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NEW AREAS OF LAND-GRANT EXTENSION EDUCATION
NEW AREAS OF LAND-GRANT EXTENSION
A report and interpretation by Extension administrators and specialists from:

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

with The Center for Agricultural and Economic Adjustment, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, and Education Research Associates, Boulder, Colorado
The land-grant system is 100 years old. It was started in 1862 with the Morrill Act, by which Congress laid the basis for federal support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts. Some 25 years later, another federal law provided for an agricultural experiment station at each of these colleges. Staff members at these stations contributed greatly to the development of scientific agricultural knowledge, but it was difficult to disseminate their findings to farmers. Thus, in 1914 Congress established the Cooperative Extension Service, whose function it was to translate technical knowledge into a form readily usable by the farmer so to serve a growing nation.

The high aspirations of the new nation could be realized, as the Founding Fathers knew, only if democracy rested on a literate population. Free primary education was eventually made available to everyone, and in the land-grant colleges the opportunity for education beyond high school was opened to the country's youth. The colleges, moreover, sent their "extensions" into the broad society, serving and educating the people of their state. With its threefold responsibility for resident teaching, research, and extension education, the land-grant system has become an efficient and flexible instrument, attuned to both national purpose and specific local needs.

Today the system has attained maturity. Although the 68 land-grant colleges and universities comprise only 5 percent of all 4-year institutions of higher education, they account for over a fifth of the national total of students, nearly a third of the faculty and the budget, a third of the doctorates awarded in the social sciences, half of those in the biological sciences and engineering, and nearly all of those in agriculture. The extension services of the land-grant colleges and universities make up about three-quarters of all university extension activities. Over half of the organized and contract research done by America's institutions of higher education, including virtually all agricultural research, is carried out within the land-grant system.

Some of the tasks that the land-grant system undertook have been completed; others are carried on for each new generation in well-established routines. However, the system itself is dynamic. The efforts discussed in this report demonstrate its continuing vitality and adaptability: four major land-grant institutions have again sought out the educational needs of their communities and set about devising new means of filling them.
The United States is a society in revolution. Not, indeed, political revolution—politically it is probably the most stable nation in the world today—but economic, social and cultural revolution. Economic growth, great as it has been in the recent past, is barely keeping pace with population growth. The increase in population between 1950 and 1960 was three times that of any previous intercensal period. Each year an average of one person in five moves to a new residence. Many of these moves shift the persons affected to a new region, to a new type of occupation, to a new way of life. In its over-all effect, this incessant restless activity has brought to ever broadening sectors of the population material well-being and opportunities for cultural advance beyond the dreams of prior ages. In both underdeveloped countries and totalitarian states, the present American economy is the measure of people's hopes for the future.

Because of their very rapidity and unequal impact on people, such changes have given rise to social problems, sometimes of disturbing seriousness. The particular problems vary, of course, from one state to another. However, throughout the nation they have one element in common—the necessity and the difficulty of keeping the public informed and engaged in efforts to cope with the major issues.

This is an account of how the Cooperative Extension Services of four land-grant institutions—the University of Arkansas, Cornell University, Iowa State University, and Pennsylvania State University—undertook to educate the public of their states on some of the most important local problems. All four institutions have in common the traditions of the land-grant system; but the regions they serve differ greatly in economics, politics and cultural forms. All four states used the same method of reaching the public, with only minor adaptations to local circumstances. All achieved remarkable success. Thus in this venture these universities have not only served their states well but have added a new dimension to land-grant education, one that educators throughout the country may well find of interest.

The Cooperative Extension Service of Ohio State University participated in the joint planning for this effort. Because of particular state needs it established a timetable of activities which extended beyond those of the four other states. Thus Ohio did not participate in the preparation of this report. The public education phase of the Ohio operation, which is expected to involve 65,000 persons, began Oct. 1 and was to continue into early January, 1962. After studying initial results of the effort, Ohio concurs in the general ideas contained in this report.
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In each of the four states, a university team decided which broad public problems could most usefully be examined in a statewide educational effort. The general objectives were the same in all four: to choose local priority problems that citizens would deem significant and timely; to analyze in depth but in terms intelligent laymen could understand, the complex interrelation of social, economic and political factors; and to emphasize the opportunities for public or private action to deal with the problems. The intent was not to give answers but to lay a factual basis for a public debate, to stimulate the kind of education that leads to more effective action on matters of common concern, to focus attention, to furnish a meeting-place for a variety of competing points of view — in short, to facilitate democratic decision-making.

