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INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It has been a long time coming! This Workshop represented the first opportunity that Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and Sea Grant (SG) leaders and administrators have had to collectively discuss contemporary issues of marine extension programming. This Workshop has been the dream of numerous Sea Grant Extension program leaders who have wrestled with the issues of working within, between and sometimes outside of the two organizations.

Legislation enacted in 1966 established the Sea Grant College Program. Roughly two-thirds of Sea Grant Extension Programs are affiliated and/or operate through the CES of their respective coastal or Great Lake states. It has taken us nearly twenty years to finally conduct a workshop bringing the key leadership elements of SG and CES together to collectively address issues of more effective programming.

Participants in the Workshop agreed unanimously that the effort was meritorious and should be conducted on a regular basis. Most participants became more sensitive to, and aware of issues and answers for effecting a complete "Partners in Parallel" and were supportive of meeting periodically to share ideas, innovate programs and resolve issues and problems.

Thank You! — to each and every person who made this Workshop possible and/or contributed to it’s success. The work of the Planning Committee was essential to the development and implementation of the Workshop. Without their insight, resource investment and tenacity in planning the program it would never have happened. The speakers deserve a special pat on the back for taking the time to prepare their relevant and timely presentations thanks also to John Woeste, Dean for Florida CES, and Jim Cato, Director of Florida Sea Grant, for their guidance and support through the development, planning and implementation of the Workshop.

The first ECOP Marine Extension Program Workshop is history. The recommendations produced from this effort will have a positive impact on SG/CES relationships in the future. This Proceedings will provide reference to recall the importance of this historic meeting. I look forward to the next ECOP Marine Workshop.

Marion Clarke
Editor and Workshop Chairman
OBJECTIVES

1. To determine current levels of integration of Sea Grant (SG) Advisory Programs into Cooperative Extension Service (CES) Programs.

2. To develop recommendations to improve Cooperative Extension Service and Sea Grant administrative linkages, support, and operational efficiency.

3. To enhance the effectiveness of Cooperative Extension Service supported Sea Grant Extension Programs.
RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION GENERATION PROCESS

Michael W. Duttwiler, Facilitator
New York Sea Grant Extension Program

A facilitator was assigned the explicit task of assisting attendees in the itemization of issues relative to the integration of Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension programs and specific recommendations for addressing those issues.

The facilitator was present at all presentations and maintained a running list of issues and recommendations identified by the numerous speakers. These were reported immediately before lunch on Day 1 and distributed in hard copy that afternoon. An updated issue list was reported immediately before the evening break.

The facilitator synthesized the cumulative issues and recommendations lists into general areas of concern. These were reported at the start of Day 2 and provided in hard copy by midday. Afternoon discussion groups expanded upon the issues and recommendations lists and recommended that a working group refine the cumulative lists emphasizing specific action opportunities. About 20 attendees, including the facilitator, developed a first draft of the workshop recommendations.

On day 3, all in attendance reviewed and modified the draft recommendations with assistance from the facilitator resulting in the recommendations by issue area which are included with the workshop proceedings.
RECOMMENDATIONS

I. ISSUE AREA 1. FEDERAL AGENCY AWARENESS OF MARINE EXTENSION

A. Need for greater awareness of marine issues within the Departments of Commerce and Agriculture.

B. Need to increase recognition at USDA/FES that marine extension currently is an integral part of CES programming in many states.

C. Need for broad, common understanding of the empathy for our SG and CES missions as well as respecting that those missions may differ in some ways.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Enhance regular communication procedures between NSGCP and FES.
2. Discussions on marine extension programs and topics at regional meetings of extension directors and assistant and associate directors.
3. Formation of marine resource subcommittee or task force of ECOP to address recommendations herein and other relevant issues.
4. Participation by marine interests in appropriate national extension advisory boards.
5. That a subsequent joint CES/SG workshop be held within two years continuing the progress we have initiated.

II. ISSUE AREA 2. NATIONAL APPROACHES TO COLLABORATION

A. Need to have NSGCP and CES recognize that CES and MAS need not have a nationally uniform pattern of collaboration for successful cooperation to occur. Corollary: CES and SG need to realize that their goals are the same and that reasonable guidelines and policies can and should be developed for the consideration of local programs.

B. States and counties must maintain flexibility in scope of programs and clientele. Delivery of programs should be based on characteristics of the problem, not solely on existing organizational structures.

C. Need for integrated planning, reporting and evaluation procedures.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Establishment of a national statement of CES Marine Extension program direction that recognizes the various federal, state, and local participants in marine extension programs, by the appropriate ECOP committee.
2. Establish common marine extension planning, reporting and evaluation procedures.
3. That joint CES/Sea Grant programs consider commonality of program titles that recognize the partnership that both the constituents and sponsors can easily identify.

4. Ensure marine extension initiatives are included in FES NARS reports.

III. ISSUE AREA 3. ENHANCING STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAM COLLABORATION

A. Need for integrated planning, reporting and evaluation procedures.

B. Need for better documentation and communication of the importance of marine resources as a basis for allocation of program resources.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Include marine extension programs in CES long range plans specifying staffing and implementation strategies.

2. Include marine issues, when local and state program priorities are established.
SETTING THE STAGE

$10,000,000 and 200 PERSONS, COOPERATIVE EXTENSION MARINE AND GREAT LAKES PROGRAMS, 1985

Bruce Wilkins, Program Leader
New York Sea Grant Extension Program

In preparation for this first ECOP Marine Extension Workshop in March 1985, a questionnaire was sent to Cooperative Extension Directors in all states and territories. This is a report on the data received on management elements of those programs.

Twenty-two of 31 states and territories reporting identified Marine or Great Lakes Extension Programs; two of those reported one bi-state effort. Responses were received from all states we knew had current Marine or Great Lakes focused Cooperative Extension Programs.

Directors were asked to identify Marine and Great Lakes focused Cooperative Extension efforts including, but not restricted to, efforts having Sea Grant support. In this report the term "marine" often has a broad meaning inclusive of efforts emphasizing the Great Lakes. Individual interpretation of respondents influence the data detail (e.g., whether indirect costs were included on county contributions) but not major patterns. Data on staff were sought only for individuals spending 10 percent or more of their time on marine programs.

STAFF SIZE AND COMPOSITION

The 22 state Cooperative Extension Marine and Great Lakes efforts involve over 166 FTE's and 219 individuals. FTE's reported by individual states (and the joint Indiana/Illinois Program) ranged from 2 to 17. Nine programs reported less than 5 FTE involved, while six others each reported 5-10 FTE and over 10 FTE. Only in Alaska did marine staff represent more than 7 percent of a state's total Extension FTE's.

The significance of a Marine or Great Lakes effort is obviously influenced by a State's geography. Montana and Colorado reported no such efforts, but Cooperative Extension Marine Programs were also reported as absent in such states as Hawaii and Rhode Island.

Staff reported as having some marine involvement typically committed 50 percent or more of their professional time to this area.

There was variation in the field staff patterns representing the 68 regional FTE's and 28 county FTE's. Twelve states reported no county staff FTE's while four states reported no regional staff. Programs tended to emphasize county or regional positions in the field. Perhaps surprisingly, only 6 states reported having both county and regional marine positions at this time.

The 50 college-based FTE's was also composed primarily of staff with a majority of their time spent working in this area (42 of 64 individuals).
Four programs reported on FTE in Administration. Four of five programs with 13 or more marine program FTE's noted Administrative duties required 1 to 1.5 FTE.

This survey also sought to gain some indication of the significance of a state's coastal region. Coastal counties represented up to 71% of the counties in states reporting programs. As one might expect, those counties do hold a larger proportion of the states population. Twenty-one to 87 percent of the state's residents live in coastal counties, excepting two states where 11 percent or less of the population resided in such counties.

FISCAL SUPPORT

Over $10,000,000 supports these programs (Table 1). Budgets for marine efforts in individual states varied from $44,000 in one state to over $1,000,000 in three others.

The National Sea Grant College Program provided over half of the total, $5,358,000. Sea Grant supported some efforts in all but one state reporting they had a Marine Program. Individual states reported receiving between $20,000 and $606,000 in Federal Sea Grant dollars.

State Extension dollars are the next largest funding source for marine efforts, totaling $1,582,000. These funds support marine programs in all but three states reporting. Support in individual states ranged from $11,000 to $234,000. Eight states each reported over $100,000 of their State Extension dollars are committed to Marine or Great Lakes efforts.

There may have been differing interpretations of the proper classification of state funds earmarked for Marine Extension work. Some states apparently included state appropriated Sea Grant funds under this heading while at least five reported $1,024,000 of funds with similar constraints under the category "others". Those five programs received $24,000 to over $6000,000 of state Sea Grant support.

Table 1. Funding and Source of Funding for 21 Marine and Great Lakes Cooperative Extension Programs (1985)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number Reporting</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sea Grant</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$5,358,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Extension</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,582,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College funds</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>670,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counties</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>633,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,941,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$10,184,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College funds reportedly provide $670,000 of support to marine extension work in 9 states.

In over one-half the states (12) county appropriations of $633,000 supported marine and great Lakes Extension Programs. County contributions averaged over $50,000 in states where they existed, one state reported $200,000 of county funds supporting marine efforts.
Interestingly 15 programs reported 1,941,000 "other" dollars supporting these Cooperative Extension efforts. Here imagination takes hold, with $30,000 in private support in one case, $70,000 from bookstore sales in another and $115,000 in other federal support in a third Smith-Lever and Renewable Resources Extension Act monies were reported of significance to these efforts in few states.

ADMINISTRATIVE ELEMENTS

By now you likely expect wide variation in administration of these programs — you are right! Even the names we use differ widely. More than one dozen different names are used by this two-decade old activity. While most programs (13) include "Extension" in their title, 3 do not. Thirteen include "Sea Grant" in their title. A plurality (4) use the title "Sea Grant Extension Program", three others label their efforts "Marine Advisory Service". No other title was reported by more than two states. Titles used by 5 states credit neither Extension nor Sea Grant.

I do wonder where 4-H would be today if some states were still calling their Cooperative Extension youth efforts "corn clubs", others were calling them "5-T's" and ten other names were being used in other states.

In six states (over one-quarter of the programs) marine programs are identified as separate and major Cooperative Extension divisions akin to Agriculture or 4-H. In 5 of those, and in one other state, the Marine Program Leader reports directly to the Extension Director. In others, the Marine Program Leader reports through an Associate Director most commonly the one responsible for CRD (7 cases) or Agriculture and Natural Resources (4 cases).

Titles of individuals providing programmatic leadership to Marine and Great Lakes efforts vary from "Program Leader" (5), to "Coordinator" (5) and include "Assistant Director" and "Dean of" Marine Programs.

Written performance reviews of field staff are typically jointly prepared (11 cases), often by the program leader and an area or county supervisor. The latter initiates the process in 9 states. In some states the program leader makes no direct determination of the quality of staff performance.

As all but one of these programs have staff supported by non-traditional Cooperative Extension funding, accommodation to that uniqueness has sometimes been needed. Six programs report some differences exist in handling marine staff in comparison to other Extension staff. Involving a program leader in performance reviews was one such difference, permitting more out-of-county travel on non-state or county funds was another.

The six programs in which marine efforts were reported as having organizational status equivalent to Home Economics or CRD reported no difference in handling of marine staff.

SUMMARY

Twenty-two of this nation's State Cooperative Extension Programs report an identified Marine or Great Lakes component. There are over 186 FTE and 219 Cooperative Extension staff involved in these efforts. The work covers virtually all our marine coasts including the Great Lakes.
Annually well over $10,000,000 is contributed in support of these efforts. Over $6,000,000 of this is funding new to Cooperative Extension.

This growth has occurred in less than two decades; decades marked by increasingly stringent Federal and state budgets. It may be pleasing to all that this has occurred with the commitment of only two or three federal positions.
DIFFERENT STROKES FOR DIFFERENT FOLKS

James D. Murray, Director
Marine Advisory Services
UNC Sea Grant College Program

Of the 31 coastal states which have a Marine Advisory Service Program, it is safe to say that no two have identical administrative relationships in relating to the Cooperative Extension Service. By itself, this distinction is unimportant since the goal of Marine Advisory Services is to extend practical information to people who can apply it to solve practical problems. However, four patterns emerge in reference to MAS/CES administrative linkages, with each pattern containing advantages and disadvantages in relation to how effectively the MAS achieves its overall mission. It is important for administrators both in Sea Grant and CES to recognize and reinforce their administrative strengths and to recognize and minimize any adverse impacts of their administrative weaknesses. The purpose of this paper is to identify the commonalities between MAS and CES, to explore the differences in administrative ties, and to highlight the strengths and weaknesses of those ties. The key to an effective MAS program is to develop managerial talent which is flexible enough to make the necessary changes to overcome administrative constraints.

By their very nature, MAS and CES have many similar goals. It is popular for us in MAS to explain our program by saying that we work similarly to CES but have different clientele groups. In the coastal area I would argue that even this is overstated. For example, in North Carolina our consumer seafood specialist conducts dozens of programs through the homemaker groups organized by county home economists, our marine education specialist helped develop a marine program for the state 4-H camp, our recreation and tourism specialist has worked with CRD agents on community waterfront development projects and our fisheries agents have coordinated workshops on water management which affects both coastal farmers and fishermen.

As reported in Partners and Parallels, the shared goals of MAS and CES include:

1. To extend research-based objective information to people who can use it.
2. To identify problems that need research attention.
3. To increase people's awareness of marine resources.
4. To conduct educational programs to encourage more effective conservation and use of natural resources.
5. To develop linkages to make it easier to work on common problems and to serve common goals.

The CES is managed similarly in each state and given the similarity of program goals as reported above one would think Marine Advisory Services would be similarly managed by CES. For historic reasons, this is not the case. CES has been in existence since the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914. In most cases, CES grew up with the Land Grant colleges or universities where it is located. Through the years a similar management structure evolved in each state, because CES was an integral part (along with research and education) of the Land Grant College or University. Generally, assistant Directors for major programs (usually Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H, and
Community Resource Development) report to the Director of CES who in turn reports to a Dean or Vice President for Agriculture.

With the passage of the National Sea Grant College Act in 1966, the MAS entered the scene as a relative newcomer. In an attempt to fit MAS into on-going university systems, flexibility was given to the states to adapt to their local situation. As such, much variety developed around the country and today no two MAS programs are managed exactly alike. Certain administrative patterns have emerged and these will be discussed below. From a national perspective there are advantages and disadvantages to this diversity. The advantages include:

- A more quickly adapted MAS program at the state level. Because flexibility was allowed, individual states could adapt a MAS program to the strengths present in their state. This also removed any perceived threat of federal interference into the state university system.

- It allowed for experimentation with a variety of management structures for the MAS. Later developing MAS programs had several models from which to study and choose for their program. Even the older established programs still look around the system at site visits or during Sea Grant Week to obtain ideas on management from other programs.

Some of the disadvantages include:

- The diversity makes the program more difficult for others outside the organization to understand. This is most true for federal employees, lobbyists, congressional aides and even clientele groups who are exposed to more than one state's program.

- A second disadvantage is that it is more difficult to establish a national front when asked to respond to a national issue. This has been particularly true for national organizations or federal agencies as they ask the MAS to assist them with a national program. They soon find there is no one in Washington who can send out a memorandum and magically make something happen in all 31 programs.

- A third disadvantage has been the greater difficulty inherent in trying to establish a national identity for Sea Grant. Almost 20 years after the passage of the Sea Grant Act we still have a wide divergence in what we call ourselves. In the April 1985 survey, ten programs use extension in the title while six did not. In recognition of this problem, Dr. Ostenso distributed a memorandum as recently as January 1985 asking the states to identify Sea Grant when putting out news releases which discussed their programs. In our present austere funding climate, Sea Grant can stand all of the good exposure it can get.

Assuming that you do not have the perseverance to want to listen to 31 different management variations, I have broken down the administrative relationships into four patterns or groups running from fully enmeshed with CES to no formal ties. In each case an example of a state which seems to typify the pattern will be used to illustrate. It should also be stated that each state does not always fit neatly into these patterns.
TYPE ONE

IMMERSED IN CES

Generally, MAS programs of this type often have major program status within CES with the MAS Director having assistant Director responsibility. Five states now give MAS this status. Usually the MAS Director reports to an administrator in CES and MAS personnel appointments are very similar or identical to CES appointments.

Maryland is an example of this type. The MAS director is the Assistant Director for Marine Sciences and Natural Resources and has equal responsibility on the flow chart with the four traditional CES programs of Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H, and Community Resources Development. MAS appointments are identical to CES appointments. The agents and specialists have faculty status and are on a tenure track. The Sea Grant Director has no formal authority over the program other than through funding decisions, however the MAS Director works hard to coordinate with both the CES and Sea Grant programs and attends weekly staff meetings of both organizations.

Advantages of Type 1:

1. It gives the MAS program another powerful advocate at the state level. CES has many contacts with state legislators and advocacy groups and they are quick to point out that their organization contains a marine component.

2. By having a vested interest in the program, CES feels it is their own and may work harder to obtain state or federal funding through the legislature or Smith-Lever funds.

3. The CES director or regional directors may work harder to obtain county support and funding for field staff. Through the years, CES administration has developed a working relationship with county administrators, and it is much more effective to have CES initiate Sea Grant funding discussions in their annual budget discussions with county administrators.

Disadvantages:

1. Since MAS programs represent a maximum of only 6% of the CES effort in a state there is the possibility of MAS programs being swallowed up by CES and low priority given to their needs. This is more perception than reality, but perceptions can be important from a staff standpoint.

2. Another constraint is there is more bureaucracy in the system. Bureaucracy is proportional to the size of an organization and in some states with over 1,000 professionals in CES, the paperwork, coordinating meetings and steps necessary to get a decision made are burdensome on an individual. The Extension Management and Information System (EMIS) system is an example here.

3. It takes more time to work within the system. This is not only a function of the bureaucracy mentioned above, but is also a necessity of our responsibility to our parent organizations. Agents must attend local advisory committee meetings. MAS directors must participate in
administrative staff meetings or on affirmative action compliance reviews and so on.

TYPE 2 - Joint management of the program

In this situation, the Director of MAS usually has appointments in or administrative links to CES and the Sea Grant Program. The two organizations may be in different organizations or in different units of the same organization. The New Jersey program is an example. The CES program is a function of Rutgers University, while the Sea Grant program is managed by a Consortium of Universities from an administrative unit in Sandy Hook. The MAS director and staff can be employees of either organization and both the CES and Sea Grant Director have equal say in policy decisions.

Advantages

1. An MAS Director can take advantage of the strengths of both organizations. County funding can be obtained through ties with CES, while specialist support can be developed through one of the member institutions of the Consortium.

2. Institutional and financial support can be developed through more than one parent organization. Often the CES and Sea Grant administrators travel in different circles, but both may be looking for funding or programmatic opportunities for the MAS program.

Disadvantages

1. The MAS Director can easily get caught in the middle between two organizations. Assuring proper credit in the media for parent organizations is one area of difficulty. An important factor in making this work is the ability of the CES, Sea Grant, and MAS Directors to be flexible and willing to compromise.

2. In times of limited funding it is easy for the CES or Sea Grant Director to ask the other organization to pay.

3. It is time consuming for the MAS Director to be administratively a part of two organizations.

TYPE 3

The MAS program is not formally administered by CES, but the MAS coordinates closely with it. Sub-contracts or cost sharing of CES agents or specialists time are sometimes used in this type of program. In North Carolina, for example, CES has no formal administrative responsibility for MAS, but a memorandum of understanding identifying joint responsibilities and areas of cooperation has been signed by both the CES and Sea Grant Directors. The liaison is accomplished through the Assistant Director for CRD, who participates in MAS staff meetings. Likewise, the MAS director has periodically participated in CRD staff meetings. Additionally, CES faculty with subject matter relevance to marine programs attend all MAS staff meetings, and an MAS sub-grant is given to the Seafood Extension Specialist to develop a seafood extension program.
Advantages

1. The MAS can use the staff and facilities of CES without the inherent bureaucracy that goes along with being a part of it.

2. There is only one boss to keep happy who also controls funding decisions.

Disadvantages

1. There is likely to be less of a commitment to the MAS by CES.

2. County funding is unlikely since new funds are likely to be used for programs for which they control.

TYPE 4

There is no formal administrative relationship. The CES and MAS administrators have no formal method of communicating. Generally, the relationship is friendly and the MAS and CES agents in the field cooperate on a case by case basis in programs of mutual concern. Delaware, for example, had an "amicable divorce" with CES over ten years ago and has no memorandum of understandings or formal ties with CES. They exchange annual reports and the administrators meet from time to time on an ad hoc basis. However, there is a working relationship in the field. Sea Grant has funded research by Extension specialists. The MAS seafood specialist has trained home economists and the marine education specialist has conducted many programs with the 4-H program.

Advantages

1. The Sea Grant Director has total control of the MAS program.

2. The MAS Director has only one boss who also controls funding. This makes for straight line decisions.

3. The time burdens on the MAS Director are reduced because there is not as much need to coordinate programs with CES.

Disadvantages

1. Again, in this type of structure, there is no opportunity to develop financial support from CES and the counties.

2. There is a loss of some of the support services obtained from CES. These include such items as in-service training opportunities, the CES mass-media communications system, county office facilities, and A/V equipment. It should be pointed out that if good relationships are maintained many of these services can be negotiated.

3. An advocate is lost at the university, state, and local levels. The CES system has many friends and contacts around the state. If you are part of the team, these contacts can be valuable from a programmatic and funding standpoint.

Now that we have seen that there are many variations of the CES/MAS administrative relationships, it must be stated that no one program is structured
inherently better than another. There are advantages and disadvantages to each type of structure. The organization is important but the key to effectiveness is the people involved in the organization. An MAS Director is needed who recognizes the strengths of the parent organizations and uses them to the advantage of the MAS. CES and Sea Grant administrators are needed who are flexible and can compromise. They need to recognize the MAS is different and not try to force it to fit a pre-conceived model. And last, MAS specialists and agents are needed who understand the need to keep both organizations happy and can adapt to the management philosophy of each.
AN OVERVIEW OF THE SEA GRANT COLLEGE
ADVISORY/EXTENSION PROGRAM
ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND ISSUES

Robert J. Shephard, Director
Sea Grant Marine Advisory Service

I am both delighted and excited to be here, participating in the first National Workshop for Marine Extension. I was privileged to be a member of the task force that issued the last ECOP/Sea Grant joint report, "Partners in Parallel," issued in 1979 and as a direct result of that report, this conference idea was formed. It took 5 long years to get it together, but we are here now and we must capitalize on the timing.

As I look around the audience, I see about 15-20 people that I don't personally know, and one of my objectives will be to get to meet and talk to all of you during this session. This is a golden opportunity to accomplish this objective, and I hope that all of you who are in the same position as I, will do so. If, at the end of this conference, we are not familiar with each other's positions, I think that we will have failed in this conference's primary objective, "determining current levels of integration of our programs."

In preparation for the conference, I studied the material passed out in advance and noted in particular, the document "USDA - NASULGC Committee on the Future of Cooperative Extension" and see more clearly why this conference in so timely and necessary. In this document, there is, literally, not one word that reflects the Sea Grant Marine partnership with CES. In its foreword, the document stated "......the committee charge was to review and restate the roles and responsibilities of each of the partners of cooperative extension......" I say that we are a very active partner and yet our efforts are non-existent.

Bruce Wilkins' comment on the ECOP survey are quite impressive. I see as one important issue, the lack of continuity of the title of each Sea Grant program in the states. I believe that there should be titles that reflect what we are: Sea Grant Marine Advisory and Extension Service. Whatever the name or title, it should include both agency identities.

The Sea Grant Marine Advisory/Extension Service Program consists of specialists and agents in 31 coastal and Great Lakes locations including Puerto Rico and Guam. The only Great Lakes state that does not have a formal Sea Grant Program is Pennsylvania, although there is limited coverage of the lake by the New York Program.

Additionally, the Sea Grant program is divided into 5 regions: The Great Lakes, New England, Middle Atlantic, Southeast and the Gulf, and the Pacific. This arrangement affords a great degree of cooperation because each region has a coordinator, thus immediate access is gained into all the programs by contacting 5 coordinators for any national programming or planning activities.

Lastly, the areas of work that we concentrate on are, but not limited to: Fisheries, Seafood Processing, Marine Recreation, Marine Education, Coastal Management, Aquaculture, Marine Transportation, and Pollution. Not every state is involved in each of these, but a composite shows the breadth of interest we have.
We regard the relationship with CES as a very important resource. Twenty-one of our 31 programs have some affiliation with CES ranging from complete partnership to a contractual relationship for specific tasks. Some of the plus's of this arrangement are: value added, additional resources, cooperative programs (Home Economics, 4-H) and additional congressional support of our constituency base.

It should be noted that three programs over the last year have begun development of a relationship with CES: Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and Maine.

In closing, let me reiterate; this conference is extremely timely and necessary. We need to work together to find additional ways to utilize each other's strengths and to determine the best fit of our talents in a strong partnership.

When I got here, Monday, I said that I did not yet know every participant. Today, I can report that I have taken the opportunity to meet all of our participants and discuss the partnership roles that we can play. I feel comfortable in stating that this family can work productively together.

There were some remarks made during the conference, that Sea Grant was on the way out. It is true that the Administration has zero funded Sea Grant for 1985, but Congressional feelings about the Sea Grant program are very strong and we can safely assume that the program will again be funded by Congressional order. Other remarks centered around the present NOAA dilemma of having no permanent administrator as yet. There are rumors around the Washington circuit that NOAA will be split up and programs will be reassigned to other agencies. I can neither confirm nor deny these rumors because I just don't know. The transfer of Sea Grant to another agency is a possibility, but there is no intent to dismember the Sea Grant program wherever it may go. If indeed there was such a move to dismember it, it would have to take on another name. It would no longer be Sea Grant. I would suggest that we ignore those ill-thought-out remarks that were made earlier this week.

This conference has been a complete success. I don't take any position on who needs who the most, CES or Sea Grant. I think that we need each other in these times of fiscal restraint.

We have the opportunity to move ahead as partners in parallel as of this moment. One of the commitments I will make is that I will invite CES personnel to Sea Grant site visits as participants in our review process, as well as ask you to review projects that we will be looking at. I would hope that there will be a similar offer from CES to have Sea Grant assist you in your review process.

Thank you all for the opportunity to share these three days.
WHERE AND HOW DOES MARINE AND GREAT LAKES EXTENSION PROGRAMS FIT IN EXTENSION ADMINISTRATION?

John T. Woeste, Dean
Cooperative Extension Service
University of Florida

We are pleased to meet with you this morning. We understand that you have had a busy and enjoyable workshop. No doubt the setting has added to the enjoyment; we on the other hand admire your obvious commitment to the task at hand. The reports of the Ad Hoc Committee meetings and a full room this morning indicate that you have successfully resisted the multitude of leisure type temptations in the near environment.

My comments will be in the context of Florida. As you know, we have a long coast line. Management and preservation of the coastal resources as well as helping people living in the coastal area achieve their objectives are part of the cooperative Extension program objectives. Many of the problems of people living in the coastal area fit within the "traditional" Extension program mission.

From another perspective, recognize that Florida is a very urban state. Most of the population lives within 15 miles of the coast. As a public institution concerned about public support, we saw the Sea Grant Program as a welcomed resource to expand both the content and scope of our programs for the people in Florida. With an additional research base and staff resources, the program provided the opportunity to serve new clientele and an additional set of concerns.

We elected to set-up the Sea Grant Extension Program (SGEP) as another program area of our Extension education effort. We had five statewide program areas in Cooperative Extension. We felt that adding the sixth, Marine, to Agriculture, Home Economics, 4-H, Rural Development and Natural Resources would bring efficiency and compliment our organization.

The management and support system was in place. As a result, county government support for housing agents was accomplished by the County Extension Directors and District Directors. The statewide faculty were housed in existing departments utilizing departmental space and supervision. As a result, the new staff were incorporated into existing work groups.

It should be noted that we continued to staff with two basic types of professional employees. Statewide faculty are assigned to academic departments. We believe that is essential to maintaining professional competence and a flow of information between Extension and Research. The statewide faculty provide program leadership for agents in their area of expertise. They conduct in-service training for the agents, develop educational materials for agent use in program implementation, provide technical backstopping and team teach with agents. The agents are housed in the community with the other county faculty. Thus the capacity for advising and conducting multidisciplinary programs is enhanced.

The statewide program leader is an Assistant Dean equivalent to the leaders for the other program areas. The Assistant Dean provides statewide program leadership for the program and serves on a council of Assistant Deans. We believe establishment of the SGEP leader with the title, responsibilities and privileges comparable to the
other assistant deans is essential to program coordination and integration of Marine Extension into our ongoing Extension effort.

Fitting Marine Extension into the ongoing organization is an experience in organization change. Consequently, the concepts of compatibility and similarity apply. In the process of developing the new organization, both the old-timers and the newcomers want to emphasize their differences. The newcomers particularly want institutional support and acceptance, while proclaiming - we are different! That is understandable since they are seeking identity. The old-timers worry about the critical and ill informed comments of the newcomers all the time being confident that the neophytes are getting special treatment. The challenge to administration is to find and gain acceptance of the similarities in both beliefs and actions. Consequently we incorporated the SGEP personnel as quickly as possible with standard titles, pay scales, job description, fringe benefits and the ongoing personnel and program management system. In doing so, management had to continuously monitor the incorporation process. It was easy for the old-timers to leave the new folks off of committees and organizations charts. Seemingly insignificant papers would appear that created or reaffirmed feeling of exclusion or second class status. If it affected the beliefs about membership in the organization it had to be addressed. Beyond the personnel concerns, we felt important pragmatic issues were involved. We believe that a working system turns on lateral relationships. Examples could include, the marine agents and the horticulture agent conducting a program on salt tolerant vegetation or the marine agent and the home economist developing a program on use of under utilized species. Other examples could include the marine agent seeking technical backstopping of an agricultural engineer to address corrosion problems or a pathologist to address marine animal disease problems. The greater the sense of being one team, the more likely a timely interaction will occur and the greater the chance for an effective educational program.

In summary, we have worked to develop an integrated program. Dialogue, commitment and compromise were required of all stake holders. We think, in the end, however, that the outcome has enabled us to more effectively serve the marine community and a larger number of Floridians.

EVALUATION AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

The time is short, so I'll be brief. You have worked hard at searching for ways to strengthen the Sea Grant and Land Grant College impact through collaborative efforts.

I am pleased that ECOP approved the workshop. Among other things it provided the arena for many dedicated professionals to share ideas and define the common ground.

I have reviewed the preliminary recommendations. I understand you will debate and refine them. Let me assure you we will review them carefully. I am not sure who all the actors should be or what route to ECOP they will take; but they will be studied. Also of course the Sea Grant Directors have a stake in the management of the program, consequently we will work closely with them. The creation of a staff position within the Land Grant association office to support the Sea Grant Directors should help to facilitate that interaction.

I appreciate a chance to be with you. We were delighted to have you in Florida. We want to thank the planning committee for an excellent performance and make special mention of Dr. Marion Clarke for his role in coordination and logistical support of the workshop. Lastly, I commend you for staying to the end and hope you have continued success in your program. If you can stay with us a few extra days to enjoy
the environment, please do so since it will be good for your mental health and we need the green. Have a safe trip home!
THE USDA PERSPECTIVE

Andrew J. Weber, National Program Leader,
Natural Resources and Rural Development Unit
Extension Service, USDA

I bring you greetings from the Extension Service, USDA, more particularly from the Natural Resources and Rural Development Unit. I appreciate the opportunity to participate with you in this workshop.

