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The Cooperative Extension Service was established in 1914 when the United States of America was a predominantly agrarian society. America’s population according to the 2000 U.S. Census data is 79 percent urban. Extension’s urban county offices provided educational programs to address the needs and issues of contemporary urban life. The practices of urban county offices are becoming increasingly important to the future of the Cooperative Extension Service system. The purpose of this study was to identify current practices and project the patterns of success in urban Extension for the next two to five years (2007 – 2010)

A case study and a Modified Delphi technique, descriptive research designs, were used for this exploratory study. The case study site was purposefully selected based on its reputation as an exemplary urban office. The staff of this office was interviewed about office operations and programming, programs were observed, and marketing materials and educational documents were analyzed to provide input into the statements used in the Modified Delphi survey instrument. The case study provided a baseline of current practice. A purposeful sample of Extension professionals and experts across the United States was selected to serve as the panel of experts in three rounds of the Modified Delphi. The study was conducted utilizing a web-based survey instrument,
which allowed prompt responses to statements and rapid analysis of the data. The case study participants were interviewed in a focus group for reactions to the statements used in the Modified Delphi, providing the practitioners’ perspective in reaction to the Delphi panel’s recommendations.

The study identified 80 patterns of success for urban county Extension programs. Items identified achieved both a consensus rating of 80 percent agreement within two adjacent response categories on the six-point Likert-type scale in the Modified Delphi and the agreement of the case study participants. The result is a series of recommendations referred to as patterns of success. These patterns of success were identified for Internal Operations (staffing and funding), External Operations (accountability, marketing, and partnerships/external relationships), and Programming (target population, program planning, adult and youth programming, teaching and outreach methods, and program evaluation).
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Today there is an urgent need for additional Cooperative Extension System (CES) educational and outreach research-based programs in the urban setting. There is serious need for programs that address the multifaceted social and educational issues of struggling cities and communities. School shootings, gang violence, teen pregnancy, workforce preparation, dysfunctional families, illiteracy, poverty, nutrition and health, and unemployment are only some of the many complex issues faced by urban residents (Reaves, 1999).

The Cooperative Extension System employs approximately 32,000 employees nationwide and includes 2.8 million volunteers in its outreach in over 3,150 counties. The paid and volunteer staff are a bridge between the research resources of 74 land-grant colleges and universities and the people in the communities where Extension provides informal, non-credit education opportunities (Urban Task Force, 2003).

Background of the Problem

Extension’s history

The Cooperative Extension Service was established in 1914 by the Smith-Lever Act. The stated purpose was, "In order to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture, home..."
economics, and rural energy, and to encourage the application of the same, there may be
continued or inaugurated in connection with the college or colleges in each State,
Territory, or possession...the benefits of the Act of Congress approved July second,
eighteen hundred and sixty-two...agricultural extension work which shall be carried on
in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture” (Smith-Lever Act,
1914).

A basic intent of the act was, "an attempt to offer to those belonging to the
industrial classes preparation for the ‘professions of life’” (Smith-Lever Act, 1914). The
act did not limit the participants to any group of people or geographic locations. The
intent was and is to provide practical educational opportunities to people in their own
communities, not on the campuses of the land-grant colleges and universities. The
Smith-Lever Act has been interpreted many ways by professionals working for the
Extension system, Extension clientele, and other stakeholders. “As the United States has
grown, and metropolitan areas have become the home for the majority of the
population, Cooperative Extension has ‘followed the people’ by developing programs
that address the specific educational needs of the urban residents. Programs in youth
development (4-H), human nutrition (e.g. the Expanded Food & Nutrition Education
Program (EFNEP)), and urban gardening delivered to urban areas have a proven track
record” (Urban Task Force, 2003).

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) has targeted special funds
for urban Extension. In 1955 funding was established for the Expanded Food and
Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP). Funding has been increased to include
programs such as water quality, youth and families at risk, sustainable agriculture systems, and food safety and quality. Community development was added as a program area in 1961.

Applebee (2000, p. 411) noted the effectiveness of Extension was in being, “able to respond quickly to the critical educational needs of individuals, business owners, and local government officials by developing educational programs that enhance continual evolution of learning opportunities. Cooperative Extension leaders in counties across the United States (both volunteer and paid) can be organized to seek continuous input from government, community organizations, agencies, and individuals, and they have the capability to identify important educational needs of local people.” Responsiveness to local needs is a hallmark of the Extension system and it should be expected that Extension’s focus will vary depending on the needs of that region, state, or local community. Extension has traditionally focused on “communities of place.” A new opportunity is to serve virtual “communities of interest,” people with similar interests that connect with each other on the Internet (Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, 2002).

As Extension has evolved along with the rapid changes in America, it has been challenged on many fronts. The Committee on the Future of the Colleges of Agriculture in the Land Grant University System stated (1996, p. 87), “it is spread too thin both spatially and substantively…it is often not on the cutting edge of research and many if not most of its programs do not have a broad base of support outside its traditional
circle of clientele.” Ahearn, Yee and Bottum (2003) support the view that Extension has maintained strong support from traditional clientele in rural areas where agriculture is a primary economic factor.

The issue, however, is not the tension between rural and urban Extension focus, but how Extension can best serve the urban centers of America and demonstrate its value in order to continue receiving support from public funds (Committee on the Future of the Colleges of Agriculture in the Land Grant University System, National Research Council, Board on Agriculture, 1996). Questions arise concerning what Extension programming is for the public good versus those programs for private good. The Committee on the Future of the Colleges of Agriculture in the Land Grant University System, National Research Council, Board on Agriculture (1996, p. 98) stated, “youth and family-at-risk programs may promote the national interest in reducing crime, drug abuse, and teen pregnancy and in strengthening families and, thus, warrant federal support.” Programs for private good should be paid for by the person or organization that benefits unless local taxes are specifically dedicated to such services. Increasingly, Extension’s impacts will be weighed against the costs of program development and delivery. The Committee on the Future of the Colleges of Agriculture in the Land Grant University System, National Research Council, Board on Agriculture (1996, pp. 103-104) projected that the Extension system should be:

- Results driven,
- Relevant to consumers and producers,
• Science based, and
• More efficient in both delivery mechanisms and the use of public funds.

With federal, state, and local funders facing increasing pressures on their budgets, adequate funding for Extension systems has become increasingly challenging. Although lauded by Campbell (1995) as “one of the greatest programs ever devised by the land-grant system” the Extension system’s political support is waning with the decreasing clout of agriculture (Campbell, 1995). The perception of Extension by urban and suburban residents, and of urban and suburban legislators and county commissioners often is of Extension as a primarily rural organization (Applebee, 2000). Urban indicators of success could help staff of urban Extension focus programs to overcome these perceptions. Additionally, more focused efforts to communicate the urban programming that is being done could result in changes in perspective.

Changes in the world economy have affected American society. The world has become more interrelated and this has implications for national and local policy. The complexity of issues and interdependency of disciplines requires increased partnerships to address issues both within and outside of the university. The Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (2002) recommends expansion of partnerships and an increased acknowledgment of the expertise and contributions of other organizations.

While resources, both financial and human, are decreasing, urban Extension is faced with the challenge of programming for an increasingly complex and critical array of social and economic problems, and demonstrating the impacts of these programs. There is a dearth of data on benchmarks for quality to guide urban Extension
professionals in decisions concerning urban programming (Crosby and Hamernik, 2002). These authors recommend, “Inquiry that would result in a description of a quality urban Extension program would serve as a guide for urban Extension staff, providing benchmarks that indicate a quality program.”

**The Problem Statement**

Factors influencing quality urban programming were suggested by Krofta and Panshin in 1989: rapid societal change, shrinking public resources, rapidly evolving communication technologies, evolution of programs and organization, audience balance, relationships and connections. Shrinking public resources impacts are causing county commissioners and state legislators to question the need for urban Extension. Adult education in general is under pressure to move from the governmental sector to the private sector (Finger and Asun, 2001). Shrinking resources reduce staff; further reducing programs and impacts on critical urban problems. Communication technology is changing the ways people access information and educational programs. The cost of these technologies and the expertise required to use new technologies for educational outreach impact urban Extension’s ability to remain on the cutting edge of educational outreach. Societal changes and the complexities of urban problems require broader perspective and more participatory methods in program planning. These issues bring into question Extension’s organizational ability to effectively develop programs with adequate breadth and depth without increased interaction with the entire land-grant university, urban universities, and other potential private and public partners. The
multitude of problems and the many populations that can be served, require that urban Extension decide what target populations are appropriate. How will Extension balance requests for programs for various audiences? How should urban Extension’s resources be focused for maximum impact? Who will be involved in the decision-making process on these issues? What additional funding sources should be cultivated and how will the change in funding patterns affect programming, target audiences, staffing patterns and all of the other factors involved in this type of change? With these issues in mind, it is critical that patterns of success be identified so urban Extension professionals may set meaningful goals to move toward, and against which to measure their achievements.

**Purpose and Objectives of the Study**

The purpose of this research is to describe the patterns of success of a high-impact urban Extension county or local program. The objectives are to describe the patterns of success of an exemplary urban Extension county program and to determine what the patterns of success will be in the next two to five years as identified by a Delphi panel. The issues to be examined may include, but are not limited to:

- Internal operations
  - Staffing and
  - Funding
- External relationships
  - Accountability
  - Marketing
  - Partnerships and collaborations
- Programming
  - Target populations,
  - Program planning,
  - Adult education,
  - Youth Development / 4-H
  - Teaching and outreach methodology, and
  - Program evaluation / impacts.

These issues are based on the review of literature. The issues are grouped conceptually into internal operations, external operations, and programming for clarity in the study of them and for the discussion of them.

During a case study of an exemplary urban Extension county program, the current best practices were identified. These factors along with those from the review of literature were presented to a Delphi panel of experts. This Delphi panel then identified the patterns of success for an urban county Extension program in the next two to five years. The Delphi instrument was then shared with the case study participants for their assessment from the perspective of pace-setting practitioners.

The case study and the Delphi informed each other. Feedback from the case study participants on the perspectives of the Delphi panel, especially relating to the
practicality of the recommendations, solidly grounded the recommendations in the realities of an urban Extension county office. This allowed the case study participants to reflect on which factors of the patterns of success are critical from their perspective and which ones are practical. The case study helped the participants see themselves and analyze their own practice.

**Definition of Terms**

**Accountability** – advice and feedback from all people and groups that have an interest in the services provided by an organization.

**Case study** – the descriptive study of a contemporary object, such as a person, group of people, an organization, a project, or a phenomenon where the researcher is interested in understanding the particular case and not generalizing, when the context of the situation is important, and when the researcher has little control over events.

**Delphi technique** – a structured method of group communication process that allows a panel of individuals or experts to move toward agreement on a complex issue or problem. For this study, a panel of experts will identify and come to agreement on the critical patterns of success in urban Extension programs.

**Extension system** – the outreach programs of land-grant colleges and universities established through the Smith-Lever Act of 1914.

**Funding** – the financial support required to provide products and services. In the case of urban Extension, the funding partners have traditionally been USDA, state funds, local government or county funds, gifts, and grants.
**Marketing** – the process of selling or moving the educational products of Extension from Extension staff to consumers.

**Partnerships/external relationships** - engagement with communities and organizations that may involve shared resources, responds to needs and expectations, and recognition of contributions.

**Patterns of success** – those measures describing and/or measuring success of Extension program impacts.

**Program evaluation/impacts** – the process of determining the benefits of programs in the context of the costs of doing the programs.

**Program planning** – the process of determining the need for a program, target audience, educational goals and content, programming/teaching techniques/methods, and the evaluation of the educational material presented.

**Programs** – educational outreach with specific target audiences, learning objectives, and expected impacts.

**Staff** – the paid and unpaid people developing and providing the educational programs for Extension.

**Success** – the achievement of favorable outcomes. Within this study, success includes the measure of achievement of favorable outcomes in the areas of staffing and funding, marketing, accountability, and partnerships / collaborations, and programming.

**Target populations** – the target audience or group for which an educational program is developed.
Teaching and outreach methodology – the processes used to communicate the content of educational programs.

Urban – relating to, or characteristics of, a city. Using the 2000 Census definition: all territory, population and housing units within an urbanized area (UA) consisting of a population density of 1,000 people per square mile.

Limitations of Study

Patterns of success for the current urban Extension programs provide indications for the future, but within rapidly changing contexts, the patterns of success may be obsolete in a very short time. The process of identifying patterns of success will be an ongoing activity. Replication of a Delphi study is generally impractical and it would be expected that a different panel of experts may identify slightly different patterns of success. The panel was purposefully selected to provide professional perspectives that are representative of the leaders in urban Extension at the county, state, and national levels; however, the issue of reliability may be a concern for some. The selection of appropriate panel members was critical to the reliability of the study. The nomination process was a critical part of identifying the best individuals to contribute thoughtful deliberation. The use of an external panel that provided input to the researcher on topics including the selection of the Delphi panel, wording of the questionnaire, revision of questionnaire statements, review of panelists’ input, and analysis of the data further
provided support of reliability. Other methods of research should be used to continuously gather additional data to build as complete an understanding of the issues of urban Extension as possible.

The use of a case study provides the opportunity for the actions and reflections of the staff of a quality urban Extension county program to inform the development of the Delphi questionnaire. Several case studies representing programs from different regions of the United States as well as from cities of differing size, demographic composition, and history, would provide a much richer understanding of the possible diversity of urban Extension programs. Limitations of time and expense made this unrealistic for this study.

This study was a first step in developing an evolving set of patterns of success in urban Extension county programs. Additional input from a wider variety of stakeholders, and using a variety of research methods, will provide a richer understanding of the patterns of success.

**Importance of Study**

Identifying current practices in urban Extension programming and patterns of success will provide indicators that can serve as goals for urban Extension offices. Discussion of the patterns of success and their appropriateness will further the quality of ever-evolving Extension educational outreach in American’s urban centers. Patterns of success also provide a framework of common themes for reporting impacts to stakeholders. Reporting successes in meaningful ways that demonstrate that urban
Extension is doing the right things and doing them well is critical to urban Extension’s ability to build constituency, relationships with other educational institutions, and resource support from a wider array of funding sources.

There is currently no effective system of sharing program successes and challenges of urban Extension offices with other urban offices. The sharing that occurs happens by program area or unit at national professional meetings, such as the National Association of County Agricultural Agents, National Association of County 4-H Agents, National Association of County Family and Consumer Sciences Agents, and the Galaxy Conference. The North Central Urban Conference is an important opportunity for sharing urban successes and issues. This conference, despite the regional name, serves as a national meeting for urban Extension. These meetings provide a partial view at best. The program area meetings are focused on the specific program area and therefore do not consider the wider perspective of the total county program. As with any conference, only those who are able to attend participate in the sharing of information. With reduced budgets, fewer counties will be represented. The incentive to present at these national meetings is heavily weighted toward those systems in which county educators (agents) are faculty. This leaves many urban Extension professionals ill informed of current best practices. Some urban Extension staff have commented that they feel isolated within their own state Extension system. There is a need for more sharing of information. A recent study of the Ohio State University Extension recommended “Diffusion of best practice programs and initiatives” (Battelle,
2005). Because the Extension system prides itself on being a source of research-based information, it would be appropriate to conduct more research on the state of the urban counties, including successes, best practices, and challenges.

The lack of research-based data on best practices or expectations of the total program of urban county Extension programs results in ambiguity concerning the goals toward which the staff should be striving. Local context is of critical importance and programming that is based on local needs is a hallmark of the Extension system. However, when general expectations are ambiguous and benchmarks are not known, local staff and stakeholders have few standards against which to measure their achievements. This is especially critical in light of the perception that Extension is primarily a rural organization and any culturally held standards may be strongly influenced by the rural model. This rural model, whether real or perceived, does not translate well into the culture of the urban environment. The United States population is now predominantly urban/suburban and therefore Extension should develop a model that speaks to that reality.

The closing of the Multnomah County (Portland) office in Oregon and the Mecklenburg County (Charlotte) office in North Carolina due to loss of funding from county commissioners, as well as serious funding cuts in several other urban counties, makes patterns of success more immediately important. Urban Extension programs across the United States are struggling with reduced or level funding. With rising costs, the result is reduced staffing and reduced programming. The lack of staff to address adequately the complex issues facing urban residents results in continued erosion of
support for urban Extension. The lack of current technology for outreach places Extension at a disadvantage in competing with other forms and sources of information distribution. Relationships with funders, current clientele, potential clientele, other educational institutions and agencies, the media, and the urban leadership are critically important for Extension’s capacity to be an effective urban educational institution.

Patterns of success will be a method of showing levels of success. With this knowledge, Extension administration will be able to determine funding and staffing needs in urban offices and better able to establish realistic program focus and impact expectations. An increased understanding of the resources needed for successful urban Extension programs will allow realistic discussions of new opportunities to build the necessary resources and relationships needed to achieve higher levels of success. Patterns of success will be a tool for reporting meaningful impacts to stakeholders, including clientele, the general public, and funders. Successful communication of impacts and consistent practice of key urban Extension patterns of success should lead to an Extension Service that is seen as a key urban, as well as rural, institution.

**Researcher’s Perspective**

With the diversity of urban and suburban communities in America and the diversity of professionals working in urban Extension offices, it may be assumed that there will be multiple perceptions of reality based on the context of the setting. Since I proposed investigating a somewhat poorly defined concept, the research question during the case study is approached from a constructivist perspective. This perspective
assumes that the reality may be multiple and is socially constructed based on people, places and historical contexts. With so many interpretations of the constructivist perspective, I have chosen to follow Habermas (1972) as he delineated constructivism as a socially constructed reality that has multiple realities based on the social and historical context. Tesch has expanded the understanding of a constructivist perspective in a way meaningful to most Extension professionals who value a realist perspective based on their dedication to outreach based on unbiased, research-based information. Tesch (1990, pg. 15) explains, “Our knowledge is the outcome, we believe, of transactions with the social world, shaped by our methods of inquiry, and of transactions with the data we produce, shaped in turn by our ideas and our analytic procedures.”

Using a constructivism paradigm means that the goal of the study is not to identify a singular definition what the practices of an urban Extension county or local program are, but rather to identify and describe a local reality and how that reality is experienced. This local reality includes the patterns that may be adaptable to local urban settings across the United States. The exploration of Penn State Cooperative Extension of Allegheny County as a case study will provide insight into the local reality and how it is experienced. The study participants on staff in Allegheny County also will provide a local and practical perspective on the findings of the Delphi panel. It is hoped that the reality experienced in Allegheny County is a reality that may be shared through this study in a way that may be useful to other urban Extension county offices. It is not a singular reality defined by a totally objective researcher, but an interpreted reality
shared through a researcher who is a subjective member of the Extension family. I tried
to clearly articulate this reality using the words of the staff of Penn State Cooperative
Extension of Allegheny County and the Delphi panel.

From the perspective of the research community, constructivism differs from the
positivist’s perspective in very real ways. Positivists believe that there is a real,
definable world that can be objectively described. It is an approach that functions more
effectively in the study of natural and physical science. In social science, people have
differing views and interpretations, thus what is refer to as “multiple interpretations of
reality.” Each situation is defined by specific contexts that include differing historical
and cultural experience. There is shared tacit knowledge within every urban area and
every urban Extension office. Therefore the reality for Extension in Allegheny County
is somewhat different from the reality of Extension in any other urban area. However,
there are lessons that can be learned. These lessons are better understood when the
readers of this study understand the historical, cultural, and social contexts. A
constructivist also realizes that each reader will interpret what is written in slightly
different ways; yet another layer of multiple interpretations. Constructivist researchers
“argue for quality criteria that translate internal and external validity, reliability, and
This study will be judged as trustworthy and authentic to the degree that the reader
perceives it as a close approximation of the local reality and experience of urban
Extension in any urban area in the United States. This position is no less “scientific” or
rigorous, it simply relies on different criteria to establish rigor.
The second phase of the research was a modified Delphi process. The Delphi process is more positivist in approach. However, a postpositivist perspective was used in the Delphi process and the resulting interpretations. Denzin and Lincoln (1994, pg. 480) define postpositivism as, “researchers assess a work in terms of its ability to (a) generate generic/formal theory; (b) be empirically grounded and scientifically credible; (c) produce findings that can be generalized, or transferred to other settings; and (d) be internally reflexive in terms of taking account of the effects of the researcher and the research strategy on the findings that have been produced.” To conform to this position, the study is grounded in both the findings of the case study and the literature. It is hoped that the findings may be useful and adaptable to other settings; and that my interpretations are clearly delineated, as well as are the research methods used to gather the data and make the interpretations. Qualitative methods of rigor have been followed. These methods can be audited for internal and external validity in terms of trustworthiness, credibility, transferability, and confirmability.

The concept of “patterns of success” is used instead of the more positivist/postpositivist concept of indicators of success. The words “indicators of success” suggest that there is a singular, definable set of behaviors that should be true in every situation and location. “Patterns of success” encourages the reader to interpret the data in a more constructivist way. These patterns are general qualities that may be transferred or adapted to other Extension situations and locations. They are not singular absolutes, but guides to programming and relationships with institutions of higher education, other organizations, clientele, staff, and resource providers.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The expectations of the total Extension program in a county are loosely defined so that the county program may be based on the context and identified needs of the county. It is expected that the programming in most counties will include the four program areas of agriculture and natural resources (horticulture in urban counties), family and consumer sciences, 4-H/youth development, and community development. The county staff is expected to base their specific programming on the identified needs of the county, county staff expertise, expertise available from specialists, and state and national Extension initiatives. This allows the local county Extension staff the opportunity to be creative and develop programs appropriate for the county. Few, if any, benchmarks or indicators of success have been established to which Extension staff may compare their programs or to which they may aspire. In the context of this study the term “patterns of success” was used instead of benchmarks or indicators of success. Patterns of success are intended as best practice goals, not performance measurement tools.
The literature review for this study is intended to be representative, not exhaustive. It begins by setting the context of urban Extension within the history of the Cooperative Extension Service and then expands to the literature framing the state of urban Extension.

Within the context of Extension’s history and the need for urban Extension, the literature review then focuses on programming issues, including program planning, programming methodology, program evaluation, target audiences/participants, programming partnerships, program marketing, and the staffing and funding required to achieve expected programming levels. The literature was reviewed with attention focused on patterns of success in urban programming.

The literature review attempts to describe the current situation, the goals set forth by USDA committees and other stakeholders, and the perspective of professionals outside of Extension working in the fields of adult education and youth development.

**Urban Extension within a Historical Perspective**

The term “university extension” was first used in the 1840’s and was first put into practice by James Stuart, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge University when he presented lectures to women’s associations and working men’s clubs in the north of England in 1867-1868 (Van den Ban & Hawkins, 1996). This concept then was replicated at London University and Oxford University, and by the 1880s became known as the “extension movement.” In the United States, New York and New Jersey first appropriated funds for university extension work in 1891. However, Chautauqua programs had more outreach to the people of the United States (Rasmussen, 1989).
The Cooperative Extension Service was established by the Smith-Lever Act of 1914. This legislation expanded the agricultural education efforts of Seaman Knapp in educating southern farmers on boll weevil control. Extension began as a program for educating the farmers of America and soon expanded to home demonstration programs for farmers’ wives. The boys’ and girls’ clubs later became a part of the Extension program and became known as 4-H. Today Extension is “a publicly funded, lifelong learning system that links the education and research resources and activities of 74 land-grant universities, 3,150 counties, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture” (Urban Task Force, 2003).

These programs expanded and were adapted to the local needs. “The responsiveness of the agency to locally defined needs is seen as a unique characteristic of Extension that is missing from most other governmental organizations” (Warner & Christenson, 1984, p. 126). The Cooperative Extension Service has a history of dynamic adaptation to the needs of the nation’s people. Applebee (2000, p.411) states, “Cooperative Extension leaders in counties across the United States (both volunteer and paid) can be organized to seek continuous input from government, community organizations, agencies, and individuals, and they have the capability to identify important educational needs of local people.”
During World War I, agents were called on to administer several programs related to the war effort in addition to working with farmers to increase production during a time of machinery and manpower shortages. Youth and adults were organized and trained to help farmers plant and harvest crops (Bliss, Symons, Wilson, Gallup, Reese, & Schruben, 1952; Rasmussen, 1989).

During the Depression years, Extension programs helped farmers manage difficult financial problems and helped farmers create cooperatives for marketing farm products. Extension worked with people in cities and towns, teaching youth and adults how to grow vegetables in subsistence gardens and how to preserve the food they raised. Rural and urban youth were trained and employed during summer months as Victory Farm Volunteers.

World War II brought more challenges to the agricultural system of America. Machinery, equipment, fertilizers, and farm workers were again in scarce supply. Extension helped to address these issues as well as urban issues. Victory Gardens became a popular Extension program in cities. Extension worked with local businesses, industry and governments to find land for these urban gardens, while training city residents in the science of growing and preserving vegetables. According to Rasmussen (1989, pg. 111) “An estimated 15 million families planted victory gardens in 1942, and in 1943 some 20 million victory gardens produced more than 40 percent of the vegetables grown for fresh consumption that year. Production from this source continued at high levels in 1944 and 1945.”
Extension continued to address critical issues into the postwar years. In 1969 $4.5 million of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) was targeted for youth nutrition education programs. During the energy crisis of the mid-1970’s, Extension made energy conservation a major educational program in both rural and urban areas. During the 1970’s, Extension began programs targeted specifically at low-income city dwellers, teaching financial management skills to residents of low-income housing in Mississippi (Rasmussen, 1989) and later in other urban centers. In the 1980’s federal funds were appropriated specifically for urban community gardening programs for low-income people. Extension also began addressing the problem of drug abuse through health and youth programs. During the 1990’s and into the present, Extension has been educating people on the national epidemic of obesity and overweight.

Urban 4-H continues to address educational issues by “encouraging young people to develop inquiring minds, an eagerness to learn, and the ability to apply science and technology, to learn practical skills and acquire knowledge, to maintain optimum physical and mental health, and to increase leadership capabilities” (Rasmussen, 1989). 4-H is an active partner with urban school districts in improving scientific literacy and reading skills. 4-H is now described as “a community of young people across America who are learning leadership, citizenship, and life skills” (National 4-H Council, 2004).

4-H may have been the beginning of international programs in Extension with a youth exchange program that started in 1923. Teams of 4-H youth and their leaders
were sent to France representing the American Committee for Devastated Europe, a philanthropic group formed to help Europe recover from the effects of the war (Rasmussen, 1989). Urban 4-H youth now increase their world views through participation in international exchange programs. Extension has since expanded its interest in international issues to all program areas and the characteristics of an internationalized Extension program have been established (Ludwig, 1994). The American Extension model has been adapted for use in many nations.

**The Need for Urban Extension**

When the Smith-Lever Act of 1914 was enacted, more than 50 percent of the United States’ population lived in rural areas, and 30 percent of the workforce was engaged in farming. Today fewer than two percent of Americans farm for a living and only 10 percent of Americans live in rural areas according to a report in 2002 by the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service. There are many public issues that relate to Extension’s program areas and where Extension information is needed to link science to public policy according to the Committee on the Future of the Colleges of Agriculture in the Land Grant University System, National Research Council, Board on Agriculture (1996). The food and agricultural system as presented by Extension includes human health, natural resources and the environment, and economic well-being. Extension is known for presenting this information in an accessible, accurate, practical, science-based way. Extension plays another critical role, linking local people’s needs to researchers as they plan their future research agenda and to public policy makers.
The Extension system is uniquely suited to be a partner in creating the research and public policy agenda relating to the broadly defined issue of food and fiber because of its links with rural, urban, and suburban people. A 1962 study conducted in Massachusetts demonstrated the need for Extension information and programs in suburban areas (Barcus, 1962). Krofta and Panshin (1989) believe that there is a need for urban Extension programs, including youth development needs such as teen pregnancy, dropping out of school, and lack of positive adult role models. Families continue to face financial challenges, disruption of the family structure, and issues of aging. Environmental quality, such as air and water quality, brownfields, development of green space, and landscaping are primarily urban and suburban issues. Reaves (1999) updated the list with these additions: school shootings, entertainment and gang violence, workforce preparation, dysfunctional families, illiteracy, poverty, nutrition and health, and unemployment.

The Strategic Framework Team (1995) expressed the changes American society is experiencing, “Society is different today as a result of changes in values, ethics, community norms, family structures, and mobility; of aging and more diverse populations; of growing economic disparity, including the decline of the middle class; of a rural to urban shift; of a reduced sense of community; of the rise of a global economy and interdependence; of advances in science and technology; of concerns for environmental quality; and of political uncertainty.” These are fundamental changes in our society and the speed of change will only increase with the shrinking of our world.
through technology. These changes are not limited to urban areas; rural areas face these same changes. Many of the same programs must be developed for both urban and rural areas. The difference may be in the context.

With a considerable portion of the Extension budget coming from the state partner, and the increasing influence of urban and suburban legislators in the funding decisions for Extension, it is imperative that Extension programs and information are effectively marketed to urban and suburban residents. The Committee on the Future of the Colleges of Agriculture in the Land Grant University System, National Research Council, Board on Agriculture. (1996) stated, “Where people went, so went Extension’s local funding base.” Panshin (1992) wrote that Extension’s responsibility is to all people of the state, and he emphatically stated that Extension has no choice but to cultivate an urban presence. Usinger-Lesquereux (1995) agrees that for Extension to have a viable future, it must address the issues of America’s urban communities.

Changes may be necessary to effectively address the complex and politically-charged urban issues. Krofta and Panshin (1989) recommend: broadening the research base to include more of the university as an Extension resource, gaining commitment of Extension and the university to urban outreach, creating targeted urban programs, hiring a more culturally diverse staff who understand urban issues, provide more training for urban staff, and become more visible in urban areas. These issues are critical because America’s urban and suburban communities are becoming more diverse and complex. We are becoming a more multicultural and multilingual country according to the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (2002).
This is not an issue of urban versus rural; taking funding from rural to expand urban programs. The real issue is moving the Extension system forward quickly enough to maintain pace with the changes our world is facing. “…The key issue is whether publicly financed extension programs provide public goods in the national interest” (Committee on the Future of the Colleges of Agriculture in the Land Grant University System, National Research Council, Board on Agriculture, (1996, pg. 98). This may require that Extension form more effective partnerships with other agencies of the federal government, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Education, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Department of Defense to provide funding for the needed urban programs.

**Funding**

Ahearn, et al, (2003) report significant shifts in national funding patterns for Extension with the Federal partner providing only 24 percent compared to 47 percent from state support, and 27 percent from local funds in 2000. The local portion reported includes 6.6 percent from non-tax dollars, including grants, contracts and gifts.

The decrease in public funding has resulted in efforts to diversify funding by increasing support from non-tax dollars. However, grants, contracts and gifts pose new issues that Extension must address. Barth, et al (1999) raise several questions concerning this trend. These include the loss of control of program content due to funding source, what agency has authority in subcontracts, what agency maintains the controlling interest in partnerships, and will user fees be a barrier for some appropriate target audiences? Barth, et al, recommend a list of guiding principles to help Extension
maintain its values when seeking alternative funding. These principles are 1.) Mission driven programs, 2.) Appropriate sources of funding, 3.) Appropriate uses of funds, 4.) Balancing public good versus individual advancement, 5.) Responsibility of all staff to identify sources of and acquire alternative funds, 6.) Efficiency and effectiveness in the use of funds, 7.) Balance between teamwork and entrepreneurial efforts, 8.) Fairness in performance appraisals concerning acquiring alternative funding, 9.) Flexible employment arrangements, 10.) Comparable and equitable pay, 11.) Incentives for success in acquiring alternative funds, 12.) Planning for sustainability of programs when funding ends, 13.) Access to programs be maintained for people regardless of their ability to pay, and 14.) A commitment to these principles at all levels. In short, care must be taken to consider practical, ethical, and legal issues when seeking alternative funds.

In more practical terms, Jackson and Johnson (1999) recommend critical analysis of each funding opportunity. In addition to considering if the project is within Extension’s mission, staff must determine if the project to be funded fits within the direction of current programs and initiatives, and does not result in lost opportunities or the reduction in quality of other programs. Covering all real costs is basic, yet all too often the work required may consume more resources than the available funds provide. Staff also must consider if the funder is an appropriate partner for Extension, realizing that accepting funds from an organization may involve political or public relations issues. An equally important issue, especially with foundation grants, is project sustainability. Carroll, Gross & Leist (2003) recommend planning financial
sustainability into project proposals. All too often organizations go into low-income urban communities and do a project, gather data, and leave with no thought to the impact of dropping the project. Sustainability of high-cost programs addressing complex urban issues is not easily achieved since limited-resource clientele are not likely to be able to pay for these programs.

These precautions do not imply that Extension staff should not seek alternative sources of funding, but it does mean that careful consideration be given prior to accepting any funds. Alternative funds are increasingly needed to provide quality programs that address critical issues for new and existing Extension clientele. The Strategic Framework Team, (1995) emphatically states that alternative funding is a necessity for Extension. This 1995 report recommends a balance between existing or traditional sources of funding and new sources, and emphasizes the need for Extension’s search for new funding sources to remain mission driven.

Lack of adequate funding will only reduce Extension’s ability to address the complex and challenging issues of contemporary society. Increasing funding sources has the potential to expand Extension’s partnerships with other public agencies, not-for-profits, and the private sector (Crosby & Hamernik, 2002). The potential is for greater visibility and increased political support from these other organizations. The Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service of the USDA has recognized this and provided limited funding through the Communities, Youth, and Families at-Risk (CYFAR) program. In addition to programming for at risk populations, CYFAR encourages diversity, inclusivity and pluralism in Extension staff and
programming, as well as internal and external partnerships that strengthen programming for youth and families at-risk (Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service, 2002). Betts, Peterson and Roebuck (2003) see initiatives such as CYFAR as niche programming expansion that serves a growing population of urban poor.

It is often assumed that funding is a result of the funder’s evaluation of the value of the services provided. Kabes (1991) reported that Minnesota state legislators ranked these reasons for support of Extension programs: “1.) quality of Extension work in your district or in the state, 2.) impact Extension has made on the people it serves, 3.) trust established between you and Extension, and 4.) relevance of Extension work in the state.” O’Neill and Richardson (1999) recommended the use of cost-benefit evaluation and provided detailed information on how this should be done in Extension. Certainly, cost-benefit analysis is a strong supporting factor for many Extension programs.

Customer satisfaction ratings also are useful in supporting Extension’s requests for funding. Impersonal surveys convey data from a research-based perspective, but combining survey data with a more personal message is often more effective. Radhakrishna (2002) developed a formula for writing success stories that have the potential for great impact on readers. The impact of Extension’s programs on “real people” can never be overlooked when requesting funding from government sources according to Jackson and Smith (1999). They also state that Extension’s ongoing efforts to be “good stewards of the resources in which they are entrusted” is a factor in continuing funding. Relationships with legislators, especially personal relationships
between Extension clientele and legislators are a key factor in working with governmental funders according to Jackson and Smith (1999).

However, “Even when policymakers are persuaded of the efficacy of an Extension program, they have questioned whether the program should be supported with scarce public dollars rather than through user charges,” Kalambokidis (2004). Hamilton County Administrator, David Krings, made a similar statement at Ohio State University Extension’s Urban Conversation in January 2004; basically saying it is sometimes not a matter of our being pleased with Extension’s work, it is a matter of insufficient funds to cover all of the mandated services that must be supported. This is a paradigm shift from Extension staff’s assumption that quality programs with positive impacts directly result in continued funding. The reality may be that when there is inadequate funding to cover mandated services, Extension may not be funded regardless of program quality and magnitude of impacts. This does not mean however, that Extension should stop striving to improve its programs, program evaluation, and impact reporting to stakeholders.

**Evaluation and Accountability**

Requirements to document program impacts are likely to increase. The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 put in place a formal structure to link allocation of public funds to program impacts. “The Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (FAIR, or the Farm Bill) and the Agricultural Research,
Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 reinforced the move to performance-based management, using indicators of inputs, outputs, outcomes, and processes” according to Ahearn, Yee & Bottum, 2003, p. 4.

With the often overwhelming opportunities for programming in urban counties, it is easy to neglect appropriate program evaluation and accountability reporting. A framework for evaluation and training would assist staff in improving their performance on this important part of programming according to a study by Radhakrishna and Martin (1999). Bailey and Deen (2002) found that in the state of Washington, when a framework and training were provided to staff, the feedback showed that there was an increased appreciation for evaluation research, an increased understanding of why a specific process needed to be followed, an increased awareness of the ethical issues involved in gathering data, an increased knowledge of program evaluation techniques, and an increased understanding of why evaluation should be part of program planning. For national initiatives, Fetsch (1997) recommended the use of valid and reliable instruments for data collection that would allow aggregation of comparable data from all states doing projects within the initiative.

There are many forms of evaluation that may be used with Extension programs. There is a movement toward the combined use of quantitative and qualitative data since it appeals to those who value quantitative data and those who value the more humanistic perspective. Brown and Kiernan (1998) assert that combining quantitative and qualitative measures leads to a more rigorous examination of the impacts. Government funders usually require quantitative data. The type of evaluation should be selected
based on the size and type of the program, the program objectives, the needs or requirements of the funders, the participants, and how the evaluation will be used. Data may be gathered from self-reports, tests, performance measures, interviews, observations, review of documents, and with video and/or audio devices (Worthen, Sanders & Fitzpatrick, 1997).

Extension staff has used measures of increased learning and behavioral change with self-reported pretest-post test instruments. In behavior change instruments, the participants’ limited knowledge at the beginning of a program may prevent them “from accurately assessing baseline behaviors” according to Rockwell and Kohn (1989). These authors suggest post test-pretest instruments.

Wisconsin’s “Logic Model” is used in many Extension programs. This model’s inclusion of inputs, outputs and outcomes within a situation’s context has proven quite useful for the types of educational programs Extension presents. The Logic Model’s list of inputs and outputs allows for appropriate cost reporting in the cost-benefit analysis. Arnold (2002) reported that using the logic model, Extension staff is able to measure more accurately the learning that occurs in a program because they have specified the desired learning outcomes during the program planning process. Tying evaluation into the program planning process is a key factor in increasing the use of appropriate evaluation.

Success Outcome Markers for Extension (SOME) has been suggested by Rockwell, Jha, and Krumbach (2003) as a method of program planning and evaluation for Extension staff to measure the hard-to-measure human behaviors of many of the
developmental programs urban extension staff now conduct. Success with this method requires creating a vivid and compelling vision of success, listing the beneficiaries of the program, and writing outcomes for each of the beneficiary groups. This model focuses more on gradual change outcomes and less on the inputs and outputs, but does help conceptualize social change markers that indicate gradual change toward a long-term impact goal.

An important point is documented in a study by Usinger-Lesquereux (1995, p. 124), “…there was a definite sense of accountability being directed to funding sources – not for the appropriate use of funds, but rather to the funders themselves.” For evaluation and accountability to be authentic, it must be focused on meaningful issues of the intended impacts as well as the costs and benefits involved in project.

Partnerships

Outreach and engagement is becoming an increasingly important part of the work of colleges and universities. This has come about because of the public’s view that these institutions of higher learning are not contributing to the communities in which they exist. There is a convergence of need and practice with both communities and universities, especially in the fields of human development and community development, to be more engaged in the needs of urban communities (Chibucos and Lerner, 1999).

Land-grant universities and urban universities have not traditionally worked together in providing extension education in urban counties. The Urban Task Force (2003) suggested that as partnerships between the land-grant and urban universities
develop, “a greater appreciation of the need for urban Extension is expected to result.” Other governmental agencies are engaged with outreach education, but Extension’s history of successes and its close relationship with local communities give it a competitive advantage and make partnering with Extension attractive to these other agencies (Crosby and Hamernik, 2002).

Building partnerships will not be easy. Universities, resident/research faculty, Extension faculty and staff, non-profit staff, corporate staff, and the community all come to partnerships with separate and different agendas. Bradbard, et al (1999) believe that by working together to understand each partner’s world view, all partners are enriched and projects can thrive. This statement is echoed by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (2002) and adding, that because of the complexity of issues, Extension must respect and value the experience, expertise, and view of partners outside of the university. Applebee (2000, p. 416) stated a similar belief, “The Cooperative Extension System has the foundation to become a system of partnerships that enable learning in all contexts in society.”

Respect and trust are the basis for partnerships, but time and deep commitment are required when differences of opinion and approach do arise. Having clearly defined common goals and vision maintains a partnership’s focus (Fabes and Melmed, 1999). Additionally, a strategic plan that focuses on the goals, objectives, and needs of the community keeps partnerships client focused (Ney, 1999; Mullis, 1999). Partnership building requires commitment to the mission of the project as well as excellent “people” skills.
Franz (2003) summarized the success factors in partnerships between university faculty and Extension faculty. First, partners were committed to an issue and worked on communication, promotion of outcomes, and involvement of stakeholders. The partners had specific drivers of learning: mutual respect, trust, a willingness to challenge each other, a supportive environment in which to work, and successful outcomes. Finally, successful partners had an appreciation for what they learned from each other and the affirmation they received from their partners.

Partnerships, whether between Extension and partners within the university or between Extension and outside organizations, can result in more dynamic ways of addressing issues and doing projects, according to Betts, Peterson, and Roebuck, (2003) and Votruba, in Chibucos and Lerner (1992). There is a synergy in partnering as well as better use of resources. Partnerships can invigorate Extension staff and their programs. Partnerships can be the catalyst for unique learning opportunities for Extension staff, resulting in more comprehensive programs for our urban clientele (Usinger-Lesquereux, 1995; Walker, 2003).

**Staffing**

“The number of full-time-equivalent Extension personnel dropped by 12 percent from 1977 to 1997, with the largest declines found in community resource development and 4-H youth programs, two of the four main Extension program areas” according to Ahearn, Yee & Bottum (2003, p. 1). Specifically within 4-H, this decline has occurred at the same time that the outreach and needs for urban programs has increased. This is indicative of the staffing problem facing urban Extension staff.
As stated earlier, the environment of urban counties is multicultural and multilingual, however Extension staff does not always reflect that level of diversity. The Strategic Framework Team. (1995, pg. 6) recommended that the Extension system would be “strengthened by incorporating diverse histories, cultures, experiences, perspectives, and world views.” Although Extension staffs have indicated openness to work with diverse clientele, the tendency in two states studied was to continue to work with predominately white audiences (Ingram and Moore, 1999).

The change in the diversity of staff has been slow. Phelps and Taber (1996) have examined the similar lack of diversity in urban community colleges and prescribe the following steps for increasing diversity in staff: 1.) identifying and targeting gatekeepers, 2.) implementing facilitative processes, and 3.) rewarding desired behaviors. Perhaps the most difficult part of this plan to implement is developing facilitative processes that would effectively integrate people of diverse backgrounds into the white, middle-class culture of Extension. Multicultural mentoring is one suggested way to pave the way to inclusion (Rodriguez, 1995) with the mentor helping the new employee understand the organization’s mission, culture, and values.

The approach to integrating new staff with diverse backgrounds may be pluralistic or assimilatory. Pluralistic inclusion allows those with diverse backgrounds to maintain their unique cultural identity, enriching the heterogeneous cultural mix within the organization. An assimilatory approach would expect the new minority staff person to adapt to the cultural ways of the organization. This approach misses the
opportunities of expanding the cultural world views of the organization. Laden (1998) calls pluralistic inclusion a process of celebratory socialization where those in the organization embrace the new perspectives and knowledge of incoming members.

The potential benefits of more diverse staffing include alternative problem-solving approaches; more ways to think, feel, express, act, and view the world; and a more interesting and stimulating environment (Pai, 1990). However, this may be threatening to the majority staff members. Changing the culture may take several years, as reported by Safrit, Conklin, and Jones, (2003). An intermediate step that can be changed more quickly is changing the organization’s climate, which is the organization’s language, observable routines, and the rewards for behaviors. Schauber (2001) states, “Extension’s diversity culture can be changed by identifying and then changing the Extension diversity climate…a conceptual framework for identifying Extension’s diversity climate is thus a key to changing its organizational culture.”

**Expanding Diversity of Participants**

The importance of increasing diversity within the staff of urban Extension educators is because of the high level of diversity within the urban centers of the United States. Diversity goes beyond race and includes ethnicity, culture, gender, sexual identity and expression, age, socioeconomic status, religious background, mental and physical abilities, language, and life experiences (Sork, 1997).

In 1984 Warner and Christenson reported that the typical Extension client was a white, middle-class American with average family education and income, living in an urban area. These authors went on to report that Extension was serving a lower
proportion of Hispanic- and African-Americans than is present in the total population. Warner and Christenson suggest that in the 1970’s and 80’s, Extension could have been discriminatory, not in intent, but due to bias in target populations; financial resources needed to participate in some programs, such as 4-H; programming methods; and philosophy. Usinger-Lesquereux (1995, p. 6) asserted, “From superficial scrutiny of this and other Extension organizations, staff and faculty approach education through an expert model and focus primarily upon the needs of a specific program and/or a particular profession and not toward serving the educationally disenfranchised, as indicated in the organization’s mission statement.” This statement suggests the need for an increased effort to be inclusive in program development in order to serve non-traditional populations.

Interpretation of Extension’s mission of improving the national economy (originally agriculture) and helping build the capacities of the disenfranchised (originally people in rural America) in the context of 21st century America may require a focus on human and community development in urban centers. This interpretation may be challenging, considering the complexities of our fragmented society, social inequity, economic stagnation, and reduced public funding. Targeted federally funded programs, such as EFNEP and Communities, Youth, and Families at-Risk (CYFAR), continue to allow Extension to work with targeted low-income populations. With decreasing funding, grants and gifts may direct Extension programs toward specific populations based on the focus of the funders. The decision to work with a particular
group of people is a political decision (Cervero and Wilson, 2001). This decision, because of limited resources for Extension, also involves who is not served by Extension.

There is a great need to provide additional education to those who have had the least education. The lack of education results in higher unemployment and when employed, lower wages. It therefore benefits the individual and the community for these individuals to participate in educational programs (Stacey, 1999).

**Programs and Program Planning**

Extension’s political support continues to come largely from the traditional agricultural/rural base. Political support must be increased for programs that serve limited-income urban populations if these populations are to be served. However, Usinger-Lesquereux (1995) perceives Extension’s outreach model as one of barter; in exchange for political support, Extension provides educational programs based on the supporters’ input on needs for programming. This organizational norm discourages active partnering with communities or populations with little political power. This type of organizational norm must be examined and potentially challenged in urban settings.

Bottum and West (1990) identified the following as issues that should be addressed by land-grant universities and Extension: racism and other social and economic divisions, jobs, family issues, education, the environment, sustainability of systems, health care, care for dependents, youth development, housing issues, and programs for the incarcerated. It is clear that these are complex and challenging goals. The complexity of urban educational programming only makes the task more difficult.
Daley, Fisher and Martin (2000, pg. 539) state it well, “Providing adult education in an urban context is a dynamic and challenging process that is frequently underestimated for its complexities and convolutions. Urban practitioners are continually faced with competing ideologies that necessitate keeping one foot on either side of a conceptual divide in order to function.”

Hartley (1977) found that even in the 1970’s, agriculture agents and their advisory committee members had identified the need for leadership development training and group facilitation to improve the performance of the agents. Hartley’s study also identified the increasing desire for community development programming. Boyd and Apps (1980) conceptualized three transactional modes of adult education: (1.) the individual, (2.) the group, and (3.) the community. In 1984, Brookfield wrote that the Cooperative Extension Service primarily was a transmitter of knowledge to individuals in a community. Extension has moved well beyond that characteristic since that time. Community participation and empowerment are increasingly a part of Extension reports.

Extension prides itself on research-based education. This positivist, empirical approach to programming also has impact on the program planning process. This empirical expert model of program planning and development may not be appropriate when working with urban communities and minority groups where a constructivist or humanist approach fits better with the targeted group’s social norms. This is exemplified by the current popularity of community processes such as asset mapping and appreciative inquiry. Applebee (2000, p. 416) confirms this when stating, “The
practices to achieve the mission should focus on local, constituency-based decision making and practical learning.” Extension’s more traditional approach of needs assessment is still useful and appropriate in many situations, however it may be too reactive, resulting in slow responses in a rapidly changing environment (Sork, 1997). Sork (2000) also recommends the use of formative evaluation so adjustments are possible as programming is developed and delivered.

When working with people with backgrounds different from the predominantly white, middle-class culture of Extension educators, the educators are faced with “different (and often contradictory) interpretations of the meanings of instructional approaches” (Daley, Fisher, & Martin, 2000, pg. 543). These different interpretations suggest the need to approach program planning with new populations in a participatory manner that allows extensive input from representatives of the target population in order to develop a culturally sensitive educational setting and method of teaching.

To enter into such a participatory partnership requires that Extension educators are aware of their own position within society’s hierarchy as well as the hierarchical position of the target population. The relative positions of the Extension educator and the participants have implications of power, privilege, and experience that will affect the interaction (Cervero and Wilson, 2001). The challenge is to effectively partner with the target population in as equitable a way as possible in order to identify the appropriate educational approach.

Many Extension agents have training in agricultural education in which the most predominant model for adult education has been androgeny (Knowles, 1990).
Androgeny’s emphasis on self-directedness may be true of the white middle class, however, Daley, Fisher, and Martin, (2000) question the validity of this approach with many minority populations for whom group processing and socializing are more dominant than the individualistic approach of self-directed learning.

Familiarity with such issues as women’s more relational or connected knowing (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986; Hayes, 2001) may be needed. Amstutz (1999) points out that the suggestion that self-directed learning is a more “mature” form of learning discounts the contexts of collaborative and cooperative learning. Grace (2001) criticizes androgeny as focusing too much on “concerns with the individual and technical, sidelining concerns with the social and cultural” and as a “depoliticized and decontextualized process” (pg. 264) resulting in an educational practice that ignores many people at the lower socioeconomic rungs of society. Shore (2001) echoes Grace’s critique. Kilgore (2001), pg. 53, goes so far as to state, “Many theorists have convincingly demonstrated that commonly held assumptions about generic learners and learning are irrelevant and even willfully oppressive when recklessly applied to all kinds of people without regard for their unique life experiences and attributes, such as race, class, and gender.”

The implication of these issues is that program planning should become more inclusive and holistic. Wlodkowski (1997) writes of motivational factors that should be addressed in program planning: establishing inclusion, developing attitude, enhancing meaning, and engendering competence. Planning for the inclusion of sensory stimuli and emotions (Dirkx, 2001; Hill, 2001), questioning of facts and theories within the
context of a participant’s own background (Amstutz, 1999; Smith, 2001), avoidance of dichotomizing knowledge and helping learners seek, acknowledge, and foster alternative forms of knowledge (Amstutz, 1999; Cranton, 1998), focusing on assets rather than deficits and including self-reflection (Barnes and Mercer, 1995; Guy, 1999; Kropf, 1998; MacKeracher, 1998; Smith, 2001), sharing power in the learning situation (Bounous, 2001; Cranton, 1998; Guy, 1999; Johnson-Bailey and Cervero, 1997; Sheared, 1999), culturally and contextually relevant (Dohmen, 1999; Guy 1999; Jeria, 1999; Queiro-Tajalli & Smith, 1998; Sheared, 1999), peer teaching and collaborative learning (Bounous, 2001; Timmermann, 1998), using learning aides (Dohmen, 1999), learning useful knowledge and skills (Dohmen, 1999), learning based on problem solving (Birkenholz, 1999; Bounous, 2001), and encouraging participants to share their own stories (Cranton, 1998; Dirkx, 2001; Smith, 2001; Wolf, 1998).

These issues are of value for many minorities as well as with the aging white, middle class of America. With the aging of American society, we must understand and meet the needs of the older adult learner (Fisher and Wolf, 1998). Much study has focused on educational approaches that improve the learning environment for older adults and these considerations will become increasingly important for Extension educators in urban, suburban, exurban, and rural areas.

Informal adult education, in light of the literature on critical thinking and transformative education, becomes an issue of empowerment of people and communities, essentially community development. Many theorists and practitioners in community development espouse participatory development of programs (Ewert and
Educators may attempt to build programs on the concept that a combination of knowledge and skills will empower individuals to actualize change, but this approach without a sound theoretical background in education, social change and community development often fails (Ewert and Grace, 2000). Ewert and Grace (2000) argue that dialogue and critical reflection by participants are necessary ingredients for sustainable social change. These authors further assert that participatory decision-making is essential for meaningful problem solving and change. Technological solutions imposed on communities rarely provide the long-term solutions that will be sustainable. Finger and Asun (2001) perceive a need for adult education to return to a mission of social change as the path to regain relevance. They believe the movement from adult education for the common good to adult education for individual actualization has lessened the compelling need for adult education. It is worth considering how Extension can therefore redefine much of their adult programming in terms of community development. Finger and Asun (2001) recommend that a higher level of adult education is the use of participatory action research to address community issues. This requires a movement from the expert model of adult education delivery to a facilitatory partnering with participants in searching for community solutions. The Urban Planning Programs of Michigan State University, Michigan State University Extension, and six urban cities (Kotval, 2003) is an example of Extension partnering both with an academic unit and local communities. Kotval indicates that the program has built true relationships and an attitude of partnership.
Youth Development

The environment in which a young person grows up has profound impacts on that young person’s development in society (Avenilla and Singley, 2001). It is therefore clear that youth development must take into account the environmental context in which youth are living. In urban centers, the stresses of a neighborhood can be difficult for youth and adults alike. There is great concern for America’s youth and this concern and fear has given rise to terms such as “youth-at-risk.” It is inappropriate to think that youth at risk are only urban poor. Youth-at-risk is a term that is not socio-economically bound. The Children’s Defense Fund (2000) refers to “affluenza—the poverty of having too much that is worth too little” and it afflicts youth from all socioeconomic strata. The Committee on Community-level Programs for Youth, National Research Council and Institute of Medicine (2002) reported its belief that 25 percent of American youth are seriously at risk of not being able to become productive adults in today’s society. These youth are the future of American society. The African concept of the village raising children is affirmed in the model of Bronfenbrenner (1994) in which all segments of society form a web of information sharing about each child’s development, and there is community-wide agreement on the standards of behavior.