The specific problem areas chosen in each of the four states were the following:

**ARKANSAS:** There has been a rapid decline in the number of farms, and thus of jobs in agriculture; industry has not expanded fast enough to absorb the excess rural population. Family incomes have lagged behind the national average, and many communities in the state have stagnated or even suffered a decline in well-being. As a consequence, there has been such a great out-migration that the state's population has declined and the composition of the remaining population has changed.

**IOWA:** This is an agricultural state undergoing industrialization. Large population shifts are taking place within the state, and during the past decade the number of out-migrants exceeded the in-migrants by 230,000. To a greater degree than in the other states, an attempt was made in Iowa to place these local problems in their national and international context. How do citizens identify common goals, set priorities among them, go about achieving the aims they agree on?

**NEW YORK:** In contrast to the three other states, New York has had a net in-migration during the postwar period, reflecting a demand for labor greater than the local supply. The state's economy, as indicated by such indexes as average per capita income, is healthy; but a number of counties are undergoing difficult adjustments to the decline in agriculture, to shifts in population patterns, or to technical progress in industry. In New York the main emphasis was on the responsibility of local leaders in coping with such problems.

**PENNSYLVANIA:** In Pennsylvania the central issue, once again, was the economic push from the countryside and the low absorptive power of industry. There has been a decline in jobs on the farm. Mining activity also has fallen off. In steel and some other industries employment has declined in part because of
automation. Where would greater initiative, more investment, and more intelligent use of natural resources help the state in adjusting to these problems? How can the rate of economic growth be increased?

FACT SHEETS

In each state the university prepared four to six “fact sheets” on the problem areas identified. Each “fact sheet” was 8 to 12 pages in length and printed in an attractive and easily read format. The purpose of the fact sheets was to point out possible alternative policies and give the reader the data necessary to make intelligent decisions. It was not the intent, however, to provide answers to policy questions. Each series was given a descriptive title, useful in publicity and in integrating the fact sheets into a consistent whole.

The contents of the fact sheets, briefly summarized, were as follows:

Arkansas Future

“Arkansas Today”—Past trends in population, jobs, and income, both for the whole state and for separate regions and the relation of these to the farm problem. Basic causes and principal effects of the farm problem.

“A Changing Arkansas”—Projected changes in agriculture, population, occupations, incomes, family living, community services. Emphasis on agriculture as the determinant of other factors.

“A Developing Arkansas”—Industrial and community development programs under way, whether based on private industry, volunteer efforts, or state or federal aid to economic growth. Projected benefits and limitations of these programs.

“Arkansas Future”—The role of education and leadership in future economic growth. What goals are both realistic and desirable in industry, agriculture and education? What public policies, private initiatives and costs are implicit in each goal?

Iowa Future

“What Do Freedom and Democracy Demand?”—The meaning of democracy, the dynamics of the democratic political process, and the chief threats—internal and external—to the democratic way of life. The relation between individual goals of free men and national goals of a democratic society.

“What Does Growth Require?”—Economic growth in relation to national and individual needs. The stimulants of growth, including public and private effort, individual and family economic decisions.

“What Prospects for Agriculture and Main Street?”—Changes under way in agriculture and in communities heavily dependent on agriculture. The relation between national and individual goals for agriculture. Alternative national farm policies and the costs and consequences that each entails.
“What Prospects for Families and Communities?”—The implications for individuals, families and communities in Iowa of the trends and policies discussed earlier in the series. Industrial development, its prospects and limitations. Education as an aid in economic and social development and in providing satisfactory family and community life.