From our perspective, workshops such as this are extremely important. They provide a number of very important benefits that improve our ability to deliver programs. Both the formal and informal exchanges that will take place over the next two and one-half days will provide us with an opportunity to learn about new techniques and methods for effectively and efficiently delivering programs, identifying common issues and needs, exchanging information and program materials and establishing and strengthening both formal and informal networks that will be utilized long after this meeting is over.

Extension Marine Programs have and do play an extremely important role in the Coastal and Great Lakes States. They are part of a National Delivery System that provides users and clients with research-based information through educational programs. From a National perspective, Extension Marine Programs serve to illustrate the flexibility of the Cooperative Extension System. Those of us in Extension are aware of the unique partnership between the Federal and respective State and county governments that results in the Cooperative Extension System. In Extension Marine Programs, another partner has been added. That partner is the Office of Sea Grant of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce. This relationship has been and continues to be an extremely productive one. We hope that this workshop will build upon and strengthen this relationship.

Your planning committee is to be complimented on the excellent program that they have put together for you. The objectives that have been set forth for this meeting are not only timely but are also achievable. However, I challenge you to extend yourselves beyond the accomplishments described in each of the objectives. With respect to the first objective, not only determine the current level of integration of marine programs into the Cooperative Extension System, but develop and implement a strategy to institutionalize them. Are marine programs in your State in the mainstream of Extension? If not, why not? How do you get them there?

In the second objective, as you pursue the development of recommendations to improve administrative linkages, support and operational efficiency of Extension Marine Programs, go beyond just the development of recommendations. Identify ways to implement the recommendations. Recommendations without a plan for implementation are much like good intentions. I am mindful of the old adage of roads being paved with them.

In an era of constrained resources, your third objective is critical. We are going to have to do more with less. Even modest increases in resources are not realistic. We are going to have to go about our business in a more efficient and effective manner than ever. Let’s identify those efficiencies that are cost effective and adopt them.
I am most appreciative of the opportunity to participate in this workshop, and I look forward to working with you to achieve the objectives that have been set forth.
EXTENSION AND OUTREACH PROGRAMS IN NOAA

Dan Panshin, Director
NOAA Extension Program
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
U.S. Department of Commerce

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) is our nation's major civil air and sea agency. NOAA is also big, diverse and complex. It is a very large federal agency, with some 14,000 employees and an annual budget of about $1 billion, and makes up approximately half of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

NOAA is diverse: it has research and program activities directed to the ocean, atmosphere, space and sun. And NOAA is complex, both in its programs and in its organization. NOAA has fourteen staff offices that directly serve the Administrator and have responsibilities across the entire agency. In addition, NOAA has five line offices that have most of the people and resources in the organization and that carry out the operational programs of the agency:

- National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service
- National Marine Fisheries Service
- National Ocean Service
- National Weather Service
- Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research

As an agency that conducts applied and practical programs, NOAA has an orientation to service and to users. In recent years this commitment to outreach has received emphasis—and significant growth and increase in visibility in this function have resulted. NOAA now operates a family of educational and technology transfer activities directed to external audiences. At present, there are nineteen outreach and extension offices and programs in all parts of NOAA with about 500 people and a $25 million annual budget.

Within this outreach and extension array, there is great variety in the types of programs conducted, size of offices, date the program started, and in office names. By far the largest as well as one of the oldest is the Sea Grant extension effort that has operated since 1968 and is comprised of about 400 people and $19 million annual budget (including nonfederal matching funds).

To illustrate this variety further, let me offer some other examples. There are three outreach and extension offices with NOAA-wide responsibilities: NOAA Extension Program Office, Office of Business Affairs, and Office of Research and Technology Applications. Within each of the five line components of NOAA, there is a lead office serving as a focal point for outreach and extension activities within that component. These, too, vary in their names as well as other characteristics. In the National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service and the National Weather Service this office is called External Relations. In the National Marine Fisheries Service it is Constituent Affairs whereas in the National Ocean Service and the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research it is External Affairs.
What I'd like to do at this point is to make a conscious shift in my presentation. I'd like to speak for a few minutes about some of my perspectives of Sea Grant and of the national Cooperative Extension system — and look at their relative strengths — from my vantage point of having worked in both organizations. Both Sea Grant and Extension are strong and in many ways are similar. On the other hand, in many ways they are also quite different and each organization can learn from the other.

What can Extension learn from Sea Grant? My perspective of Sea Grant is that a major strength it has is its commitment to, and success in, accountability and evaluation. Sea Grant tells its story, its mission and results, clearly and well. Sea Grant communicates to external audiences, especially the Congress, most effectively. Extension would profit by examining and seeking to emulate this fine Sea Grant effort.

In turn, what can Sea Grant learn from Extension? My perspective of Extension is that one of its major strengths is the active and significant participation of the county and private partners in the funding of extension. In the current fiscal year, for example, funding for the national Cooperative Extension system looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Dollars (in millions)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>330.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>451.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>182.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>994.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is, Extension on a national basis receives more than $200 million making up 21.4 percent of its funding, from county and private funding. Surely Sea Grant can learn from this: both the value of diversification of funding sources and the tremendous richness that is gained by the identification and caring that local people have for programs they directly pay for.

Finally, I have an overall perspective that comes from having served in Washington, D.C., in both Sea Grant and Extension assignments. This perspective is in the form of an observation and of a challenge. My observation is that at local and state levels both Sea Grant and Extension are highly visible and have great impact — and that both programs are much less visible and have much less impact within the Executive Branch of the federal government in Washington, D.C. My challenge is this: both Sea Grant and Extension need to have senior managers in the U.S. Department of Commerce and in the U.S. Department of Agriculture to develop a better awareness, understanding and support for our programs. It's important as part of our accountability and as part of our responsibilities to communicate. And in the most practical of terms it's important to our survival, health and prosperity.
NASULGC: A Vehicle for Cooperation, and its Role in Marine and Great Lakes Programs

John Kermond
National Association of State Universities
and Land-Grant Colleges

Today, I propose to address three areas with respect to the above title: What is NASULGC; what is the Marine Division of NASULGC; and, some general observations as to the "cooperative-vehicle" aspects of the Association.

The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges (NASULGC) is the oldest higher education association in the country. In fact, it will be 100 years old next year, and within its 100th year the U.S. Congress will go into its 100th session. NASULC has 145 member institutions with almost 2 1/2 million students enrolled. Member institutions annually award around 38% of all bachelor degrees, 44% masters, and 65% of the doctorates in the United States.

NASULGC is headquartered in Washington, D.C., with a total staff of 27 persons. The Association's mission is the support of high quality public education. Being in Washington this translates to a keen interest in federal budget and legislation. The Federal Relations staff number 18 which reflects this emphasis.

The objectives of the Association are as follows:

* To interpret for the American society the unique and special contributions of public universities and colleges.

* To develop and promote a federal legislative program on institutional support.

* To develop strong partnerships between: Public universities and the Federal Government; Public universities and state governments; Public universities and other segments of higher education.

* To develop further the university-federal partnership in all areas of mutual interest. These include, but are not limited to, the arts and humanities, human health and nutrition, urban affairs, food and agriculture, land resources, home economics, energy, the atmosphere, veterinary medicine, engineering, the environment, water resources and marine affairs, technology, national security and defense.

* To continue to work for the full development of historically black land-grant colleges through the Office for Advancement of Public Black Colleges.

* To pursue the full development of urban universities and to enhance the capacity of these institutions to deal with urban problems.

* To serve as a forum for discussion and resolution of major issues affecting public higher education.
Federal relations activities are conducted via the following areas: Agriculture and Natural Resources; Higher Education; International Programs and Studies; Special Programs; Advancement of Public Black Colleges, and Communications Services.

The officers of the Association for 1985 are: Chairman, C. Peter Magrath, The University of Missouri; Chairman-elect, Ira Michael Heyman, the University of California Berkeley; Immediate Past Chairman, Edward J. Bloustein, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey; and President, Robert L. Cudius.

The Marine Division is the newest entity within the Association. The Division was formally approved in November of 1983. Its predecessor, the Marine Affairs Committee, was an outgrowth of earlier activities in support of the National Sea Grant College Program. In fact through the Sea Grant Association there has been a linkage between Sea Grant and NASULGC since 1974.

There are presently 80 institutions participating in the Marine Division.

The Marine Division exists to serve the academic marine community and the nation by (1) promoting cooperative activities in research, education, and public service (including emphasizing the roles which member institutions play on both the national and international scenes); and (2) formulating plans and programs for the understanding, conservation and development of marine, coastal and Great Lakes environments.

The concerns of the Marine Division include the entire marine spectrum — marsh and coastal regions, the Great Lakes, the Exclusive Economic Zone, and the open sea.

The Marine Division has officers, a Board of Directors, and senators. Elected members come from the voting delegates (3) nominated by their institutions. Unlike other NASULGC activities, the Marine Division includes participation by non-NASULGC institutions.

The activities of the Marine Division are performed by committees. For 1985, these committees include:

- Agenda (development of the action plan for the Division). Chairperson: Feenan Jennings, Texas A&M University;
- Annual Meeting Program (planning for the Division activities at the November Annual Meeting of NASULGC). Chairperson: John Toll, University of Maryland;
- Education (consideration of the wide range of marine related higher education issues). Chairperson: Rita Colwell, University of Maryland;
- Estuarine (address national estuarine research issues). Chairperson: Jerry Schubel, State University of New York;
- Exclusive Economic Zone (assessment and planning for scientific opportunities in the EEZ). Chairpersons: David Ross, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution and Bob Friedheim, University of Southern California;
- Federal Relations (responsible for Division involvement in legislative and budget matters of special concern to members). Chairperson: Bob Corell, University of New Hampshire;
Institutional Resources (responsible for ascertaining marine resources activity in academia). Chairperson: George Keller, Oregon State University;

International Marine Science (responsible for providing a forum for international marine issues). Chairperson: Harris Stewart, Old Dominion University;

Marine Forum (provision of an information exchange for members on Federal programs and new initiatives in marine science). Chairperson: Louis Echols, University of Washington;

Marine Museum (advancing the concept of a National Marine Center for Washington, D.C.). Chairperson: E. Art Trabant, President, University of Delaware;

Membership (responsible for policy advice and recommendations regarding membership of the Division). Chairperson: David Gardner, President, University of California;

Nominating (responsible for the preparation of an annual slate of nominees to elected positions). Chairperson: Irving Shain, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin.

The officers of the Marine Division for 1985 are: Chairman, John A. Knauss, University of Rhode Island; Chairman-elect, John Toll, University of Maryland; and, immediate past Chairman, E. Arthur Trabant, University of Delaware.

The Marine Division staff prepare a twice monthly newsletter (Washington Report on Marine Affairs), conduct Marine Forums for delegates (twice yearly) and essentially attempt to provide a means of networking the academic marine community. Many of the member institutions are linked by electronic mail, and NASULGC maintains its own bulletin board on OMNET's SCIENCEnet system.

The U.S. higher education community is already committed to the field of Marine Science. Some interesting facts about marine-related activities found in universities:

1. There are 175 U.S. universities with curricula in marine sciences (according to NOAA).

2. There are 150 universities and colleges performing research in oceanography (as defined by NSF).

3. U.S. universities currently spend a total, from all sources, of about $230 million on marine sciences research (as shown by NSF analysis).

4. The federal government provides 80% of university funds ($185 million) with the balance coming from state and local sources ($25 million) and industries, foundations and other private sources ($20 million).

5. Four agencies provide 90% of the federal funds for ocean sciences: NSF, ONR, NOAA, and DOE.

6. Over the past five years the Sea Grant Programs have supported education, research, and public service activities at over 250 educational institutions in 39 states, plus Guam, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia.
7. There are 50 universities (17 members; 33 associate members) cooperating in the operating and scheduling of ships in the academic fleet through UNOLS.

8. There are 10 universities organized as JOI (Joint Oceanographic Institutions, Inc.) operating NSF's ocean drilling projects.

From the above general aspects of marine related activities found in universities, one can turn to the more specific matter of NASULGC as a "vehicle for cooperation," and then as to how that ties in with the objectives of this workshop.

At NASULGC there is an excellent working relationship between the Agriculture and Natural Resources federal relations group and the Higher Education federal relations group (where the Marine Division is administratively "housed"). Matters of mutual interest are discussed freely and openly and every effort is made to coordinate or contribute positively. The Extension Committee on Organization and Policy is operated within NASULGC, and currently Howard Diesslin, past Extension Director at Purdue University, serves as an Associate Director within Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Closer links between the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and the Marine Advisory Service (MAS), though, will not come from any federal legislative or budget directives. Nor will it come by any administrative fiat. To "determine current levels," to "recommend improvements," and to "enhance the effectiveness" between CES and MAS will come only after an intense personal relations exercise. It is a well known fact that institutions per se do not speak. People who represent these institutions made decisions on behalf of the institutions and also communicate on behalf of the institution. So it goes that only people from various components of, say, a university have to communicate their own components' wishes — to build bridges. No one should be naive enough to expect overnight miracles in universities where the inertia of academia is very strong. But neither should anyone be so fainthearted as to refuse the challenge to do business better and to continually strive for the excellence that universities are noted for. Communication is the first step in moving out of any parochial shell.

Obviously there are many instances around the country where CES and MAS have joined forces, or engaged in some degree or another of symbiosis. Land-Grant and Sea Grant do share some commonalities. It is of interest to speculate that if ever NOAA (the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) was dismantled, the MAS component could go to the CES, the research component to the National Science Foundation, and the education component to Health and Human Services or the Department of Education. By the same token, Sea Grant could perhaps be absorbed entirely within the Department of Agriculture. My point here is not to suggest or recommend this action, but simply to point out that research, teaching and public service can come in a multitude of forms.

As a final comment, perhaps a similar Intergovernmental Personnel Agreement (IPA) assignment by a MAS entity to the Washington CES headquarters could be of assistance in meeting the longer term objectives of the workshop.

The Marine Division of NASULGC welcomes your visiting the Washington headquarters office, and to your participation/involvement in Division activities.
RELATING TO TRADITIONAL CES PROGRAM AREAS

A REVIEW OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND OPPORTUNITIES IN AGRICULTURE

James L. App
Assistant Dean of Agriculture and Rural Development
Florida Cooperative Extension Service, IFAS
University of Florida

I welcome the opportunity to participate in this national workshop. From my own experiences we have enjoyed nearly a decade and a half of close working relationships and mutually beneficial program support. Ten years ago this month, I spoke at a Marine Workshop in Biloxi, Mississippi, and the title of the talk was "The Advantages of the Marine Program Within The Land Grant Universities." It appears that while much has transpired the past decade, some basic organizational issues have remained.

In preparation for this workshop, Marion Clarke conducted a survey of states and asked each state to identify agricultural efforts that have been significantly beneficial to Sea Grant Extension efforts. I would like to touch upon the complimentary accomplishments derived from the agricultural program and chat briefly on the opportunities.

1. CONNECTICUT—Norman Bender

   Agriculture and Sea Grant agents are cooperating in disseminating research findings regarding potential users of brown seaweeds as mulch.

2. NEW HAMPSHIRE—Peter Horne

   Annual "Natural Resources and Planning Lecture Series" jointly sponsored by two counties, and their respective focus on the consideration of natural resources including wetlands—an important part of the coastal marine environment.

3. NORTH CAROLINA—Bill Hoskins

   A) Management of agricultural drainage in the estuarine areas:

   B) Development of marsh and beach stabilization programs.

4. ALABAMA—Bill Hoskins

   A recent publication on "Fish and Shellfish Handbook" was completed including one of the authors from agricultural extension.

5. ILLINOIS—INDIANA—Robert Espeseth

   A) Workshops on aquaculture research and legislative strategy.

   B) Assistance in drafting legislation for Illinois aquaculture
council.

C) Developed publications on aquaculture opportunities in Illinois and Indiana.

6. OREGON—Howard Horton

Recently conducted joint workshops on farm ponds and aquaculture with the agricultural agents. Worked with agriculture agents in designing programs to reduce river pollution from the residues of dairy farms.

7. CALIFORNIA—Christopher Dewees

Development of squid and herring processing methods. Education on water policy issues.

8. MINNESOTA—Gail McClure

Coastal erosion coordination: An effort has been made in the three Minnesota coastal counties with agricultural extension and the Sea Grant to assist local officials with coastal erosion problems. Extension and Sea Grant have gotten together all the agencies who have coastal erosion responsibilities with local county government officials. Local officials have made their needs known, and agencies are working together (for the first time) to resolve these needs.

9. LOUISIANA—Lowell McCormick

Crawfish farming—An expanding industry in Louisiana: In 1984 about 100,000 acres of managed ponds were devoted to crawfish production. Almost 1,200 individuals were involved, many of whom are small farmers and minorities. A multi-discipline educational program is conducted each year on improved production methods.

10. VIRGINIA—E.N. Boyd

A) Programs to market fresh seafood in midwest.
B) Series of training programs for retail food merchants.
C) Applicants of computer technology for the seafood industry.
D) Developed series of educational videotapes with industry and trade organizations.
E) Determined safety of shellfish in southern growing water areas.

11. RHODE ISLAND—J. Whitney Bancroft

A) Extensive research completed in developing multiplier effects of the marine industry to Rhode Island.
B) Enzymatic treatment and storage studies demonstrated that shelf life of fresh fish can be extended by 90%.
C) New uses found for seafood processing wastes.

D) Brine shrimp research—Identifying brine shrimp populations of unknown and uncertain origins through a protein "fingerprinting" technique.

E) And several other examples.

12. SOUTH CAROLINA—Paul M. Horton

A) In-service training for coastal counties in agriculture.

B) Tour of crawfish facilities in Louisiana.

C) CES staff assistance with crawfish.

13. FLORIDA—Marion L. Clarke

Satellite freeze forecast systems:

(1) Currently have adapted this technology to give fishermen water temperature data.

(2) Have developed a print mode to give hard copy.

(3) Are working on putting navigational data on the screen and currently working on a low powered off-shore transmission of data to tv sets on boats off the coast of Florida.

(4) Currently have the following products available:

(A) Water temperature data

(B) Weather including marine forecasts

(C) Automated field operation systems radar map for Florida and coastal waters

(D) Our technicians have developed a high resolution product that is currently available.

We are working on using weather facsimile data providing the marine user with data not currently available to the public from any other source. We anticipate that we will be looking to use polar orbiting satellites to get imagery from more localized areas.

SEA GRANT TOLERANT VEGETATION PANEL

A. Assembled panel of industry, agency and extension personnel to assess the state of the industry, capabilities and needs; project future plant material requirements and determine research and extension activities.
B. Developing planting and maintenance guidelines for 19 different species of dune and salt water wetland plants.

C. Updating old listing of supplies of salt tolerant vegetation.

D. Work on publications for select plant materials.

I would like to make some general observations on programs being conducted or evolving in the colleges of agriculture which have far reaching implications for marine extension programs.

I. These efforts are directed at retaining and/or improving water quality. A national extension taskforce is underway in an assessment of program needs in ground water quality. Our own experience in Florida with pesticides (EDB and Time) and nitrates as possible major pollutants is one example. The marine extension program has a strong bond of commonality with a vigorous environmental toxicology program. This is particularly critical as one looks at the estuaries and the saltwater resource and the food chain.

II. Computer software

Each of your State's cooperative Extension services as well as the marine advisory program are developing user-friendly practical software. It's my observation that much of the economic analysis and cash flow information provides a conceptual framework for application in the marine sector. These software programs could be analyzed, amended, and transformed for use in the marine advisory program to a wide series of audiences. Developing high quality user-friendly software is expensive and this presents an excellent opportunity for the marine advisory program to develop products at a fraction of the cost—compared to "going it alone."

III. Satellite-Freeze-Forecasting-System

While this system of satellite imagery, developed by NASA and the Natural Weather Service, was first utilized as a cold detection and freeze forecasting for terrestrial crops, it can provide extensive measurements in the marine environment (water temperatures; cloud cover; movement of storms; etc.). It could become a very potent management tool in the marine advisory program.

IV. Salt Tolerant Plant Species

The increased need for developing salt tolerant plants continues due to increased populations locating in the coastal areas. Erosion problems, limited water resources, and saltwater intrusion has accelerated this effort.

V. Public Policy Education Programs

There are several extension program efforts underway throughout the U.S. addressing various facets of growth management, water management, environmental quality. Many of these programs are educational programs addressed to providing critical information for decision-makers and groups of decision-makers, enabling them to make their own decisions and selecting courses of action.
Once again, I would urge the marine advisory program leaders to remain heavily involved in those program efforts. This would ensure that the marine interests would be well represented—so that the materials developed would be germane and relevant to the marine industry.

There is a long list of compliments and an even longer list of mutual program opportunities. Once again, I welcome the opportunity of being with you.
A REVIEW OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND OPPORTUNITIES 
IN MARINE AND GREAT LAKES EXTENSION PROGRAM 
IN HOME ECONOMICS

Doris A. Tichenor, Director 
Home Economics Program, IFAS 
University of Florida

I appreciate the invitation to discuss with you some accomplishments, opportunities and ideas concerning joint or cooperative programs between Sea Grant and Home Economics Extension and Research. My perspective will be that of a newcomer to a Sea Grant state, a person with no prior experience in working directly with Sea Grant Programs, although I was acquainted with it in a general way from having served on a number of national committees and task forces with Extension professionals from Sea Grant states.

Since coming up to the University of Florida in March 1984, as Director of Home Economics Programs, a position which includes both serving as Chairperson of a Home Economics Department and serving as State Leader for Home Economics Extension Programs, I have become keenly aware of opportunities for potential cooperation between home economics and marine education programs. Because of the urgency of other tasks such as departmental reorganization and recruiting for faculty vacancies, we have scarcely begun to explore these opportunities but we have a good foundation of mutual respect and positive relationships upon which we can build. One visible evidence of our intentions is the participation in this workshop of one of our departmental faculty members, Ms. Lizette Murphy, Extension Specialist in Consumer Food Marketing. I have asked Ms. Murphy to help develop and maintain a communication link with Sea Grant personnel who share our interests in consumer, family and nutrition issues and programs. As we add new departmental faculty members in human nutrition and applied food science and technology, I expect an increase in our cooperative work in these areas. In the meanwhile I appreciate Lizette's willingness to add this responsibility to an already full Plan of Work.

Since I was virtually without prior experience of my own to call upon in preparing for this presentation, it was necessary for me to examine information from other sources. In careful reading of the brochure based on a January 1983 report to the national Council of Sea Grant Directors, I am somewhat surprised to find this statement "...helping to improve the productivity of marine resources and the quality of life for the people who enjoy them, are affected by them, or who depend on them for a living." And on the next page, in a section on Origins, the following "...and to increase to the greatest amount possible the social and economic benefits derived from them."¹

Compare these statements, if you will, to this quote from the section in Home Economics/Family Living in Extension of the Eighties: "The Home Economics component

¹. The National Sea Grant Advisory Source: Serving the Nation's Marine Community. A brochure based on a January 1983 report to the National Council of Sea Grant Directors. March 1983.
has as its goal the improvement of the quality of life for individuals and families through enhancement of their economics and social well-being. 2

It seems to me, then, that we have considerable parallelism between the missions and goals of Extension home economics and those of the Marine Education Program. Is that bad? Of course not. On the contrary the parallelism provides us with a legitimizing basis from which to explore ways to cooperate and form partnerships that will lead to greater achievement of the goals of both program areas.

I am sure that we would find a similar parallelism between home economics research and Sea Grant research programs, although a history of inadequate funding for home economics research has severely restricted efforts in this area.

Another source of information to which I turned for help in preparing for this presentation was the Extension Narrative Accomplishment Reports (NARS) which are submitted annually by all state Cooperative Services and stored in USDA's computer system. When I asked for a retrieval of FY 84 NARS reports on the keywords Sea Grant/Home Economics, can you guess how many I got? Only one. ONE. Yet, when I received the responses to the Marine Extension Programmatic Survey, I found some sort of home economics example in the responses from 22 of the 29 Sea Grant states. Therefore, I must ask an embarrassing question of those of you here representing CES from those 22 states. How come the Sea Grant/Home Economics work going on in your states doesn't show up on your NARS reports? It's a simple matter of concisely reporting your accomplishments and including the right key words. Please consider this in your upcoming reports for FY 85, so those of us who are new to the area and looking for ideas will continue to have examples from other states in addition to the ones provided in your survey responses.

Incidentally, the one NARS example I found dealt with ground water quality and was submitted by a CRD specialist.

A wide variety of examples were cited in the survey responses from states suggesting a challenging array of opportunities that might be explored by those of you interested in expanding Home Economics/Sea Grant cooperation. I attempted to categorize the examples and I would like to spend the next few minutes discussing some of these.

1) In service training and education for home economists.
   - Selection, handling, home storage and preservation, preparation, nutrition, teaching methodology.

2) Developing educational materials and methods
   - Publications, bulletins, including correspondence course materials.
   - Slide-tapes, television, video tapes, radio, learn by-mail, newspaper releases.

3) **Consumer Seafood Educational Programs**

- Cooperating with home economists. (Many of our Florida Coastal counties conduct programs in shopping malls, often during Seafood Month in October).

- Florida home economics agents have a seafood handbook for reference in answering consumer inquiries.

- Minnesota’s catchy (no pun intended) title for "Fixing Fish" caught my eye when I was reviewing the examples.

- Increasing consumer awareness and acceptance of underutilized species was a focus of consumer-oriented programs in two states, while other emphasized selection and use of lower-cost species. Some programs of this nature were included in Expanded Food and Nutrition Program’s (EFNEP) efforts with low income families.

4) **Research and Development**

- Computer programs for nutritional assessment of seafood recipes.

- Quantity recipes developed and tested for use in restaurants and institutions.

- Microwave recipes developed and tested for consumer use.

- Development of new products such as fish patties.

5) **New Hampshire: an example of a clear, concise, specific state report, submitted by Peter J. Horne:** "A program was cooperatively planned by staff of the Cooperative Extension Service and the Sea Grant/Marine Advisory Program at the University of New Hampshire. The program was designed so that participants would become familiar with at least six species of New England fin fish, their nutritional value and method of preparation. Objectives included increased use of fin fish in family meals. Trained leaders have reached over 1,000 persons in five counties with this information to date. Familiarity with species of fish increased 50% from pretests with 83% of participants planning to use fish more often in a wider variety of ways. This program will be expanded into other counties next year."

Isn't that an elegant report?

In conclusion, I would like to share with you a few ideas for expanding cooperation in areas where such cooperation already exists, plus a couple of additional areas where I found little or no evidence of current work.

1) **Seafood economics for consumers:** Developing and disseminating current information about comparative portion costs of various forms of the same seafood, prepared-at-home vs. convenience foods, vs. the same seafood purchased ready to eat (i.e., fast food carry-out). (April 26 Kiplinger Washington Letter says franchise fish restaurant sales will rise by 18% this year).
2) Increased research and educational efforts are increasing consumer acceptance and consumption of locally abundant, currently underutilized species (Example: Gulf Coast mullet).

3. Consumer-directed educational programs on safe handling of seafoods from market to home to table.

4) Consideration of the families of people employed in the fishing industry as a specific audience for home economics programs on such topics as budgeting, money management, family stress management, and human relationships. This idea was suggested to me by one of our Florida marine agents, who pointed out the stress on such families resulting from uncertain income, frequent and extended separation of fishermen from their families, fears about safety in bad weather, and the like.

I have never heard of a home economics program in any state with these families as a specific target audience, but I suggest it for your consideration and possible discussion with the home economics state leader in your state.

In conclusion, I would like to quote from Partners and Parallels, TF on SG Relationships 1979:

"There is much common ground in the needs, programs and goals of (Sea Grant) and Extension...the overall of both programs, namely to serve the public in the broadest sense, demands a strong common commitment...talent and...resources must be marketed to achieve our common goals..."

"Although perhaps not easy to find, this resource of talent exists and is readily available given firm organizational support and...leadership."

---

Introduction

1. Over 20 years ago government leaders began to realize that in the race to be first in space our country had badly neglected ocean science.

2. In 1963, an innovative educator presenting the keynote address at the American Fisheries Society's annual meeting asked persuasively, "Why do we not do what wise men did for the better cultivation of the land a century ago? Why not have Sea Grant colleges?"

3. Eleven years later, this same man rescued a first of its kind, but sinking, Florida 4-H marine education proposal that his Sea Grant site visit colleagues felt was inappropriate for the predominately adult education orientation of Sea Grant.

4. Fortunately, Athelstan Spilhaus felt strongly that youth education could fill a critical need in offering future voters learning experiences that provide a needed understanding of the sea and coastal zone. Furthermore, he accurately predicted that 4-H marine educators could advantageously borrow from the proved methods of Extension 4-H agriculture and home economics education.

Florida 4-H/Sea Grant Overview

1. Beginning in 1975, the University's Institute of Food and Agricultural Science's Extension 4-H Department and Sea Grant cooperatively embarked on a voyage that evolved from a demonstrated need for a marine education program for Florida 4-H youth. Also, the 4-H agriculture and home economics projects to include additional relevant subject matter areas. And, marine education was a natural!

2. A "National 4-H Marine Education Survey" was conducted by Florida in 1975 for the Federal Sea Grant Administration to identify some of the haves and needs of states involved in the development of marine educational opportunities for 4-H and other youth. This study provided an extremely useful data base that expedited some highly accurate predictions and decisions essential to the success of the Florida program. Most importantly, the study helped our fledgling 4-H marine program establish a unique and continuing partnership with Sea Grant.

3. Objectives:

Develop a wide range of fascinating educational marine projects and activities designed to enrich the knowledge, skills and values of Florida 4-H youth relative to better utilization and conservation of ocean and coastal resources.
Extend the Florida 4-H Department's capability for effectively serving special interests of other state and federal agencies seeking information and direction regarding the development of 4-H marine education programs and activities.

4. Resources:

The Florida 4-H Department obtained approximately $85,000 from federal and State Sea Grant agencies which was used during 1975-80 to accomplish:

- County and state planning meetings
- County needs assessment surveys
- Consultation contract services
- Development of summer camps and institutes for 4-H youth
- Development of a 4-H marine lending library
- Marine 4-H resource kits for every Florida county
- A slide/cassette marine program overview
- Marine 4-H program interface with other states
- Development of 4-H marine exhibit materials for use at state and national conferences
- Employment of a two-year, 4-H marine education assistant who was utilized to excellent advantage in the further development of literature, teaching aids, financial resources, in-service training and fiscal accountability.

5. Curriculum:

Marine 4-H projects and activities such as underwater photography, coastal management, oceangoing plants, offshore fishing, shell collecting, sharks, intertidal zones, beachcombing, mangrove wetlands, sea safety, net making, snorkeling, aquariums, venomous sea creatures, fish identification, birds of the sea, boating, and seafood nutrition are taken by thousands of youth through school and community 4-H clubs led by Extension supported volunteer 4-H staff.