Although this problem is true for all segments of American society, it is a particular challenge for low-income, minority youth. Interpersonal and communication skills that are needed in everyday life and on the job (Committee on Community-level Programs for Youth, National Research Council and Institute of Medicine (2002). Olive (2003)
suggests that for African-American youth, the disarray of the family, the survival needs of the family, and the multiple transitions the youth often face are factors of the increasing level of risk.

The groundbreaking research of Blyth and Roehlkepartain reported in 1993 demonstrated the impact of communities, both assets and problems, on the development of youth within the community. Their research identified the following behaviors as “at-risk”: tobacco, alcohol and illicit drug use, sexual activity, depression/suicide, anti-social behavior, and school problems. Blyth and Roehlkepartain (1993, pg. 58) had these recommendations for youth-serving organizations, such as 4-H:

- Cooperate rather than compete. Redefine goals in terms of community needs rather than organizational needs.
- Avoid underselling the value of their efforts on behalf of youth.
- Establish consensus within the community on when and where activities and programs can operate with the least conflict.
- Work to increase the diversity of youth involved and the number of opportunities per youth that are available in the community.
- Cooperate with schools and other organizations to gather information on all opportunities available for youth in the community.
- Work actively with the families of the youth to encourage their support of the schools and other organizations that work with young people.
- Support school levies and other needed school policy issues that benefit youth.
- Provide activities for all types of youth.

The Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1992) published a similar list that also included strengthening and increasing the diversity of adult leadership in youth programs and advocating for youth. Brendtro, Brokenleg and Bockern (1998) wrote of ecological hazards in the lives of youth at risk and these include: destructive relationships, climate of futility, learned irresponsibility, and loss of purpose. They
further wrote of what elements are needed to “reclaim” youth that are at risk. These elements are positive relationships, brain-friendly and non-threatening learning activities, discipline for responsibility, and fostering pro-social values and behaviors. The increasing chaos influencing American families’ lives and the decrease in competence and character are trends that continue to impact youth development (Bronfenbrenner, 2001). There is strong evidence for and agreement on the effectiveness of positive youth development (Connell, Gambone, and Smith, 2001; Connell and Kubisch, 2001; Damon, 2004; Dierking and Falk, 2003; Eldredge, Piha, & Levin, 2002; Hamilton and Hamilton, 2004; Huebner, 2003; MacDonald & Valdivieso, 2001; Pace, 2003; Perkins and Borden 2003; Steinberg, Almeida, and Allen, 2003;). Further, Csikszentmihalyi and Schneider (2000) see the need for high levels of challenge and skill development to prepare adolescents for the roles of adulthood. Youth development programs that enhance “life satisfaction and positive affect” have been demonstrated to “buffer against the negative effects of stressful life events” according to Park (2004, pg. 35). Park (2004a) further asserts that programs that include character education act as buffers against negative life events.

Out-of-school time programs are increasing as more working parents need child care for younger children and supervised activities for older children. The Future of Children Report (2000) states that nearly three-fourths of all youth ages six to seventeen have mothers who work. These programs fall into three categories: school-age child care, academic enrichment programs, and youth development. These programs are normally provided by schools, community and faith-based organizations, community
schools, and child care providers (Eilertson, et al., 2003). 4-H has fit nicely with the out-of-school time care providers because of its relationships with schools, community organizations, faith-based organizations, and childcare providers. However, the organizations that provide these services are challenged in finding qualified staff to work with the children and youth. These staff positions are traditionally poorly paid; a situation that results in poorly qualified staff. This situation offers 4-H an opportunity to train those who provide services in positive youth development as well as in the use of 4-H program materials. In those cities in which a citywide coalition of agencies works together in providing out-of-school programs (Noam, Miller, and Barry, 2002), 4-H has the potential to accept an active role in the coalition, building relationships with agencies throughout the city. One of the key factors to teach is caring, an affect that Rauner (2000, pg. 20) defines as “an endlessly cycling process comprised of three interrelated components: attentiveness, responsiveness, and competence, all of which are necessary and none alone sufficient for caring.”

Participation in voluntary, structured activities during out-of-school time “is associated with development of positive identity, increased initiative, and positive relationships with diverse peers and adults, better school achievement, reduced rates of dropping out of school, reduced delinquency, and more positive outcomes in adulthood” (Barber, Eccles, and Stone, (2001). New research has shown that working with families is important. Bradshaw and Garbarino (2004) have shown that single parent families are at higher risk for youth developmental problems. These authors recommend teaching parents age-appropriate activities to do with their children, encouraging parents to
engage in these activities, and promoting parent networking (2004). However, participation in out-of-school programs declines with age. Allowing youth, especially teenagers, a significant voice in these programs could increase participation rates of older youth (The Future of Children Report, 2000). Relevancy also is an issue with Wynn (2003) suggesting that programs related to career options, job training, job mentoring, and apprenticeships could have great appeal.

4-H is filling needs in the out-of-school time, but there continues to be opportunities for enrichment programs during school. Schools are partnering with agencies, business and organizations to address a multitude of issues facing children. The connection between the in-school and out-of-school learning is seen as an opportunity to interconnect and align the learning in both spheres so that youth get a coherent, consistent message (Irby, Pittman, and Tolman, 2003). Noam (2003) cautions that the bridging between in-school and out-of-school programs does not mean that out-of-school programs should become school-like, but rather that the goals and objectives be consistent.

A newer concept that is more positive in approach is focused on asset development, a more positive human development context that serves “to protect from, or inhibit, health-compromising behavior and enhance the opportunity for positive developmental outcomes” according to Benson, (2002, pg. 125). Included in the assets approach is character education, which can include such approaches as service learning, social-emotional learning, and prevention programs (Berkowitz and Bier, 2004). Service learning is seen as a potentially and hopefully authentic, place-based way of
connecting youth to their community. Blank, Johnson, and Shah, (2003, pgs. 115-116) see this “environment integrating” service learning as “a framework for interdisciplinary, collaborative, student-centered, hands-on, and engaged learning.” Community involvement helps to integrate youth into the community while building capacity and exposure to civic involvement. Youth organizations are a positive format for this civic engagement because, unlike schools and family settings, the youth interact as equals within the group, free from the institutional hierarchy of adults providing leadership. In the experience of youth organizations involved in civic projects, “youth can learn how members of a group can disagree, debate, negotiate differences, and ultimately reach a group decision” (Flanagan and Van Horn, 2003, pg. 283). Self-determination by youth, especially older youth, is critical in empowering youth for future decision-making (Kirshner, O’Donoghue, and McLaughlin, (2002). Civic involvement helps youth understand the environment and culture of their community as emphasized in the “service to my community” part of the 4-H pledge. Authentic civic involvement provides a setting for developing skills such as writing, public speaking, networking, and collaborating (Sherman, 2002). Not only does civic involvement benefit youth, it benefits the community (Pancer, et al., 2002). Additionally, it is important that youth be treated as partners in community development when included in these projects (Perkins, et al., 2003).

Engagement in the community is a step toward the preparation of youth to join in the social fabric of the workplace. Exploring careers expands a youth’s world as well as expanding that youth’s understanding of self. Ferrari recommends that career
exploration and development programs closely align with the principles of positive youth development and sound educational theory. Career programs should be intentional and developmentally appropriate, include active involvement in exploration of a wide variety of options, be focused on skill development and positive role models, be of adequate duration, frequency and intensity, and be led by adults with adequate training for working with youth (Ferrari, 2003). Ferrari (2003) also emphasizes experiential learning in authentic situations. Apprenticeship type experiences can fit this model and provide technical, personal, and social competence (Hamilton and Hamilton, 2004). Mentoring has proven to be a successful method to enhance youth development in and outside of career training programs. One example of an effective mentoring program outside of career education was in mentoring Latino immigrant youth as they transitioned into American culture (Roffman, et al., 2003).

Benson and Saito (2001) suggest there are four primary settings in which youth development occurs: programs (semi structured processes often led by adults to address specific goals and outcomes), organizations (place-based youth development opportunities with a variety of activities and relationships aimed at improving youth development), socializing systems (these include: schools, families, neighborhoods, religious institutions, museums, and libraries), and community (the geographical setting and that setting’s social norms, resources, and relationships).

Positive youth development as a method of working with marginalized youth from non-dominant cultures must be adapted to fit with the culture of the youth. Attention must be paid to institutionalized oppression by society. Ecological systems
theory, in which an individual’s development through life is inextricably intertwined and shaped by her or his socio-cultural environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1989; Schiamberg, Paulson, and Zawacki, 1998), is especially helpful when working with diverse populations (Greene and McGuire, 1998). When working with Native American youth, the emphasis must be on the extended family and the concept of the interrelatedness of the family and the tribal community, rather than issues of individuality (Cheshire and Kawamoto, 2003). Latino youth are diverse populations that differ based on the socioeconomic factors and the country from which their families immigrated. Spanish-speaking staff is not necessarily a benefit when working with Latino youth, but it is not a hindrance either (Rodriguez, et al., 2003). Issues of family and gender roles are important when interacting with Latinos. Gender is a natural component in how youth interact and learn. Adult leaders must understand these gender issues to work effectively with Latino youth (Denner and Griffin, 2003). Adult leaders’ comfort with youth sexuality issues impact quality of interactions with youth (Russell and Andrews, 2003). Youth with physical and mental disabilities come from all segments of society, however, these youth may need specially trained adults who understand how to modify programs for pace and adapted milestones in achievement (Onaga,, Carolan, Maddalena, and Villarruel, 2003). Youth development programs cannot avoid or shy away from such difficult issues as physical and mental disabilities or the taboo issues of sexual orientation (Delgado, 2002). Delgado stresses the need for authentic integration of youth into the fabric of the community through meaningful service activities and including youth in community organizations so that they may see
successful adults and learn societal norms of interaction. However, working with targeted minority groups as a separate population also may serve as a “safe haven” for youth development Johnston-Nicholson, Collins, and Holmer, (2004).

All of the previously mentioned components of youth development are important to quality youth development. However, they have not emphasized the importance of having friends. Friendships are both normatively and differentially significant for both children and adolescents (Hartup, 1999). Friendships build the capacity to deal with change and stress. The quality of friendships impacts development, with supportive friendships with individuals possessing positive social qualities and skills being developmentally positive while “coercive and conflict-ridden relationships are developmental disadvantages, especially among antisocial children” (Hartup, 1999, pg. 10).

Evaluation of positive youth development programs had the following themes in common: they “involve methods to strengthen social, emotional, behavioral, cognitive, and moral competencies; build self-efficacy; shape the messages from family and community about clear standards for youth behavior; increase healthy bonding with adults, peers, and younger children; expand opportunities and recognition for youth; provide structure and consistency in program delivery; and intervene with youth for at least nine months or longer. Although one-third of the effective programs operated in only a single setting, it is important to note that for the other two-thirds, combining the resources of the family, the community, and the school was important to success” (Catalano, Berglund, Ryan, Lonczak, and Hawkins, 2004, pg. 117.)
Youth development program evaluation can demonstrate that a program is effective and serve as a way to improve programming. Too often little if any evaluation is done because of the pressures of time and lack of staff and evaluation resources. However, when evaluating, Izzo, et al. (2004) recommend that the evaluation first look at the theory underlying the program as a way to guide the collection and analysis of data. The acknowledgment and coherence with theory builds the credibility and meaning of the evaluation.

Pittman, et al. (2001, pp. 5-6) report a paradigm shift in youth development that includes some common themes:

- “Problem-free is not fully prepared….
- Academic competence, while critical, is not enough. Success in adolescence and adulthood requires a range of skills. It includes intellectual competence, but it does not stop there. Numerous commissions, organizations, and reports, including the SCANS report (Secretary’s Commission of Achieving necessary Skills, 1991) on employability skills, have defined a generic set of vocational, physical, emotional, civic, social, and cultural competencies.
- Competence alone, while critical, is not enough. Skills may go unused or be used in unproductive, antisocial ways if not anchored by confidence, character, and connections.”

As youth serving organizations continue their work and decide how to allocate finite resources, youth-serving organizations should include youth in all decisions (Ream and Witt, 2004).

**Teaching and Outreach Methods**

The method of teaching in some Extension program areas, primarily Horticulture and Family and Consumer Sciences, is often the expert-mode of traditional classroom teaching. This transference of information from expert to participant is appropriate in some situations and with some clientele. A basic criticism of this method
is that little is learned since the attention span under these circumstances is limited (Van den Ban and Hawkins, 1996). A larger problem with expert lecture teaching is that the emphasis is focused on the importance of the information rather than the educational needs of the learner. The Strategic Framework Team’s statement (1995), “Extension must encompass both education and information-giving as it establishes learning partnerships” addresses the need for a more learner-focused approach. The team indicates that Extension’s outdated programs and old educational models limit its effectiveness in urban counties. However, there is no clear vision of what this next age model of education should or will be. This lack of a clear model is due to the transition period in which we currently live (Cervero, 2000).

Much of current adult learning theory focuses on the need for more than just information transfer. Several contemporary theorists and adult education practitioners call for more use of critical thinking and transformative learning. These are lofty goals that may require more intensive education than typical Extension programs provide. In-depth learning experiences have the potential to help people “improve their own lives, as well as the health and well-being of their community” (Rockwell, Jha, and Krumbach, 2003).

Critical thinking has been defined as “reflective and reasonable thinking that is focused on deciding what to believe or do” (Ennis, 1985, in Jones, 1992). Jones (1992) lists the following ways to foster critical thinking:

1. Consider the strengths and weaknesses of opposing points of view.
2. Reflect on, discuss, and evaluate one’s beliefs and actions.
3. Evaluate a wide range of alternatives when making decisions.
4. Raise ethical questions about consequences of actions and decisions of themselves and others.
5. Engage in collaborative inquiry by the adult learner and adult educator.
6. Reflect on probing questions by the adult educator and adult learner.
7. Engage in exploratory dialogue with themselves or others.
8. Identify implications of actions.
10. Identify, examine, and question assumptions.

Strategies for teaching critical thinking include: “critical analysis, debate teams, dramatization, action maze, crucial incident, scenario building, creative visualization, listening teams, journal writing, and PMI (pluses, minuses, implications)” according to Jones (1992). Critical thinking is a component of transformative education for it allows the learner to examine, analyze, and draw conclusions for themselves.

Transformative education changes our frame of reference and allows us to see and understand the assumptions on which decisions are made. Mezirow states (1997, pg. 7), “We transform our frames of reference through critical reflection on the assumptions upon which our interpretations, beliefs, and habits of mind or points of view are based.” Reflection on learning is a key component of transformative learning because the learners must come to understand their own underlying assumptions and beliefs before they can change them. This is accomplished through a process of (1) becoming more aware and critical of assumptions, (2) becoming more aware of frames of reference and paradigms, and (3) becoming more able to work with others to pose and solve problems by examining assumptions and paradigms, and coming to logical conclusions based on the collective wisdom of the group. This type of learning is
learner-centered, reflective, participatory, interactive, group-based, and problem-solving (Mezirow, 1997). Pilling-Cormick (1997) sees transformative learning as an individual act, as long as it results in transformed understanding.

Context-based teaching and learning is ideally based in real-world context where the social structures, tools and culture are a part of the activity. Hansman (2001, pg. 44) recommends, “incorporating the learners’ developmental needs, ideas, and cultural context into the learning experience.” Experiential learning is focused on doing the task in order to learn it, and may or may not include prior instruction. Context-based learning may include all or some of the following activities according to Hansman (2001): modeling of the activity in the actual setting by an instructor, trying the activity alone or in a group setting and reflecting on the learning, the instructor may provide learning aides while the students are trying the activity, but these aides are gradually taken away, allowing the students to continue to learn on their own in the real setting. Reflection on the learning and discussing it with others is an additional way to reinforce learning.

Group learning is another option that could make Extension education more effective. Will (1997) reports that there is growing evidence that group learning enhances knowledge retention and creative problem solving. Will differentiates between two forms of group learning, cooperative and collaborative learning. Cranton (1996, pg. 26) defines cooperative learning as “a structured process that requires learners to work together on a task, share information, and encourage and support each other.” MacGregor (1990) defines collaborative learning as “shared inquiry” and collaborative
learning may include the instructor working with the group in constructing new knowledge. Small-group work encourages creative problem solving, an asset in life and work.

Cranton and King (2003) see the emphasis on objective, scientific knowledge as a broad problem in all areas of professional development and they see a need for professional development to include, “understanding ourselves, others, and the norms of the organization, community, and society in which we live” (2003, pg. 31). This issue may be summed up by Applebee’s observation (2000, p. 418 ), “In many cases, humanist approaches, constructivist approaches, public policy analysis, and reflective practices may not be aggressively incorporated into professional development of Cooperative Extension faculty and staff. Developing preparation programs for Cooperative Extension educators that focus on the practices of the humanist traditions, learning systems, public policy, and transformative learning principles could lead to significant practice change in the future and alleviate some of the current confusion and conflict around mission and resource allocation.”

Fulton and Hamilton (1993) made the strong statement, “Clientele depend on agents for solutions to problems. If agents assume the role of the ‘Shell answer man’ without helping clientele examine underlying conditions and assumptions, agents will be viewed by clientele as just another information source, handy if they’re there, dispensable if they’re not.” They go on to point out that by helping clientele evaluate information analytically, Extension adds value to their educational service. Jones (1992) believes that teaching critical thinking is necessary for the viability of Extension and
helping people to think critically about social, economic and environmental issues that affect them is central to the mission of Extension. In many cases, the move to critical thinking will require helping program participants internalize the notion that they can think critically in the face of years of formal education that rewarded non-critical thinking (Cohen, 1997). Making these changes in how Extension educators teach is risky and will likely include failures. Edelson & Malone (1999) see the need for experimentation and risk-taking as essential to meet the needs of urban continuing education.

The enduring image of the Extension educator as an expert transferring knowledge is diametrically opposite the concept of Falk and Dierking (2002) of a teacher being a facilitator of learning rather than a deliverer of knowledge. Falk and Dierking (2002, pg. 134) write of free-choice learning that occurs in a wide variety of settings. They believe it is the responsibility of the educator to provide the following:

1. “access to the learning resources of all parts of the community;
2. a breadth and depth of educational opportunity available to them sufficient to satisfy curiosity, a need to know, and to ensure a full and satisfying life;
3. opportunities to learn in supportive and educationally reinforcing social and cultural environments;
4. the opportunities to learn in supportive and educationally reinforcing physical environments;
5. access to age-appropriate exploration and mastery learning opportunities at every developmental stage of life.”
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The literature makes it clear that more is learned through experiential learning than through classroom lecture. The importance of experience and reflection is made by Kelsey and Mariger (2003). Experience and reflection are components of service learning, a method that has become popular in public schools, colleges and universities, as well 4-H/youth development programs. Authenticity, a tangible connection to the real world, is a benefit of experiential service learning. As early as 1926, Lindeman (pg. 8) wrote that “the approach to adult education will be via the route of situations, not subjects” and the teacher acting as co-learner in collaborative learning groups.

Houle (1996) included a case study of a program presented by a fictional Wisconsin Extension educator written by Dr. Terry Gibson, Director of Program Support of the University of Wisconsin-Extension in Madison. In this case study, the Extension educator, Wayne, works in an interdisciplinary team that includes Extension professionals, faculty at the university, and resource people from the community. Wayne provides leadership for educational programs such as managing growth, creating positive environments for youth and families, and maintaining quality water for drinking and recreational purposes. His goal is to solve community problems by building the capacity of individuals and the community to solve their own problems. Wayne and his peers use a wide variety of the most current technology as well as time-tested outreach methods. Urban offices, such as that in Milwaukee County, would have “over a hundred staff members” (Houle,1996, pg. 85).

Merriam (2001) sees a lack of a clear theory of learning and teaching, but suggests that there are three ways in which all current theories are contributing to adult
learning theory. These are: (1) seeing the adult learner as a holistic being, not simply in a cognitive view, (2) learning is more than acquisition and storage of information, it is a process of making sense of our lives, and (3) learning is contextual. Assessment of these forms of deeper learning must include multiple levels: perception, action, and reflection. Kasworm & Marienau (1997) sees this form of assessment as “ecological validity.”

**Technology in Extension Outreach**

Although many have concerns about the digital divide, Daley, Fisher, and Martin, (2000, p. 547) point out the benefit of distance education breaking down the boundaries of race, ethnicity, class and gender, “by circumventing the issues of groups, power, and public space.” This argument assumes access to the needed technology, an assumption that may not be accurate for many of the poorest of the urban poor. In addition to the issue of availability of the equipment to assess the learning resources available through advanced technology, Gibson and Gibson (1997) remind us that the differences in learners, both individual learning styles and cultural, racial, gendered, age, and ability issues also should be addressed when planning technology-based learning resources for urban poor. The inability to learn the technology may impede learning with populations unfamiliar with the technology.

An ever-increasing population of learners is turning to the Internet to access learning opportunities. Most see this as a method for individual learning, but there is opportunity for group learning as well. Kasworm and Londoner (2000) see opportunity for not only content delivery, but also teaching people how to use new technologies. The latter is the need to teach computer and technological literacy. This basic level of
how to use the technology is referred to as “tool literacy,” yet there also is the
“representational literacy” or the ability to “understand, produce and negotiate the
meanings” of materials delivered by technology (Kerka, 2000). With the vast amounts
of information available through technologies, “critical literacy” or the ability to
evaluate the information is critical to meaningful use of the information.

The Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (2002, p. 3) eloquently
stated that technology is part of the solution, “Twenty-first century education will
become most powerful as a mixture of ‘high tech’ and ‘high touch.’ Lifelong learning
applications using digital technologies and distance education offer limitless
possibilities to engage multiple audiences, expanding Extension’s educational role as a
“brand name” quality source for unbiased, research-based information and
education….The challenge for Extension is to be successful in the on-line technology
transfer and just-in-time learning arena.” Extension’s other challenge will be continuing
to provide the highly personal educational opportunities to those populations and in
those situations for which technology is not the answer, considering the cost of these
programs.

There is great opportunity for urban Extension in the challenge of using
communications technology to expand urban outreach. “Satellite training, Internet
access, CD ROM, and videos have supplanted bulletins, brochures, and meeting
presentations—the traditional media of cooperative extension” according to the
Committee on the Future of the Colleges of Agriculture in the Land Grant University
the national level has moved forward with the e-Extension initiative and CSREES believes this central web resource will provide the following benefits:

- Less time and energy invested in reinventing and creating new materials
- Resources that are more responsive to diverse clientele needs – culture, language, learning styles, literacy level, ADA, etc.
- Increased time for face-to-face clientele contact on in-depth problems and issues.

Rockwell, Jha, and Krumbach (2003) see Internet-based information as a way to increase awareness of issue and participation in more in-depth Extension programs, such as publications, field days, health fairs, festivals, training events, invited presentations, web page information, newsletters, personalized media columns and special news feature stories. The cost of technology and for professionals who know how to develop high-quality, technology-based educational curricula may be a limiting factor. Maintaining a balance between high-technology and high-touch programs also will be a challenge. Conversely, technology can enhance face-to-face learning environments by connecting with experts or other learners who are geographically separated from the classroom. Technology can be used to allow on-going contact when learners disperse (Spencer, 1998).

Experience from the use of technology in higher education may be instructive. Burge (2000) cautions that technology should allow maximum control by the learner and freedom to be creative and learn in ways most comfortable for the learner. His experience has been that technology is ideally one part of a mix of teaching/learning
methods that works best when combined with self-study, peer group work, and instructor feedback. A potential drawback of distance education using technology is a lack of social interaction that detracts from the full potential of the learning experience according to Steward (1995). Providing technology resources for Extension educators as well as other educators appears to be a valuable effort. The issue for any educator using technology is to keep the learners and their educational needs and preferences foremost when developing materials for learning experiences using technology. Olgren, (2000, pg. 15) believes that technology should not be considered just a delivery system, but rather “an environment that enables learning…to engage students in actively constructing knowledge” through, “a full repertoire of learning strategies.” Wilson and Lowry (2000) see great possibility in the Internet as a format for constructivist learning. Similarly, Burge (2000) and Miller (2001) caution that such resources should address the varied needs of varied learners, being sensitive to cultural, racial, gender, and age differences. The issues concerning people with physical disabilities must be considered (Herrmann, Fox, & Boyd, 2000) for both equity of use and to comply with the Americans’ with Disabilities Act.

The use of Internet-based learning materials can allow for the creation of group learning with learners who are geographically separated, a “community of interest.” Cook (1995) recommends Internet-based activities that build teamwork in the individuals of the community of interest. Interactive learning technologies where learners may interact with each other as well as with the instructor are usually more effective than non-interaction technologies (Gibson, 2000).
A challenge of quality technology-based learning resources and opportunities is developing the ability of staff to design and implement these learning resources. Gallant (2000) suggests that teaching and learning issues drive the use of technology, and that professional development is needed to accomplish the expertise required to do this. Planning for the large numbers of learners who may use a technology-based resource is particularly difficult since the planner does not know who they are, their educational goals, or what special needs they may have (James and Gardner, 1995).

Marketing

A common comment heard about Extension is “it is a best kept secret.” When an organization is doing a great job at informal education, this should not be the case. In some instances, it may be that those people who are participating in a program rate it very highly, yet do not know that the program is part of the Extension system. This situation may require better training of the staff, both paid and volunteer, to always announce that the program is part of the county’s Extension Service. Others have suggested the best-kept-secret syndrome should be remedied by better “branding” of Extension.

Chappell (1994) recommended a standard marketing plan, including analysis of the situation, determining the goals and objectives, developing a strategy, initiating the strategy with the appropriate coordination and controls, and then evaluating the outcomes. In Barcus’s study (1962) of Massachusetts suburban areas, he suggested the process include: determining the types of information people needed and wanted, and then developing a campaign to inform people that the information is available through
Extension. As discussed earlier in this chapter, others have identified more effective and accountable methods of reporting to funders. This is essentially another marketing thrust.

A client orientation is essential for a successful marketing program. Chappell (1994) suggests that Extension must know clients’ needs, attitudes, and buying behaviors and be responsive to these factors during their program development and delivery. Extension has a reputation of being responsive to local needs. A stumbling block may be developing and delivering programs that fit into rapidly changing attitudes and behaviors. This may require greater use of technology and 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities for some populations. Shore (1997, pg. 80) expands these issues in discussing the marketing of continuing professional education programs to those in the medical field. He indicated it is a matter of, “knowing the customer, hunting for a specific niche, communicating with customers, analyzing the competition, becoming a brand maker, making the right offer to the right people at the right time, exploring distribution channels, testing materials, and delivering on promises, are all essential to effective CPE marketing.”

Maddy and Kealy (1998) present the experience of Cornell Extension in branding to create, “memorability, preference, and loyalty in consumers’ minds.” They describe the necessity of marketing a brand in order to “target increasingly fragmented audiences with increasingly relevant messages, for increasingly tailored products.” Extension staff may raise the concern that increased marketing and visibility will create demand that cannot be met with the limitations of reduced staff and resources. This is a
valid concern. However, so is the issue that without increased visibility and user support in urban counties, Extension will remain the best-kept secret and risk even further reductions in staff and resources.
Figure 2.1 framework for exploring patterns of success in Extension’s urban county offices
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

A case study and descriptive-survey research design was used to explore and describe the patterns of success of a high-impact urban Extension county program. Three separate phases were used to gather data. A four-day site visit of a respected urban Extension program was used to gather qualitative data indicating current practices. These current practices, with additional perspectives from the literature in informal continuing education, adult education and youth development, were used to develop a modified Delphi questionnaire, thus grounding the questionnaire in both typical practices in an urban program and practices supported by the literature. A purposeful sample of experts in urban Extension, adult education and youth development, and Extension stakeholders responded to three rounds of the Delphi questionnaire. The results of the modified Delphi process were then taken back to the participants of the case study for their reactions to the patterns of success identified by the Delphi panel. The reactions from the case study participants were collected using a focus group discussion format. Conceptually, this research design examined what is, what should be, and what could be. Schofield (2002) proposed that such an approach is a reasonable one, considering, “there is no completely satisfactory solution” to making a study applicable to even the fairly near future.
Case study data collection methods consisted of observations of staff in the office environment and while delivering programs, and interviews with educators and a county government stakeholder. Berg (2004, pg. 260) summarized the use of the case study when he wrote, “Case studies of organizations may be defined as the systematic gathering of enough information about a particular organization to allow the investigator insight into the life of that organization.”

Stake (1994) classified case studies based on the research purpose. His case study typology has three categories: intrinsic, instrumental, and collective. This study falls within the instrumental category. With instrumental cases, the primary focus is not to understand the particular case, but to gain understanding about a research question or problem. In instrumental case studies, the particular case is selected because it will further the understanding of the research question. Allegheny County, Pennsylvania was chosen based on its reputation, its proximity to the researcher making multiple visits possible, and its likelihood of providing understanding of the research question. Berg (2004, pg. 259) wrote that any case study should “generally provide understanding about similar individuals, groups, and events.” Yin (1989) refers to this type of generalization as “analytic generalization” which is not to be confused with statistical generalization.

A multiphase modified Delphi technique, a structured group process with three rounds of input from a panel of experts, was then used to identify the patterns of success of urban Extension county programs for the next two to five years. The patterns of
success of a high-impact urban Extension county program may be used to provide
direction for urban Extension programs. Urban Extension staff can then identify areas in
their own programming in which they are excelling, areas in which they may strive for
improvement, and identify barriers that must be overcome in order to achieve a higher
level of performance and impact. The study examined staffing, funding, accountability,
marketing, partnerships and external relationships, target audiences, program planning,
adult education outreach, youth development outreach, teaching and outreach methods,
and program evaluation.

With little, if any, research data on patterns of success of urban programs in
Extension, the Delphi technique was used as a process to identify patterns of success for
the future of urban county Extension offices. Guba and Lincoln (1989) wrote of the
social construction of knowledge as the best informed and most sophisticated
construction of knowledge, therefore the use of an expert panel. Goodman (1984)

stated that the constructivist approach does not look for a truth, but looks for goodness
of “fit.” This “fit” is information that mirrors the situation and provides guidance for
new situations. Schofield (2002) stated, “A consensus appears to be emerging that for
qualitative researchers generalizability is best thought of as a matter of the “fit” between
the situation studied and others to which one might be interested in applying the
concepts and conclusions of that study.” With this perspective as a guide, I used a
multiphase, modified Delphi method of inquiry. The Delphi method of inquiry has been
used in many educational settings as well as in business, long-range technological development, decision-making, public administration, and evaluation of programs (Rieger, 1986).

The Delphi technique was selected because the rounds of feedback from the panel of experts is designed to move toward a convergence of opinion on a topic where subjective group judgment rather than precise analytical methods are suitable for the problem, the individuals appropriate for the panel of experts are geographically dispersed and cannot meet face-to-face due to constraints of time and travel, the problem is complex and requires a diversity of input based on experience and expertise, and anonymity is desired to avoid deference to a perceived expert by other panel members (Linstone and Turoff, 1975). Each panelist had the opportunity to generate new information that might not otherwise occur without anonymity and multiple opportunities to review the initial questionnaire (Morrison, et al., 1984; Somers, Baker, & Isbell, 1984, in Brougher, D.R., 1991). The goal is to get a degree of consensus on an issue through the “informed judgment” of the best possible minds available (Ziglio, 1996). Those items on which consensus is not reached are identified and may be addressed by future study.

The results of the Delphi process were then shared with the participants of the case study at the Penn State Cooperative Extension in Allegheny County, Pennsylvania. The participants were asked to react to the findings of the Delphi panel of experts,
indicating if they were currently doing the practice, their agreement or disagreement based on their practice in an urban county, the barriers that exist to practices not being done, and suggestions for overcoming the barriers.

The methodology chapter is organized into four sections presenting the steps used to accomplish the objectives of this study. The sections are (1) selection of the case study site and Delphi panel, (2) instrumentation, (3) data collection, and (4) data analysis.

Selection of Case Study Site and Delphi Panel

A respected urban Extension county office was identified by reputation. Once the site was identified, permission to do a case study was requested of the Director of the Pennsylvania State University Cooperative Extension Service and the County Extension Director in Allegheny County. A description of the study was shared with the staff prior to being interviewed or observed. Permission was requested of each person observed or interviewed prior to the site visit.

The Delphi technique is based on the principle that experts communicating in a group process will result in a more rational projection about the future than individuals working separately would. Most Delphi studies have used a panel of 15 to 20 experts, although the number of experts is not as critical as the expertise of the individuals on the panel and the quality of both the intellectual interaction and the ability of the researcher to capture the essence of each panelist’s ideas. (Ulschak, 1983; Delbecq, Van de Ven & Gustafson, 1975).
The panel of experts is critical to the veracity of the Delphi process. Scheele (1975) recommends three categories of panelists.

1. **Expert** – people who are seen as holding the necessary knowledge and experience to provide quality information. This category included an Extension state director and Extension associate directors from states with significant urban populations, urban specialists, program leaders working primarily in urban programming, urban county chairs/directors, and urban county agents/educators doing the programming. These panelists were selected based on reputation and the recommendation by their peers and state Extension directors.

2. **Stakeholders** – people who will be affected by decisions made by the panel. This category included urban county chairs/directors, urban agents/educators doing the programming, and core funders.

3. **Facilitators** – people who have process skills that will assist the Delphi by clarifying, categorizing, synthesizing and facilitating the communication process as a participant. These people are ones listed above and chosen based on both their urban programming expertise and their facilitation skills.

A potential fourth category was mentioned, people who have a world view. They would be helpful in enlarging the vision of the panel. Again, these are people who were selected because of both their knowledge and experience in urban Extension as well as the more expansive and inclusive views. This category includes experts in the fields of adult continuing education and youth development.
The study used a panel of experts knowledgeable in urban Extension education, adult continuing education, and youth development. Individuals were identified as experts based on meeting two or more of the following criteria: (1) a high level of knowledge and experience in urban Extension education; (2) experience in urban informal adult education or youth development; (3) experience in administering urban extension programs at either the county, district, state, or national level; and (4) experience in research or scholarly work in the area of informal adult education or youth development; as well as the general characteristics defined by Scheele (1975).

A diversity of perspective provides a more comprehensive understanding of the problem and objectives of this study. The panel included (1) two individuals with a national perspective, (2) five individuals with state or district experience, (3) nine individuals with county or local experience, (4) one individual with experience in informal adult education, (5) one individual with experience in urban youth development, and (6) two stakeholders outside of Extension (a county administrator and a state legislator). Panel selection also took into consideration diversity in geographical representation, gender, ethnic/racial background, and age. Dalkey and Helmer (1963) suggested that if panelists hold widely differing perspectives, consensus would be more difficult to achieve because of the increased chances of miscommunication based on the assumptions and language of the perspective or paradigm. However, Mitroff and Linstone (1993) suggested that to gain the greatest insight into an issue, it is critical to
include diverse perspectives that represent all perspectives potentially involved. This will potentially make the communication process during the Delphi much richer and provide an opportunity for more meaningful interpretation.

The current and recent members of the Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES) Urban Taskforce and Extension Directors in urban states nominated Delphi expert panelists. Nominators were asked for personal contact information and a short justification for the nomination. Self-nominations were accepted and considered. A review panel of two faculty members with extensive knowledge of urban Extension and of urban informal adult education and youth development assisted the researcher in the selection process. These steps are critical in addressing Nash’s (1978) concern of a representative and competent panel. As Patton (1990) wrote, the logic and power of purposeful sampling is in getting information-rich cases and informants. The selection of the panel is a critical factor in getting meaningful data. The Delphi panel included eight males and twelve females. The geographic representation was: two from the West Region, six from the South region, seven from the North Central Region, and five from the Northeast Region. Sixteen of the panelists were Caucasian and four were African-American. Eighteen of the panel members were Extension employees and two were not. Two panel members held both national and state level appointments, six had state or regional positions, and nine were county-based personnel with four of them serving as county directors. One panelist was a state senator and director of a non-for-profit organization and the other was a county auditor/treasurer.
Individuals identified to participate as Delphi panel experts were invited by letter to participate. The letter explained the Delphi process and why their input was important. A personal telephone contact was made by the researcher with each potential Delphi panel participant to clarify the objectives of the study, the Delphi process, and the importance of her or his participation. A script was used to detail the nomination process, the obligations of participants, and the Delphi process, including length of the process and the method of providing input. Commitment to participate was sought. Personal contact information was collected, including e-mail, telephone, fax, and dates the panel member would not be available to allow for scheduling the rounds to match the majority of the panel members’ schedules.

Panel participants used code names. The use of code names allowed panel participants to respond to a specific panelist’s comments and to follow a specific panelist’s thought process and rationale.

Instrumentation

A review of website documents from Penn State Cooperative Extension, Allegheny County was completed prior to the site visit. The documents were examined, coded, and analyzed. Data from the documents was used to develop observation and interview protocols for the four-day case study. As recommended by Yin (1989, pg. 70), “the protocol contains the instrument but also contains the procedures and general
rules that should be followed in using the instrument.” Additionally, the protocol included field procedures. Following Yin’s (1989, pg. 75) recommendation the field procedures included:

- Gaining access to key organizations or interviewees;
- Having sufficient resources while in the field;
- Developing a procedure for calling for assistance and guidance, if needed, from other case study investigators or colleagues;
- Making a clear schedule of the data collection activities that are expected to be completed within specified periods of time; and
- Providing for unanticipated events, including changes in the availability of interviewees as well as changes in the mood and motivation of the case study investigator.

The protocols were submitted to The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board for approval prior to the site case study. The observation protocol was both general for overall impressions and focused (Adler & Adler, 1994) to include examination of staffing and audience diversity, teaching methodology, program planning and evaluation, marketing methods, and program impacts.

The interview protocol was a semi-structured interview. A few open-ended questions were asked to illicit responses on target audiences for programming, marketing of programs, teaching techniques, goals and objectives of key programs, expected impacts, evaluation of programs, and philosophy of outreach. Questions were posed as “how do you do” versus why, as recommended by Wolcott (1990) for eliciting freer responses. Probes were used for explanations of initial responses and to gain deeper insight into superficial responses, presented in a “tell-me-more” way (Glesne,
1998) to illicit fuller understanding. Additional documents were provided to the researcher by the staff during the sites visits. These documents were examined, coded, and analyzed.

The questionnaires for each of three rounds of the Delphi process were posted on Zoomerang. Zoomerang (2002) is an Internet-based service for business and individual surveys. Zoomerang provided a format for prompt responses to questionnaire rounds and the ability to download data quickly and easily.

The first round instrument was developed from the case study and a review of the literature. The literature review focused on current thought in the Extension system on outreach methodology, target audiences, staffing, funding, marketing, and evaluation/reporting of results. Literature from allied fields, including youth development, informal adult education, distance education, and marketing, were used to clarify concepts being studied. Three rounds were conducted based on recommendations from Cyfert and Gant (1971) and Altschuld (1993) indicating that minimal useful data is gotten after the three rounds to warrant the cost and effort of additional rounds. The Round I instrument contained positional statements developed from and grounded in the case study and literature. Instruments II and III were developed based on responses to the preceding instrument. A six-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = mildly disagree, 4 = mildly agree, 5 = agree, and 6 = strongly agree) followed each positional statement. Experts were asked to indicate their level of agreement with each statement and to provide their rationale for their responses. Space was provided for panel members to add new statements.
The position statements in the Round I instrument were further revised and refined based on a field test for content and face validity with a review panel of five Ohio State University Extension faculty and one recently retired OSU Extension faculty, and one research methods professor in the Department of Human and Community Resource Development at OSU considered knowledgeable about urban extension and who were not members of the Delphi panel in this study. The field test panel was informed of the purpose of the instrument to identify the indicators of successful urban Extension programs in the next two to five years. The field test panel was asked to review the instrument for clarity and content to achieve the stated purpose. Their feedback to the researcher was used to revise and refine the instrument for Round I. No attempt was made to establish construct (the extent to which the instrument is associated with some psychological construct and the extent to which test scores serve as a measure of that construct) and criterion validity (the predictive relationship of the items to some relevant external criterion) because of the predictive nature of the study and the use of the Delphi technique (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1996). Since no attempt should be made to statistically generalize the results of this study to other populations or situations, neither ecological nor population validity were established for this study.

Reliability cannot be measured with conventional procedures of estimation with the Delphi technique. Reliability establishes the stability in measurement over time or across forms. Reliability therefore does not apply to the Delphi technique since panel members are seeking consensus and each successive instrument is modified based on panel members’ input. Repeating the process with a different panel of experts may be
considered a test of reliability (Delbecq, et al., 1975; Dalkey, et al., 1972). Dalkey (1969) reported a reliability correlation coefficient approaching 0.9 with a group size of 13 and further stated that reliability increases with the size of the expert panel, therefore the use of 21 panelists.

One member of the expert panel dropped out during Round II. That person’s responses were removed from Round I. Because the ongoing process required the panel to come to consensus, once an expert panelist dropped out he was not permitted to return to later rounds. Parton (1994) suggested that removing the data after the other panelists had included the departed panelist’s responses did affect the validity of responses after the point of withdrawal. For this reason, the need for commitment to the entire process was stressed in the initial interview with potential expert panelists. Those who had doubts were encouraged not to participate. Phone calls for non-respondents to any round were made as recommended by Parton (1994) and Brougher (1991). The data were based on the responses of those panelists who completed all three rounds. The expert panel interview and selection process as well as the panelists’ interest in the topic helped to ensure completion of all rounds by the expert panel members. Pill (1971) reported that participation in the expert panel was in itself a motivation due to the value of the information and interest in the topic and outcome.

The Round II instrument was developed based on the responses to Instrument I and included one new statement and 18 statements reworded based on the input of the Delphi panel of experts. Statements from Round I on which consensus was achieved were not included in round II. Consensus was considered to be reached when 80 percent
of the ratings from the Delphi panel of experts fell within adjacent rating categories on
the six-point Likert-type scale (Ulschak, 1983). This high level of consensus results in a
higher level of confidence in the importance of the items identified by the Delphi panel
of experts. Feedback to the Delphi panel of experts included statistical feedback (a
frequency table for each statement), the individual’s explanatory response, and all
comments by the panel of experts for each statement, reported using code names.

A researcher sounding board, consisting of two OSU Extension faculty who
were familiar with the Delphi technique and urban Extension, reviewed new or revised
statements and the researcher’s summary of the input from the Delphi panel to assure
that the researcher captured the essence of the Delphi panel’s input. This review panel
helped to address Nash’s (1978) concern of possible researcher bias in interpreting the
Delphi panelists’ responses. The goal was to

- identify and group together common ideas,
- identify key phrases or words in each new group of ideas or suggestions,
- identify each new group with a label, and
- develop a written statement for each new idea or suggestion (Glaser and Strauss,
  1967; Thomas (2001); Kelbaugh (2003).

New descriptive statements were written to maintain the original wording provided by

The Delphi panel of experts were asked to evaluate all items on the Round II
instrument, reviewing their original position and the statements of the other expert
panelists, and providing a new rating on each statement using the same six-point Likert-
type scale used in Round I. As in Round I, each expert panelist was requested to provide supportive rationale for his or her position and clarification where his or her rating varied by two or more points from the mode reported for rest of the panel.

The Round III instrument was developed based on the responses to the second instrument and suggestions made by the Delphi panel of experts. The Round III instrument contained those items on which consensus was not achieved in Round II plus any additional statements suggested by the panel of experts. The researcher sounding board reviewed new and revised statements included in Round III following the same procedures as in Round II. The Delphi Round I instrument was submitted to The Ohio State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) for review and approval.

**Data Collection**

**CASE STUDY**

Date collection prior to the case study involved document analysis of annual reports, program materials on the Pennsylvania State University, Allegheny County website, and written materials requested from the County Extension Director of the Pennsylvania State University, Allegheny County. These written materials included curricula, marketing pamphlets, annual report, web page, organizational chart, and staffing data. This analysis began the process of building a context within which the observation and interview protocols were developed. Focus was on the topics identified from the literature review: programs, program planning, teaching methodology, program evaluation/impacts, target populations, partnerships/external relations, funding
and marketing. The written reports served as a starting point in the interview conversation, which was then used to confirm or disconfirm the written documents. This interplay between written documents and interview and observational data allowed for confirmation of the interpretation of the documents as suggested by Hodder (1994). The interviews also allowed for the development of the context within which the documents were developed.

A letter was sent to the staff of the case study site to explain the research project and to request their participation. The letter described how the issues of confidentiality and anonymity would be handled, their full freedom to decline to participate, and my role as researcher.

My goal during the case study was to the extent possible “walk in the shoes” of the staff of the Pennsylvania State University Extension, Allegheny County in order to move from “an external understanding to (a better approximation of) an internal one…” (Drisko, 2004, p. 116). Although I attempted to stay open to everything, the goal was to gather data within the boundaries of the study as recommended by Hays, 2004. The researcher’s purpose in case study research is not to study everything going on in the site, but to focus on specific issues, problems, or programs. In every instance, there must be boundaries set before the study begins. One way of bounding the study is through the use of research questions (Hays, 2004).

Once at the case study site, I moved between interviews and observations based on scheduling and opportunity. The first step was to reiterate the purpose of the study and discuss issues of confidentiality and anonymity, and my role as researcher. At the
opening of each interview, the options each person had concerning their participation in the research were discussed. They were given the option of their reviewing the interview and observation protocol, making changes in the protocols based on their perspective, providing member checks on the interview transcripts, and other roles they saw as desirable. This was done to demonstrate my trust in them as potential partners in research and as a way to solicit input for the research process. Getting input on the research process from participants helped to moderate my biases and to better understand the perspectives of the Extension staff in Allegheny County. Member checking helped to address the issue of researcher bias and validity. Analytic induction was used to test emergent propositions. I searched for negative cases and attempted to use verisimilitude to enhance validity (Adler and Adler, 1994).

Although the protocol initially focused on the factors indicated in the literature (programs, program planning, teaching methodology, program evaluation/impacts, target populations, partnerships/external relations, funding and marketing), I remained open to other possibilities raised by the participants or observation. Observations moved from the general to the specific to the extent possible within the context of a short observational period.

The interview protocol was semi-structured so as to gain greater breadth and allow more opportunity for the participants to speak freely, rather than only respond to scripted questions. I attempted to cover all of the major issues in my questioning while allowing participants to focus where they wished. A level of analysis was built into the interview protocol so that the interview participants became partners in the analysis of
the information they provided, clarifying meaning as they proceeded (Kvale, 1996). This method is consistent with the analytic realism (Altheide & Johnson, 1994) perspective. Where permitted by the participant, the interview was recorded in order to have a more complete and accurate transcription of the conversation.

All interviews opened with general conversational questions and then moved into more specific questions pertaining to the research questions. I did not follow the traditional role of a researcher during interviews (not sharing feelings, answering questions, a formalistic relationship) but instead chose a more informal peer-to-peer hierarchy as suggested by Fontana and Frey (1994). Questioning was open-ended and allowed the participants to get into their own flow. Questions were phrased as “how do you” rather than “why did you” as recommended by Becker (1998).

Taped interviews were transcribed. Interviews that were not taped were transcribed and elaborated the evening after the interview to capture as much as possible from the interview notes.

More time was spent in interviews than observations because according to Hays (2004, p. 229), “Interviews are one of the richest sources of data in a case study and usually the most important type of data to be collected. Interviews provide the researcher with information from a variety of perspectives.”

**DELPHI**

Each of the Delphi panel of experts was contacted by telephone to confirm their intent to take part in the study, clarify the objectives of the study, explain the procedures, answer any questions, stress the importance of the study, and encourage
prompt responses. Due to the professional expectations of employment, it is assumed that all panelists were proficient in the use of computers and web-based communications; a concern expressed by Dillman (2000). All written correspondence was sent using electronic communication modes. An electronic invitation to complete the questionnaire with instructions on the purpose of the study, how the Delphi technique proceeds, and how to access and respond to the questionnaire was sent. Three days after the electronic invitation, panel members who had not responded to the round were sent an electronic inquiry to assure receipt of the invitation to complete the questionnaire and determine their ability to access the web site from the link. Those who did not respond to the electronic message were contacted by telephone to determine the cause of their non-response. If the panelist were experiencing difficulty accessing the Zoomerang questionnaire, the link was sent from the researcher’s computer instead of from the Zoomerang site. Reminder notices were sent two days prior to the due date for responses to each round. An automatically generated response thanking panelists for completing the questionnaire was sent following submission of their responses to each round as recommended by Dillman (2000). A note of appreciation was sent with the pre-notice for the instruments used in Rounds II and III of the study. The pre-notice included the enticement that those panelists who responded to the instrument within five days would be included in a drawing for a gift certificate.

The questionnaire was on Zoomerang, a survey tool created by MarketTools (2002). Participants responded to the questionnaires using a six-point Likert-type scale and were provided space to include written rationale and feedback on each position.
statement. Results were downloaded from Zoomerang into a MicroSoft Excel spreadsheet and then were available for analysis using the Statistical Package for Research in the Social Sciences (SPSS, 2003). The Delphi method is a respected technique for futuring, however Shieh (1990) did point out a methodological problem in the lack of a commonly accepted definition of consensus in a Delphi study. To address this concern, 80 percent was chosen as the level of consensus. In a review of research that used the Delphi methodology, 80 percent was the highest level of consensus used and was therefore chosen for this study.

A drawing for a gift certificate was used to encourage timely responses to Rounds II and III and frequent positive communications was sent to encourage panelists to complete Rounds II and III. These incentives and communications addressed the concern expressed by Turoff & Hiltz (1996) concerning the loss of interest by panelists due to the repetitive nature of the Delphi technique. A final letter of appreciation was sent electronically after completion of data collection. Each panelist was sent an executive summary of the study and a link to the dissertation when the dissertation was posted on-line.

The Delphi research technique is primarily qualitative in that it is a communication process; a sharing of ideas among individuals. It can be more qualitative by approaching the panel as co-investigators or it can be more quantitative by being strongly structured and researcher-driven. Ziglio (1996) raised the question of reliability from a quantitative perspective. He feels that replicability is an issue. It is unlikely that two Delphi panels would be used to address the same issue in essentially
the same time and context. Therefore, triangulation may be appropriate, using other research methodology to confirm or disconfirm the results of the Delphi study.

A return visit to the case study location to share the results of the Delphi was arranged. The results were shared in a focus group format to get reactions to the statements identified as patterns of success that should be expected in urban Extension county offices in the next two to five years. The interviewees were asked which areas they believe they as an urban office were already achieving the identified patterns of success. They were asked to identify barriers that exist to achieving those statements identified as patterns of success for which they were currently not achieving. The interviewees also were asked if these unachieved patterns were realistic from their perspective as urban Extension practitioners and what changes would be needed to achieve these currently unachieved patterns of success. The responses of the focus group provided a practitioners’ perspective in a specific location. This practitioners’ perspective served as a reality check on the expert panelists’ identified patterns of success. As such, it was a form of triangulation.

For the case study segment, interviews were audio taped (with permission of participant) for transcription at a later time. Notes were taken on key elements and body/facial language. Once interviews were transcribed, they were provided to the participants for their review, editing, and approval. Participants were given the opportunity to provide additional information or to further explain their comments. Participants had the right to use their name, a synonym, or to remain anonymous. The
interview protocol and participant informed consent forms were presented for approval by the Internal Review Board of The Ohio State University prior to the start of the research. Interviews were conducted by the researcher.

The observation protocol focused on the same issues as the interviews with the addition of office staffing, staff interactions, and office culture. The observation protocol and participant informed consent forms were presented for approval by the Internal Review Board of The Ohio State University prior to the start of the research. No individual was identified by name or position in any way that allowed readers of the study to determine identity, unless permission to do so was obtained from the individual. Observations were hand-written notes taken during and immediately following periods of observations. Observations were conducted by the researcher. My role as an observer was as the peripheral-member-researcher (Adler & Adler, 1994), being an Extension employee, though not an employee at the observation sites. Observation protocol was somewhat emergent, with special attention directed toward realities as observed and interpreted.

Data Analysis

CASE STUDY

Analysis of qualitative research is more than assembling quotations from interviews to substantiate ideas. It involves analysis of more than what is observed in the setting and stated during interviews. It requires a self-discipline on the part of the researcher to reflect the lives and experiences of those living the experience that the
researcher is trying to understand. Hays (2004) compares the process of data analysis during data collection to a detective in the process of solving a crime. Each bit of information is used to further the ongoing investigation. Hays understands that the goal is not just to gather as much information as possible, but to gather the information with the goal of answering the research question(s).

Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest that the goals of a quality case study include:

- prolonged contact with the site,
- a systemic, encompassing, integrated, holistic overview of the context,
- capturing the insiders’ day-to-day realities,
- produce compelling interpretations that are consistent with insiders’ realities.

