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>27</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, 8 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 166 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.
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.
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 36% 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. Biostream, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey; and President, Robert L. Clodius.

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 Oceanographics 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.