6. Publications:

Florida 4-H Marine Science Program Members Guide
Field Study of the Marine Environment Leader's Guide
Fins and Scales Project Manual
Intertidal Zone Project Guide
Life in the Sea Project Guide and Record
Life in the Sea Leader's Guide
Starting and Maintaining a Marine Aquarium Member's Guide and Project Record
Wetlands Project Manual

7. Recognition Opportunities:

4-H project records and demonstration categories of competition are available for those 4-H'ers wishing to compete for the various forms of club, county, district and state recognition for outstanding achievement in the marine program. 4-H'ers receive medals, trophies, certificates, State 4-H Congress trips and National 4-H Congress trips through the Florida 4-H Foundation.
8. Results:

During the past 10 years, over 50,000 youth and 10,000 adults have been involved in 4-H Marine education projects and activities in over 80 percent of the counties in Florida - a dramatic increase compared to zero enrollment when the program began.

The 4-H marine program was tested with a 4-H program consequences evaluation model designed by the USDA Extension Evaluation Section and applied by the University of Florida Extension Program Evaluation Department. Strong evidence in the form of newfound behavioral changes occurring in a random sample of 4-H marine program participants indicated increased intellectual and physical abilities directly attributable to 4-H.

Florida has been willingly utilized as a 4-H marine program "stepping stone" for other states and countries to the following extent: The 4-H Department has responded to formal requests from over 300 public and private educators in over 35 states Sweden, Australia, Mexico, and the Virgin Islands for information pertaining to Florida 4-H marine strategies and materials.

- Two states (N. Carolina, Virginia) utilized components of the Florida "model" to help obtain substantial funding from Sea Grant to implement their 4-H marine education programs.
- Florida has been publicly acknowledged, at many regional and national conferences of 4-H educators, for serving as a dependable marine education resource. The USDA Extension 4-H staff and the National 4-H Council Staff have periodically requested 4-H marine program advisory services from Florida.

National Review

1. Nationally, 4-H enrollment in the marine project area included 20,660 males and 19,376 females totaling 40,036 - 100% increase during the last 10 years in which over 375,000 4-H'ers have been involved in marine education. Furthermore, there has been an extremely well balanced boy/girl ratio, which is not necessarily the case in other 4-H curriculum areas.

2. Geographically, the U.S. northeastern and southeastern ES-237 reporting regions have traditionally shown average 4-H marine enrollments. However, there is a fairly broad distribution of state reporting 4-H marine activity throughout the nation. And, over the last 10 years the average annual frequency of states involved in 4-H marine programming has been 34, which represents 68% of 50 states!

3. The high level of interest shown by 4-H'ers, volunteers, Extension personnel, sponsors and others attracted to this program has also attracted county, state regional and national mass media coverage. Some include:

- Sea Grant '70's periodical published by Texas A&M University
- Marine Advisory Program Newsletters
- Extensions Service Review, U.S. Department of Agriculture Information Services
- Sea Frontiers published by International Oceanographic Foundation
- State newspaper articles and television programs

This media coverage facilitates positive donor relations, specific program visibility and general public awareness of Sea Grant and 4-H as compatible and worthwhile organizations.

**States Involved FY 1984**

1. **Eastern Region:**
   - Connecticut
   - Delaware
   - Maine
   - Massachusetts
   - New Hampshire
   - New Jersey
   - Rhode Island
   - Vermont

2. **Central Region:**
   - Indiana
   - Michigan
   - Ohio
   - Wisconsin

3. **Southern Region:**
   - Alabama
   - Arkansas
   - Florida
   - Georgia
   - Kentucky
   - Louisiana
   - Mississippi
   - North Carolina
   - South Carolina
   - Texas
   - Virginia
   - Puerto Rico

4. **Western Region:**
   - Alaska
   - California
   - Hawaii
   - Oregon
   - Utah
   - Washington
   - Guam (territory)

**4-H Examples**

1. **Alabama:**

   State 4-H Personnel and Advisory Service Staff have jointly planned and organized marine 4-H camps in the past and have scheduled the 1985 camp for August.

2. **Arkansas:**

   Marine youth camps.

3. **California:**

   Training 4-H leaders. World of Water Competition. 4-H Day at Marineland.
4. Connecticut:

4-H agents and leaders have participated in marine resource training programs resulting in several 4-H agents incorporating materials into their education programs. Emphasis has been placed upon training 4-H volunteer leaders at the state and regional levels.

5. Illinois - Indiana:

Marine science module on "Wetlands" published in cooperation with 4-H Foundation. Great Lakes heritage module developed and under consideration.

6. Louisiana:

4-H seafood contests are conducted in numerous coastal parishes. In one area, over 800 entries were made in the contests. It is anticipated that in the near future, a statewide seafood contest will be conducted. The seafood industry has expressed interest in supporting such a contest. 4-H agents are heavily involved in these contests as well as other seafood fairs and festivals.

7. Maine:

Programs using a marine demo trailer and classes for schools and the general public.

8. Maryland:

Will have first 4-H marine camp in 1985. An oyster culture project which won a national award.

9. Massachusetts:

Use a traveling 4-H sea museum trailer for display and contacts at beach parking lots, schools, malls. Turtle nesting beach surveys are a popular activity.

10. Michigan:

Great Lakes 4-H camp: A one week junior leaders training program that takes place on Beaver Island in Lake Michigan.

11. Minnesota:

4-H Sailing: A joint Sea Grant Extension-St. Louis County 4-H effort. Offered for youth 9-19 on the St. Louis River. The program goes from building specialized 8' boats in winter to learning to sail them in the summer. Program is extremely popular and has picked up national exposure. Special boats were designed for this program and it appears they will be marketed nationally.
12. Mississippi:

Joint Sea Grant/CES programs have introduced youth groups to the marine and coastal environment through the use of marine education field trips. These programs have emphasized the multiple user group concept.

13. New Jersey:

Development, promotion and implementation of a comprehensive educational program in marine science within the 4-H club structure is now progressing.

14. North Carolina:

4-H marine science camp, and 4-H projects in marine awareness.

15. New Hampshire:

Approximately 50 4-H members in the 10 counties are enrolled in a Marine Science project/activity. Twenty-four teens participated in either 2 week "Oceanbound" or about one week "Sailing" trip program operated by N.H. 4-H Camps last year. One week of each is planned again for '85. Marine Science is one of two special programs conducted by half-time 4-H agent in Rockingham County whose job is to reach non-traditional audiences.

16. Ohio:

Developing a Sea Camp program at the Kelly's Island 4-H camp.

17. Oregon:

Have worked with the 4-H staff in Curry County to develop educational materials on the salmon and trout enhancement program such as: How to do a Stream Survey, Life Cycle of Salmon and Steelhead, Habitat Requirements of Salmon and Steelhead, etc.

18. Rhode Island:

Mobile marine education program has continued to operate for 5 years now. About 15,000 youth receive instruction through contracts with the schools for the "Blue Lobster" program. Marine life in handling tanks and student intern support the teacher naturalist in this instruction. Moving equipment to different schools each week provides the mobility and flexibility necessary for success.

19. Georgia:

The Jekyll Island 4-H center has been established with CES operating the facility, and MHPEX provide marine resources programming. In the past year approximately 2800 participated in marine resource programs at the facility.
Conclusion

1. This is a popular and effective 4-H curriculum area, systematically
developed from a proven need and generously supported by the people and
programs of the Land Grant and Sea Grant Institutions. And, the program
is still growing.

2. The many expressions of recognition and appreciation this program has
received are typified by the words of a 17-year-old James Perry, State 4-
H Marine Achievement recipient from Putnam County, Florida:

"Thank you for 4-H and the Marine Science Program for capturing
my interests, educating me and increasing my recreational pleasures
for a lifetime".

3. Ladies and gentlemen, I've appreciated and enjoyed this occasion to share
the good news of the 4-H/Sea Grant "connection". If only one word could
be used to describe the future of 4-H marine education that word would
be opportunity. Thank you.
A REVIEW OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND OPPORTUNITIES
IN MARINE EXTENSION PROGRAMS AND CRD

Sidney C. Cleveland, Assistant Director
Cornell Cooperative Extension

It is my pleasure to address the topic of "accomplishments and opportunities in Marine Extension Programs and CRD." For the past eight years as assistant director of Cornell Cooperative Extension for Rural and Community Development programs, I have been deeply involved in the Sea Grant Extension program. Prior to that I was involved in the establishment of the New York Sea Grant Program effort from its beginning. As a county extension agent in Orleans County, New York, on the south shore of Lake Ontario, I was involved in early discussions and worked closely with some of the pioneers who established the New York effort. After moving to Cornell in 1974 into extension administration, I continued working closely with Sea Grant as an extension representative in northern New York supporting program efforts in the eastern Lake Ontario-St. Lawrence Valley. It is from this background that I share my strong philosophical and programmatic commitment to the principles and ideals of Sea Grant as an important partner in the total Cooperative Extension program effort in New York State.

It would be easy for me to utilize my allocated ten minutes just discussing the New York program. However, I have included input from Dr. Jim Barron, Washington State University, who currently chairs the ECOP-CRD/Public Affairs Subcommittee, and input from surveys conducted by Marion Clarke in preparation for this workshop.

Other presentations which will explore opportunities for joint programming in agriculture, home economics and 4-H Youth Development, document the appropriateness of it with the Sea Grant Extension Program. However, I know of no area in Cooperative Extension more ideally suited for joint program efforts than Sea Grant. It would be very easy to encompass all of Sea Grant program initiatives under the label of CRD; however, we need to be targeted in assessing the goals and objectives of each extension program area and to fully appreciate that Sea Grant is an important contributor to any state's total Cooperative Extension program effort. This has certainly been the case in New York and under Bruce Wilkins' able leadership as a state program leader, we have been able to work hand in hand in spirit of cooperation with our ultimate goal being an improved Sea Grant/Cooperative Extension program effort.

Let's examine why Sea Grant has been highly successful in becoming institutionalized and recognized as a high impact program effort in Cooperative Extension.

First, Sea Grant programs have been planned at the grass roots level and they have been based on the needs of the clientele. There was concern in the early days that Sea Grant would be a "top down" program effort, but we can rest assured today that Sea Grant is in the hands of the users and that these people have a great sense of pride, ownership, and commitment to the program. It has provided a level of credibility that few other agencies or organizations can truly achieve. This is documented in the continued funding and support of Congress for Sea Grant.

Yes, there have been times when it would have been easy to drift away from this grass roots philosophy, which is so important in understanding Cooperative Extension programs.
Secondly, Sea Grant has built its reputation through the years by a proactive program rather than a reactive one. To me, there is a lot of difference. People associate proactive programs with leadership and reactive programs with followers of the crowd. I believe the majority of people want Sea Grant to assume a leadership role and provide programs that will cause things to happen, rather than trying to respond to changes after they have occurred. Establishment of program advisory committees and the involvement of program participants in determining the direction and focus of the program, has been an increasing strength of Sea Grant.

Thirdly, Sea Grant has built its reputation on the technical competence of its staff. We have clearly demonstrated this in all areas of program as we have responded to the needs of coastal residents, groups, organizations across this country. People look to Sea Grant as a source of objective educational information that is research based. We have the documentation to substantiate the program impact and no other program has better evaluated its program impact than Sea Grant.

Fourthly, Sea Grant's funding is zero-based budgeting which constantly forces all of us to have at our finger tips accountability data that responds to the numerous "fire drills" that continue to rage as to whether or not Sea Grant should be funded.

With this as background, let's examine the changes occurring in CRD programming. We have seen CRD move through a progression of being a highly process oriented educational program to now focus heavily on technical subject matter areas such as economic development, local government education, natural resources policy, groundwater, and environmental issues. This has focused the content areas of CRD programming much more closely with the thrust of Sea Grant Extension efforts.

Yes, it's important to have the content as the bricks, but we also need the process as the motor in which to ultimately achieve total program balance. Sea Grant programs are aimed at individuals and firms in marine related business, much like extension has dealt with agribusiness. There are significant set of problems; issues, and concerns that are community or public issues which most appropriately bring Sea Grant programming and CRD programming into the same philosophical grounds. Obviously, in this area there is much to be gained from collaboration, cooperation and ultimate integration between Sea Grant's marine advisory services and Extension's CRD programs.

Let me underscore once again my deep philosophical commitment to viewing Sea Grant Extension programming, CRD, or Community Issues Programs, as one important total program effort regardless of how we label it.

As we examine appropriate areas of program interface, let's begin with economic development. Port development, tourism, sports fisheries, community support of issues which provide the ideal grounds for which we can blend together and team up the resources of Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension to respond to these needs. Mississippi has conducted a comprehensive study on the coastal tourism industry. New York has held statewide meetings on bed and breakfast business development to identify several programs.

In the area of natural resources and public policy education, environmental issues abound in marine areas, sometimes extending well inland to where sources of pollution can affect aquaculture and well offshore, to where effects of onshore activities may ultimately impact. New Jersey has conducted programs for municipal and state officials.
and local organizations to assist in the prevention of coastal erosion and dredging options for channel improvement.

**Organizational leadership development.** The fishing industry and other marine related groups are like traditional extension clientele. Fiercely independent and often isolated from much of society. With new technology, changing markets, economic conditions and community pressure they need to work together in new ways. To be effective they need the organizational and leadership skills training so effectively provided through Cooperative Extension educational programs. South Carolina’s leadership training in state and national marine issues for local leaders is a good example.

The partners and parallels document emanating out of the task force on Sea Grant relationships in June of 1979 was a visionary report which provided a very important philosophical framework for us to pursue in integrating our joint program efforts. This report explored the commonality, the common ground, and common goals of Cooperative Extension and the Sea Grant advisory service. Priorities to identify problems, increase awareness, conduct conservation education, and develop linkages and networks were key. The report identified national programs in common that related to environment, economic development, coastal recreation, consumer and public issues, which today we have fully blended together our resources to programs in these areas.

Each state has used different strategies to best achieve joint Sea Grant/CRD program efforts. In New York our commitment has been to effectively capitalize on the strengths of Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension for the ultimate benefit of the residents of the state. Other presentations regarding the pluses and minuses, or pros and cons of Sea Grant - Cooperative Extension has benefited equally by having important new audiences available, new opportunities for extension staff audiences to become involved in tourism, bed and breakfast, seafood education, marine youth education efforts, and to have the synergistics resulting from the creative challenges that come with any new program area. Obviously, state residents have benefited by having a broader range of resources available to meet needs.

In summary, we are still very much in the transitional process of fully exploring and identifying the best combination of staffing and programming to the ultimate benefit of Sea Grant marine educational programs and CRD programs. I hope the process will never stop. Because it is out of the dynamics of exploring joint program efforts and tailoring existing program resources to meet the needs of marine and coastal interests that we achieve program improvement and upgrading.

Obviously, I would like to see the integration process move faster, however, I must be a realist in accepting the decentralized nature of our national extension and Sea Grant system. However, it is important that we fully understand and explore the opportunities resulting from joint Sea Grant - CRD program efforts. The opportunities are endless and we need to continue to have the vision necessary to capitalize upon them.

I am extremely proud of what Sea Grant has accomplished in New York State and nationally. It has been a source of inspiration for me to have had the opportunity to be involved in the development of the Sea Grant program. The institutionalization and integration process into Cooperative Extension has not been easy, but as documented by the reality of this workshop we have made major progress. It is not just a question of Sea Grant and CRD, it is the bigger question of Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension on which we must focus and establish our priorities.
This workshop is important because it documents the recognition, the interest and the commitment, and vision on the part of Cooperative Extension/Sea Grant administrators to capitalize on the success we have to date, and in planning for the future.

I wish to thank the planning committee and others for making this workshop a reality. I hope that this is only the beginning of future opportunities to share, explore, and to capitalize on both the successes and failures of joint Sea Grant/Cooperative Extension program efforts.
IMPLEMENTING MARINE EXTENSION PROGRAM

SEA GRANT IN STATE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAMS

Peter Horne
University of New Hampshire

A New Hampshire Perspective

It is timely that I have an opportunity to attend this ECOP/Sea Grant Workshop. My compliments to Dr. Marion Clarke and the conference committee who have planned an excellent agenda.

Brian Doyle, Program Director for the University of New Hampshire Sea Grant Marine Advisory Program, and I both came down here to benefit from your deliberations within the next few days in hopes that a proposal we are making at the University of New Hampshire to integrate the Sea Grant Program with the Extension Program will be a strong one. The purpose of our proposed integration is to combine resources for the ultimate benefit of our clientele. I would like to discuss the factors which we are considering in our rationale and sketch out our plan of action with the expectation that we'll have a stronger proposal after our discussion with you.

First of all, I believe we are all committed to the land grant mission which is to apply the resources of higher education toward the socioeconomic well-being of people. Whatever the program area, the process of identifying problems and committing our resources to solving those problems needs to be a thoughtful one. To accomplish this, we need to examine our organizational strengths and weaknesses, we need to be flexible and to keep in mind that the primary reason for linking with other organizational resources is to be more effective in fulfilling our mission.

This is the case in New Hampshire, and I'd like to share the situation with you to demonstrate the need to proceed with our plan for program integration. The Gulf of Maine is a magnificent resource and, as one can tell from looking at this coastal outline, it reaches from the tip of Cape Cod, Massachusetts to the Atlantic Provinces. (See attachment) A full range of marine activities takes place both offshore and along the coast of the three states and the Atlantic Provinces which border the Gulf. The Universities of New Hampshire and Maine are jointly designated as a Sea Grant College and, by this designation, share in program resources that support a Sea Grant Marine Advisory Program directed toward the marine community within the Gulf of Maine. The New Hampshire coast is only 18 miles long, whereas Maine's coast, if you unfold its accordion-like coastline, is over 3,000 miles. Add to that its 2,500 islands, and one can see that New Hampshire is minuscule in comparison. But, don't let this fool you. The users of the Gulf of Maine don't think of its size. They are simply interested in finding ways to conduct their individual enterprises or enjoy the recreational value of the resource. The harbors are full. There are clam management issues, aquaculture development issues, sport fishing, commercial fishing and commerce and industrial activities, side by side, to mention a few. One small section of the New Hampshire coast, called Hampton Beach, hosts over 100,000 people a day on its narrow strip of sand. The 7,000 acres of marsh land in New Hampshire are under constant pressure by the developers, and public policy issues abound related to the wise use of this resource over the long term.
In Maine and New Hampshire over 90 percent of the population live within 30 miles of the coast, and, in the coastal area of New Hampshire and southwestern Maine, two of the fastest growing counties in the United States are receiving newcomers every day. It is apparent that the users and the issues which emerge from the intermingling of people and the sea have no regard for state lines.

Since the Universities of New Hampshire and Maine are relatively small, it has made sense to combine the research and Extension resources of both Universities to be more effective in addressing the problems described above. In fact, the New England land grant Universities have several joint agreements to share expertise across state lines on a bi-state and regional basis where it can improve efficiency.

A key value which people hold in the two states is to have local accessibility to the resources of the University through the Cooperative Extension Service. The campuses of the Universities of Maine and New Hampshire are 200 miles apart, and yet, the county Extension offices that stretch between the two Universities offer local accessibility and the opportunity to tailor-make Extension programs to the needs of the people along the coast. For example, this networking capability has enabled local leaders from coastal communities in Maine to join their counterparts from New Hampshire in leadership development programs which have been sponsored by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The Maine-New Hampshire Marine Cooperators network has facilitated communications among Extension agents, Sea Grant and other state agency personnel to scope out research problems and to develop cooperative efforts.

The point is that the outreach capability of Extension, working closely with Sea Grant, is growing. These Maine-New Hampshire efforts have resulted in some excellent programs: i.e., 4-H Marine Science, Harbor Management, Clam Management, Nutrition Education and Fisheries Technology.

We are now at a point in our development where Extension programs in New Hampshire can be strengthened by a formal relationship with Sea Grant. The Cooperative Extension Service would like to be more responsive to the marine community, and it is in a position to make the necessary changes toward that end. The Maine-New Hampshire Sea Grant Marine Advisory Program which has successfully conducted programs in Marine Education, Commercial Fisheries, Coastal Resources Management and Marine Recreation/Tourism during the past eight years can benefit from the resources and delivery system of a larger network with local input through county councils in both states. There is a need on the coast of New Hampshire to be more active in both sport and commercial fisheries, aquaculture, and estuarine extension work. By combining resources, there is an opportunity to expand programs in this area. The College of Life Sciences and Agriculture at the University of New Hampshire, of which the Extension Service is a close affiliate, has a strong biological knowledge base which can be enlisted toward solving problems in the marine community. The Director of the Cooperative Extension Service at the University of New Hampshire reports to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and has access to disciplines beyond the College of Life Sciences and Agriculture should it be necessary.

All in all, we feel, by integrating our programs, we can offer more problem solving capability to clientele in New Hampshire. We also believe we can improve our efficiency and broaden our local base of support.

Our proposed plan of action is as follows. The University of New Hampshire Sea Grant Marine Advisory Program will become a fifth program area of the Cooperative Extension Service. It will be called the Sea Grant Extension Program. Brian Doyle,
Program Director of the University of New Hampshire Sea Grant Marine Advisory Program, will become a program leader and will participate equally in program development and administration with the other program leaders in agriculture, forestry, 4-H and home economics. Although the Sea Grant Advisory Program is much smaller, it is strong, and with visibility and full status within our organization, it will flourish both at the state and county level. If this plan is accepted, we fully intend to provide the support necessary for this program to be successful.

The two coastal county Extension councils will be asked to participate in supporting an Extension agent to initially serve the New Hampshire marine community in the area of fisheries, aquaculture and marine resource management. The Extension agent in this position will be backed up by Sea Grant Extension specialist resources in both New Hampshire and Maine. The two University of New Hampshire Sea Grant marine education specialists will become marine Extension specialists and will hold extension educator rank. The Cooperative Extension Service personnel system provides for more systematic recognition and support. Sea Grant educational specialists will continue to carry out their plans of work with both formal and educational groups such as schools and informal adult and youth groups. They will also help expand the 4-H Marine Programs initiated by agents in the field.

The Sea Grant Extension program will have access to all the computer, leadership development and training resources available to the University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension Service, its cooperators in New England and throughout the land grant system. The Sea Grant Marine Advisory budget will be committed to this program. Both Sea Grant and the Cooperative Extension Service will share in publications, communications and marketing programs which will benefit all parties.

A memorandum of understanding will be developed which will specifically address these arrangements. It will be reviewed annually to determine the effectiveness of this working relationship and adjustments will be made as necessary over time. If, after a given period, it is determined that the integration is not working, then both parties will have the option to discontinue the agreement according to a systematic plan.

In summary, we have an excellent opportunity to build a program which rests on the insights and experience of others. We know that twenty out of thirty Sea Grant Marine Advisory programs across the United States are currently affiliated or integrated with the Cooperative Extension Service. We are open and flexible as we move toward this integration and would welcome your comments and suggestions.

Given the circumstances of limited financial resources, individuals and organizations of like mind can serve clientele more efficiently if they combine their resources in a systematic way. This approach has been successfully demonstrated at other institutions. We, too, are prepared to take the cooperative action necessary to make a difference in the way people use the Gulf of Maine resource base toward their socioeconomic well-being.

It's a pleasure to be here, and I look forward to hearing your suggestions based on your Sea Grant Extension experiences over the past twenty years.
Minnesota's Sea Grant Extension Program is integrated into the Agricultural Extension Service of the University of Minnesota. The philosophy guiding the program is similar to that of the total Extension Service.

First and foremost, we are an educational program. Our purpose, like most land-grant institutions, is to extend the knowledge base of the University in forms and formats that bear on people's problems. Likewise, as connoisseurs of the local or grass roots perspective, we have a responsibility to be strong participants in setting the University's agenda, especially as it relates to research and public policy. Our goal then, is to develop and advance the decision-making capacity of Minnesota citizens. We do that by offering high quality continuing education programs to targeted individuals and groups that increase awareness, address areas of concern and conflict, and generally foster change through a growth and development model. That means we strive to be much more than information providers, or experts, in specialized areas of knowledge or technology.

To hold ourselves accountable to this mission we have developed value statements, or things we believe in, to help guide our decisions and hold us accountable. A few of the values which guide our work include:

1. Our teaching should emphasize the development of problem-solving skills.
2. As University educators, we should stress perspective, overview and analysis.
3. Volunteers should be involved in our delivery system to the maximum extent possible.
4. It is in the best interest of Minnesota citizens to attain a global perspective and understanding on issues related to their lives. Therefore, we should provide leadership in extending University resources internationally.
5. We should contribute to regional and national Extension efforts. Many issues which face Minnesota are broad in scope. We seek to minimize costs and enhance quality through joint program efforts.
6. A quality research program at the University is essential to a quality Extension program. Extension serves as the conduit for client needs to be translated into research priorities.
7. Extension strives to develop and maintain flexibility to allocate resources to meet emerging societal need. Extension faculty must resources be on the "cutting edge" of change.
8. Programs should be the result of dynamic, interactive process that reflects local needs, University expertise, and national priorities. Efforts at the local level should reflect the partnership between the county and the University.
9. We have a unique partnership among counties, the University and U.S.D.A.; this partnership should be strengthened.

10. It is in the best interest of all citizens that we function to minimize rural/urban dichotomies to develop a society free of artificial divisions.

11. The resources and knowledge of the total University should be available to the Agricultural Extension Service. We seek to develop structures and an environment which encourages interdisciplinary programming.

12. We constantly endeavor to integrate the three functions of the land-grant philosophy—teaching, research and extension.

13. Staff are our most important resource; we must develop policies, resources, and an environment which attract, retain and motivate quality staff.

14. Staff must practice an ethic of life-long learning; therefore, a quality staff development program is essential.

15. We have a special obligation to rural Minnesota. In addition, our programs should be available in urban areas to the extent resources allow.

16. Extension faculty must be effective educators and be competent in the use of educational principles and methods, as well as subject matter.

17. Extension must be aggressive in seeking public and private funding beyond regular appropriations.

We believe these value statements are the beacon by which we guide our decisions. They help us take the philosophical statements of our mission and bring them to life.

October 1985 will mark the beginning of the twelfth year for the Minnesota Sea Grant Extension Program. The program was initiated by the Continuing Education and Extension Program and the Agricultural Extension Service. The Sea Grant research effort was initiated in 1977 with four projects. In 1983, continuing Education and Extension withdrew financial support, and is no longer involved.

The Program is administered jointly through the Agricultural Extension Service and the Sea Grant Program. Sea Grant Extension appointments are in the Agricultural Extension Service, Community Natural Resource Development (CNRD) program area. Agricultural Extension Service pays 20-25 percent of Sea Grant agents' salaries, and Sea Grant agents have similar rights and responsibilities to other agents with AES appointments. The relationship allows Sea Grant agents access to all county extension programs and state extension specialists. Sea Grant agents are considered Northeast District CNRD staff by Agricultural Extension Service for purposes of coordination and administration. All planning and reporting is handled jointly by the CNRD program area and the Sea Grant Program. Sea Grant staff take staff development and training offerings through the Agricultural Extension Service.

Currently, the Sea Grant Extension Program is primarily limited to the Great Lakes coastal area. That comprises three counties, or about 3.5% of our total counties, serving approximately 6% of the state's total population. The coast is 206 miles long, 32 of which are within the city of Duluth. It is a major recreational resource within an international seaport. The Sea Grant Extension Director supervises the work of five
regional or multi-county staff, all located at the University of Minnesota–Duluth campus, and he coordinates the work of one campus-based specialist, located on the St. Paul campus. The agents are accountable through the Sea Grant Extension Director to the area CNRD program area. The Sea Grant Extension Director is administratively responsible to both the Sea Grant Director and the Associate Director of CNRD.

Currently, the Sea Grant Extension efforts are divided into seven program components:

1. Marine Recreation and Tourism
2. Coastal Industries
3. Communications
4. Marine Education
5. Fisheries
6. Aquaculture
7. Coastal Engineering

If I were to characterize the program as it is regarded within the Agricultural Extension Service, I would say it is a high quality educational program with an exceptionally talented staff of agents. We see strong cooperation and coordination among AES and Sea Grant staff at the local level. The impact of Sea Grant Extension programs on the total Agricultural Extension Service, however, is limited because of the scope and size of the program. Programming is confined to the coastal region and the Sea Grant Extension staff comprise less than 2 percent of the total extension service faculty. Nevertheless, I believe the limited resources of both Sea Grant and Agricultural Extension Service are considerable enhanced by the integration of the programs.

Several problem areas exist and will continue to exist as we move forward with this partnership:

1. Integration in all areas, including Sea Grant, required strong commitment for cooperation, collaboration and communication. These three "C's" take a great deal of time and are essential if trust is to build and more high quality integrated programs are to be the result. It is difficult to protect the time to be certain these three "C's" are handled effectively.

2. Because integration is by its nature an ambiguous, not clearly defined state, there is always a tendency for undue amounts of time to be spent on clarifying boundaries, relationships and administrative spheres of control. The goal of effective integration is to lower such divisions and distinctions. Ironically, however, sometimes our philosophies are ahead of our implementation skills, and we find ourselves caught up in attempting to define a highly ambiguous condition and losing our philosophical compass-point in the process. In such instances, program suffers and the staff experience increased stress. We believe, however, that as trust builds, the need for precise definition should diminish. Here, as in many other instances, the AES underestimated the magnitude of the effort of working through the process. That is not to say it is not worth it. To the contrary, I think it is. It just means the task is more difficult than we imagined.

3. Within its borders, Minnesota has more surface water than any other state in the nation. Water quality has become a national and a state priority. Fifty-eight agencies, at last count, in Minnesota are engaged in water
quality work. There is a tremendous need for more leadership and coordination. Minnesota Agricultural Extension Service needs to be more responsive in the water quality area. On the one hand, Sea Grant Extension would appear to be uniquely qualified to provide some of that needed leadership and thereby expand its visibility and impact on the state and the organization. However, the coastal focus of the program seems to preclude this role and we are not particularly skilled at looking at options or negotiating compromises. A similar scenario could be mentioned with regard to water transportation. Sea Grant has done programming in this area around the port of Duluth, but many of the state's issues also involve the Mississippi River. What is the opportunity for Sea Grant to exert leadership? Similar examples could be given in tourism, fisheries, and public policy. To what extent can the state's needs and the state's priorities shape the scope and the function of the Sea Grant Extension program? Certainly, Agricultural Extension Service's commitment to Sea Grant and Sea Grant's potential for growth within the Agricultural Extension Service will hinge on the answer to that question.

To conclude, we are happy to have the Sea Grant Extension Program integrated into the CNRD program area of the Agricultural Extension Service. We think that we are basically compatible partners. The agents in Minnesota have strong programs and they are capable of educational leadership beyond the objectives and goals of their current program. We are committed to the communication, cooperation and collaboration needed to more fully develop our potential.
SEA GRANT IN STATE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION PROGRAMS

A SEA GRANT DIRECTOR'S VIEW

William Q. Wick, Director
Oregon State University Sea Grant College Program

"The ultimate goal of the Sea Grant concept is to exploit the ocean in the national interest," Harve Carlson, October 1965.

There is absolutely nothing in Sea Grant's enabling legislation that says Sea Grant Advisory Services (Extension Sea Grant-ESG) should be integrated with State Extension Services (ES). Nevertheless, ES is probably a suitable home for ESG—if ES, after 70 years, is flexible enough to accommodate Sea Grant's functional paradigm.