A description of the context of the case study site was included to allow for a fuller understanding of why certain programming was done, how it was done, who was involved, and much of the other rationales that context provides. The context also was important because it defines the parameter in which this case is transferable to other Extension locations (Yin, 1989).

A description of the process of doing the case study allows readers of the study to assess the rigor of the study. An emphasis was on maintaining a ‘chain of evidence’ as recommended by Yin (1994). It is hoped the study could be replicated at the same site to assess reliability or at other sites for the purpose of comparing and contrasting the findings across multiple sites.
Bias is a real presence and I made every effort to confront this reality by repeatedly challenging myself to identify my own biases. Miles and Huberman (1994) provide the archtypical biases for which to be alert:

1. *the holistic fallacy*: leaving out or avoiding the loose ends and negative cases in order to strengthen perceived patterns.

2. *elite bias*: giving too much emphasis to the input of high-status participants and less emphasis to the input of perceived lower-status participants.

3. *going native*: losing my perspective as a researcher due to over-involvement in the case and the participants.

These categories of bias were reviewed during the case study to remind myself of these potential pitfalls. These self-reviews served as a self-check of unintended bias. Additionally, I frequently reminded myself of Becker’s (1998) admonition to “doubt everything anyone in power tells you” and to look for other opinions. “Going native” was perhaps a more critical concern because of my professional background as an Extension educator. I constantly had to be on guard of being the coworker / peer and not the researcher looking for data without the bias of my profession.

The transcript of each interview was sent to the participant for verification of accuracy and the opportunity to clarify points and to share additional thoughts that may have arisen since the interview. Member checking served as a part of the issue of trustworthiness or validity since participants were challenged to challenge my assumptions and conclusions (Denzin, 1994; Hays, 2004; Hodder, 1994; Lincoln & Denzin, 1994; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Requesting additional input resulted in participants providing insights not mentioned earlier, thus making the case study more
comprehensive. Those participants who reviewed their transcripts primarily made grammatical corrections. Changes of meaning and expansion of ideas were very limited and were accepted as reasonable expansions of the interview statements.

Member checking was of particular importance because of the predominance of females in the case study. Fontana & Frey (1994) remind us that the gender of the interviewer and the participant does make a difference in the interaction and how the knowledge that is being shared in the interview is filtered by the culture of gender and race. The issues of how I filtered the observations and interviews considering gender and racial issues is one that was a point of reflection in my researcher’s log. During the analysis, the data are again filtered and examined “through the researcher’s lens” (Hays, 2004, p. 233). For this reason, it is important for the researcher’s perspective and relationship to the case to be made explicit so that the readers of the research may filter the case report with that knowledge.

Data were gathered using document analysis, observations and interviews. Particular attention was paid to include multiple perspectives by interviewing and observing a diversity of staff, including volunteers, unit educators, and Extension educators, as well as administrative staff. To gain the outsider perspective, a county government funder was interviewed. The limitation with gaining the outsider perspective was the limited availability of these people during the relatively short time allowed for this case study. The collection of data using multiple forms of data and multiple sources is triangulation (Jansick, 1994). Triangulation is used to increase the level of understanding of the insider’s view.
Two peers were engaged to review and provide feedback on my decisions and interpretations throughout the case study and the Delphi. This researcher reflexive panel responded to questions concerning methodology that arose during the research, provided a check to my biases and assumptions, challenging me to deeper and more honest analysis. This form of peer review during the research has been recommended by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Padgett, Mathew, and Conte (2004, pg. 227) view peer debriefing as “a meta-strategy for enhancing rigor.”

NUD*IST (Non-numerical, Unstructured, Data: Indexing, Searching and Theorizing), a computer package designed to assist researchers in handling qualitative data coding, data organization, and data retrieval, was used in this study. The decision to use a computer program was made to aid in the coding and retrieval of the relatively large amount of data (Kelle and Laurie, 1995) and to assist in the manipulation of data in the conceptualization and analysis of the data (Kelle, 1995).

Three basic decisions had to be made concerning coding. 1.) The size of the text units was decided to be single paragraphs to consecutive paragraphs on a single topic because this would give me maximum flexibility in retrieval and analysis. 2.) The header would include the participant’s name. Other data, such as sex, title, the date, and duration of the interview were maintained in a separate file. 3.) The sub-header was defined as the question asked by the researcher so that the response could be placed in context with the question.
The coding strategy was based on the literature and expanded as themes emerged in the document analysis, observations and interviews. Bogdan and Biklen’s (1982) general base data coding categories provided a structure that was refined minimally for a second level of data coding. This second framework for data coding provided an examination of the data through a different lens, thereby gaining a perspective that did not necessarily become apparent when using the themes that were defined in the literature. These categories included

1. Context – the setting of Extension work.
2. Situation – how subjects define the setting and topic.
3. Perspectives – organizational ways of thinking, including the tacit knowledge.
4. Relationships – how staff relates to other staff, units, clients, funders.
5. Processes – the processes used as staff relate to other staff, units, clients, funders.
6. Activities – the informal behaviors of staff.
7. Events – infrequent occurrences in the life of the offices.
8. Strategies – methods, techniques and policies by which staff accomplish things.
9. Relationships, internal – regular patterns of behavior among staff.
10. Relationships, external – patterns of behavior toward clients, staff of other agencies, and funders.

To this list, the following categories have been added based on Ritchie and Spencer (2002).

12. Diagnostic – what factors underlie perceptions and why actions are taken or not taken.

These broad codes were used at the beginning of the study and additional codes were added as needed. The approach of starting with broad categories and then incrementally adding additional codes as needed in the process of refining the coding was recommended by Araugo (1995).
Nodes were developed as the analysis of the data moved forward. Diagrams of the analytical scheme helped to conceptualize the organization and integration of the data as the analysis progressed.

Memos were used to track the analytical process and were coded with specific reference to field notes pages and interview transcript pages as recommended by Corbin (1986). All memos were dated, titled, cross-referenced, and filed as part of the analytic evidence trail. These memos along with annotations, draft documents, and supporting documents formed what Gibbs (2002) referred to as the metadata.

As data was collected, it was reduced (Miles and Huberman, 1994) through coding, selective focusing, clustering, summarizing, writing memos and finally, writing up the results. This reduction not only allowed analysis, it was analysis. So too were the “cycles of decontextualization/recontextualization and exploration of relationships between categories in the hierarchical network of codes led both to splitting of categories and the pruning and consolidation of others.” (Araugo, 1995, p. 103). The goal was to see relationships among the data and then the pertinent data was “reassembled to tell the story of the case” (Hays, 2004, p. 232).

The analysis was done within the perspective of analytic realism (Altheide & Johnson, 1994). Analytic realism is based on the view that the social world is interpreted by both the participants and the researcher through a communication process. Within this process, both researcher and participants “become increasingly aware that the categories and ideas used to describe the empirical (socially constructed) world are also symbols from specific contexts” (Altheide & Johnson, 1994, p. 489).
These authors further suggest that the words of the participants are not enough for understanding and that the researcher must strive to gain the participants’ tacit knowledge, those norms that are not spoken because they have become the underlying “way things are,” the unwritten rules and assumptions of the setting. To find the essence of each person’s story required an examination of not only what was said, but “how it was said” (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996, pg. 83). Examining what was said and how it was said in the context of the motivation to tell that part of their story in the way it was presented helped to explain tacit meaning that was projected. This may be done through the use of metaphors that hint at the socially shared knowledge of the culture (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996).

The final form of analysis was drawing conclusions (Miles and Huberman, 1994). It was the point where I as researcher had to make sense of what the data means, so that the Delphi questionnaire could be grounded in the case study data and the literature. Looking for common themes as well outlier data was the primary thrust.

Denzin’s (2002, p. 362) interpretive criteria was used as a basis for judging what to include in the when writing the results and discussion of the results. These criteria are

1. Do they illuminate the phenomenon as lived experience?
2. Are they based on thickly contextualized materials?
3. Are they historically and relationally grounded?
4. Are they processual and interactional?
5. Do they engulf what is known about the phenomenon?
6. Do they incorporate prior understandings of the phenomenon?
7. Do they cohere and produce understanding?
8. Are they unfinished?
Lincoln and Guba (2002) provide further guidance in assessing quality in case study reports. They recommend resonance, rhetorical, and applicability criteria.

Resonance criteria refer to the degree of fit the case study report has to the site, especially if the constructivist paradigm is used. Under this paradigm, the researcher must minimally reflect the multiple realities of the participants and avoid recommendations that do not take into consideration these multiple realities. Resonance criteria also require that the researcher make clear his values and involvement in the study.

Rhetorical criteria include the form, structure and presentation of the case study. The report should be well-organized, clear and well crafted. However, these criteria are more than writing style, they are emotional impact. The report should demonstrate power, creativity, intellectual commitment, openness to problematic issues, and fairness. Most importantly, the report should clearly represent the voice/s, meaning/s, and realities of those who shared their experience with me. The case study report should be written with enough rich description that readers may see the applicability to their own situations. It was important to remember Wolcott’s (1994) caution about generalizability that there is no single correct interpretation of a social setting and to remember that each reader will be interpreting the findings in his or her own way. In this way, the reader is making decisions on the transferability of the data, which is perhaps a more appropriate concept than generalizability.
Descriptive statistics were calculated for each round of the Delphi process. The responses of the Delphi panel on the Likert-type scale were converted to numerical values for analytical purposes (1=strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3=mildly disagree, 4=mildly agree, 5=agree and 6=strongly agree). Measure of variance and central tendency were computed using SPSS for each statement. Frequency counts and percentages, mean and standard deviation were reviewed in determining consensus. The mean for each statement for which consensus was reached was used to describe the level of importance for that statement. Statements with consensus were grouped into two levels based on the mean. Patterns of success for urban extension programs with a mean score of 5.0 or higher were considered vital patterns of success for urban Extension county offices. The mean score of 5.0 was selected on the rationale that a pattern of success should be at or above the level of “agree” on the six-point Likert-type scale with 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = mildly disagree, 4 = mildly agree, 5 = agree, and 6 = strongly agree. Statements that were rated between 4.25 and 4.9 were considered important patterns of success.

Consensus on a statement was considered to be reached when 80% of the ratings fell within two categories on a six-point scale. For each round those statements not meeting the 80% criteria for consensus were included in the following rounds. Additional items suggested by the panel of experts also were included in the following rounds. Content
validity was established following procedures outlined in the Instrumentation section. Written rationale in support or disagreement with statements on each round was included on the instrument for the next round.

Common themes expressed on statements where consensus was reached were reported, as well as outlier comments. For statements on which consensus was not reached, descriptive data and themes were presented and analyzed as issues of divergent views. This was important because of the tendency in the Delphi procedure for opinions to move toward consensus. Lack of consensus may provide distinct perspectives according to Linstone & Turoff, 1975; Scheibe, Skutsch & Schofer, 1975; and Ulschak, 1983.

The Delphi procedure was planned to end after three rounds. Linstone and Turoff (1975) state that three rounds are sufficient to attain stability in responses while avoiding disinterest on the part of the panel of experts due to excessive repetition.

The use of multiple methods for gathering and analyzing data would follow the trend Denzin (1989) mentioned of more and more researchers using multiple methods to gain better results and deeper understanding of people’s construction of reality. Data was triangulated with information gathered through other means (Delphi, interviews, observations and document analysis) as a form of cross-checking (Denzin, 1989). A research journal in which to keep reflective writings on my biases was maintained. As Fontana and Frey (1994) point out, it is a responsibility of the researcher to be as true as possible in telling the participants’ stories as they see their stories and realities.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Urban Extension offices in the United States of America continue to carry out the mission of the Cooperative Extension Service by providing informal continuing education in the areas of urban agriculture, family and consumer sciences, youth development and community development. Staff of these urban offices are faced with increasing pressures due to the magnitude of the issues facing urban populations, the complexity of the issues, competition from other governmental agencies and not-for-profits, low staff to population ratios, funding challenges, and varied expectations by stakeholders. Although specific challenges vary by urban location, similarities in how to address the challenges are expected. The exploration of patterns of success for urban county Extension programs was needed to provide guidance to these urban Extension programs. By sharing what practitioners and experts believe will be patterns of success for the future, urban Extension staff and Extension administration may focus their resources on those components of urban programming that have the greatest likelihood of success in the near future.
The study used a case study and a three-round modified Delphi technique to collect qualitative and quantitative information to explore and describe the characteristics identified as patterns of success for urban Extension offices. The case study provided a systematic view of current practice in a successful urban Extension program. A panel of 20 experts, purposefully selected using a nomination process, was used to identify the patterns of success. The case study educators served as a site-specific practitioners’ panel to identify their own patterns of success, both current and for the near future.

Background data about the case study site are presented. Data from interviews and observations are presented with the appropriate Delphi statement. These case study data are inserted at the point when the statement is reported to have reached consensus. Data that does not correspond with any of the Delphi statements are presented with the background data from the case study.

The results of the Delphi study reported in this chapter are presented in chronological order. All three rounds of the modified Delphi instrument are discussed. Each round is represented by a summary of each statement and whether consensus was reached. Descriptive statistics presented include frequency, mean, and standard deviation, as well as written comments by the panel of experts. Qualitative descriptive data collected from the case study are presented within the frame of the modified Delphi instrument. The statements on which consensus was reached are presented in two categories in Chapter 5. Those statements for which the mean level of consensus was
reached at 5.0 and higher were considered to be *vital* patterns of success. Statements for which consensus was reached at a mean level between 4.25 and 4.99 were considered to be *important* patterns of success.

**Findings: Case Study**

Penn State Cooperative Extension of Allegheny County Pennsylvania was the site of the case study. This site was selected through a nomination process. Nominations were solicited from members of the most recent National Urban Task Force of CSREES.

Allegheny County is located in the rolling hills of southwestern Pennsylvania. Three major rivers flow through the county, the Allegheny, the Monongahela, and the Ohio. Pittsburgh is the county seat and largest city. The population of Allegheny County according to the 2000 Census is 1,281,666. The population of the county has declined 4.1 percent since the 1990 Census. The county’s racial breakdown is 84.3 percent white, 12.4 percent Black or African American, 1.7 percent Asian, 1.1 percent two or more races, and 0.9 percent Hispanic or Latino. The percentage of the population 25 years or older with a high school diploma is 86.3 and with a Bachelor’s degree or higher 28.3 percent.

Allegheny County is home to US Steel and Westinghouse as well as eight other Fortune 500 companies, including Heinz, USX, USAirways, PPG Industries, General Nutrition Centers, PNC Corporation, Mellon Bank, and Alcoa. The Pittsburgh Regional Alliance spearheads sustainable regional growth. Recent new projects include the David L. Lawrence Convention Center, Heinz Field (football stadium) and PNC Park (baseball
park), and the redevelopment of Pittsburgh’s central shopping district and the adjoining riverfronts. The region’s corporate, university, and health care infrastructure has been the catalyst for high-tech industries including information technology, biomedical technology, environmental technology, and advanced materials and manufacturing.

Rand McNally’s “Places Rated Almanac” named Allegheny County and the Greater Pittsburgh area the “Most Livable Community in the Nation” in 1985. The region continues to be rated high and has been placed in the top ten areas to live in the nation by Money Magazine, Fortune Magazine, National Employment Review, and Century 21 Real Estate Corporation. The region is also ranked in the top ten of the 50 largest metropolitan areas in the United States for cultural facilities.

Allegheny County passed a Home Rule Charter in 1999 and has been governed by a County Executive and County Council since 2000.

Penn State Cooperative Extension in Allegheny County has a staff of ten educators (agents), five program assistants, five Expanded Food and Nutrition Program educators, six Nutrition Education Program educators, and three support staff. Their brochure states, “At work in your community—delivering practical education, based on university research.” Educators work in five program areas: 4-H Youth Development; Children, Youth, and Families; Horticulture; Leadership and Community Development; and Nutrition, Health, and Wellness. Extension information about these programs is available at the office’s website: http://allegheny.extension.psu.edu/.
The 4-H Youth Development program “develops essential life skills through planned ‘learn by doing’ experiences, for youngsters 8 to 19 years old, from all backgrounds in all locales.” Specific programs include:

- Community, special interest, and project clubs
- School enrichment and after-school opportunities
- County, state and national events
- Cultural and citizenship education
- Presentations and competitions
- Leadership development
- Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resources and Related Sciences (MANRRS) introduces minority middle school and high school students to agriculture as a career path.

Children, Youth, and Families programming is “to encourage personal growth and improve the quality of life for children, youth, and families in your community….” The specific programs include:

- Family Living and Parenting (teach parents, kinship care providers, and working families how to develop skills to enhance their family’s well-being.)
- Better Kid Care (for child care providers, parents, and employers).

Horticulture provides programs to “improve production efficiency and the competitiveness of commercial operations” and “to improve your home or community garden.” This unit’s program offerings include:
Leadership and Community Development works “to create strong communities, a good economy, adequate housing and health care, clean air and water, profitable businesses, good community leaders, strong families, and responsible youth.” The program is delivered through three efforts:

- Learning Today, Leading Tomorrow (LTLT) – a leadership program developing personal and interpersonal, group organizational, and community leadership skills.

- Futures Festival – an intergenerational program for youth and older adults to plan, produce, and evaluate an event.

- Choosing Our Direction – assisting groups, organizations, and nonprofit agencies in developing an effective strategic plan.
The Nutrition, Health and Wellness program provides three main programming thrusts:

- **Health and Wellness** “to help you and your family improve your health and well-being through community cancer risk reduction.

- **Nutrition and Food Safety** “to improve individual and family eating habits” with programs in
  - Nutrition education
  - Diet-related chronic disease prevention
  - Fight BAC! Food safety
  - Contemporary food issues including food irradiation and biotechnology.

- **Nutrition Links Programs**
  - EFNEP nutrition education for limited-income families, pregnant teens and adults
  - PANEP (Pennsylvania Nutrition Education Program) for those who receive Food Stamps.

**Findings: Round I**

The results of Round I are based on responses of 20 panel members to the Round I instrument. One member of the panel completed Round I and then did not complete Round II. That member’s responses to Round I were removed and the statistical analysis does not reflect his Round I responses. His withdrawal did result in four statements falling from a consensus of 80 percent or more to 79 percent. Since these statements were already withdrawn from Round II, they were listed as having reached consensus and were marked with an asterisk (*) in table 4.1 that may be found on page 110.
The instrument contained 100 literature- and case study-based statements related to the patterns of success of urban Extension offices in the next two to five years (2005 through 2010). Table 4.1 contains the descriptive statistics for each statement. The panel reached consensus on 27 of the 100 statements during Round I. Once consensus on a statement was reached, that statement was removed from further rounds of the modified Delphi instrument. Consensus was reached when 80 percent of the responses fell within two categories on a six-point Likert-type scale.
Table 4.1

Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Urban Extension offices are adequately staffed in all four program areas (Family &amp; Consumer Science, 4-H Youth Development, Community Development, and Agriculture/Horticulture &amp; Natural Resources).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have a background in community development.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Urban Extension educators are at ease in working with diverse audiences.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Urban Extension educators are at ease working in urban settings.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

Table 4.1 Distribution of Ratings of Significance by Delphi Panel for Each Item on Round I – frequency, mean and standard deviation.

(Continued)
Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8) Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population.</td>
<td>II 9</td>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Urban Extension educators welcome diversity.</td>
<td>III 9</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Urban Extension educators work with state specialists to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>NA 0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Urban Extension educators collaborate with colleagues outside of Extension to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.</td>
<td>11 10</td>
<td>0 4</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Urban programs have the support of state level Extension administration.</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td>0 1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.</td>
<td>12 11</td>
<td>0 3</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming.</td>
<td>13 12</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
### Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>MIldey Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15) Urban Extension staff has close working relationships with local communities and agencies.</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Urban Extension office/s are located within the urban core.</td>
<td>15 14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Urban Extension has satellite offices throughout the county.</td>
<td>16 15</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of collaborating organizations.</td>
<td>17 16</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Urban Extension staff maintains positive working relationships with governmental funding partners.</td>
<td>18  NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for sustaining base programming in the four program areas.</td>
<td>19 17</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Urban Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming.</td>
<td>20 18</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22) Urban Extension offices maximize resources by partnering with other agencies and organizations.</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Urban Extension offices seek effective funding partnerships with other agencies of the federal government, such as the Dept. of Health and Human Services, Dept. of Education, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, and Dept. of Defense.</td>
<td>21 19</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Urban Extension offices seek funding from non-tax dollars.</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Urban Extension offices maintain a balance between existing traditional sources of funding and new alternative sources.</td>
<td>22 20</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if there are plans for sustainability of programs when this funding ends.</td>
<td>23 NA</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Rounds</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27) Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) Urban programs are effectively marketed.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Extension has &quot;brand name&quot; recognition in urban areas.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) Urban program marketing is responsive to clients' needs and attitudes.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) Urban Extension targets clientele with relevant messages and programs.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32) Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) Urban Extension staff effectively reports that programs provide public good in the local, state, and/or national interest.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35) Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data).</td>
<td>33, 29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data.</td>
<td>34, 30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37) Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs on a cross section of county audiences including the urban poor.</td>
<td>31, 27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) Urban Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs.</td>
<td>35, 31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the value of the programs they support.</td>
<td>NA, NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the impact of the programs they supports.</td>
<td>36, NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
### Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41) Urban extension staff effectively reports the level of community</td>
<td>37 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation in program planning.</td>
<td>38 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community</td>
<td>39 32</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation in program evaluation.</td>
<td>40 33</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43) Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of</td>
<td>41 34</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>targeted populations.</td>
<td>42 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44) Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs.</td>
<td>43 35</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45) Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability</td>
<td>44 36</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure.</td>
<td>45 37</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46) Urban Extension educators focus on those populations with the greatest need, specifically the urban poor.</td>
<td>46 38</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47) Urban Extension educators do programs for the suburban populations.</td>
<td>47 39</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48) Urban Extension staff maintains programming for traditional clients.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49) Urban Extension programs do not duplicate services provided by other</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations in the community.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50) Urban Extension educators use research-based information.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51) Urban Extension educators involve representatives of target</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populations in program planning.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52) Urban Extension educators use program planning processes that are</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusive.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53) Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holistic.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54) Urban Extension educators use program planning that is based on</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the realities of the urban environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

* Item 48 achieved consensus in Round 1 prior to the removal of a panel member who then did not respond to Round 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Rounds</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly</th>
<th>Mildly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55) Urban Extension educators develop programs based on the positive attributes of the community (assets based) instead of the deficits.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56) Urban Extension educators use program planning that crosses academic and program boundaries to address community issues.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57) Urban Extension educators use the logic model in program development.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58) Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59) Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60) Extension is a catalyst for environmental change in urban counties.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61) Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #:</th>
<th>Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62) Urban Extension educators address family issues, such as financial challenges, health, nutrition, disruption of the family structure, parenting, and issues of aging.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63) Urban Extension educators address environmental quality, such as air and water quality, brownfields, development of green space, and landscaping.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64) Urban Extension educators teach job preparation skills.*</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65) Urban Extension educators address economic development.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66) Urban Extension educators address community development.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67) Urban Extension educators extend their outreach through volunteers.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68) Urban Extension educators provide train-the-trainer programs for professionals.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69) Urban 4-H targets urban youth who have multiple risk factors.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

* Item 64 reached consensus in Round 1 prior to a panel member withdrawing from the panel for Round 2.

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70) Urban 4-H effectively programs with both urban &quot;at-risk&quot; youth and suburban, low-risk youth.</td>
<td>57 NA</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71) The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H youth programs reflects the diversity of the youth population.</td>
<td>58 42</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72) Urban 4-H programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interest, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation.</td>
<td>59 43</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73) Urban 4-H gives youth, especially teenagers, a significant voice in the programs offered.</td>
<td>60 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74) Urban 4-H programming includes exploring careers.</td>
<td>61 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
### Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>**75) Urban 4-H uses authentic civic involvement to provide a setting...</td>
<td>II NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**76) Urban 4-H provides opportunities for youth to experience mentoring...</td>
<td>II NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>77) Urban 4-H provides enrichment programs during school.</strong></td>
<td>II NA</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>78) Urban 4-H provides out-of-school time programs.</strong></td>
<td>II NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**79) Urban 4-H uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach...</td>
<td>II NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong> Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Statement 76 reached consensus in Round 1 prior to the withdrawal of a panel member in Round 2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80) Urban 4-H uses service learning as an authentic way of connecting</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth to their community through interdisciplinary, collaborative,</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engaged learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81) Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82) Urban 4-H staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive youth development.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83) Urban 4-H shares 4-H program materials with staff of other youth-</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serving organizations.*</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84) Urban 4-H partners with other youth-serving organizations.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85) Urban 4-H uses the 4-H club format as an important component of</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban youth development programs.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

* Item 83 reached consensus in Round 1 prior to the withdrawal of one panel member during Round 2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86) Urban 4-H works with a wide diversity of youth, including those of different races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, and physical and mental abilities.</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87) Urban Extension provides 24/7 availability of information and educational opportunities.</td>
<td>67 49</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88) Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods.</td>
<td>68 50</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89) Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners' ability to solve problems and make decisions.</td>
<td>69 51</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90) Urban Extension educators use transformative learning methods to help learners examine the assumptions on which and the frame of reference within which their decisions are made.</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91) Urban Extension educators use a variety of learning techniques, such as self-directed learning, group learning, peer teaching, and collaborative learning techniques.</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92) Urban Extension educators use service-learning to enhance participants' learning.</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93) Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community.</td>
<td>70 52</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94) Urban Extension educators minimize use of the expert model in teaching.</td>
<td>71 53</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95) Urban Extension uses formative evaluation so improvements are possible as programming is developed and delivered.</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96) Urban Extension’s program evaluation measures multiple competencies, such as social, emotional, behavioral, cognitive, and/or decision-making.</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97) Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered.</td>
<td>72 54</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98) Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes changes in critical thinking and problem solving.</td>
<td>73 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99) Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes social impacts on the community.</td>
<td>NA NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100) Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community.</td>
<td>74 55</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two and three represent the item’s corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
The panel members were asked to comment and support their ratings in the space provided with each statement. The panel wrote 332 comments during Round I. Written comments led to the creation of one additional statement and the modification of 11 statements. The researchers’ reflexive panel assisted in the synthesis of the comments into new and changed statements. Where possible and appropriate, the original wording from the panelists’ comments was used in creating new and rewording existing statements. Appendix G contains all written comments received in Round I. Appendix E shows the Round II instrument with new and reworded statements. All comments received in response to the Round I instrument were printed in italics following the corresponding statement in the Round II instrument.

**Statement 1: Urban Extension offices are adequately staffed in all four program areas (Family & Consumer Sciences, 4-H Youth Development, Community Development, and Agriculture/Horticulture & Natural Resources).**

Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* with 65 percent in the *strongly disagree* and *disagree* categories. A representative comment was “The four program areas may be represented, but the staff numbers are unrealistically small, given the population numbers in metro counties.” Other comments represented the realities in some states where individual staff members may be responsible for multiple program areas, such as, “we still have agents covering two or three subject areas,” or for multiple counties, “to change from county to regional delivery bases.”
Statement 2: Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments reflected this range, but one comment may have summarized the situation effectively, “Although many of our urban extension educators are well versed and capable in the use of sound educational theory and methods, I believe this is an area where in general we are focused more on subject matter expertise over effective educational methodologies.”

Statement 3: Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have a background in community development. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to agree. Comments generally reflected that this is a skill that is developed with experience on the job in some instances. Building this capacity was generally seen as desirable, “I believe it is an area that we as an organization or extension nationally should provide more leadership and training so that Extension educators have more capability in the community development area.”

Statement 4: Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Although the range of responses was wide, the comments focused on the need for training in leadership. It was forcefully stated by one panelist, “This is an
especially critical area in the urban areas where community engagement and involvement depend on effective leadership capacities in our Extension staff.”

Statement 5: Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments supported the range of responses with some states providing this type of training for Extension staff and other states not providing this training and hiring individuals without this training.

Statement 6: Urban Extension educators are at ease in working with diverse audiences. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Eighteen of the responses were spread over the mildly agree to strongly agree categories. Comments indicated that this is generally true to varying degrees and improving. It was seen as an important issue because of the increasing diversity in urban areas.

Statement 7: Urban Extension educators are at ease working in urban settings. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree with most responses spread over the mildly agree to strongly agree responses. Comments supported that educators are at ease in urban settings, however one panelist qualified the response with, “There are still many neighborhoods that are perceived to be too risky for most extension staff to work in.”
Statement 8: Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The comments indicate that this is an area in which Extension is slowly improving, however the issue of limited staff numbers makes this goal difficult to achieve, as stated in the following comment, “In one of our major urban areas there is only one advisory and four program representatives – they simply cannot reflect the diversity of the area.” Other panelists questioned the need for a focus on ethnic and racial diversity and suggested, “The quality of the educators is more important” and “I think other factors are much more important, like personality, etc.”

Statement 9: Urban Extension educators welcome diversity. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *mildly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Comments supported this statement.

Statement 10: Urban Extension educators work with state specialists to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *disagree* to *strongly agree*. The comments reflected the reality that individual state specialists vary in their ability to effectively work with urban audiences. There appear to be specialists in all program areas that work with county educators, but county-based educators do not see the majority of state specialists as
helpful with addressing urban issues. A few comments focused on a systematic disconnect between urban county staff and state specialists, one of which was, “There is somewhat of a disconnect between our county-based staff and state specialists that limits the amount of assistance provided by campus-based specialists, especially in urban programs.”

**Statement 11: Urban Extension educators collaborate with colleagues outside of Extension to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.**

Consensus was reached at an 85 percent level in the categories agree and strongly agree. Slightly more than half of the responses were in the agree category. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. Collaborating with others was seen as an important factor in urban Extension. “The development of partnerships and collaborative efforts is essential in urban areas.” “I can only do my work through partnerships with those agencies that are ‘on the street’ – Housing Authority, Salvation Army, etc.” One statement indicated that this could be improved, “More work needs to be done in this area to work the partnerships and collaborations...to truly make Extension the 'Front door to the University'...to all University resources available to all elements of the community.”

The staff in Allegheny County demonstrated the importance of collaborating with colleagues outside of Extension to provide programming for urban audiences. It was demonstrated in Family and Consumer Sciences, Horticulture, and Youth Development. Family and Consumer Sciences educator, Nancy Crago hires people from outside of Extension to assist in training for child-care providers. Both the Consumer
Horticulture educator, Sandy Feather, and the Commercial Horticulture educator, Mike Masiuk, work with people from Phipps Conservatory to provide programs for clientele. Mike spoke of bringing in speakers from the green industry to teach other professionals as well as amateur gardeners. Susan Taylor, Youth Development educator, shared how she trains teachers in public and parochial schools who then use 4-H curricula with their students. Much of Youth Development educator Brack Barr’s outreach is through the staff of Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCAs, YWCAs, church groups, and school teachers.

**Statement 12: Urban programs have the support of state level Extension administration.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *disagree* to *strongly agree*. Most panelists felt that state level Extension administration provided support. In two states, where agriculture is a major economic factor, it was felt that traditional agriculture and natural resources was given more support than urban programming.

**Statement 13: Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. A few panelists wrote comments indicating that this is happening, such as, “Our urban Extension educators use any resources they can access of the entire land-grant university system in our state.” However several comments indicated the opposite. “We talk this a lot, but in practice it is not developed at all. It is a goal to strive for.” “Not at all as they should.”
Statement 14: Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree and comments reflected the diversity of experience. “Limited involvement, but much more needs to happen.” “I have had partnerships with faculty at the University of New Hampshire, but also with other U’s in the region to provide interns or faculty for training/occasional direct delivery.”

Statement 15: Urban Extension staff has close working relationships with local communities and agencies. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree, with all but two responses in the agree and strongly agree categories. More than half of the responses were strongly agree. Although most of the comments were positive about what occurs and the need for this, two comments mentioned that closer relationships are needed. Both indicated what is stated in this comment, “To a good extent, though more needs to be done.”

In Allegheny County the educators work closely with local communities with projects such as the Steel Valley Cancer Coalition where Extension staff work with churches, health agencies, and community advocacy groups. The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program and Pennsylvania Nutrition Education Program both work closely with agencies and schools to provide nutrition education to low-income youth and adults. The 21st Century Learning Centers in three school districts demonstrate a
high level of cooperation in programming for youth. Horticulture has demonstration
gardens in county parks and is teaching youth arboriculture practices in Pittsburgh city
parks.

**Statement 16: Urban Extension office/s are located within the urban core.**
Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to
this statement. The responses ranged from *disagree* to *strongly agree*. Comments varied
widely.

**Statement 17: Urban Extension has satellite offices throughout the county.**
Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to
this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The
responses varied reflecting the variability in counties across the United States. In some
larger urban counties this is the case while in smaller urban counties, budget restrictions
do not allow multiple offices.

**Statement 18: Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of
collaborating organizations.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen
of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *disagree* to
*agree*. Comments indicate that currently this happens in isolated cases.

**Statement 19: Urban Extension staff maintains positive working
relationships with governmental funding partners.** Consensus was not achieved on
this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses
ranged from *disagree* to *strongly agree*. A majority of responses were in the *agree* and
*strongly agree* categories. The comments indicate that currently the relationship varies
with location. “Concern that governmental administrators and policymakers have very little knowledge of Extension.” “In general this is true – urban Extension staff interact with local policy makers…” “Many urban Extension programs produce newsletters and/or annual reports specifically for boards of supervisors…” “Very little time and political structure prevents us from getting to know our reps and county commissioners.”

Statement 20: Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for sustaining base programming in the four program areas. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to agree. Comments focused on the current situation. An example that also shows that the situation varies by location was, “Urban extension offices vary across our state in terms of the local (county) funding provided -- in some cases it is adequate, in most not.” However, a few panelists mentioned that sustaining should not be the goal, “We may be able to sustain current programming, but is that the appropriate goal? We are not doing enough now, so we should work to do more and not just sustain.”

Statement 21: Urban Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Statements varied based on current practice. This representative comment suggests some examples of this happening, “I think this trend will continue to grow
in the future. This may help support urban extension programs in the future, but it raises some concerns about public good activities that seldom have funding behind them. Also there is concern about programs evolving to the point that they are simply driven by whoever provides a source of funds. Finding the right balance between fees for service and public support for extension programs may be a challenge for us in the future.”

Statement 22: Urban Extension offices maximize resources by partnering with other agencies and organizations. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the categories agree and strongly agree. Some comments indicated that more could be done, partnering with other agencies was seen as “a strength.” A realistic cautionary comment about Extension’s operations was, “Our own administrative systems are not conducive to formalizing partnerships since there are often reams of paperwork and miles of red tape to work through before actually getting programs on the ground.”

This issue was addressed specifically in the junior arborist program in Allegheny County. Because of financial problems, Pittsburgh’s city parks were not being maintained as well as they had been in the past. A park conservancy was developed to take over the management of the parks. Extension’s role in the collaboration was to develop a curriculum to train youth in arboriculture practices. The youth then worked as interns in the park conservancy organization. Another example was the use of the facilities at Roundhill Farm Park, a county park for urban youth to do
4-H animal science projects. Without the use of this county facility and the animals housed there, these youth would not be able to afford to participate in these projects.

Statement 23: Urban Extension offices seek effective funding partnerships with other agencies of the federal government, such as the Dept. of Health and Human Services, Dept. of Education, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, and Dept. of Defense. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Partnering with federal agencies beyond the United States Department of Agriculture was seen as a positive, but it was noted that this is not generally occurring now. This was seen by two panelists as a state administration responsibility, “this effort should be more systemic rather than relying on individual efforts.” One comment raised an interesting issue, “they may explore grant opportunities not lasting partnerships.”

Statement 24: Urban Extension offices seek funding from non-tax dollars. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the categories mildly agree and agree. The comments focused on the current situation. Concerns panelists raised included, “I am a one person operation so time constraints hamper me” and “the problem with foundations, however, is that it is not sustainable money. Good for projects that produce a product or need transitioning.”
Allegheny County has programs that seek non-tax dollars. Cindy Javor, who leads the Nutrition Education Program, charges businesses a fee for employee training programs. These programs focus on health and nutrition. Likewise, the Better Kid Care programs Nancy Crago provides for child-care providers are done on a fee basis. Nancy actively writes grant proposals to fund her programs.

Statement 25: Urban Extension offices maintain a balance between existing traditional sources of funding and new alternative sources. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments focused on current budget challenges and in light of the reduced funding, panelists questioned if “balance” is the correct focus. One panelist commented, “I think our urban extension educators and urban extension office leaders spend a lot of time figuring out strategies to support their programs. They work with local governments, state extension leaders, private funders, grants, etc.” This panelist also pointed out a concept that is being considered. “One idea that is being explored is to re-tool our local extension offices as the "storefront" for the entire university and combine university academic outreach and student recruitment with extension programming…”

Statement 26: Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if there are plans for sustainability of programs when this funding ends. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to agree. Comments indicated that there is consideration of this issue, but the hope may be, “that after the program gets going and
proves itself other sources of support will be found.” A systems issue was raised by one panelist, “While there is an interest in sustainability, we've not developed an infrastructure to support such.”

**Statement 27: Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. There were no comments.

**Statement 28: Urban programs are effectively marketed.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. One panelist pointed out that this is a big challenge. Three panelists shared the same concern, “Perhaps not on a state level, but they are definitely on a local level.” One panelist stated, “Still the best kept secret and the best deal.”

**Statement 29: Extension has “brand name” recognition in urban areas.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Panelists pointed out that Extension has branding problems and much confusion. “There is a general lack of public awareness although specific clientele served know us they often don't connect us with the broader university.” Another panelist stated that “4-H and Master Gardeners” are known as a brand.

**Statement 30: Urban program marketing is responsive to clients’ needs and attitudes.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists
responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. A panelist stated that programming is based on a “needs assessment process.” Another stated, “Again - not from state sources. Would respond @ #5 if question was ‘local source’.” Two comments focused on limited resources for marketing.

**Statement 31: Urban Extension targets clientele with relevant messages and programs.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Comments ranged from, “at the county office level we are good at this” to “we do our homework enough with the general public.”

**Statement 32: Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Comments also varied. “Media is much more difficult to penetrate in urban markets.” There are some “good attempts, but not always with much success.” “Some outstanding successes.” A factor is also, “lack of time.”

**Statement 33: Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. “More should be done.” “So much can and should be done in this area. Customized email should be a top priority.” “Lack of time” and “our clientele often does not have access to internet.”
Statement 34: Urban Extension staff effectively reports that programs provide public good in the local, state, and/or national interest. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The comments generally fit with, “we could do a much better job.” In one state, “We started a process two years ago that has improved reporting of actual impacts of programs. But it is not comprehensive enough.”

Statement 35: Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data). Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments are very similar to those in statement 34.

Statement 36: Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The comments have the range found in this comment, “Sporadic -- some programs do a decent job, most not.”

Statement 37: Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs on a cross section of county audiences including the urban poor. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree.
Comments range from “Data does not always fall into the reporting system easily” to “this is dependent on the target of their outreach.” One comment indicated that the urban poor are “hard to reach.”

**Statement 38: Urban Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Comments ranged from, “We tend to focus more on impact rather than satisfaction evaluations” to “although this data is often collected -- not sure how it gets reported.”

**Statement 39: Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the value of the programs they support.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *disagree* to *strongly agree* with consensus reached in the *agree* and *strongly agree* categories. Seventy percent of the responses were *agree*. The typical comment was, “Most funders are supportive and believe the programs they support are valuable.” However, one panelist qualified the comment to, “Except for base extension funding.”

Allegheny County’s Joe Catanese, Chief of Staff, Office of the County Council, indicated, “Once you see it (PSCE) and understand it, you learn what it is and what a value it has.”
Statement 40: Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the impact of the programs they support. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Comments ranged from, “I have not heard them express that” to “This is especially true of our youth program.”

Statement 41: Urban extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program planning. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. The single comment made was, “We engage our partners in the process whenever possible.”

Statement 42: Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program evaluation. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Comments ranged from, “Not much of this reported” to “Legislatively this happens.”

Statement 43: Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted populations. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. The single comment was, “When it occurs.”

Statement 44: Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to agree.
Comments indicate that this is likely in the future and is being requested in at least one state. However, a panelist commented, “Some money losers are quite effective. Not sure this is the most relevant view.”

Statement 45: Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments range from, “Is there a national extension program evaluation system?” to “This is a critical need.”

Statement 46: Urban Extension educators focus on those populations with the greatest need, specifically the urban poor. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. There were two distinct types of comments. The first was, “We do program to all populations, however, being driven by significant grant and contract funding, these tend to be more targeted towards people in need.” The second focus was, “I think that there is still a "comfort zone" when working with target audiences. Many times we steer away from those groups/clientele that are outside of that comfort zone.” One panelist suggested that Extension should include programming for “people with special needs.”

Statement 47: Urban Extension educators do programs for the suburban populations. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree, only one rating was in the strongly disagree category. All other ratings were in
the mildly agree to strongly agree, with consensus being reached at the 95 percent level in agree (79 percent) and strongly agree. Although both groups are served, balancing the programming is difficult. “Struggles with the appropriate balance between urban and suburban. The majority of the metro population is suburban, but the "need" is urban.”

Allegheny County does not exclude suburban populations. 4-H horse clubs are predominantly in the suburbs. The majority of the Master Gardeners appear to be suburban. This is fairly typical of metropolitan Extension programming.

**Statement 48: Urban Extension staff maintains programming for traditional clients.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to agree. Consensus was reached in the categories, mildly agree and agree. This statement’s level of consensus dropped to 79 percent when one panel member withdrew from the study during Round II. Comments indicate that in urban counties the programming for traditional clients is less in amount than that for other clientele. However, the issue of “what is meant by traditional?” was raised.

Allegheny County educators had difficulty with coming to consensus on how to define traditional clientele. It was felt that the 4-H horse clubs were traditional clientele as were Master Gardeners and the home gardening public. The professional horticulturists have become the traditional clientele of the agricultural sector. The concept of traditional is context and time based. A discussion of the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) resulted in the current target population being
non-traditional clientele because the current population served includes many people in treatment centers compared to the free-living low-income individuals who have traditionally been EFNEP participants.

Statement 49: Urban Extension programs do not duplicate services provided by other organizations in the community. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Most of the comments were aligned with this one, “It happens occasionally, though staff make a good effort to cooperate rather than duplicate.” However, one panel member commented, “This is the area where the most work needs to be done in my opinion.”

Statement 50: Urban Extension educators use research-based information. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the agree and strongly agree categories. The single comment was, “that is our mission.”

Allegheny County educators see themselves as providing research-based information to their clientele. Deno De Ciantis, County Extension Director (CED), stated that this was one of the strengths that made it natural for Extension to take over the floundering 21st Century Learning Centers in three school districts. Lisa Janosko cited the use of research-based information, “We stick to USDA” when talking about what they teach. Brack Barr cited the value he places on being able to tell people that 4-H materials are research-based. “I can proudly say, there is no other youth-serving
organization that has the project material, proven, researched materials, that work to
teach kids and I pull out the book, while the things we have that are developed by
college professors are not developed for college professors.”

Statement 51: Urban Extension educators involve representatives of target populations in program planning. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Only one rating was outside of the agree categories. The single comment was, “I do.”

Statement 52: Urban Extension educators use program planning processes that are inclusive. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Comments ranged from, “I do” to “Limited diversity of clientele and advisory groups impact program planning.”

Statement 53: Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are holistic. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. The single comment was, “I do.”

Statement 54: Urban Extension educators use program planning that is based on the realities of the urban environment. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged
from mildly disagree to strongly agree. The two comments were, “I do,” and “Many times the approach that is used is based on statewide recommendations that are not applicable or effective for urban program planning.”

Statement 55: Urban Extension educators develop programs based on the positive attributes of the community (assets based) instead of the deficits. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Comments indicated, “Growing trend -- especially in the human resources program areas. Not sure in the more traditional areas.” However, another panelist commented, “There are times when the deficits are considered so that the programs can be relevant to the needs.”

Statement 56: Urban Extension educators use program planning that crosses academic and program boundaries to address community issues. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Comments indicated that the situation varies based on the individual educator, the type of program, and the state / local culture. In one case, “We still program based on traditional programming areas - FCS, Ag, 4-H/Youth.” While others indicated, “It really depends on individuals and the issues they are working on. In some cases there are examples of excellent cross-disciplinary work.”
Statement 57: Urban Extension educators use the logic model in program development. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Comments indicate that the logic model is used by 4-H / youth development educators.

Statement 58: Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Comments indicate that this is an area where growth is needed, “We COULD be much more of a catalyst.” “There are some areas where this is true, but not overall.” There is the issue of magnitude, “While one may say that they strongly agree, the magnitude of change is only as much as resources can allow and in urban extension that tends to be lean.”

Statement 59: Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The issue of magnitude and resources was raised as it was in statement 58.

Statement 60: Extension is a catalyst for environmental change in urban counties. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Again, the issue of magnitude was raised. Another panelist shared, “more so in the past than now.”
Statement 61: Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. The single comment was, “Though not sure all would acknowledge that.”

Statement 62: Urban Extension educators address family issues, such as financial challenges, health, nutrition, disruption of the family structure, parenting, and issues of aging. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree with all but one rating in the agree and strongly agree categories.

Allegheny County has both the EFNEP and Pennsylvania NEP nutrition programs and has a fairly broad outreach to lower-income adults and youth. These programs are done in many settings, including church groups, substance-abuse rehabilitation centers, county agencies, schools and out-of-school programs. The Family and Consumer Sciences educator teaches child-care provider training (Better Kid Care and Keystone Stars), parenting and kinship care for grandparents raising grandchildren, and leadership in the Master Parent Leadership program.

Statement 63: Urban Extension educators address environmental quality, such as air and water quality, brownfields, development of green space, and landscaping. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists
responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the agree and strongly agree categories. The single comment was, “Less work in this area because of limited staffing and staff changes.”

Allegheny County’s horticulture and natural resources program is focused on enhancement of the environment through landscaping. There is an emphasis on expanding the variety of plants used in local landscapes. Mike Masiuk works with the commercial horticulturists to increase their professional skills, especially in the area of integrated pest management (IPM). Sandy Feather writes for the Pittsburgh Post Gazette and trains Master Gardener volunteers. The focus is primarily ornamental horticulture.

Statement 64: Urban Extension educators teach job preparation skills. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at the same level in the mildly agree and agree categories and in the agree and strongly agree categories. The two comments were, “Not a significant, consistent focus” and “in some cases.”

Both the Horticulture and FCS units in Allegheny County teach job preparation and enhancement skills. The commercial horticulture programs focus on improving the skills of professional horticulturists. Pesticide applicator training is required to maintain a pesticide applicator license and Extension staff provides this training. The arborist training for youth interns is another example of job preparation training. FCS provides child-care provider training in Allegheny County.
Statement 65: Urban Extension educators address economic development.
Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the mildly agree and agree categories. The two comments were, “Depends on how economic development is defined.” and “This is a huge area and requires significant expertise to have real impact in urban areas.”

Penn State Extension of Allegheny County has programs that enhance the economic environment of the county, but do not specifically address economic development as a program focus. This Extension office does not currently have a community development educator on staff.

Statement 66: Urban Extension educators address community development.
Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. There were two comments. “While one may say that they strongly agree, the overall impact is directly affected by the amount of resources brought to bear in an environment where magnitude may drown out even very effective programming.” “Community Development is often neglected due to a lack of programming resources.”

Statement 67: Urban Extension educators extend their outreach through volunteers. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly
agree with consensus achieved in the agree and strongly agree categories. Although one comment dealt with the fact that volunteers are difficult to get, most of the comments were typified by, “Here's one of the real strengths of Extension.”

4-H club advisors and Master Gardeners are the two strong volunteer groups in Extension in Allegheny County, although Brack Barr (Youth Development) stated, “Let me talk about the hard stuff first and get that out of the way. I think like most people it is getting volunteers.” Despite this statement, there is a large group of volunteer club advisors. Nancy Crago (FCS) has trained volunteers for the Master Parent Leadership program.

Statement 68: Urban Extension educators provide train-the-trainer programs for professionals. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree with 95 percent of the ratings in agree and strongly agree. “Our experiences have shown that a modified train-the-trainer strategy that includes monitoring for quality and ongoing support is far more effective than straight train-the-trainer professional development.” A single negative comment dealt with working in high poverty areas, “Hard to implement in hi stress areas.”

In Allegheny County Nancy Crago (FCS) does train-the-trainer programs in parenting as part of the Master Parent Leadership program. Some of the horticulture programs train the managers and unit leaders and these individuals go back to the job and train others, although this was not conceived as a train-the-trainer program. The
Master Gardener program is in many aspects a train-the-trainer program. Master Gardeners are trained to teach others in both one-to-one and group sessions. Susan Taylor trains school teachers on the use of several 4-H projects for school enrichment.

**Statement 69:** Urban 4-H targets urban youth who have multiple risk factors. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Comments indicated that this is happening and that more could be done. Even when staff is not trained for this, there are other ways of achieving it. “Staff is not always equipped, but does a good job of working with/through other agencies.” The following issue was raised for all of the urban 4-H statements, “Your statement, Urban 4-H is misleading. Extension uses traditional 4-H. However, the urban educators modify the programs to make them relevant for the urban youth.” The statements were modified for Round II to read, “urban 4-H / youth development.”

**Statement 70:** Urban 4-H effectively programs with both urban “at-risk” youth and suburban, low-risk youth. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The outreach to specific audiences varies by location. In one large city cited by a panelist, “All of our 4-H youth development outreach is with inner-city youth, most all at ris,” while in other areas both populations are targeted. A comment pointed out a misconception in the statement, “Many of the
suburban youth are at greater risk in some of our communities.” It may be important to consider that in some cases of programming, “as well as interested youth.” The statement was modified for Round II.

Statement 71: The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H youth programs reflects the diversity of the youth population. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Comments indicated that this should be a goal and that programs strive “to be inclusive,” however one panelist stated, “We are still working within our comfort zone with 4-H/Youth adult leadership. We need more diverse adult leadership.”

Statement 72: Urban 4-H programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interest, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. One possible solution presented, “that is why we partner with agencies.”

Statement 73: Urban 4-H gives youth, especially teenagers, a significant voice in the programs offered. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Focusing on the present, two panelists commented that with limited staffing it is difficult to reach teenagers. However, as one panelist wrote, “This helps keep them interested.”
Statement 74: Urban 4-H programming includes exploring careers.
Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Two comments were presented. “This depends on how this is approached on a local level.” “Very helpful.”

Statement 75: Urban 4-H uses authentic civic involvement to provide a setting for developing skills such as writing, public speaking, networking, collaborating, teamwork and leadership. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the mildly agree and agree categories with more than twice the number of responses in the agree category. The single comment was, “Limited opportunities.”

Brack Barr (Youth Development) spoke of the herb-growing project at Westinghouse High School in Allegheny County. The youth were involved with actually growing herbs and selling them. Skills enhanced by this program included public speaking when selling the product, networking in the restaurant and retail grocery businesses, working as a team, and developing leadership as each youth shared in leadership roles.

Statement 76: Urban 4-H provides opportunities for youth to experience mentoring or apprenticeships to enhance technical, personal and social competence. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly
agree. Consensus was reached prior to the withdrawal of a panelist in Round II. The consensus level is therefore at 79 percent after removing that panelist’s rating. The consensus was in the categories of mildly agree and agree. The single comment was, “This is key to their future.”

Allegheny County’s Youth in Government and arboriculture program are examples. Youth in the Government project had the opportunity to shadow a county government employee and learn through a very short apprenticeship situation. The arboriculture training provided the youth with an opportunity for youth to serve as apprentices with employees of the Pittsburgh Park Conservancy.

Statement 77: Urban 4-H provides enrichment programs during school.

Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was in the mildly agree and agree categories. No comments were provided.

Several of the units of Penn State Extension of Allegheny County are conducted as school enrichment programs. EFNEP and PANEP have components in the school. Susan Taylor (Youth Development) focuses a significant portion of her programming on school enrichment programs. The most popular projects are chick embryology and IPM.
Statement 78: Urban 4-H provides out-of-school time programs. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree with 90 percent of the ratings equally split between the agree and strongly agree categories. The single comment was, “that is our focus.”

Brach Barr’s (Youth Development) work is primarily in out-of-school programs. He works with Boy Scouts, Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCA, YWCA, and church youth groups. Susan Taylor (Youth Development) supervises the 21st Century Learning Centers program in three school districts. This after-school program focuses on improving school attendance and classroom performance through an intensive after-school program.

Statement 79: Urban 4-H uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. There were no comments.

Statement 80: Urban 4-H uses service learning as an authentic way of connecting youth to their community through interdisciplinary, collaborative, engaged learning. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to agree, with nearly two-thirds of the ratings being agree. The single comment was, “Service is a component.”
4-H Youth Development in Allegheny County uses service learning in programming. The arborist training program includes hands-on activities such as tree planting and pruning. Each year the students in the 21st Century Learning Centers do a service project. The Teens and Greens project includes service-learning activities. 4-H Horse Club members have repaired stables and riding facilities at two county parks.

**Statement 81: Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. One panelist stated that this is limited while another shared that this is achieved by, “working with other youth-serving organizations.” Staff expects more emphasis on service-learning as a result of a new state specialist being hired to focus efforts on this learning method.