New York’s Operation Advance

“Leadership and the Democratic Dialogue”—The global context within which Americans must consider their special problems and obligations. Introduction to the five areas to be considered in the series.

“What’s Ahead for Our Schools?”—The aims of public education in a democratic society, especially the aim of excellence, in relation to the changing requirements of the national economy. Growing student populations, increasing costs, state and federal aid programs. The role of community leaders in satisfying the dual need for quantity and quality in education.

“Roads for the Future”—The growth of public expenditure for roads to approximately 20 percent of the gross national product. Roads as part of community design. How to achieve efficient public transport at a reasonable cost.

“Outlook for Local Government”—The problems of local governments, including welfare and other services, aggravated by growing populations, rising expectations and increasing costs. Responsibility for most community services and their cost shared among local, state and federal agencies. Costs and taxes projected for various types of communities.

“Paying for the Future”—The principles behind various types of taxes and their relation to economic growth. Current and projected national, state and local taxes.

“Looking Ahead”—With the growing complexity of problems to be solved, experts have taken over many public responsibilities; effects on the democratic political process. A growing need for competent leaders, informed and responsible citizens, and competent public servants to deal with growth and development.

Pennsylvania Growth

“Why Do We Have to Grow?”—Population, employment and income trends in the state. The relation of the state’s basic industries with community well-being.

“What Must We Know—to Grow?”—Shifts in employment patterns, especially the accelerating demand for better education and higher skills. Implications for educational policy, vocational training and job guidance.

“What Do We Have—to Grow?”—Pennsylvania’s natural resources and their relation to the state’s potential economic growth.

“How Do We Go—to Grow?”—Community resources and techniques for stimulating economic development.
Education to assist adults in making public decisions is most useful when it is related directly to the process of political democracy. Education cannot substitute for this process, but it can contribute to it. Many other forces—political parties, elected leaders, interest groups, idealism, self-interest, whatever—form the background of political decisions. Education can be one more factor. When the level of information and judgment is raised, usually a larger proportion of the electorate and of local leaders will agree on how to define the key issues and possibly even on the direction and limits of political action.

How many persons should one try to reach with an educational effort of this type? Merely to provide an “interesting educational experience” for a small portion of the voters can have little effect on the quality of the democratic dialogue between elector and elected. So long as a minimum quality can be maintained, one answer to this question, then, is to seek the widest possible dissemination among responsible adults. This was done in Arkansas and Iowa. On the other hand, if participation is restricted to a particular sector of the electorate because of its common background or problems, certain fundamentals can be taken for granted, and a more pointed emphasis is possible. Thus, in Pennsylvania, the major emphasis was on rural areas, with the large cities more or less passed over. In New York, in an even more restricted operation, a deliberate effort was made to enlist only persons who had experience of some kind in leading civic affairs.

However the potential public was defined, the key to the distribution system was discussion groups of 6 to 12 persons. These are less effective than formal classes for many educational ends, but they are an all but ideal instrument for the purposes these four institutions had in mind. A few interested individuals, possibly only one, who call together a group of friends, neighbors or associates, constitute the nucleus of each such group, which from its inception is self-administering. To reach a very large public, thus, it is necessary to locate only about one-tenth as many interested individuals, who in turn will create their own discussion groups. Ten interested persons in one city or county—a modest enough figure—can organize 10 groups with a total participation of 60 to 120 persons. If there are 50 county Extension offices in a state, each need locate only 50 interested persons to have 25,000 persons or so discussing critical public issues. (In New York the method was the same in principle, but the audience was limited to community leaders.)

Small, informal group meetings stimulate the exchange of opinions. People’s discussions of national and local problems and their role as citizens on priority issues form part of the bedrock of democracy. The exchange, moreover, is disciplined by the data in the fact sheets and given direction by the suggested
policy alternatives. Since the same fact sheets are used simultaneously over a wide area, they provide an instrument for coordinating an educational effort over either a whole state or a portion of it.