Understanding Sea Grant

Sea Grant was formed primarily by blue-water oceanographers. Some of them thought they had designed another much needed source of ocean research funding. What really emerged was a unique people-oriented, university-based marine resources development program. A year or two after program inauguration, 'hard science' had been augmented by 'soft science', if you will. A major infusion of academic talent had crawled under the tent from outside the traditional boundaries of marine science. Lawyers, economists, anthropologists and, yes—extensionists and others had enlisted in Sea Grant and brought a new dimension to ocean development: People had entered the marine equation. And, because of this, the extension element of Sea Grant has continued to grow—now to 30-40% of the pie at most Sea Grant Colleges.

Sea Grant, Like Land Grant, Is a State of Mind

Sea Grant is perceived to be a larger program than it is, locally and nationally—a small tail wagging a big dog. At OSU, Sea Grant makes up about one-seventh of the $24 million annual marine budget, but many people assume that marine science, fisheries, ocean engineering, oceanography, etc., are synonymous with Sea Grant. Thus, Sea Grant is expected to be more and do more than it is capable of. One of our state Senators said, "Sea Grant is a good program but the research ship is always off South America."

Learning from each other

Atheiston Spilhaus seemed to really mean it when he called for 'county agents in hip boots'. After 17 years of experimentation, some conclusions can be drawn about this cooperative effort.

ESG-Sea Grant can and has learned from ES-Land Grant. But, ES, also can learn from ESG.

Consider this Extension mission statement: "The Oregon State University Extension Service provides education and information based on timely research to help Oregonians solve problems and develop skills related to youth, family, community, farm, forest, energy, and marine resources."
What does ESG get from ES?

Attitude—'smell of the hide'. A string of degrees does not an extensionist make—in fact, extension may be more art than science. I'm biased since I learned from office-sharing with an old time county agent.

Legitimacy—many Americans, rural or otherwise, know about Extension and county agents.

A method of operation, administration and training.

A cooperative funding model.

An army of colleagues.

Contrast this Ext/Sea Grant mission statement: "The Extension/Sea Grant Program provides training, education and technical assistance to people with ocean-related needs and interests. Major efforts are concentrated in fisheries and wildlife, marine engineering, food science and technology, economics, business, resource management, education, and recreation."

What does ES get from ESG?

An exciting new program area, more stimulating than rural civil defense, as I recall.

A sense of close functionality, among research, education, and extension. More on this later.

Some revised approaches to program delivery: interstate talent sharing, multi-state agent staffing, agents as specialists, increased use of research faculty for the extension function.

Access to a remarkable new collection of talent. In Oregon, for example, about half of the USDA Superior Service Awards since 1970, and many other recognitions have gone to ESG faculty. ESG in Oregon makes up about 5% of ES faculty.

Early Arguments

In the earliest days of Sea Grant I irritated colleagues by arguing that Sea Grant was simply a wet analogue of Land Grant and that marine advisory (ESG) programs were the same functional entity as ES. Elements on the other side replied in derision—'Do you mean the Agricultural Extension Service?' Perhaps some of you were involved. If so, you will remember that these were serious occasions that cost thousands of flight miles, days of time, and even a bucket of tears, if you can imagine.

But, then I became a Sea Grant College Director, and I've had reason, ever since, to ponder the question. I have found that there are differences between Land Grant and Sea Grant and differences between ES and ESG. Some of these are cosmetic; others are fundamental. Perhaps some have to do with aging. Let's look at some examples:

Size—Sea Grant is a small program, perhaps a tenth or less in total than even the ES part of Land Grant.
Historic—Land Grant's functions, specified in the Morrill, Hatch, and Smith-Lever Acts arose in three sequential human generations. Sea Grant's functions were established simultaneously. Because of this, Sea Grant maintains a functional closeness that Land Grant may have no chance of achieving. Schuh, "We (Land Grant Universities) need to revitalize the tripartite mission of training, research, and extension." Figure 1 helps me to understand the relationships among research, education and extension.

Competition and survival—Sea Grant people live by their wits, from budget to proposal and from year to year. Sea Grant is not merely slated for federal budget cuts; it's slated for annual extinction. This has made Sea Granters' alert, nervous, and somewhat belligerent. Fortunately, most elements of ES do not face this constant preoccupation with survival.

Each program is a friendly (?) competitor with all others.

The air of uncertainty has an effect on Sea Grant planning and conduct. Director's spend more time than they will admit in rebuilding positive attitudes. This is time lost from productivity.

ESG has pioneered new program delivery arrangements, out of necessity. These actions, such as talent sharing, are not usually the practice in ES.

Most of the 250 universities and colleges involved in the 29 program Sea Grant network are non Land Grant or private. Their extension philosophy is often underdeveloped.

Longevity may breed rigidity. Is Land Grant rigid? Sea Grant, to date, has been evolutionary. Freedom for new ideas can result in extraordinary productivity. As we, in Sea Grant, move toward more regimentation in planning and review, innovation may diminish. One of our best researchers told me—"little minds make little boxes."

Varied planning, proposing and reporting horizons between ES and ESG are an irritating difference. Can this be solved?

Sea Grant Research Myths and Realities

Sea Grant research is believed to be problem-oriented, localized and quick response. This is not true—in a sense that folks outside the universities can understand.

Fundable Sea Grant research is good science tending toward the basic side of the spectrum. Supporters, legislators, and the marine community presume that it is problem solving and wealth generating. It is, in time. The selected projects, however, may seldom match needs identified by ESG.

Fundable Sea Grant research is generic (national, regional), but is expected by constituents to be specific and localized.

Fundable Sea Grant research is futuristic and long term, but is perceived to be quick response.

These are the facts of life and cause the Sea Grant Director some heartburn. Who will conduct the suite of rapid response, crisis oriented, short term research projects?
Figure 2 illustrates the functional assignments for faculty in the OSU Sea Grant College. Other Sea Grant programs may vary in numbers but not fundamentals. Involved in Sea Grant are 81 faculty from five universities. These 81 total 36.6 full time equivalents (FTE's). Research involved 59 faculty, 20.4 FTE's. ESG totals 17 individuals, but 12.3 FTE's. Four faculty, 3.6 FTE's, are in administration and communications. These four are the only direct hires. ESG and research faculty are in other departments or other universities.

I describe this fascinating situation to explain a problem. There are times when I need and covet ESG for its faculty FTE's. I need help to take on the rapid response research and may need help in what I call "white hunting". I call on our ESG and they help, smiling most of the time. Both the ES and ESG Program Directors must agree to permit these occurrences. I predict that more and more of the short term studies will be conducted by ESG agents and specialists. California seems to be doing a good job at this now. This is certainly not new since ES has been involved in demonstration projects since time began. The difference may be in the complexity of emerging technologies.

As described in Partners and Parallels, there are several patterns in integration of ESG with ES. Most Sea Grant Colleges are administered from Land Grant campuses, the home of ES. The philosophical fit is comfortable, usually. Still, some of these have chosen not to integrate or to cooperate in segments. The caution may relate to unique Sea Grant needs or past experiences. Non Land Grant and private institutions have been especially cautious and uncomfortable.

Let me suggest, humbly, a more fundamental reason. Extension in Land Grant and Sea Grant may be operating under two paradigms. Admittedly, each overlaps the other.

1. In the Land Grant case, the primary goal is to improve the capabilities of people. Technical knowledge is the medium through which the training occurs. Experienced ESG agents in ES offices display this mode.

2. The central focus of the Sea Grant model seems to be a dedication toward making the functional elements of research, education, and extension mutually and closely supportive in developing the natural and human resources of the ocean arena.

Which paradigm fits Harve Carlson's statement?

At a later time, let's share a deep look at these questions. For the present, and for the OSU Sea Grant College, I am pleased that OSU has an integral relationship with ES.
SEA GRANT IN NEW YORK COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

Bruce Wilkins, Program Leader
New York Sea Grant Extension Program

New York has nearly 2500 miles of shoreline, most of that on the Atlantic. We are unique in having another 600 miles on the Great Lakes. Twelve million people live in our coastal counties.

And yet, as recently as 1971, no Cooperative Extension efforts were focused on marine or Great Lakes efforts. The 40 million pounds of food produced by New York fishermen were not considered when we in Extension said we were concerned with production of food and fiber.

Today - Cooperative Extension in New York has more than 25 positions with significant coastal emphasis. Marine efforts are a division, equivalent to agriculture or 4-H. And, I believe - know - Cooperative Extension and Sea Grant have benefited from this joint effort.

Sea Grant, competitively funded, has brought to Extension a vigor useful in any organization.

Extension has provided the strong philosophical and structural base valuable to Sea Grant, and students in our colleges are better served too.

We, as most in the survey, currently emphasize regional staffing. We have 12 regional extension specialists each trained in a specialty such as commercial fishing or processing, recreation industry, 4-H or coastal structures. We have seven campus-based staff including myself, none currently have full time extension responsibilities. Marine economics, food and nutrition, aquaculture are representative of these positions.

The staff we have targeted for growth in long range plans since 1978 are County staff. Four county agents today have 40-50% of their time committed to marine topics. All are in 4-H or home economics. Within the past two months, three other counties have decided to commit significant portions of existing positions to the marine area.

Muan of N.Y. Cooperative Extension's funding comes from counties. Today five counties contribute an additional $80,000 in salary support for specialized staff, one county contributes $60,000 of that.

In the past five years, we have shifted or eliminated 8 regional positions that had been largely supported by funds derived from Sea Grant. We are moving toward more state and county support for our Sea Grant efforts. There are many reasons for that, we can discuss those if you wish.

Sea Grant Extension efforts were set up 14 years ago as "Skunk Works". Perhaps you have read "In Search of Excellence" which describes elements important in today's successful organizations. If so, you know skunk works are entrepreneurial units within big organizations. Break a "champion" of an idea loose from many normal institutional constraints, give them tightly limited resources and tell them to get the job done. It is there that innovation is most likely to flourish in large organizations. The IBM PC was developed by a skunk works. The authors don't stress it but skunk works, though fine, must be blended back into the organization for long time survival.
If Sea Grant was or is a skunk works, what has or can contribute toward making it more fully a part of the Extension family? I have noted nearly 20 elements one might see as important. Some or all should have relevance in your situation as well as ours.

I'll look separately at state and county actions. We in this room presumably can influence the state items. These include:

A. A leader is present whose performance review and career is based primarily on making the marine effort successful. A champion—without this, forget it.

B. A name that gives credit to both partners. For example, Sea Grant Extension Program.

C. Have a staff position for marine efforts within Extension administration. Needn't be the person in A, but probably most logical.

D. Have representation on the state Extension advisory board from your marine constituency. Surprisingly few committees in most marine programs, yet this is a tenant of good extension programming.

E. Have the Extension Director on the Sea Grant College advisory or governing board.

F. Publication and media support for the Sea Grant Extension Program is identical to other Extension efforts. (Sea Grant Extension using the Sea Grant communicator seems poor).

G. Other support areas are as available to Sea Grant Extension staff as to others (penalty mail, awards, travel, computers).

H. Marine efforts gain equivalent fiscal support from funds controlled by the Director of Extension.

I. Where appropriate, divisional status is achieved.

J. Marine extension staff assume wider Extension leadership roles.

K. Indirect costs for this extension effort equals that charged on Smith-Lever funds.

What about county action? In all states, county extension effort is extremely significant. What are some key steps, indicators of progress with county staff and programs?

1. Marine programs in counties are topics at meetings of district or regional administrators.

2. Some county staff time is committed to marine programming.

3. Marine topics are included in statewide meetings of county administrators.
4. Some county funds are committed to marine efforts.
5. Some county staff position descriptions include marine responsibilities.
6. A county committee with a marine focus is established.
7. Representation from the marine audience sits on the county extension board.
8. Technical competency for some county positions specifies a marine field.
9. County leaders selected from among those with marine background.
10. You tell me.

Certainly some sticky wickets have to be overcome. The different funding sources make that a reality. They can be overcome if we keep in mind what the primary intent is. Penalty mail, names, performance review procedures - we can find a win-win solution, if we commit ourselves to that.

It is in our minds that most of the problems exist, and we can change that, as well as our practices. A marvelous phrase of Aldo Leopold applies here. In writing of expanding opportunities for hunting he noted "The job of recreation engineering is not one of building roads into the still lovely wilderness, but of building receptivity into the still unlovely human mind."

There is, and there will be, a dynamic tension between any new organization seeking to make its place in a larger group. Sea Grant Extension programs within Cooperative Extension reflect that.

But, if we are committed to providing the maximum benefit to the peoples of our state, we will move through such barriers to imaginative and productive solutions.
PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

GAINS AND LOSSES TO THE PARTNERS

James E. Carpenter, Director
Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service

I would like to talk first about the gains to the partners because I feel there are many more gains than losses in this relationship between the Cooperative Extension Service and the Sea Grant Advisory Service.

The Sea Grant-Land-Grant linkage implies to me more than a likeness in mission, i.e., Research, Teaching, Extension. It also implies a joining together to ultimately serve the people of this nation.

The biggest gains come from the joining together of the Sea Grant Advisory Service with the Cooperative Extension Service for the following reasons.

1. The Cooperative Extension Service has a long (70 years +) history and tradition of effectively designing and delivering informal action education programs that meet the needs of the people being served.

2. The Cooperative Extension Service is statewide in scope, allowing a much broader coverage than would be possible without the linkage between the Cooperative Extension Service and the Sea Grant Advisory Service.

3. The Cooperative Extension Service is closely tied to the knowledge base of the land-grant system which allows access to research and technology that can be immediately applied in finding alternative solutions to problems faced by the Sea Grant Advisory Service staff.

4. In addition to the knowledge base ties, the Cooperative Extension Service has numerous resources that are directly applicable to the work of the Sea Grant Advisory Service. In our state, the best example that comes to mind is our Information Services Department which has provided support for publications; mass media, including radio, television, and newspapers; audio visual material; and other teaching aids. The Computer Application Services is another department that has been regularly utilized by the Sea Grant Advisory Service. We also have a Food and Fiber Center that works with the further processing of food and fiber products, including seafood, which has worked closely with the Sea Grant Advisory Service.

5. The linkage provided an opportunity for expanding the clientele base for the Cooperative Extension Service. In our state, the Sea Grant Advisory Service Program focuses in an area that has little agriculture, therefore, limiting to some extent the clientele that are involved with the Cooperative Extension Service on a continuing basis. The Sea Grant Advisory Service introduced MCES to a number of individuals and groups who have been made aware of the total scope of Cooperative Extension Service programs and now are regular users of our educational programs and services.
8. The linkage between the Sea Grant Advisory Service and the Cooperative Extension Service increases the political support base for both units. The location of Sea Grant Advisory Service in the Cooperative Extension Service adds credibility to the program, but also through this affiliation allows access to a substantial political base that supports Cooperative Extension Service programs.

In the losses column, the following items should be considered:

1. By creating the linkage between the Sea Grant Administration and the Cooperative Extension Service Administration, both sacrifice some loss in flexibility that each would have if full administrative control rested with either of the units. Any decisions end up being compromise decisions that take into account the needs of both organizations.

2. Program planning and reporting processes are complicated by the different requirements of both units. Different fiscal years further complicate these processes.

3. Accountability is more of a problem than it would be if the linkage between Sea Grant Advisory Service and Cooperative Extension Service did not exist. It requires more time and attention to assure that one partner does not neglect the other in the area of accountability.

4. The Sea Grant Advisory Service, in some cases, is such a small part of the total program of the Cooperative Extension Service, it runs the danger of being overlooked or neglected by the Administration and Supervisory Staff of the Cooperative Extension Service.

I would add that if this does happen, I would blame the Sea Grant Advisory Service Program Leader just as much as the Administrative Staff of the Cooperative Extension Service.

5. The Cooperative Extension Service has more of a program focus at the local level than does the Sea Grant Advisory Service which seems to have more concern for regional and national program emphasis.

I am pleased to be asked to be a member of this panel to address the gains and losses to the partners. I have tried to share with you some of the basic thoughts I have concerning this topic and will be pleased to try to respond to any questions or to elaborate on any of the points that I have covered in this brief time period.
GAINS AND LOSSES TO THE PARTNERS

Walter J. Walla, Asst. Director
Agriculture and Natural Resources
Texas Agricultural Extension Service

I appreciate the opportunity to present my views on the gains and losses in the marriage between Sea Grant and the Extension Service. I use the term "marriage" rather than partnership because marriage implies a closer association and greater responsibility on the part of the partners in order for the association to endure. In a marriage, there are gains and losses to both partners when the contract is made, but as in any successful marriage, the outcome is that both partners are stronger because of the union.

Let me outline from my short association with Sea Grant what I perceive to be the gains and losses to the partners:

Gains to Sea Grant

a. Increases the credibility of Sea Grant as a part of established educational entity.

b. Provides facilities and support (secretarial, office space, equipment, etc.) which allows Sea Grant to devote a greater portion of their limited resources to delivery of educational programs.

c. The whole information delivery system of Extension is at the disposal of Sea Grant (county extension agents, specialists in other areas, communications department, etc.).

d. Reduces the need for administrative overhead i.e., district directors supervise marine agents, etc.

Gains to Extension

a. Broadens extension's horizon in focusing on a non-traditional audience.

b. Broadens extension's support base at the local level.

c. Indirect effect of cross-fertilization of Extension—exposes staff to new innovative programming ideas.

Potential Losses for Sea Grant

a. For a small program, it becomes part of a large bureaucracy and efforts and concerns may be diluted.

b. Non-traditional budget process does not get Extension support at the National level.

c. Sea Grant has a difficult time conforming to Extension's reporting process.
Potential Losses for Extension

a. Draws on already strained resources.
b. Some administrators have difficulty relating to marine programs.
c. Administrative lines are generally a matrix which causes communications problems.
d. Non-traditional budgeting causes problems with Extension's accounting systems.

I have been associated with Extension twenty-three years and Sea Grant seven months, and some would question my views due to my lack of tenure with Sea Grant. But, in my short stay at this meeting and my tenure with Sea Grant, I feel that there have been problems in the past. Most have originated due to inequitable treatment of Sea Grant by Extension. I have learned through the years that most problems, or perceived problems, can be overcome through communications. This meeting sponsored by Sea Grant and ECOP is a step in the right direction. We need to continue this effort and foster increased communications. Just as in a successful marriage, both partners must realize that in order for the partnership to succeed, there has to be sacrifices made on both sides. But above all, both Sea Grant and Extension must be committed to making the partnership work. It's working in Texas, and I'm committed to making sure the partnership continues to work.
GAINS AND LOSSES TO THE PARTNERS

James C. Cato, Director
Florida Sea Grant College Program
University of Florida

Sea Grant has as one of its major missions the extension education of those people who use our marine resources. This mission is accomplished nationwide using a number of administrative structures and organizational patterns. One of these administrative structures utilizes a strong partnership with the Cooperative Extension Service within the Land Grant University of each state. This paper is written to examine some of the gains and losses of Sea Grant Extension and Advisory Programs operating within the framework of the Cooperative Extension Service.

These comments were formulated with input from about ten persons nationwide. They represent Sea Grant faculty at all levels from agents in the field through Sea Grant directors. Comments came from faculty working both within and outside the Cooperative Extension Service framework. Thus, the gains and losses are presented from the Sea Grant perspective.

Two other comments are in order. First, no attempt is made to distinguish between both real and imagined gains and losses. Even if they are imagined, they need consideration from an administrative viewpoint in order to minimize conflicts within the organization. I do not personally view some of them as gains and losses which merit much consideration. However, they are all presented in order for all partners to be aware of real or imagined problems which might arise. Second, as is normally consistent with human nature, more losses are normally seen than gains. This may or may not represent the true case. No weights are assigned or implied to any of the gains or losses.

Gains and losses presented are organized into a number of categories. These include administrative, programmatic, financial, professional development, evaluation, credit, personnel, fringe benefits and credibility. Each is presented below.

Administrative

Gains

1. Allows the use of an already established support system at state and local levels regarding clerical help, facilities and offices. Other support items include editing, graphic and media services.

2. Adds a new program area with the same basic goals to an existing educational system program. This avoids the potential problem that building another program with the same educational goals might be viewed as competitive.

Losses

1. There are sometimes too many supervisors involved. A multi-county Sea Grant agent may be responsible to eight county extension directors, two district directors, a marine extension program leader and a Sea Grant director. All have legitimate reasons for the agent to follow certain
2. Within the Cooperative Extension Service, all field agents are regimented to the same policies. Thus, resources available to Sea Grant affiliated agents (e.g., travel funds) may not be allowed for use since they are not available for other extension people. For example, a typical policy for field extension faculty is limited or no out-of-state travel for training or to give training regardless of the specialty or interest. This may be fine as Cooperative Extension Service policy but is contrary to Sea Grant which often encourages this since the program is small and networking across state programs in encouraged. Many marine agents were hired with a "specialty" in mind both in-state and regionally. This is a necessity in a new, small and growing program. Sea Grant also has semi-formal regional extension program capabilities.

3. The Cooperative Extension Service does not adapt quickly to changing requirements and opportunities. In some programs field agents may report to a different branch of the service than specialists. This may lead to little centralized Sea Grant control and make it a difficulty to respond to outside Sea Grant stimuli.

4. Sometimes leadership may appear ineffectual. A Sea Grant marine project leader may come from extension and serve Sea Grant part-time with loyalties primarily to extension thus leading to Sea Grant always being compromised. This is particularly true in the early years. It is too easy in this type system for too many non-Sea Grant demands to be placed on Sea Grant advisory leaders.

5. Sea Grant needs to operate like a small business and be able to seize upon opportunities and change direction rapidly. The Cooperative Extension Service operates like a large corporation using a detailed administration with long planning lead time and changes direction slowly. Thus, a small business is having to operate within the constraints of a large corporation. This may cause unproductive, time consuming requirements for extra communication and coordination.

6. Early in some Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension Service partnerships, the agreement came from the "top down". This caused problems in that Sea Grant faculty were secondarily responsible to Sea Grant needs. Over time, working from the "bottom up" with marine trained people has solved part of this problem.

7. The Cooperative Extension Service is a very strong "observer" of county political lines. Many marine activities are more regional in nature, for example, fisheries, shipping, etc.

8. The traditional extension agent relates to a land grant university specialist and/or agricultural experiment station. Sea Grant normally relates to all universities in the state or region. Sometimes extension administrators at various levels do not appreciate the significance of this relationship. Agents sometimes feel they do not get credit for working with faculty at other universities. They are forced to go to the "land grant" campus first
when they know there may be a better resource available at another location. They also must only go "out-of-state" with questions through the state extension specialist.

9. In the Sea Grant system, extension has a front line high priority and essentially drives itself alongside research and teaching. On non land grant campuses, research normally comes first. When a Sea Grant program based in a non land grant setting attempts to operate its advisory program in partnership with a Cooperative Extension Service in a land grant setting, conflicts sometimes arise.

Programmatic

Gains

1. Non-traditional multidisciplinary expertise from the Cooperative Extension Service becomes available for use in programs. Examples are using agricultural engineering in seafood processing, ornamental horticulture in coastal vegetation, and the already established 4-H program, rather than having to build this expertise within the Sea Grant Program. Without Cooperative Extension Service involvement, these resources might not be interested.
   Access also becomes available nationwide to Cooperative Extension Service resources and marine agents receive stimulation from interacting with a diverse staff of professional colleagues.

2. Instant access is gained to county commissioners and other local influential groups to help in program planning.

Losses

1. Sea Grant program planning sometimes is forced into traditional CES program planning and reporting categories which don't fit all Sea Grant program areas. This is also true in applied demonstration type projects.

2. The extension approach depends heavily on serving the right people. These normally are the community leaders and traditional agricultural constituencies. Some feel this may result in missed opportunities to place emphasis where the greatest need exists in the marine area. In addition, program focus may be diverted from marine audiences to those that comprise the traditional extension constituency such as landowners and agribusinesses.

3. Some view the Cooperative Extension Service as too commodity oriented, thus causing marine extension to focus on marine commodities and overlook the general marine resource areas as well as coastal engineering. Traditional Cooperative Extension Service program planners have sometimes been viewed as narrow-minded about marine programs.

4. Agents sometimes feel the depth of their programs (and expertise) is overlooked because of specificity of agricultural extension programs and that they become forced to work in some of these specific areas.
5. Programmatically agents feel responsible to Sea Grant and administratively to extension. This creates conflicts.

6. Research perspectives and the integration of research, teaching and extension activities may be lessened unless specialist staff are housed in academic departments.

**Financial Gains**

1. The financial resources of the established Cooperative Extension Service program can effectively be used to support, build and bailout (during grant delay periods) a Sea Grant advisory service. The provision of match is also not to be overlooked. The federal mail franking privilege creates financial savings. Housing, administrative support, and some salary support from local counties are provided by the Cooperative Extension Service with cost savings to Sea Grant and a direct line is open to soliciting and receiving both state and county appropriated extension funds for marine specific positions. However, the competition with agriculture within the Service for new funds is substantial. Integration of extension and Sea Grant programmatic and administrative planning also has the potential for cost saving.

**Losses**

1. The indirect costs on a federal Sea Grant advisory program budget might not be used to directly benefit the program. The Cooperative Extension Service receives the federal portion of extension funding without charging indirect costs. This is based on tradition, history and early agreements between the Land Grant Universities, the U.S.D.A. and the federal government. However, indirect costs for Sea Grant advisory efforts are charged by the university. Some question this differing arrangement for receiving federal funds for performing similar functions.

**Professional Development Gains**

1. Sea Grant faculty are able to take advantage of training programs within the Cooperative Extension Service although there is often a problem with programs of interest being available or "making" due to the small number of marine agents involved in a traditional agricultural setting.

**Losses**

1. Agents and specialists may not have an appropriate professional home. The professional extension organizations are too agricultural oriented. Most staff meeting topics are not related to marine interests. Regional and statewide development programs often break with groups along commodity, discipline, or problem solving lines. The marine staff attending are not large enough to be a "group", yet they are required to attend.
2. Sometimes there are conflicts in dates regarding Cooperative Extension Service and Sea Grant training programs. Whose should take precedence?

Evaluation

Gains

1. The training opportunities, role models and the reward structure are based on advisory and extension activities.

Losses

1. The Sea Grant Director and advisory program leader may be removed from direct involvement of supervision and evaluation of advisory personnel from both input and seeing the results. Within the Cooperative Extension Service the existing framework may be satisfactory. However, there may be problems because of Sea Grant goals and objectives conflicting with those of the Cooperative Extension Service. In all other Cooperative Extension Service programs, the complete "drive" for the program comes from within (4-H, ENP, Community Development, Agriculture, etc.,) the system rather than partially from outside considering needs of an office (Sea Grant) in another federal department (Commerce).

2. Cooperative Extension Service people supervising agents are sometimes not comfortable as they know little about the subject matter of marine programs. Sea Grant agents sometimes feel that because of this, evaluations can differ among District Directors and others. Agents also sometimes feel that they are evaluated against agricultural agents on items that don't apply in the marine sector. The audiences are quite different and the marine audience is sometimes much more mobile (fishermen, shippers, etc.) Some audiences in Cooperative Extension Service come from tradition. Sea Grant is still building that tradition.

Credit

Gains

1. Who gets program credit is very important to a program. With an up-front agreement both the Cooperative Extension Service and Sea Grant benefit from a high visibility in the marine area. In fact, the Cooperative Extension Service may benefit relatively more from having a marine component. With effective credit, Sea Grant can gain more avenues to recognition and credit through the Cooperative Extension Service visibility system.

Losses

1. Everyone is expected to market Sea Grant/Cooperative Extension Service/County Extension/University etc. at the same time. This is difficult.

2. Marine extension loyalties are divided between Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension Service. Some staff may be hesitant to identify too closely
with Sea Grant, because of pressure from the Cooperative Extension Service which neutralizes the effort to build a strong image for Sea Grant. Sometimes this leads to all loyalties going to extend the needs of Cooperative Extension. When Cooperative Extension does not want to share credit a real problem exists. This extends to appropriate credit on letterheads, business cards, publications, etc.

Personnel

Gains

1. Personnel services are provided by the existing experienced system.

2. An extension service career ladder (sometimes with tenure) with a peer evaluation system exists.

Losses

1. The personnel system and methods for filling positions is very slow which creates problems for a small program.

Fringe Benefits

Gains

1. Federal retirement is a major consideration for some personnel.

Credibility

Gains

1. Good rapport with local officials and political leaders is derived largely from association with the Cooperative Extension Service, an established organization that is known and trusted at the local level. This system spreading across counties is particularly important to program development.

Losses

1. The local power base may be highly agriculture oriented and in fact may resist sharing resources to help support a marine program. Land based urban and rural clientele may be used to broaden programs. Marine programs are coastal, more specific and have smaller audiences. This may be perceived as being a credibility problem.

Each of the items discussed is intended to represent items in a shopping list of what might be gains and losses from the Sea Grant perspective of operating within the Cooperative Extension Service. Whether they actually exist, or the intensity of the gain or loss, will depend on the state of maturity of the partners and of those faculty and administrators operating within the programs. Hopefully, this discussion will aid as Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension Service partnerships do grow and develop where that is the chosen method of operation.
GAINS AND LOSSES

B. J. Copeland, Director
UNC Sea Grant College Program
North Carolina State University

We have been asked to comment on our view of the gains and losses of having or not having the Sea Grant Marine Advisory Services incorporated into the Cooperative Extension Program. In our case, at the University of North Carolina, the Marine Advisory Services is within the Sea Grant College; and, the Sea Grant College is a component within the University System composed of sixteen campuses. Traditionally, within our system the land grant university (i.e., North Carolina State University) has the responsibility for administering the cooperative extension service in North Carolina. Additionally, North Carolina A&T University, which is a constituent campus of the University of North Carolina, has responsibility for administering the 1890 extension program. In addition to the Agriculture Extension Service there are several other extension programs within the University. The School of Textiles at NCSU has an extension program, the NCSU School of Forest Resources has an extension program, the NCSU School of Engineering has an industrial extension program, the NCSU Division of Lifelong Education has responsibility for a variety of extension activities, there is a multi-college Furniture Institute that carries on extension programs, Western Carolina University has an Institute for Mountain Living with extension responsibilities, East Carolina University has an Economic Development Institute that carries out extension programs, and so forth. All these programs are administered through Deans to Vice Chancellors to Chancellors, to ultimately, the Vice President of the University System for Research and Public Service Programs; who is, incidentally, the same administrator who has responsibility for the Sea Grant College.

When Sea Grant first began in North Carolina in 1970 the Marine Advisory Services was composed of three projects administered just like any other project within a granting program. The Agricultural Extension Service had a project in seafood processing and handling through the North Carolina State University Food Science Department. The Industrial Extension Service within the North Carolina State University School of Engineering had a project in fisheries harvesting including gear and boats. The third project was part of the Division of Continuing Education at East Carolina University. It had the first marine agent and was located in northeastern North Carolina to deal with the diverse fisheries there. Eventually, we organized a Sea Grant College Marine Advisory Services Program which was recognized by the University as an entity comparable to other extension programs within other schools of the University. The only "project" left today is the seafood processing project in the North Carolina State University Food Science Department, but it answers administratively to the Director of our Marine Advisory Services. We worked out a memorandum of understanding between the Agricultural Extension Service and the Sea Grant Program to facilitate several cooperative ventures which have worked very well.