**Statement 82: Urban 4-H staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Eighteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Reflecting the range of ratings, the comments ranged from, “Not very often,” to, “One of our true strengths!”

**Statement 83: Urban 4-H shares 4-H program materials with staff of other youth-serving organizations.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached prior to the withdrawal of a panel member during Round II. The resulting consensus level is 79 percent in the categories of mildly
agree and agree with two-thirds of the responses in the agree category. There were no comments.

4-H projects and curriculum materials are freely shared with collaborating organization by the youth development staff in Allegheny County. Brach Barr commented, “they wouldn’t admit it sometimes.” This sentiment was again stated during the discussion of how 4-H projects are taken off the Internet and used without giving recognition to Extension as the developer of the materials.

Statement 84: Urban 4-H partners with other youth-serving organizations. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. The single comment was, “so much more could be done.”

Statement 85: Urban 4-H uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Commenting panelists all agreed that the club format is not always appropriate. A typical comment was, “While we use the club format for some outreach, we have had positive experiences with special interest groups and individual youth participating in programs. Clubs require ongoing management and support.”

Statement 86: Urban 4-H works with a wide diversity of youth, including those of different races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, and physical and mental abilities. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists
responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the agree and strongly agree categories. There were no comments.

Much of the youth development outreach in Allegheny County is done through schools and youth-serving organizations. These include programs that reach Native American youth, and youth from a wide variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds due to the high level of diversity of the Pittsburgh metropolitan area. Youth with a variety of mental abilities are included in the 21st Century Learning Centers, although youth that are highly disruptive are dismissed from the program.

Statement 87: Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The single comment was, “Opportunities for information are available via Internet for those with access. However, this does not mean that ALL individuals seeking our assistance have access to us 24/7.”

Statement 88: Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. There were no comments.
Statement 89: Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners’ ability to solve problems and make decisions. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. There were no comments.

Statement 90: Urban Extension educators use transformative learning methods to help learners examine the assumptions on which, and the frame of reference within which, their decisions are made. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the mildly agree and agree categories. There were no comments.

Statement 91: Urban Extension educators use a variety of learning techniques, such as self-directed learning, group learning, peer teaching, and collaborative learning techniques. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the agree and strongly agree categories. There were no comments.

Allegheny County educators appeared to be well trained in adult learning principles. This was especially evident in the programs described by Nancy Crago and Mike Masiuk. Nancy talked about group learning. Mike has developed technology-based learning tools that provide the option of self-directed learning as well as group learning. Mike’s work in shrub identification and integrated pest management was an example.
Statement 92: Urban Extension educators use service-learning to enhance participants’ learning. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the agree and strongly agree categories. There were no comments.

Horticulture was presented as the prime example in Allegheny County. The Master Gardeners do a significant amount of service learning in such projects as the maintenance of display gardens, answering horticultural questions, and teaching classes. These learning opportunities are called volunteer payback, but include significant service opportunities.

Statement 93: Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. There were no comments.

Statement 94: Urban Extension educators minimize the use of the expert model in teaching. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Eighteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. There were no comments.
Statement 95: Urban Extension uses formative evaluation so improvements are possible as programming is developed and delivered. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the mildly agree and agree categories. There were no comments.

Statement 96: Urban Extension’s program evaluation measures multiple competencies, such as social, emotional, behavioral, cognitive, and/or decision-making. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the mildly agree and agree categories. There were no comments.

Allegheny County educators address multiple competencies when appropriate and that is often in the more in-depth programs. The Master Gardener program evaluates social, behavioral, cognitive and decision-making competencies. All of the listed competencies are evaluated in the 21st Century Learning Centers as part of the grant requirements. The University of Pittsburgh is doing the evaluation. The intensive nature of the effort impacts not only the cognitive and behavioral issues, but also improves social interactions, emotional factors especially in the theatrical program, and decision-making in connection with decisions related to life style choices such as reduced smoking, drug use, criminal activity, and other problematic behaviors. EFNEP measures behavioral and cognitive change, but also touches upon social issues and decision-making.
Statement 97: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. There were no comments.

Statement 98: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes changes in critical thinking and problem solving. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. There were no comments.

Statement 99: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes social impacts on the community. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the mildly agree and agree categories. There were no comments.

Allegheny County staff believes that social impacts only occur sometimes. This may be due to the limited and programmatic-based evaluation that is done. Many of their programs have the potential to have social impacts. Youth Development programs may produce social change, but this is difficult to measure because this requires a long-term approach to evaluation. The Steel Valley Cancer Coalition is an example of a program that has resulted in social changes in the community. With Penn State Cooperative Extension of Allegheny County bringing organizations together to address issues such as parenting, childcare, and youth development, the fact that organizations and governmental agencies are working together is a social impact.
Statement 100: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. There were no comments.

Findings: Round II

The results reported are based on responses of 20 panel members to the Round II instrument. The Round II instrument contained 74 statements. Consensus was reached on 20 statements. Consensus was reached when 80 percent of the responses fell within two categories on a six-point Likert-type scale. Table 4.2 contains the descriptive statistics for each statement in Round II. The panel members were asked to comment and support their ratings in the space provided with each statement. The panel wrote 411 comments during Round II. Written comments led to the creation of one additional statement and the modification of 11 statements. The researcher’s reflexive panel again provided input in the rewording of existing statements and writing of new statements using the panel’s original wording where possible. All comments from Round II are provided in Appendix H. The Round III instrument is displayed in Appendix F. Data from the case study are included with statements on which consensus was reached. Table 4.2 follows.
Table 4.2

Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) County Extension programs are adequately staffed to fulfill their mission based on the size of the county's population.</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) County Extension programs are staffed based on program areas that address current county needs and issues.</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods as well as specific subject matter training.</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have a background in community development.</td>
<td>3 5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development.</td>
<td>4 6</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation.</td>
<td>5 7</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Urban Extension educators are at ease in working with diverse audiences.</td>
<td>6 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

Table 4.2 Distribution of Ratings of Significance by Delphi Panel for Each Item on Round II – frequency, mean and standard deviation. (Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8) Urban Extension educators are at ease working in urban settings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Urban Extension educators welcome diversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) State specialists, in subject areas pertinent to urban programming, have adequate understanding of urban issues to work effectively with urban Extension educators to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) State level Extension administration provides adequate resources for effective urban programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14) Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Urban Extension office/s are located within the urban core.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Urban Extension has multiple offices in strategic locations in the county.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of collaborating organizations.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Urban Extension staff maintains positive working relationships with governmental funding partners.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for sustaining base programming in the four program areas.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Urban Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21) Urban Extension offices seek effective funding partnerships with other agencies of the federal government, such as the Dept. of Health and Human Services, Dept. of Education, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, and Dept. of Defense.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Urban Extension offices work toward adequate funding by seeking to increase both traditional and new sources of funding.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if there are plans for sustainability of programs when this funding ends.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Urban Extension offices effectively market their programs.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Extension has &quot;brand name&quot; recognition in urban areas.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round II and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27) Urban Extension offices are responsive to clients' needs and attitudes when marketing programs.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30 24</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) Urban Extension targets clientele with relevant messages and programs.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32 25</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33 26</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) Urban Extension offices effectively report program impacts.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34/3727</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32) Extension has a state and federal system to effectively report urban program impacts.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>NA 28</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data).</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35 29</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36 30</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35) Urban Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs.</td>
<td>38 31</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the impact of the programs they supports.</td>
<td>40 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37) Urban extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program planning.</td>
<td>41 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program evaluation.</td>
<td>42 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted populations.</td>
<td>43 32</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs.</td>
<td>44 33</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41) Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure.</td>
<td>45 34</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42) Urban Extension educators focus on those populations with the greatest identified needs.</td>
<td>46 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43) Urban Extension programs do not duplicate services provided by other organizations in the community.</td>
<td>49 35</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44) Urban Extension educators involve representatives of target populations in program planning.</td>
<td>51 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45) Urban Extension educators use program planning processes that are inclusive.</td>
<td>52 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46) Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are holistic.</td>
<td>53 36</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47) Urban Extension educators use program planning that is based on the realities of the urban environment.</td>
<td>54 NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(continued)
Table 4.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48) Urban Extension educators develop programs based on the positive attributes of the community (assets based) when addressing identified needs.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49) Urban Extension educators use program planning that crosses academic and program boundaries to address community issues.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50) Urban Extension educators use the logic model (i.e., resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts) in program development.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51) Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52) Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53) Extension is a catalyst for environmental change in urban counties.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item’s corresponding number in Round I and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54) Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach.</td>
<td>61, 40</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55) Urban Extension educators address community development.</td>
<td>66, 41</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56) Urban 4-H / youth development targets urban youth who often have multiple risk factors.</td>
<td>69, NA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57) Urban 4-H / youth development effectively programs with both urban and suburban youth.</td>
<td>70, NA</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58) The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H youth development programs reflects the diversity of the youth population.</td>
<td>71, 42</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59) Urban 4-H / youth development programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interest, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation.</td>
<td>72 43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60) Urban 4-H / youth development gives youth, especially teenagers, a significant voice in the programs offered.</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61) Urban 4-H / youth development programming includes exploring careers.</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62) Urban 4-H / youth development uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education.</td>
<td>79 44</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63) Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk.</td>
<td>81 45</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Round I</th>
<th>Round III</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64) Urban 4-H / youth development staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65) Urban 4-H / youth development partners with other youth-serving organizations.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66) Urban 4-H / youth development uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67) Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68) Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods.</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69) Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners' ability to solve problems and make decisions.</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70) Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Round</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71) Urban Extension educators minimize the use of the expert model in teaching.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0% 5% 10% 35% 40% 10%</td>
<td>2 7 8 2 4.40 0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72) Urban Extension's program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0% 11% 11% 16% 58% 5%</td>
<td>2 3 11 1 4.37 1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73) Urban Extension's program evaluation includes changes in critical thinking and problem solving.</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0% 11% 0% 33% 50% 6%</td>
<td>2 0 6 9 1 4.39 1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74) Urban Extension's program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5% 10% 0% 25% 50% 10%</td>
<td>1 2 5 10 2 4.35 1.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and III. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Statement 1: County Extension programs are adequately staffed to fulfill their mission based on the size of the county’s population. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The majority were in the categories strongly disagree and disagree. Most of the comments related to the current situation where urban Extension county offices are understaffed. However a few of the panelists questioned the focus on the present by the majority of the panelists. The most pointed comment was, “Based on the focus on the future for this round, I’m not clear now on this question and wonder if people are looking at it the same way I am. My rating is based on thinking that to some extent staffing should be based on population. More importantly, it should also be based on community needs.” The issue of community needs was raised by others and resulted in the rewording of the statement for Round III to read, “Urban county Extension programs are adequately staffed, based on the size of the county’s population and the community needs, to fulfill their mission.”

Statement 2: County Extension programs are staffed based on program areas that address current county needs and issues. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Several comments addressed the need to be focused on emerging needs, such as …”Staffing should include current and future needs.” Different patterns of staffing also were mentioned by different panelists. “…it is necessary to have variations in terms of numbers and focus areas in the urban counties.”
“In the future we MUST staff according to the needs of the community – not our
traditions.” Based on these comments, the statement was changed for Round 3 to read,
“Urban county Extension offices have flexibility in staffing that allows them to address
current and emerging issues.”

Statement 3: Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the
application of sound educational theory and methods as well as specific subject
matter training. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20
panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly
agree. Many of the comments indicated that currently Extension educators are more
prepared and capable in their subject matter than in educational process skills. A
representative comment was, “We generally focus on subject matter expertise versus
process, audience, and educational theory understanding.” Comments such as, “These
personnel need to be strong in collaboration and network building, grantsmanship, and
marketing” and “Subject matter less important than leadership, facilitation, methods,
etc.” led to adding the following statement, “Urban Extension educators have a strong
background in skills needed for working in urban settings, such as human relations,
grantsmanship, coalition building, mass media, and marketing.”

Statement 4: Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have
a background in community development. Consensus was not achieved on this
statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses
ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments on this statement referred
to the current situation as well as what should be the reality. Because of statements such
as, “I think that most Extension educators are very much aware that their role is to connect with communities, but only a specialize[d] few have actual community development training or experience, the statement was reworded for Round 3 to read, “Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have an understanding of urban community development concepts and practices.”

Statement 5: Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments primarily focused on what the situation is currently while expressing the need for this skill. An example was, “This is a training deficit that needs improvement.” One panelist optimistically stated, “This is fixable. The resources are out there to train and make this work.” Another panelist was emphatic in response, “I see leadership development as a much more integral focus for Extension educators than with community development.”

Statement 6: Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree with most ratings in the agreement categories. The need for this skill was commonly expressed. “This is a key skill for any educator, no matter what the discipline.”

Statement 7: Urban Extension educators are at ease in working with diverse audiences. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly
agree with 85 percent in the agree and strongly agree categories. A few panel members expressed that this ease varied, “…with their exposure to diverse audiences as well as their formal training and field of study.” One panelist expressed a connection with this statement to statements 5 and 6, “This is very important and closely linked with skills in leadership and facilitation, the stronger these skills the easier it is to work with diverse groups.”

Educators in Allegheny County appeared to be at ease working with diverse audiences. The educators expressed ease with a wide diversity of audiences and they spoke of working with people of races other than their own race in a very matter-of-fact way. The only example of a race of people who were not represented as a specific target population was Latinos. Nancy Crago stated, “There is a Spanish population. There is a group and they are very assimilated.”

Statement 8: Urban Extension educators are at ease working in urban settings. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree with 75 percent of the ratings in agree and strongly agree. Based on comments about some urban settings being “too challenging” or “too dangerous” and that some urban settings are more “comfortable” than others, the statement was changed for Round 3 to read, “Urban Extension educators are at ease working across the wide range of urban settings.”
Statement 9: Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments indicate some improvement, but more panelists stated that much more staff diversity is needed with comments such as, “What does it say about us that we are not able to attract a diverse staff in diverse communities.” The challenge of reflecting the diversity of the community with Extension’s small urban staff numbers was mentioned twice.

Statement 10: Urban Extension educators welcome diversity. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree with the consensus reached in agree and strongly agree categories. “It is an important criterion for success in urban counties,” was a typical comment.

The educators in Allegheny County state that this is current practice in their county. An example on this was in the programming of Brack Barr (Youth Development), an African-American who is providing programming in shooting sports with youth in cooperation with the National Rifle Association. Brack commented on this project, “I have found that in an urban area, I know it is an old cliché, but you have got to think outside the box. You don’t look at any project and say, “no I don’t think that will work.” The minute you say that you will find somebody or a group that can do it.”
Statement 11: State specialists, in subject areas pertinent to urban programming, have adequate understanding of urban issues to work effectively with urban Extension educators to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Comments were rooted in what currently exists and the comments generally reflected a lack of urban experience and understanding in most state specialists. One future-oriented comment was, “A bold stroke would be to explore different configurations of state specialists. Are there other faculty members, other colleges or other campuses that should be providing resources for urban programming?” Another panel member shared, “Here in Hennepin County we have actually used monies formerly dedicated to Extension to collaboratively hire a University/County liaison person to actively promote sustainable relationships between the two organizations throughout both…not just Extension.”

Statement 12: State level Extension administration provides adequate resources for effective urban programs. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments were varied with some reflecting understanding of the wide array of pressures on Extension administration for resources, “This is critical but must be balanced with other needs” and others stating, “Not happening and likely will not in the near future.” A core issue may be, “Although I
don’t think this is the case, it is important. It has been very difficult to convince administrators and traditional clientele in times of dwindling resources that the political influence and power is becoming more urbanized.”

**Statement 13: Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. This was seen as essential, “This is essential if we are to adequately address urban issues,” it is seen as not adequately happening currently.

**Statement 14: Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Comments reflected that this is not currently happening other than in isolated cases. One comment explicitly touched on the need for administrative leadership and assistance in this, “Another admirable objective but it appears mainly left up to individuals to develop resources rather than administrators developing relationships of mutual benefit and formalizing collaborations.”

**Statement 15: Urban Extension office/s are located within the urban core.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *disagree* to *strongly agree* with 75 percent in the *agree* and *strongly agree* categories. Comments ranged from this being necessary, “How can we serve communities that we only ‘visit’” to not needed at all, “I like the
idea of taking Extension to the people, not vice versa!” Some comments expressed concern about accessibility and travel time, so the statement was changed to “Urban Extension office/s are strategically located within the urban core” for Round III.

Statement 16: Urban Extension has multiple offices in strategic locations in the county. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. The cost-benefit issue was frequently raised and the concern for limited budgets. The statement was changed to “Urban Extension has multiple offices in the county” for Round III.

Statement 17: Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of collaborating organizations. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. One panel member shared that this arrangement was, “very helpful” but went on to state that, “It’s not necessary forever…but it did help to strengthen the partnership and understand needs better.” At the other end of the range, “Working together is more important than being housed together.” In general comments reflected that it would be good in specific instances, but not generally needed.

Statement 18: Urban Extension staff maintains positive working relationships with governmental funding partners. Consensus was achieved on this statement at the 90 percent level in the categories agree and strongly agree. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to
strongly agree. This was seen as essential, yet challenging, “Extremely important but training should be provided to assist offices. The climate has become very competitive so we must continue to improve.”

The relationship between Penn State Cooperative Extension and Allegheny County government appears to be improving. Joe Cantanese, Chief of Staff for the Office of County Council, stated, “We don’t take adequate advantage of Extension’s programs. The Council didn’t understand Penn State Cooperative Extension in Allegheny County…. By Deno coming to the Council budget meeting, it is an opportunity for the council to see what Penn State Cooperative Extension does.” Joe Cantanese continued, “It is all about relationships. National Family Week is not just PSU, but other outside organizations. It brings all these groups together. As Chief of Staff, I come to listen. I can then help with the county to connect to the others and their expertise. It is a good opportunity to have input and to build relationships.” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) commented, “Deno has really positioned himself and our whole program where we are seen as a more active part of the county and doing some partnering with other county departments.”

Statement 19: Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for sustaining base programming in the four program areas. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments indicated that this is not currently the case, but only a few stated it should be. “Agree with
statement that urban programs SHOULD be adequately funded with public funds, to be
successful, however, the reality is and will continue in the future that private funds will
be critical in complementing public contribution.”

Statement 20: Urban Extension offices charge user fees for programs that
provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming.
Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to
this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree with 75
percent rating this statement as mildly agree and agree. Comments ranged from user
fees being inappropriate to appropriate. The comment that this should not only be for
urban Extension resulted in rewording this statement for Round III as “Extension
offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized
or customized programming.”

Statement 21: Urban Extension offices seek effective funding partnerships
with other agencies of the federal government, such as the Dept. of Health and
Human Services, Dept. of Education, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development,
and Dept. of Defense. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20
panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to
strongly agree with 75 percent of the responses being agree to strongly agree. The
agreement focused on the concept of this being done at the state or federal level, not at
the county level. “If we could have a more cohesive statewide approach, this would be
an excellent opportunity.”
Statement 22: Urban Extension offices work toward adequate funding by seeking to increase both traditional and new sources of funding. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. “It is a matter of survival” was a representative statement.

Statement 23: Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if there are plans for sustainability of programs when this funding ends. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to mildly agree with consensus achieved in the categories disagree and mildly disagree. Some panelists pointed out that not every program requires sustainability. Others felt that quality program for a justifiable need would ultimately get additional support. Other panelists saw the need for sustainability when working in certain situations, such as, “The impact on clientele when programming stops due to loss of funds can be significant. We need to insure that there is some mechanism in place to continue programming efforts, especially when working with at-risk or low income clientele.”

Staff in Allegheny County concurred. Nancy Crago (FCS) stated, “That depends on the program.” An example of one project where sustainability is built into the grant is their new Community Food Project where food will be raised to sell. It has a strong business plan for sustainability of the project. Susan Taylor (Youth Development) stated, “Sometimes you can meet some immediate needs of your clientele.”
Statement 24: Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. A concern was expressed about “mission creep” while other panel members called for a reexamination of the mission. “Yes, but be sure that the mission is not interpreted in the context of only supporting "traditional" programming.”

Statement 25: Urban Extension offices effectively market their programs. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Many of the comments focused on what is currently done and the barriers to more effective marketing, while also stating that this is needed for the future.

Statement 26: Extension has “brand name” recognition in urban areas. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments focused on the current situation and the need for change in the future.

Statement 27: Urban Extension offices are responsive to clients’ needs and attitudes when marketing programs. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree with 85 percent being in the range of mildly agree to strongly agree. Comments concurred that this is a needed effort.
**Statement 28:** Urban Extension targets clientele with relevant messages and programs. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded this question. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree, with consensus in the mildly agree and predominantly in the agree category. “We have to improve our targeting and understanding of clientele needs” is a representative comment. One panel member saw a need to improve with “prospective” clients.

Allegheny County educators agreed. Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture) shared one of his marketing strategies, “We are using the Internet more to e-mail announcements out. For some of the workshops where we had to limit it to 20 or 30 people we threw the carrot out there that you will get the e-mail before the people who get snail mail.” Mike added, “I like to think we are getting a little smarter about how we are marketing.” Nancy Crago (FCS) targets clientele in social service agencies with electronic announcements as well as sending flyers.

**Statement 29:** Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Current challenges were the focus of most comments, however, one panelist stated, “Mass media is the key to marketing, "brand name recognition" and informing public.” Another panelist cautioned, “Media may not always be the best method. For example a physical presence and word of mouth can be important also.”
Statement 30: Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The comments indicated that this is a need and that urban county staff struggle with it. One panelist recommended, “We need a strategy and targeted clientele groups to be really effective.”

Statement 31: Urban Extension offices effectively report program impacts. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. “Effectively reporting impacts I think has been one of Extension's significant challenges...we should have appropriate techniques and tools to develop and measure relevant outcomes/impacts for Extension to be successful (competitive and fund-worthy) in the future.” The focus of most comments was on the need to improve.

Statement 32: Extension has a state and federal system to effectively report urban program impacts. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Eighteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Some panel members reported that their state had a uniform statewide reporting system while others stated their state does not. “Uniformity would be helpful” according to one panelist while another cautioned, “Separating out urban impacts could be a good thing (e.g. communication with urban legislators) - or it could
be divisive. We need to think through how to effectively use impact data.” To clarify the statement it was modified in Round III to, “Extension has a statewide system to effectively report urban program impacts.”

Statement 33: Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data). Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments indicated that this would be useful, but not widely done. “Must do a better job of reporting impacts including those stories that show the "human" side of what we do. Anecdotal evidence is useful despite what some may say. Combined with quantitative data, these "stories" can build a very strong case for programming impact.”

Statement 34: Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This was seen as an area for improvement and constrained by lack of “staff, time and resources.” Another panelists’ statement provided a good summary of the thoughts of others “As a whole, we are not properly trained in the effective collection and use of quantitative data.”

Statement 35: Urban Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. A few states require this, however other states require “outcome
measures.” Because of the statement that all Extension should do this, this statement was modified in Round III to read, “Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs.”

**Statement 36: Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the impact of the programs they support.** Consensus was achieved on this statement in the categories of *mildly agree* and *agree* as well as in *agree* and *strongly agree*. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *disagree* to *strongly agree*. This is increasingly required “by funders at all levels” and one panelist stated, “If impact is happening, then funders will respond with funding.”

One program that Joe Cantanese, Chief of Staff for the Office of County Council, remarked on was Allegheny County’s Youth in Government program. He believes the impacts of having youth see government in action first-hand are so positive that he has pushed to have the program duplicated in school districts in the county.

**Statement 37: Urban extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program planning.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *disagree* to *strongly agree* with consensus reached in the *mildly agree* and *agree* categories. Comments indicated that, “This is a ‘should’…if we are talking about meeting needs, then we need to engage our audiences and not just assume…” However, one panelist questioned, “I’m not clear on how this would be reported.”
Nancy Crago (FCS) sees this being done in Allegheny County depending on the type of program. She stated, “It depends on the level of programming. Often the participation may be from the organizations with which we are networked giving ideas and developing programs with us.” Brack Barr did speak of youth participating in the development of self-specified projects.

**Statement 38: Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program evaluation.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree with consensus achieved in mildly agree and agree categories. This was seen as needed as a way to “add credence to our programming with stakeholders and local governments.” During the focus group in Allegheny County, the educators said they occasionally included community participation in program evaluation, but did not share any examples.

**Statement 39: Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted populations.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Comments indicated that this is important, “but difficult to report.” One panelist requested, “Define increased empowerment.”

**Statement 40: Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree.
agree. This was seen as not happening as part of the planning process and if happening, “seems to be more gut feeling.” Another issue raised was, “Seems to be a focus now but we don't have good tools to know how to do it with social type programs.”

Statement 41: Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments varied widely from, “We are far from a nationally uniform accountability structure. Is it even desirable?” to “It would certainly help improve our national impact if we could compare 'apples to apples’.”

Statement 42: Urban Extension educators focus on those populations with the greatest identified needs. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree with consensus reached in the mildly agree and agree categories. Those panel members who commented were generally not in agreement with the statement. An example is, “I am not sure this should be the focus...we should be 'extending' the resources of the University to all residents, but with an emphasis on those with the greatest need.”

Targeting the populations with the greatest needs was done, “Sometimes, mostly.” It also was stated that, “It depends on the program.” In horticulture Mike Masiuk talked about developing programs based on the people on his advisory committee. “I found when I first started off you pick the cream of the crop, the more progressive, and I found that I was getting the high end of what is out there. I think we
were doing programming geared toward that and we weren’t doing the beginners.”

When he and his advisory committee discussed this, his target changed to address the needs of the landscape workers. The 21st Century Learning Center project is targeted toward youth who are not doing well in school and helping these students improve their school performance. EFNEP targets low-income youth and families with children.

**Statement 43: Urban Extension programs do not duplicate services provided by other organizations in the community.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. “I don't see how you can't avoid some duplication, however it generally occurs because services are not adequately delivered” indicated that the need usually exceeds the supply of programs. We may not be duplicating, but being duplicated, “Seems to me that more try to duplicate us.” To make this statement clearer, it was modified in Round 3 to read, “Urban Extension programs do not unnecessarily duplicate services provided by other organizations in the community.”

**Statement 44: Urban Extension educators involve representatives of target populations in program planning.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *mildly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Consensus was reached in the *agree* and *strongly agree* categories. A panelist asked, “Do we involve enough decision makers though?” A prime example of this is the Steel Valley Cancer Coalition in Allegheny County. It was described as, “Program is focused on breast cancer and is volunteer driven.”
Statement 45: Urban Extension educators use program planning processes that are inclusive. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree with consensus reached in agree and strongly agree categories. Although there was strong agreement, there was recognition that, “it is hard to do.” Another panelist challenged, “We must increase our input especially with minority groups. We tend to rely too much on groups and individuals from populations with which we are most comfortable.”

Educators in Allegheny County have a very positive attitude toward including others in program planning. Nancy Crago (FCS) stated, “This is something we strive for. There is always room for improvement, but this is our goal.” She commented during a staff meeting, “Fast Break for Fathers and Families’ will be planned and presented with other county agencies.” She also shared, “We do a lot of collaborating; a lot of networking and some partnerships. This month, the 4th week of November, is National Family Week. That is a year-round thing, but we have some things targeted for this month with local organizations coming together to plan activities and to promote it throughout the month of November.” Mike Masiuk (Horticulture) commented about ongoing programming with Phipps Conservatory, “It was nice because the best part about the cooperative effort was that we were able to do things that there is no way we would do by ourselves.”
Statement 46: Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are holistic. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. “We must move beyond our approach of programmatic areas in program planning. Many times our programs would show more impact if we were able to use a holistic approach rather than traditional programming.”

Statement 47: Urban Extension educators use program planning that is based on the realities of the urban environment. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the agree and strongly agree categories. Although there was consensus, one panel member commented, “I have noted in a number of instances, rural successes have simply been imported to the urban area without the same level of success.” Another panelist alluded to the idea that there may be multiple realities with the comment, “if there is an agreed-upon way to determine those realities…” Deno De Ciantis (CED) in Allegheny County stated emphatically, “yes, otherwise, we would be out of business.” An example of this understanding is the use of a specific type of goats housed on a county farm park as a way of involving inner-city youth in animal science projects. Talking about urban youth, Brack Barr (Youth Development) commented, “Our kids can be [there at] different times and lead them and show them, and they won’t buck and run from people.” Brack provided another example, “I am working with a high school not far from here in what we call our junior MANRUS program…. MANRUS, the acronym
stands for Minorities in Agriculture and other Natural Resources. It started at a meeting at Michigan State where people started saying, ‘there are not enough minorities that understand a future with a degree in agriculture.’ Thinking another way, maybe we can expand the term minority, saying there are a lot of people who grew up in a city that know what you can with a degree in agriculture and even know how much agriculture you can still do in a city.”

Statement 48: Urban Extension educators develop programs based on the positive attributes of the community (assets based) when addressing identified needs. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the categories, mildly agree and agree. There was only one comment and the panelist shared, “I’m not sure I understand this.” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) in Allegheny County interpreted her agreement as, “We start where people are and then do programs that move them to where they want to go.” Brack Barr (Youth Development) provided an example in the herb project at Westinghouse High School where an old unused greenhouse was rehabilitated. The project will involve the school’s Business Academy and biology program to raise and sell herbs.

Statement 49: Urban Extension educators use program planning that crosses academic and program boundaries to address community issues. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. The comments indicated, “this should be the case” and “essential.” A new project in Allegheny County exemplifies
this trend in Extension. “We often have programs that address needs of both adult and youth programs. The food security program has both components, just addressed in different ways.” This Community Food Project will include horticulture, community development, nutrition, and youth development.

**Statement 50: Urban Extension educators use the logic model (i.e., resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts) in program development.**

Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. “Other than 4-H YD I don't believe most Extension staff are aware of the logic model.” Another panelist indicated that it [the logic model] “needs to be properly taught.” As a result of the comment, “This is unclear” the statement was changed in Round 3 to read, “Urban Extension educators use the logic model (planning programs by considering resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts) in program development.”

**Statement 51: Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties.**

Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. “It would be nice to affirm this but without partnerships and collaboration it is very difficult to accomplish in an urban area.” The potential is there, as stated, “Not like it could be!”
Statement 52: Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Being a catalyst for economic change, “is limited by the ratio of programs to population.”

Statement 53: Extension is a catalyst for environmental change in urban counties. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in mildly agree and agree categories. One comment indicates that this is happening while another states it is, “limited by the ratio of programs to population.”

Educators in Allegheny County agreed that this happens especially through the Master Gardener Program and Commercial Horticulture programming. The two demonstration gardens result in considerable exposure according to Sandy Feather (Consumer Horticulture), “I do get an awful lot of feedback from people whether it is people who visit us there while we are working or people who read the sign that identifies us as cooperative extension gardens and they can get in touch with us if they want to or need to. We do get calls and comments and e-mails. People stop by. I do think they are valuable for people. It is hard to get a handle on it because they are both in public parks, but we figure somewhere around 15,000 people a year see those plants.” Sandy’s weekly gardening column in Pittsburgh’s Post Gazette also has considerable impact. Mike Masiuk’s (Commercial Horticulture) plant programs have
impacted the variety of plants used in Allegheny County and the variety of those grown in local nurseries. “We thought that people were using the run-of-the-mill plants and they weren’t using the newer cultivars. The nursery industry was growing that because that was what people were asking for. It was a merry-go-round. So we thought maybe we could make an impact on that. We started putting on plant material classes like 3 days on shrubs and 3 days on perennials and we brought in what we thought were top-notch speakers.”

**Statement 54: Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. The one panelist who commented thought, “This may be true, but many programs are targeted at client needs which are not necessarily related to community development.”

**Statement 55: Urban Extension educators address community development.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Urban Extension is, “mostly like a small fish in a very big lake” but another panelist states, “This is a future growth area.”

**Statement 56: Urban 4-H / youth development targets urban youth who often have multiple risk factors.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in mildly agree and agree categories with most
responses in agree category. One panelist objected to the term “urban 4-H.” Another panel member commented, “this is a clientele group that many agents do not feel comfortable working with.”

The three 21st Century Learning Centers in Allegheny County are targeted toward youth with multiple risk factors that impact their success in school. All three programs are in communities where the level of unemployment and poverty is high. Most of the after-school youth development programs also are in urban settings with youth from low-income families.

Statement 57: Urban 4-H / youth development effectively programs with both urban and suburban youth. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree with consensus reached in mildly agree and agree categories. The issue of resources to do this was raised. One panel member commented, “Extension educators must have the ability to adjust programming to meet the needs of both groups.”

This statement resulted in a lively discussion between the Allegheny County educators.

Brack: I think so.
Nancy: I don’t know we are as effectively programming with suburban youth. I think we are stronger in urban youth.
Brack: I think we are pretty strong. The only thing that makes us weak is where we go.
Nancy: Well maybe that is what I mean. We aren’t really out in a lot of the suburbs are we, except for the school programs.
Brack: The key word is lot. We are not in a lot of suburbs and that has to do with two people covering the county.
Deno: How do we define suburban? All of our 21st Century School programs are in suburban schools. All of our horse projects are in suburban areas. So, suburban in that they are not the City of Pittsburgh.
Brack: Living in a county that is heavily industrial. The word suburban doesn’t mean the same here as it does in other places. A lot of our suburban areas are just little Pittsburghs. If you look at the Mon Valley, these are industrial centers that have gone bust because the manufacturing centers are gone. You don’t see the neat little white picket fences. Indeed when the mills were there you didn’t see them because the air was polluted by discharge from the local mill. I think we do, but our suburban kids are not the middle class or upper middle class suburban kids.
Nancy: I guess the key word is effectively. The resources we have in terms of human resources limits us.

Statement 58: The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H youth development programs reflects the diversity of the youth population. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Comments indicated, “Here’s where we are lacking.”

Statement 59: Urban 4-H / youth development programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interest, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. There was only one comment, “This would be ideal.”

Statement 60: Urban 4-H / youth development gives youth, especially teenagers, a significant voice in the programs offered. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the mildly agree and agree categories.
Brack Barr (Youth Development) agreed. “I think we do. They choose what project they want to do and we have the project called the “self-determined project” so if you look at the long list of projects we have and there is something they are doing in the community and they want to make it 4-H, we would put it under that. Then as soon as possible we would try to include an overall plan, what is the management of the club or of the particular project.”

Statement 61: Urban 4-H / youth development programming includes exploring careers. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly agree to strongly agree with 75 percent of responses in the agree category.

Statement 62: Urban 4-H / youth development uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Seventeen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. The only comment was, “Don’t really know.”

Statement 63: Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. “If we chose to, 4-H could compete successfully for funding traditionally going to "prevention" programs. Often we are doing the same thing, just using different language.” Another panelist stated, “In conjunction with youth-serving organizational partners.”
Statement 64: Urban 4-H / youth development staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. “So much more could be done.”

Statement 65: Urban 4-H / youth development partners with other youth-serving organizations. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. “Partnership is essential. Extension is not the only game in town.”

Statement 66: Urban 4-H / youth development uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Most commenting panel members did not support the club format. One stated, “We need to come up with several different models not just the 4-H club model….Way too restrictive.”

Statement 67: Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. This may depend on the program with, “some programs much better than others.”
Statement 68: Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. The one comment was, “When it is appropriate and technology is available.”

Statement 69: Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners’ ability to solve problems and make decisions. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Eighteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. There were no comments.

Statement 70: Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. “We could certainly increase our role in research. This could be enhanced by collaboration with urban universities.”

Statement 71: Urban Extension educators minimize the use of the expert model in teaching. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. One panelist commented, “There is no single method of teaching that suits all. Extension Educators try to understand their audiences and figure out the best possible method to use.”
Statement 72: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. The question of what empowerment means was again raised by a panel member.

Statement 73: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes changes in critical thinking and problem solving. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Eighteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the mildly agree and agree categories. There were no comments. The educators in Allegheny County concurred without any discussion.

Statement 74: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Panelists indicate this is a need and that Extension must improve, “Sometimes but we must become better at this.”

Statement 75: Please comment on the process. “Had to keep reminding myself that this is a future question. Pretty cool though.” “Seems long and tedious. Many questions similar. Sometimes it is obvious that different members of the group are interpreting statements differently -- that may be inherent in this type of process.” “Thought provoking!” “Very interesting, and enlightening but sometimes unclear.” “Very good set of statements. It is hard to stay focused on what needs to happen versus
what is currently happening.” “Seems that panel members are responding as assessments of what is, not how important that indicator is for a successful urban extension office. My comment is based not as much on ratings, but on the comments panelists submitted. Please clarify for all, again, thanks.” “This is a very long process and requires a great amount of time.” “long!”

**Findings: Round III**

The results reported are based on responses of 20 panel members to the Round III instrument. The Round III instrument contained 55 statements, including one new statement suggested from the comments of panel members. Consensus was reached on 37 statements. Consensus was reached when 80 percent of the responses fell within two categories on a six-point Likert-type scale. Table 4.3 contains the descriptive statistics for each statement in Round III. The panel was asked to comment and support their ratings in the space provided with each statement. The panel wrote 330 comments during Round III and these are displayed in Appendix I. Data from the case study is included with all statements whether consensus was reached or not. Table 4.3 begins on the next page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Urban county Extension programs are adequately staffed, based on the</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>size of the county's population and the community needs, to fulfill their</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Urban county Extension offices have flexibility in staffing that</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allows them to address current and emerging issues.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of sound educational theory and methods as well as specific subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matter training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Urban Extension educators have a strong background in skills needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for working in urban settings, such as human relations,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grantsmanship, coalition building, mass media, and marketing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and II. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

Table 4.3 Distribution of Ratings of Significance by Delphi Panel for Each Item on Round III – frequency, mean and standard deviation.
Table 4.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5) Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have an</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding of urban community development concepts and</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Urban Extension educators are</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trained in leadership development.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Urban Extension educators are</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trained on group facilitation.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Urban Extension educators are</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at ease working across the wide range of urban settings.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population.</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) State specialists, in subject areas pertinent to urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programming, have adequate understanding of urban issues to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work effectively with urban Extension educators to provide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate programming for urban audiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and II. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11) State level Extension administration provides adequate resources for effective urban programs.</td>
<td>12 12</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.</td>
<td>13 13</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming.</td>
<td>14 14</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Urban Extension office/s are strategically located within the urban core.</td>
<td>16 15</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Urban Extension has multiple offices in the county.</td>
<td>17 16</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of collaborating organizations.</td>
<td>18 17</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for effective programming in the four program areas.</td>
<td>20 19</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and II. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18) Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming.</td>
<td>21 20</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) Extension seeks funding for urban programming from other agencies of the federal government, such as the Dept. of Health and Human Services, Dept. of Education, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, and Dept. of Defense.</td>
<td>23 21</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Urban Extension offices work toward adequate funding by seeking to increase both traditional and new sources of funding.</td>
<td>25 22</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension.</td>
<td>27 24</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) Urban Extension offices effectively market their programs.</td>
<td>28 25</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) Extension has &quot;brand name&quot; recognition in urban areas.</td>
<td>29 26</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and II. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24) Urban Extension offices are responsive to clients' needs and attitudes when marketing programs.</td>
<td>30 27</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing.</td>
<td>32 29</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing.</td>
<td>33 30</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) Urban Extension offices effectively report program impacts.</td>
<td>34 31</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) Extension has a statewide system to effectively report urban program impacts.</td>
<td>34 32</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29) Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data).</td>
<td>35 33</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30) Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data.</td>
<td>36 34</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31) Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs.</td>
<td>38 35</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and II. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32) Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted population.</td>
<td>43 39</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33) Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs.</td>
<td>44 40</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34) Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure.</td>
<td>45 41</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35) Urban Extension programs do not unnecessarily duplicate services provided by other organization in the community.</td>
<td>49 43</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36) Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are holistic.</td>
<td>53 46</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37) Urban Extension educators use the logic model (planning programs by considering resources, activities, outcomes, outcomes, and impacts) in program development.</td>
<td>57 50</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and II. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Table 4.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Percentage and Frequency Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rounds</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38) Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39) Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40) Urban Extension educators use community development as an</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underlying concept for all Extension outreach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41) Urban Extension educators address community development issues.</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42) The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H / youth development</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programs reflects the diversity of the youth population.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43) Urban 4-H / youth development programs are provided by persons (paid</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of common characteristics such as interests, culture, racial/ethnic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background, gender, or sexual orientation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and II. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item # Rounds</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree 1</th>
<th>Disagree 2</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree 3</th>
<th>Mildly Agree 4</th>
<th>Agree 5</th>
<th>Strongly Agree 6</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44) Urban 4-H / youth development uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education.</td>
<td>79 62</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45) Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk.</td>
<td>81 63</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46) Urban 4-H / youth development staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development.</td>
<td>82 64</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47) Urban 4-H / youth development partners with other youth-serving organizations.</td>
<td>84 65</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48) Urban 4-H / youth development uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs.</td>
<td>85 66</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49) Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities.</td>
<td>87 67</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50) Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods.</td>
<td>88 68</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and II. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.

(Continued)
Table 4.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51) Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners' ability to solve problems and make decisions.</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52) Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community.</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53) Urban Extension educators minimize use of the expert model in teaching.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54) Urban Extension's program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered.</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55) Urban Extension's program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Bolded items achieved consensus. Column two represents the item's corresponding number in Round I and II. Likert-type scale responses rates represented by percent over frequency.
Statement 1: Urban county Extension programs are adequately staffed, based on the size of the county’s population and the community needs, to fulfill their mission. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The comments indicate a general agreement that staffing is not adequate, although the term “adequate” may be interpreted in many ways. “This is very important but there can be many interpretations of ‘adequately staffed’.” Basing staffing on a combination of population and identified need was indicated. “It is important that there is some proportionality in the staffing pattern in order to reach the high population density areas of the state. Staffing should not just look like the rural areas.” “Staffing according to population size AND community needs is essential.” Opinion varied on the staffing patterns. “In urban areas what is a traditional Extension definition is totally inadequate and the type of positions we have must be innovative and responsive to the real needs of the urban setting.” “Besides funding availability being a major factor in program staffing, it has to do also a lot with extension losing its focus by not considering their efforts towards those 4 program areas where they have proven their success over the years. Change is important only when it brings prosperity but to change focus and program staffing for short-term gains can be risky business and may hurt extension rather than help extension programs for the long run. For extension to succeed, it cannot depend on temporary workers and volunteers to do some of the primary functions of extension work. Extension programs go through a long process and their continuity needs permanent extension staff.” One panelist reminded us of the
population pattern shift and that there may be common issues for urban and rural. “In our state, there has been a significant shift of population from rural areas to urban, according to the 2000 census. If we think that staffing should follow population, then the current shift of Extension staff from rural to urban areas just hasn't happened. It needs to now and especially in the future. And, if you look at needs, it is increasingly evident in my state that needs seem to cross rural/urban lines and complex issues such as immigration of minority populations are impacting both. Programs developed for urban target populations are increasingly appropriate for rural populations.”

Nancy Crago (FCS) in Allegheny County responded to the original statement of there being all four program areas. “That is not happening right now” in Allegheny County. There is no Community Development educator. The Family and Consumer Sciences educator provides leadership education and strategic planning programming, but this is not the primary focus of her programming. “We also do some work in leadership development, both individual and organizational. So we are involved in doing some strategic planning and facilitation for a couple of organizations; and some board development stuff. So we are doing a lot of community development kinds of activities, but its tough when you don't have a person who is specifically dedicated to that programming area. So, you can only have so much impact.”

Deno De Ciantis then commented on the revised statement as listed in Round III. “We have never been adequately staffed.” The County Extension Director indicated the educator to population ratio is approximately 1:180,000. He continued, “At what point does it become impossible to provide a certain level of penetration to the market
of your service? At some point it becomes impossibility. So then you have to begin changing your programming methods and your outreach methods and how you do everything just to have the coverage.”

“Should we be adequately staffed in all program areas? Yes, because there is an identified need in all of the program areas in our county. I can tell you now the state couldn’t afford it.”

Statement 2: Urban county Extension offices have flexibility in staffing that allows them to address current and emerging issues. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at the 80 percent level in the categories agree and strongly agree. “Flexibility” was commonly mentioned in the comments. “It is necessary for urban extension offices to have flexibility in staffing if they want to succeed in this competitive world. We do not have the flexibility today but this has to improve in the future.” One possible option was, “In my State, Extension is shifting to a more regional educational service base...in addition to county base of service delivery.” Another panelist posed the issue of flexibility as either flexibility in positions or, “staff that are flexible in how they interpret their responsibilities.” No matter what the solution, it is based on funding, “Local governments will not have an interest in funding positions that are not representative of their needs. This will require changes in the manner in which we currently make decisions.” This statement was not discussed in the Allegheny County focus group, however, Deno De Ciantis (CED) commented on the issue of flexibility during an interview. He said, “And to try to be
flexible to the changing landscape; be it political, be it fiscal, be it whatever; to be in a position where you are not strapped into doing things a certain way and to feel that it is okay to do things differently. To not do some things at certain times and to do other things at other times. So, I think that is important to have particularly in urban work because it can change pretty quickly. If you don't have that flexibility, I think you are in for some real difficult personal challenges.”

Statement 3: Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods as well as specific subject matter training. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. However, 79 percent of the responses were in the agree and strongly agree categories. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. There were no comments, however the following comment written for statement four seems to apply here. “The perception is that urban clientele are more "savvy" and thus require a higher degree of expertise in program presentation. With this in mind, Extension Educators must be on the front line of educational theory AND application.” Nancy Crago (FCS) responded, “I felt they should. You can always be trained. The issues keep changing.” Deno De Ciantis (CED) commented about Brack Barr (Youth Development), “Brack would say that is more important in 4-H anyway. He is an expert in anything you want because he can call up the university and answer just about anybody’s question. To a certain degree, just about anybody can – we have a link to the university. You can become a master of just about anything there from a subject matter perspective.” Some may argue that this is true in Youth Development but not in areas
such as horticulture, however, Mike Masiuk related how he had to retrain early in his career in Allegheny County. “I, being in Allegheny County, looked at where the industry was, went into ornamentals; working with greenhouses as well as with landscape, the green industry. That was somewhat of a retraining. My degree was in fruit and vegetable science. I worked with Siebenthaler’s Nursery a year before I moved here. That was where the industry was in this county and I started doing program in that area. A lot of the programs were my own in-services. I was there to learn it at the same time.”

Statement 4: Urban Extension educators have a strong background in skills needed for working in urban settings, such as human relations, grantsmanship, coalition building, mass media, and marketing. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Eighteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 83 percent in the agree and strongly agree categories. “These are critical skills for a successful urban agent.” One panelist singled out the media role, “The Extension agents of the future will need to be very savvy in media skills and will have to depend on the media to get their messages out.” Comparing this statement to statement #3, a panelist wrote, “These areas are more important than educational theory.” With a focus on the future, “More work needs to be done in training staff in coalition building and the use of media and marketing. We need to leverage resources more than ever before and we need to get the
One panelist expressed that the need for these skills may vary, “Their skills needed for working in urban settings vary with their field of expertise and their experience.”

In Allegheny County there were examples of each of these skills. Nancy Crago (FCS) and Deno De Ciantis (CED) have been successful in networking and building coalitions. Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture) has developed expertise in the use of the Internet and electronic marketing of his programs. Both Sandy Feather (Consumer Horticulture) and Cynthia Javor (Food and Nutrition) have columns in Pittsburgh’s Post Gazette. Deno De Ciantis and Brack Barr both have educational backgrounds and experience in human relations. All of the educators have experience in grant writing and management.

**Statement 5: Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have an understanding of urban community development concepts and practices.**

Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree with consensus reached in agree and strongly agree. “This is so important for future development of Urban Extension Services.” “Most of our programs should be built on these concepts.” One panelist expressed that, “Urban Extension Educators have an understanding of urban community development but their degree of understanding would depend largely on their experience in this field or area and their field of expertise.” Another panelist stated, “If they do not have this understanding when hired, the organization should make training available to new employees.”
The educators in Allegheny County agreed that an understanding of community development was needed. Deno De Ciantis (CED) stated, “everybody needs to have at least an awareness of it and understand the implications of it in their program area in the context of community development. The stuff we are doing with the community food security project, we have one eye on the subject matter and there is the other eye on what impact it is going to have on the community.”

**Statement 6: Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Eighteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at the 95 percent level in categories agree and strongly agree. The comments were consistent in stating, “Leadership on the community level can be the key not only to effective programming but is also a key component in overall effectiveness.” “These skills are critical for success.” One comment had several points, “Urban agents are working in the most complex field setting in Extension and therefore should be a ‘pool’ for organizational leadership in the future. It is important that urban agents have leadership skills as they are expected to work/lead groups/coalitions to meet organizational objectives. Extension should have organized leadership programs locally.” Educators in Allegheny County agreed with Nancy Crago (FCS) saying, “absolutely!”

**Statement 7: Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus
was reached at the 95 percent level in categories agree and strongly agree. The comments were consistent in stating that group facilitation skills are important. “Urban extension educators must have this skill. It is prerequisite for any program planning and implementation.” “Urban agents are put into a facilitator role in many collaborations and each should have these skills.” “As our communities continue to grow and our resources stay level, the increased use of group facilitation will be vital to our continued success.” A few of the panelists commented on the need for continual improvement, “Staff are good at this but probably don't keep up to date with the latest techniques or how to fine tune their current skills.” “This is another important component of an effective professional that has not been addressed systematically enough.” Allegheny County staff agreed and again stated, “absolutely!”

Statement 8: Urban Extension educators are at ease working across the wide range of urban settings. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at the 90 percent level in the categories of agree and strongly agree. “A basic truism of urban life is that it is diverse and dynamic not a monoculture and static.” “They must be aware of the diverse working opportunities in the urban setting.” “I believe most are and they have to be to be successful. Otherwise we have little creditability.” One panelist saw a need in a specific area of urban life, “Most are not trained enough to be comfortable in high profile situations.”
When this statement was read during the focus group of educators in Allegheny County, they simply laughed and said, “yes.” It appeared so obvious to them as to be laughable. During an interview Brack Barr (Youth Development) shared, “I've spent so many years working here, that I looked up one day and I knew a lot of people. I knew the mayor of the City of Pittsburgh before he even thought of getting involved in politics, and on down. Generally, if you say you want to do something with this group, I know somebody somewhere.” Deno De Ciantis (CED) said, “I grew up in Pittsburgh, so by definition I am urban.”

**Statement 9: Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 90 percent in the categories agree and strongly agree. Comments reflected the need for diversity of urban personnel. “We will never serve citizens well, if we cannot recruit and support a diverse (in many ways) staff. If we can't find people to hire and provide a responsive workplace; how could we expect to attract the interest of citizens with diverse needs for whom we provide no salary.” “Perception is reality. We must be a diverse faculty in order to work in the urban environment. If not we have little credibility.” A panelist pointed out a reality that Extension faces, “This would be an ideal objective, but if staff is already limited other skills tend to get priority. We must be aware of what community leaders and supporters value.” With increasing urban diversity, “This is really a moving target for my state as immigrant populations are constantly changing.”
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The staff of Allegheny County indicated, “Yes, it should.” Concerning the Allegheny County staff, Deno De Ciantis (CED) stated, “I think we are pretty good. I think we are a heck of a lot better than most of the other counties. When you compare our staff as a whole, we pretty closely approach the demographic breakout.” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) pointed out, “I notice it when working with kids, often the racial balance is different in the community for under 18 than for adults. Duquesne is an example, if you look at the adult population compared to youth, it is very different.”

Statement 10: State specialists, in subject areas pertinent to urban programming, have adequate understanding of urban issues to work effectively with urban Extension educators to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in categories agree and strongly agree. Comments were varied. “This is often not a top priority of specialists. They are so focused on subject matter that the location is very secondary.” Focusing on the future, it was stated, “We must have the state level backup via specialists to assist us in the development and presentation of programming that meets the needs of our target clientele.” One panelist indicated, “It is important that specialists give leadership to the total organization. They should be expected to be able to contribute to the urban agents in a useable, effective way. It may mean extra training on their part, but it’s important.”
The educators in Allegheny County agreed that this should be. Susan Taylor (Youth Development) explained, “They should, but they don’t. Sometimes I think that is because urban Extension educators are a minority compared to the statewide Extension educator population – a small audience. But our clientele is way bigger. So when they just listen to me and I say we need this and this and this, they don’t see it as a big area they need to work on.” Nancy Crago (FCS) added, “I think if we approach them, most of the time they are open to working with us. Whether they always take the initiative to say, I would like to talk to you about how I can work with you on urban audiences is another story.” Deno De Ciantis (CED) commented on the current situation. “In some program areas where there is an understanding of ‘urban-ness’ we take advantage of that, but most of them don’t have a clue. You can get subject matter support and if you can separate that out, you are okay.”

**Statement 11: State level Extension administration provides adequate resources for effective urban programs.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Seventy-nine of the responses were in the *agree* and *strongly agree* categories. Several of the comments were similar to this one, “Urban programming needs to be a complete partner in the program. Although I don't think this is the case, it is important. It has been very difficult to convince administrators and traditional clientele in times of dwindling resources that the political influence and power is becoming more urbanized.” “More than 80 percent of our population live in urban areas of the state, but we certainly don't have 80 percent of the
resources. Probably less than 10 percent of the resources...so that does not demonstrate a conviction or understanding. We need to get to where administrators understand we must fund where the people/clients are....” “Extension will have to adequately fund urban Extension programs if Extension is to survive into the foreseeable future.” “I simply do not see the commitment yet of resources to Urban Extension in my State as future population shift continues from rural to urban areas or as populations age differently depending on geographical areas.” A few panelists who wrote comments put some responsibility back on the urban staff. “Working as a real partner with local government will help to make this possible.”