At the end of each series the participants filled in an opinion record. More than a quarter were motivated enough by the experience to return the forms for statewide tabulation. Some of the statistics are given in the table below. Even with the deliberate restriction of the activities to particular sectors of the population in New York and Pennsylvania, a total of more than 145,000 persons participated. In Arkansas about 6 percent of the total adult population participated, or about 14 percent of the number that voted in the 1960 election; in Iowa the comparable figures were 4 and 5 percent. As indicated in the table, the breakdowns by sex and occupation (as well as age, though these figures are not shown) indicate a wide representation from the whole population. In Iowa 60,000 persons participated, representing every one of the state's 100 counties. In one Arkansas county 2,000 took part. The average county in New York involved more than 200 community leaders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants:</th>
<th>Arkansas</th>
<th>Iowa</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>58,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>8,500*</td>
<td>20,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of adult population</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of voting population</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants who completed opinion records:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent of all participants</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent male</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White collar &amp; blue collar</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students or retired</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Community leaders only  
*b Rural residents primarily  
*c For Iowa, adult summary only  
* Not pertinent
THE ROLE OF EXTENSION

Despite years of work in Extension, many of those involved in these state-wide efforts had not fully appreciated the educational potential of having an Extension office in every county of every state, each with professional and secretarial staff, mimeograph machines and telephones, personal contacts with newspaper, radio and television personnel, each a function of the land-grant university. It was the existence of this efficient organization that made it possible to involve so many persons with (compared with similar programs) so little effort to engage their attention. In Arkansas, for example, both newspapers in the state capital, the Arkansas Gazette and the Arkansas Democrat, as well as radio and television stations helped promote “Arkansas Future.” Moreover, it was given full support throughout the state by major business, farm, civic, service and church groups. In Iowa, according to a poll taken by The Des Moines Register, the largest newspaper in the state, one out of every five adults who heard of the series became a participant. In New York the 8,500 participants were drawn from the most influential groups of the state’s population—state legislators, mayors, county officials, school superintendents, county Farm Bureau presidents, trade union officials, business leaders, doctors, lawyers, judges, PTA presidents, heads of the League of Women Voters, and other civic leaders.

Success of such dimensions was possible only with a coordinated statewide plan. In each case the State Extension Service produced not only the fact sheets but also organizing guides, promotion brochures, and various other materials to assist county Extension workers. The activities were given coordinated statewide promotion by the press, radio and television stations, and key state organizations and individuals. County Extension offices served as the operational base in each county. District supervisors worked individually with each county staff to define and plan the optimum approach for that county. The administrators responsible made it clear that in their view this effort had high priority, though, as is usual in the Extension operations, the county offices enjoyed very wide latitude in working it out.

This relation between state and county was important. The support at the state level went well beyond supplying the educational materials and operating tools needed by the counties. The aim was to establish a statewide climate of opinion that both encouraged county leaders and organization officials to act and permitted them to do so. Key individuals and leaders of major statewide organizations then not only accepted this approach but were willing to advise local organization officers that it was worthwhile. The development of such state support created a framework within which the county Extension offices could work effectively.
No less important, however, the county Extension staff retained its traditional operational flexibility. Historically Cooperative Extension developed as statewide networks of essentially local and largely independent county bases. In recent years these have been brought closer together by many common problems—district, state and national—that citizens face. However, the county office remains largely independent, with a genuine option to participate or not participate in a statewide effort, and once involved, is free to respond with anything from a gesture to an all-out effort. In this instance, all of the counties of Iowa, Arkansas and Pennsylvania exerted some effort. In New York only Manhattan and a few suburban areas with complex problems of their own chose not to become involved.

Whatever the level of the organizing effort, the central aim of the county staff was the same: find persons willing to set up a group. Efforts to locate them were made through the mass media and public meetings; churches; service, civic, professional and commodity groups; specially organized steering committees; schools, libraries, local colleges and similar agencies; and direct contacts. Some staffs had a single county-wide organizing plan; others developed separate tactics for farm areas, towns and larger cities.