I will direct my comments from the standpoint of a Marine Advisory Services administered directly by the Sea Grant College. Therefore, when I talk about gains I will do that in the context of gains by being separate from the extension service and when I talk about losses I will do that in the context of losses by not being part of agricultural extension.
The Gains

One important gain by having a Marine Advisory Services administered through the Sea Grant College is the reduction in length of the administrative chain. In MAS, we have an administrative chain of only two links: i.e., the Director of Marine Advisory Services answers to the Director of the Sea Grant College who answers to the Vice President of the University for Research and Public Service Programs. This enables policy and operations to proceed rapidly and if we need to change directions we can do so quickly. This is a real plus in a rapidly changing and recently developing field of marine extension. This also includes the added advantage of having the undivided attention of the Sea Grant administrator for Marine Advisory Services. We can write better proposals and we can better integrate the Marine Advisory activities within the goals of the Sea Grant Program.

Another important gain is the elimination of layers of bureaucracy. The Agriculture Extension Service is a very large organization, at our place they have over 800 FTE’s. The inherent bureaucracy in an organization that large is very time consuming and complex. A lot of time is spent in various layers of staff and administrative meetings. The nature of Marine Advisory Services is such that interregional and interstate activities must occur and the bureaucratic layering for approvals of staff travel and staff activities can be a hindrance.

A third gain is to not be lost in a huge agency with different priorities. The extension service is a long standing, eminently successful operation, but they are not apt to change very quickly to accommodate a strange, multidisciplinary program like marine sciences. Marine sciences, by its nature, is multidisciplinary and involves a different set of clientele than what the Extension Service has traditionally responded to. Sometimes there are conflicts between the agricultural interests and the fishing interests and we believe that this can be more reasonably solved by cooperating at the top than it can by being integrated at the bottom.

The Losses

One major loss from not being a part of the Extension Service is not taking advantage of an ongoing, visible operation. The Extension Service is a long standing, highly thought of adventure and the Marine Advisory Services could take advantage of that track record and high visibility. The development of a small autonomous organization characteristic of many of our Marine Advisory Services Programs is a difficult task, given the fact that people normally recognize the university as having but one extension program. It takes time and a good job of public relations to overcome that loss.

Another loss is possibly financial. The Extension Service has done an excellent job in incorporating county and local funds into the total operation support of the extension program. The Marine Advisory Services, operating on its own, has great difficulty in taking advantage of that possibility.

A third loss could be the missing out on long-term tradition. Land Grant Universities and the Extension Service, along with increasing citizen’s awareness, all grew up together over several decades of development. That fine tradition may have several advantages although it might also have several disadvantages. Depending on how the Marine Advisory Services conducts itself, that long-standing tradition could be overcome by a first class organization and program.
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On Balance

The crucial question regarding how we should proceed into the future revolves around the balance of the gains and losses from being separate or integrated. I would argue that that question cannot be answered unless one takes into consideration the nature of one's university, the nature of one's clientele, various priorities and how the program is financed before the question can be answered in a general case. In our case, we believe that the gains of doing our own thing outweighs the losses of being separate.
GAINS AND LOSSES TO THE PARTNERS

Dale Baker, Director
Minnesota Sea Grant Extension Program

Before I talk about Gains and Losses to the Partners, I would like to give you a brief overview of the Sea Grant Extension Program in Minnesota. The gains and losses which I refer to today come from our being a part of the Agricultural Extension Service in Minnesota. It is important to understand that gains and losses will be individualized depending on the program's history, the administrative structures within the State, and the personalities involved.

Sea Grant Extension in Minnesota was initiated eleven years ago. The program was initiated as a joint effort of the University of Minnesota, Agricultural Extension Service, and the Continuing Education and Extension Program. The two programs shared in providing matching funds and an administrative structure. The Sea Grant Extension program is located at the University of Minnesota Duluth Campus which is 150 miles from the twin cities campuses where both the Sea Grant Directors office and the Agricultural Extension Service are headquartered. The Minnesota SGEP has utilized Agricultural Extensions Area Extension Agent concept and has five area extension agents located on the UMD campus. We also have one Sea Grant Extension Specialist (45% time) who is located in the Fisheries Department in St. Paul. These area extension agents have different marine backgrounds and have specific subject matter responsibilities. Each agent geographically covers the entire Minnesota coastal area.

Minnesota Sea Grant has had a research component and a Sea Grant Director for the past several years. Continuing Education and Extension made a decision that SGEP did not fit their mission and decided three years ago that they did not want to be a partner and dropped their financial support. Today Sea Grant Extension agents have Agricultural appointments and their efforts are coordinated by both Agricultural Extension and the Sea Grant Program.

The gains and losses which I will discuss today are ones that have been discussed internally with the Minnesota Sea Grant agents. I have grouped all my losses under the heading:

We Are Neither Fish Nor Fowl

1. Being part of both Agricultural Extension and Sea Grant Extension caused increased "organizational maintenance". This organizational maintenance amounts to, by our agents calculation, 20% of our total effort, or in simpler terms, 1 day a week is spent on this endeavor. These efforts include program development, staff meetings, district conferences, staff development, etc. Many of these organization maintenance items are a given time commitment regardless of the partnership. Minnesota SGEP and Ag. Extension have addressed the question of increased "bureaucracy" brought about being a member of Agricultural Extension. Recently areas of increased organizational maintenance demands because we are a part of Ag. Extension, as perceived by the agents, on their time were resolved by making district extension meetings optional, making Ag. Extension staff development offerings optional, and combining the Ag. Extension and Sea Grant planning process together. We, therefore, have resolved this problem in Minnesota to our satisfaction.
2. We don't nicely fit into the Ag. Extension organization. In Minnesota in the past there have been three clearly defined program components Ag., 4-H and Home Ec. The fourth area, CNRD (where Sea Grant enters the organization) has been less well defined and has the appearance of being a "catch all" area for programs which don't nicely fit into other areas. In the past year it is my impression that Minnesota has taken a much clearer look at its CNRD program area and worked at defining its mission. This will definitely benefit Sea Grant Extension.

3. Sea Grant Extension Agents cannot get continuous appointments with the Agricultural Extension Service. The rational is used, that because Sea Grant Extension budgets flow from a different source (i.e., Dept. of Commerce) Ag. Extension cannot offer a continuous appointment (similar to a tenure commitment) to Sea Grant Extension personnel. Ag. Extension States have less control over Sea Grant dollars than they do over their traditional funding sources. Continuing appointments may also become a thing of the past for Ag. Extension personnel and term appointments (3 or 5 years) are what we are looking at for the future.

4. There are no professional organizations within the Agricultural Extension Service for Sea Grant Extension personnel. Agriculture, Youth and Home Economics have their own professional organization, CNRD or Sea Grant have not formed one. I would argue that the onus lies on Sea Grant and CNRD personnel to see that an organization is formed.

5. Problems with establishing identity. Are we Sea Grant agents, or Ag. Extension Agents? Both, are questions which we have been asked in the past. Many Ag. Extension County Agents are unsure how we fit into the system. Time and continuous contact with Agricultural Extension personnel at meetings and conferences should resolve this problem.

6. The Sea Grant Extension Program sometimes faces double jeopardy. There are sometimes differing expectations from Sea Grant and Ag. Extension and the Sea Grant Extension program gets caught in between. The solution to this problem lies in better communication and laying out clear cut expectations.

Conclusions:

The losses because of the partnership in the case of Minnesota do not bring about programmatic losses but most likely result in higher stress levels to Sea Grant Extension personnel. Gains because of the Partnership. Gains have been grouped under the heading.

The Fowl are Willing to Share their Homes and Food with the Fish

1 Training and Staff Development capabilities are something which Minnesota Agricultural Extension excels. Sea Grant Extension personnel take advantage of training and staff development programs offered by Ag. Extension throughout the year. These programs are excellent and meet a lot of our needs. They do not meet many of our programmatic needs but on a Great Lakes regional basis we are able to meet specific programmatic needs of our agents. Our agents also offer staff development offerings to other county agents.

2. We have clear access to county staff and specialists for program support and delivery. County agents located in all 87 Minnesota Counties and hundreds of
state specialists in St. Paul, amounts to a tremendous human resource, talent base and communication network.

3. Through the Agriculture Extension Service we have the ability to reach clientele through other professionals. It is not only Sea Grant Extension personnel who deliver Sea Grant programs. We are able to rely on county extension staff to deliver a variety of our program efforts.

4. We have the access to salary dollars, staff support money and program support dollars. Twenty percent of the salaries of our extension agents are paid by the Ag. Extension Service. We have the access and take advantage of a large amount of program support (i.e., franking privilege) and staff support (travel support) for a variety of Sea Grant Extension efforts.

5. Use of the Agricultural Extension appointment and fringe benefits. All Sea Grant Extension staff have a federal appointment and fringe benefit package offered by the Agricultural Service. We have all the benefits, rights and privileges of these appointments. These appointments are specifically designed for individuals with extension responsibilities. These types of appointments also carry the right to go on single and double quarter study leaves. Appointments within other parts of the University could be negative for individuals and extension responsibilities.

6. There is a sense of belonging to a large organization which can provide a lot of support. This relationship leads up to believe we are part of a major organization with a variety of career paths. This same sense of belonging could never be duplicated with a small organization such as Minnesota Sea Grant in Minnesota.

7. Personnel evaluations and salary determinations are done by the Agricultural Extension system. This system is specifically developed for extension personnel and fits Sea Grant Extension responsibilities. Many evaluation systems which are used within the University do not fit individuals with Extension responsibilities.

Conclusion:

It is my strong impression that being a part of the Agricultural Extension in Minnesota is a major benefit and the gain greatly out weighs the losses.
GAINS AND LOSSES TO THE PARTNERS

John H. Judd
Michigan Sea Grant Extension

By the way of introduction, Michigan Sea Grant was initiated in 1969 as a program of the University of Michigan. Sea Grant Extension (SGE) was a part of the overall program, but had no link to Cooperative Extension (CES). In 1977, we developed a cooperative program between the University of Michigan and Michigan State University. At that time, SGE was tied to CES. Agents are now a part of CES and are designated as District Extension Sea Grant Agents. The Program Leader also serves as Associate Program Director for Natural Resources and Public Policy within CES.

With that as background, I would like to address some of the gains and losses as perceived from the standpoint of a program that is both a part of CES, yet very much a part of the Michigan Sea Grant College Program.

CES/SGE: POSITIVES OF CO-HABITATION

1. Identification with the Education Role of CES - As a part of CES, we are within a recognized group, known for its aid to people. Extension County Offices are known as the place to go to get help and information. Agents act as a conduit to bring Sea Grant Extension into contact with clientele and to feed problems to SGE agents.

2. Advantage of an Existing Network of Workers and Structure in Place - In many cases, knowledgeable agents are already in the field. SGE agents can call upon this expertise as well as aid these agents in their efforts. We have found this to be the case in such program areas as tourism and fisheries. A cadre of specialists on campus can be called upon for research and expertise. These individuals have the land grant philosophy and established and proven educational abilities. There is also an on campus support system of publications and in-service training. CES can also provide a media backup for the agents in the form of a news release network as well as radio and video coverage.

3. Sea Grant's contribution to the CES System - SGE can go a long way toward enriching the perspectives of CES staff on all levels. Broadening of CES horizons results in the Extension staff becoming involved with new clientele or with previous clientele in new ways. CES agents have aided groups and individuals in such areas as underwater park planning, coastal tourism and coastal community development. We have also helped to add new directions to ongoing programs. For example, we have aided in the planning development and teaching of a 4-H Great Lakes Camp for teen leaders. Because SGE has gone through five years of zero funding, we have had to place great emphasis on program evaluation and documentation of results. We have become a catalyst and an example for a greater emphasis on evaluation by many programs within CES.

4. Professional Belonging and Career Opportunities - Sea Grant agents feel a greater sense of professional belonging by being a part of CES. There are established role models through which new agent staff can more quickly learn to become a part of the extension team. CES provides broader
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opportunities for career development and a career ladder for professional advancement. Within our system, there is greater job security through continuing employment after six years within the program.

**OPPORTUNITIES**

Although there are perceived problems of Sea Grant Extension being within Cooperative Extension Service, these can perhaps best be seen as opportunities where both SGE and CES can benefit through changes or modifications.

1. **Sea Grant Extension as a "step child" of Land Grant - Agriculture, Home Economics, and 4-H form the major portion of most Cooperative Extension Programs. Natural Resources, as a fourth program area, is generally much smaller. In some instances, it becomes the catch-all for any programs that do not have a home. When SGE falls within any one of the program areas, it is to a great extent lost within the larger system that is CES.**

2. **Program Visibility - As mentioned above, SGE is usually a part of one of the larger program areas within CES. As such, many times it carries the titles of both SGE and CES. This adds to the difficulty of identifying SGE to the various publics that make up our clientele. There is also the difficulty of conveying the concept of SGE/CES joint effort to new clientele.**

3. **Voids in Inservice Training - Many of the Extension inservice and staff development programs are not appropriate for SGE, yet agents are expected to attend as a part of their job requirement. In addition, regional planning meetings leave a void as far as SGE is concerned. A number of SGE programs have developed their own sessions for inservice. We now find that agents from other program areas are attending our sessions.**

4. **Evaluation of Agents and Programs - In the early years of SGE/CES cooperation, some administrators found it difficult to evaluate SGE agents and programs. Many times CES personnel had the wrong perception of Sea Grant's role and agents were not looked upon as a true part of CES. By educating the administration concerning Sea Grant, what we do and why we do it, this is no longer a problem. There still remains, however, the requirement for dual reporting. CES and SGE reporting years are, in our case, six months out of phase. This requires two sets of annual reports and also, two sets of plans of work.**

5. **Multiple Administration - Because ours is a cooperative program between two universities, SGE must be responsive to both, as well as to CES. We are involved with different funding sources, each with its own set of matching and reporting requirements, as well as different annual start dates. Finally, each institution has its own philosophy regarding administration, research, education and extension.**
ASSESSING NEEDS

Andrew J. Weber, National Program Leader
Natural Resources and Rural Development Unit
Extension Service, USDA

Let me begin by providing some clarification of the title of my discussion this afternoon. This is not intended to be a discussion of the latest state-of-the-art for conducting needs assessments. There are others here in the audience that are better qualified than I am to address that topic. The recent handbook authored by Midge Smith entitled "Identifying and Prioritizing Citizen Needs for Extension Program Development" is clear, concise and I commend it to you for your use.

I prefer to explore with you some of the more subtle aspects of needs assessments that we either take for granted or tend to overlook. You and I live and work in an information society. Our programs transfer information and knowledge. Communications are a fundamental and essential element of every dimension of Extension programming. Within this context needs assessments are or can be a powerful tool. The emphasis here is on the word tool.

Formally, we might define a needs assessment as a process that produces several products. These products include an identification of needs segment, a segment that prioritizes needs and a selection segment from which programs will be developed. The most basic element of this definition is the term process. There are times when it appears to me that we are long on technology and short on process. Within the context of needs assessments, process has a number of different connotations. From my perspective, it implies involvement, planning, communicating, listening (and hearing), responding, decision-making, and legitimizing just to name a few. I do not want to imply that process is an end in itself. However, a complete and comprehensive process is what gives the product that is produced power.

Since the frame of reference of most of you here is that of a program manager, let me make my point with a series of questions. Keep score for me. Answer the following questions with respect to your own programs. Can you articulate local needs that Extension Marine Programs can have an impact on? Do you have local support for Extension Marine Programs that address these needs?

Does this local support include influencers (at least elected and appointed local officials) in local communities and/or counties. Have clientele and local influencers participated in identifying and prioritizing needs and developing program strategies.

Let's focus at the State level for a moment. How does your State staff know what the needs of local clientele are? Are State level decision-makers aware of what the local issues, needs and priorities are? How do you establish program priorities? Who has legitimied them? Can clientele needs, issues and program priorities for your State be aggregated with other States to form regional or national statements of needs, issues and program priorities?
I can go on and on with questions. How many have you answered yes to? Often we lament the lack of support for our programs. However, this lack of support more often than not can be traced to the fact that we have not utilized a very effective process in the assessment of clientele needs or development of programs. If your answers to the questions were negative, examine the process that you use. Does one exist? How can it be improved?
ACCESSING CLIENT'S NEEDS AND INCORPORATING THESE NEEDS IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

Donald E. Sweat, Agent
Florida Sea Grant Extension Program

ABSTRACT

Florida Marine Extension Agents plan annual programming based on needs identified by various client groups; local and state agencies and local advisory committees.

Additionally, state staff and specialists are compiling statewide needs identified by an agencies' liaison committee as well as an industry advisory committee.

These identified needs are discussed at an annual Marine Agents' planning conference, and when deemed of regional or statewide importance, are coordinated into major statewide programs with specialist involvement.
PROGRAM EVALUATION

EVALUATING MARINE ADVISORY AND SEA GRANT PROGRAMS
TWELVE CARDINAL SINS

M. F. Smith, Associate Professor & Program Evaluation Specialist
Florida Cooperative Extension Service, IFAS
University of Florida

Evaluation is a sinful profession, especially if you define "sin" as an act committed willfully or negligently which prevents the best possible results to accrue from the study of a program. Of course we evaluators are not to blame—we just get caught up in the sins of programmers who willfully or negligently commit acts which prevent the best possible results to accrue from programs! Actually, neither evaluators nor programmers can "throw the first stone" for both, working together, can prevent most of the sins which occur in evaluating extension programs.

What I want to talk with you about today is planning Marine Advisory evaluations to be useful, feasible, ethical, and accurate.4

Useful means someone wants the information—some decision(s) will be affected;

Feasible means the information is delivered at the time to be of use and at a cost that is reasonable;

Ethical means it was done fairly—people's rights were not violated; and

Accurate means the data are credible—they can be used with confidence.

The discussion is couched in terms of actions which keep evaluations from being useful and/or feasible and/or ethical and/or accurate. These are the Cardinal Sins of Program Evaluation.

Sin 1: Designing an evaluation without first having a clear definition of the program.

The primary problem the Florida Cooperative Extension Service (CES) has found with conducting impact studies is the lack of clear program design or program logic which lays out a logical, plausible path to problem amelioration. This problem is common to field studies, especially those of programs aimed at reducing people's needs. Sometimes energetic professionals are anxious to get on with doing something to meet pressing needs and do not take the time to establish firm empirical bases for what gets done and/or the way it gets done.

Another reason the rationale tends to be omitted is that funding for Sea Grant and other programs gets continued on the basis of documentation of need not on documentation of program success in satisfying those needs or in improving marine situations.

A description of a program framework is important to an evaluation for several reasons: (1) It is hard to design an evaluation for something if you do not know what it is. (2) A program generally has intermediate objectives that must be met before overall goals are achieved. Having the program described and causal linkages noted allows for data collection to occur at the most opportune times to capture results and in time to make program adjustments if expected outcomes are not occurring. (3) If a program does not achieve its objectives, the lack of program design will prevent one from knowing if the cause is system failure or theory failure. System failure would be if the causal sequence was not set in motion; i.e., the intended activities were not implemented. Theory failure would be if the activities were the wrong ones for the intended outcomes. An example of system failure in the St. Johns County, Florida, Marine Advisory Program could be if the Marine Agent did not make information available to fishermen on ways they could increase their successful decisions about where to fish. Theory failure would be if the reason fishermen were not catching more fish related to equipment or regulatory problems rather than inadequate information for decision making. (4) Describing a program before designing the evaluation of effects would require a great deal of time to detect. (5) This assessment may also avoid the waste of resources spent on evaluating a program that never got off the ground while at the same time increasing accountability. Accountability refers to evidence that there is indeed a target population that can be dealt with by means of the program; that this population is important either because of its size or the intensity of the problem; and that the program is actually being undertaken with the target population.

Evaluations can be done which do not require clear program frameworks. However, evaluations designed to determine if programs are effective require a clear delineation of what the program is trying to do—clear objectives. And, if we want at the same time to collect information for program improvement—for changing the course of programs—then the strategies or activities planned and carried out to meet the goals must also be specified.

II. Measuring something that does not exist — Type III Error.

How a program is expected to be by those removed from the point of direct intervention or how it is described in written documents may be substantially different from how it is in the field. Program descriptions can be inaccurate as a result of a people problem or a programming problem. People problems may be of three types: (1) dreaming—they describe what they want to happen; (2) making a mistake—they think something is going on which is not, a key program characteristics are accidently omitted; and (3) lying—they describe what they want others to believe is happening. The programming problem stems from the fact that problems and situations change. The wisest course of action six months after a plan has been written may not be what was planned.

The point here is that some checking should be done to see if what is planned is actually what is being carried out, before large sums of money are spent on designing data collection instruments, collecting data, and then discovering that what was

"measured" was not being implemented. This may not mean that what is going on in the field is bad or inconsequential. However, in the public arena such a finding may be hard to distinguish from program failure and may have adverse effects on whatever program does exist.

Sin III: Measuring something no one cares about—Type IV Error.⁷

Sin IV: Failing to identify and consult stakeholders.⁸

The mere fact that data can be collected does not mean they will be useful or that anyone will note their existence. Every question in an evaluation should be traceable to some definite use by some specific person(s). Credible evaluations are very resource intensive. They use resources that might have been spent on program delivery had the evaluations not been done. "Nice to knows" have no place when resources are scarce.

Measuring something that is inconsequential or that no one cares about (Sin III) is likely to result from ignoring stakeholders (Sin IV) but may result anyway if the stakeholders are not approached early in the evaluation planning and if they are not helped to answer the right questions: Who? What? When? How?:

WHO is the evaluation for? Who wants the information? Who are the stakeholders?

WHAT do they want to know?

WHEN do they need/want the information?

HOW do they prefer to learn the results?

A word of warning about stakeholders, if they are persons other than those implementing the evaluation: One cannot afford to carry out evaluations without considering stakeholder wants/needs nor can one assume that they know exactly what they want or what an evaluation can deliver with a reasonable amount of resources. However, they should be given the opportunity to communicate their evaluation needs and to receive estimates of costs to deliver that information with some specified degree of accuracy. Expectations should be explored early on and re-explored as the evaluation progresses.

Be aware that a request for data on the "results" of a program may not be specific enough for an evaluation to meet stakeholder needs. For example, in one Marine Advisory program in St. Johns County, Florida, "results" could be reported as the number of cubic feet of sand dunes resulting from the placement of the trees on the beach or the change in the rate of erosion now as compared to when the trees were not there or the value of a bridge that did not wash away this year as a result of the sand dunes being in place. Program staff may need to educate stakeholders about what results/impacts are possible and then question them carefully to clarify what will best meet their needs.

---

⁷ Ibid.
Sin V: Allowing demands of the evaluation to outweigh the payoffs.

This is a sin that causes staff resentment and wasted resources on incomplete and/or inadequate data collection. Evaluations require a great deal of planning and careful execution for results to be credible. Non-committed implementors can sabotage evaluations by collecting the wrong information or by collecting the right information at the wrong times or by simply doing nothing. Excuses can always be found, for example, day-to-day demands of running the program. Thus, it is important to consider in advance what rewards can accrue from evaluations for the organization and for those who carry them out.

Staff should be encouraged to get involved, to be selfish and go after something they want, e.g., to create awareness of their programs to higher administration; for concrete evidence to justify additional resources; for data to use to write a paper so one can travel to a professional association meeting and/or for a publication which most consider necessary for academic survival. At the same time, the CES organization should look for ways to make evaluations pay off for the staff, e.g., a category in the performance appraisal process which recognizes the collection of useful data—not just any data but useful data.

The point here is that evaluations need clear goals just as much as do programs. And, if they are not begun with definite specifications about what needs to be different when they are finished, they are not likely to cause any differences or to satisfy anyone's needs.

Sin VI: Failing to set standards or comparisons against which to judge program results.

Standards are the yardsticks against which program results are measured. They are helpful as a basis for interpreting purely descriptive information about a program or service, as a means for making decisions about what we are evaluating, and as a way of communicating with others what we value in our programs.9

Setting standards before data are collected increases the clarity of the information desired from the evaluation, protects against claims that findings are either irrelevant or insufficient to indicate program performance, and forces program managers and decision makers to be honest and realistic about program expectations.

Evaluation at its most basic level involves just two procedures: Measuring something and comparing the findings to some expectation or standard.10 It is generally not the absolute value of something that is measured which is significant but the difference between the value and that of some other comparable program, person, or organization. Thus, the intended purpose of standards is comparison.

Program staff need to take on the job of defining standards for their programs. Unless they define what they are trying to accomplish they will not know if they have succeeded or failed and they run the risk of having others set standards for them when evaluations are to be done.

Sin VII: Allowing the evaluation to confine the program.

Design flexibility is a requirement for field studies. That is not an admonition to "make it up as you go", but does suggest that some planned procedures will almost always be found to be unfeasible and some preplanned questions will turn out to be of less interest than those that emerge as data are gathered and more is learned about a program. The totality of the evaluation project should be envisioned at the start but the plans should not be hardened until sufficient data warrant such a direction.

Evaluations have to be as dynamic and fluid as the programs they are designed to assess. We cannot control program situations and have them have relevance for drawing conclusions for what would have happened in uncontrolled situations—which is the norm for Extension. If conclusions are to be valid, evaluations must assess what occurs naturally.

Sin VIII: Coveting one evaluation design or approach.

There is no one best design. There can be no absolute judgement about what is practical. What is entirely feasible in one situation is entirely impractical in another. Each evaluation setting should be approached as a problem to be solved—and the resulting design should reflect the best thinking about the problem as opposed to an attempt to follow a prescriptive design or model. The prerequisite for this situational responsiveness is a firm grounding in fundamentals—in knowing a lot of possibilities and alternatives and coming up with a unique combination to fit each setting.

Sin IX: Worshipping numbers.

Recent discussions with individuals in the Marine Advisory area—as well as with those in other areas—have recalled for me the need for balance in the types of data collected. There seems to be an enchantment with the use of numerical formulae to arrive at estimations of program impact and an over use of dollars as the variable reported. The prevailing enchantment with numbers sometimes leads to an underestimate of the value of clear and logical reasoning. So much effort is put into collecting and processing statistical descriptions that little time is left to think about overall patterns and other types of significance, e.g., practical, social.

Program staff should not force qualitative impacts into quantitative molds for reporting nor should efforts on qualitative impacts be decreased just so more numbers can be reported. What does need to be done, though, is to exert more effort in defining exactly what the impacts (qualitative and quantitative) are and finding ways to know if they have occurred. As was pointed out in Sin VI, program staff have the responsibility to define the means by which their programs can be evaluated. If numbers (or dollars) are not appropriate, what is?

Sin X: Collecting evaluative data from subjects who are not a part of the targeted audience.

This Sin is likely to result from programmers failing to identify exactly who programs are for. When it occurs, a program will appear to have less impact than may be the case. For example, among the potential audience for a Marine Advisory program are at least four groups:

Older fishermen who, because of age, are winding down their operations. The amount of change to be expected from them is minimal. They are likely to want to be reducing expenditures and to have little interest in adopting new technologies.

Hobby or part-time fishermen most of whom work full-time in other jobs and fish on weekends. The amount of change to be expected may be minimal because of lack of technical ability, lack of appropriate equipment, and/or lack of real interest in fishing as a business.

Sports fishermen who compete with commercial fishermen with fish sales but are not required to abide by the same rules and regulations, e.g., the current problem in Florida with overproduction of King Mackerel.

Commercial fishermen who are seriously pursuing fishing as a way to earn a living. They will make any changes that can be shown to be profitable if the risks are not too high.

The point here is that if evaluative data are collected from all four types, the level of success may appear minimal or nonexistent. Instead data should be collected from those who are actually targets of a program—those who have the interest and ability to do new things. It also means that they have to be identified and programming efforts focused to insure sufficient reason to expect impact to have occurred.12

Sin XI: Using the whole population when a sample would be adequate.

A large amount of resources is wasted by collecting evaluative data from more persons or situations than are necessary to satisfy those who are asking questions about programs. An equal amount may be wasted and suspect conclusions drawn when more are initially contacted than resources will allow for follow up.

Sampling can save time, money, and other resources; increase the speed with which data are collected and summarized; and increase the accuracy of results.13 At a time when the need for accountability is high and the amount of resources low, sampling becomes a very viable alternative.

Each evaluation situation should be considered individually. It is not always necessary to strive for 0.05 or 0.01 levels of significance. It depends on who has an interest in the findings and how the findings will be used. Budget analyst types and most journals tend to recognize 0.05 or better as a necessity for credibility. However, county level officials may be satisfied with 0.10 or an even greater risk.

The same can be said for accuracy. When operating at the 95% confidence level and the concern is drawing conclusions about a large population, the difference in an accuracy rate of +5% and +10% is 300 respondents, e.g., if the population is relatively homogeneous on the topic of interest, 100 respondents selected randomly and heard from can yield +10% accuracy with 95% confidence whereas 400 are required for +5%.14

14. Ibid.

Showing immediate impact seems to be the interest of just about everyone now that CES is facing more competition for resources. Some of that may be required but longer-term studies need to be set up if the organization is not to be under more pressure later on.

CES may need to adopt the Gallo wine slogan and promise to "collect no data until it is time." Unfortunately this could mean waiting 15 years or longer to determine the ultimate impact of some agricultural technology. Marine and Sea Grant personnel have similar long-term concerns. For example, Florida's beach erosion did not occur in one year nor is it going to be abated in one year.

Longer-term studies should have several intermediate check points when data can be collected and reported. What this will require is a clear program rationale—a hypothesis trail, if you will—which identifies precursors of the ultimate impacts. These can be checked at the most opportune times for CES to be accountable but more importantly, at the best times to know if programs are on track and people's needs are being satisfied.

This paper is focused on some of the actions which prevent Marine Advisory and Sea Grant efforts from being all they can be. The sins are the same for almost any program area. Marine Advisory and Sea Grant programs experience similar evaluation problems to other areas because they have similar programming problems. However, some are experienced in a different way or to a greater intensity, e.g., identifying and consulting stakeholders may be a greater concern here than in the other program areas because of the separateness of Sea Grant funding and the specificity with which funds must be spent.

Pogo had a saying which seems to fit Extension's state of affairs in program evaluation: "We have met the enemy and he is us!" Avoiding programming sins will go far in making it possible to avoid evaluation sins.
QUANTIFYING EFFECTIVENESS

Stanley Hecker
Associate Director for Programs
Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium

Abstract:
There is little consistency among programs in the means used to determine and then present effectiveness of their educational outreach offerings. A need exists for a simple technique that could be used universally. Utilizing some of the concepts of multi-attribute utility technology described by Edwards and Newman (1982) and some suggestions on the acquisition of feedback discussed by Wilkins (1980), a simple mathematical expression is presented which permits quantification of effectiveness of educational offerings. The expression is unit norm referenced in order to permit comparisons to be made of offerings of any size.

Introduction.

I think we must all accept the fact that there is a need to evaluate our efforts, if for no reason than to determine if particular undertakings should be repeated in the future. Practical evaluations should provide the type of information which will lend itself to comparison. In these austere times, the comparison can become a very important decision actor in the preparation of annual and long range plans. The point to bear in mind is that it is essential to be cost effective in order to fit the plans into ever-decreasing real budgets.