Nancy Crago (FCS) in Allegheny County stated, “we have support verbally, but they don’t always put the resources behind the words.” Continuing in this line of thought Susan Taylor (Youth Development) felt, “The other thing is I think in Pennsylvania we are not seen as a leader in youth development. I blame a lot of that at the state level. When stakeholders or whomever you want to call them come to the table, 4-H is not invited. YMCA, the Scouts and others and we are not seen as a part of that.”

**Statement 12: Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Consensus was reached at 90 percent in the categories *agree* and *strongly agree*. The complexity of modern issues is cited, “Because the problems are so diverse with our clientele this must be our vision for the future.” Another panelist
addressed the land-grant mission with, “That is the land-grant philosophy and should be implemented so that more of the resources of the university can be brought to bear on key issues.” A few challenges to this reality were raised, “Another admirable objective but it appears mainly left up to individuals to develop resources rather than administrators developing relationships of mutual benefit and formalizing collaborations.” “I just haven't seen the commitment yet for Extension to tap into the larger University resource base. Appears to be unfortunate 'turf' issues to be dealt with.”

Deno De Ciantis (CED), Allegheny County, responded, “Yes, we should use the entire university. Can we – that’s another question.” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) added, “This happens in very limited areas. I think there are some things in nutrition.” Deno De Ciantis continued stating the barrier to this happening is, “how to get resources out of the college (agriculture) and invest it in other colleges to get them to provide a level of support….There is a kind of movement now to embrace the mission of the land-grant university. They are contending that they are not, across the board, living up to the expectations of the land-grant, you know the engaged university. The extent to which Extension actually gets anything out of that is up in the air. Professors can do anything they want to engage the community in outreach. It is convoluted and complicated.”

Statement 13: Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming. Consensus at the 90 percent level was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded. The responses ranged from mildly
disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in the categories agree and strongly agree. Many statements support this concept. “They can and should be viable resources for urban programming.” “I see an increasing commitment to working with other Universities.” “Where mutual goals exist, there should be coordinated programming efforts.” One reason it should be done is, “Urban residents view local universities as their most suitable resources. It is important that we make the connections to work with urban universities.” Some issues concerning this statement included the following statements. “Although the identity problem is real, we must remember that we have been in place conducting outreach much longer than other units within our systems. We need to step-up and take the lead rather than be the follower.” “Commendable but largely left up to individuals instead of having administrative links.”

The staff in Allegheny County stated, “We do.” They further felt this is appropriate. A few examples were given and Nancy Crago (FCS) pointed out that the work was, “not collaborations so much, but networking and sharing.” An issue of “turf” was mentioned by Deno De Ciantis (CED), “child care training is very convoluted in this county with different players. It was very ‘incestuous.’ It was kind of a lock by a number of people who have some pretty high profile leadership in this area. It is very strange because they are all connected through the University of Pittsburgh with a specific faculty member.” However, Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture) pointed out a very positive working relationship with Chatham College where he is an adjunct faculty member.
Statement 14: Urban Extension office/s are strategically located within the urban core. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus at the 85 percent level was achieved in the agree and strongly agree categories. While one panelist stated, “we must be close to where the people are” another disagreed, “With technology and our focus on outreach to the communities, the location of the office is not as important as it has been.” Two panelists expressed a similar statement, “It is true sometimes and that is Extension's goal but it is not practical sometimes due to forces beyond Extension's control.” Another panelist stated, “We need multiple offices - many of our urban counties are diverse in their demographics AND geography. Multiple offices will allow us to meet the needs of all our clientele not just the suburban or inner-city.”

The Penn State Cooperative Extension of Allegheny County is located in the City of Pittsburgh and they believed this to be important. The office is located in a building with several county agencies, including 911 emergency response and Head Start. The office is not in the commercial / retail center of the city, but approximately six miles from the downtown shopping and entertainment center.

Statement 15: Urban Extension has multiple offices in the county.
Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. A comment shared in Statement 14 and this one concur, “Yes, this should be a priority. Again we must have a presence close to the population. We need to be creative in thinking about
offices in schools, other agencies, shopping malls, post offices, etc. Places where people
go for other business.” A panelist shared a different view, “Again, I think it is how we
serve audiences that is more important than where we are located.” The cost issue was
seen as a restraint by two panelists, “It would be unwise use of Extension money to
have more than one office.” Although agreeing with the statement, a management issue
was shared, “It is a challenge to "manage" satellite offices, but they have many
advantages.”

The Allegheny County educators indicated that they do not have satellite offices,
but that it would be positive. They pointed out what they perceived as formidable
drawbacks, “it is an incredible expense” and “that doesn’t really get us to where we
want to be and who is going to staff them?” “We don’t have adequate staff for one
office, let alone other offices. If we were to do it right, we would have one office where
we are now and at least three others because of the county and the population centers.

From my observations, their 21st Century School project has office space in each
of the participating schools. The staff did not see that as an “Extension office” but as
“21st Century” offices.

Statement 16: Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of
collaborating organizations. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen
of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to
strongly agree with 78 percent of the responses in mildly agree and agree. Very
moderate support was indicated for co-located offices by statements such as, “Not really
necessary but may be useful. Could be an answer to rising costs of delivery” and “This
is true only on very few occasions.” Many concerns were raised. “Staff must be adept at positioning Extension and maintaining an identity while working collaboratively with others.” “In theory this is good, but there are some challenges in maintaining our identity if we are not careful. Branding will continue to be a key role for urban offices.”

Susan Taylor (Youth Development) of Allegheny County commented, “actually, we collaborate with some of the people in the building now. EFNEP especially. The 21st Century staff has offices in the school buildings. Deno De Ciantis (CED) responded, “But those are single programs. I would see the co-location as an office for the general public, not just that program.”

**Statement 17: Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for effective programming in the four program areas.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. Comments in support of the statement include, “I think it is important to have all program areas in an urban setting” and with a qualification, “Yes, this should be a goal...but it may not need to be evenly distributed across the four areas. It should be flexible so money flows to where the needs are greatest.” Another approach was shared, “I don't think we'll continue to want to think in "4 program areas". Do these program areas reflect the language or interest of local and state governments and if not, why would they want to fund them. We will need to define program areas as state and local priorities if we are to be successful.” Multiple
Panelists commented on the funding source and this was representative, “Public funds are an important component of urban program funding but must be combined with other sources in order to support the total program.”

In Allegheny County the response was, “Not happening.” Deno De Ciantis (CED) explained, “The educators are employees of Penn State and Penn State pays their salaries and benefits. Many of the other staff are hired on grants and contracts. We have had as many as 33 and it has dropped down to 28. It varies with funding cycles. We have had good experiences with getting funding though the county and on our own.” One educator went so far as to suggest, “I think increased funding from our legislators - mandated! We have some funding, but we need more.”

Statement 18: Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. “We are already doing this with several of our programs. It certainly offers us an opportunity to recover costs.” Multiple panelists saw this as an approach for the future, “This will become more important in the future.” Another perspective was, “People are willing to pay for information/education that they feel will benefit them. Too often we are not willing to even ask.” Cautionary comments were stated. “It will be important to work with other organizations to ensure that a fee does not limit a specific audience’s participation.” “Though we need to guard against doing too much of this so that we don't have time for the public good work.” The strongest negative response was, “I am against the user fees
because I have seen over the years how some programs became so expensive. Extension programs will not be able to serve all people. Only on a few occasions maybe!"

The first response in Allegheny County was, “That is a state policy.” Deno De Ciantis (CED) stated, “It is interesting. We are part of outreach now. We are sort of connected to the same structure as continuing education, which is profit driven. They must generate the revenue to keep themselves going. We are now beginning to look at a model that is closer to that, where we are looking at a model based on user fees. We are already getting money from the public, so this is a constant discussion. How much user fees? What is the threshold whereby the tax dollars quit supporting the program and user fees start supporting the program. Those are very complicated questions for us….Should we? I say no. Do we and do we have to, yes.”

To this, Susan Taylor (Youth Development) prodded, “This asks about a specific personalized and customized situation.” The conversation then got heated over whether consultations to traditional farm operations were being charged user fees. It was assumed that farmers do not pay the fees and that it is targeted toward more urban audiences.

Susan Taylor continued, “Okay, Nancy does Better Kid Care training for child care sites. There is a site at Children’s Hospital that works with severely handicapped youth. If they came to Nancy and asked her to do a specialized program just on working with their handicapped audience, should she be charging extra for that?” Deno De
Ciantis responded, “Would she? Probably. Should she? I would argue no. However, she is charging for the regular ones.” Susan: Yes, but minimum. It is not covering her time.”

Deno continued, “Cindy did a training on nutrition for a corporation and their staff. This was a specific program for nutrition and health. We set up a whole thing and we charged them and they agreed to it. But how that differs from the Extension agents who want to deal with the farm cooperative or the dairy cooperative or the Christmas tree growers or the forestry people on how to log, I don’t know where the line is drawn. I think there is an issue relative to traditional and non-traditional Extension audiences and I don’t think there is a clear definition on this whole idea.” Susan replied, “I would agree with you that I don’t think it has been made clear.”

In an interview, Deno De Ciantis (CED) had framed the issue, “The bottom line is that at one time when we were able to do everything for free, now we are trying to determine how are we going to be able to squeeze a penny or a buck out of somebody; it is troubling because taxpayers are already paying to support us; maybe not at the level we need to have. So that is a struggle for us. So the resource piece is huge. Frankly, the only reason we are going to user fees is that we don’t have sufficient funds to keep the program going at the level that it is going.”

Susan Taylor described the situation in Youth Development programs, “this past year is the first year we had to charge. It is $20/classroom for school enrichment and $10/ member for a regular club member. So that has added a whole layer of bureaucracy and paperwork.”
Statement 19: Extension seeks funding for urban programming from other agencies of the federal government, such as the Dept. of Health and Human Services, Dept. of Education, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, and Dept. of Defense. Consensus was achieved at the 90 percent level on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in agree and strongly agree categories. Many comments contained qualifications. “This I think is a key to the future, but relationships and grant training will be needed.” “The seeking should be more systemic and sustainable rather than just grant writing.” “This is very important and we must learn to develop relationships with other governmental units. We often do what they are very interested in but we never make the connections!”

Allegheny County educators said, “We have done that.” However, Deno De Ciantis (CED) countered, “I think that whole issue happens at a higher level than the county level. I think that is where the ball has been dropped. When I was involved in the urban taskforce, there was an effort to get connected with all of these different federal departments to try to figure out a way to have them buy into the extension vehicle to provide services to the public. It has not been done in a coordinated manner.”

Nancy Crago (FCS) added, “We have funding from the department of aging, but that funding, because of the way it came to the state, could not come to the county. They could not give me a couple of thousand dollars for the work I did because of the
funding stream.” “The question is not so much the grant writing piece as sustainable funding. Are there opportunities for sustainable funding from the different departments to achieve their goals using our vehicle?”

Susan Taylor (Youth Development) interjected, “There is another problem involved here and often programs are so restrictive in the use of the dollars; whether it is the funds can only be used at the state level or at the county level. That HUD drug money that came was so restrictive that often it ties your hands and sometimes, it is just not worth the money.”

Statement 20: Urban Extension offices work toward adequate funding by seeking to increase both traditional and new sources of funding. Consensus was achieved on this statement at the 90 percent level. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in agree and strongly agree categories with the preponderance of ratings in strongly agree. “This must be a priority.” “Securing additional funds (from all sources) will be a major part of urban agents’ job responsibility.” Cautionary and qualification statements were shared. “Special grants should be used as supplement rather than core programming.” “What choice do you have if your traditional source is changing or shrinking and again this is most effective if all levels of the organization are working toward this.”?
The Allegheny County staff agreed, “Yes we do that.” Deno De Ciantis (CED) added, “We think that our position there is going to improve. We got a $15,000 increase for 2005, but we are looking at a marked increase request. We are trying to position ourselves so that next year when the county begins to climb out of their fiscal doldrums, we will be at the table and be able to significantly impact our budget.”

Looking at a new funding source, Brack Barr (Youth Development) said he will be, “getting involved this year with shooting sports. They (parents) contacted a local gun club that is kind of anxious to do a youth program. The gun club found out that the NRA (National Rifle Association) has monies for people who want to do a youth program. So we will take our expertise in working with youth and in developing that to work with the gun club.”

**Statement 21: Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Twenty of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in agree and strongly agree categories at an 85 percent level. Agreement with qualification was provided. “Must be flexible and broad in our definition of the mission of Extension. Often we forget how broad it really is.” “Provided there is a modern view of the mission of Extension.” “Yes, but be sure that the mission is not interpreted in the context of only supporting ‘traditional’ programming.” One panelist wrote, “If we are to establish ourselves in a competitive environment, it is important that our efforts support the organization’s mission. Otherwise, we will not be understood for who we are.” Another cautionary
comment was, “I understand that there may be some pitfalls in spreading our human resources too thin in areas that we are not really prepared to address. Should be on a county-by-county basis.”

The mission of Extension resulted in a lively discussion in Allegheny County. Deno De Ciantis (CED) asked, “What is the mission of Extension?” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) responded, “I think the mission statement that we have is so vague that it covers anything.” Discussion turned to the 21st Century Schools project and if it fit the mission. Deno stated, “In some ways we wouldn’t be getting into the 21st Century project if we weren’t providing service in running the program.” Susan retorted, “The main thing is the educational component…our mission is education and the youth program leads to productive, self-sustaining adults and that is within our mission.”

Deno continued, “I think we have decided not to go after certain grants. I think that within our office we have a certain parameter of expertise and programming that we feel confident and capable of doing. So we have gone with those instead of going for something in areas where we don’t have a lot of expertise.” Nancy Crago (FCS) added, “Also, within the state priority areas. Yes, just because money is available does not mean we are going after it.” Another educator stated, “The tobacco settlement money, we found out that we couldn’t do it as a county office, it had to come to the organization as a whole. What we would have to do, we weren’t set up for that.”
Susan pointed out a difference from rural areas. “There are other agencies that do what might be considered traditional extension programs in rural counties; here there are agencies that are already doing these programs and doing them better than we can. Like the food safety training that our health department is doing. We are not doing that because our health department is doing it.”

**Statement 22: Urban Extension offices effectively market their programs.**

Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at the 89 percent level in agree and strongly agree categories. Comments were quite aligned. “Marketing will be the key to our overall success.” Two panelists suggested further, “Each program area should have a ‘marketing’ component included within the program plan. Again, urban is a highly competitive environment and Extension needs the branding.” and “We must begin with understanding that Marketing is an integral part of our budgets...it is not an add-on.”

Focusing on the Allegheny County office in general, Nancy Crago (FCS) stated, “I think we have made great strides in the past couple of years. We have a lot of new marketing pieces. They have improved our image and we have more resources to do marketing and have improved our image.” “We have tried to elevate our image to make us more competitive for funding.”

Deno De Ciantis (CED) explained, “It is a double-edged sword. In the private sector, marketing means more customers, more customers means more revenue. More revenue means you can grow your business. Here, more marketing means more clients;
that means taking the resources we have and stretching them even further. So, when I sit down with our marketing people and say, 'we want a marketing campaign that raises the image and recognition of us, but doesn’t necessarily increase our usage,' they all laugh at me. If people know about you, people will want to use you.”

**Statement 23: Extension has “brand name” recognition in urban areas.**

Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Eighteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree*. The most affirmative statement was, “It is imperative for our future.” While others stated, “It does where we are providing relevant programming.” And one panelist stated, “This is a difficult challenge.”

The first things Allegheny County educators mentioned were specific programs, not the Extension office. “Yes to ‘Better Kid Care.’” “I would say some program areas, such as 4-H.”

Thinking of the whole office, “At the same time, whatever people access from us, they often don’t see the big picture. I run into people who say, “Oh, I have been to Better Kid Care training in your office, but I didn’t know you worked there too.” They don’t know the organization. The recognition of Penn State Extension of Allegheny County is improving, but does not have overall recognition.”

Portions of the population know Penn State Cooperative Extension. “There is a difference between users and non-users in recognition.” “Most people really aren’t concerned with the source of the information as long as they get information.”
There is name recognition when the organization is tied to the land-grant university. Brack Barr (Youth Development) shared, “When I say Penn State Cooperative Extension, they latch on to the Penn State and ask, do you work for the university? Well what branch are you at? I explain the whole Cooperative Extension movement, the act, everything. A lot of people say, ‘I have never heard of that before’.”

Even within the community of agencies marketing is difficult according to Deno De Ciantis (CED). “For many, many years nobody really knew who or what Extension was. I have spent a lot of my effort making connections throughout the governmental system of the county. And then, organizations and agencies; we started to make sure they all knew who we were. My staff, as they are going out into the community, made sure that they presented the fact that they were part of Penn State Cooperative Extension and there is that people-to-people marketing that happens on a regular basis.”

Deno shared the impact of a marketing brochure. “We did an impact report and had 2,500 to 3,000 of those printed and sent to high priority areas and people. We just had 11,000 of our new brochure printed that we are distributing to legislators, both senators and house members at the state and federal level to put in their waiting rooms and their offices. We sent them to our magisterial offices and are sending them to the county executive, the county manager, and county council so they put them in their waiting rooms.”
Other programs focus more on conventional marketing. Nancy Crago commented, “We cooperate, like if I'm doing a parent education program, I'll broadcast that to the Parent Education Network. Of course, with the National Family Week, all of the partnering organizations share their audiences.”

Statement 24: Urban Extension offices are responsive to clients’ needs and attitudes when marketing programs. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was at the 89 percent level in agree and strongly agree categories. “Important for the future.” “Our clientele are what we are all about. We must be sensitive to their diversity.” “This is important and could be helped along if the staff and volunteers are diverse and can identify some of the issues to be considerate of when marketing programs.” While one panel member stated, “Marketing programs can only be focused so much, not indefinitely for every client group.”

The Allegheny County staff stated that they are doing this and much was shared in the interviews and the focus group. The effort at the county organizational level was described by Deno De Ciantis (CED) as, “My most important role is as a relationship builder. All I do is establish relationships with people in places that make the most sense for us to have that as links. As they relate to government, as they relate to organizations and agencies, I am involved in a number of agencies in the community and serve on a number of boards. I have an opportunity to talk to people about Extension.”
At the level of each unit’s programming these examples were shared. “The classes are targeted toward home gardeners. We had talked about vegetable gardening, canning and preserving the harvest, turf gets a lot of play. We don't call it that, we call it ‘Have the Best Lawn on the Block,’ emphasizing cultural controls and so forth.

To market the EFENP, “we are always ‘on-the-prowl.’ We go to committee meetings and meet people. It is grassroots work, so we dig for it.

A large horticulture program has grown from the following tactic, “We use to mail out 10,000 brochures and we looked at the expenses and it is still the same x number of people coming to these. So, now we said that anybody that has attended one of these in the past 10 years is in the database and we will add people, but we are not going to continually mail to people who are not showing up.”

“We do brochures, like for the child care training. We develop a calendar and that is mailed to all of the registered and licensed persons. I do a separate mailing of our trainings. We have a collaborative calendar where all the training organizations do it. We have an Extension mailing to participants in our programs within the last year and to people who call and request.

A program targeted toward parent, “The national program, ‘What's a Parent to Do?’ is on bullying. Marketing it through the after-school sites. Fliers also are available for download from website.”

**Statement 25: Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing.**

Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *mildly agree* to *strongly agree*. Consensus
was reach in agree and strongly agree at 89 percent. This comment was typical of most of the others, “When marketing programs extension must use the media. Recognition is important and this can be achieved through the media.” One panel member posed the challenge of working in the media. “This is highly competitive and our agents who work in media must be skilled.”

The Allegheny County staff agreed that they all make efforts that vary in effectiveness. They also agreed that, “The urban media market is very difficult. If there is a fire or shooting, you don’t get your story covered.” “We provide the information, but they often don’t use it and we don’t follow up to see if they did or why they didn’t.”

Regular columns are effective. “We have two staff who write for the Pittsburgh Post Gazette. One, the nutrition article comes out in the food section every other Thursday. Both are done in a Q&A format. The gardening one comes out every Saturday. We get a pretty good bit of exposure because the articles identify the writer as a staff member and part of Penn State Cooperative Extension Allegheny County. It provides the phone number and the web link. From that perspective, we are getting a lot of pretty decent exposure there.”

In Allegheny county one tactic that appears effective for individual programs was shared by Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture), “we try to send the schedule to the garden writer at the Post Gazette and ask, ‘would you like to interview any of these people [speakers]?’ They are happy to do it and generally they will do a full page story
interview of one of the speakers and that will get a lot of interest when it runs a week or
two prior to the event. When we remember to meet the deadlines of *American
Nurseryman* and things like that we put it there.”

Media exposure can result in an avalanche of requests According to Deno De
Ciantis (CED). “Our challenge is that in the past a number of years ago, we had a little
radio program that was on gardening. It generated so much activity that the person who
was doing it backed away from it because it was too overwhelming.”

A mixed marketing approach can be successful. Sandy Feather (Consumer
Horticulture) shared, “This year I'm using my column to tell more people how things
went in the garden this year. I do get an awful lot of feedback from people whether it is
people who visit us there (a demonstration garden) while we are working or people who
read the sign that identifies us as cooperative extension gardens and they can get in
touch with us if they want to or need to. We do get calls and comments and e-mails.
People stop by…around 15,000 people a year see those plants. I know people go out of
their way to stop by on work nights because that is advertised.”

Media coverage is important for elected officials, so including that with
programming can be important. Joe Cantanese, Chief of Staff of Allegheny County
Council, said, “It is important to get media coverage of what we are doing for the kids.
Youth in Government is great for that.”

**Statement 26: Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in
marketing.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Eighteen of the 20 panelists
responded to this statement. The responses ranged from *mildly agree* to *strongly agree.*
Consensus was reached in agree and strongly agree categories at 84 percent. The six comments all reflected this message, “In the future, it will become even more important to better utilize the Internet as that will continue to be a key source of information.” One added the qualification, “Within urban there tends to be a higher degree of Internet usage. However, this in only true within middle- and upper class communities. Low income and limited resource individuals and families still have challenges in accessing the Internet.”

The Allegheny County staff reported that they currently do this and are attempting to increase this effort. “We do targeted email lists to cooperators and past participants.” “We do that [email lists] with the school enrichment programs too.”

Mike Masiuk has done much with the Internet, “We put all the information on the symposium on the Web. With the commercial horticulture clientele that I have, the percent of people that have Internet access is getting greater. We are using the Internet more to e-mail announcements out. For some of the workshops where we had to limit it to 20 or 30 people we threw the carrot out there that you will get the e-mail before the people who get snail mail. So, people are more likely to give out their e-mail address, although some people are reticent about giving out the e-mail address.”

**Statement 27: Urban Extension offices effectively report program impacts.**

Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in agree and strongly agree at 95 percent. “Effective reporting of our impacts will provide the "proof" of our effectiveness to key stakeholders.” “Future
funding will depend on this.” One panelist suggested a specific format of reporting, “We need to do a much better job of this and think about reporting in a journalistic fashion.” Impact reporting, “Still needs improvement.”

The Allegheny County staff reported, “Generally we do.”

**Statement 28: Extension has a statewide system to effectively report urban program impacts.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 95 percent in agree and strongly agree categories. “Again, in the future our state leadership will have to openly support urban Extension and give it all the support of our more rural cohorts. Lip service will not keep us in business!” “It is important to separate out the urban efforts so that the different techniques / approaches can be better evaluated for impact and future programming.” “Local impact reporting is probably more important on an individual basis but holistically, statewide would be better.”

We have a state system. It is an evolving system that is getting more comprehensive, but still our impacts don’t fit neatly into their system” stated, Deno De Ciantis (CED).

**Statement 29: Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data).** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 89 percent in agree and strongly agree categories. Most of the comments indicated, “Important and training
needed to improve. I think part of good marketing is showing a personal touch.”

“Qualitative AND quantitative impact data is much more impressive. The combination of the two provides a rich level of insight.”

Allegheny County educators stated that they do. Nancy Crago (FCS) stated, “This is more time consuming and we don’t always take the time. It depends on the program and how in-depth it is.” Nancy gave an example for a program using “listening posts.” “You generate 2 or 3 questions and have facilitators or interviewers trained and assigned to go around and just interview people. It is sort of informal mixing with the group and asking questions. We had, ‘what did you think of the retreat?’ ‘What did you do here that you will take back home with you?’ ‘Any other comments?’ You just listen. You interview them basically. Then you compile the data. We have photos of the banners and the families parading with their banners.”

In another program Nancy does, “We may do some observation there or some hands on kinds of things where we evaluate some of those types of activities. The participants completed a plan for rearranging the environment of their child care center.”

“Leadership has a post assessment. We do a lot of pre- and post-testing. I do observations. That is pretty much the evaluation methods we use. Sometimes we do a focus group, but that is really not an evaluation, it is really an assessment thing” added Nancy.
Statement 30: Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 89 percent in the categories agree and strongly agree. Panel comments agreed on the importance of quantitative data, “Extremely important, how else would you expect long term funding.” A need was expressed, “We are not as good here but we must become better trained to collect and report this data.” Barriers to accomplishing this are, “We need to improve on this and allot time to reporting impact.... Too often we are exhausted by the time we get to reporting or else on to something else and so it doesn't get done like it should.”

The Allegheny County staff states, “Yes.” As an example, Nancy Crago (FCS) shared, “We had workshops and the workshops here with the child care program, we always do a training evaluation and a trainer evaluation. And that is always about one page to fill out. There are a series of questions with ratings that they fill out. There are eight to ten questions and demographic data.”

Statement 31: Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 84 percent in categories agree and strongly agree. “This is currently required by our state legislator and expect it to continue in the future.” “This is a positive direction and should be done.” Two panelists commented, “Certainly good but not as important as impact information.”
In Allegheny County, the staff stated, “yes.” One example was provided by Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture), “We found that the evaluations were always ‘keep it up.’ The people that went through these things just thought these were great.”

Statement 32: Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted population. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 84 percent in mostly agree and agree categories, with 63 percent of the ratings in agree. The comments, although in agreement, have qualifying statements such as, “Again, time must be devoted to this. We have wonderful empowerment stories to tell but don't take the time to tell them.” Another example was, “Empowerment is a great indicator but we will need to develop better instruments for measuring.” It was not seen as equally important in all program areas, “This should be done by both qualitative and quantitative data, especially in the community development and family areas.”

This statement received moderate agreement in Allegheny County. A qualifying statement was, “Depends on the program goals.”

Statement 33: Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 85 percent in agree and strongly agree categories. Panelists generally recognized that cost-benefit analysis does not work equally well for all program areas, “It might be hard for some programs to do this but at same time some
programs can use this method effectively.” Barriers to this statement being achieved are, “I am not sure how we can effectively do this without additional resources and training.” “This should be developed at the beginning of the program, before implementation, to ensure that agents are expending time/money most effectively.” Though useful, there are other considerations, “We need to work with staff to do this, acknowledging that there are other considerations beyond financial costs and benefits.” Allegheny County educators responded with moderate agreement. Nancy Crago (FCS) qualified the agreement with, “Sometimes.” “It often is not appropriate based on the type of program. This does not fit with social types of programs.”

Statement 34: Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Two panel members made similar comments that may be represented by, “This would be great!!! But can we get everyone to agree on one reporting system?” Another stated, “Reporting results nationally is important but I'm not sure about a national accountability system.” “There should be a national uniform structure for key programs in urban areas in order to better reflect our impact nationally and to our national stakeholders.” “I question whether this is realistic.” The question, “Is there an accountability structure?” confirmed the puzzled looks on the faces of the Allegheny County staff.
Statement 35: Urban Extension programs do not unnecessarily duplicate services provided by other organizations in the community. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in agree and strongly agree at 89 percent. “Future funding sources will be increasingly critical of us if we duplicate services or fail to collaborate.” However, multiple panel members shared a similar idea, “We are duplicated often, because we fail to invest enough to take program markets for ourselves. Other programs see our limited success and recognize that they can then invest enough to take the market.” One recommendation was to, “Coordinate/network/collaborate vs. duplicate.”

In Allegheny County there was qualified agreement. Nancy Crago (FCS) agreed with some of the panelists’ comments, “Other organizations are duplicating us more than us duplicating them.” Susan Taylor added, “We enhance other organizations’ programs, bringing research-based information.” Finally, Deno De Ciantis added, “It really doesn’t matter, there are so many needs and even within a single need, so many people wanting and needing education, that there are plenty of clients to go around.”

Statement 36: Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are holistic. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in agree and strongly agree categories at 90 percent. “Important to have the ‘bigger picture’.” An interdisciplinary approach was recommended, “We have to move away from the traditional "Big 3" program areas.
Programming based on needs of the community will usually incorporate all areas of Extension expertise.” This may be accomplished through, “develop interdisciplinary teams that will offer more holistic programming. Although no examples were shared during any of the interviews or the focus group, the Allegheny County educators agreed.

Statement 37: Urban Extension educators use the logic model (planning programs by considering resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts) in program development. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in agree and strongly agree categories at a 94 percent level. Comments included, “This is a great model to follow.” and “If used, stronger impact would result.” “We will need training to do this effectively...but certainly is needed.”

Nancy Crago (FCS) and Susan Taylor (Youth Development) agreed and qualified their agreement with, “FCS and 4-H do. We don’t know about the others.” The horticulture educators did not speak of this method of program development.

Statement 38: Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Seventy-nine percent of the responses were in mildly agree and agree. Two comments had a similar perspective, “But not just Extension - we must partner to truly be a catalyst.”
and “Extension has a unique role to play in identifying needed change and putting the key organizations together to help address change.” The third comment was similar, but less proactive, “Not sure if our goal should be catalyst or to support a catalyst.”

Confirming the Delphi panel’s consensus, the staff in Allegheny County shared these comments. “This is our hope.” “It could be more so, but it is an issue of resources versus the magnitude of the problems we address. With limited staff and resources, we are limited in our impact.” “We work with others to improve this, but we are still quite limited in resources.”

**Statement 39: Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Seventy-nine percent of the responses were in mildly agree and agree categories. “This is often where Extension can "shine" and it is important to have economic impact related to our program efforts to be able to interpret our value to urban audiences.” The other two comments were the same as the first and third comments in statement 38.

In Allegheny County educators felt that economic change was important. Deno De Ciantis (CED) stated, “Some of our programs do. Horticulture does this in the commercial programs.” Nancy Crago (FCS) added, “The Better Kid Care program impacts economic change. It is based on the target population and the goals of the program. Some of the programs that I currently do focus on workforce development in terms of educating child care providers. So, that is the early education side, 0 to 5 years. These include relative care providers, home-based providers. Cooperative Extension is
part of a statewide training program that is administered by Pennsylvania Pathways. In our state providers who are registered and licensed must get six hours of training per year to maintain their registration with the Department of Public Welfare.”

Youth entrepreneurial science training is economic change for the future. “Our group that has been going for three years now at Westinghouse High School, they had a greenhouse that hadn’t been used for years. The school district rehabbed that section of the school with the greenhouse. So they are getting ready to raise herbs for sale.” This project is done in collaboration with the high school’s science and business departments.

Statement 40: Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagreement to strongly agree. Comments ranged from “Depends upon the program.” to “It is a natural approach for programming in all areas.” There was also a range of comments based on intent, “It is a natural approach for programming in all areas.” to “We are not always trying to develop the community although that may be an additional outcome.”

The educators in Allegheny County disagreed with the Delphi panel and felt that community development was an important underlying concept for Extension outreach. Nancy Crago (FCS) stated, “yes, we consider how the programs fit into the community situation and how changes in individuals and organizations impact the community.” Brack Barr confirmed Nancy’s position, “We don’t focus on community development,
but we do leadership development in most of our 4-H programs.” Nancy Crago added, “And many of the FCS programs. Any time we work with people, we are enhancing their abilities to get things done in their neighborhoods and communities.” It was pointed out that collaborations are a form of community development – building the capacity of organizations.

Nancy Crago added, “Then, the other piece that I do is the leadership. And I did a Master Parent Leadership program that we did a few years ago based on the information from that, so that they developed their parent education skills as well as their leadership skills so that they could then go out and share parenting information with other organizations and parents.”

Statement 41: Urban Extension educators address community development issues. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 84 percent in agree and strongly agree categories. “Essential for those programs appropriate.” “This would be good to be in a position to work on this.” Two panel member chose to amend the statements. “Should be done in a collaborative effort for best impact.” “A better word might be neighborhood development for Extension Educators.”

Statement 42: The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H / youth development programs reflects the diversity of the youth population. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Seventy-nine
percent of the responses were in *agree* and *strongly agree* categories. Four panel members made comments similar to this one, “We must be a reflection of our communities to become truly effective within those communities.” One panel member supported this goal, but questioned the practicality of it.

Susan Taylor (Youth Development) stated that in Allegheny County, “When we are talking about leadership, a lot of them are not volunteers, they are staff working with kids in centers. Is that what we are including?” April Scott (21st Century Learning Centers) added, “I think when we talk about the 21st Century project, the adults pretty much reflect the population that we are working with.” Brack Barr (Youth Development) expressed, “My thing is a personal thing. Most of our leadership is female. It is very hard to find men who will volunteer because men, except in those situations like Susan mentioned in centers where we partner with a Boys Club, a YMCA. Their staff is still mainly female. They may happen to have a paid staff who is male.” Nancy Crago (FCS) agreed, “I think that in terms of male participation, that is something that is so sorely needed. Especially where you have not just a population of young men, but also males can have a positive influence on young girls, especially if they are in single parent homes.”

The consensus was that in some respects, the adults do reflect the diversity of the youth to a great extent, except in terms of gender. When asked if the diversity of the adult leadership should reflect the diversity of the youth, it was agreed that it should.
Statement 43: Urban 4-H / youth development programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interests, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 95 percent in the categories agree and strongly agree. Two supporting comments were written. “With youth this is extremely important. Extension must mirror the diversity that our urban counties exhibit.” “This should be a goal continued into the future.”

The response in Allegheny County was, “Kind of a no-brainer.” “Yeh.” “I think we strive for it, but we can always improve.” “Definitely.” April Scott (21st Century Learning Centers) added a different perspective. “I think it is alright to have people who are slightly different who bring new light to the situations or different experiences. All of the staff at 21st are of the community, but Christie and I are not from the community and we are able to bring new light or information on some things that they may not be able to see outside of their community.” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) added an explanation. “In particular in these areas, a lot of people do not travel outside of their neighborhood.”

Brack Barr (Youth Development) added to this perspective, “We strive to give the kids and the adults an understanding that the world is a lot bigger than their neighborhood. It is a leap when you are not from here to understand where this
community or neighborhood ends and a new one begins.” Deno De Ciantis further explained, “All you have to do is to look at the color of the street signs. Every time a street sign color changes, you know you are in a different area.”

Brack Barr continued, “We want that statement to be ‘Yes.’ Also, we want people to be able to walk or cross those different lines and receive information from people who don’t look like them, who don’t think like them and don’t have the same cultural background. To process that information and see it as useful even though it may be totally different.”

Brack shared an experience. “At a church conference, they singled me out because they knew what I did. The thing was about discrimination. ‘If you had somebody who was openly gay, and they wanted to be a 4-H leader what would you do?’ I said I would screen them. It is my understanding that we can’t discriminate against them because they are openly gay. Now, in 4-H as in most youth-serving organizations, one of the rules is no sexual activity. So, if you see somebody who is trying to recruit, that is a no-brainer. We would do that if some male leader was trying to molest females, or vise versa. The question was asked if I would be supported from above. I said, I can’t speak to above my office, but in this office, I think I would be supported. I can’t discriminate against them because they are openly gay any more than I can discriminate against someone because they are married or are heterosexual.”

Deno De Ciantis added, “In terms of screening volunteers. They have to go through a screening. Our state laws are Act 33 and Act 34 that govern that.”
Statement 44: Urban 4-H / youth development uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 83 percent in mildly agree and agree. The range of comments reflected the ratings. “We must work towards more needs-based programs.” “I think it is a combination.” “Both should be taken into consideration but delivery should be heavier on the asset side.”

The staff in Allegheny County was not familiar with the concept of assets-based programming. The first response was, “I’m not sure what assets and needs-based means.” It was explained and another educator stated, “I think it is a combination. The program starts with assets-based, looking at where are you now and where would you like to go.” The others then responded, “yes, it is a combination.”

Two examples that may fit with this statement were shared by Brack Barr (Youth Development). “When I think about our club, the youth there learn how to shoot from their fathers who are mainly the members. Mothers too. But mainly their fathers or older brothers or uncles bring them in, teach some safety, take them out on the range.” The other example was the Westinghouse High School example, “they had a greenhouse that hadn’t been used for years. The school district rehabbed that section of the school with the greenhouse. So they are getting ready to raise herbs for sale.”

Statement 45: Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus
was reached at 95 percent in agree and strongly agree categories. “Important priority for urban youth programs.” “In cooperation with youth-serving organizations.” The previous comment may resolve the concern expressed here, “We must be careful with our programming in this area. It is certainly needed, but will we have staff that is adequately trained to address this special needs group?”

Brack Barr (Youth Development) was emphatic while the others gave moderate agreement. “My experience of working in drug abuse programs is, that is just what the dealers do. They talk to the kid and pump up their egos and show them that they are smart kids. Here's a way you can make money. Believe it or not, a kid that knows he is good and has people who tell him that, will bypass the illegal quick money. The real successful kids will do it intentionally; most kids will do it by accident. We do concentrate on leadership. If you can do anything in 4-H what is it - it is leadership. The 4-H style is leadership development. It’s done by habit.”

The 21st Century School project focuses on truancy reduction, inappropriate social behaviors as well as improved school performance.

**Statement 46: Urban 4-H / youth development staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 95 percent in agree and strongly agree categories. “Here is where we can offer training in program delivery methods that focus on the experiential system of learning (Learning
by doing).” “As youth educators, we should be seen as experts in youth development and could serve as a resource for other agencies.” This panelist echoed the collaboration theme, “Again collaboration will be increasingly essential.”

The Allegheny County educators agreed that they do this and it should continue.

**Statement 47: Urban 4-H / youth development partners with other youth-serving organizations.** Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. One hundred percent of the responses were in agree to strongly agree categories. “Avoids duplication and extends Extension outreach to other youth. Makes sense.” “We must utilize our resources in the most effective way possible BUT we MUST be certain that Extension 4-H/Youth is seen as a full partner and not lost in the background!!!”

The consensus in Allegheny County was a strong, “yes.” Deno De Ciantis (CED) stated, “It’s the only way to do it in urban areas.” Brack Barr (Youth Development) explained, “In a large urban area like ours, it also becomes easier to find people who are working with kids. Those are usually the better ones. The programs that already exist; they were already working anyhow and you place in their hands the projects we have, maybe do a little training on some aspects of it and then they and their staff run with it. Sometimes they find the volunteers themselves from their community.”

Brack Barr listed the groups he partners with, “Boys and Girls Clubs, YMCAs, YWCAs, not as much with Scouting although we are starting to make inroads there. Church groups, a lot of church groups that do after school programming, usually around tutoring.” He continued, “the Y is my best example. They had a regular program, but
there are certain days when they will do 4-H. They have told me that 4-H has helped them to organize the kids, period. When they want to form clubs, they find that the materials we have, nobody has anything better than we have.”

Deno De Ciantis (CED and formerly Youth Development) stated, “Frankly some of these programs, even though their job is youth development, they have the staff, but the staff doesn’t necessarily have the expertise or the resources. A lot of them focus on sports and things like that. So, it gives us an opportunity to enhance their programming and to instill some things that enhance what they are doing with the kids. Especially in the after-school programming; they throw a couple of balls out there and say, ‘go at it.’”

**Statement 48: Urban 4-H / youth development uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from disagree to strongly agree. Two of the comments seem to adequately represent the other statements. “4-H Clubs are a great way to get inner city youth involved. However, we have to be open to the definition of what is a club. Allow for many variations that meet the needs of the youth.” “Different models will serve us much better and offer the kind of flexibility that is needed.”

Consensus with the Allegheny County educators was reached that this is not the case in Allegheny County, nor should it be. Nancy Crago (FCS) opened the discussion with, “No, not always. Should they?” Deno De Ciantis (CED) elaborated, “I think the question is ‘can they?’ Should they? How can you argue against all of the assets of a
club, all of the learning opportunities and experiences? But the world certainly has changed. I look at how we differ from Boys & Girls Clubs and the resources they have verses the resources we have. I have two 4-H Extension educators to deal with the entire county. It just is not going to happen...It is a challenge. Would we like to? I think there is no question in that. But, boy, to sustain those clubs, especially in at-risk communities where parents are stressed, they just can’t be consistent volunteers, so it is difficult to keep things going.”

Brack Barr (Youth Development) continued, “We collaborate with so many people who have their own club format that they fit 4-H into what they are doing. Most of the time, they say – ‘now is the time we are going to do 4-H.’ I am happy to say that they do the 4-H pledge. If they are working in the Boys & Girls format, they fit it into that format. If they are working in YMCA, they fit it into that format.”

Susan Taylor (Youth Development) added historical perspective. “We made a decision several years ago that the only way to go was to partner and collaborate with others. If we got so hung up on the rules of the club format, we would be nowhere. So, we have been very flexible and the purpose of that was so we could reach more kids.”

However, in one situation Brack Barr’s approach was, “I said, having them organized in a club might be even more fun for the kids. Because the kids would work and would work more with their own peers planning other activities not just specifically around the shooting, but getting into some community service stuff, service learning, what not.”
The 4-H youth component of the EFNEP (Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program), “is done on a club format with each club meeting year round. School-based clubs meet throughout the school year. This makes our numbers low (500).”

**Statement 49: Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged fairly evenly from mildly agree to strongly agree. “With the use of web sites we can easily be a 24/7 organization.” “Use of the Internet will open many doors.” However, one panel member stated, “This may become essential in the future, but for the immediate future there seems to be so much else for us to concentrate on.”

The Allegheny County educators did not reach consensus on this statement. Brack Barr (Youth Development) stated, “With the use of the Internet we do. Some projects that are on the Internet can be downloaded directly. Depending on what they are doing, they don’t necessarily have to have day-to-day contact with us.”

The conversation then rolled from one person to the next. “I think 24-7 may be an exaggeration, but certainly staff…. “It seems like we work that.” “Staff works in the evening, on the weekends; and when we aren’t around and they want information, it is on the web.” “We also get requests on our voice mail when the office is closed or over email that we respond to when we are back in the office.” “What do you mean by 24-7? Like at 5 PM when somebody calls here, will they get somebody? Probably not, but they can leave a message.”
“Also too, often times we are meeting with people who work, so I have many meetings after work meeting with people. The collaborators are the best, because there are paid people there that we can work with during the day. But, there are a lot of meetings at night or on the weekends because their work life is different from their volunteer life – so we make ourselves available.” “We have trainings and workshops on weekends and participate in programs that are on Sundays.”

The response to the question, “Do you feel you have a strong presence on the Internet, the response was, “yes.”

However, not everyone in the focus group saw Internet presence as positive. Brack Barr stated, “I hope it doesn’t become too strong. You can put so much on the Internet that they don’t have to come to the Extension office. I’m not sure if there isn’t some thought way above us, that the Internet could do that. You put enough on the Internet and someday somebody will say, well why do we need educators and pay them to go out and talk with people. We can make the case that there is nothing like the expertise we bring.”

Deno De Ciantis (CED) added, “Everybody was real excited to put stuff on the web and all of a sudden all of our 4-H projects are now on the Web and you can download them. Anybody in the community can download that stuff and use it. We don’t know if they are using it properly, how they are applying it, when they are applying it. We have no control over it. I think that is to our detriment. Especially if
they are going to use our materials, we are not doing ourselves any favors by giving it away for free so to speak where anybody can get it and use it. We see our stuff all over the place. They have taken Penn State off, the Clover leaf off.”

“All of our Extension publications will be on-line” said Susan Taylor (Youth Development). Deno responded, “I think that there are some that is okay for, as an example is the hort stuff. Anyone who wants it gets it. They don’t have to take that information and deliver it. 4-H stuff is a delivery method. Those projects are used beyond whatever is on those pages for technical information.”

Nancy Crago (FCS) then interjected, “I think some things are good for the Internet and some things aren’t. You brought out a good point, you don’t know how they are being used. I think there is still a need for the other. I don’t think the web can replace.…”

Deno then said, “They will take them off the web and replicate them and will take 4-H off and use it as their own stuff. It is unethical and it happens all of the time. I think we do ourselves a great disservice by not controlling what goes on the web a little more effectively.”

Another point of view was, “I have seen that done with the publications that are in print where they have taken our name off our material and used it as their own. The thing about the web is that for a lot of urban communities, there are people who are not going to have access. At least with publications, we can get some of that material out. When they don’t have access, then they are left out of it.”
However, Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture) felt the Internet was an important delivery method. “So, what we do is put it on the website. We used to have links to pictures, but now we send it out with the pictures right in there. So you go ‘pest activity current report’ and we will put things like that out. We stopped doing growing degree days. We were reporting growing degrees, but I do it through the end of June, after that there only about half a dozen key insects the rest of the summer that growing degree days ever matters. So I just put on magnolia scale and you click on it and there is a larger picture. And, there is an archive. You can click on birch leaf miners and you can click on ‘controls’ and it takes you to Penn State's control options.”

Statement 50: Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in agree and strongly agree at 89 percent. “This is very important if we are to stay competitive.” “This is how we will best reach folks in the future at a cost that is reasonable.” “It will be important in the future that adequate resources are allocated by administration to ensure that technology is available in order for urban educators to successfully implement programs using this technology.”

Consensus in Allegheny County was, “Yes.” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) jokingly said, “Do we use them well? I tear my hair out some days.” Nancy Crago added, “We still use it.” Previously, there have been references to the use
of computer-based training in horticulture and the use of satellite broadcasts in family and consumer sciences. The connection with Continuing Education allows for ‘learn-at-home’ options, such as audio-video tapes, web-based, and self-study.

A horticulture example shared by Mike Masiuk, “So you could do it self-study or hybrid classes where you can send people to the site with the list of plants, fact sheets. So far we are producing a CD and we have the shrub part done. So you get on there and you can click on shrubs and you can click on whatever shrub you want and get habit, leaf, winter buds, whatever, and a photo….PSU has an office of mobile technology that could help with using PDAs for teaching.”

Statement 51: Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners’ ability to solve problems and make decisions. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached at 95 percent in agree and strongly agree categories. “To me this is a key component in designing programs. This helps the client in many other situations, once they improve their critical thinking and decision making skills.” Being mindful of the audience was emphasized, “Audience and age appropriate methods should be utilized when and wherever possible.”

This statement was not discussed by the Allegheny County educators. Critical thinking was not mentioned in the interviews.
Statement 52: Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community. Consensus was achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly agree to strongly agree. Consensus was reached in agree and strongly agree categories at 84 percent. The benefits were emphasized, “Yes, and it will give us more credibility with clientele plus add value to the communities.” Caution was also expressed, “But don't let the research get in the way of providing clientele-based programming!”

Consensus in Allegheny County was that they do this. “We do it on an annual basis.” “Everybody is required to research if you include evaluation and stuff like that. Periodically, every program should be evaluated, which involves a certain amount of research, so, yes.” “A good example is the cancer coalition where they are using research for community issues.”

Statement 53: Urban Extension educators minimize use of the expert model in teaching. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. One panel member focused on matching teaching method to topic, “At times the expert model is appropriate, but should have options of teaching available in order to best deliver a specific topic.” Another panelist focused on target audience, “Expert model can work with some urban audiences but with others can quickly alienate.” A third panel member stated, “May not be the best as we move ahead.”
Consensus was not reached in Allegheny County. Susan Taylor (Youth Development) commented, “I don’t know there is an effort to minimize it, but I don’t use it a lot.” Nancy Crago (FCS) added, “In adult education you would want to minimize it. We use adult education principles. We don’t use that expert model in teaching.”

However, in the horticulture programs, it appears to be more prevalent. A Master Gardener training class used it and descriptions of the commercial horticulture programs seemed to focus on an expert approach. It appears that clientele in commercial horticulture expect it, “I would like something with Penn State's name on it that supports what I am telling people to do. You are telling me to do this and I'm saying yes this is what I want to do and this is IPM.” However, the Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture) did share, “We do lectures and we go in there. The pesticide credits are probably the least rewarding. I don't know if you want the other end of it too. People show up and just want the credits. They sit there for a half and hour and ask, ‘is it over yet?’ It is a credit mill and you have to do this because Penn State signed this letter of agreement with the Department of Agriculture years ago.”

Statement 54: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered. Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. “This should become an integral part of our evaluation efforts.” Defining and measuring empowerment are difficult, “How do you define and measure empowerment?”
Consensus was not reached on this statement in Allegheny County. Deno De Ciantis commented, “That depends on the program.” April Scott (21st Century Learning Centers) indicated, “A lot depends on the goal of the program. We are going to measure something else that does not directly affect empowerment, but it happens anyway.”

**Statement 55: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community.** Consensus was not achieved on this statement. Nineteen of the 20 panelists responded to this statement. The responses ranged from mildly disagree to strongly agree. Seventy-nine percent of the responses fell in mildly agree and agree, as well as agree and strongly agree categories. “We are probably better at measuring impact to some degree than anything else we measure.” One panel member recommends including it in the program planning process, “Yes, we must incorporate this in our initial program planning.” “We still have lots of work to do on this.” “This will be a requirement for evaluation in the future.”

Consensus was not reached in Allegheny County. The staff agreed that, “it depends on how they design the program. We don’t want to say we do all of these things all of the time, you would think we were lying! [Laughs.]”

**Emergent Issues**

There were issues raised during the interviews and observations that did not fit into the frame of the Delphi instrument. These issues touch on what motivates the educators in Allegheny County and how they view themselves and their work.
Audiences

Educators spoke about the people they interact with as they do programming. This factor, although not related directly to patterns of success appears to be a factor in satisfaction with the work environment. Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture) spoke of his audience. “It's the people. It’s an industry [green industry] that has good people. One of the examples is the people in the industry. My wife is in health care. She has gone to horticultural conferences and I have gone to conferences she has attended and it is totally different. It is a totally different field. These are nice, friendly people. We use to go to Perennial Plant Association and a lot of it is the contacts you build over a period of years.”

Brack Barr (Youth Development) shared, “Two people that came from very urban/suburban backgrounds became goat and sheep experts. I called her and said I had lost the phone number of a man up there and he was going to donate some goats to us. She said she would give us the goats. She has championship goats. She said, I haven't been with your kids, but I know what you are trying to do. In fact she gave us some LaMancha goats. They are the type of goats that even if they are totally wild, 3 or 4 days of handling and they become like pets. They follow you like dogs. The kids will be able to lead them, teach them to stand. The lady takes these goats to shows.”

The diversity of the work and flexibility

Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture) also talked about the work he does. “I think what I really enjoy about it is the diversity and the change. While you are doing the same job for 23 years, I am not doing the same things I was doing 23 years ago. So
far, as long as you are doing good programming they [administration] are not coming in saying you have to do program a or program b. It is still like whatever, if you have an advisory group and they are telling you what you should do and it is helping the industry and making changes, you are free to do that. Flexibility. They allow you to go out and try some things. They are encouraging to try different things. Nobody is there saying well that was a flop; and there have been some flops.”

Brack Barr (Youth Development) also spoke of diversity of work. “You have a smattering of everything. Penn State has come here a couple of times to show what we do in school, what we have done with faith-based groups, some of the things we did with Teens with Greens and some other things. I take people on tours to see the horse club on the north side of the City of Pittsburgh not far from Three Rivers Stadium that has been there for 35 years. And a man that I recruited to do 4-H there. Then I take them down to White Oak, not far from Roundhill Farm, to an area that is suburban where there is a 12-acre llama ranch and he is doing 4-H; teaching kids how to take care and train the llamas.”

**Urban is different**

The concept that urban is different from the rest of Extension was mentioned by the educators in Allegheny County. Deno De Ciantis (CED) shared, “And, I think it was in my second year my regional director asked me and a couple of others to go to the North Central national urban conference. Going there; all of a sudden, it was like ‘oh my god! I’m not the only person having to deal with an institution that has no clue about what we do.’ So, I made some really wonderful connections there and from that I
connected with a number of people. I advocated for an urban conference for the state of Pennsylvania. We brought a couple of keynote speakers in. One was Jim Oliver from Chicago and another was Ruth Allen from New York. They were talking about this group of CEDs who were getting together to talk about forging our way. I ended up going to that meeting in San Diego and got involved in that.”

Brack Barr (Youth Development) also spoke of the difference between urban and rural Extension. “We have some challenges in the youth area, just from the perspective that with 4-H being our main model or our main conveyor of our youth development stuff. There is still a paradigm issue with how people perceive what 4-H is and so we are constantly battling that. We don't really operate clubs. We have a few. We have some pretty active horse clubs and we have some nutrition clubs. There are a few out there.”