EVALUATION

Less than a year elapsed from planning to completing the individual statewide efforts. And understandably, statistics showing extensive participation in the operations gave genuine satisfaction. How much, really, was accomplished? It is difficult to answer this question adequately, but a true evaluation must include our sense of new insights as well as the numerical data on participants and their reactions.

Our feeling about what happened can be summed up in two words: It worked. The reasons for the success of our efforts, we believe, can be grouped into several categories, each of which is worth discussing.

Priority Problems

The problems chosen for discussion were real and pressing. They were also personal in the sense that each individual could relate himself to the problem and respond to it—as an individual, as a member of a family, as a member of his community.

Educational Materials

We thought originally that fact sheets could be used in self-administered groups as an efficient substitute for trained discussion leaders or experts, of whom there are too few to staff a broadscale effort. We now believe that fact sheets have positive qualities of their own. They permit a broad, disciplined, efficient extension
of scarce scholarly resources. The interdisciplinary involvement of several scholars provides a balance in the presentation of facts, ideas and issues. The average expert likely to be personally involved in an effort at mass education can hardly match such a team.

Also, the very presence of an expert can convert any group into an audience; participants see their role mainly as passive, absorbing a portion of what they are told. The average expert is seldom able to break through this barrier of strangeness and induce his listeners to participate more actively. Moreover, on many of the subjects discussed in these groups, such as the relation of the individual to the state in a free society, the truth to be sought is philosophical rather than empirical; on such matters there are no true experts. An uninhibited exchange in a neighbor's living room may be able to develop a greater awareness of ethical alternatives than a good lecture.

On the other hand, in such a program as this, fact sheets are of crucial importance, because they are the only thing that disciplines the discussions and integrates them into a statewide debate. They must be designed specifically for self-administering groups, with questions to focus discussion. They must have local relevance to give the reader both a sense of the whole and an opportunity to act on specifics, with the alternatives and probable consequences clearly stated.

The appearance of the materials is important. Typography and layout make visible the logical sequence of ideas and questions. "Here are some complex and difficult issues," the format suggests, "but you will have to answer the questions for yourself." People appreciate the factual guidance, the intellectual discipline. They also appreciate that no one tells them what to think.

**Mobilizing Resources**

This was a total Extension effort. State and county Extension workers functioned as a coordinated unit, with substantial agreement between the state and county Extension staff and substantial support from the whole university.

To achieve these results required strong state Extension leadership. The agents know that many so-called local problems are typically the product of broad social changes, and therefore that Extension work, if it is to be responsible and keep public support, cannot be provincial. The state Extension staff can help in identifying problems county people face and in providing an education toward a meaningful local response. The county Extension staff ordinarily respond to a firm general commitment, particularly when this is combined with a clear statement of priorities—the attempt to complete some tasks and postpone others.

With a tangible goal based on valid ideas, a surprising degree of scholarly support can be mobilized. In the programs conducted by the four states, scholars with limited prior association with Extension were pleased to contribute to an objective they deemed important. Fuller use of the university's resources was
possible when it was clearly known what was wanted. Requests could thus be quite specific.

All four states also sought assistance off the campus, in the expectation that outside consultants could provide the necessary organizational skill and expertise. But outside consultants offer other benefits. They can clarify the staff requirements in subject matter and method. Cooperation with an outside consultant often results in tighter scheduling of activities to get the operation under way. An outsider, just because he is outside, is not hampered by personal commitments, institutional ties, and other similar barriers to viewing the work to be done.

Public Response

The four states' educational effort was more readily accepted by important groups and organizations, by the mass media, and by the individuals who set up or joined discussion groups, than initially by Extension itself. The massive public response far exceeded expectations. There was an underlying reason. Farmers, businessmen, clerks, workers, professionals and housewives—in short, men and women—find the times characterized by confusion and anxiety. They want to understand. With fact sheets to discipline them, participants in the discussion groups were able to help each other achieve some intellectual grasp of important public issues, and thus establish a foundation for democratic action.