Over the years, the work evaluation has conjured up visions of the bad guys versus the good guys. Evaluations, though should be considered as tools or bits of advice which if viewed in a non-adversarial contact can help us to do better jobs. To further advance the nonadversarial view, we should recognize that we can do our own evaluation. They need not be done by the experts from out of town. Self evaluation has the added benefit of giving a greater insight into the effectiveness of both the undertaking and the planning process which led to the decision to conduct it.

Some of the higher undertaking of advisory/extension programs are workshops, meetings, and short courses. This discussion will address some thoughts on evaluating them and presenting the results in a form that can readily be used for comparison.

In beginning this discussion, it is important to accept the fact that the object of the programs is to motivate some form of beneficial change in the audience. Additionally, it must be understood that the change may not occur immediately following the program. Under these conditions, it becomes necessary to observe the audience over some pre-established period of time. Practically speaking, it is almost impossible to observe all of the attendees during the time period decided on. Using conventional statistical procedures, it is a relatively simple matter to randomly select a representative sample of the audience for observation.

Some may question the added level of effort needed to conduct the observations. This should not be viewed as a difficult or costly task. Agents are in the field daily making contact with their constituencies. They should make a conscious effort to visit with members of the sample population to conduct the observations necessary for the evaluation.
What is it that we are trying to recognize?

Bennett (1975) has suggested a seven level hierarchy of effectiveness indicators. This hierarchy is shown in figure 1.

1. End Result
2. Practice Change
3. Knowledge, Attitude, Skills, and Aspiration Change
4. Reactions
5. People Involvement
6. Activities
7. Inputs, Time and Money

Figure 1

Improvement in the quality of life attributable to information acquired at a program offering might be considered the highest form of effectiveness indicator, or an end result. The audience member at this level might exhibit the characteristics of an improved economic situation or be more efficient in the pursuit of his or her profession.

A step down from this level might be the case of a person who changes a longstanding practice due to program information.

A desire for additional information may have been caused by the whetting of a person's intellectual appetite on a particular subject. This might be considered a parallel to knowledge, attitude, skills, and aspiration (KASA) change.

The reaction level might be recognized when a person talks about attending or commits himself to attend a program after being exposed to an announcement.

In order for a program to realize any measure of effectiveness, there must be an audience. Therefore people will always be involved.

Necessary for the effective functioning of any advisory/extension organization are its activities. These include the day to day contacts with the constituency to determine needs and to publicize programs along with the planning and presentation of program offerings.

Inputs, time, and money are vital factors for any program. The assessment of the needs of the constituency goes on continuously and provides a significant portion of the input to the annual and long range plans. The plans include, among other things, the time allocations for the staff and the budgets necessary to operate.

In order to collect information that may be used to evaluate offerings, Wilkins (1980) expressed the opinion that there are three levels of attending that agents in the field use in observing clientele: passive, receptive, and inquisitive. He associated the three attention levels with the seven levels of Bennett's hierarchy as shown in figure 2.
End Result
Inquisitive Practice Change
KASA Change
Receptive Reactions
People Involvement
Passive Activities
Inputs, Time, and Money

Figure 2

It is evident that increasing effort is needed to develop evidence of attainment of the higher levels of Bennett's hierarchy. Wilkins (1980) explains that as evidence of attainment of the higher levels is acquired, effectiveness of the program is more clearly demonstrated.

Up to this point, the discussion has centered about effectiveness indicators and attention levels to recognize attainment. As stated earlier, it is necessary to present evaluative information on any offering so that it can be compared to any other regardless of size. Although the classic anecdotal method of establishing effectiveness through selective interviews is generally a delight to read, it does not lend itself to ready comparison. The simplest comparative method is one whose output is referenced to a common datum. Perhaps the only technique that does lend itself to that type of comparison is the odious mathematical approach.

How to get there from here?

What we really have is a case of identifying impacts on people which can be attributed to an advisory/extension offering. People are our datum and the impacts we are seeking can be developed as response ratios with respect to the audience at the offering. End results, practice changes, and KASA changes were felt to represent the significant impacts.

The response ratios can be readily derived by dividing the number of observed changes in the sample population by the total sample population.

End result = End results/population
Practice change ratio = Practice changes/population
KASAS change ratio = KASA changes/population

It is readily apparent that if every member of the sample population exhibited a change in any of the response factors, that ratio would be equal to one. A simplistic approach to quantifying effectiveness might be to sum the three ratios and divide by three.

This process, though disregards the fact that the response factors are not all of equal importance and that there are a number of other factors that contribute to overall effectiveness. In order to overcome this shortcoming, the response ratios and
the other contributing factors should be weighted with respect to their levels of importance.

Hecker (1984) felt that modification of the multi-attribute utility technology process discussed by Edwards and Newman (1982) offered promise since it provided for a unit norm referenced weighting scheme. Simplification of the process calls for preparing a list of all of the times contributing to the end being sought. In the case of our evaluation, this list consists of the seven levels of Bennett's (1975) hierarchy of effectiveness indicators, with slight modification. These were then organized into subcategories with the three attention levels suggested by Wilkins (1980) providing the group relationships.

The groupings are then presented in a verbal value attribute diagram with the modification made by Hecker (1984).

The value attribute diagram is now used as the foundation for a weighting scheme. A number of techniques were considered and the ratio weighting method was selected. In ratio weighting, the relative importance of each attribute must be established. The least important is assigned a base value of 10 and the others are ranked by comparing their importance with the lowest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>End Result</th>
<th>Practice Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>Reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audience Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People Involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inputs, Time, and Money</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3

Using suggestions gleaned from discussions with a number of Advisory Program Leaders, it was decided that the receptive level of attention was five times as important and the inquisitive level twenty times as important as the passive level of attention. The ratings of 10, 50, and 200 were summed and the contribution of each to the sum became its ratio weight. The ratio weights derived by this process are:

| Inquisitive | 0.769 |
| Receptive   | 0.192 |
| Passive     | 0.038 |

The same process was used with each of the hierarchical groups of effectiveness indicators associated with each of the attention levels as modified by Hecker (1984).
Figure 4 is a value attribute diagram containing the ratio weights of the attention levels, the effectiveness indicators, and their products.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Ratio 1</th>
<th>Ratio 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inquisitive</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Change</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASA change</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People Involvement</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inputs, Time, Money</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As experience is gained in this technique, the importance ranks and ratio weights can be refined until such time as little or no change appears in the values.

The product.

As the weighting scheme was being developed, a great deal of thought was given to the means of applying the factors that might be considered less than significant with respect to eventual changes in the audience. At the respective level of attention, reactions and audience interest might be expected to occur at all educational offerings. They could probably be determined by means of a questionnaire or post test. Since at that time the audience is still caught up with the scope of the program offering, it was felt that they would vary little from offering to offering.

The three effectiveness indicators at the passive level of attention are necessary ingredients for any offering to occur. They along with the two at the receptive level were considered to be essentially constant for all offerings. Their weights were summed into a single value which is assumed to be constant.

Using this constant, the response ratios, and the attribute weights of the significant responses, a simple mathematical expression for effectiveness was derived.

\[
\text{Effectiveness} = 0.23 + 0.154 \frac{K}{P} + 0.231 \frac{B}{P} + 0.385 \frac{E}{P}
\]

where

\[
0.23 = \text{constant based on the sum of the less significant factors}
\]

\[
0.154 = \text{KASA change attribute weight}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
K/P &= \text{KASA change to sample population response ratio} \\
0.231 &= \text{Practice change attribute weight} \\
B/P &= \text{Practice change to sample population response ratio} \\
0.385 &= \text{End result attribute weight} \\
E/P &= \text{End result to sample population response ratio}
\end{align*}
\]

Data was collected during the latter part of 1983 and early 1984 in fifteen Advisory Service programs. The data on twenty-six offerings was applied to the mathematical expression. Effectiveness ranged from a low of 0.236 to a high of 0.590.

Conclusion.

The object of this paper was to explain a practical technique of quantifying effectiveness of workshops, meetings, and short courses that would lend itself to comparison. While this objective was achieved conceptually, it is necessary to emphasize to our program personnel the essential nature of accurate feedback from the field. The excellent paper by Wilkins (1980) can provide a better understanding of the need for and the means of collecting feedback on our clientele. Improved understanding of needed numerical information to parallel anecdotal feedback will probably result in higher effectiveness scores than those indicated by the 1983/1984 data.

Effectiveness based on the 1983/1984 data seemed to indicate that it may not be necessary to maximize exposure to information. It may only be necessary to have a positive thinking audience that is willing to accept and try changes that could be beneficial.

One personal observation from a number of discussions with Advisory Service personnel is the general lack of enthusiasm for any form of evaluation. This is a problem that must be overcome perhaps through a concerted education program.

This paper suggests one technique for quantifying effectiveness. Others can and will be developed to respond to the increasing demand for accountability for the expenditure of public funds.

It is important that the process of evaluation and quantification of the results be started so that experience can be gained.
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CONTEMPORARY ISSUES

RESEARCH LINKS AND SHARED RESOURCES: THE SEA GRANT EXTENSION/RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

Norman K. Bender, Program Leader
University of Connecticut Sea Grant Program

My presentation will look at the relationship of Marine Extension and research programs as they have developed in the National Sea Grant college Program.

* First I will look at the similarities between the objectives of both Land Grant and Sea Grant in this area.

* Then I will consider some of the factors which help in building strong MAS/research ties.

* Third, I will discuss an approach to this subject that has worked well in Connecticut.

* Finally, you will have the opportunity to discuss:
  - Your concerns regarding MAS/research interaction and
  - Examples of successful approaches in your state program (Cooperative Extension and Sea Grant Marine Advisory Programs.

Land Grant and Sea Grant Models

"Extension in the '80s" discusses Cooperative Extension's relationship to research: "The basic mission of Cooperative Extension is to disseminate, and encourage the application of research-generated knowledge to individuals, families, and communities."¹

Priority program areas to be developed using this research base are:

"The Agricultural System
Natural and Environmental Resources
Community and Small Business Development
Home Economics/Family Living
4-H/Youth Education and Development
International Concerns"²

The Land Grant system utilizes the Cooperative Extension Service and agricultural experiment station in each state to develop the interaction of Extension/research. It

² Ibid.
is common to have departmental faculty with split appointments involving various combinations of research findings in Extension education programs.

An additional strength of the Land Grant system is having field faculty (County Extension Agents and Regional Specialists) employed in the same department (Cooperative Extension) and college (agriculture and natural resources) as agricultural researchers and campus based Extension specialists.

The basic relationship of Extension and research within the Land Grant system as stated in "Extension in the '80s" is:

"Extension education programs are in large part research-driven. Research should remain as the base for the system's major educational and informational efforts."

The National Sea Grant College Program and it's state programs also emphasize the need for the development of research and Advisory Service (Extension) projects that are closely intertwined. Sea Grant's basic goals are reflected in the following statements from "The National Sea Grant Advisory Service: Serving the Nation's Marine Community."

1. The continued intellectual and professional development of our population is critical to the improved well-being of society in general, and the marine-related sector in particular.

2. The nation's academic institutions have knowledge and resources that can help solve marine-related problems common to citizens, businesses, communities, organizations and government agencies around the country."

Sea Grant's organizational structure varies from state to state as regards MAS campus and field faculty and their ties to Sea Grant researchers.

Researchers (on Sea Grant funds) often are scattered throughout a state Sea Grant system in different universities both public and private. This differs from the more unified approach found in Land Grant where most Extension and research staff are located in one or two colleges (agriculture, family studies, etc.) within the same university.

Thus, Sea Grant MAS staff may be administratively and physically separated from their state's Sea Grant researchers. MAS staff may be attempting to develop working ties with researchers who are unfamiliar with the goal of achieving a continuing interaction of research and MAS personnel.

Factors That Can Build Strong Sea Grant Extension/Research Ties

While Sea Grant programs have taken various approaches in building Extension/research ties, there are several factors that I see as crucial to this process:

3. Ibid., p. 19
4. The National Sea Grant Advisory Service: Serving the Nation's Marine Community, Madison: University of Wisconsin Sea Grant Program, National Committee on Sea Grant Advisory Services, March, 1983.
1. Identification of marine problems/issues by Extension staff that can be appropriately addressed by researchers.

2. Effective communications between Extension and research workers regarding both appropriate research issues and research findings.

3. Ability of individual Extension and research staff to work together (this is the glue that holds it all together).

4. Administrative support through adequate funding and other encouragement of Extension/research interaction.

A. Gene Nelson (Oregon State University) described successful Extension research interaction as a form of synergy. That is, results provided by the interaction are greater than could be achieved separately by Extension or research workers. Nelson makes a case for successful Extension/research interaction producing greater accomplishments with less energy. 5

In other words, Sea Grant programs that achieve a high level of Extension/research interaction also are making more efficient use of program resources. This is especially important during a period of cutbacks in marine resources research and development programs such as we face today.

Robert Kramer (University of Florida) concludes "that the time has come to think and act as equal partners with researchers in the research, development and Extension process." 6 He points out several factors that can contribute to this goal. Among them are:

- "Extension personnel should be as well prepared academically as research personnel...."

- Extension personnel should do research regularly and be recognized by peers, department chairs and administrators. Some research costs for research by Extension personnel should be paid from experiment station funds.

- Extension personnel should do some research on Extension programs on Extension time and costs paid by the Extension's budget.

- Extension personnel should be permitted and encouraged to have joint appointments... (this may more exactly apply to campus faculty than field faculty; however, it should be considered for some field positions. N.B.)

- Extension personnel should be equally eligible for sabbatical leaves as research personnel, and should be encouraged to take such leaves. The time should be spent in research enhancing the conceptual and analytical tools of the faculty member. ...
- Extension personnel need to be participating members of their department, college, university and society.

- Extension personnel should actively consult with researchers and build consultative terms with strong problem orientations.

- Extension and research personnel should take 'listening trips' together.7

Extension/research ties are strengthened when both researchers and Extension workers perceive this interaction as being a high priority within their program or department. It helps when they also see it as a positive factor in their career development.

**An Approach That Has Worked in Connecticut**

I would like to share with you some experiences in Connecticut that illustrate how Extension and research workers have produced important accomplishments.

Before July, 1982, Connecticut Marine Advisory Service was an individually funded project. We worked without benefit of a comprehensive Sea Grant Program. It has taken until the past year for Sea Grant research projects to produce findings available to our MAS staff.

Thus, we have had about ten years experience in organizing Extension/research interaction without a formal Sea Grant research component. Out of this situation Connecticut MAS specialists developed ties with appropriate researchers resulting in strong ties between Marine Extension and research workers.

One Extension/research project involved a team consisting of a MAS regional specialist, an assistant professor of resource economics and a graduate student. Funding came from the Agricultural Experiment Station, Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension. Results were reported in a master's thesis, an Experiment Station bulletin and a MAS Extension bulletin.

The project studied the costs and returns of the Connecticut charter and party boat fleet. It was developed out of requests for such information from boat captains to the MAS specialist. The project team was assembled after working out time and funding requirements with the MAS Program Leader, CES Associate Director and Experiment Station Associate Director.

Information from the project was utilized in a variety of ways. These include:

- Current fishing captains compared their financial situation with the data evaluated in the study report.

- Potential captains improved their understanding of costs and returns common to the fleet.

- Commercial lenders used the data when evaluating loan applications.
- State officials used the data when making decisions concerning the impact of expanded tax exemptions upon state revenues.
- Marine Extension and research workers in other states have used the bulletins when designing similar projects.

This is one example of an Extension/research team approach. It illustrates the potential benefits available through cooperative efforts.

**Summary**

Extension/research interaction is identified by both Land Grant and Sea Grant as an important approach in solving issues within the two national systems. It can succeed only if certain conditions are present. These include:

- identification of appropriate problems and issues.
- effective two-way communications between Extension and research staff,
- ability of individual Extension and research staff to work together,
- administrative support.

The potential opportunities are out there. It is important that we share the various approaches to realizing them.
MANAGING THE COUNTY EXTENSION MARINATION PROCESS

Bruce DeYoung, Program Coordinator
New York Sea Grant Extension Program

Abstract

Developing county extension leadership for marine programs is both challenging and rewarding. When successfully accomplished, county extension staff acquire the capacity to conduct marine programs with local support. This paper describes management tools and marketing strategies for helping county extension to assume leadership for marine programming.

Introduction

Culinary novices and experts alike understand the secret of food marinades: Enhance the flavor but retain the taste! So also with introducing prospective extension program innovations — enhance county extension capacity but retain its character. Successful marinades are characterized by county extension staff feeling excited and confident about assuming marine program leadership. But, how can this be influenced and achieved?

In New York State, the majority of Cooperative Extension revenues are derived from county government. Reflecting this, innovations like county extension leadership for marine programming must prove to be valuable before becoming an ongoing practice. Sea Grant can encourage this to happen in a variety of ways. It can help county extension to identify and assess key opportunities for marine programming. Sea Grant can also help to develop local fiscal and client support for county extension assuming marine responsibilities.

A Working Model

In New York's case, we're marinating county extension by using classic Extension theory and methods! Our marination recipe is portrayed in Figure #1 as a model by Rogers (1983) of the innovation decision process. Since marine program leadership by county extension is an innovation in New York State, this model applies nicely to our situation. In the decision maker a potential program innovation; forms an attitude; assesses adoption or rejection; implements the choice; and confirms the decision. We utilize this model by providing specific educational experiences which encourage county extension's passage through the process.

To gain knowledge about marine program opportunities, "internal and external" market research is conducted jointly by college and county extension staff. The external survey examines marine extension program needs of existing or potential constituents against local funding patterns and priorities. The characteristics of a county extension unit are also examined for potential linkages to marine programs. The unit's goals and staff interests are assessed to learn where marine program leadership would be advantageous. Often the Cooperative Extension Representative (District Director) can be helpful in this activity. If these evaluations identify promise for county marine extension program leadership, then the issue moves to the second stage — Persuasion.
When county extension is in the "Persuasion Stage," they focus much attention upon the perceived characteristics of the marine program innovation. To form an attitude about the innovation, information is sought on several characteristics: advantages; compatibility; complexity; trialability and observability. It is valuable at this point to develop a discussion document on these for use by county extension. Professional staff and lay leaders draw on their visions and may change the draft of this document several times as it evolves. Needless to say, it is important to involve key individuals and committees in these discussions.

**Management Tools**

Management tools can then move this talk into action. In the Decision Stage, specific educational activities are used to stimulate choices being made by county extension. For most, a means of coping with the inherent uncertainty of an innovation's consequence is small-scale testing. We in New York consciously facilitate the trial of new marine programming by county extension. This is done by reducing the financial and psychological cost of specific trials proposed by county extension.

Some mechanisms for this include:

* Providing training and educational program support for county staff assuming marine project leadership.

* Helping county extension to tap private support for marine projects.

* Providing small grants ($2000) for county extension to develop innovative marine projects.
* Spinning off Sea Grant's proven marine programs to county extension leaders.

* Providing professional recognition and promotion for county extension staff conducting marine programs.

* Encouraging tests of multi-county marine extension positions with matching college/county financing.

* Helping county extension to gain county government financial support for creating new marine units.

Our experience indicates that the Implementation and Confirmation stages of the model are periods of declining involvement by college extension administrators. Most marine projects successfully implemented by county extension as trials become institutionalized. This happens when county extension is recognized by the legislature and constituents for its successful marine programs. When this happens, marine client representation is added to advisory committees and marine program responsibilities are inserted into staff position descriptions. In short, county extension becomes marinated by the success of its marine educational programs!

Conclusion

Sea Grant and Extension leaders can play an important role in developing county extension leadership for marine programs. By viewing marine programming in the context of a county extension innovation decision, this process can be managed as a series of planned education events. In this way, a variety of educational experiences can be provided to decision-makers throughout their deliberations.

As in many Extension efforts, the most powerful educational tool is that of encouraging field trials of the innovation by decision-makers (county extension). This educational strategy is not new to marination technology for in 400 B.C., Sophocles noted, "one must learn by doing the thing, for though you think you know it — you have no certainty, until you try."
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DEVELOPING RELEVANT PROGRAM COMPONENTS FOR MARINE AND GREAT LAKES
PROGRAM PLANNING AND REPORTING

Marion Clarke
Florida Sea Grant Extension Program

Historically program planning and reporting have been difficult since the establishment of the Sea Grant Extension Program (SGEP). This relates to the program planning categories used in developing the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) Plan of Work (POW) and reporting through the State Extension Management Information System (SEMIS/EMIS) reporting system of CES.

With the inception of the SGEP into the Extension Programs around the nation, they were initially forced to use the reporting and planning categories already established for existing extension programs. Marine fisheries activity was reported under livestock production, aquaculture activity under crop production, etc. A few limited reporting and planning components were relevant such as organizational maintenance, but for the most part program components of the SGEP were lost and not identifiable in the jungle of Extension Programs.

Is this loss of program identity a problem? If it is important to evaluate statewide programs and their impact, and if it is important to have similar programs reported under consistent program components then it is definitely a problem. When a marine extension agent is developing a plan of work or reporting his activity through a SEMIS or similar system that does not have a clear identity with the program activity, it tends to get reported differently by different agents. This results in an array of data in different categories that cannot be consolidated by major program activity. The resulting data is not useful for planning future programs or is not readily available to document accountability throughout the system.

Over the years individual programs have attempted to solve the problem by establishing program reporting and planning components that are more relevant to marine programs. In a survey conducted prior to the ECOP National Marine Extension Program Workshop it was identified that there is currently no consistency in the reporting or POW categories used by CES affiliated Sea Grant Extension Programs. Eleven of eighteen Marine Extension Programs responding indicated one or more special program components for planning and reporting. One marine program reported eleven separate categories. There was no consistency or standard categories used by any of the programs. However there were some similarities that could provide a base for more consistent program components for Marine and Great Lakes Extension Programs. Program planning and reporting categories currently being used by responding programs included:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aquaculture</th>
<th>Sea Grant</th>
<th>Sea Grant</th>
<th>Sea Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fisheries</td>
<td>Marine Recreation &amp; Commerce</td>
<td>Marine Recreation</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Fisheries</td>
<td>Marine Recreation</td>
<td>Marine Industries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish/Aquaculture</td>
<td>Fish/Shellfish</td>
<td>Fish/Shellfish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coastal Processes and Management
- Coastal Zone Management
- Coastal Management
- Great Lakes Coastal Devel.
- Coastal Processes & Devel.

Living Marine Resources
- Marine Science
- Marine Resources
- Natural Resource Policy
- Planning & Mgmt.

There are numerous voids in marine and Great Lakes programmatic planning and reporting components. That is, the scope of the Sea Grant Extension Program nationwide is made up of program areas that do not fit the categories reported in the survey or that exist in the traditional program components of CES.

A productive activity for the ECOP Task Force on Marine Extension Programs, when and if created by the Agriculture and Natural Resources Subcommittee of ECOP, would be to take the program planning and reporting categories suggested by the survey and refine them into a national set of program components. They need to be broad enough to cover the diversity of programs within the Marine and Great Lakes Extension Programs, yet specific enough to measure local, state, regional and national scope and impact of programs. These program components then need to be integrated into the USDA/CES System from the Office in Washington, D.C. all the way down to the individual states. This would give consistency to planning and reporting and facilitate a much more effective and efficient FOW and reporting process for Marine and Great Lakes Extension Programs.

Recently in the process of completing an annual narrative report and Civil Rights/Equal Opportunity report, I encountered the age-old problem, there was a box to check for program area. All program areas of CES were there but no place to indicate a marine extension program. What happens to this data? I have been told that no one knows for sure but it most likely gets combined with the Natural Resource data and can never again be compiled to identify program impact or intensity in marine and Great Lakes Extension programs nationwide. In Florida the Program Planning and Evaluation Office puts an additional box with Marine on it for our narrative reporting and other required reporting and planning information. What does USDA/CES do with it? No one knows for sure.

Marine and Great Lakes Extension Programs are increasingly becoming an important element of CES programmatic activity. It is one of the best CES entrees into the urban clientele which USDA/CES has identified as a major priority. It is high time that we develop relevant guidelines and a system that will effectively integrate the Marine and Great Lakes Extension Programs into the USDA/CES System. This important extension activity should officially be made a part of the CES system at the national level. This task can be accomplished by the establishment of an ECOP Task Force to study the issues and make recommendations to ECOP. This recommendation was accepted by the Workshop participants and is included in the major recommendations of the Workshop.
"MINORITIES IN MARINE PROGRAMS: AS PARTICIPANTS AND EMPLOYEES: THE SITUATION AND ALTERNATIVES"

Arva Jackson
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association

Within the topic assigned to me is an inference that the current level of minority participation is low in marine extension programs either as employees, constituents or both. Those closest to these programs have the opportunity to sense the disparity between what is and what might be. Fiscal year 1983 data for the "potential, planned, and actual clientele contacts by state and program - professional and paraprofessional combined" is available for both the 1862 and 1890 institutions and is attached. A break-out of how many of these contacts, if any, represented any integration of Sea Grant Advisory Programs into Cooperative Extension Service Programs was not available to this author, and may not exist. Let us assume that some of these contacts do represent a marine extension connection since about half the advisory service units are administered through the state Land Grant University Cooperative Extension Service. However it would be misleading to co-mingle statistical evidence from the 1862 and 1890 institutions as representative of minority participation even in the Cooperative Extension Service Programs since the establishment of the Second Morrill Act in 1890 provided a mechanism to endow those schools with a large black enrollment...a legacy that continues to the present. John Hope Franklin in his 1947 history of Negro Americans wrote of this period:

"Radical agrarian organizations had flourished all over the United States after the Civil War. The national grange, or patrons of husbandry, was attracting thousands of farmers by 1870, but it was kept within bounds in the south during reconstruction because of the dangers of Negro-radical rule. Prostrated by depression, however, the southern farmers' alliance had branches in every southern state. Although they did not admit Negro members, they believed that Negroes should at least be lined up in a parallel organization. In 1886, therefore, the colored farmers' national alliance and cooperative union came into existence. It grew rapidly. By 1891, it claimed more than a million members in twelve state organizations. There were local chapters wherever Negro farmers were sufficiently numerous. After a national organization was perfected in 1888, there was for a time close cooperation between the white and Negro groups.....Professor C. Vann Woodward says that under the tutelage of radical agrarian leaders the white masses of the south were learning to regard the Negro as a political ally bound to them by economic ties and a common destiny. Never before or since have the two races in the south come so close together as they did during the populist struggles."^8

Clearly today's extension agents must have had resourceful, effective role models. If Woodward was right, what can be done in our time to create windows of opportunity to realize the moral imperative of the attainment of equal educational and employment opportunity for minorities? It is important to influence the civil rights posture of the extension community since there is an 1862 Land Grant University in the 50 states, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, Micronesia, and the District

of Columbia and in the Tuskegee Institute and sixteen 1890 Land-Grant Universities (in sixteen states). They enroll 16 percent of U.S. undergraduates and grant 42 percent of the doctoral degrees. Almost 40 percent of American nobel prize winners went to Land Grant Schools. It is within this context that it is useful to assess the role of minorities in marine programs because the linkage of the Land Grant and the Sea Grant Programs can be expected to grow stronger. But first it is pertinent to recognize the diversity among Sea Grant Advisory Programs in meeting their objectives. Each state experience reflects its special environment. For example, those states with a history of agrarian development are likely to attract those with special skills in agriculture thereby reinforcing the critical mass of expertise. Additionally, and for this presentation even more germane, is the reality that the ratio of minority - to - non-minority population varies from state to state; and in each state the composition of that minority profile is different. Florida with a substantial percentage of hispanics may need a strategy different from that used in Delaware. When Indo-chinese refugees settled in the Monterey Bay area cultural differences "led to misunderstandings and conflicts with other commercial fishermen in the area."9 We are a nation comprised of immigrants. "As a pilgrim father that missed the first boat," cried "The immortal Mr. Dooley" in 1902, "I must raise me clarion voice again the invasion of this fair land be it th' paupers and arynchist in Europe. Ye bet I must - because I'm here first!" The "Arnychists" who were being so obliquely defended by Mr. Dooley's creator - satirist Finley Peter Dunne - were latecomers to the U.S. - Italians, Slavs, Greeks and Turks, who were raising the hackles of predecessors from Germany, Scandinavia and the British Isles. Although few among nearly 50 million total immigrants from all countries escaped some form of prejudice, few, too, have failed to enhance the flavor of life in the U.S.10

We must accept that the pursuit of a color-blind society is unlikely to be achieved without addressing the differences of time and place and culture, and economy...and certainly, politics. Who makes the decisions about who gets a job? Who decides who may get what education? How is it determined who will be a successful marine extension specialist? Many of you who are attending this ECOP National Marine Extension Workshop are such decision-makers. You have the power, authority or influence to address the problem inferred in my topic title. Once put into words problems become dynamic attracting charges and counter-charges/claims and counter-claims. Within the achievement of the objectives of this workshop is the parallel possibility of creating a more racially diverse workforce and providing service to a more racially diverse community. Alternatives can be recommended, but while being carried forward at least two preliminary steps should be undertaken. The first step should be a survey of every existing Marine Extension Program to determine the number of agents, specialists, administrators and FTE's (full-time equivalents) by race in each of the Sea Grant College Programs. To rely solely on the receipt of assurances that compliance have been achieved provides the illusion of responsible stewardship. Little sustained collection and use of racial or ethnic data to determine whether program benefits actually are reaching minority group beneficiaries on an equitable basis perpetuates perceptual yardsticks of progress or recidivism dependent upon the eye, experience and expectation of the reviewer. Such data provides no more than a common base of information from which direction may be determined. Such action may be currently out of favor. However, as in every other area we tend to be more responsive to those activities that are inspected, rather than those that are expected.

The second preliminary step is a conscious recording of techniques that work to build bridges between different racial and ethnic groups. The Monterey Bay experience is a case in point. Such case studies would have a salutary effort when shared with others who may face similar challenges.

Concurrently the following techniques may offer do-able alternatives without major expenditures of new monies.

1. Internal exchange program

Although the expertise required by specialists may appear to be a deterrent, in the possibilities are attractive. Aquacultural research and extension is a fruitful area, as is pollution. The use of remote sensing data can be applied to land, sea and air. Any specialist or agent with a knowledge of the use of environmental satellite data in one program could contribute to a parallel extension program.

2. Shared projects

Undoubtedly this is already operational. The process recommended is to design projects involving a marine extension component - an 1882 component and an 1890 component. Working toward a shared pay-off provides easier access to projects that may be conducted later under the aegis of one component.

3. Areas of excellence (4-H Programs)

The identification of 4-H programs with significantly large numbers of participating minorities provides a seed-bed for the development of future marine specialists. Exposure to the marine environment at an early age can be a significant event leading to a career choice. The need to prepare for such a career by selection of course material and even the college to attend can follow such an intensified experience.

4. Newsletter clearinghouse

To the extent that Sea Grant Programs have house organs a clearinghouse for their exchange and dissemination to other members of the extension family could increase the communication flow among the extension network. Casual learning about operational programs is often the needed spark to help a potential candidate look for more specific job-related information.

5. Advertise in minority publications/public radio

Within the past five years magazines/newspapers directed at a specified racial/ethnic community have flourished. Notice in such a specialized paper is often more effective than those placed in major news organs. In some communities there are radio programs beamed directly at a minority audience. Because they are sometimes public, a public service announcement allows them to fulfill their responsibility to the public.
6. Use existing associations/organizations

This is not always a workable effort, but in instances where organized, secure associations/organizations have a good relationship with the marine extension service to use their network in an effort to attract minorities to the service may establish one more link with that group and so add to the consolidation of mutually beneficial joint efforts.