Susan Taylor (Youth Development) talked about how the County Extension Director has changed things. “Deno has really positioned himself and our whole program where we are seen as a more active part of the county and doing some partnering with other county departments. And I think Deno came in at a good time when a lot of changes were being made in Extension. It was moving out of the traditional to what it is today. Some people say that Deno didn't know about Extension before he came here, but that might be good. He didn't have preconceived notions about what it should be or what it was. We are sort of unique. We're a lot different in some aspects from other counties because we are a very urban county. Our county does things that sometimes looks very different.”
I want to teach; to do programs

With increasing pressures to access additional funding, market programs better, evaluate more thoroughly, and complete reports, Extension becomes frustrating. Nancy Crago (FCS) related, “Some of the organizations that serve seniors want help with grant writing to continue programming. They don't know how to write a grant. I don't have enough time to do this; it pulls me away from programming. I like doing programs. Getting everything done takes a lot of time.”

Susan Taylor (Youth Development) lamented, “Reporting is cumbersome and time consuming - there is just so much of it. We could have more direct contacts if we were not required to report so much. We just have such extensive record keeping. Yes, although it seems like more and more paper work and less fun. Between the school time and the paper work, and now I've taken on being director of the 21st Century Learning Center program which I told Deno would only take 50 percent of my time and now it is sucking up 100 percent of my time. I'm hoping after the initial getting going with it I will have some more time.”

Others stated, “We just want to do the program; we don't want to be bothered with all this stuff.” More than one person stated a sentiment similar to this one, “There is a disconnect with urban coworkers; we feel isolated.”

Thinking out-of-the-box

Brack Barr (Youth Development) reflected on the fact that he has done some things he never expected to do. “Actually getting involved this year with shooting sports. They found out that some of the kids’ parents have those guns and are involved in target
shooting, getting ready for hunting. I was surprised at the number of girls that have 22 riffles. So, we are going to start with the safety part. They did a beautiful thing that I think will help. They contacted a local gun club that is kind of anxious to do a youth program. The gun club found out that the NRA has monies for people who want to do a youth program. So we will take our expertise in working with youth and in developing that to work with the gun club.”

Brack continued, “I have found that in an urban area, I know it is an old cliché, but you have got to think outside the box. You don't look at any project and say, ‘no I don't think that will work.’ The minute you say that you will find somebody or a group that can do it. I said years ago to some people who came down from Penn State, I build positive gangs. I like to take negative words and make them positive. The gangs, Crypts and Bloods, when you get together after school, you play basketball, you're in a gang. When you go to church on Sunday or go to the synagogue, wherever, you're in a gang. What makes that gang negative or positive depends on what you do with it, so when I tell the kids, 'come on, I'm going to turn you into a bunch of gangsters, it gets them to look, gets their attention.' And I say, 'never forget as you are doing this, collecting food for the food bank, you are a gangster, but you're not a criminal. It is a point of pride. I'm a part of one of the best gangs on the Earth; you are a 4-Her.’”
An idea shared by Deno De Ciantis (CED) is a great opportunity. “City of Pittsburgh government access TV is up for bid. It covers the city council and department meetings. Right now they are bidding out telecasting. Will be bidding out programming and WPSX could extend outreach this way. Could include local programming. Could be an opportunity for us.”
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS, DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Few studies of Extension’s county operations in urban areas have been conducted. The scope of current practice is not well defined and recommendations for future practice have been a matter of opinion. A need exists to understand current practice and to identify the patterns of success for the near future, specifically two to five years. During this era of decreasing public financial support for governmental programs and increasing need for education programs that address the complex issues of urban areas, Extension must focus resources on those activities that will result in the greatest impacts and continued support. The review of the literature revealed the goals for local Extension offices are framed rather broadly (Urban Task Force, 2003). These goals are primarily based on opinion-gathering discussion of the National Urban Task Force. A need to examine the factors of practice that will lead to success became evident through the review of the literature.

As Extension Systems and local Extension offices across the nation struggle with reduced funding from federal, state, and local governments, urban Extension is challenged to provide educational leadership for complex issues with shrinking resources. If patterns of success for urban Extension offices could be identified, then the
staff of these offices could focus its energy and resources on those identified activities. Likewise, the state Extension administrators could decide how they might more effectively support the local urban Extension offices.

The purpose of the study was to describe the patterns of success of a high-impact urban Extension county program. The objectives were to describe the patterns of success of an exemplary urban Extension county program and to determine what the patterns of success will be in the next two to five years. The patterns have been clustered into the following areas: internal operations (staffing and funding), external relationships (accountability, marketing, and partnerships & external relationships), and programming (target populations, program planning, adult and youth programming, teaching and outreach methods, and program evaluation).

**Methodology**

A case study of an urban Extension county office and a modified Delphi study using a panel of 20 experts was conducted to identify patterns of success of local urban offices. The case study and Delphi panel were purposefully selected following a nomination process. Criteria for selection were described in chapter three.

The case study data collection methods consisted of document analysis, observations of staff in the office and while delivering programs, and individual and group interviews. The document analysis and the literature review were used to develop a semi-structured interview protocol and an observation protocol. Interviews and observations were conducted during one-day visits to the case study site. Five visits were made to the case site.
The modified Delphi, a group process, allowed a panel of experts to rate items on a six-point Likert-type scale and provide written comments on the items in the researcher-developed instruments. The panel of experts identified the degree to which they felt an item was a pattern of success for urban Extension county offices in the next two to five years. The process involved three rounds in succession, designed to accomplish convergence of opinion. The instrument for Round I contained 100 statements derived from the literature and the case study. Respondents received feedback following Rounds I and II including a statistical summary for each statement not achieving consensus on the previous round, plus all participants’ comments identified by code names to provide anonymity for the panel experts. The descriptive statistics provided for each statement were frequency, mean, and the variability. The computer program SPSS was used for data analysis. The mean was used to describe the level of importance of the item as a pattern of success in urban Extension county offices. For items where consensus was not reached, the frequency distribution of ratings and representative comments of panelists were reported.

The statements developed for Rounds II and III were the statements on which a predetermined level of consensus was not achieved during the previous round. Consensus was considered to be achieved when 80 percent of the ratings fell within two adjacent categories on the six-point Likert-type scale. In Round II, one new statement was added and eleven were modified, based on suggestions from the Delphi panel. Round III included one new statement and no modified statements.
Case study participants were asked to respond to the statements included in the Delphi instrument in a focus group format. They were requested to respond to each statement indicating (a) if they as a unit were currently doing the activity or process, (b) if they were not doing the activity or process, did they believe it was something they should be doing, and (c) if it was something they should be doing, what barriers were keeping them from doing it. The results were then compared to those of the Delphi panel to provide a reality check from the staff of an urban Extension county office. Consensus was reached in the focus group when all of the participants agreed with a statement or modified it to the point they could agree.

Conclusions

The conclusions of the study represent the collective opinion of the Delphi panel of experts and the educators of the Penn State Cooperative Extension of Allegheny County. These opinions are time- and context-based and are not representative of any other population. However, the conclusions do provide generalities of urban Extension practice that may be instructive for any urban Extension county office. One hundred and two statements were considered during the three rounds of the modified Delphi process and the focus group with the educators at the case site. Consensus was reached on 83 statements in the modified Delphi process. I removed three of the statements from the list because of concern about the validity of the ratings on these statements.
Consensus was achieved on the following statements that were identified as vital patterns of success (having a mean score of 5.0 and higher). The statements are listed by category and within each category in descending order of mean score with the mean score in parenthesis.

**INTERNAL OPERATIONS (Staffing)**

- Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation. (5.26)
- Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development. (5.22)
- Urban Extension educators are at ease working across the wide range of urban settings. (5.20)
- Urban Extension educators have a strong background in skills needed for working in urban settings, such as human relations, grantsmanship, coalition building, mass media, and marketing. (5.06)
- Urban Extension educators are at ease in working with diverse audiences. (5.05)
- Urban Extension educators welcome diversity. (5.05)
- Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population. (5.00)

**INTERNAL OPERATIONS (Funding)**

- Urban Extension offices work toward adequate funding by seeking to increase both traditional and new sources of funding. (5.53)
- Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within the established mission of Extension. (5.25)
• Extension seeks funding for urban programming from other agencies of
  the federal government, such as the Dept. of Health and Human Services,
  Dept. of Education, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, and
  Dept. of Defense. (5.20)

EXTERNAL OPERATIONS (Accountability)

• Urban Extension offices effectively report program impacts. (5.39)
• Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with
  quantitative data. (5.17)
• Extension has a statewide system to effectively report urban program
  impacts. (5.16)
• Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with
  stories (qualitative data). (5.16)
• Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs. (5.16)
• Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs. (5.05)

EXTERNAL OPERATIONS (Marketing)

• Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing. (5.39)
• Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing. (5.34)
• Urban Extension offices effectively market their programs. (5.32)
• Urban Extension offices are responsive to clients’ needs and attitudes
  when marketing programs. (5.11)
EXTERNAL OPERATIONS (Partnerships and External Relationships)

• Urban Extension staff maintains positive working relationships with governmental funding partners. (5.55)

• Urban Extension staff has close working relationships with local communities and agencies. (5.45)

• Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming. (5.20)

• Urban Extension offices are strategically located within the urban core. (5.20)

• Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach. (5.10)

• Urban Extension offices maximize resources by partnering with other agencies and organizations. (5.05)

• Urban Extension educators collaborate with colleagues outside of Extension to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences. (5.05)

PROGRAMMING (Target Population)

• Urban Extension programs do not unnecessarily duplicate services provided by other organizations in the community. (5.16)

• Urban Extension educators involve representatives of target populations in program planning. (5.15)
PROGRAMMING (Program Planning)

- Urban Extension educators use research-based information. (5.30)
- Urban Extension educators use program-planning approaches that are holistic. (5.21)
- Urban Extension educators use the logic model (planning programs by considering resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts) in program development. (5.17)
- Urban Extension educators use program-planning processes that are inclusive. (5.05)

PROGRAMMING (Adult Programming)

- Urban Extension educators address family issues, such as financial challenges, health, nutrition, disruption of the family structure, parenting, and issues of aging. (5.45)
- Urban Extension educators address environmental quality, such as air and water quality, brownfields, development of green space, and landscaping. (5.25)
- Urban Extension educators extend their outreach through volunteers. (5.25)
- Urban Extension educators provide train-the-trainer programs for professionals. (5.20)
- Urban Extension educators teach job preparation skills. (5.00)
PROGRAMMING (Youth Programming)

- Urban 4-H / youth development partners with other youth-serving organizations. (5.47)
- Urban 4-H provides out-of-school time programs. (5.35)
- Urban 4-H / youth development staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development. (5.26)
- Urban 4-H / youth development programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interests, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation. (5.26)
- Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk. (5.11)
- Urban 4-H works with a wide diversity of youth, including those of different races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, and physical and mental abilities. (5.00)

PROGRAMMING (Teaching and Outreach Methods)

- Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners’ ability to solve problems and make decisions. (5.37)
- Urban Extension educators use a variety of learning techniques, such as self-directed learning, group learning, peer teaching, and collaborative learning techniques. (5.35)
- Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods. (5.32)
Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community. (5.05)

Consensus was achieved on the following statements that were identified as important patterns of success (having a mean score between 4.25 and 4.99).

INTERNAL OPERATIONS (Staffing)

- Urban county Extension offices have flexibility in staffing that allows them to address current and emerging issues. (4.90)
- Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have an understanding of urban community development concepts and practices. (4.85)

INTERNAL OPERATIONS (Funding)

- Urban Extension offices seek funding from non-tax dollars. (4.35)

EXTERNAL OPERATIONS (Accountability)

- Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the value of the programs they support. (4.90)
- Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the impact of the programs they support. (4.80)
- Urban extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program planning. (4.50)
- Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program evaluation. (4.42)
EXTERNAL OPERATIONS (Marketing)

- Urban Extension targets clientele with relevant messages and programs. (4.60)

EXTERNAL OPERATIONS (Partnerships and External Relationships)

- State specialists, in subject areas pertinent to urban programming, have adequate understanding of urban issues to work effectively with urban Extension educators to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences. (4.95)

PROGRAMMING (Target Population)

- Urban Extension educators do programs for the suburban populations. (4.95)

- Urban Extension educators focus on those populations with the greatest identified needs. (4.45)

PROGRAMMING (Program Planning)

- Urban Extension educators use program planning that is based on the realities of the urban environment. (4.90)

- Urban Extension educators use program planning that crosses academic and program boundaries to address community issues. (4.75)

- Urban Extension educators develop programs based on the positive attributes of the community (assets based) when addressing identified needs. (4.55)
PROGRAMMING (Adult Programming)

- Urban Extension educators address community development issues. (4.95)
- Urban Extension educators address economic development. (4.50)
- Extension is a catalyst for environmental change in urban counties. (4.47)

PROGRAMMING (Youth Programming)

- Urban 4-H / youth development programming includes exploring careers. (4.95)
- Urban 4-H shares 4-H program materials with staff of other youth-serving organizations. (4.79)
- Urban 4-H / youth development targets urban youth who often have multiple risk factors. (4.70)
- Urban 4-H uses authentic civic involvement to provide a setting for developing skills, such as writing, public speaking, networking, collaborating, teamwork and leadership. (4.65)
- Urban 4-H uses service learning as an authentic way of connecting youth to their community through interdisciplinary, collaborative, engaged learning. (4.65)
- Urban 4-H provides enrichment programs during school. (4.58)
• Urban 4-H provides opportunities for youth to experience mentoring or apprenticeships to enhance technical, personal, and social competencies. (4.58)
• Urban 4-H/youth development gives youth, especially teenagers, a significant voice in the programs offered. (4.55)
• Urban 4-H/youth development effectively programs with both urban and suburban youth. (4.50)

PROGRAMMING (Teaching and Outreach Methods)
• Urban Extension educators use service-learning to enhance participants’ learning. (4.90)

PROGRAMMING (Program Evaluation)
• Urban Extension uses formative evaluation so improvements are possible as programming is developed and delivered. (4.84)
• Urban Extension’s program evaluation measures multiple competencies, such as social, emotional, behavioral, cognitive, and/or decision-making. (4.55)
• Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes social impacts on the community. (4.45)
• Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes changes in critical thinking and problem solving. (4.39)
Two statements reached consensus, but at levels below the criteria set for vital or important patterns of success.

- Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if there are plans for sustainability of programs when this funding ends. (2.95)
- Urban Extension staff maintains programming for traditional clients. (4.05)

Consensus was reached, but the comments by the Delphi panelists and the case study findings did not support the consensus. This lack of consonance appeared to result from lack of understanding of the concepts.

- Urban 4-H / youth development uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education.
- Urban Extension educators use transformative learning methods to help learners examine the assumptions on which and the frame of reference within which their decisions are made.
- Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted population.

Consensus was not reached on the following items as patterns of success for urban Extension county offices.

INTERNAL OPERATIONS (Staffing and Funding)

- Urban Extension offices are adequately staffed in all four program areas (Family & Consumer Sciences, 4-H Youth Development, Community Development, and Agriculture/Horticulture & Natural Resources).
• Urban county Extension programs are adequately staffed, based on the size of the county’s population and the community needs, to fulfill their mission.

• Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods as well as specific subject matter training.

• Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for effective programming in the four program areas.

• Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming.

EXTERNAL OPERATIONS (Accountability, Marketing, and Partnerships and External Relationships)

• Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure.

• Extension has “brand name” recognition in urban areas.

• State level Extension administration provides adequate resources for effective urban programs.

• Urban Extension has multiple offices in the county.

• Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of collaborating organizations.

PROGRAMMING (Target Population, Program Planning, Adult and Youth Programming, Teaching and Outreach Methods, and Program Evaluation)
• Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach.

• The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H / youth development programs reflects the diversity of the youth population.

• Urban 4-H / youth development uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs.

• Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities.

• Urban Extension educators minimize use of the expert model in teaching.

• Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered.

**Discussion and Implications**

The discussion of the results will be structured into the areas of Internal Operations, which includes staffing and funding; External Relations, which focuses on accountability, marketing, and partnerships and external relationships; and Programming, including target populations, program planning, adult programming, youth programming, teaching and outreach methods, and program evaluation.
INTERNAL OPERATIONS: Staffing

Consensus was not reached on the issue of adequate staff in any of its three iterations. In Round I the statement was, “Urban Extension offices are adequately staffed in all four program areas (Family & Consumer Sciences, 4-H Youth Development, Community Development, and Agriculture/Horticulture & Natural Resources).” Seventy percent of the responses were in the three disagree categories with a mean of 2.65. The comments were consistent that this is not the case, indicating the panel was describing the current situation. In Round II the statement was reworded to, “County Extension programs are adequately staffed to fulfill their mission based on the size of the county’s population.” Seventy five percent of the responses were in the categories strongly disagree and disagree with a mean of 2.20. One panelist wrote, “Based on the focus on the future for this round, I'm not clear now on this question and wonder if people are looking at it the same way I am. My rating is based on thinking that to some extent staffing should be based on population. More importantly, it should also be based on community needs.” Another panelist appeared to continue to respond based on the current situation, “Staffing has not kept up with organizational expectations for urban staff efforts.” The statement was reworded again for Round III to, “Urban county Extension programs are adequately staffed, based on the size of the county’s population and the community needs, to fulfill their mission.” In Round III the comments indicated a focus on the future and the ratings were 75 percent in the three agree categories with a mean rating of 4.35. Several of the comments stated the term “adequately” was open to interpretation. Two comments were quite similar and could
be represented by the comment, “It is important that there is some proportionality in the staffing pattern in order to reach the high population density areas of the state.” One panelist pointed out even while population in his state was becoming heavily urban, most of the staff was assigned to rural areas. The general tone indicated there is a need for increased staffing in urban areas if Extension is going to have the expected impacts and ability to address complex issues.

The staff of Allegheny County expressed they were not adequately staffed, have never been adequately staff and need more staff to effectively provide programming that impacts the large urban population. The County Extension Director (CED), Deno De Ciantis, stated, “When I run professional staff to population ratios in this county, I am running 1:180,000…. At what point does it become impossible to provide a certain level of penetration to the market of your service? At some point, it becomes [an] impossibility; so then you have to begin changing your programming methods and your outreach methods and how you do everything just to have the coverage.” Brack Barr, Youth Development Educator, agreed, stating, “If we had more money to hire more people, we could reach more people.” During an interview, Susan Taylor, Youth Development Educator, shared her perspective on the issue of staffing,

“We’re in a state where they are laying off people. Our region had been told that they had to lay one more person off out of the southwest region. Deno thought it would be a good idea to bring in these other dollars to take on this other project with outside dollars. It gives us some more job security. Because even though I think two 4-H agents for a county this size is way too few, if you are sitting in a county where you have lost
your 4-H agent, it is kind of how you look at things. We actually had one person laid off a couple of years ago and we are hoping that we can at least maintain our staff. Even though we will all tell you we don’t have enough staff.”

When asked what they would change about Extension, nearly every one of the educators in Allegheny County identified additional funds so they could have more staff to reach more people. The focus was never on increasing resources for themselves; the focus was uniformly on the desire to do outreach to more people.

The comments make it apparent staffing is inadequate in urban counties. The data are not absolutely clear concerning the need for all four program areas. The data suggest the four program areas may not be necessary. This is interesting in the context of the current situation in Ohio where two large urban county Extension offices have been told by their county commissioners they only want to fund certain program area/s, such as 4-H youth development. The concept of staffing urban offices based on identified needs may become a reality for urban Extension offices.

An additional statement was written to reflect the issue of staffing flexibility that could address changing county needs. This statement achieved consensus on the need for flexibility, but the comments showed there are questions as to how this may be achieved. This should be expected since states will have differing staffing considerations such as whether staff is tenured faculty or not, if staffing is based on a regional approach, and location of the land-grant university is near / in the urban area or far removed. Because of the highly variable situations, the data are not definitive. Flexibility was identified as an important pattern of success with a mean rating of 4.90.
The statement “staff should have a strong background in educational theory and methods” did not achieve consensus. However, consensus was nearly reached at 79 percent agreement at a vital level (mean of 5.11). A few of the panelists believe their urban staff does have an adequate background in educational theory and methods, and most of the panelists believe all Extension educators are hired on their subject matter training and not their knowledge and ability in educational theory and methods. The data are very close to supporting more emphasis on educational theory and methods.

Several of the Delphi panelists indicated other abilities were more important. This resulted in the addition of the statement, “Urban Extension educators have a strong background in skills needed for working in urban settings, such as human relations, grantsmanship, coalition building, mass media, and marketing.” Consensus was reached on this statement. The level of consensus (83 percent) and mean (5.06) indicated the panel believed these skills to be of vital importance to urban Extension educators. The term “savvy” was mentioned more than once in this context. A statement that captured the meaning and spirit shared by many of the statements was, “Having a strong subject matter background is important, however if you lack the skills and expertise to deliver this program effectively your subject matter expertise will not be helpful when working with diverse audiences.” These skills, in addition to technical knowledge, were considered, “keys to success.”

The focus group in Allegheny County agreed the skills (human relations, grantsmanship, coalition building, mass media, and marketing) were important and each staff member demonstrated strengths in one or more of these areas. However, they
felt a strong background in educational theory and methods was important as foundations for educational outreach. Deno De Ciantis spoke on behalf of Brack Barr who had left the discussion, “Brack would say that is more important in 4-H anyway. He is an expert in anything you want because he can call up the university and answer just about anybody’s question. To a certain degree, just about anybody can – we have a link to the university. You can become a master of just about anything there from a subject matter perspective.” Nancy Crago, Family and Consumer Sciences Educator (FCS), added, “You can always be trained [referring to technical topics]. The issues keep changing.”

The statement, “Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have an understanding of urban community development concepts and practices” achieved consensus at the level of an important pattern of success. The literature indicated continuing education programs are more successful when the practitioners understand and use community development principles, such as target audience participation in program planning, the use of participants as co-researchers, and the educator as facilitator instead of the imparter of knowledge. When the original statement was changed from “a background in” to “an understanding of” community development concepts and practices, consensus was achieved. The staff in Allegheny County concurred and felt some of their programs may focus on a particular subject matter, but also function as community development. An example shared was, “the community food security project, we have one eye on the subject matter and there is the other eye
on what impact it is going to have on the community.” This result suggests training in community development concepts and practices would be appropriate for Extension educators working in urban counties.

Training in leadership development was rated as a vital pattern of success. The conversation concerning this issue was emphatic and brief in Allegheny County, “Absolutely!” Panelists agreed upon the importance of this both in outreach programming and in the management of urban Extension programs and offices. Not only was leadership development seen as vital, the need for training in leadership development of new employees and continuing development for experienced employees was stated by a Delphi panelist, “This is an extremely important skill that has not been adequately addressed.” Although it is only a small percentage of her outreach, Nancy Crago (FCS) does provide leadership training.

“Then, the other piece that I do is the leadership. At this point, I am probably spending 10 percent to 15 percent of my time on that. I have done some different things in the past. I have developed a couple a curriculums called Family Community Leadership that was a Kellogg program several years ago. I did some local things here in the county based on that. And I did a Master Parent Leadership program that we did a few years ago based on the information from that. So that they developed their parent education skills as well as their leadership skills so that they could then go out and share parenting information with other organizations and parents. We did a train-the-trainer program there for some years and that was successful. Now, I’m on a state planning team to develop a statewide leadership training curriculum. That was piloted last year
and it is being introduced statewide in March. We will be training leadership teams identified by the regional directors for the regions of Pennsylvania. So that each region will have a core leadership team to go out and conduct leadership training between other Extension educators on leadership skills. And that focuses on interpersonal leadership skills and group leadership skills in the community, as well as organizational skills.”

Group facilitation also was rated as a vital component by the Delphi panel with 95 percent consensus with a mean level of 5.26. Both Nancy Crago and Susan Taylor (Youth Development) responded with “Absolutely!” in unison. The panel identified group facilitation as a key skill for urban Extension educators. On-going training was indicated as a need to keep staff current on new techniques. As with leadership development, this was seen as important both in Extension’s outreach efforts as well as inside the organization. Deno De Ciantis spoke of Nancy Crago’s work in this area saying, “we are involved in doing some strategic planning and facilitation for a couple of organizations; and some board development stuff. So we are doing a lot of community development kinds of activities, but its tough when you don’t have a person who is specifically dedicated to that programming area. So, you can only have so much impact. But, we are beginning to get some recognition for the work we are getting done.” The quality of the work was emphasized while the barrier to more impact was a lack of staff to do this work. The data suggest this is an area where additional training for urban Extension educators is appropriate.
Urban staff being at ease with diverse audiences was rated a vital pattern of success with consensus at 85 percent and a mean of 5.05. The level of ease was tied into other vital patterns, “This is very important and closely linked with skills in leadership and facilitation, the stronger these skills the easier it is to work with diverse groups.” One panel member emphasized the importance of the County Extension Director’s role, “Urban Extension Educators MUST be open minded and willing to reach out and openly embrace diversity. This is especially true of the local administrator. They [local administrators] must set the example.” The staff in Allegheny County demonstrated ease in working with professionals, individuals, and county leaders. They described their work with a wide variety of audiences in a very matter-of-fact way, showing an ease that is desirable in urban settings. Comments by the Delphi panelists indicated current staff is generally at ease with diverse groups. However, there is a continuing challenge with new staff being hired and new immigrant groups moving into cities. The implication is diversity training remains an on-going need for urban Extension educators.

The issue of urban staff being at ease in urban settings was seen as so obvious, it was laughable in the eyes of the staff in Allegheny County. Most of the educators are from Allegheny County and their ease in a variety of settings was obvious. This was seen as essential for success in urban areas. Two Delphi panelists mentioned different situations they saw as challenges. One stated, “I don't think all urban Extension staff are comfortable working in all urban settings -- some areas and groups are too challenging or appear too dangerous to work with.” While the other panel member shared, “Most
are not trained enough to be comfortable in high profile situations.” No two individuals will be equally at ease in any particular urban setting, just as no single individual will feel the same level of ease throughout her or his career. “Field of study, experience, formal training and exposure of diverse urban audiences are some of the factors that can determine how at ease they feel when working in urban settings” commented a panelist. Many of the educators in Allegheny County have lived in the county for years. Brack Barr (Youth Development) commented, “I’ve spent so many years working here, that I looked up one day and I knew a lot of people. I knew the mayor of the City of Pittsburgh before he even thought of getting involved in politics, and on down. Generally, if you say you want to do something with this group, I know somebody somewhere.” It is this familiarity that aids in the sense of ease with the setting. The comments suggest ease in urban settings comes from experience in urban settings. An implication for urban practice would be the expectation that candidates for urban Extension positions be from, or have experience working in, urban settings.

The statement, “Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population” reached consensus in Round III, at the level of vital pattern. Consensus was reached at 85 percent with a mean level of 5.00. “Staff diversity reflecting the diversity of the community” was seen as desirable by the Delphi panelists and a few of the panel members commented that Extension is increasing the diversity of its staff. However, it was repeatedly mentioned, “This would be an ideal objective, but if staff is already limited, other skills tend to get priority.” The educators in Allegheny County were in agreement with the Delphi panel. Deno De
Ciantis (CED), assessed the current diversity of the staff by saying, “I think we are pretty good. I think we are a heck of a lot better than most of the other counties. When you compare our staff as a whole, we pretty closely approach the demographic breakout.” The staff does appear to reflect the major diversity patterns in Allegheny County based on a white majority and African-American minority. The staff appears to be predominately middle-aged and females outnumber males. These data suggest hiring criteria should include an attempt to attain a diversity balance reflective of the local population.

“Urban Extension staff welcoming diversity” was rated as a vital pattern of success. Consensus was reached at 80 percent at a mean level of importance of 5.05. Comments were in agreement and it was pointed out improvements have been made in this area. A panelist commented, “it is not enough to be more diverse, we, as educators, must understand and embrace the benefits diversity can bring to our jobs.” Others believe, “however we still have much to learn in really understanding our diverse audiences and educating them effectively.” Allegheny County staff concurred with the Delphi panel. Implications from these data suggest diversity training should address understanding of diversity and also move to a level that impacts valuing and embracing the benefits of diversity.

INTERNAL OPERATIONS: Funding

The Delphi panel agreed funding for urban Extension programs was not adequate, but opinions varied concerning the four program areas. Consensus was not reached on the statement, “Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for
effective programming in the four program areas.” Some panelists commented funding of each of the program areas should be based on the needs in the community. However a different paradigm was presented by one panelist, “I don't think we'll continue to want to think in "4 program areas". Do these program areas reflect the language or interest of local and state governments and if not, why would they want to fund them. We will need to define program areas as state and local priorities if we are to be successful.” A realist perspective was frequently expressed that funding was not likely to ever be adequate, so some panel members suggested ways of overcoming this constraint. “This is probably rarely the case so the focus should be on developing partnerships, collaborations, and external grants to meet needs.” The Allegheny County educators also viewed the current funding as inadequate and took a realist view they had to be responsible for getting additional funding and working with and through other groups in the county to maximize effectiveness. They all stated more funding was needed in response to the question “What would you change about Extension?” Deno De Ciantis (CED) stated, “Well, funding! (Laughs). I didn’t bring it up because maybe it is such an obvious thing for those of us in urban areas. Our funding is marginal at best.” Implications to practice appear to focus away from more funding for the traditional program areas to funding based on local needs and priorities. Consensus was not reached on the need to fund the four traditional program areas. These data again confirm the realities being faced by two of the urban counties in Ohio.
An approach to deal with reduced funding that has been adopted in some states is user fees. The Delphi panel did not come to consensus on this issue. User fees were seen as a way to place value on service and recover costs. Panelists mentioned some staff had difficulty with the concept after providing services for no cost for many years. “People are willing to pay for information/education that they feel will benefit them. Too often we are not willing to even ask.” One panelist was particularly concerned that user fees should be consistently applied not just in urban situations, but also with the traditional agricultural clientele. “The same standards should be used that are applied to the ag production side of our programs. Private producers enjoy all of extension's technical expertise at no charge.” This issue was a point of discussion during the focus group discussion. One educator saw the work agriculture educators did as providing “general programming.” Another immediately challenged that child-care training was in the same category, yet child-care providers are charged to participate. Consistency across all program areas and counties is needed for user fees to be seen as equitable.

The most common concern was user fees had the potential to reduce the amount of public-good programming Extension did. An example was shared where the county funding of Extension in an urban county was completely withdrawn. Most of the programming ended, except for, “one of the farm advisors negotiated an agreement with a local water quality control board to conduct applied research related to run off affecting water quality in the county. The county extension office was awarded a grant for more than $150,000 for the advisor to conduct the research.” The panelist added, “This may help support urban extension programs in the future, but it raises some
concerns about public good activities that seldom have funding behind them. Also there is concern about programs evolving to the point that they are simply driven by whoever provides a source of funds. Finding the right balance between fees for service and public support for extension programs may be a challenge for us in the future.”

The issue of user-fees and other forms of cost recovery was a major change for the staff in Allegheny County. Deno De Ciantis (CED) stated, “The bottom line is that at one time when we were able to do everything for free, now we are trying to determine how are we going to be able to squeeze a penny or a buck out of somebody; it is troubling because taxpayers are already paying to support us; maybe not at the level we need to have. So that is a struggle for us. So that the resource piece is huge.” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) wondered if the effort was cost effective when you consider the staff time required to account for the effort. “This past year is the first year we had to charge. It is $20/classroom for school enrichment and $10/ member for a regular club member. So that has added a whole layer of bureaucracy and paperwork. One of my phone messages was from someone up at Penn State and they said the report I mailed in, the figures aren’t right, so I have to go back and figure out where the heck that problem is.” Although user fees are a reality in some states, the lack of consensus suggests this issue needs more study and careful consideration.

“Maximizing funding by partnering with other agencies and organizations” reached consensus at 85 percent in Round I with a mean of 5.50, placing this practice at the vital level. It was seen as being done and a strength of how urban Extension interacts with other organizations. Even with that, “More could be done.” Maximizing
not only funding, but staff resources and program resources was repeatedly
demonstrated and mentioned by educators in Allegheny County. Examples include a
cancer awareness project, Teens with Greens, the junior arborist program,
demonstration gardens in county parks, 21st Century Learning Centers, the shooting
safety program with gun clubs, the herb project with Westinghouse High School, and
gardening programs with Phipps Conservatory. The partnership with Allegheny County
government has resulted in support beyond the appropriated funding. “We get in-kind
support. Because of the fact that we have a partnership with them, we are allowed to use
pooled vehicles for travel. We do get material and occasionally equipment; I guess
pretty much through the salvage. Occasionally, I have had the opportunity to have funds
applied to the purchase of material that we need.” It appears to be part of the culture of
Extension in Allegheny County. The use of the term “partnership” has legal
implications and for that reason it would be better to use the term “collaborate.”
However, collaborating with other organizations to maximize resources appears to be
essential in urban counties.

Consensus was reached at 90 percent with a mean level of 5.20 on the need for
Extension to seek funding from other departments of the federal government. A few
examples were shared, such as the military and block grants. The concern was this
should not be on a grant basis and done on the basis of individual urban offices or
programs, but the effort should be done at the highest administrative level.
Relationships should be developed that take advantage of Extension’s national
educational network to provide on-going outreach for other agencies of the federal
government. The conversation in Allegheny County dealt with the concern a partnership be developed at the federal level. This would not exclude the opportunity to continue to seek grants where appropriate. Nancy Crago (FCS) summarized the concerns nicely, “Historically, that is how Extension differed from all the other organizations because we were always there. The other agencies would be there for three years and their project would fall apart and they would be gone until there was another grant. There was no long-term consistency. That’s what I see happening with Extension and it is really not positive.” There was strong agreement of the importance of Extension expanding its role as an educational outreach arm for federal agencies beyond the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The implication was this should be done as an on-going partnership and not as a grant program. Current federal philosophy seems to be moving toward grant awards rather than formal partnerships or collaborations. However, using Extension for educational outreach for other federal agencies appears to be a logical approach to maximize human and fiscal resources of federal agencies.

The effort to seek non-tax funding was seen as necessary and appropriate and reached consensus at the level of an important practice with consensus at 80 percent and a mean of 4.35. The educators in Allegheny County do this and agreed this was an appropriate way to increase their funding. This then brings up the issue of what balance between traditional tax-based funding sources and non-tax funding, such as foundation and corporate funding, is appropriate. Comments on the issue of balance resulted in dropping the use of the term “balance” and approaching the issue from the need to increase both traditional tax-based funding and new sources of funding. This was rated
as a vital pattern of success with consensus at 90 percent and a mean of 5.53. Non-tax
dollar funding was viewed as a growth area, although many recognize cultivating these
new sources of funds requires a great deal of time and effort. Allegheny County staff
viewed this as a necessity. The County Extension Director framed it as a, “mixed
portfolio.” Nancy Crago (FCS) added, “We are looking toward more grants. You spend
a lot of time writing these things and you are not sure you will be getting anything. You
wonder if it was worth the time you could have spent programming. Right now, I have
done some grant writing and actually one of the things I did last year was at the
leadership retreat. I spent quite a bit of time developing the proposals and sending them
out. Some of them we didn’t get, but we did get a couple. When your programs become
dependent upon your ability to get the funding, it puts everything on a different level
where you just don’t do certain work.” When programming is so heavily dependent on
non-tax funds, programmatic decisions must be evaluated differently from Extension’s
past processes. Within the current reality of reduced tax-based funding, non-tax funding
is the alternative. The implication for future practice is urban Extension must attempt to
increase both tax-based and non-tax funding sources.

Making sustainability of funding a criteria when seeking funding is generally
seen as needed when serving low-income, disenfranchised clientele because of the
history of organizations and universities coming into a community and doing a program
that is grant funded and then leaving when the funding has ended. Extension in
Allegheny County faced small resistance because of this issue when getting involved in
the 21st Century Learning Centers project. There are situations where sustainability is
not an issue, where the project is planned to be temporary or a pilot. The Delphi panel came to consensus at 80 percent; however, the consensus was sustainability should not be a criterion for success. The mean was 2.95, placing consensus nearly evenly in disagree and mildly disagree categories. Comments indicated there should be more flexibility, realizing a program may demonstrate success then result in other funding, someone else picking up the project, fulfilling the need and moving on, or, on occasion, termination of the program because of lack of continuing funding. Allegheny County Educators came to the same conclusion. A new program Allegheny County is starting has the potential to become a self-supporting enterprise; yet another option.

“Seeking funding only when it is within the mission of Extension” reached a vital level of consensus. Consensus was at the 85 percent level with a mean of 5.25. However, the Delphi panel commented repeatedly on the need to interpret the mission of Extension in “broad,” “modern,” and non-traditional context, and “not interpreted in the context of only supporting "traditional" programming.” Allegheny County educators saw the need to work within both the mission of Extension and “within the state priority areas.” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) thought the mission of Extension was, “so vague that it covers anything.” Yet with further discussion she defended a large 21st Century Learning Center program by stating, “Our mission is education and the youth program leads to productive, self-sustaining adults and that is within our mission.” Examples also were shared of grants that were not sought because they were more appropriate efforts for other organizations, restrictions on the funds, or lack of expertise. It was obvious these educators give serious consideration to Extension’s mission when
seeking funding and they understand a modern, expansive Extension mission. Dr. Fehlis, a member of the Delphi panel, mentioned the “modern” interpretation of Extension’s mission in one of his comments. When asked what he meant by modern interpretation, he wrote, “This comment refers to some people's concept of our mission, both in Extension and outside Extension, who have a very traditional view of the mission of Extension that basically limits us to rural, agricultural programs. We must clearly present our mission as ‘educational outreach to the people in the areas of ANR, FCS, 4-H and Youth and CD for all audiences.’ As the clientele and needs of the clientele change and our society changes this becomes even more important to our future. I am especially concerned about the perception of our mission by administrators and faculty in the University who are not Extension faculty, many of our elected officials from local through national levels and commodity groups. We must be viewed as a 21st century organization meeting the needs of a 21st century America.” Although not directly related to the issue of funding, the implication from these data was Extension should work toward agreement on an expansive interpretation of its mission.

EXTERNAL RELATIONS: Accountability

“Effective reporting of impacts” was seen as a vital practice for the future with a mean rating of 5.37 and consensus at 95 percent. The Delphi panel’s assessment of current practice was that there was much improvement needed. One statement tied many individual comments together, “Effectively reporting impacts, I think, has been one of Extension's significant challenges...we should have appropriate techniques and
tools to develop and measure relevant outcomes/impacts for Extension to be successful (competitive and fund-worthy) in the future.” The interrelation between program impact, effective accountability, and funding was a theme of panelists who wrote comments. Some panel members indicated reporting impacts was being done reasonably well at the county level, but not at the state or national level. The panel indicated the need for statewide systems that effectively facilitate reporting of urban impacts that may differ from others because of programming methods unique to urban areas. The system also should be able to report urban impacts separately for urban legislators. However, one panelist warned that care was needed not to prevent this from becoming a divisive issue within Extension state systems. Educators in Allegheny County were in consensus about the importance of reporting impacts, but did not feel their impacts fit easily or comfortably into the current statewide system. Implications from these data are: states should have an impact-reporting system that effectively reports the unique techniques and methods used in urban programming and the system should have the capacity to segregate urban impacts for use with urban stakeholders.

“The reporting of qualitative and quantitative data” was seen as a vital practice for the future of urban Extension. Consensus for both types of data was 89 percent and the means were 5.16 for qualitative data and 5.17 for quantitative data. Barriers to collecting these types of data were lack of adequate training on how to do this and lack of time. Both the Delphi panelists and the educators in Allegheny County mentioned these barriers. Although qualitative and quantitative impacts were listed as separate statements, panelists responded that both were critical. Many stakeholders expect the
quantitative data while the qualitative data “show the human side of what we do.” The implication is, both forms of data are important and training is needed so urban Extension professionals may be effective in gathering and reporting these data.

“The reporting of customer satisfaction” was rated as a vital pattern, although many of the comments were similar to this one, “Certainly good but not as important as impact information.” Some states require customer satisfaction surveys while others focus more heavily on program impacts. This is done in Allegheny County, although the educators agreed satisfaction is not as important as program impacts. The consensus during the Delphi was 84 percent with a mean of 5.05. Despite the rating of vital practice, the lack of enthusiasm for this practice in the comments moderates the implication of this practice as a pattern of success.

“The funders’ positive perceptions of the value and impacts of urban Extension programs” were rated as an important practice for the future by both Delphi panelists and Allegheny County educators. Consensus was reached in the Delphi at 85 percent for both statements. The mean rating was 4.9 for perceptions of value and 4.8 for perceptions of impacts. It was stated Extension staff is not always effective in communicating the impacts and value of their programs. These data suggest training may be needed to improve the ability of educators to communicate their programs’ impacts and value.

“Reporting the level of community participation in both program planning and evaluation” were rated as important practices for the future. The level of consensus was 85 percent with a mean rating of 4.5 for program planning and 84 percent with a mean
rating of 4.42 for program evaluation. “This is a ‘should.’ If we are talking about meeting needs, then we need to engage our audiences and not just assume.” “This will add credence to our programming with stakeholders and local governments.” There were concerns about how to report the levels of participation and the need for this to be uniform statewide. In Allegheny County it was seen as only being needed in more in-depth programming. Community participation in some programs was seen as including actual participants, while others interpreted it as participation by staff of cooperating organizations and agencies. Reporting community and clientele participation in both program planning and evaluation will enhance impacts.

“Reporting increased levels of empowerment” did not achieve consensus (79 percent). This practice was very close to consensus, however the lack of supporting comments led to the conclusion not to consider it an important pattern of success. The issue of defining and measuring empowerment was seen as challenging. The Allegheny County staff applied a practical response, “Depends on the program goals.”

“Use of cost-benefit evaluation” was rated as a vital pattern for the future with consensus at 85 percent and a mean rating of 5.16. Comments indicated cost-benefit evaluation may become more common and expected, but it may not be appropriate for all of the types of outreach done by Extension. Additionally, some panelists wrote cost-benefit evaluation does not capture all of the important considerations. Being a more empirical method it may provide a different perspective on program development. “This should be developed at the beginning of the program, before implementation, to ensure that agents are expending time/money most effectively.” Although some highly
effective programs may not be cost-effective, cost-benefit evaluation can be used to maximize resources. The same issues were raised in Allegheny County. Allegheny County staff saw some benefit in cost-benefit reporting, but felt it is appropriate only in certain situations. It may be Extension staff’s unfamiliarity with this type of evaluation makes it a more difficult concept to accept and apply. The implication from these data is, cost-benefit analysis could be a useful tool for program planning and reporting. It would be positive, albeit more difficult to do.

The idea of a “nationally uniform reporting system for urban Extension” resulted in no consensus. Some see it as possible and likely, while others think it is totally unrealistic any agreement could be reached on a nationally uniform system. This may be true considering the differences of opinion on this Delphi panel.

EXTERNAL OPERATIONS: Marketing

“Effective marketing of Extension programs” is seen as a vital activity for urban Extension’s future. Consensus was reached in Round III when the panel was firmly grounded in thinking about the future. Consensus was at 89 percent with a mean of 5.32. Local urban offices were seen as more effective at marketing than was marketing at the state level. “Without effective marketing, Extension programs will face great difficulty in securing funds.” To address this challenge, Extension programs must use a wide variety of methods for marketing their programs whether it is at the local, state, or federal levels. Such methods should include the electronic media and the traditional mass media. Resources must be devoted to a marketing effort. In Allegheny County the marketing effort has been focused on improving the image of the organization and its
programs. The educators feel it has been successful. Deno De Ciantis (CED) mentioned a concern that is not isolated to Allegheny County, “It [marketing] is a double-edged sword. In the private sector, marketing means more customers, more customers means more revenue. More revenue means you can grow your business. Here, more marketing means more clients; that means taking the resources we have and stretching them even further.” Penn State Cooperative Extension of Allegheny County has a very attractive marketing brochure they distribute to legislators, both senators and house members at the state and federal level to put in their waiting rooms and their offices. “We sent each member about 50 of those. We sent them to our magisterial offices and sent them to the county executive, the manager, and county council so they put them in their waiting rooms and offices. We are putting them into libraries and sending them to different organizations and agencies to put out for the public.” Deno’s assessment of the current situation is, “it is much, much better now than it was ten years ago. We have had a little bit of impact of people recognizing who we are. It is a challenge. We have almost 1.5 million people. The extent to which you can penetrate that on a regular basis is pretty challenging.” The office’s web page has a dynamic look and the marketing materials are available on the site. Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture) shared a very professional, glossy poster developed for an annual plant program. It was produced with the assistance of Extension personnel at Penn State. These data support the need for effective marketing efforts at the county and state levels.
Although most of the comments support the need for effective “branding” of urban Extension, consensus was not reached on this item. Educators in Allegheny County indicated some of their programs have brand recognition such as 4-H and Better Kid Care, but overall the Extension program does not. There is some brand recognition from Extension clientele, but non-clientele have no awareness of Extension. Staff did indicate there is a concerted effort to open every Extension presentation by stating this program is one part of a larger programming effort by Penn State Cooperative Extension of Allegheny County. Deno De Ciantis (CED) stated, “My staff, as they are going out into the community, made sure that they presented the fact that they were part of Penn State Cooperative Extension. Additionally, there is that people-to-people marketing that happens on a regular basis.” Brack Barr (Youth Development) emphasized the name recognition of Penn State. “Then the other thing is just getting the word out that Extension is in an urban area like this. When I say Penn State Cooperative Extension, they latch onto the Penn State and ask, ‘do you work for the university? Well what branch are you at.’ I explain the whole cooperative Extension movement, the act, everything. A lot of people say, ‘I have never heard of that before.’” The understanding of the need for this branding by staff and volunteers, and consistent effort to remind clientele and stakeholders of the brand, has the gradual effect of establishing the brand. It appears there are differing views on branding. Some see branding as targeted toward specific programs and program areas, while others see it as organizational branding. There may be a need for both levels of branding.
“The importance of being responsive to clientele’s needs and interests” was rated as a vital pattern for success in the future. Consensus was reached at 89 percent at a mean of 5.11. Understanding and respecting the concerns of diverse populations was seen as a component of being responsive to clientele’s needs and interests. The Allegheny County educators believe they are responsive to clientele needs. The staff felt this was another reason to work closely with other community organizations, because it helped Extension staff identify and understand clientele needs. Effectively identifying and understanding clientele needs is necessary if the marketing and programming are to be relevant. Communicating relevant messages was rated as an important component of urban Extension’s marketing. It was acknowledged by one panelist that when marketing to the general public it is more difficult to craft targeted, relevant messages. In Allegheny County Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture) spoke of placing program-marketing materials for a horticulture program in nurseries and garden centers. When targeting commercial landscapers, he promotes programs in the wholesaler establishments where the landscapers purchase materials. Nancy Crago (FCS) markets materials through agencies serving the targeted clientele.

“Targeting clientele with relevant messages and programs” reached consensus at 80 percent with a mean of 4.45, making it an important pattern of success. The Delphi panel’s comments were mixed. One panelist thought county offices were doing a good job, while others thought much more needed to be done. Two panelists commented on
whether the marketing was to existing or potential clientele. One stated, “with existing clients, ‘yes’; with prospective clients, ‘not enough’.” The Allegheny County educators believe they are doing this and it is important.

“The use of mass media in marketing” was rated at the level of vital pattern. Consensus was at 89 percent with a mean rating of 5.37. Two key points were made in this statement. Urban mass media is highly competitive and it is difficult to get into the media, but it is the most effective way to build brand recognition and to market programs. The second point is some urban Extension educators have the personality for working in mass media and others do not. Training and experience are needed to build competency. In Allegheny County, Nancy Crago (FCS) noted, “We provide the information, but they often don’t use it and we don’t follow up to see if they did or why they didn’t.” Time as well as personality may impact this barrier. However, Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture) uses this technique, “We try to send the schedule to the garden writer at the Post Gazette and ask, ‘Would you like to interview any of these people [speakers]?’ They are happy to do it and generally they will do a full page story interview of one of the speakers and that will get a lot of interest when it runs a week or two prior to the event. We will get a flurry of last minute calls in the last week or two. We use newspapers.” Another example is, “We have two staff that write for the Pittsburgh Post Gazette. A nutrition article comes out in the food section every other Thursday. Both are done in a Q&A format. The gardening article comes out every Saturday. We get a pretty good bit of exposure because the articles identify the writer as a staff member and part of Penn State Cooperative Extension Allegheny County. It
provides the phone number and the web link. From that perspective, we are getting a lot of pretty decent exposure.” These comments and the level of importance suggest training is needed to improve the ability of staff to work with and in the media. The opportunity to share what works also would be useful.

“Using the Internet to market programs” was rated as a vital practice with a mean of 5.37 and consensus at 95 percent. Access for Extension staff is not a barrier; however the time and ability to keep web pages updated and interesting is a concern. Using the Internet is a cost-effective way of getting information to a wide audience, especially if done in concert with information in the mass media directing people to the Extension web page. Building an Extension Internet clientele is a challenge but one that can result in outreach to large numbers of people. The concern that low-income audiences may not have access to materials on the Internet was expressed, but by providing information to those who can access information through the Internet frees Extension staff for doing more personalized marketing to non-Internet users. Allegheny County staff felt they were doing reasonably well in using their web page. They were more positive about their use of targeted electronic mail lists as an efficient method for marketing and providing information to current clientele. These data strongly suggest the value of increasing the use of the Internet for marketing.

EXTERNAL RELATIONS: Partnerships and External Relationships

The original statement, “Urban Extension educators work with state specialists to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences” was modified to read, “State specialists, in subject areas pertinent to urban programming, have adequate
understanding of urban issues to work effectively with urban Extension educators to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.” This modified statement reached consensus at an 80 percent level with a mean rating of 4.95, making it an important pattern of success. However, the general consensus of the Delphi panel and the Allegheny County educators was, most state specialists are not well prepared to address urban issues or to work effectively with urban educators and in urban settings. There are notable exceptions in each of the program areas and there are some exemplary partnerships between state specialists and urban Extension educators. The urban forestry specialist at Penn State is working on a junior arborist curriculum with Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture). Nancy Crago (FCS) is working with specialists in family living and in leadership. Brach Barr (Youth Development) mentioned several specialists at Penn State and other land-grant universities he calls for assistance. Another educator stated, “I can call or email anybody up there and get help, but in terms of on-going research programs, I don’t think there is as much communication. I see that slowly changing as younger people are coming into the university.” Suggestions to correct this included partnering with faculty from urban universities, placing urban specialists directly into urban Extension offices, exploring different configurations of state specialists, and dedicating an individual to serve as a liaison between urban Extension educators and university faculty to promote sustainable outreach relationships. Although the number of urban Extension professionals may be small in most states, each of these professionals provides access to large numbers of clientele. Susan Taylor (Youth Development) made the comment, “Sometimes I think that is
because urban Extension educators are a minority compared to the statewide Extension educator population – a small audience but our clientele is way bigger. So when they just listen to me, when I say we need this and this and this, they don’t see it as a big area they need to work on.” Nancy Crago (FCS) commented, “I think if we approach them, most of the time they are open to working with us. Whether they always take the initiative to say, ‘I would like to talk to you about how I can work with you on urban audiences’ is another issue.” Developing effective partnerships between state specialists and urban Extension staff was rated as an important practice for the future. The data suggest the state specialists need training for this to happen.

The partnership between urban Extension offices and state-level Extension administration was seen as varying greatly from state to state. As initially stated, “Urban programs have the support of state level Extension administration” there was no consensus. Comments varied from, “there is excellent support” to “there is moral support, but little else.” When the statement was changed based on panelist input to, “State level Extension administration provides adequate resources for effective urban programs” statements continued to vary widely. Consensus was not reached, although it was close at 79 percent and had a mean rating of 4.84. In some states there is support while in others urban staff see little hope for meaningful support. “Not happening and likely will not in the near future.” Nancy Crago (FCS) said, “We have support verbally, but they don’t always put the resources behind the words.” The Delphi panelists shared some strong statements. “More than 80 percent of our population live in urban areas of the state, but we certainly don't have 80 percent of the resources. Probably less than 10
percent of the resources...so that does not demonstrate a conviction or understanding.
We need to get to where administrators understand we must fund where the
people/clients are.” “Extension will have to adequately fund urban Extension programs
if Extension is to survive into the foreseeable future.” A comment at the programmatic
level was shared by Sandy Feather (Consumer Horticulture), “PSU wants the MG
program to be self-sustaining. There is concern statewide about this because it makes
the MG program’s future uncertain.” The comments shared suggest the relationship
between county offices and state Extension should be improved in some states.

“Using the resources of the entire land-grant university for urban Extension
outreach” was rated as a vital practice. The consensus was 90 percent with a mean of
5.10. Practice varied as reported by different panelists. In some places this happens and
in others it does not. Technology, improved communication systems, and the renewal of
the land-grant mission are improving this situation. Barriers to urban Extension using
the resources of the entire land-grant university include lack of administrative support
for this, funding not available to support collaborations outside of the traditional
departments involved in Extension work, little or no awareness of Extension by most
university faculty, and turf issues. Deno De Ciantis (CED) in Allegheny County
commented, “There is a movement now to embrace the mission of the land-grant
university. They are contending that they are not, across the board, living up to the
expectations of the land-grant, the engaged university.” Based on the literature, the case
study, and the Delphi panel’s input, the entire land-grant university should be working with Extension. The implication is, Extension should use the resources of the entire land-grant university.