The average self-administered group is vigorous, for it brings people together as equals. Self-organized groups ordinarily have both sufficient diversity to produce a stimulating discussion and enough social homogeneity to encourage informal self-discipline. Even though the group functions on its own, participants tend to identify with the university and the county Extension Service, which thus acquire an expanded support and participation in the state.

Opinion records at the end of each fact sheet were designed as a part of the educational experience. They helped each participant think his own ideas through to a personal conclusion. The prime aim of the discussion, it was emphasized, was to improve the quality of individual judgment and not to reach a consensus. The differences registered were thus a replica in miniature of the larger democratic process, and part of what was learned was that differences are legitimate.

**Implications**

The success of these ventures, we believe, imposes a responsibility on our institutions to follow through. The public expects us to do more, and this expectation makes us aware that we are moving into a larger educational sphere. The results we have achieved have tentative but nonetheless important implications for our institutions.
ENLARGING EDUCATIONAL DEMANDS

In recent years our universities have greatly increased the range of their services to society. But within the scope of the growing and maturing land-grant functions the traditional responsibility to agriculture and rural people has remained a vital concern.

Agriculture and rural America are at the root of social and technological revolutions transforming the nation. What once had been the sector of the economy managed by those with the least education has been transformed into the one with “the greatest rate of progress, measured either in terms of social adjustment or of social efficiency.”1 This change has been achieved in part by the help of our land-grant institutions. These institutions today retain a large role in helping the farmer and his family improve their productivity, their competitive position and their welfare. To achieve this our responsibility includes but reaches beyond changed practices on individual farms. Education and service for the countryside must attack vexing problems stemming from technological, economic, social and political changes. In today’s world, a static approach is self-defeating.

What should our stance be toward those moving out of agriculture, typically with insufficient vocational training for other kinds of jobs, especially when these jobs require greater training and skill? What is our responsibility for that large portion of rural youth whose future lies in an urban setting? Is it possible both to help farm communities preserve the good features of rural life and help farmers adjust to the shocks of rapid change? Where the city meets the country, can the problems generated be solved jointly? Is it not important, thus, that city people understand the farm problem? Do secondary education, economic growth, health services for the aged and similar problems demand a broader tax base than the individual community or county can provide? If so, what change in the organization of governmental units is called for?

If Extension is to meet the demands that these questions imply, a fundamental broadening of our orientation is needed. Whether farmers’ sons stay on the farm or leave, their life today is significantly influenced by public policies emerging from the state capital, from Washington and from the community. Increasingly, the unit of change has become the whole society rather than a section of it and the method of change political democracy. New questions are posed for land-grant educators: Whom shall we educate? In what way? Toward what end?

1 Dr. Ayres Brinser, Director, Agricultural Education Program, New England Board of Higher Education.
If the individual farm family cannot cope with certain major problems facing rural America, if solutions for these depend on decisions made by a society that has become increasingly urban, then the whole of the American public ought to understand these problems. Whether a person is to adjust to change directly or, as a citizen, by influencing public policy, his prime requirement is the same—to be informed. He must be able to place his personal problems and aims in a larger context, to find the route to that policy where self-interest and interest of the community overlap. The importance of individual decision makes participation in a democracy a “hard, complicated business. It requires people—as individuals—to know what they want, to understand the issues and the alternatives, to have a reasonable idea of what is possible, to be willing to make choices, to act according to their convictions and accept workable compromises.”

Democratic society also requires leaders. “Leadership is not a substitute for citizen action; rather, it provides the focus, program or agenda on which citizens can respond with wisdom . . . The people demand that they be consulted and they are always ready to exercise their power to protest or reject; but they expect their leaders to formulate issues and program policies.”

In short, if we are to continue to serve rural people adequately, we have to educate an audience far broader than the one Extension has traditionally taught. And if we are to educate on public issues involving the whole society, we have to learn how to engage audiences representative of every sector. Developing the fact sheets, we now believe, was a step toward this larger goal, for in working through this task we had to pose new questions. For instance what social issues, what background information, placed in what context, make this a valuable educational instrument for the people of a state?