The Extension Service has a unique resource in the national network that has developed from "sea to shining sea". From those with such resources much should be and is expected to help mend the fraying fabric of our society as they carry out their responsibility for extending information to people. A diverse workforce serving a diverse clientele is an honorable message for what has become an honorable member of the national silhouette - the Marine Extension Service.
1890 INSTITUTIONS AND MARINE EXTENSION PROGRAMS

Lawrence Carter, Administrator
1890 Extension Programs
Florida Cooperative Extension Service

I appreciate very much the opportunity to share with you the current state of the art of involvement of 1890 institutions in Marine Extension Programs.

Based on a most recent survey of Research and Extension administrators at 16 1890 institutions and Tuskegee Institute, there are only two of these institutions presently engaged in either Research or Extension programs, namely, Virginia State University (4-H Marine Program) and Florida A&M University (CSRS Research Project). While many liberal arts minority institutions including the 1890 Land-Grant colleges/universities are providing training for minority youth in several other sciences, there are virtually no programs at these institutions designed for career options in marine science.

The lack of marine education programs at these institutions also provides the overall rationale for less than one percent of minority persons currently employed in the marine sciences either as Research scientists or Extension professionals.

The current situation can also be resolved if strong and viable marine extension education programs are provided at 1890 institutions alone or through joint programming with predominantly white institutions receiving support from the State Sea Grant College Programs. This is especially possible in those states that are either on or in close proximity to the Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf Coastal areas.

Close contact from directors of State Sea Grant Programs with university contact persons at 1890 institutions, including Research and Extension administrators, could be viewed as a step in the right direction to insure that an increased number of minorities are involved in marine science programs. However, on the other side of the coin, interest in these special programs should and must be pursued by 1890 administrators of both Research and Extension Programs.

Florida A&M University is mentioned at this point because of its location near the Gulf Coast, and can be used as a focus for marine extension programming at other 1890 institutions. Florida A&M University is one of the 1890 institutions presently not involved in marine education or extension programs. However, the possibilities do exist because of the institution's proximity to the Gulf Coast and employment of one trained minority faculty member in marine biology.

Tallahassee, the capital of Florida, and only thirty (30) miles away from the Gulf Coast, is a dynamic location for marine education programs. Other than Florida A&M and Florida State University, there is one junior college to draw minorities from, 19 elementary, 6 middle, and 4 high schools in the city. Thus, there is a wealth of youth, especially minority youth available for exposure to marine and extension education programs. However, a lack of marine education programs at these schools/universities precludes opportunities for attracting minority youth in marine education programs for college level training and ultimate career choices.

Marine Extension programs would benefit small farm operators near the Gulf Coast who could derive supplemental income from a diversified farming operation.
There farmers could be potential participants in the marine advisory programs of the state.

From my knowledge base, one of the primary purposes of the State Sea Grant College objectives is to transfer knowledge from research data. This knowledge base is for both educating the general public and insuring its proper application.

Researchers at Florida A&M University have conducted considerable research on the ecology and value of coastal wetlands such as salt marshes and estuaries. This program was initiated with Cooperative State Research Service (CSRS) funds in 1973. Initially, studies were concentrated on the soil genesis and morphology of wetlands. Later, the research was expanded to include studies on soil-plant relationships, dynamics of nutrients and organic carbon cycles and their effects on marsh environment and water quality.

Another long range research project under the Wetlands Ecology program dealt with the ecology of animal communities, especially of the commercial species, and plant productivity in relation to the total ecology of salt marshes.

Some of the significant findings of this research with particular implications for marine and extension education programs are:

1. The primary productivity of marsh plants are comparable to that of agricultural crops.

2. Decomposition of marsh plants provides a rich supply of organic detritus on which the entire food-web depends.

3. A rich invertebrate community exists in the marsh sediments which provides food for commercial crabs, shrimps and fish.

4. Fish populations of the marshes, tidal creeks and estuaries consist of both permanent residents and migrating species.

5. The migratory species utilize the habitat as nurseries during the early part of their life cycles, and many migratory species are commercial species such as mullet, speckled trout, black bass, etc.

6. The tidal creeks may be manipulated for mariculture of crabs, or shrimps, and commercial fish.

These significant findings have been reported in published papers in scientific journals but can be much more useful when disseminated to the general public through some marine extension programs. Though this research project at Florida A&M University is one of the most comprehensive programs in the United States, the lack of a marine advisory unit at FAMU hampers the Extension staff from disseminating the knowledge in a usable form to consumers.

Florida A&M University along with other predominantly black 1890 institutions could benefit from financial resources derived from State Sea Grant College funds to conduct both research and marine extension programs.

A viable marine education and extension program at Florida A&M University and other 1890 institutions would encourage greater minority participation and have a
significant impact on helping industries, communities, and citizens use the knowledge base to help solve problems related to coastlines in close proximity to these institutions.

There is a great need for minority youth participation along with other 4-H members in marine education. They too need to know about the vast natural resources of the sea and other coastal areas. While most of our marine resources are renewable, however, many are facing serious problems because of abuse, poor management, pollution, and other factors. All citizens need to be aware of ways to protect our natural resource habitats. It is most important that youth gain the knowledge and cultivate proper attitudes necessary to enable them to make sound decisions concerning coastal resource management, as well as become concerned, involved adults.

Finally, I want to offer the following suggestions for increased participation of minorities in marine education programs:

1. Encourage minority 4-H youth to participate in marine science 4-H projects.
2. Encourage minority 4-H youth to participate in 4-H marine camps.
3. 1890 institutions can initiate special summer camps for out of school kids on their campus to inform them about marine education training and careers.
4. Identify minority institutions other than 1890 institutions near coastal areas and encourage them to include options in marine science in their science curriculum.
5. Conduct on-campus summer workshops for adults and community residents with an interest in fishing and other outdoor sports.
6. Provide scholarships/fellowships for use by minority youth and others to pursue careers in marine science.
7. The State Sea Grant College should fund research projects at 1890 institutions either independently by or through joint projects with other institutions near coastal areas.
8. Establish marine advisory committees on campuses of 1890 institutions so that there will be linkages with the Sea Grant College, Research and Extension programs.
9. Minority graduates in natural sciences and biology programs should be encouraged to seek career opportunities with the U.S. Department of Commerce and State Extension Programs.
10. Initiate directed individual research projects in marine sciences for high school juniors and seniors, and college youth. These may be for a semester or year long projects. Students could write reports or papers on these projects.
SYNOPSIS OF DISCUSSIONS

Thomas Sweeney, Leader
South Carolina Sea Grant Consortium
Charleston, SC

This section is a synopsis of the discussions held during the ECOP meeting in Clearwater, Florida. Each section is summarized below, but the reader should feel free to contact the discussion leader if more detail is desired.

The topics and discussion leaders were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPICS</th>
<th>SGMAS LEADERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERSONNEL and PROGRAMS</td>
<td>Bruce Wilkins (NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVERHEAD</td>
<td>Tony Mazzacaro (MD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY and LOCAL SUPPORT</td>
<td>Alex Wypyzinski (NJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENT STRUCTURES OF CES/MAS PROGRAMS</td>
<td>Jim Murray (NC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A universal opinion that seemed to follow through all of the discussions revolved around the individuality of programs. Every state is different, and no one program will work for everyone. In fact, the differences in programs may be beneficial. The general conclusion was that each state should handle its own problems, but access other states' experience with similar structure and policies when outside assistance is needed. Flexibility is essential.

NOTE: "MAS" is used to represent all marine oriented Extension efforts.

TITLES:

I. PERSONNEL AND PROGRAMS

Primary interest was on program titles. Most felt that the terms agent and specialist were appropriate. Staff titles should be connected to program name.

There were three overall favorites for program title.

1. Sea Grant Extension Program (most commonly used)
2. Sea Grant Marine Extension Program
3. Marine Extension Program

All agreed that Extension should be part of program name, and that less variability among program names might help identify a national program.

II. OVERHEAD
1. Overhead should be renamed "indirect costs" for less negative connotation.

2. Because of the large diversity in indirect cost rates, base amounts to be charged, and charges returned to the program, the group recommended a state-by-state approach. No "national" policy was recommended.

3. NOTE: Tony reduced his MAS/CES overhead to "0", effective July 1, 1985.

III. LOCAL AND COUNTY SUPPORT

Diversity of programs' arrangements with counties and CES made overall recommendations difficult. Most participants received little or no county support. A notable example is New Jersey which has 1.3 F.T.E.'s, office space, supplies, and secretarial support contributed by county.

1. A common problem among participants was the practice of precluding MAS Leaders and agents from approaching county administrators for funding. This usually fell to the CES Director.

2. A second common problem was the inability of MAS programs to get equal billing during an extension director's request for county support. MAS is usually not included with traditional CES areas of effort that also have needs for funding.

Two states have developed programs to allow direct county solicitation by MAS staff.

1. Minnesota allows agents to contact counties on project by project basis.

2. New York puts the agent in the position of having to develop individual budgets for their program and work directly with county administrators on a long-range plan which is approved by all concerned. MAS agents also work to educate CES departments on the value of including MAS programs in their planing. This program was well received by discussion group.

3. Some states such as Ohio, access CES funding and allocate positions using formulae based on population, acreage under cultivation, and crop diversity. A suggestion was made to include commercial fishing, marinas, boat owners, etc. in this formula. How to go about doing this was not discussed.

No easy method for increasing county support were brought forward, although two suggestions were made.

1. Increase visibility of MAS programs at county level and educate county administrators on the benefits of having MAS programs in their counties. Include county administrators on mailing list for MAS publications and newsletters.

2. Increase MAS visibility with their county staff and attempt to build marine agents into system so they are an integral part.
IV. "DIFFERENT STROKES FOR DIFFERENT FOLKS"

Eight states participated in the discussion with a range of MAS integration from totally to informal ties. The following is a list of issues discussed.

1. Travel posed a problem in some states where traditional "agents" seldom crossed county or state lines, but MAS staff were focusing on more regional or national scales. A suggested solution was strong communication and agreements between CES/MAS programs that allow for staff changes.

2. In some states the MAS leader can be as far away as 6 hours which might contribute to communication problems. The general consensus was that the MAS leader was responsible to maintain effective channels of communication even if it wears out the seat of the driver. It is important for this point to be made at the time of hiring the MAS leader.

3. Evaluations of MAS staff should involve both CES and Sea Grant administration. Whoever has the lead position in the evaluation should consult and include the other administrator.

4. Professional development structures within CES were seen to be beneficial even to programs not totally integrated into CES. The interaction with other professionals and the career ladder options were definite, positive results. The psychological benefit of belonging to a "larger", "more established" organization was also seen as a benefit to the smaller and younger MAS programs.

EDITOR'S NOTE:

Many thanks to the four MAS leaders who took the time to organize their discussion groups' comments. Their efforts were appreciated by this editor.
A LOOK INTO THE CRYSTAL BALL

DOTTING THE "i's" AND CROSSING THE "t's": MARINE AND GREAT LAKES PROGRAMS IN TOMORROW'S CES PROGRAMS!!

Andrew J. Weber, National Program Leader,
Natural Resources and Rural Development Unit
Extension Service, USDA

During the past two and one-half days, a considerable amount of discussion and debate has been expended on a diverse number of subjects. As we reach the conclusion of this workshop, the time has come to sharpen our focus and the title of this section of the program suggests just that.

Perhaps it would be well to reflect on the objectives of this workshop that we discussed on Tuesday. Let me refresh your memory. They include:

1. To determine current levels of integration of Sea Grant (SG) Advisory Programs into Cooperative Extension Service (CES) Programs.
2. To develop recommendations to improve Cooperative Extension Service and Sea Grant administrative linkages, support and operational efficiency.
3. To enhance the effectiveness of Cooperative Extension Service supported Sea Grant Extension Programs.

Quite frankly, I think we have developed the means to achieve these objectives. That involves dotting the "i's" and crossing the "t's". The most important "i's" and "t's" to be dotted and crossed are the recommendations that we have developed here this week. They address three major issue areas that include Federal Agency Awareness of Marine Extension, National Approaches to Collaboration. Collectively, the recommendations include:

1. Enhance regular communication procedures between NSGCP and FES.
2. Presentations on Marine Extension Programs at regional meetings of Extension Directors and Assistant and Associate Directors.
3. Formation of marine resource subcommittee or task force of ECOP.
5. Establish national statement of CES Marine Extension Program direction through appropriate ECOP committee.
6. Establish common marine extension planning, reporting and evaluation procedures.
7. That joint CES/Sea Grant programs consider commonality of program titles that recognize the partnership that both the constituents and sponsors can easily identify.

8. Ensure marine extension initiatives are included in FES NARS reports.

9. Include Marine Extension Programs in CES long-range plans specifying staffing and implementation strategies.

10. Include marine issues, when local and State program priorities are established.

This represents the basic "i's" and "t's".

The reason that I emphasize the recommendations is that if they are to be effected, it will require a commitment from each of us to do our part. I am reminded of an old adage about "roads being paved with good intentions". We should not let these recommendations fall into that category. I challenge you, as we review the issue areas and recommendations in the next session, to think of the recommendations in terms of first person singular. What can I do to make them a reality? Following through on these recommendations are fundamental to strengthening Marine Extension Programs and moving them into the mainstream of the Cooperative Extension System.
DOTTING THE"T"S AND CROSSING THE"T"S: MARINE AND GREAT LAKES PROGRAMS IN TOMORROW'S CES PROGRAMS

An Extension Director's Perspective

B. K. Webb
Associate Dean and Director
Cooperative Extension Service
Clemson University

It is a pleasure for me to be here this morning. I have changed my speech at least 10 times. I thought I had it completed until John Woeste spoke a moment ago, and took all of my thunder!

When Marion asked me to come and speak as a representative of the Extension Directors, I thought it would be a very pleasant task for me. As I have sat here during the past two days and heard some of the comments of disdain and distrust that have been directed at CES, I feel like I am standing here representing the big, bad guy in the whole organization.

I do hope this morning, though, that I might be able to say something that will be constructive and possibly something controversial that will continue some of the very excellent dialogue that has been started.

Before I make my few comments, I think you should know a little more about where I am coming from. In a number of ways, I am somewhat nontraditional, and I am not sure I was the best choice Marion could have found to represent the Extension Directors. First of all, I am an engineer and you don't find many people with a hard science background in administrative positions. I don't know why, but you don't. A more important difference is that I came up on the teaching/research side, and not on the extension side. My folks love to tell me I just "don't understand." I've never been out there in one of the counties! That must be a great educational experience. I am sure it is, but when you come up on the teaching/research side, I am sure I am a non-traditionalist as far as Extension Directors are concerned.

As Marion pointed out, I am also a new boy on the block. I have only been the Director, since November 2, 1984, and that allows me to be somewhat of an idealist. I have not had time yet for all of my theories and ideas to be disapproved. I think it is important though that I have been involved in Sea Grant for quite some time. The first year that South Carolina funded Sea Grant research projects, I had a research project funded, and have been involved in Sea Grant in the state ever since.

To really establish my credibility though, and to let you know where I am really coming from, my greatest claim to fame is that I served as David Veal's major professor, when he did his Ph.D. at Clemson several years ago. With that kind of a background, I am sure you are anxious to hear what else I have to say!

I've really enjoyed this session. It has been extremely beneficial to me, and it has been heartening to me. I told Margaret Davidson last night, we're in a lot better shape in South Carolina than I thought we were, or a lot of the other states are in a lot worse shape than I ever imagined! I think the former is probably true. I think we have a very good relationship in South Carolina. But, based on my experiences in the
past and, particularly, the comments I have heard during the last two days, I would like to be—when I was making some notes, I said "brave" enough, and then I put in parenthesis "stupid" enough, to offer some suggestions for your consideration, so that is what I will try to do.

Let me start, first of all, by saying that I think Sea Grant needs the Cooperative Extension Service more than the Cooperative Extension Service needs Sea Grant. I think if we are realistic about it, we would have to admit that. Arva Jackson pointed out yesterday very well that CES is an old organization, has been around a long time, has a lot of credibility, and is going to be here for a long time. Some of you from Sea Grant have talked about Mother telling you for the last five years that she didn't love you—zeroing out your funding. If I were in that kind of situation, I would be looking for a new home, or I'd certainly be trying to develop some kind of contingency plan. I was interested in John Kermond's comments yesterday about what the potential for some reorganization may be.

Another thing that has impressed me and, again, I am coming as somewhat of an outsider and look to wear the CES hat much more so than the Sea Grant hat, but several of the comments have impressed me, that in some states the Sea Grant people are wanting to have their cake and eat it too. I say that to point out, in a number of instances, there have been cases where the good parts of being associated or integrated in the CES, you would like to have those, without having to take the bad parts. I assure you I recognize up front that there are some good and some bad, and I will address that more in a few minutes. But I think if you are going to integrate the programs, then we have to take the good and the bad.

The other thing, and again coming as somewhat of an outsider, that has really impressed me in the last two days is that 31, or whatever the number may be, programs, regardless of what is done from an organizational or integrating standpoint, need to get together and speak with a more unified voice. There's strength in numbers, as I am sure you can appreciate. In good time, it may be o.k. to be out, sort of isolated and set aside, but when the times get tough, there's some strong advantages and benefits to being a part of a system. It is the tough times that are going to make it hard for individual units and programs to survive, in my opinion.

I have also been impressed by the fact that in many states there have been some very poor communications, even between two programs that have a common objective. I use that term advisedly. I know they are different, and I would like to second the point that John Woeste made that too often we tend to stress the differences, and that is a very negative approach and can lead to all kinds of problems. The common objective between Sea Grant and CES is to provide a service to a user group, so we've got to communicate with each other and cooperate, and I would certainly urge stronger cooperation in many cases than I have seen evidence of, regardless of what the organizational structure may be. I would remind you, as I am sure you are aware, that there can be no strong cooperative efforts developed if there is distrust on either side of the fence.

For my final point, I think this is an appropriate time, certainly in South Carolina, and I would suggest nationally, for everyone, both Sea Grant people and CES people, to consider joining together, integrating the programs, and moving forward together to get a job done. Let me point out that there has probably never been a better time to consider integrating Sea Grant or any other program in the CES than at the present time. I know in our state, and I think John and Craig and everyone else would agree,
CES is really in a state of transition. It certainly is in South Carolina. The economic crisis in production agriculture is having a major effect upon our programming.

Another thing that has surprised me during the last two days was the number of programs and apparently the number of states in which the Cooperative Extension Service is referred to as the Agriculture Extension Service. In South Carolina now, we have less than three percent of our population involved in production agriculture, and we are not going to survive in South Carolina as the Agricultural Extension Service. I'll be up front with you. This county, John, is probably the best example that I know that was used recently at a mid management conference as an example of where the Cooperative Extension programs may have not stayed relevant, and the clientele said you are not meeting our needs, and you had to rethink and redo, and they have done an excellent job in that regard. We are having some societal and structural changes that are occurring in our society because of the crisis in rural America that is going to have some significant impacts on all of our higher educational programs and, particularly, our Extension programs. So I think the opportunity is available for us to join together and have a much stronger program than we have ever had.

My friend in Georgia, Tal Duvall, likes to use the term "relevant programming." At one time, a lot of people were using the term balanced programming, but from an Extension standpoint in South Carolina, and in most states, I think, we are trying to assess what the needs of the public are. We hear a lot about needs assessment and other terms that may be applied to it. No program will survive and succeed unless it fulfills a need—that's a basic premise upon which I operate. I don't care if you are talking about a teaching program, or an Extension Program, or any other program, it has to meet a need, or it will not survive. If we are going to survive then, we must meet the needs of people that we are serving, and that's our clientele. It does not matter to me whether they are marine interests, whether they are 4-H families or home economists. We also should recognize that every segment of our user groups that we are talking about, are in a state of transition also. There are some very dramatic and drastic changes underway in our families and family structure, in our societal structures, in our commercial agriculture, and I would say the same things are true in the marine area. All you have to do, I think, is look at what the population trends are going to be. John mentioned the ten-mile wide strip around the Florida coast. In South Carolina, ten years ago, the Piedmont, the northwestern corner of state, 250 miles from the coast, was the population center of the state—highly industrialized, the center of our textile industry. The projections are if current trends continue, by the year 2000, two-thirds of the population in South Carolina will live in our coastal counties. That has some very significant impacts, not only on Marine Extension, on Sea Grant programs, but on our Cooperative Extension programs. So there is a real challenge out there for all of us, and we are not going to run out of opportunities, challenges, and I think the time is appropriate for us to join together and move forward to serve our clientele. Thank you.
THE FUTURE OF MARINE EXTENSION: A PERSPECTIVE

Richard N. Jarman, Executive Director
Maryland Sea Grant College

There is in place today a productive network of coastal and Great Lakes marine extension programs. One very notable feature of the network is that differences exist among the component programs. There are differences in organization, funding, size and capability. The reasons for this "diversity" are many fold and would require an examination of each program to identify completely. In considering the future of marine extension, however, it will likely be the common characteristics among marine extension programs that most directly influence what happens. In large part, it will be the common elements or circumstances that contribute to the existence of a marine extension network which determine the future of marine extension.

Marine extension has developed as the result of collaborative efforts among many individuals and organizations. The partnership between Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension is clearly one of the most outstanding examples of successful collaboration. The Sea Grant/Cooperative Extension partnership provides a good framework for considering the factors and circumstances that will influence the future of marine extension.

What are the characteristics that Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension have in common? The programs are university-based. While there is and will continue to be a certain freedom associated with being university-based, there remains the fact that the programs must reflect and are guided by what is appropriate for a university to do. Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension are in the business of helping citizens and decision makers understand and use the best, most accurate information available, i.e., the programs are oriented to working with information and knowledge users. Both Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension are in partnership with federal agencies. This partnership involves funds, program direction and guidance.

While certainly not a comprehensive list of common elements, the three general features mentioned above—university-based, user oriented and federal partnership—have definite implications for the future of marine extension. Possibly the most profound implication embodied by these common elements is that marine extension is in an environment of rapid change, i.e., the "rules" under which marine extension is operating are changing. Administrators are being challenged by the public to re-evaluate the effectiveness and quality of university activities. The questions being asked and the actions being taken focus on ensuring that university programs remain relevant to the needs of society and use available resources most effectively. Change is also occurring within Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension's constituencies. User communities are becoming more sophisticated and their needs more complex. User expectations as to what universities can and should provide continue to change. Finally, the federal partners in Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension are faced with changing missions and responsibilities. Just as universities are being called on to reassess their role, so too are federal agencies. It is all too evident that the amount of federal funds available and how and to what they are allocated is undergoing change.

How this changing environment may affect Sea Grant, Cooperative Extension and in turn marine extension is suggested in a 1975 report, "The Post Land Grant University: The University of Maryland Report". Based on an extensive evaluation of the University of Maryland, this report deals with strategies for achieving new economies and greater
productivity within Land Grant universities. The report is an acknowledgement of increased fiscal austerity and cultural and societal change. A very positive note of encouragement for Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension is given.

The research work of the Agricultural Extension Station should be as vigorous ever, as should the mass education efforts of the Cooperative Extension Service.

But food comes from the sea as well as the land, so marine science, coastal waters research and Sea Grant extension activities should increase at state universities on America's seacoasts.

This encouraging finding, however, is tempered by the recognized need for effectiveness and quality—"The University does not need to increase its public service appreciably, but it does need to be more methodical and better organized in its approach to public service". An important point to be taken from this report as well as the reality of today's circumstances is that Sea Grant, Cooperative Extension and the professionals of marine extension must pay attention to working together even more diligently than in the past. Rather than be driven by circumstances, the challenge is to join forces and move forward. Rather than constrain and consolidate, the view can and should be toward expanding and improving.

How might Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension respond to the challenges ahead? Some possible approaches include:

- Joint planning at the highest levels of management and if necessary modifying current program planning methods and products.
- Greater attention to involving and drawing upon the full range of capabilities and expertise that exists within the university community.
- Encouraging innovative approaches to organizing and delivering programs.
- Jointly identifying and organizing efforts that draw support from non-traditional funding sources.
- Clearly identifying and explaining to administration the partnership between Sea Grant and Cooperative Extension must remain progressive, adaptable and innovative. As Abraham Lincoln said:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise to the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew. We must disenthrall ourselves."
DOTTING THE "i's" AND CROSSING THE "t's": MARINE AND GREAT LAKES PROGRAMS IN TOMORROW'S CES PROGRAMS!

Marion Clarke
Florida Sea Grant Extension Program

The very nature of the design and title of the Sea Grant College Program is patterned after the Land Grant College System. This is clearly identified in "Partners and Parallels" a publication resulting from the deliberations of the ECOP Task Force on Sea Grant Relations that was published in June of 1979.

The Task Force identified five shared goals that Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and Sea Grant (SG) have in common:

1. To extend research-based objective information to people who can use it.
2. To identify problems that need research attention.
3. To increase people's awareness of marine resources.
4. To conduct educational programs to encourage more effective conservation and use of natural resources.
5. To develop linkages to make it easier to work on common problems and to serve common audiences.

They also identified four major program areas of national significance that CES and SG have in common. Each of these major program areas have sub-program areas of mutual interest and concern.

I. Environment
   Pollution
   Land use
   Water use

II. Economic Development
   Jobs
   Public Services
   Transportation
   Coastal Recreation

III. Energy Development
     and conservation

IV. Consumer & Public Issues
    Food and Nutrition
    Food Safety
    Natural Resource Appreciation

A variety of administrative structures were found within the programs as well as among personnel titles and supervisory schematics. CES was similar yet different from the new marine element of the CES operations. Yet in 1979 when this committee examined CES/SG relations, they elected to name the document "Partners and Parallels". This gives a positive note to the findings of the Task Force. The Task Force apparently found more reasons to be partners in Marine and Great Lakes Extension Program delivery than there were differences.
I concur with this finding. I am of the opinion that a Sea Grant Marine or Great Lakes Extension Program is much better off as a part of the CES than programs operating a mini-extension program of their own. It is not a "rose garden" but no one promised a "rose garden". There are key differences that make the integration of CES and SG extension activities difficult to implement. Where there is a true team effort the CES/SG scenario is by far the most effective and efficient method of Marine Extension Program implementation.

To make the team effort most effective it must be a true and full partnership in order for SG Marine Extension to effectively parallel and operate within the CES. Programs that do not charge overhead for funds coming in through the Sea Grant funds have more dollars to invest directly into the Marine Extension Program. Overhead rates charged by institutions to implement Sea Grant Extension Programs range from 0 to 67%. Are there any overhead rates charged to USDA for funds coming in to implement CES programs? How many Sea Grant Extension Programs get a portion of the publication and training dollars available for CES programs? To truly be a full partner in extension programming, marine programs should have a fair share of these dollars. Do CES Agriculture Research and Experiment Stations invest dollars in marine and coastal issues? Are state lines available for marine extension personnel to augment the dollars available from Sea Grant? To what extent have county governments participated in funding local Marine Extension Positions. Is the same formula advocated for marine positions as are recommended and implemented for CES positions? Do marine extension program issues and operations receive their fair share of operational considerations equal to other CES programs such as Home Economics, Agriculture, and 4-H? Do they receive appropriate attention at the county, state, regional and national level?

If the issues and questions raised above can all be answered yes, your marine program probably has a full and true partnership with CES. If there are discrepancies as to equal treatment of the Marine Extension Program with other CES program elements, it can only be labeled a partial or limited partnership. If Marine Extension Programs are going to realize their full potential in the CES they must be considered a full partner.

Tomorrow's CES and Marine Extension Programs? I feel there is a lot to gain by this full integration of marine programs into tomorrow's CES. The stability and security of SG Extension Programs will be enhanced with the establishment of a full partnership. The recommendations of this workshop will prove to be the catalyst for initiating elements of this full partnership as the National CES Offices recognizes marine programs as a viable part of CES extension program.

Recently extensive pressure has been brought to bear upon CES at county, state and national levels to modernize their programs to develop and expedite research and extension programs that more effectively relate to the needs of today's society. This means developing extension education programs that relate to a primarily urban society with different interests and needs of the traditionally rural population and the small farmer of the past. Accountability to justify expenditure of tax dollars for extension activities has been receiving increased scrutiny at all levels of government.

The Cooperative Extension Service has a lot to gain from establishing this full partnership with Sea Grant Extension Programs. A large percentage of
coastal and Great Lakes states populations tend to concentrate in coastal and lake counties. Marine Extension Programs provide a natural and effective entree to urban populations. CES is examining how programmatic changes in existing traditional programs to accommodate the new trends in clientele needs can be accomplished. Current programs of Sea Grant Marine Extension Programs are focused on issues and programs of interest to urban populations around the nation. The effectiveness and stability of Marine Extension Programs that can be realized from a full partnership with CES will enhance the political and critical significance of CES and Sea Grant to urban populations around the nation. We, CES and SG, will all gain from effecting a full partnership at the earliest possible date.

The ECOP Task Force on Sea Grant Relationships established numerous mutual interests and the need for a partnership among Sea Grant and CES Programs around the nation. The changing needs of clientele and the changing nature of clientele served by CES and SG mandate changes in the way we do business. Change is many times resisted by the traditional ways we do what is perceived to be the best course of action. CES must change to survive the current surge of public opinion which results in political realities. They are effectively examining their position and preparing to make changes in programmatic approaches to extension education in a changing and diverse society. Let's hope that in the move to serve urban populations CES does not overlook the Marine Extension Program as an effective tool for serving this diverse group. Sea Grant Marine Extension Programs are currently working in urban areas on urban interests and as a full partner with CES it can play a key role in bringing CES to the urban areas of our nation.

If effective and full partnerships are developed between SG and CES, marine and Great Lakes Extension Programs will be considered a major program area, and among the most visible and valuable to CES in the decade ahead.
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APPENDIX B

WORKSHOP EVALUATION
EXTENSION COMMITTEE ON POLICY (ECOP)
NATIONAL WORKSHOP ON MARINE EXTENSION PROGRAMS

Please take a few minutes to complete this evaluation. Your response will help us in planning future workshops. Thank you.