“Urban Extension staff working with faculty and staff at urban universities” was seen as a vital pattern of success. Consensus was reached at 90 percent with a mean of 5.20. There is great opportunity, especially now, that universities are focusing more on being engaged in their local community and in outreach. In some cases, the urban universities have more resources focused on urban issues than do the land-grant universities. There are opportunities for Extension to host student interns for practical outreach experience. A panelist wrote, “Local extension staff will often develop effective working relationships with other institutions in their areas using their facilities to provide seminars, working with their faculty, etc. to get research-based information that may not be available through our own organization.” Mike Masiuk (Horticulture) has a close working relationship with Chatham College in Pittsburgh and Nancy Crago (FCS) has worked with the University of Pittsburgh. The University of Pittsburgh is doing the evaluation of the 21st Century Learning Centers for Allegheny County. The Allegheny County educators agreed that working with local urban universities is an important practice. Barriers involve maintaining Extension’s identity when working with large urban universities, the time to build the relationships, and lack of funding to support efforts. A non-Extension panelist wrote, “To my knowledge, no one has
accessed our facility which is the flagship Urban College in the state.” The data strongly suggest that Extension form collaborations with local urban universities or pertinent departments of urban universities.

A current strength and vital pattern of success for the future is collaborating with individuals and organizations outside of Extension, as well as local communities to provide outreach. “More work needs to be done in this area to work the partnerships and collaborations...to truly make Extension the ‘Front door to the University’...to all University resources available to all elements of the community.” Consensus was reached in Round I at 90 percent with a mean rating of 5.45. In Allegheny County these collaborations are extensive, so it was not surprising that the educators agreed that this practice is vital. 4-H collaborates with schools and community groups to provide youth development. Nutrition programs are given to clientele of other community organizations and agencies. Horticulture collaborates with Phipps Conservatory, many of the professional organizations, as well as city and county parks and recreation departments. Family and Consumer Sciences networks extensively with other agencies and organizations, often coordinating educational activities. Partnering with other organizations is a part of the culture of Penn State Cooperative Extension of Allegheny County. The strong and early agreement with this statement and the comments supporting this collaboration makes collaborating with local communities and organizations a priority.
The Delphi panel rated locating urban Extension offices in the urban core as a vital practice with consensus at 85 percent with a mean of 5.20. The Penn State Cooperative Extension office of Allegheny County is an example, being housed in a large office complex in the City of Pittsburgh with several other governmental agencies and organizations. The rationale expressed by the Delphi panel included, “being in the community served instead of just visiting,” “being an integral part of the urban setting,” and “easy accessibility to and for clientele.” The cost factor was seen as a barrier to this happening in some locales. One panelist stated, “Location of the office may not be as important as the location of the programming.” Having multiple offices could be a way to be a part of as many communities as possible, but this idea did not reach consensus. With limited financial and human resources, this was not viewed as practical. The idea of co-locating with collaborating organizations did not come to consensus. Some panelists saw this as potentially beneficial in some situations while other panelists were concerned about maintaining a strong Extension identity and the costs involved. Although Allegheny County has a few of its staff located in schools where they do the 21st Century Learning Centers, the staff did not view this as co-locating. The data support the implication that, when possible, Extension offices should be in the urban core.

“Maintaining positive working relationships with governmental funding partners” was seen as a vital pattern for the future. Consensus was reached at 90 percent with a mean level of 5.55. Many panelists stated more should be done even though it may be difficult and require significant time. However, it can be done formally through
hearings and meetings, as well as through targeted newsletters for these funders; and informally in networking meetings and at community events. Urban Extension staff must make sure governmental administrators and policymakers know and understand Extension’s impacts. The educators in Allegheny County fully supported this concept. Susan Taylor’s (Youth Development) assessment of Deno De Ciantis’s (CED) impact on this issue is, “Deno has really positioned himself and our whole program where we are seen as a more active part of the county and doing some partnering with other county departments.” Joe Catanese, Chief of Staff for the Allegheny County Council made several comments on this topic.

“Deno presented about Extension to the County Council. It was the first time Extension was represented and made a presentation. We don’t take adequate advantage of Extension’s programs. The Council didn’t understand PSCE Allegheny County….Deno De Ciantis keeps the county involved. For instance, National Family Week. Getting Council involved is important…. It is all about relationships. National Family Week is not just PSU, but other outside organizations. It brings all these groups together. As Chief of Staff, I come to listen. I can then help with the county to connect to the others and their expertise. It is a good opportunity to have input and to build relationships.”

PROGRAMMING: Target Populations

“Targeting populations with the greatest need” was evaluated as being an important pattern of success with consensus at 80 percent and a mean of 4.45. The comments indicated the specific population should not be the target, but the need should be the target. The benefit may be to a specific target population, but the program is built around the need. Comments indicated our cultural perspective is focused on issues. The educators in Allegheny County focused far more on issues and then determined the population to target. In practice, it is a combination of identifying needs and the
appropriate target population. The federal nutrition program EFNEP targets low-income individuals with children. The Steel Valley Cancer Coalition targets women in a specific geographic location where cancer rates are high. The 21st Century Learning Centers target youth who need extra help to thrive in school in specific school districts where the need is highest. Cindy Javor spoke of providing fact sheets to flood victims.

“Urban Extension continues to serve the suburban populations.” Consensus was reached in Round I where the panel’s perspective was still focused on what currently exists. Consensus was at 95 percent with a mean of 4.95. One panelist wrote, “Struggles with the appropriate balance between urban and suburban. The majority of the metro population is suburban, but the need is urban.” Balancing the suburban and urban programming is a tension for urban staff. Some programs by nature fit better with one population or another. The Master Gardener program with its volunteer component is more attractive to suburbanites, yet it does not exclude anyone who is interested and willing to participate. Other programs, such as the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program and Family Nutrition Program are targeted toward a specific demographic group. A key issue is monitoring so that potential populations are not excluded due to marketing or other unintended actions. Allegheny County’s horse clubs are predominantly suburban due to the expense of owning horses. However, animal science projects has been made possible for inner-city youth by using animals housed on a farm in a county park. Although consensus was reached in Round I, and the
panelists’ comments were primarily focused on current practice, the Allegheny County staff indicated that current practice should continue. The case study support adds to the level of confidence, supporting this statement as a pattern of success for the future.

The statement, “Urban Extension staff maintains programming for traditional client.” achieved consensus, but at a level below that of importance (4.05) for future practice. Consensus was reached during Round I, again implying the high possibility that the panel was rating statements on the current situation. The comments are, “Less than in other counties in terms of 4-H, etc.” “What is meant by traditional? Is this reference to rural?” “Teammate does that.” During the focus group, a lively discussion ensued on the question of what is meant by “traditional.” Was traditional being viewed in the perspective of the statewide Extension system or of urban traditions? It was stated that an urban traditional clientele was being developed. Even within the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, “the types of clients have changed over the years. We now focus on people in treatment centers who are trying to change their lives around.” The discussion was inconclusive.

“Urban Extension should not unnecessarily duplicate services provided by other organizations in the community.” This statement was rated as a vital pattern of success for the future with consensus at 90 percent and a mean of 5.21. In the first two rounds, a few panelists’ comments were more of the tone that we have a different, more grass roots based approach, so we are improving on delivery rather than duplicating. In Round III, two themes emerged. One theme was other organizations are duplicating our work and out-performing us because of investing more resources toward the efforts.
The other theme was we must “Coordinate / network / collaborate vs. duplicate.” This may be the more productive theme because, “Future funding sources will be increasingly critical of us if we duplicate services or fail to collaborate.” The coordinate / network / collaborate theme appears to be the direction Allegheny County has taken. Collaborations were mentioned repeatedly in interviews with each of the educators. Examples include the Family and Consumer Sciences efforts in child care programming, the Horticulture work with Phipps Conservatory and the City of Pittsburgh’s arborists, the Youth Development work in the 21st Century Learning Centers and other youth development organizations, and the Nutrition work in social service agencies. Susan Taylor (Youth Development), stated it well, “We enhance other organizations’ programs, bringing research-based information.” These collaborations were not limited to external organizations, but also included cooperative programs with educators in surrounding counties and with state specialists.

PROGRAMMING: Program Planning

“Delivering research-based information” was rated as a vital pattern of success with consensus at 85 percent and a mean of 5.30. It is a cultural norm of the Extension organization that is easily summed up, “That is our mission.” Brack Barr (Youth Development) mentioned it as a selling point for 4-H curricula. Lisa Janosko (Nutrition Education Program) mentioned it when talking about adapting curriculum materials in the Pennsylvania Nutrition Education Program. Deno De Ciantis (CED) stated it was the strength of Extension’s 21st Century Learning Centers approach. The implication is to continue with this strength.
“Involving representatives of target populations in program planning” was rated as a vital pattern of success. Consensus was achieved at 85 percent with a mean of 5.15. It is something Extension professionals usually do. The concern is, do Extension professionals involve the correct people? Advisory committee members are often organizational leaders. Are we truly involving potential participants, and when we consider who the potential participants might be, are we including people who are not current Extension clientele or people who are under-represented in our current outreach? These are challenges that should be addressed. Mike Masiuk shared information from earlier in his career when he was developing programs based on input from his advisory committee. The programs were focused on “the cream-of-the-crop” in the horticulture industry, not the workers who needed educational opportunities the most. Based on this realization, Mike adjusted his programming to address the needs of the horticultural workers. The educators in Allegheny County do this and believe it is important.

“Being more inclusive during program planning” was identified as a vital pattern of success. Consensus was 85 percent with a mean rating of 5.05. The comments reinforce the example given from the horticulture unit in Allegheny County. “We must increase our input especially with minority groups. We tend to rely too much on groups and individuals from populations with which we are most comfortable.” In Allegheny County, “We have a local planning group that is in the county, called United for Children. It has 6 goal areas: one of them is parenting engagement and extension. I chair the workgroup for the parent engagement piece” stated Nancy Crago (FCS).
The panel rated “being holistic in program planning” as a vital pattern of success with a mean rating of 5.21 and consensus at 90 percent. As one panelist put it, “We must move beyond our approach of programmatic areas in program planning. Many times our programs would show more impact if we were able to use a holistic approach rather than traditional programming.” Extension’s efforts to be more issues-based and to work in teams may help address this challenge. Barriers to this arise from the academic base of Extension specialists where each department is a separate unit. However, efforts such as the new Community Food Program that is starting in Allegheny County take a more holistic approach to programming by including horticulture, community development, economic development, personal and business finance, and youth development. The implications from the two statements about program planning being inclusive and holistic are intertwined. Including people from the community who will be directly affected by the programming will help Extension be more effective in understanding the issues and potential solutions. Listening to these outside voices will help us avoid our program-unit focus because the outsiders probably don’t know our program units.

The panel indicated “program planning that is interdisciplinary and crosses academic and program area boundaries” is an important pattern of success. The consensus was at 80 percent with a mean rating of 4.75. Panelists’ comments suggest when this is done it is done based on individual initiative, not administrative or organizational encouragement. With Extension having a grass-roots culture this may be appropriate, but this lack of organizational support may limit adoption of this practice.
An example of organizational support is in Minnesota where a liaison was hired to bridge the gaps between departments and between Extension and departments. It is interesting that holistic program planning that is issues-based was strongly supported as a vital pattern, yet when framed as “interdisciplinary” program planning, the level of support decreased.

“Basing program planning on the realities of the urban environment” was rated as an important pattern of success with consensus at 80 percent and a mean of 4.9. This statement viewed through a positivist / empiricist perspective suggests there is one urban reality. However, from a constructivist perspective there are likely multiple realities; a factor that complicates this statement. Barriers to success are importing programs that “have worked well in less-urban areas and expecting them to work as well in urban situations.” An example of a program that would be based on urban realities is storm water management. “This is very important but often underserved because of our lack of skills. For example, storm water management is a huge issue in which we have little expertise.” Using expertise from other disciplines and working cooperatively with other agencies could help us address this urban issue. Planning based on urban realities is not only focused on the types of programs offered, but also how programs are presented. Nancy Crago (FCS) spoke of this reality in planning a major program. “We have been doing this [child care training] since the late 80s and early 90s, but the program has grown, so it now takes up a good half of my time or maybe more than that. It involves administering, managing it, hiring trainers, collaborating with other trainers, developing training calendars; all of those things are part of the program
responsibilities.” An implication of urban realities is likely issues-based programming. Since most urban issues are complex, the solutions are likely to arise from multiple disciplines working together.

“Assets-based programming” was identified as an important pattern of success with consensus at 80 percent and a mean rating of 4.55. However, comments tended to suggest not all panelists were familiar with the concept of assets-based programming. “I'm not sure I understand this. For the most part I think this should be done but if school dropout or water pollution are very important issues, should we not get involved?” The level of understanding may be based on program background and training. “Growing trend – especially in the human resources program areas. Not sure in the more traditional areas.” This may be a concept that should be introduced into the Extension system and explored to realize its potential.

“Program planning based on the logic model” was rated as a vital pattern of success. It reached consensus at 94 percent with a mean rating of 5.17. Comments indicate 4-H is a leader in the use of the logic model, primarily because 4-H Youth Development educators have been provided education in the use of this model. In Allegheny County both Youth Development and Family and Consumer Sciences use the logic model. A strength of the model is, “If used, stronger impact would result.” The need for increased and improved training in the use of the logic model was recommended. Other models have been used, but none of these other models have
gained wide support. Each model has strengths that could be evaluated for use in urban Extension. This model could provide a stronger program-planning framework that would result in more effective reporting of impacts.

PROGRAMMING: Adult Programming

Consensus was not reached on Extension being a catalyst for social change in urban areas. All ratings were in the positive categories. Many of the comments indicated Extension strives for this but is limited by resources. One example shared was with school gardens. Perhaps the key pattern might be, “Extension has a unique role to play in identifying needed change and putting the key organizations together to help address change.” This perspective was affirmed with another statement, “But not just Extension - we must partner to truly be a catalyst.” Deno De Ciantis, CED in Allegheny County, said, “It could be more so, but it is an issue of resources versus the magnitude of the problems we address. With limited staff and resources, we are limited in our impact.” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) added, “we work with others to improve this, but we are still quite limited in resources.” The identification of partnerships and collaborations being a vital pattern of success has impacts on this issue. One implication may be that urban Extension educators may need to change their perspective from doing programs that address an issue to being one of a group of collaborators who address an issue. Perhaps Extension educators with expertise in leadership and group facilitation fill the role of bringing the right people to the table and facilitating the discussion of how to address social issues in the community.
Consensus was not reached on the statement, “Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties.” Many of the same comments made on the previous statement were shared on this statement. An additional one focused on the issue of what we measure in evaluation and how it is reported. “This is often where Extension can ‘shine’ and it is important to have economic impact related to our program efforts to be able to interpret our value to urban audiences.” Through partnerships and collaborations, program planning and evaluation that include economic impact, and effective reporting of impacts, Extension could respond affirmatively to this statement. Two programs in Allegheny County having definite economic impact are the commercial horticulture program and the Better Kid Care program. Both build technical skills that impact business’s bottom line as well as the general economy. The impacts however are not measured and reported effectively in these cases, by admission of the educators involved. Measuring and reporting economic impacts may become increasingly important and should be built into the program plan. The Better Kid Care program model, where Nancy Crago (FCS) brings together many people and organizations to address the issue of child care in Allegheny County, exemplifies the concept of Extension educators acting as leaders and facilitators to address an issue.

Consensus was reached at the level of important pattern for the statement, “Extension is a catalyst for environmental change in urban counties.” This statement achieved 80 percent consensus with a mean rating of 4.47. Many of the same comments were written as were presented with the previous two statements. However, the comments did not provide a rationale for why Extension is seen as a catalyst in the
environmental area and not in others. Both the commercial horticulture program and the Master Gardener program were mentioned in the Allegheny County conversation. The partnerships in programming with Phipps Conservatory and the professional landscapers’ groups may result in more perceived visibility and impact. Both of these programs are quite prominent in Allegheny County. The weekly column written by Sandy Feather in the *Post Gazette* adds visibility for the horticulture unit too. Another part of the perception could be based on the impact of the Master Gardener program, but this is just speculation. More research is needed to ferret out the rationale for the difference between social and economic issues and environmental issues.

Community development as an underlying concept for all urban Extension outreach did not reach consensus. Some panelists did not see community development as part of every program. When it does happen, “We are not always trying to develop the community although that may be an additional outcome.” Our intentions may not acknowledge this, “Though not sure all would acknowledge that.” The impact may more accurately be described as at a neighborhood level. At least a few felt, “It is a natural approach for programming in all areas.” The educators in Allegheny County were in agreement that community development is an underlying concept in Extension programming. Nancy Crago (FCS) pointed out that in Allegheny County, “we consider how the programs fit into the community situation and how changes in individuals and organizations impact the community.” Youth Development Educator, Brack Barr stated, “We don’t focus on community development, but we do leadership development in most of our 4-H programs.” The project Brack does with the students at Westinghouse
High School is community development. He has worked with the students and teachers in growing herbs to be sold to local restaurants and markets. This builds the capacity of the youth, teaching entrepreneurial skills, and adds value to the high school program.

The new Community Food Program, focused on food security in city neighborhoods, also is community development through a horticulture project. The junior arborist program not only teaches professional skills, it improves city parks. Nancy Cargo’s child care programs also have positive impacts on neighborhoods and communities by increasing the number and quality of child care available in a community, as well as improving individuals’ business skills. Nancy did acknowledge, “Any time we work with people, we are enhancing their abilities to get things done in their neighborhoods and communities.” Perhaps Extension staff underestimates the number of programs that build community capacity. A better understanding of community development concepts may help urban Extension educators purposefully plan community development impacts into their programming. Including community development impacts in all program areas could result in a more holistic approach to programming. If the logic model were used, then these impacts would be more likely measured and reported.

Consensus was reached at the level of vital pattern of success for “urban Extension addressing family issues, such as financial challenges, health, nutrition, disruption of the family structure, parenting, and issues of aging.” Consensus was reached in Round I at 95 percent with a mean rating of 5.45. Allegheny County saw this as current practice and important for the future. Nancy Crago concurred that her programming does this in Allegheny County. With both EFNEP and PANEP in
Allegheny county the impact is greater in part due to the number of staff (14) doing outreach in the county. The Delphi panel was focused on current practice during Round I and the lack of comments supporting a future focus results in doubt about the panel’s intent for future practice. More research is needed to address this concern.

The panel also identified “horticulture and natural resources address environmental quality, such as air and water quality, brownfields, development of green space, and landscaping” as a vital pattern of success. Consensus was in Round I at 85 percent with a mean rating of 5.25. Although there was a positive rating, the limitation of resources to do this was an issue. Allegheny County agreed that this is current practice and important for the future. Allegheny County Extension’s programming in landscape plant selection and landscape maintenance certainly impacts environmental quality. However, Mike Masiuk stated Extension is not working in the area of brownfields because it is seen as the University of Pittsburgh’s area of expertise, although the University of Pittsburgh is involved only in assessment and not education. The limitations of number of staff and state specialist expertise limit outreach into such areas as air and water quality, brownfields, and development of green space. The question of the Delphi panel’s intent results in the need for additional research on this statement.

The teaching of job skills was rated as a vital pattern of success in Round I with consensus at 79 percent and a mean rating of 5.00. This implies job skills training is currently done, although one panelist indicated, “Not a significant, consistent focus.” In Allegheny County examples include, landscaper training, pesticide applicator training,
Better Kid Care, the new community food security project, and urban arborist for kids. Teenage students also are learning job skills in their work with the 21st Century Learning Centers and the herb-growing project at Westinghouse High School. The concern of the Delphi panel’s intent suggests the need for additional research on this statement.

Addressing economic development in urban areas was rated an important pattern of success. Consensus was reached in Round I at an 85 percent level with a mean rating of 4.50. As one panelist commented, “it depends on how economic development is defined.” Extension may be limited in programming if you define Economic Development as attracting businesses to a community or incubating new businesses, although these happen in Extension in some urban centers. However, urban Extension’s resources in this area are limited and the issues are complex, making impacts somewhat difficult to achieve. Allegheny County does not have an educator to address economic development education. Deno De Ciantis (CED) stated, “we really aren’t players in this. We don’t have the resources.” The lack of support for this issue in the case study and the concern that consensus was reached in Round I when most of the Delphi panelists were not focused on future practice results in doubt concerning this statement. Additional research should be conducted.

Addressing community development issues was identified as an important pattern of success. Consensus was 84 percent with a mean rating of 4.95. Community development is seen as a growth area for urban Extension. However, in most urban areas, the resources are limited. To have significant impact, resources are needed to
build networks, collaborations, and partnerships to address community development issues. One panelist pointed out, our efforts are more often neighborhood-based efforts. Several examples have been shared already. Allegheny educators see this as something they do and that should continue. Nancy Crago (FCS) added, “The way we program in partnerships and collaborations is community development because it builds capacity in those organizations we work with. We do strategic planning for organizations.” Leadership also may be included in community development and Nancy Crago has been involved in both development of curriculum materials and teaching. Considering the statements that address community development in this instrument, the results concerning the level of importance have been somewhat mixed. This suggests the need for research targeted at better understanding the place of community development. If urban Extension is to program in a more holistic way, it seems intuitive that community development could be the model upon which to build.

A vital pattern of success in urban Extension is the use of volunteers to extend its outreach. Consensus was reached in Round I at 80 percent with a mean rating of 5.25. This was seen as one of Extension’s real strengths. Deno De Ciantis stated, “we would be very limited if we didn’t use volunteers.” The Master Gardeners volunteer in both the consumer and the commercial horticulture programs. Certainly, the 4-H program is heavily dependent on volunteer leaders. The use of volunteers is a part of the core culture of Extension. Because it is a core practice that was rated as vital, and
strongly confirmed by the case study participants, it is likely to continue as a vital pattern of success for the future. The preponderance of support for the use of volunteers likely outweighs the concern about Round I consensus.

Train-the-trainer programs are a vital pattern of success in urban Extension. Consensus was reached in Round I with 95 percent and a mean rating of 5.20. The limited comments in the Delphi questionnaire support this practice. There were many examples in Allegheny County. This is done in some child care programs, commercial horticulture where managers are trained and then train workers, school-based 4-H programs where teachers are trained in projects, and out-of-school programs where staff of youth serving organizations are trained. A leadership program is just beginning where Penn State Extension educators will be trained to train others. Consensus of the Allegheny County educators was that this is a vital practice that will continue. The train-the-trainer model is a core model of Extension and the level of support for this model counterbalances the concern about the statement reaching consensus during Round I.

PROGRAMMING: Youth Development / 4-H

One panelist disagreed with the use of the term 4-H indicating 4-H is a traditional program that is not applicable in the urban setting and preferred the term youth development. The panelist stated, “Your statement, Urban 4-H is misleading. Extension uses traditional 4-H. However, the urban educators modify the programs to make them relevant for the urban youth.” For this reason, the statements were changed in Rounds II and III to “urban 4-H / youth development.”
Consensus was reached at the level of important pattern of success for the statement “urban 4-H / youth development targets youth who often have multiple risk factors.” Consensus was at 85 percent with a mean rating of 4.70. It was stated by one panelist, “Staff is not always equipped, but does a good job of working with/through other agencies.” Another panelist indicated the need to “hire individuals with non-traditional degrees that are comfortable working with at-risk youth.” In Allegheny County, the youth development staff felt they did this in collaboration with many agencies and organizations in the community. They were observed working with youth who have multiple risk factors in the 21st Century Learning Center program. These youth performed poorly in school, many coming from low-income families that lacked the resources to address poor reading skills and behavioral problems. The educators believe this is an important practice for the future. The two suggestions for how best to work with at-risk youth seem appropriate. Extension can work with others who have the necessary expertise. Hire Extension educators with the expertise and train those lacking the expertise.

“Urban 4-H / youth development effectively does programs with both urban and suburban youth” reached consensus at the important pattern level with consensus at 85 percent and a mean rating of 4.50. The programming for these two populations may be different. “Urban and suburban youth do not always have similar programming needs. Extension educators must have the ability to adjust programming to meet the needs of both groups.” Allegheny County staff stated that the capacity to work extensively in the suburbs is limited by only having two staff educators. They also discussed the wide
differences in suburban communities. They indicated the industrial suburbs along the
rivers “are just little Pittsburghs,” while the more affluent outer suburbs where many of
the 4-H horse clubs are located are quite different. Brack Barr (Youth Development)
stated the situation graphically, “If you look at the Mon Valley (communities along the
Monongahela River), these are industrial centers that have gone bust because the
manufacturing centers are gone. You don’t see the neat little white picket fences. Indeed
when the mills were there you didn’t see them because the air was polluted by discharge
from the local mill. I think we do [work with suburban kids], but our suburban kids are
not the middle class or upper middle class suburban kids.” Consensus was that
programming should be provided for both urban and suburban youth, but more people
are needed to do that effectively. The implication is, serving both populations is
important and adequate staffing is needed to achieve this level of programming.

The statement, “the diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H youth programs
reflects the diversity of the youth population” had 79 percent of the responses in the
agree and strongly agree categories, but did not reach consensus. Comments from the
panel generally agreed that this must happen if urban Extension is to serve a diverse
youth population, but the challenges of doing this appear to be significant. In Allegheny
County it was pointed out that with the urban youth, paid agency staff are serving in the
role normally done by a volunteer in non-urban settings. When looking at the staff,
there is a lack of males. This was seen as a critical deficiency. “I think that in terms of
male participation, that is something that is so sorely needed. Especially where you
have not just a population of young men, but also males can have a positive influence
on young girls, especially if they are in single parent homes.” The difficulty of getting volunteers from the parents of urban youth is a challenge mentioned by Brack Barr (Youth Development) during an interview.

“Programming here is both easy and hard. Let me talk about the hard stuff first and get that out of the way. I think like most people it is getting volunteers. What Extension has, everybody needs. When you get a chance to make a presentation, people see that it is wonderful. And, in my case, since I work with youth, they want to bring me their kids and ask when we can get started. I tell them since in this particular county there are actually only two of us working as Extension educators with youth that I can’t do any one club myself. What I am looking for is volunteers, a parent interested in what their children are doing. Wanting them to have something better. In a large urban area like ours, it also becomes easier to find people who are working with kids. Those are usually the better ones. The programs that already exist; they were already working anyhow and you place in their hands the projects we have, maybe do a little training on some aspects of it and then they and their staff run with it. Sometimes they find the volunteers themselves from their community. But that’s the sticking point; it’s the volunteers.”

Consensus was reached at the level of vital pattern for the statement, “Urban 4-H programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interest, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation.” This statement had consensus at 95 percent with a mean rating of 5.25. One panelist saw this as, “why we partner with agencies.” The assumption being the staff of the agencies share the common characteristics with the youth served by the agency. A few of the panelists see this as a reason for Extension staff to be diverse, “Extension must mirror the diversity that our urban counties exhibit.” The limited staff numbers would necessarily limit outreach to youth with different characteristics. Consensus also was reached with the educators in Allegheny County with the caveat, “there is value in youth being exposed to people
different from themselves.” The issue of sexual orientation is difficult when placed in the context of working with youth. Brack Barr (Youth Development) illustrated this with,

“At a church conference, they singled me out because they knew I what I did. The thing was about discrimination. If you had somebody who was openly gay, and they wanted to be a 4-H leader what would you do? I asked, ‘I would screen them. It is my understanding that we can’t discriminate against them because they are openly gay. Now, in 4-H as in most youth-serving organizations, one of the rules is no sexual activity. So, if you see somebody who is trying to recruit, that is a no-brainer. We would do that if some male leader was trying to molest females, or vise versa.’”

The conversation then turned to a different consideration. One staff member shared, “I think it is alright to have people who are slightly different who bring new light to the situations or different experiences. All of the staff at 21st are of the community, but Christie and I are not from the community and we are able to bring new light or information on some things that they may not be able to see outside of their community.” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) pointed out, “In particular in these areas, a lot of people do not travel outside of their neighborhood.” Brack Barr elaborated, “We want that statement to be ‘Yes.’ We also want people to be able to walk or cross those different lines and receive information from people who don’t look like them, who don’t think like them and don’t have the same cultural background. To process that information and see it as useful even though it may be totally different.” Perhaps the ideal situation is the combination of people who are similar to the youth and others who differ. Seeing adults successfully negotiate differences is valuable for youth.
Extension may never be able to have staff with which the youth can identify in terms of the many variables. Working with other organizations allows this to happen in a grassroots way. It confirms the recommendation to work collaboratively.

Reaching consensus at the important pattern of success level was the statement, “Urban 4-H / youth development gives youth, especially teenagers, a significant voice in the programs offered.” Consensus was at 80 percent with a mean rating of 4.55. Although there is agreement on the need, there again is the limitation of staff numbers. “Would be nice but probably not effectively done because of scarce resources.” Allegheny County staff feels this happens, especially with its use of the self-determined projects. Training may be needed for staff and volunteers in allowing teens a greater voice in their urban 4-H / youth development programs.

The “exploration of careers in urban 4-H / youth development” was evaluated as an important pattern with consensus at 90 percent and a mean rating of 4.95. The Delphi panel wrote few comments. Brach Barr’s involvement in the MANRRS Program, (Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Related Sciences) demonstrated the commitment to career exploration in Allegheny County. His herb-growing project at Westinghouse High School teaches business skills that can be transferred to any career. This project is an example of developing life skills important in the workplace. Educators in Allegheny County agreed this was current practice and should continue.

“The use of authentic civic involvement to provide a setting for developing skills such as writing, public speaking, networking, collaborating, teamwork and leadership” was rated as an important pattern of success. Consensus was at 90 percent
with a mean rating of 4.65. The only written comment was, “limited opportunities.” The County Extension Director, Deno De Ciantis, shared two examples. “Whenever possible we try to use authentic involvement. Our Youth In Government project is one that is a small project numbers wise, but it engages kids in county government. Youth doing tree work is authentic.” In the 21st Century Learning Centers where the performing arts is a focus, the writing and production of plays likewise is an authentic focus on writing, public speaking, collaboration and teamwork. Since this is as important pattern of success, there should be an opportunity for urban educators to share ideas so educators in other areas may learn how authentic civic involvement can occur.

“Providing opportunities for youth to experience mentoring or apprenticeships to enhance technical, personal and social competence” was rated as an important pattern in Round I with consensus at 79 percent and a mean rating of 4.58. Only one statement was written, “This is key to their future.” Allegheny County staff felt they do this to a limited extent. The examples mentioned previously, including the Youth In Government project, the Junior Arborist, and a new Community Food Project, provide this type of opportunity. The MANRRS Project emphasizes the use of mentors from the community according to Brach Barr. The educators shared a concern that doing mentoring in a meaningful way is challenging and time consuming. The limited support for this statement and the Round I consensus do not provide the level of confidence in this statement as a pattern of success for the future.
“Urban 4-H providing in-school enrichment programs” was rated as an important pattern of success. Consensus was achieved in Round I at the 80 percent level with a mean rating of 4.45. The Delphi panel wrote no comments. The popularity of the chick embryo project in Allegheny County is an example of a successful program. Susan Taylor (Youth Development) shared, “We have branched out and offer about 10 different projects. Of course, embryology is the most popular. Two years ago the state academic standards included the information about IPM (Integrated Pest Management) that the kids have to know and we have a project on that. We are one of the few places that have resources and information on IPM. They also use some of our plant science and natural resource projects that are popular...I think last year I worked with 120 schools. I can’t remember the exact number. Most are repeats. Twenty percent of them are new ones.” Susan attempts to gather impact data. “I kind of just do a real quick evaluation. It is more life skills. Have the kids improved their record keeping? Have you seen better school attendance? It is pretty much a survey for them to fill out. I try to tie it in to their science skills. These projects are also, because we are agricultural sciences, the projects that help your kids practice science skills, like observation, record keeping, all those things that are good science skills for them to be using.” The staff of Allegheny County rated this as an important practice for the future. Although the Delphi panel’s rating is uncertain concerning future practice, the strong support in Allegheny County recommends school enrichment programs as an important pattern of success for the future.
“Urban 4-H / youth development providing out-of-school programs” was seen as a vital pattern of success. Consensus was achieved in Round I at 90 percent with a mean rating of 5.35. The common Delphi comment was, “that is our focus.” There are several examples of this in Allegheny County. Urban Extension youth development does a great deal of programming for other agencies. Certainly, the 21st Century Learning Centers are major efforts in three communities. This effort was accomplished by hiring staff to implement the program with grant dollars as the source of the necessary funding. “A large number of the staff is Americorp. The other staff is employed either full-time or part-time out of Penn State.” There was strong support for this as current and future practice in Allegheny County. Despite the concern about Round I consensus, the level of consensus and the high rating placed on this practice, as well as the strong support in Allegheny County, urban 4-H / youth development out-of-school programs will be considered a vital pattern of success. Out-of-school urban 4-H / youth development exemplify collaboration with other agencies.

The statement, “Urban 4-H / youth development uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education” reached consensus at the important practice level. Consensus was at 83 percent with a mean rating of 4.39. However, the comments mostly indicated program should be based on needs or a combination of needs and assets. The concept of assets-based programming does not appear to be well understood. This suspicion was confirmed by a statement made by an Allegheny County educator, “I’m not sure what assets and needs-based means.” Another educator stated, “I think it is a combination. The program starts with assets-based, looking at where you are now...
and where would you like to go.” The lack of understanding of the assets-based program model appears to invalidate the finding on this statement. More research is recommended on this topic and more training on assets-based program development may be appropriate.

“The use of service learning as an authentic way of connecting youth to their community through interdisciplinary, collaborative, engaged learning” was identified as an important pattern of success in Round I with 100 percent consensus and a mean rating of 4.65. This early consensus suggests the Delphi panel saw service learning as a current practice. The educators in Allegheny County offered two examples: tree planting by youth and horse club members helping to repair facilities at county parks. Brack Barr (Youth Development) shared, “in all of the projects I can, service learning is a component. Explaining to the youth what this does, not just to the immediate gain in knowledge of how to make something, but what is the larger impact of this type of activity on your club, your community, your world (part of the 4-H pledge).” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) added, “I think we are going to see an improvement in this area in our state because they have just recently hired a state specialist to design this. So, we are seeing some new things in this area.” The focus on the future in the Allegheny County comments suggests that service learning in youth development programming is an important pattern of success for the future. Service is part of the 4-H pledge, indicating it is part of the culture.
“Providing prevention programs for youth-at-risk” was identified as a vital pattern of success. Consensus was reached at 95 percent with a mean rating of 5.11. Collaboration was seen as one way to do this, “In conjunction with youth-serving organizational partners.” Another indicated, “If we chose to, 4-H could compete successfully for funding traditionally going to ‘prevention’ programs. Often we are doing the same thing, just using different language.” This use of different language is an important factor in how urban Extension interfaces with potential partners. Allegheny County believes they do provide prevention programs. Brack Barr (Youth Development) made an interesting comment that relates to both the use of language and prevention programs.

“I said years ago to some people who came down from Penn State, ‘I build positive gangs.’ I like to take negative words and make them positive. The gangs, Crypts and Bloods, when you get together after school, you play basketball, you’re in a gang. When you go to church on Sunday or go to the synagogue where ever, you’re in a gang. What makes that gang negative or positive depends on what you do with it, so when I tell the kids, ‘Come on, I’m going to turn you into a bunch of gangsters!’ it gets their attention. And I say, ‘Never forget as you are doing this, collecting food for the food bank, you are a gangster, but you’re not a criminal.’ It is a point of pride. You are part of one of the best gangs on the Earth; you are a 4-Her. The kids like it.”

With 4-H programs being research-based, Extension has the opportunity to market its youth development curricula for use by risk-prevention programs. Programming in collaboration with risk-prevention programs is recommended.

Gaining consensus at the vital level was “providing positive youth development training for the staff of other youth-serving organizations.” Consensus was at 95 percent with a mean rating of 5.26. “One of our true strengths!” Doing this would position urban Extension well, “Youth educators should be seen as an expert in youth
development and could serve as a resource for other agencies.” This type of training is needed and wanted. “Here is where we can offer training in program delivery methods that focus on the experiential system of learning.” Not only is this done by youth development / 4-H educators, but others too. In Allegheny County Nancy Crago (FCS) trains child-care providers and parents. Allegheny County educators saw this as a practice for the future. The implication is that urban extension youth development educators should be encouraged to become experts in youth development and marketed as expert trainers for the staff of other urban organizations.

Likewise, “sharing 4-H materials with youth development professionals in other organizations” was seen as a vital practice for urban Extension. Consensus was at 79 percent with a mean rating of 4.79. “So much more could be done.” 4-H materials are shared with teachers in public and parochial schools as indicated in Allegheny County. This was considered a positive practice as long as the other professionals don’t represent these materials as their own. This concern was shared by the staff of Allegheny County in their discussion of having 4-H materials available on the Internet. Deno De Ciantis (CED) expressed this concern.

“Everybody was real excited to put stuff on the web and all of a sudden all of our 4-H projects are now on the Web and you can download them. Anybody in the community can download that stuff and use it. We don’t know if they are using it properly, how they are applying it, when they are applying it. We have no control over it. I think that is to our detriment. Especially if they are going to use our materials, we are not doing ourselves any favors by giving it away for free so to speak where anybody can get it and use it. We see our stuff all over the place. They have taken Penn State off, the Clover leaf off.”
However, Penn State Cooperative Extension of Allegheny County continues to share the resources. Deno De Ciantis stated, “Frankly some of these programs, even though their job is youth development, have staff that doesn’t necessarily have the expertise or the resources. A lot of them focus on sports and things like that. So, it gives us an opportunity to enhance their programming and to instill some things that enhance what they are doing with the kids.” Despite the concerns expressed by the educators in Allegheny County, materials are shared freely and this was considered an appropriate practice in the future. Sharing materials with other organizations may imply that Extension may be involved in a collaborative way with other organizations. If Extension is collaborating, there is an opportunity to train the other staff in appropriate use of the materials. Collaborators are less likely to pirate the materials due to the close relationship. Illegal use of Extension materials should be addressed by informing offending organizations that credit must be given when Extension materials are used.

“Partnering with other youth-serving organizations” was rated as a vital pattern of success. Consensus was at 100 percent with a mean rating of 5.47. A very positive view was stated, “Avoids duplication and extends Extension outreach to other youth. Makes sense.” A less positive response was, “We must utilize our resources in the most effective way possible BUT we MUST be certain that Extension 4-H/Youth Development is seen as a full partner and not lost in the background!!!!” Deno De Ciantis (CED) in Allegheny County stated, “Only way to do it in urban areas.” Partnering with youth-serving organizations is part of the culture of Allegheny County. A less common partnership for an urban Extension program was Brack Barr’s (Youth
Development) collaboration with a gun club and the National Rifle Association.

“Actually getting involved this year with shooting sports. They found out that some of the kids’ parents have those guns and are involved in target shooting, getting ready for hunting. I was surprised at the number of girls that have .22 rifles. So, we are going to start with the safety part. They did a beautiful thing that I think will help. They contacted a local gun club that is kind of anxious to do a youth program. The gun club found out that the NRA has monies for people who want to do a youth program. So we will take our expertise in working with youth and in developing that to work with the gun club.” Collaborating with other organizations is highly recommended and has been confirmed in other statements.

The Delphi panel did not reach consensus on the issue of using the club format in urban 4-H / youth development. The Delphi panel wrote many comments. Without taking away from the positive outcomes of the club format, it was not seen as essential or always desirable. “There are opportunities for the 4-H Club model, but it is not the only model that is effective.” “4-H Clubs are a great way to get inner city youth involved. However, we have to be open to the definition of what is a club. Allow for many variations that meet the needs of the youth.” The statement, “While we use the club format for some outreach, we have had positive experiences with ‘special interest groups’ participating in programs. Clubs require ongoing management and support.” The need for management is one of the challenges to using the club format. With large numbers of youth, there is often insufficient staff to manage large numbers of clubs. Another barrier expressed was, “All urban youth and agencies serving those youth do
not accept the club format.” Another panelist indicated the need to be innovative, “We need to come up with several different models not just the 4-H club model... Way too restrictive!.”

In Allegheny County Deno De Ciantis (CED) stated, “I think the question is ‘Can they? Should they?’ How can you argue against all of the assets of a club, all of the learning opportunities and experiences, but the world certainly has changed. I look at how we differ from Boys & Girls Clubs and the resources they have versus the resources we have.” When working in collaborations, it is important to be flexible. Brack Barr (Youth Development) shared his experience, “We collaborate with so many people who have their own club format. They fit 4-H into what they are doing. Most of the time, they say – ‘Now is the time we are going to do 4-H.’ I am happy to say that they do the 4-H pledge. If they are working in the Boys & Girls format, they fit it into that format. If they are working in YMCA, they fit it into that format.” Susan Taylor (Youth Development) provided some historical perspective, “We made a decision several years ago that the only way to go was to partner and collaborate with others. If we got so hung up on the rules of the club format, we would be nowhere. So, we have been very flexible and the purpose of that was so we could reach more kids.” Although there was no consensus reached by the Delphi panel, the educators in Allegheny County were clear that the club format has many benefits, but is not necessarily the best model when collaborating in urban counties.
The statement, “Urban 4-H works with a wide diversity of youth, including those of different races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, and physical and mental abilities.” reached consensus at the level of vital pattern of success. Consensus was reached during Round I, implying this is a current practice. The staff in Allegheny County agreed that they do not discriminate in any outreach. The commitment to being inclusive is a core value of Extension, indicating that this practice is one that will continue to be a pattern of success.

PROGRAMMING: Teaching and Outreach Methods

“Urban Extension provides 24/7 access to information and educational opportunities” did not gain consensus even though all responses were in the positive-response categories. Comments reflected the use of the Internet would make this possible and most panelists writing comments indicated this is needed. A barrier mentioned by a panelist was, “This may become essential in the future, but for the immediate future there seems to be so much else for us to concentrate on.” In Allegheny County there was general agreement. Information provided on the Internet was 24/7 availability. However, having Extension materials on the Internet was not seen as totally positive. “Everybody was real excited to put stuff on the web and all of a sudden all of our 4-H projects are now on the Web and you can download them. Anybody in the community can download that stuff and use it. We don’t know if they are using it properly, how they are applying it, when they are applying it. We have no control over it. I think that is to our detriment.” However, having horticulture information on the Internet was viewed as appropriate. The difference, according to the youth development
educators, was 4-H materials are process-oriented and the process of using these materials was important. It was felt many organizations were using 4-H materials as their own and removing 4-H and Penn State Extension identification. However, this is not limited to Internet materials as one educator pointed out, “I have seen that done with the publications that are in print.….” Interestingly, a large amount of horticulture information has been placed on the Internet and Mike Masiuk has spent significant time developing additional resources for both commercial and consumer horticulture clientele.

Extension’s human presence, although not 24/7, is quite adaptable. The Allegheny County educators shared the extent to which they flex their schedules to be available when needed. This flexibility combined with Internet presence is highly functional. It is interesting to point out the USDA has put resources into establishing the eXtension Internet-based system with the support of state directors of Extension. The lack of consensus, and the concerns about 4-H youth development materials, has implications for the national eXtension effort.

“The use of technology supported teaching and learning methods by urban Extension educators” was rated as a vital pattern of success. Consensus was reached at 89 percent with a mean rating of 5.32. One panelist saw it as, “This is how we will best reach folks in the future at a cost that is reasonable.” Another stated, “We have to be seen as current and up-to-date. Technology is just one way of doing this.” Technology is expensive and one panelist saw the purchase of technology as administration’s responsibility. Allegheny County educators use satellite broadcasts, the Internet,
interactive video, and CDs to aide in teaching and learning. They see it as both helpful and frustrating at times. Mike Masiuk (Commercial Horticulture) has both ability and interest in technology and has been developing original materials for teaching landscape plant materials courses that involve on-site learning using geographical positioning technology, CD-ROMs, web-based materials, and classroom instruction.

The panel rated as a vital pattern of success “the use of critical thinking techniques to increase learners’ ability to solve problems and make decisions.” Consensus was reached at 95 percent with a mean rating of 5.37. Few comments were made. One panelist stated, “To me this is a key component in designing programs. This helps the client in many other situations, once they improve their critical thinking and decision making skills.” This value-added education does not simply solve an immediate problem, but hopefully results in better analysis of, and decision-making in, other situations. Moving beyond being simply a provider of information to an educational system that teaches people how to learn and apply their learning may be an important step for Extension. Allegheny County educators agreed with the Delphi panel. The level of agreement and importance suggests that critical thinking teaching techniques should be taught to Extension educators and the use of these techniques rewarded.

The statement, “Urban Extension educators use transformative learning methods to help learners examine the assumptions on which and the frame of reference within which their decisions are made.” was evaluated as an important pattern of success. Consensus was at 85 percent with a mean rating of 4.42. The Delphi panelists wrote no
The discussion of this issue during the focus group in Allegheny County was on how critical thinking and transformative learning differed. The educators defined transformative learning as, “It is the ability to make behavioral changes based on information you have.” Within this definition, they felt they were doing this in some programs where behavioral change was appropriate. However, this is not the definition of transformational learning used in the Delphi statement. This misinterpretation by the Allegheny County educators and the lack of comments by the Delphi panel suggest the results for this statement are not valid.

“The use of a variety of learning techniques, such as self-directed learning, group learning, peer teaching, and collaborative learning techniques” was identified as a vital pattern of success by the Delphi panel. Consensus was reached at 85 percent with a mean rating of 5.35. The panelists wrote no comments. The Allegheny County educators believe they do this where appropriate to the subject matter and the educational goals and objectives. The descriptions of some of the 21st Century Learning Center activities appeared to include collaborative and group learning. Consensus was reached in Round I during which many of the panelists were thinking in the present. This may imply the use of these learning techniques is current practice. The lack of comments from the Delphi panel casts doubt on the rating of this statement. However, the support of the case study participants appears to favor retaining the statement as a pattern of success.
“Using service learning in Extension programs for adults” was rated as an important pattern of success with consensus at 80 percent and a mean rating of 4.90. Delphi panelists wrote no comments. The Master Gardener program in Allegheny County was seen as the prime example of service learning. The volunteer work is considered an experiential learning opportunity. Examples shared included the demonstration gardens in county parks, responding to gardening questions and teaching classes for home gardeners. The Allegheny County educators saw this as a valuable learning tool. This suggests that Extension should explore additional ways to incorporate service learning into its programs.

“Doing research on community issues in partnership with people in the community” was rated as a vital pattern of success. Consensus was reached at 84 percent with a mean rating of 4.90. One panelist saw this research collaboration as, “Yes, and it will give us more credibility with clientele plus add value to the communities.” Another panelist seemed to misunderstand the point of the statement and commented, “But don't let the research get in the way of providing clientele-based programming!” Participant-educator research is a form of programming. The Allegheny County staff viewed program evaluation as an example of this statement. This confusion in interpretation of the statement’s meaning suggests the data are not valid. The concept of participatory research is that practitioners and the participants, as co-researchers, research some aspect of the community as a way to teach the participants about the issue and to provide them with research skills. This statement will require further study to determine if it is valid.
Minimizing the use of the expert model of teaching did not reach consensus in the Delphi process. The panelists indicated its use may or may not be appropriate based on the topic, the learning objectives, and the audience. “At times the expert model is appropriate, but should have options of teaching available in order to best deliver a specific topic.” “Expert model can work with some urban audiences but with others can quickly alienate.” The Youth Development and Family & Consumer Sciences units in Allegheny County indicated they did not use the expert model very often. Nancy Crago (FCS) stated, “We use adult education principles.” In the case of the basic Master Gardener course, the classic classroom lecture expert model that is prevalent in many horticulture programs was observed. These data appear inconsistent with the data on critical thinking where it was suggested that Extension teach critical thinking skills that help clientele beyond addressing immediate needs for information. The issue of the expert model of teaching may require additional research to fully understand the implications of these data.

PROGRAMMING: Program Evaluation

“Formative evaluation” was rated as an important pattern of success. Formative evaluation is important because it allows improvements as programming is developed and delivered. Consensus was reached during Round I and no comments were made. The educators in Allegheny County stated this was a current practice. Because of the lack of comments, it is not possible to determine if formative evaluation is considered a pattern of success for the future. More research will be needed.
“Urban Extension’s program evaluation measures multiple competencies, such as social, emotional, behavioral, cognitive, and/or decision-making” achieved consensus in the important practice range with consensus at 85 percent and a mean rating of 4.55. Consensus was achieved in Round I and no comments were written. In Allegheny County the educators stated that measuring multiple competencies was current practice. However, they qualified their statement by saying, “It is dependent on the goals of a program.” and “It depends more on how in-depth the program is. Some are more limited in scope.” Longer, multi-session programs had more in-depth measurements. The Master Gardener program measures cognitive, behavioral, and decision-making competencies. All of the competencies mentioned in the statement are measured in the youth participating in the 21st Century Learning Centers due to the intensive nature of the programs. In this program cognitive and behavioral changes were central to the efforts to improve student performance in school. These were developed through the tutoring component and strict rules for involvement. However, social skills and emotional well being were secondary goals developed through performing acts activities. It is expected the overall program would affect the decision-making ability of the students. Intensive measurement was specified in the grant. The Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program was cited as another intensive effort that measures cognition, behavioral change, decision-making, and social competencies. The goals and levels of evaluation vary greatly for single-contact programs. Because of the lack of focus on the future by most of the Delphi panelists, consensus during Round I is
difficult to evaluate. With the strong support of this concept in Allegheny County, it is likely that measuring multiple competencies will continue to be a pattern of success.

“Evaluation of the level of participants’ empowerment” did not reach consensus. Empowerment is a difficult concept to define and even more difficult to measure. Empowerment is a worthy goal according to one panelist. It is a change that would likely be seen only in the more intensive, long-term programs. The comment from an Allegheny County educator was, “A lot depends on the goal of the program. We are going to measure something else that does not directly affect empowerment, but it happens anyway.”

“Evaluation of changes in critical thinking and problem solving” had consensus at the level of an important pattern of success. Consensus was 83 percent with a mean rating of 4.39. The Delphi panelists wrote no comments for this statement. Critical thinking and problem solving were components seen in the Master Gardener program, especially as these volunteers responded to questions on the gardening hotline and when teaching classes. Nancy Crago (FCS) mentioned Master Parent Leadership and other leadership programs evaluated critical thinking and problem solving. Teaching critical thinking was seen as a vital practice, therefore evaluating this teaching should be encouraged by Extension administration.

“Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes social impacts on the community” achieved consensus in Round I at the level of important pattern of success. No written comments were made. In Allegheny County it was agreed, this is done in some programs where social impacts are intended. Examples that were discussed during
interviews included 4-H programs such as Master Parent Leadership, Better Kid Care, the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program, and some of the 4-H programs. The support expressed in Allegheny County appears adequate to allay concerns about the intent of the Delphi panel in its Round I consensus. The statement was retained as an important pattern of success, but there is need for additional research on the issue of evaluation of social impacts on the community.

“Evaluation of economic impacts on the community” did not reach consensus. Comments indicated this is being done in some cases, but not consistently. The need for this to improve and increase was indicated. Allegheny County educators indicated this is done when it is appropriate. It has been planned into the evaluation of their Community Food Project that is just starting. It could be done with the Better Kid Care program as well as some of the youth development programs, such as the herb project at Westinghouse High School and the junior arborist program. Further research is needed on this issue.

EMERGENT ISSUES

Job satisfaction was raised during the interviews in Allegheny County. Two factors were raised, 1) working with truly nice, dedicated clientele and 2) the diversity of work and the flexibility to try new approaches. In urban settings, clientele should be quite diverse and staff should value and embrace this diversity. Urban Extension professionals must feel at ease with many very different people and work well with them. The diversity of people may range from professionals who are peers from other organizations to clientele with multiple risk factors, including homelessness or lack of
English language skills. Programs, outreach methods, and professional responsibilities are likely to change with the changing needs and issues of the communities served. Urban Extension professionals should embrace change and new challenges and find them invigorating. Extension professionals are generally allowed to approach their work in many different ways and are often encouraged to take risks in addressing new issues and clientele. This too should be viewed as invigorating and not as unwanted challenges.

Urban is different. Deno De Ciantis (CED) as well as several of the educators in Allegheny County raised this issue. There was a sense of isolation from other urban professionals as well as a bond to them. There appears to be tacit “urban” assumptions and knowledge. Brack Barr (4-H / Youth Development) spoke of “thinking out of the box” and saw this as an urban mindset. There was a sense that new challenges, such as drug problems, gangs, and dysfunctional family issues tend to come to urban areas before they spread out to rural areas. The sense that urban is the cutting edge of Extension programming. This issue of urban-is-different needs further exploration.

**Recommendations for Extension**

As a result of this study several recommendations may be made. It should be stated that recommendations be read with the awareness that Extension’s urban county programs vary state-to-state and within each state. Therefore readers should evaluate
each recommendation based on the context of their location, including: the current practice, available resources, and local needs. Recommendations will follow the format used in the study:

- Internal Operations – staffing and funding
- External Operations – marketing, accountability, and partnerships and external relationship
- Programming – target populations, program planning, adult programming, youth programming, teaching and outreach methods, and program evaluation

**Internal Operations**

Staffing in urban Extension offices should be based on population of the area served and the needs of the communities served and not the four program areas. Staffing flexibility is vital for the urban Extension offices if they are to quickly address emerging issues. The skill set needed for urban Extension educators includes: group facilitation, leadership development, human relations, grantsmanship, coalition building, mass media, and marketing. A basic understanding of community development concepts and practices also is helpful. These skills are in addition to expertise in a pertinent field. Urban Extension staffing should reflect the diversity of the community served. The staff members should welcome and value diversity. Staff also must be comfortable with the wide range of urban settings. This may mean hiring candidates who are from or have experience working in the urban community. Because of the sense of urban-is-different and the possibility of an urban personality, it makes
sense that search committees for urban professionals be composed of urban Extension professionals who may be better able to identify the characteristics needed for success in urban Extension.