The large number of citizens who participated, the strong support state and local agencies gave the program, the success of our institutions in developing a discussion series on complex controversial problems—these are some indices that the program was appropriate to both the universities’ capabilities and the educational needs in our states. The direction was consonant with present and coming needs of people and communities. The operation proved manageable. The timing was right; the efforts had the strength of an idea that has come of age.

---

Our plans for the future are less definite, of course, than the operations already completed. The statewide efforts discussed in this report will be our base; the relation between the land-grant institution and the state's social growth and economic development will be our guide to further progress.

**A LOOK AHEAD**

**ARKANSAS:** The "Arkansas Future" series, which delineated the major problems of development facing the state's citizens and communities, has been a guide to County Development Councils now operating in 28 of Arkansas' 75 counties and being organized in other counties. Many of the citizens now serving on these councils participated in the discussion of "Arkansas Future"; thus there is a direct connection between this educational experience and their subsequent efforts to cope with the problems of their community. The "Arkansas Future" series is also being used for the in-service training of Extension personnel. The logical framework provided by the series has become a point of departure for work in depth with leadership. In the over-all educational design now being built to help Arkansas public and leaders deal constructively with social growth and economic development, self-administering techniques will play a strong role.

**IOWA:** "Iowa Future" was the third step in statewide efforts by Iowa State University to educate citizens on the state's major problems. "Challenge to Iowa" in 1958 dealt with agricultural adjustment. District "Conference-Workshops" in 1959 acquainted 1,500 selected leaders with needs and avenues for action on economic growth. The public is becoming increasingly aware that the University is willing and competent to help in the social growth-economic development area. Thus new demands are being made for research, program leadership and suitable educational instruments. Such tasks must be fashioned to suit local conditions. For instance, the rapid industrialization in the southeastern section of Iowa has led to an area development approach involving ISU's research, education and Extension capabilities. The target is effective area and local action. On a statewide basis the general discussion of "Iowa Future" will be converted into analyses by community leaders of the particular community problems of highest priority.

**NEW YORK:** The expectation that New York's "Operation Advance" would open up an enlarged area of land-grant activity has begun to be realized. The first stage, involving 8,500 leaders, constituted a general survey of problems amenable to control and direction through community leadership. The second stage, now under way in five test counties, will help community leaders move toward a clearer focus, measuring specific problems and identifying alternative patterns of action on three areas of community management—growth and development, education
and conducting the public business. Educationally, this will involve not only more fact sheets used in self-administered discussion groups, but also a "management workbook" to help participants apply expert survey and analysis methods to specific community matters, and county "seminar-workshops" in which university and other experts will be involved. The second stage, developed in the five test counties, will be extended statewide. Meanwhile the test counties will press the Operation Advance horizon yet another step.

PENNSYLVANIA: The tabulation of opinion records following the "Pennsylvania Growth" series, circulated in brochure form throughout the state, received considerable attention from the press. Also, a series of meetings between agricultural and other leaders helped place Pennsylvania's agricultural adjustment in clearer perspective. Rural development, county zoning and planning and other related efforts that had been in operation before the series were thus given a substantial lift, and county staffs are exerting pressure to "give us the tools" to get on with the job. The county Extension workers planning committee has requested another statewide self-administered discussion series for 1963. A number of county offices developed county fact sheets to help citizens, particularly those who had participated in the "Growth" series, in understanding specific local problems. The state staff is now identifying the educational and service tools it must provide.

Our four institutions, thus, have taken the first steps to meet this new educational responsibility. Our educational needs have increased in complexity and scope, but our basic purpose has remained unchanged. Land-grant tradition demands that Cooperative Extension be useful at the highest level of public need; thus we cannot deny responsibility for this new challenging educational dimension. Now we must improve our ability to bring into integrated play the full range of resources available to "Democracy's colleges"—resident instruction, research and statewide Cooperative Extension. As we view them, our initial steps are part of a larger continuing effort, attuned to both the concerns of our state and major national issues. The critical problems we face locally and nationally unify us and, we believe, invite the extension services and universities of which we are part to shoulder a new responsibility rooted in the original purpose of our land-grant institutions.