1. What did you think about the workshop in its entirety?

- I observed the following about the workshop a) established relationships were the most likely to be favored eg. marine extension folks talk more to marine extension folks; b) participants appeared unfettered in sharing their opinions; c) although informal the topics and speakers were given serious attention. Overall, the workshop provided a secure forum for dialogue. It is possible that there were concerns considered too sensitive to bring to the floor as there was a "hum" in some of the discussions outside the scheduled sessions.
- It was successful in bringing CES and SG people together to have frank discussions of our organizational relationships and the opportunities for the future.
- Very useful.
- Had positive feelings about the entire session. It was time to get together. I was concerned that there might be a hidden agenda that would force cooperation. If so, however it was not evident.
- Approved, well planned, responsive of participants, seemed quite positive.
- Good workshop. Many excellent presentations — experience, insights very timely for New Hampshire.
- It was helpful in a general sense, but its effectiveness in building cooperativeness and interactions between Sea Grant and Extension.
- I didn’t attend it all but felt I learned something about the concerns of the interface with CES.
- Too long — too many speakers being redundant — could have been better focused.
- Intense — structured thoughtfully — permitted good mix of formal/informal discussion. Presentation quality was mixed.
- Being the first workshop on Marine Extension it needed to be broad in coverage and intensity. Quality and Quanity very good.
- Overall I thought it was excellent. I thought that on day 1 too much time was spent on conflict areas between SGEP & CES.
- I believe that it was a historic happening and very very useful for future collaboration. Thanks for the opportunity.
- More productive than anticipated.
- Great — workshop exceeded my expectations — and more than achieved the goals.
- Overall it was very good. There was probably too much in the way of formal presentations. Too many speakers. Should have had more time for discussion.
- Extremely valuable. Many fine presentations. Too little time for discussion, probably a lot to cover at a "first" meeting.
- Overall, it was very good. There appeared to be too many speakers in some sessions in too short a time for them to adequately develop their ideas and thesis.
- Excellent.
- Well planned, moved toward meeting objectives.
- Overall, it was an excellent workshop. It was very enlightening and allowed for a good and open exchange of ideas.
- Workshop was good and ultimately accomplished its prime objectives, however, better control needs to be exercised to avoid redundancy.
- Good beginning effort — should continue effort to link SG/CES efforts. Would suggest future joint SG/CES workshops be less structured.
- Overall, very good — too many speakers, too pinched for time — needed more discussion time.
- Very worthwhile.
- Useful, well organized, but too much repetition of subjects. Many speakers found that their talks had already been given by others.
- Very beneficial but we had too many speakers — we should have just covered the topic of CES - SG links — nothing else!
- Very good.
- Excellent; more pregnant with promise for making significant change than and other workshop in which I've ever participated.
- Very good — perhaps too many speakers — would have liked some further development on some ideas presented eg. evaluation.
- Excellent, except — far too little time for the audience to talk - speakers can learn by listening, also.
- It was an excellent opportunity to address the SG/CES relationships which was much needed. There were too many speakers, too little formal discussion time. Should not try to structure all of the allotted time.
- Timely - should be held biannually to strengthen partnership.
- Too long - needed goal stated in beginning i.e. Develop plan for future interaction. Good location - should have not gotten into nuts/bolts.
- Too 'loaded' in Florida and N.Y. SG/CES presented long (60% + of total) therefore non-objective as "national" forum/workshop. Only 6% of SG Directors and 4% CES Directors involved in developing recommendations — this is not satisfying for taking forward "national" recommendations — but very important to have had this meeting/forum to initiate discussion, air problems/business, start of better "understandings" of SG/CES by each group.
- Generally good. The vast number of speakers was or is a questionable practice, if you get a poor presenter it's a blessing, if you get a good one it's a bane.
- Too one-sided, these may be thoughts or ideas from non-extension organizations that could be beneficial to extension and this could generate some cross-pollination.
- Very good in some parts. However, it seemed that too many speakers were crammed into short time slots. This did an injustice to all (most) speakers - it's virtually impossible to give quality talk and create a dialogue with the audience in 15 minutes.
- A good effort to clear the air. Should help to improve relationships and strengthen programs.
- Good opportunity to explore the issues to learn about ways in which other programs work together. Overall good, but too many speakers.
2. Were there certain sessions you enjoyed more than others, if so please tell which ones and why.

- I found the following three sessions noteworthy in a descending order of appreciation: *Sea Grant in State Cooperative Extension Programs How, McClure, With and Within *Evaluating Marine and Great Lakes Extension Programs Hecker and Smith *A Review of Accomplishments and Opportunities in Marine and Great Lakes Extension Programs and Home Economics.
- 1) Survey of marine programs - provided detailed information.
- 2) Presentations on specific array of SG/CES collaboration like 4-H, home economics, etc.
- 3) The seafood buffet - an excellent introduction to Florida Seafood!
- No - all about the same as to enjoyment. However, sessions on evaluation and affirmative action were superfluous to the overall topic.
- All sessions seemed to have a useful thrust. There was a need for time to discuss and question presentations and philosophies. And there was never enough time for personal interaction — but there seldom is in any conference.
- Can't respond.
- Arva Jackson — Fantastic — Eloquent, Gains and Losses to the Partners — B.J. Copeland, Discussion groups — (most applicable to my situation) Bill Wick, Bruce Wilkins.
- Friday morning — speakers were to the point on (what seemed to be) the issues surfacing earlier.
- Bruce DeYoung — short, to the point on a topic not previously covered.
- Stand outs for me — Gail McClure, Bill Wick, B.J. Copeland (for reverse English on the subject) Bruce DeYoung, Don Sweat, Midge Smith, Doris Tichenor, Bud Webb, Rick Jarman. Organization, substantive, — Reason on all cases — clarity. I appreciated Bruce Wilkins report on Survey of Marine and Great Lakes Extension Programs — a contribution to a much needed knowledge base.
- Sea Grant in State Coop. Ext. — Philosophy Gains and Losses - Sense of where we are — Arva Jackson — excellent presentation opportunity for informal sharing.
- No - I felt that the ability to bring everything together by recommendations was an excellent way to bring together the important concepts of this conference.
- I enjoyed the "Gains and Losses" except for the Copeland part. I very much enjoyed "Sea Grant in Cooperative Extension Program" the "Research Links" by Bender was appropriate and excellent. Jarman presentation outstanding.
- Small group sessions - discussions.
- All sessions were good — only suggestion would be to reduce total number of speakers to allow for more discussion.
- Liked the small group discussions.
- Yes, many such. Opening morning presentations were all excellent! DeYoung, Jackson, Weber, both excellent presentations. Tichenor, Bender, Woeste, Webb, Jarman.
- The women who spoke did a lot better job than many of the men. They appeared better prepared and were very articulate. Norm Bender, Rick Jarman, Bruce DeYoung and Sid Cleveland were best men speakers because they were articulate and specific.
"SG in State Cooperative Extension Programs" and "Gains and Losses to the Partners" were especially strong; Mike Duttweiler's role was absolutely crucial and he carried it out in superior fashion.

(Found useful).

1) Developing programs at the county level.

2) Had an opportunity to learn about ways in which SG/CEs can better work together, i.e. positive and negatives of SGE/CES cooperation.

All sessions on day one were excellent as were the first 3 on day 2. The following sessions were very well presented but of little value in this type of a building and creating linkages program: 1890 programs, assessing needs, evaluation, home economics and NASULGC.

Small group discussions were good. The ECOP regional discussions, however, were of little value.

Small group discussion(s) including ad Hoc group on focussing how to best approach ECOP regarding marine education. Arva's presentation was outstanding — she talked with not to us and synthesized the issue: 11-year-old vs. 17-year upstart!

No

All were worthwhile but could have used one or two papers maximum to cover each topic followed by work groups.

Sessions II and IV were directly focused on the principle question. Perhaps a one and one-half day conference would have been adequate — or perhaps open the agenda more.

We should NOT have covered topics such as minorities, needs assessment, and evaluation as they are not relevant to the joining of CES & SG!

The positive side of working together rather than so many negative points of problem.

Wilkin's survey summary was not especially relevant; the data seemed to pale in significance in summarization. There were too many gains and losses presentations.

"Gains and Losses" was the most relevant to my interest. Fewer speakers would have been better.

Among many, Gail McClure, Arva Jackson, Midge Smith, Andy Weber. They had important points to make, produced a few, and made them well.

The two one-hour group session. I believe that such a workshop should provide equal time between the speaker/panel presentations and the working groups.

Those sessions which allowed for group discussion, heard a variety of views.

Discussion group topics — best. Highest interaction regarding relevant topics. Many of the talks repeated previous material.

Generic topics/presentations — the continued "showcasing" of specific elements of the FL, N.Y. programs was mostly a waste of time — and limited opportunity for substantive discussion major topics/problems.

Interestingly enough the females on the program were, in my opinion, by far the best presenters i.e. Arva, Midge, Doris, Gail. They were prepared, on target, knowledgeable, articulate.

Most of the Tues. and early Wed. sessions were excellent. The time allocations to speakers was not adequate. The volume of material did not allow for orderly digestion, thought, and discussion.

Bruce DeYoung's talk on county support was best. This was primarily because he had enough time to deliver a paper and create a dialogue. Others which didn't fit well were on minorities and evaluation. While I realize N.Y. and Florida were organizers, they were a bit too dominant on the agenda.
If it is not a crime it shall be! to put as many speakers in such a short time with little chance to discuss the material presented. Some speakers were more to the point than others. Small group discussions often not focused enough, but the intervention was beneficial.

3. Are there any topics that were not covered in this workshop that you think would have been beneficial? If so please list.

- N/A
- The topics were adequate. More time should have been allowed for questions and comments after each speaker. This was a weakness of the program structure. As a result we lost some potential benefits from the conference.
- No
- I'd like to have had a good historical discussion of the Land Grant evolution and how the various parts of Extension came to be. Perhaps we could learn from the history of both Land and Sea Grant.
- No
- No
- Would like to have heard from a State CES Director complement Bud Webb who was not, as Bud is, comfortable on an advocate of integration of MAS & CES programs.
- Not applicable for me to answer—I'm not MAS or SG.
- Solutions.
- Negotiation Techniques.
- Setting the Sea Grant Extension Research agenda. More opportunity for small group discussions. It would have been helpful to have a resource sharing opportunity.
- No.
- None that I know of.
- N/A
- More detail on accountability systems and how to use them.
- Someone looking at gains and losses who was a Field Agent.
- All included were needed, no more needed to be able. For next time—Research by SG Extension staff more program emphasis i.e. small group by fishery, aquaculture etc. Long range SG Ext. plans, Coastal Ext., Professional Assoc. (Agent Assoc.)
- Future Topics
- Effective use and consolidation of reports for SG & Ext. How to gain institutional commitment (for non-Land Grant campuses or colleges).
- The importance of economic impact of marine related resources on states and localities. How to jointly impact legislatures and county boards to get support!! Computer tie with CES?
- How do we integrate extension more fully into Sea Grant and NOAA? (What we did address was how to integrate Sea Grant into Extension).
- None I can think of.
- Leave out the topics listed above and leave more time for discussion on the other topics. Need more extension people and need for more of them to stay at our group sessions.
- Discuss the importance of flexibility among the various MAS programs. Discuss possibilities of short term (1 month or so) sabbatical or talent exchanges among MAS programs.
- Relationships come first, prospects second. Would suggest communications be encouraged i.e. allow SG and CES people to talk, share and interface
with each other as people and adults with considerable life-long learning experiences.

- Workshop has covered broad range of topics. None missing that I can think of.
- More opportunity to reflect on topics. Way too many speakers were crammed in. Need time to think.
- More open discussion would have helped. The packed agenda precluded or discouraged discussion. Small groups are ok, but some of the key folks weren't heard in forum.
- How various Sea Grant (MEP) programs are organized in a little more detail.
- No
- Would have liked to hear more from the SG programs which are not formally linked to Ext. How can the informal linkages lead to cooperative programs?
- Exercising priorities in deciding which services to the public.
- It was quite comprehensive - too much so in fact. A lot of redundancy.
- Next meeting should include more group discussion of recommendations.
- Discussion on how NSDA views Sea Grant by Nell Greenwood or similar person
- Is the SG Advisory Service/CES cooperative effort the "best" model to emulate? Would have appreciated more info on non-CES Advisory Programs. We considered all other "models". Was there a fear that this evaluation would reflect poorly on the SG/CES cooperative effort????
- Needed topics on recreational aspect of Sea Grant's involvement. Economic impact, quality of life.
- The other side of the coin i.e. non-CES thoughts and ideas on extension type work (SG Adv. Ser. of non-CES related programs).
- 1) Discussion of different types of memorandum of agreements between CES and Sea Grant.
- 2) Discussion of rationale used by most CES Programs for not creating an equal program status for marine or Sea Grant.
- Coverage OK. Still not really clear on the desired outcome. What was our mission - specifically?

4. Do you feel this workshop was helpful to you and do you think other workshops of this nature would be beneficial?

- Yes. For me it opened a wider window on a community, I had not known as well.
- One immediate benefit was a focus for discussion with my state's CES administration responsible for SG/CES activities. Presentations coming examples of SG/CES work will strengthen our efforts to do similar things in our state.
- Yes. Yes.
- Yes, it was helpful. As a Sea Grant Director, I am for progress, but not for mindless follow the leader. I watched for symptoms.
- Periodic.
- Yes - too many end to end presentations though - I would allow for more discussion.
- Yes - however the schedule was too energetic and discouraged group discussion.
- Not applicable for me to answer - I'm not MAS or SG.
- Modestly helpful: it let me feel better about our CES/SG relationship: a short, focused workshop could be beneficial.
- Yes - my reasons are not necessarily germane to the Marine Extension Program - I was taking an opportunity to gain wider access to the Marine Extension Community.
- Very much—to fully understand and appreciate national Sea Grant Extension Perspective.
- Yes. This type of communication has been valuable and should be maintained.
  1) Absolutely
  2) Biannual workshops for the next decade are necessary.
- Yes - should be structured with more discussion/interaction time.
- Yes - should be held on regular basis.
- Yes
- Definitely.
- Yes, very helpful as the CES/SG relationship is very important to our program. Yes, it would.
- Yes -- this workshop will be meaningless unless there are others plus regular continuing of communications.
- I gained a great deal from the workshop both from the aspects of my Sea Grant position and from my CES position. I would like to see a workshop of this kind held every couple years.
- Yes — definitely.
- Yes, and others should be held.
- Yes
- Was helpful but future workshops should focus on specific program.
- Yes — more fortification of existing ideas rather than changing approaches. No, not soon.
- Yes and yes.
- Yes — sometime in the future.
- Yes; it will be springboard for action through local level follow-up.
- Yes.
- Yes and yes.
- Excellent, but expensive — but worth the cost.
- Very helpful to me — this should be held biannually.
- Yes but every other year. Have ECOP sponsor next one.
- Yes — if better structured (see "1") and better attended, would be much more "helpful". The creation for opportunity for dialogue on this subject was most important accomplishment of the meeting.
- Too much show and tell, need more in-depth topics, on site visits, practitioners. Need more outsiders on the program, too many in-house presenters. Discussion leaders for group discussions should learn to lead the discussion rather than dominate the conversation and impose their preconceived ideas on the group (structures) the shortness of time may have caused some problem here. However, discussion leaders need to draw out participants, serve as a facilitator, etc.
- NOTE: Courtesy demands that non-smokers be given some consideration in meetings like this. Either eliminate it from the room (most desirable) to segregating the two groups.
- Somewhat. Future workshops should be broadened and lengthened to allow for more discussion with the various speakers.
- Yes — helpful in several respects.
- Yes
- It was helpful, but I think we covered the territory fairly well.
How did you feel about the location and facilities?

- Excellent.
- Excellent.
- Fine.
- Location and facilities were first-rate after we finally had a chance to register. Saturday night was rather confusing.
- Approved excellent; feedback very good.
- I liked the beach location — I personally prefer a less urban hotel — hospitality excellent! — Seafood excellent. A beautiful area in general.
- Fine — this group needs to meet by the sea somewhere.
- Very good. You took very good care of the participants re: food, breaks, and generally in keeping meeting on schedule.
- OK
- Excellent.
- Excellent — I hope we could have a follow-up workshop within 2 years to capitalize on the momentum from this workshop!
- Great — super job of planning and communities.
- Outstanding. Well done, Marion Clarke!
- Fine selection.
- Good - should include a bit more free time.
- Excellent. Everything was smooth logistically. Good job to Marion Clarke.
- Beach great, prefer smaller facility and room with windows.
- Fantastic location and setting for marine related conference. Air conditioning was very uncomfortable most of the time, I caught a cold which is a heck of a note for warm, sunny Florida.
- Good: Coastal location, Less good: hotel too big and impersonal; windowless meeting room — would have preferred smaller, more informal, more intimate facility.
- Location and facilities were fine.
- Outstanding.
- Great! but since the location was good there should have been time built in the schedule to enjoy.
- Excellent.
- Excellent. Good.
- Fine.
- Very good. Marion Clarke and associates were excellent hosts.
- Could not have been better - great job with the seafood dinner - thanks!
- Very good for both.
- Excellent; even though we couldn't enjoy them very much.
- Great! Many thanks to Florida Sea Grant. Boat trip and buffet were nice ways to "adjust the attitude".
- Very nice - unfortunately, too little time to enjoy them.
- Excellent, but expensive - but worth the cost.
- Please remember "The mind can only absorb what the behind can endure." I understand the importance of the work time. I also understand the importance of R&R and just walk around time. It is a shame to come to such a beautiful place and have no free time to really see any of the sights. In the future you may want to consider a schedule such as: 1/2 day in the middle for full time or working 8-12; 12-5 free and working 5-9 or 10.
- Great location and facilities - a later start in morning or earlier afternoon conclusion would permit time to enjoy these. It would also allow time to process info and reflection.
Very good. More time to enjoy it. Next time more central to USDA.
Adequate — but better held at more central location (Chicago, Atlanta,
Denver, St. Louis) and not in holiday/playground atmosphere. Florida
resort communities are always "suspect" to my supervisors/auditors — (read
"Boondoggie")
The seafood feast was superb — congratulations to the organizing on that!
Great! Spouse's fee out of line.
Adequate.
Very good. I offer 2 suggestions — 1) perhaps a little R&R time should
have been built into agenda. 2) it would have been nice to be in a room
with windows.
O.K. needed more time to enjoy then next time consider a conference
that starts on a Monday or ends on a Friday so we can tie into a weekend
for recreation needs.
Location fine. Tours, meals, breakfast nicely done. The room was too
closed and cold. No reason to be cut off from the beauty of the
surroundings. Should have a non-smokers side some people very
inconsiderate about the effect of their smoke on others.

6. How often do you think a workshop of this nature should be held?

Once every 5 years.
Every three years.
Every 2 years.
Great every five years.
Cost wise, every two years.
Annually for 3-4 years — then biennially — ECOP and SG as "host".
Every two years — no more often, no longer than two days.
Biannually.
1/2 years.
Annually.
3-5 years intervals. The next workshop may concentrate on assessing
change resulting from this one, as a basis for future joint programming.
Every 3 years.
Perhaps every five years.
The specific subject area workshops every 1-2 years. Program definition
workshop soon.
A follow-up is needed within a year.
Annually — momentum needs to continue.
Every two to three years.
Biannual.
Once every 2 years. If ECOP is on a 3 year workshop cycle, perhaps Sea
Grant could develop a similar workshop in the "off year". Perhaps one
every 18 months.
Every 3 years.
2 years — although another is needed within 18 months to maintain our
momentum.
Every three years — regional workshops every three years.
At 2 or 3 yr. intervals.
Biannually.
Every 3 years.
More than 1 time/year. *I gather this is unrealistic, but suggest some
other mechanism needs to be developed to keep CES and SG talking
formally. *Turnover may have been slow in the part, but as CES and SG
move closer together - the rate of turnover and therefore the need to
get together for classificiation/reconciliation and reaffirmation of common
goals will increase dramatically.

- Every couple of years.
- 2-3 years. For program leaders - State Director.
- 2-3 years.
- Every 3 years.
- 2 years for the next; three, thereafter.
- 2-3 years.
- Schedule as needed. I would not make it an annual occurrence.
- N/A

7. Is there a specific location you would recommend for the next workshop?

- Someplace central - notice how few west coast people came. Only 5 out
  of 65 - 7%. Overall, a good job, Marion, well organized and well conducted.
  Thanks for efforts! As an afterthought, I think there was a rather heavy
  use of a few people - for instance, N.Y. Sea Grant and Bruce Wilkins.
  There was only 1 PASGEP person on the agenda - Bill Wick. It would
  have encouraged more participation if we had been more involved.
  The presentation from NASULGC (John Kernond) was in poor taste and
  the worst I have heard in many years. This individual should be relieved
  of any responsible to represent us. We do not need this kind of help.
  1. It was not his role to evaluate or justify our efforts to improve
     communication.
  2. A personal opinion that Sea Grant should be disbanded and divided
     should not have been stated. It might come off as a NASULGC
     position.
  3. His jokes were in poor taste and should not have been included in
     his presentation.
  - Atlantic City, N.J. or Hilton Head, S.C.

Had Dean Woeste's excellent talk been given at the beginning of the
workshop it would have set the scene and focused the entire proceedings
that followed.
Conference should be moved to various regions over time, let region pick
location.
  1) Chicago, 2) Detroit, 3) Memphis, 4) Atlanta.
  - Washington, D.C. - Chicago, Illinois. There was not enough CES position
    in the workshop. S.G. was too large a group vs CES. Have meeting on
discussion group for researchers. Don't leave Directors to the very end.
  - Hawaii.
  - Texas, California, Oregon, N.Y., Maine i.e. in each of the different regions.
This evaluation may sound very critical. However I congratulate most
beautifully those who developed this meeting. It was obvious that a lot
of planning and thought and just plain hard work went into it - and I
consider the workshop to have accomplished all of its objectives and then
some. I will think my time here was well spent, and I'll look forward to
the next one. I believe that the effects and benefits of this workshop will
be much more important and profound then the planners ever imagined.
  - East coast - Baltimore - Boston.
  - San Diego, Seattle, or New England.
  - No
  - Seattle, Washington.
Central.

No

Excellent conference — thanks for the opportunity.

If time is not built in to enjoy the facilities, then I suggest a submarine on the bottom of the Hudson River.

Any state with a strong and well organized and integrated extension/advisory service (linked with CES).

Perhaps the meetings could be held in each region. It would provide an opportunity to visit and learn about programs in the particular area.

Grand Traverse Resort, Traverse City, Michigan near Lake Michigan for Gt. Lks. flavor.

Yes — N. East.

Who would be willing to host?

No

Puerto Rico, Maryland, Minnesota, Texas, California (San Diego). Special Note: The Kermond presentation was a travesty. To have a NASULGC staffer make the provocative statement he did makes one wonder how solidly NASULGC is behind the Sea Grant concept. He should not be called upon to represent NASULGC again.

Where there is a critical mass of operating coop. ext. and marine extension programs in the vicinity of appropriate conference facilities.

More central location.

See #5.

For contrast — try the northwest coast or the Great Lakes — New England on the sea — "sample the activities like you did here — would be happy to find an interesting low key coastal location in New England should you decide to go to this area. (Peter Horne)

Washington — then you might build in some congressional staff. Also it would be easier for Fed's to participate.

The Oregon coast might be a good spot in 1987. You are invited.

No

The west coast.

N/A
APPENDIX C

WORKSHOP AGENDA

EXTENSION COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND POLICY

**** ECOP ****

NATIONAL MARINE EXTENSION WORKSHOP

OBJECTIVES:

1. To determine current levels of integration of Sea Grant (SG) Advisory Programs into Cooperative Extension Service (CES) Programs.

2. To develop recommendations to improve Cooperative Extension Service and Sea Grant administrative linkages, support, and operational efficiency.

3. To enhance the effectiveness of Cooperative Extension Service supported Sea Grant Extension Programs.

Tuesday, May 7, 1985

8:00 AM  Continental Breakfast

Session I:  WELCOME AND ORIENTATION

Session I & II Chairman: Marion Clarke, Florida Sea Grant and CES

8:30 AM  Welcome and Overview.

Jim Brasher, Associate Dean
Florida Cooperative Extension Service
Gainesville, Florida

8:40 AM  The Challenge for the Workshop!

Jim Cato, Director
Florida Sea Grant
Gainesville, Florida

8:50 AM  The USDA Perspective.

Jim Miller, Program Leader
Fish and Wildlife
USDA Extension Service
Washington, D.C.
Session II: ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND ISSUES

9:00 AM    Report on Survey of Marine Extension Programs.
            Bruce Wilkins, Program Leader
            New York Sea Grant Extension Program
            Ithaca, New York

9:20 AM    NOAA Sea Grant Extension Programs.
            Bob Shephard, Head
            Marine Advisory Services
            National Sea Grant College Program
            Rockville, Maryland
            Dan Panshin, Director
            NOAA Extension Service
            National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
            Washington, D.C.

9:50 AM    Different Strokes for Marine Programming.
            Jim Murray, Program Leader
            North Carolina Sea Grant Extension Program
            Raleigh, North Carolina

10:10 AM   Break

10:30 AM   Sea Grant In State Cooperative Extension Programs.
            Peter Horn, Director
            New Hampshire Cooperative Extension Service
            Durham, New Hampshire
            Gail McClure, Acting Associate Director
            Minnesota Agriculture Extension Service
            St. Paul, Minnesota
            Bill Wick, Director
            Oregon Sea Grant Program
            Corvallis, Oregon
            Bruce Wilkins, Leader
            New York Sea Grant Extension Program
            Ithaca, New York

11:40 AM   A Review of Accomplishments and Opportunities in Marine
            Extension Programs and 4-H.
            Tom Greenawalt, Associate Professor
            Florida 4-H Program
            Gainesville, Florida
11:55 AM  Thoughts on Developing Workshop Recommendations.

Mike Duttweiler, Program Coordinator
New York Sea Grant Extension Program
Ithaca, New York

12:05 PM  Lunch Break (On your own.)

Session Chairman: Jim Cato, Florida Sea Grant

1:30 PM  Gains and Losses to the Partners.

Jammie Carpenter, Director
Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service
Mississippi State, Mississippi

Walter Walla, Associate Director
Texas Cooperative Extension Service
College Station, Texas

Jim Cato, Director
Florida Sea Grant College Program
Gainesville, Florida

B.J. Copeland, Director
North Carolina Sea Grant Program
Raleigh, North Carolina

Dale Baker, Leader
Minnesota Marine Advisory Services
Duluth, Minnesota

John Judd, Leader
Michigan Marine Advisory Services
East Lansing, Michigan

3:00 PM  Break

3:20 PM  A Review of Accomplishments and Opportunities in Marine Extension Programs and Community Rural Development (CRD).

Sid Cleveland, Associate Director (CRD)
New York Cooperative Extension Service
Ithaca, New York

3:35 PM  Small Group Discussion of Issues and Recommendations.

Coordinator: Mike Duttweiler, New York Sea Grant

Groups will be divided into ECOP Regions for these discussions. Pre-designated Leaders and Recorders will be in charge of each group. Topics of discussion will be suggested but the groups will be able to address topics as identified.
5:00 PM Adjourn

6:30 PM Board "The Capt. Anderson II" for Dinner Cruise of the Inland Waterway. (Dock is a short 6 block walk from the hotel.)

7:00 PM "Capt. Anderson II" Departs the dock.

10:00 PM Return to dock near (6 blocks) the hotel.

Wednesday, May 8, 1985

8:00 AM Continental Breakfast

SESSION III: DEALING WITH FUNCTIONS AND OPERATIONS

Session Chairman: Tony Mazzacarro, Maryland Sea Grant and CES

8:30 AM Reports from Discussion Groups and Recommendations.

Mike Duttweiler, Program Coordinator
New York Sea Grant Extension Program
Ithaca, New York

9:00 AM Expanding Marine Programs Through Involving County CES Faculty: The New York Experience.

Bruce DeYoung, Program Coordinator
New York Sea Grant Extension Program
Riverhead, New York

9:40 AM Minorities in Marine Programs: As Participants & Employees: The Situation and Alternatives.

Ms. Arva Jackson, Chief
User Affairs & External Relations Staff
National Environmental Satellite Data Information Service
Washington, D.C.

Lawrence Carter, Director
1890 Programs
Florida Cooperative Extension Service
Florida A&M University
Tallahassee, Florida

10:00 AM Break

10:30 AM Assessing Needs for Marine Extension Programs.

Andy Weber, Program Leader
Natural Resources
USDA Extension Service
Washington, D.C.
Joe Halusky, Sea Grant Extension Area Agent
Florida Sea Grant Extension Program
Northeast Florida
St Augustine, Florida

11:00 AM Evaluating Marine Extension Programs & Personnel.

Stan Hecker, Asso. Director
Miss/Alabama Sea Grant Consortium
Ocean Springs, Mississippi

Midge Smith, Associate Professor
Office of Program Evaluation
Florida Cooperative Extension Service
Gainesville, Florida

11:30 AM A Review of Accomplishments and Opportunities in Marine Extension Programs in Agriculture.

James App, Assistant Dean
Agriculture Programs
Florida Cooperative Extension Service
Gainesville, Florida

11:45 AM Getting Our Recommendations Into Shape.

Mike Duttweiler, Program Coordinator
New York Sea Grant Extension Program
Ithaca, New York

12:05 PM Lunch Break (On your own.)

Session Chairman: Jim Miller, USDA

1:30 PM Small Group Discussion of Issues and Topics of Interest.

Group Discussion Coordinator:
Tom Sweeney, Program Leader
South Carolina Sea Grant Marine Extension Program
Charleston, South Carolina

Discussion Leaders:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overhead</td>
<td>Tony Mazzacaro, Maryland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Bill Clark, Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalty Mail</td>
<td>Dale Baker, Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Norm Bender, Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audits</td>
<td>Elise Newell, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Titles</td>
<td>Bruce Wilkins, New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computerization</td>
<td>Marion Clarke, Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards</td>
<td>Jim Murray, North Carolina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3:00 PM Groups Report Back on Issues and Recommendations.

Moderator: Tom Sweeney, South Carolina
Assigned Group Leaders or Recorders Reporting

4:00 PM Developing Relevant Program Components for Marine Program Reporting and Planning.

Marion Clarke, Assistant Dean for Marine & Coastal Programs and Florida Sea Grant Extension Program Leader
Florida Sea Grant / Florida Cooperative Extension Service
Gainesville, Florida

4:15 PM A Review of Accomplishments and Opportunities in Marine Extension Programs and Home Economics.

Doris Tichenor, Chairman
Home Economics Department
Florida Cooperative Extension Service
Gainesville, Florida

4:30 PM NASULGC A Vehicle for Cooperation and its Role in Marine Programs.

John Kermond, Asst. Director for Marine Affairs
National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
Washington, D.C.

4:50 PM Reflecting on Recommendations.

Mike Duttwiler, Program Coordinator
New York Sea Grant Extension Program

5:15 PM Adjourn

6:30 PM Attitude Adjustment Period

7:00 PM Sampling "Morsels From the Sea"

Thursday, May 9, 1985

8:00 AM Continental Breakfast

SESSION IV: PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER!

Chairman: Marion Clarke, Florida CES and Sea Grant

8:30 AM Research Links and Shared Resources.

Norm Bender, Acting MAS Leader
Connecticut Sea Grant Program
Groton, Connecticut
8:50 AM Where and How Do Marine Extension Programs Fit In Extension Administration?

John Woeste, Dean
Florida Cooperative Extension Service
Gainesville, Florida

9:15 AM Dotting the "i"s and Crossing the "t"s: Marine Programs in Tomorrow's CES Programs!!

Jim Miller, Program Leader
Fish and Wildlife
USDA Extension Service
Washington, D.C.

Bud Webb, Director
South Carolina Cooperative Extension Service
Clemson, South Carolina

Rick Jarman, Associate Director
Maryland Sea Grant Program
College Park, Maryland

Marion L. Clarke, Assistant Dean Marine & Coastal Programs,
Florida Sea Grant Extension Program Leader
Gainesville, Florida

10:00 AM Break

10:15 AM Finalizing Recommendations for:
ECOP: Counties: States: Sea Grant: Regions: Others!

Mike Duttweller, Program Coordinator
New York Sea Grant Extension Program
Ithaca, New York

11:30 AM Evaluation and Concluding Remarks:

John Woeste, ECOP
Jim Cato, Council of Sea Grant Directors
Marion Clarke, Workshop Chairman

12:15 PM Adjourn
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