools. That percentage is now 6 percent and relates to all funds appropriated for Extension rather than being restricted only to the Smith-Lever appropriation. This change took place in the 1981 Farm Bill and resulted from a concern that EFNEP would be removed as a Smith Lever 3(d) item and funded under an authorization separate from Smith-Lever. Since the 1890

appropriation directly related to the total Smith-Lever appropriation, the withdrawal of EFNEP could have severely reduced funding for the 1890 institutions. Therefore, to preclude this possibility, their authorization was changed to include a percentage equivalent to all Extension appropriations and not just Smith-Lever appropriations.

Section 1444 provides that the funds made available to the 1890 institutions for Extension programs be distributed on the basis of a formula identical to the Smith-Lever 3(c) formula. Section 1444, of course, could have had a section similar to Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act which would allow for earmarking funds for specific projects but the 1890 institutions did not support that concept for the immediate future.

In developing budget requests, ES-USDA automatically adjusts the request for Section 1444 funding whenever an increase is requested in Smith-Lever or other funding authorizations. These adjustments take place regardless of whether the Smith-Lever increase is for 3(c) formula funds or for earmarked 3(d) programs. In other words, if ES requests an increase for Water Quality or Youth at Risk, the Section 1444 request for the 1890 institutions is automatically increased accordingly. Therefore, in effect, the 1890 institutions receive appropriation increases corresponding to any increases received by the 1862 schools including the 1862 increases for 3(d) items such as EFNEP, Water Quality, or Youth at Risk. These 1890 increases can, in fact, be used for programs similar to EFNEP, Water Quality, and Youth at Risk. In addition, in recent years, the budget increases for the 1890 institutions have contained requests for funding to support programs similar to some of the earmarked programs under Section 3(d). The 1890 institutions have requested funding for work in the areas of teenage drug abuse, low-income elderly, and school dropouts among others.

Based on this funding arrangement, it seems appropriate that if 1890 institutions can make a contribution in a particular program area, there is the opportunity to seek funding for that purpose under Section 1444. In addition, the 1862 and 1890 schools are required to jointly plan and coordinate their respective programs.

In addition to actual appropriations for Extension programs, there are many instances where pass-thru funds are received from other agencies such as Department of Defense and the Environmental Protection Agency. The 1890 institutions are fully eligible to participate in such cooperative efforts.

The above discussion for funding arrangements also applies in a similar manner to the District of Columbia (D.C.). The legislation establishing land-grant status in the District expressly prohibited D.C. from receiving Smith-Lever funds. However, just as in the case of the 1890 institutions, D.C. has its own line item appropriation and under that item, funds can be appropriated for D.C. to carry out the same scope of programs as can be funded for the 1862 schools under the Smith-Lever Act.

(The task force acknowledges with appreciation the assistance of ES-USDA staff in developing this background information.)

It should be noted that the ECOP/NASULGC budget request process has also adhered to the foregoing legislative and policy guidelines.

- Recommendations

Beginning with FY '96, the base budget for 1890 institutions will not be less than 6 percent of the Smith-Lever 3(b), (c) and (d) for Extension for 1862 institutions. All new funding for 3(d) initiatives beginning in FY '96 and thereafter will not increase the 1890 base. However, such funds will be awarded by formula or competitively to individual states. In both cases, only proposals signed by both the 1890 Administrator and the 1862 Director will be accepted from states with both institutions. This is not to imply that both institutions will be active participants in all projects, but is intended to assure collaborative efforts when appropriate. Funds for approved projects will be allocated directly to the appropriate institution. Prior to FY '96, 1862 institutions who submit proposals for 3(d) funding are encouraged to develop joint proposals, when appropriate, with their 1890 counterparts.

All other appropriate/needed increases in the base of 1862 and 1890 base budgets will be provided for through the current budget negotiation process or such other processes adopted by ES-USDA.

The above recommendations will require some language adjustment in the 1995 Farm Bill. It should also be mentioned that joint proposals may and should involve 1862 institutions from states not privileged to have an 1890 institution.

The above recommendation would apply after FY 1995 to any increases in existing Smith-Lever 3(d) programs and to all new Smith-Lever 3(d) programs.