Funding from traditional tax dollars must be expanded and this traditional funding must be enhanced with increased funding from grants, contracts and gifts. All funding and resources should be maximized through strategic collaborations. Partnerships should be developed for Extension to provide the educational outreach for other federal departments, such as the Department of Defense, Department of Education, Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. The partnerships with these federal departments should be ongoing and established at the federal and / or state level. Project funding sources should be evaluated to make sure the project fits with a modern and expansive Extension mission.

**External Operations**

Marketing efforts must become more effective for continued funding support. To become more effective urban Extension must use a wider variety of marketing methods including electronic media and mass media. Marketing efforts should be based on an understanding of and responsiveness to target audiences needs and behaviors. Consistency in message and repetition of effort is needed. Training of staff is needed, especially because of the highly competitive nature of urban markets.
Effective reporting of impacts is critical for continuing support. The reporting of impacts should be consistent at the state level. Impacts should include both qualitative and quantitative data. Training on data collection, analysis, and reporting should be provided. The reporting tools should be easy to use and adaptable to the unique urban needs. Impacts of all urban programs statewide should be easily merged for effective reporting to urban governmental funders. Community participation in both program planning and program evaluation is needed to demonstrate that Extension programs address community needs. Cost-benefit evaluation was seen as an important tool and training is needed.

Collaboration with urban Extension staff and state specialists is important. State specialists in appropriate fields should be involved in urban programming, including conducting research, developing programs, and assisting in program implementation. Urban Extension staff must have access to and use the resources of the entire land-grant university in their programming as well as collaborate with local urban universities, maximizing the resources available.

Maintaining and expanding collaborations with local communities, organizations, and individuals is vital. Likewise, maintaining and deepening working relationships with governmental funding partners also is vital. Locating urban Extension offices in the urban core has many advantages and should be considered when financially feasible.
Programming

Extension has a culture of targeting issues identified through a needs assessment process. Once the need is identified, a program should be developed that targets the most appropriate population, which may be that with the greatest need. Extension should be conscious of maintaining a programmatic balance so that it continues to provide programs for both urban and suburban populations.

Research-based information is a critical core of Extension education. Urban Extension should avoid unnecessary duplication of services and should instead coordinate, network, and collaborate instead of duplicate or compete. In the program planning process, it is vital for urban Extension staff to involve representatives of target populations, making sure the process is as inclusive as possible. Include those who may not have formerly been invited to participate. Programs should be purposefully planned to be holistic by including a wide range of people from appropriate disciplines and academic departments as well as program participants. Programs must be planned based on the realities and complexities of the urban environment. An understanding of community development methods would be helpful. Assets-based program planning may be appropriate and should be explored. Training on assets-based program planning is recommended. Program planning should be based on the logic model for stronger impacts.

Using technology-supported teaching and learning methods is critical in urban areas. Funding and training for technology-supported teaching should be provided. A variety of teaching and learning techniques, such as self-directed learning, group...
learning, peer teaching, and service learning, should be used where appropriate. Program objectives should include critical thinking when appropriate. Training is needed in the teaching and learning techniques mentioned.

Extension is and should continue to be a catalyst for environmental change, such as air and water quality, brownfield remediation, development of green space, and landscaping. Extension also should continue to provide educational opportunities in family issues, such as financial challenges, health, nutrition, disruption of family structure, parenting, and aging. Teaching job skills was identified as a critical area for urban Extension. Addressing economic development and community development should continue and grow. Volunteers and train-the-trainer programs are critical for extending urban Extension’s outreach.

Urban Extension youth development / 4-H programs should work with a wide diversity of youth, including those of different races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, and physical and mental abilities. The programs should be provided by paid staff and volunteers with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics, such as interests, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation in order to achieve the goal of reaching a more diverse youth clientele. Out-of-school programming is of vital importance. Partnering with other youth-serving organizations is necessary, will extend Extension’s outreach to a more diverse youth population, and will allow Extension to be involved in prevention programs for youth at-risk. Extension youth development educators should be experts in positive youth development and as such, should train youth development staff of other organizations.
Important patterns of success in youth development include the following. Urban Extension should target youth with multiple risk factors. Assets-based programs should be used when possible. Both urban and suburban youth should be included in 4-H youth development. Youth, especially teenagers, should be given a significant voice in the programs offered. Career exploration should continue as an important program component. Authentic civic involvement should be used to develop skills such as writing, public speaking, networking, collaborating, teamwork and leadership. Mentoring and apprenticeships should be included to enhance technical, personal, and social competence. Service learning continues to be an authentic way to connect youth to their community. In-school enrichment programs should continue. 4-H program materials should be shared with professionals in other organizations that provide youth development programming.

Using formative evaluation to improve programs as they are developed and piloted is important. Program evaluation should include multiple competencies to the extent appropriate, depending on the intensity and length of the program. Critical thinking and problem solving are important outcomes to be measured during evaluation of programs where it is an objective.

**Questions and Concern on the Research**

The Delphi panel struggled with responding to the instrument with a focus on the future. Their focus on current practice was particularly evident in Round I. This casts doubt on those statements on which consensus was reached during Round I. In those cases where comments by the panel indicated a focus on the future, the statement
was accepted as a pattern of success. The input of the case study participants also was considered in the decision to include a statement as a pattern of success. To allay doubts, the panel should reassess those statements.

A few panel members made comments to indicate the disparity between the focus on the present and the future. During Round III each Delphi panel member was sent an additional page of instructions prior to receiving the Delphi Round III instrument. The additional page of instructions emphasized the importance of thinking of future practice. This page of instructions is displayed in Appendix F. Thinking in the future was again emphasized in the invitation and introduction to Round III. It could be said, “The best predictor of the future is the present.” If that is the case, the results of the modified Delphi Round I implied future practice based largely on what is current practice. Round III was consistently future-oriented based on the written comments. This unintended occurrence may have strengthened the results as it added to our understanding of current practice nationally, as represented by the members of the Delphi panel.

Another research methods observation was that the length of the Delphi questionnaire in this study resulted in respondent fatigue. This was most noticeable in Rounds I and II when comments dramatically dropped off as panelists moved through the questionnaire. Round III was significantly shorter however; respondent fatigue was still evident as the response rate decreased later in the questionnaire. Some panelists also wrote far shorter comments or none at all during Round III. General comments at
the end of each round addressed the length of the instrument and that the process was long and time consuming. Some panelists added that the study was important and they found it useful.

**General Recommendations**

Many of the specific recommendations will require training for Extension personnel. Potential training topics include leadership, group facilitation, community development concepts and practices, diversity, marketing, media, web pages, technology-based teaching, qualitative and quantitative impact measurement and reporting, cost-benefit planning, and the logic model. It will be important to model the use of many of these skills in the trainings.

There are many exemplary urban programs being done in counties across the United States. These programs and ideas should be widely shared with urban Extension educators. This may involve more consistent Extension urban conferences and Extension professionals attending the conferences of other organizations focused on education in urban settings. The Journal of Extension should be encouraged to provide more emphasis on urban issues.

State and federal Extension administrations should work closely with Extension’s urban professionals to ensure that policies and procedures are “urban-friendly.” With the increasing urbanization of America, these policies and procedures will be increasingly important for the entire Extension family. It is especially important that policies and procedures not impede urban Extension’s ability to collaborate. Flexibility will be important and urban Extension must be allowed to be more flexible
and rapidly adaptable to address the increasing speed of change. Extension’s research base will continue to be our strength, but research with an urban focus must become an increasing part of Extension’s research program.

The focus group conducted with the educators of Penn State Cooperative Extension of Allegheny County was lively. It helped staff members see their own as well as others’ expectations, assumptions, methods, and perspectives. This discussion helped a new employee understand how things are done in Extension in Allegheny County. As he stated, “I knew what to teach, but I wasn’t really clear on how to make it happen.” I recommend the Delphi instrument used in this study be used as a self-assessment tool for Extension’s urban offices. The assessment would be useful in setting goals for improvement.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

This study has raised many questions. The study was not intended to be exhaustive and there remains considerable need to identify current patterns of success throughout the nation. Further study of current practice that is more comprehensive would provide a more complete understanding of patterns of success in urban Extension. To this end, I would recommend the following as rich options for further defining future patterns of success for urban Extension offices.

1. The results of the Delphi provided the best thinking of twenty individuals. Their conclusions are not the total perspective on urban Extension. Experts who have expertise and interest in each separate
component should study each section of this study in a more comprehensive fashion. I recommend modified Delphi studies on each component or related clusters of components.

2. In-depth understanding of urban Extension programs and offices will add depth of understanding of our practices and provide insight into future practice. Several in-depth case studies of urban Extension county offices and urban Extension programs would provide needed knowledge and help urban Extension staff refine their practice of Extension education.

3. The lack of consensus on urban Extension being a catalyst for economic change is somewhat surprising and perplexing. Therefore, this issue is one that should be further studied to determine why Extension would not see itself acting as a catalyst for economic change. The lack of consensus is especially confusing in light of the fact that being a catalyst for social and environmental change was rated as an important factor.

4. Because of the rate of change in the 21\textsuperscript{st} century United States, Extension must continuously re-evaluate where it is as an organization and where it needs to be in the future. This necessitates on-going research. No single research methodology provides a complete understanding of Extension practice. The use of many research
methodologies would result in additional knowledge from a variety of perspectives, enriching an understanding of present practice in urban Extension as well as of the needs for the future.

5. Each state that has a significant urban Extension program should conduct an internal Delphi study using the identified patterns of success to determine the priorities that are critical for them to address.

6. A study comparing and contrasting these findings to a panel of rural county Extension experts would be useful to determine those factors that are common to all of Extension. These data would provide additional insight into how urban and rural Extension differ. These data would be useful in developing policies that maximize the outreach and impact of both urban and rural Extension.
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Patterns of Success in Urban Extension County Offices – Round 1

Patterns of Success in Urban Extension County Offices

The purpose of the study is to determine the patterns or indicators of success for urban Extension offices in the next two to five years.

Round I

Thank you for participating in this study of Urban Extension. Your input is important.

Please respond to each statement, indicating your degree of agreement with the statement as an important factor in the success of urban Extension offices. Each statement is followed by a 6-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. You may make comments to justify your rating, to question or clarify the statement, or to elaborate on the concept. You may suggest additional statements in the final comment box.

It is important that you respond to each statement. If for some reason, you do not wish to respond to a statement, please indicate that in the comment box following that statement.
**STAFFING**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

1. Urban Extension offices are adequately staffed in all four program areas (Family & Consumer Science, 4-H Youth Development, Community Development, and Agriculture/Horticulture & Natural Resources).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Comments:

2. Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Comments:

3. Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have a background in community development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Comments:

4. Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   Comments:
5. Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

6. Urban Extension educators are at ease in working with diverse audiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

7. Urban Extension educators are at ease working in urban settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

8. Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Partnerships and External Relationships

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

10. Urban Extension educators work with state specialists to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.

| 1 Strongly Disagree | 2 Disagree | 3 Mildly Disagree | 4 Mildly Agree | 5 Agree | 6 Strongly Agree |

Comments:

11. Urban Extension educators collaborate with colleagues outside of Extension to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.

| 1 Strongly Disagree | 2 Disagree | 3 Mildly Disagree | 4 Mildly Agree | 5 Agree | 6 Strongly Agree |

Comments:

12. Urban programs have the support of state level Extension administration.

| 1 Strongly Disagree | 2 Disagree | 3 Mildly Disagree | 4 Mildly Agree | 5 Agree | 6 Strongly Agree |

Comments:

13. Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.

| 1 Strongly Disagree | 2 Disagree | 3 Mildly Disagree | 4 Mildly Agree | 5 Agree | 6 Strongly Agree |

Comments:
14. Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

15. Urban Extension staff has close working relationships with local communities and agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

16. Urban Extension office/s are located within the urban core.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

17. Urban Extension has satellite offices throughout the county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

18. Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of collaborating organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
19. Urban Extension staff maintains positive working relationships with governmental funding partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

---

**FUNDING**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

20. Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for sustaining base programming in the four program areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

21. Urban Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

22. Urban Extension offices maximize resources by partnering with other agencies and organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:
23. Urban Extension offices seek effective funding partnerships with other agencies of the federal government, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Education, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Department of Defense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

24. Urban Extension offices seek funding from non-tax dollars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

25. Urban Extension offices maintain a balance between existing traditional sources of funding and new alternative sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

26. Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if there are plans for the sustainability of programs when this funding ends.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

27. Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Rating Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28. Urban programs are effectively marketed.</td>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Mildly Disagree 4 Mildly Agree 5 Agree 6 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Extension has “brand name” recognition in urban areas.</td>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Mildly Disagree 4 Mildly Agree 5 Agree 6 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Urban program marketing is responsive to clients’ needs and attitudes.</td>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Mildly Disagree 4 Mildly Agree 5 Agree 6 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Urban Extension targets clientele with relevant messages and programs.</td>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Mildly Disagree 4 Mildly Agree 5 Agree 6 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing.</td>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree 2 Disagree 3 Mildly Disagree 4 Mildly Agree 5 Agree 6 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

---

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

34. Urban Extension staff effectively reports that programs provide public good in the local, state, and/or national interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

35. Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

36. Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
37. Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs on a cross section of county audiences including the urban poor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

38. Urban Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

39. Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the value of the programs they support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

40. Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the impact of the programs they support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

41. Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:
42. Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

43. Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

44. Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

45. Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

---

**TARGET AUDIENCES AND PARTICIPANTS**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

46. Urban Extension educators focus on those populations with the greatest need, specifically the urban poor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:
47. Urban Extension educators do programs for the suburban populations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

48. Urban Extension staff maintains programming for traditional clients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

49. Urban Extension programs do not duplicate services provided by other organizations in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

---

**PROGRAM PLANNING**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

50. Urban Extension educators use research-based information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
51. Urban Extension educators involve representatives of target populations in program planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

52. Urban Extension educators use program planning processes that are inclusive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

53. Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are holistic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

54. Urban Extension educators use program planning that is based on the realities of the urban environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

55. Urban Extension educators develop programs based on the positive attributes of the community (assets based) instead of the deficits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:
56. Urban Extension educators use program planning that crosses academic and program boundaries to address community issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

57. Urban Extension educators use the logic model in program development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

---

**ADULT EDUCATION**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

58. Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

59. Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

60. Extension is a catalyst for environmental change in urban counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
61. Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

62. Urban Extension educators address family issues, such as financial challenges, health, nutrition, disruption of the family structure, parenting and issues of aging.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

63. Urban Extension educators address environmental quality, such as air and water quality, brownfields, development of green space, and landscaping.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

64. Urban Extension educators teach job preparation skills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

65. Urban Extension educators address economic development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
66. Urban Extension educators address community development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

67. Urban Extension educators extend their outreach through volunteers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

68. Urban Extension educators provide train-the-trainer programs for professionals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

**PROGRAMMING – YOUTH DEVELOPMENT / 4-H**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

69. Urban 4-H targets urban youth who have multiple risk factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

70. Urban 4-H effectively programs with both urban "at-risk" youth and suburban, low-risk youth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
71. The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H youth programs reflects the diversity of the youth population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

72. Urban 4-H programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interests, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

73. Urban 4-H gives youth, especially teenagers, a significant voice in the programs offered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

74. Urban 4-H programming includes exploring careers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

75. Urban 4-H uses authentic civic involvement to provide a setting for developing skills such as writing, public speaking, networking, collaborating, teamwork and leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
76. Urban 4-H provides opportunities for youth to experience mentoring or apprenticeships to enhance technical, personal and social competence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

77. Urban 4-H provides enrichment programs during school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

78. Urban 4-H provides out-of-school time programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

79. Urban 4-H uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

80. Urban 4-H uses service learning as an authentic way of connecting youth to their community through interdisciplinary, collaborative, engaged learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
81. Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

82. Urban 4-H staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

83. Urban 4-H shares 4-H program materials with staff of other youth-serving organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

84. Urban 4-H partners with other youth-serving organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

85. Urban 4-H uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:
86. Urban 4-H works with a wide diversity of youth, including those of different races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, and physical and mental abilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

---

**TEACHING AND OUTREACH METHODS**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

87. Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

88. Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

89. Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners’ ability to solve problems and make decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
90. Urban Extension educators use transformative learning methods to help learners examine the assumptions on which and the frame of reference within which their decisions are made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

91. Urban Extension educators use a variety of learning techniques, such as self-directed, group learning, peer teaching, and collaborative learning techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

92. Urban Extension educators use service-learning to enhance participants' learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

93. Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

94. Urban Extension educators minimize use of the expert model in teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
**Program Evaluation**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

95. Urban Extension uses formative evaluation so improvements are possible as programming is developed and delivered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

96. Urban Extension’s program evaluation measures multiple competencies, such as social, emotional, behavioral, cognitive, and/or decision-making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

97. Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

98. Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes changes in critical thinking and problem solving.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
99. Urban Extension's program evaluation includes social impacts on the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>MIlidy Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

100. Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>MIlidy Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

101. Please comment on this process:
APPENDIX E

ROUND II QUESTIONNAIRE
APPENDIX E

ROUND II QUESTIONNAIRE

Patterns of Success in Urban Extension County Offices - Round 2

Patterns of Success in Urban Extension County Offices

The purpose of the study is to determine the patterns or indicators of success for urban Extension offices in the next two to five years.

Round 2

Thank you for participating in this study of Urban Extension. Your input is important.

Please respond to each statement, indicating your degree of agreement with the statement as an important factor in the future (2 to 5 years) success of urban Extension offices. Each statement is followed by a 6-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. You may make comments to justify your rating, to question or clarify the statement, or to elaborate on the concept. You may suggest additional statements in the final comment box.

It is important that you respond to each statement.

IMPORTANT!

Please keep the following perspective in mind when responding.
Rate each statement indicating the level to which you think the statement should be an indicator of success for urban county Extension offices across the U.S.A. in the near future (2 to 5 years).

1. Please carefully read each statement since some have been changed based on your input.
2. Review your original position and the statements of other panelists. Then, rate each statement.
3. Please provide supportive rationale for your position and clarification if your rating varied by two or more points from the mode reported for that statement.
4. Please remember, this round focuses on the future (what should be) not what currently is.

Thanks!

________________________________________________________

**STAFFING**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

______________________________________________________________________

1. County Extension programs are adequately staffed to fulfill their mission based on the size of the county’s population.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 5; D 8; MD 1; MA 2; A 3; SA 1*

*Comments:*

*The four program areas may be represented, but the staff numbers are unrealistically small, given the population numbers in metro counties. (Clare). Professional to population ratios are inconsistent with the level of service provided to more rural counties. (Scorpio). I don’t believe Cooperative Extension offices are adequately staffed in any area of our state -- urban offices are in some cases better off than some of our rural offices. In general, there is no urban extension office that I am aware of that is adequately staffed across the four program areas mentioned above. (Saigen). It depends on how you define an office. In some cases, yes. In other cases, I think we will be successful with offices that may have a narrower focus. (e.g. Families and Youth in a specific neighborhood or Community Development through a center with that focus). (Kids). Usually not at all. But also it is too restricting to limit staffing to the four major areas. (Blue I). Have not been in touch with offices recently. My recollection is that they*
were adequately staffed. (Sandy). we have staff that are spread very thin across a large county. (Butterfly). Although we have speciality agents, we still have agents covering 2 or 3 subject areas. In an urban setting, need experts. (Hiram). With Funding cutbacks, there have not been sufficient revenues to maintain services and service delivery as has been historically been the case. In xx Extension has been forced to cut back some educational services and to change from county to regional delivery bases. (OCBUGS). Most are critically understaffed(Robin).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

2. County Extension programs are staffed based on program areas that address current county needs and issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

3. Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods as well as specific subject matter training.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 2; D 2; MD 2; MA 5; A 7; SA 3*

Comments:

*Same background as rural/other staff. (Clare). Requirements for hiring new Extension Educators have been constantly changing with time and as a result of this, today's Extension Educators have higher degrees and great deal of experience.(Mo). Although many of our urban extension educators are well versed and capable in the use of sound educational theory and methods I believe this is an area where in general we are focused more on subject-matter expertise over effective educational methodologies. By and large extension educators in urban settings still rely on lectures, written materials and classroom type educational approaches. There is very little going on in the use of modern educational technology. Some 4-H youth development programs are the exception with the use of effective experiential and hands-on, discovery-based learning approaches in after school and other innovative youth programs.(Saigen). Usually staff are subject matter based and trained versus trained in educational principles.(Blue I). This has always impressed me.(Sandy). I have an MAT and many years of working with the public in partnership with a variety of agencies.(Butterfly). There has been a recent 'brain drain' of very experienced Extension educators, as a result of funding problems and boomers reaching retirement age. The new educators will grow into their responsibilities, but it will take time. (OCBUGS). In most instances, Urban Extension Educators*
are “pulled from the ranks” with little or no background in urban issues. Many have degrees in traditional agriculture. Such backgrounds do not readily lend themselves to working effectively in urban situations. (Yellowjacket).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

4. Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have a background in community development.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 2; D 5; MD 3; MA 5; A 3; SA 0*

Comments:

This applies to all staff and not just urban. (Clare). If when the educators were hired they had previous urban experience, your statement is valid. (2455). It is an area that can be improved, but each recognize their responsibility. (Hiram). Our urban extension educators often conduct community development work by default. There are only a handful of urban extension people in our state that actually focus on community development -- in fact community development is under supported by our land-grant institution. With shrinking public resources community development has become one of the lower priority programs in our organization. Community development does seem to be a thread that is woven through every extension educators’ program. I believe it is an area that we as an organization or extension nationally should provide more leadership and training so that extension educators have more capability in the community development area. (Saigen). New hires may/may not have this background but certainly will acquire it on the job, regardless of program area. (April). Knowledge of community development has been developed through on the job training and some opportunities for in service training (weak). My career in environmental education has given me this exposure. (Butterfly). Currently, this is not the practice. (September).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

5. Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 2; D 1; MD 4; MA 3; A 8; SA 1*
Comments:

This applies to all staff and not just urban. (Clare). Again -- leadership development is something that is not addressed in any coordinated or comprehensive manner in our organization. Although many of our leaders recognize the value and importance of leadership development it is only addressed sporadically through conferences or special seminars added to other meetings. We are in the midst of trying to develop a statewide, systematic leadership development campaign that will support leadership development in all land-grant academic appointees. This is an especially critical area in the urban areas where community engagement and involvement depend on effective leadership capacities in our extension staff. Here again -- our organization seems more focused on subject-matter expertise in hiring and advancing our extension academics. (Saigen). This is key to success. (Sandy). Once again, the background of many urban educators is such that local administrators (i.e., County Directors, Coordinators, etc.) have little administrative training. In an urban setting, this position should be filled with individuals that have been through more than just a rudimentary "leadership" development program. (Yellowjacket).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

6. Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 1; MD 4; MA 4; A 8; SA 1

Comments:

This applies to all staff and not just urban. (Clare). Many of our urban extension educators have been trained in group facilitation. This is an area where our institutions leadership has supported staff development. Over the past 10 years we have adopted and trained over 200 individuals in the Interaction Associates (IA) Essential Facilitation (EF) model and techniques. We have 8 individuals trained and licensed as trainers by IA to provide the EF training -- which is typically a 3 or 4 day long workshop. This has been well received and many of our urban extension people use this approach to plan and conduct more focused and effective meetings and events. (Saigen). Bringing people together on the same page is crucial. (Sandy). Formal training re teaching and group facilitation is weak. (Butterfly). Formal training re teaching and group facilitation is weak. (September).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

7. Urban Extension educators are at ease in working with diverse audiences.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 2; MD 1; MA 6; A 8; SA 4*

Comments:

Great improvements in recent years, though some challenges remain. (Clare). I believe most of our urban extension educators are comfortable working with diverse audiences. There are still many challenges in our state regarding working with diverse audiences. I worked in a high school in an urban county where there were 28 different languages spoken -- this presents a major challenge in terms of simply communicating with clientele. Many of our urban county extension offices have a diverse staff which helps bring all staff along in terms of understanding and appreciating diversity. (Saigen). This is more important in urban settings. The problem is not as great in rural offices. (Sandy). There are only two of us and I think I can speak for both of us. (Butterfly). This is an area of real focus for XX Extension as XX has become home to a large and diverse immigrant group. (OCBUGS). Urban Extension Educators MUST be open minded and willing to reach out and openly embrace diversity. This is especially true of the local administrator. They (local administrator) must set the example. (Yellowjacket).


8. Urban Extension educators are at ease working in urban settings.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 1; MD 2; MA 5; A 6; SA 7*

Comments:

Some urban educators continue to focus most efforts in suburban areas. (Clare). I think most of our urban extension staff members are at ease working in the safer urban settings. There are still many neighborhoods that are perceived to be to risky for most extension staff to work in. (Saigen). To my knowledge this is the case. However this should be carefully scrutinized. (Sandy). There are only two of us and I think I can speak for both of us. (Butterfly). I agree, though sadly, many XX legislators see Extension as only a rural educational service. (OCBUGS).
Comments:

9. Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 5; MD 2; MA 8; A 3; SA 1

Comments:

But getting better ...(Clare). I see an improvement over a period of 10 years ago. However, there is much room for improvement.(2455). It is an area we continue to work on, but each year we get closer.(Hiram). We are sorely understaffed in all areas of our state, that in most cases our staff does not reflect the diversity of the local urban population. In one of our major urban areas there is only one advisor and four program representatives - they simply cannot reflect the diversity of the area. As a result, I think our programs often reflect the interests and ethnic/racial background of the staff who often have excellent programs in certain areas of an urban county or with certain populations. In some cases staff have been selected to work with a particular segment of the population.(Saigen). In an ideal world this is a good goal. I think other factors are much more important like personality, etc.(Kids). I am not sure. My question would be, does this really make a difference? The quality of the educators is more important.(Sandy). XX has a high white population with a changing demographic of refugee and immigrant families from around the world. We do have an EFNEP educator who is hispanic. I am white, of Yugoslav descent, so I have been able to have some commonality with our Bosnian families. However, I find I can relate to all folks well. I do need more language skills ... hispanic, bosnian, Arabic(Butterfly). More so than than their rural counterparts, but not at an acceptable level(September)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

10. Urban Extension educators welcome diversity.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 0; MD 3; MA 4; A 9; SA 5

Comments:

*I think we are further along with urban extension educators welcoming diversity than we were 20 years ago, however we still have work to do in this area. Some of our urban extension people have developed some excellent programs that have helped other staff and clientele welcome and celebrate diversity.(Saigen). This has always been the case.(Sandy). we have a duty to serve all Americans, new and old.(Butterfly).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Mildly</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

448
PARTNERSHIPS AND EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

11. State specialists, in subject areas pertinent to urban programming, have adequate understanding of urban issues to work effectively with urban Extension educators to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 4; MD 3; MA 3; A 10; SA 1

Comments:

This works in some program areas but not others. A challenge is that state specialists are not located in urban areas so have limited knowledge of specific urban challenges. (Clare). Often the specialist are not "up" on urban methodology. Have had some good success in FCS & Youth, Natural Resources, limited in Ag. (Hiram). There is somewhat of a disconnect between our county-based staff and state specialists that limits the amount of assistance provided by campus-based specialists, especially in urban programs. There are examples of excellent specialist support -- e.g. a fisheries specialist has worked with urban coastal 4-H youth development staff to develop salmon and steelhead projects that work with Latino youth and families. Another specialist in entomology and IPM has provided assistance for urban forestry projects in several cities around our state. In general there is more specialist assistance available for traditional agriculture and natural resources programming than urban programming. Water quality and invasive species as well as coastal and marine resources are other areas where there is specialist support for county-based staff. NF&CS programs in nutrition and consumer education do have fairly good specialist support. There are only two state specialists left in 4-H YD. (Saigen). Over the years the resources have been there to meet the need. (Sandy). I have never had that experience. (Butterfly). Specialist are not always prepared to address urban needs. (September).
12. State level Extension administration provides adequate resources for effective urban programs.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 3; MD 2; MA 8; A 5; SA 3*

*Comments:*

Good experiences in this state. (Clare). While I agree that urban programs have state level extension administration support, I think there is more support for traditional agriculture and natural resources programming in our state. Agriculture is a major economic engine in our state and traditionally our institution has served this interest more than urban interests. This has been changing and there is growing recognition of balancing our efforts and providing support for both urban and rural programs. (Saigen). Varies by state (Folk). To my knowledge this seems to be the case. (Sandy). I have moral support ... no funding specifically, though my new supervisor is much more proactive on grant writing where I was all on my own before. (Butterfly). They respond to direction from the legislature...see #11 (OCBUGS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Comments:*

13. Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 2; D 4; MD 1; MA 5; A 6; SA 2*

*Comments:*

Urban and non-urban educators continue to rely primarily on a limited number of academic departments, where state specialists are housed. There are examples of other campuses and colleges being involved, but not enough. (Clare). Only when the system makes this possible. (Scorpio). Our urban extension educators use any resources they can access of the entire land-grant university system in our state. They also access local state universities and community colleges. Local extension staff will often develop effective working relationships with other institutions in their areas using their facilities to provide seminars, working with their faculty, etc. to get research-based information that may not be available through our own organization. (Saigen). We talk this alot but in practice it is not developed at all. it is a goal to strive for... (Blue I). If not, they should be reaching out to this great resource. (Sandy). I try to since I believe strongly in our mission to translate the research and activities of the U to the community. (Butterfly). Not at all as they should. (OCBUGS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Comments:

14. Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 2; D 3; MD 3; MA 4; A 8; SA 1

Comments:

Limited involvement, but much more needs to happen. Some good successes with extension educators with offices on urban university campuses. (Clare). See above for comments. (Saigen). Hopefully! (Sandy). I have had partnerships with faculty at U of XX, but also with other U’s in the region to provide interns or faculty for training/occasional direct delivery. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

15. Urban Extension office/s are located within the urban core.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 2; MD 1; MA 8; A 5; SA 5

Comments:

Though staff numbers are small. (Clare). It depends - some of our urban offices are in the urban core, most are in outlying areas where facilities are often more economical and available. In many cases the county agriculture facility houses our Cooperative Extension offices and these facilities are usually not in urban core areas. (Saigen). They do a good job. (Sandy). One office is in the city. Mine is 10 minutes away. But all my work is in the field anyway. (Butterfly). We are working on this. (OCBUGS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

16. Urban Extension has multiple offices in strategic locations in the county.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 3; D 5; MD 2; MA 7; A 2; SA 1
Comments:

Only one office exists. (Clare). If funding is available. (2455). Not all, but some. (Hiram). There are three or four very large counties that have urban areas and maintain satellite offices in outlying areas. I would not say there are offices "throughout" the counties however. (Saigen). I'm not sure what you mean by this. We have only two offices in our county. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

17. Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of collaborating organizations.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 3; MD 3; MA 8; A 5; SA 0*

Comments:

A few isolated cases of this, but not many. (Clare). There are a few examples of our urban extension staff being co-located in the offices of collaborators. For example, a marine science educator is located at a community college that co-sponsors the extension education program. (Saigen). In some locations by not universally (Folk). Am not sure. However it is a good idea. (Sandy). We are in a county admin building and the other office is in an office rental in the mill area. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

18. Urban Extension staff maintains positive working relationships with governmental funding partners.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 2; MD 1; MA 2; A 7; SA 8*

Comments:

Some contact and working relationship with governmental departments, but more is needed, especially given budget challenges. Concern that governmental administrators and policymakers have very little knowledge of extension. (Clare). In general this is true -- urban extension staff interact with local policy makers, e.g. boards of supervisors through both formal
and informal meetings and presentations. Many urban extension programs produce newsletters and/or annual reports specifically for boards of supervisors -- in one case specifically focused on extension programs in a particular supervisor's district. (Saigen). The presentation in the last budget process was a brilliant presentation. It focused on what happens in an urban setting. The presentation was before the senate finance committee. (Sandy). Very little time and political structure prevents us from getting to know our reps and county commissioners. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

**FUNDING**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

19. Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for effective programming in the four program areas.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 9; D 2; MD 4; MA 2; A 3; SA 0*

Comments:

*We may be able to sustain current programming, but is that the appropriate goal? We are not doing enough now, so we should work to do more and not just sustain. (Clare). Each county has a different level of commitment, but overall, we have excellent support. (Hiram). As mentioned earlier, none of our extension programs have adequate public support these days. Urban extension offices vary across our state in terms of the local (county) funding provided -- in some cases it is adequate, in most not. (Saigen). While I agree, I think there may be cases where community need is not high for strong base programming in one area. (Kids). Enough is never enough. However the funding has been better than most in these tight budget years. (Sandy). this is XX ... sigh. We have lost 14 staff in the state in the last two years. (Butterfly).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
20. Urban Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 1; MD 4; MA 3; A 9; SA 2*

*Comments:*

Staff still struggle with this concept. Plans are for the organization to do more of this in the future. This is a growing trend in many areas. One largely urban county has taken a lead in our state in terms of developing cost recovery efforts for their programs that largely serve private good. Many counties have relationships with other agencies that provide additional funding for extension programs that conduct special research or provide specific training or other services. An example is an very urban county that several years ago cut the extension budget to zero -- in this case one of the farm advisors negotiated an agreement with a local water quality control board to conduct applied research related to run off affecting water quality in the county. The county extension office was awarded a grant for more than $150,000 for the advisor to conduct the research. In another case, a farm advisor contracted with the county parks and recreation department to provide IPM and urban forestry training including tree hazard assessment and monitoring for the agencies staff -- in exchange, the advisor received an annual award of several thousand dollars to support other program activities. I think this trend will continue to grow in the future. This may help support urban extension programs in the future, but it raises some concerns about public good activities that seldom have funding behind them. Also there is concern about programs evolving to the point that they are simply driven by whoever provides a source of funds. Finding the right balance between fees for service and public support for extension programs may be a challenge for us in the future. If not, they should providing they are only charging a portion of the cost to them. We can do this. But my programs are difficult to totally fund this way since I am working with poor people who are working with struggling non-profits. More could be done here if Extension does truly offer services of value, which I feel it does.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

21. Extension seeks funding for urban programming from other agencies of the federal government, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Education, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Department of Defense.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 5; MD 2; MA 2; A 7; SA 3*

*Comments:*

Funding partnerships with state agencies are handled by state administration, with the exception of a limited number of small local partnerships. Unfortunately, this effort should be more systemic rather than relying on individual efforts. I don't think we
have taken advantage of this very well in our state. Most of our partnerships have been with state or local agencies. One exception is the military -- we have partnered effectively providing programs for military families and youth in urban areas.(Saigen). they may explore grant opportunities not lasting partnerships.(Folk). These partnerships are great as it is a win-win situation for everyone.(Sandy). We have not sought funding from these sources - mainly for lack of time ...(Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

22. Urban Extension offices work toward adequate funding by seeking to increase both traditional and new sources of funding.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 3; MD 6; MA 4; A 2; SA 3*

Comments:

State programs are consistently relying more on alternative sources; the urban areas are getting better but have far to go. Given the state budget challenges, I would question what the "balance" should be.(Clare). Traditional sources are at a much lower level - as a ratio of funding - compared to more rural county programs.(Scorpio). I would guess the balance still favors traditional governmental funding sources. (Seamstress). I think our urban extension educators and urban extension office leaders spend a lot of time figuring out strategies to support their programs. They work with local governments, state extension leaders, private funders, grants, etc. I'm not sure we have found the right balance yet. I believe there is a need for additional public support for extension activities. One idea that is being explored is to re-tool our local extension offices as the "storefront" for the entire university and combine university academic outreach and student recruitment with extension programming -- if the university bought into this approach it may be able to concentrate enough resources in each county to ensure adequate, healthy funding for extension programs across our state.(Saigen). Since we don't have enough dollars to begin with, I am not sure that "balance" is the right word. But, yes we do seek both sources.(Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

23. Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if there are plans for the sustainability of programs when this funding ends.
Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 5; MD 9; MA 3; A 1; SA 0

Comments:

Some consideration but not always a well defined plan. (Clare). Although staff consider long term sustainability of programs, I think they often will seek outside funds for programs they believe will be effective -- in the hopes that after the program gets going and proves itself other sources of support will be found. (Saigen). Funding is sought even when plans for sustaining programs are not in place, however efforts are made to sustain relevant outcomes of programs. (April). What source of funds are being referenced here? (Folk). We do seek ways to make programs sustainable, but the reality of time and lack of dollars make this difficult. (Butterfly). While there is an interest in sustainability, we've not developed an infrastructure to support such. (September).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

24. Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 1; MD 3; MA 2; A 10; SA 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

MARKETING

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

25. Urban Extension offices effectively market their programs.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 5; D 5; MD 4; MA 3; A 3; SA 1

Comments:
But that is a big challenge in a metropolitan area. (Clare). Strongly disagree in that there is little state wide marketing effort. Most effort is locally initiated and supported. If question was, "Urban programs are effectively marketed using local sources." - the response would be different closer to #5 (Scorpio). Perhaps not on a state level, but they are definitely on a local level. (2455). Need for internal and external marketing of urban. (Hiram). Sometimes effective at local level, rarely beyond that. (Saigen). we do what we can (Butterfly). Still the best kept secret and the best deal, financially, that a county government has going! (Yellowjacket).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

26. Extension has "brand name" recognition in urban areas.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 6; D 5; MD 3; MA 3; A 3; SA 1

Comments:

Confused with the other universities in the area. Little name recognition. (Clare). OR "Agree" but for the wrong programs/reasons. (Scorpio). There is a general lack of public awareness although specific clientele served know us they often don't connect us with the broader university. (Saigen). More could be done. (Sandy). lots of people moving in and out ... (Butterfly). Yes, for 4-H and Master Gardeners. (OCBUGS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

27. Urban Extension offices are responsive to clients' needs and attitudes when marketing programs.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 3; D 5; MD 3; MA 2; A 5; SA 2

Comments:

Again - not from state sources. Would respond @ #5 if question was "local source". (Scorpio). The Needs assessment process is very involved and is the basis for programming. (Hiram). Urban program marketing also is responsive to available/limited resources. (April). we have so little marketing ... (Butterfly). Just need to identify better our target 'clients' (OCBUGS).
### 28. Urban Extension targets clientele with relevant messages and programs.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 3; MD 4; MA 1; A 7; SA 5*

*Comments:*

What clientele? Existing? Potential? (Clare). Again - not from state sources. Would respond @ #5 if question was "local source". (Scorpio). I don't think we do our homework enough with general public. (Saigen). THEY ARE GOOD AT THIS. (Sandy). our partners help us see what is needed ...(Butterfly).

### 29. Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 3; D 1; MD 1; MA 9; A 6; SA 1*

*Comments:*

Good attempts, but not always with much success. (Clare). Media is much more difficult to penetrate in urban markets. Too many house fires and homicides. (Scorpio). The urban media market is tough. Have some outstanding successes however. Personality of agent seems to be a key factor. (Hiram). Am not sure. (Sandy). lack of time ...(Butterfly). It seems we've done better in the past. (OCBUGS).
30. Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 3; D 3; MD 4; MA 5; A 4; SA 2*

*Comments:*

*More should be done.(Clare). Room for improvement.(Hiram). Little being done with the web for urban extension. Most county programs have web sites -- put use is often limited.(Saigen). So much can and should be done in this area...Customized email should be a top priority(Blue I). Lack of time ... also our cliente often does not have access to internet.(Butterfly).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

**ACCOUNTABILITY**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

31. Urban Extension offices effectively report program impacts.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 3; D 1; MD 1; MA 4; A 8; SA 3*

*Comments:*

*Again - not from a state perspective. Could be at a #5 or #6 if the questions asked thrugh the state/fed reporting system included more urban programming alignment.(Scorpio). We started a process two years ago that has improved reporting of actual impacts of programs. But it is not comprehensive enough.(Saigen). Programs are great.(Sandy). I think I understand the question ...(Butterfly). We could do a much better job.(Yellowjacket).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

32. Extension has a state and federal system to effectively report urban program impacts.
Comments:

33. Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data).

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 2; D 0; MD 4; MA 5; A 5; SA 4

Comments:

*Again - not as much from a state perspective. Could be at a #5 or #6 if the questions asked throgh the state/fed reporting system included more urban programming alignment.(Scorpio). See Q. 34.(Saigen). I do. I was trained with Sea Grant.(Butterfly). More needs to be doen. (OCBUGS).*

Comments:

34. Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 2; D 1; MD 4; MA 5; A 6; SA 2

Comments:

*Quantitative data does not always fall into the state/fed reporting system easily.(Scorpio). Sporadic -- some programs do a decent job, most not.(Saigen). I work with written evaulations.(Butterfly).*

Comments:

35. Urban Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs.
**Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 2; MD 1; MA 5; A 8; SA 2**

**Comments:**

*We tend to focus more on impact rather than satisfaction evaluations.* (Scorpio). Although this data is often collected -- not sure how it gets reported. (Saigen). I assay my users. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

36. Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the impact of the programs they support.

**Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 2; MD 1; MA 4; A 12; SA 2**

**Comments:**

*This is especially true of our youth program.* (Hiram). Not sure we are able to always communicate impacts as well. (Saigen). I have not heard them express that. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

37. Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program planning.

**Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 1; MD 2; MA 4; A 11; SA 2**

**Comments:**

*We engage our partners in the process whenever possible.* (Butterfly).
Comments:

38. Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program evaluation.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 1; MD 4; MA 6; A 7; SA 2*

Comments:

*Not much of this reported. (Saigen). Legislatively this happens. Don’t know about this generally. (Sandy). We’re not doing a better job of this than in the past. (OCBUGS).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

39. Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted population.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 0; MD 5; MA 6; A 6; SA 3*

Comments:

*When it occurs. (Butterfly).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

40. Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 2; D 3; MD 4; MA 4; A 6; SA 0*

Comments:
Some money losers are quite effective. Not sure this is the most relevant view. (Scorpio). Focus to do more of this in the future. (Hiram). Not sure about this. (Saigen). for those where data is available (Folk). I have not. (Butterfly). Lots of focus on this right now in xx. (OCBUGS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

41. Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 4; D 4; MD 4; MA 4; A 2; SA 1*

Comments:

The same structure is used for all staff - urban and non-urban - in this state. (Clare). As much as the reporting system allows. (Scorpio). Are you talking about the Federal Report of Work? Is there a national extension program evaluation system? (Saigen). does the cooperative extension system have one? (Folk). I participate in ECI. (Butterfly). This is a critical need (September).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

---

**TARGET AUDIENCES AND PARTICIPANTS**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

42. Urban Extension educators focus on those populations with the greatest identified needs.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 2; MD 2; MA 6; A 7; SA 3*

Comments:

... though there are some program areas that focus on the public "at large." (Clare). We do program to all populations, however, being driven by significant grant and contract funding, these tend to be more targeted towards people in need. (Scorpio). Urban poor are often targets,
but not always. (Saigen). And people with special needs. (Sandy). I do. (Butterfly). I think that there is still a "comfort zone" when working with target audience. Many times we steer away from those groups/clientele that are outside of that comfort zone. (Yellowjacket).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

43. Urban Extension programs do not duplicate services provided by other organizations in the community.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 2; D 1; MD 4; MA 4; A 5; SA 4*

Comments:

*It happens occasionally, thought staff make a good effort to cooperate rather than duplicate. (Clare). Sometimes we improve existing programs. (Scorpio). We work together to provide what they cannot. (Butterfly). This is the area where the most work needs to be done in my opinion. (OCBUGS). We are still the only program in our location that utilizes a true "grass-roots" approach to programming. (Yellowjacket).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

PROGRAM PLANNING

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

44. Urban Extension educators involve representatives of target populations in program planning.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 1; MD 0; MA 4; A 9; SA 6*
Comments:

I do. (Butterfly).

45. Urban Extension educators use program planning processes that are inclusive.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 0; MD 2; MA 4; A 9; SA 5*

Comments:

*Limited diversity of clientele and advisory groups impact program planning. (Clare). I do. (Butterfly). We have to be careful that we do not slip back into our comfort zone of clientele selection. (Yellowjacket).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

46. Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are holistic.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 0; MD 4; MA 3; A 7; SA 6*

Comments:

I do. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

47. Urban Extension educators use program planning that is based on the realities of the urban environment.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 0; MD 3; MA 2; A 8; SA 7*
Comments:

I do. (Butterfly). Many times the approach that is used is based on state-wide recommendations that are not applicable or effective for urban program planning. (Yellowjacket).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

48. Urban Extension educators develop programs build on the positive attributes of the community (assets based) when addressing identified needs.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 1; MD 3; MA 6; A 8; SA 2

Comments:

Still some needs assessment efforts out there. (Clare). There are times when the deficits are considered so that the programs can be relevant to the needs. (2455). NOT CLEAR (Mo). Growing trend -- especially in the human resources program areas. Not sure in the more traditional areas. (Saigen). I do. (Butterfly). mixed approach in XX (OCBUGS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

49. Urban Extension educators use program planning that crosses academic and program boundaries to address community issues.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 2; MD 2; MA 4; A 8; SA 4

Comments:

But not enough ... (Clare). It really depends on individuals and the issue they are working on. In some cases there are examples of excellent cross-disciplinary work. (Saigen). They do use this in program planning, but then to develop a program response they may run into difficulty... (Blue I). This is needed. (Sandy). I do. (Butterfly). We still program based on traditional programming areas - FCS, Ag, 4-H/Youth. (Yellowjacket).
50. Urban Extension educators use the logic model (i.e., resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts) in program development.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 1; MD 2; MA 6; A 8; SA 2

Comments:

Some extension staff in 4-H youth development area use logic model because it has been taught by one of the state specialists.(Saigen). I do.(Butterfly). ???(OCBUGS).

51. Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 1; MD 3; MA 5; A 8; SA 4

Comments:

There are some areas where this is true, but not overall.(Clare). While one may say that they strongly agree, the magnitude of change is only as much as resources can allow and in urban extension that tends to be lean.(Scorpio). There are some programs that have done this -- e.g. school gardens.(Saigen). We COULD be much more of catalyst.(Yellowjacket).
Comments:

52. Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 1; MD 4; MA 8; A 5; SA 2*

Comments:

*While one may say that they strongly agree, the magnitude of change is only as much as resources can allow and in urban extension that tends to be lean. (Scorpio). Resources are too limited to effectively serve as change agent. (September).*

Comments:

53. Extension is a catalyst for environmental change in urban counties.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 1; MD 4; MA 3; A 9; SA 4*

Comments:

*While one may say that they strongly agree, the magnitude of change is only as much as resources can allow and in urban extension that tends to be lean. (Scorpio). more so in the past than now. (OCBUGS).*

Comments:

54. Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach.
Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 2; MD 0; MA 7; A 9; SA 3

Comments:

Though not sure all would acknowledge that. (Clare).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

55. Urban Extension educators address community development.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 2; MD 2; MA 1; A 13; SA 3

Comments:

While one may say that they strongly agree, the overall impact is directly affected by the amount or resources brought to bear in an environment where magnitude may drown out even very effective programming. (Scorpio). Community Development is often neglected due to a lack of programming resources. (September).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

PROGRAMMING - YOUTH DEVELOPMENT / 4-H

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

56. Urban 4-H / youth development targets urban youth who often have multiple risk factors.

Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 0; MD 1; MA 7; A 5; SA 7

Comments:
Staff is not always equipped, but does a good job of working with/through other agencies. (Clare). Your statement, Urban 4-H is misleading. Extension uses traditional 4-H. However, the urban educators modify the programs to make them relevant for the urban youth. (2455). AS WELL AS INTERESTED YOUTH. (Mo). the same is true for rural youth (Folk). Should be strong within the community. (Sandy). I do. (Butterfly). yes, but we could do much more. (OCBUGS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

57. Urban 4-H / youth development effectively programs with both urban and suburban youth.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 1; MD 2; MA 6; A 5; SA 4

Comments:

Not sure it is effectively if output and impact is small in size. (Clare). AS WELL AS INTERESTED YOUTH FOR 4-H PROGRAMS. (Mo). Many of the suburban youth are at greater risk in some of our communities. (Saigen). All of our 4-H youth development outreach is with inner-city youth, most all at risk. (April). A great need is met. (Sandy). We do as a team. (Butterfly). see #69 (OCBUGS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

58. The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H / youth development programs reflects the diversity of the youth population.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 4; MD 7; MA 2; A 4; SA 3

Comments:

A large suburban contingent. (Clare). MAY OR MAY NOT BUT 4-H PROGRAMS TRY TO BE INCLUSIVE. (Mo). We're not there yet... (Saigen). It should. (Sandy). Interns (Butterfly). We are still working within our comfort zone with 4-H/Youth adult leadership. We need more diverse adult leadership. (Yellowjacket).
59. Urban 4-H / youth development programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interests, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 4; MD 2; MA 6; A 7; SA 2*

Comments:

*that is why we partner with agencies (Butterfly). More diversity in staff - both on local and state levels. (Yellowjacket).*

60. Urban 4-H / youth development gives youth, especially teenagers, a significant voice in the programs offered.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 0; MD 3; MA 4; A 10; SA 3*

Comments:

*2 staff for over 250,000 kids of 4-H age. (Scorpio). This helps keep them interested. (Sandy). hard to reach teen pop since we have only one staff (Butterfly).*
61. Urban 4-H / youth development programming includes exploring careers.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 0; MD 1; MA 4; A 10; SA 6*

*Comments:*

*This depends on how this is approached on a local level.* (2455). Very helpful. (Sandy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

62. Urban 4-H / youth development uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 4; MD 4; MA 6; A 4; SA 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

63. Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 0; MD 2; MA 4; A 11; SA 2*

*Comments:*

*Working with other youth-serving organizations.* (Clare). Very limited (Saigen).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
64. Urban 4-H / youth development staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 0; MD 2; MA 4; A 8; SA 4*

*Comments:*

Not very often. (Clare). One of our true strengths! (Saigen). Our 4-H/Youth staff is severely undermanned. We cannot meet the demands of our own program let alone train other agencies. (Yellowjacket).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

65. Urban 4-H / youth development partners with other youth-serving organizations.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 1; MD 0; MA 5; A 5; SA 8*

*Comments:*

so much more could be done (OCBUGS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

66. Urban 4-H / youth development uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 2; MD 1; MA 10; A 5; SA 2*

*Comments:*

All urban youth and agencies serving those youth do not accept the club format. (2455). In some cases -- not universally successful model in urban settings. (Saigen). While we use the club format for some outreach, we have had positive experiences with 'special interest group' and 'individuals(s)' youth participating in programs. Clubs require ongoing management and support. (April). the 4-H program limits what can be done and is restrictive (Blue I). where
appropriate (Folk). Agree, but maybe some different models would work better in an urban setting. disfunction families is a factor to contend with in supporting urban extension.(OCBUGS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

**TEACHING AND OUTREACH METHODS**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

67. Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 7; MD 1; MA 4; A 6; SA 2*

Comments:

Opportunities for information are available via Internet for those with access. However, this does not mean that ALL individuals seeking our assistance have access to us 24/7.(Yellowjacket).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

68. Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 1; MD 2; MA 6; A 8; SA 3*

69. Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners’ ability to solve problems and make decisions.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 0; MD 1; MA 8; A 6; SA 6*
### PROGRAM EVALUATION

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

72. Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 3; MD 0; MA 7; A 7; SA 2*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

73. Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes changes in critical thinking and problem solving.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 0; D 2; MD 1; MA 5; A 9; SA 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

74. Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community.

*Ratings from Round 1: SD 1; D 1; MD 1; MA 7; A 8; SA 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

75. Please comment on this process:
APPENDIX F

ROUND III QUESTIONNAIRE
APPENDIX F

ROUND II QUESTIONNAIRE

As you approach Round 3

Think in the *FUTURE*; the way things should be!

Are the statements ones that you think should be the way urban Extension does business in 2007 to 2010?

It may help if you think, “SHOULD BE” instead of “is” as you read each question.

Writing the statements in the present tense is a convention of the Delphi process. Hope this helps you think “IN THE FUTURE”

Those statements that are the most important descriptors of urban Extension in the next 5 years should be rated as “strongly agree.” While those statements that are not at all important for urban Extension in the next 5 years should be rated as “strongly disagree.”

In Round 3:
  - Do not describe what currently is.
• **Do not** focus on Extension as a whole; focus only on urban Extension. Many of the statements may also be appropriate for all Extension, but that is not the purpose of this study.

• **Do not** focus on limitations to our activities, focus on what *should be!*

---

**Patterns of Success in Urban Extension County Offices**

The purpose of the study is to determine the patterns or indicators of success for urban Extension offices in the next two to five years.

**Round 3**

Thank you for participating in this study of Urban Extension. Your input is important.

Please respond to each statement, indicating your degree of agreement with the statement as an important factor in the future (2 to 5 years) success of urban Extension offices. Each statement is followed by a 6-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. You may make comments to justify your rating, to question or clarify the statement, or to elaborate on the concept. You may suggest additional statements in the final comment box.

It is important that you respond to each statement.

**IMPORTANT!**

*Please keep the following perspective in mind when responding.*

Rate each statement indicating the level to which you think the statement *should* be an indicator of success for urban county Extension offices across the U.S.A. in the near **future** (2 to 5 years).

1. Please carefully read each statement since some have been changed based on your input.
2. Review your original position and the statements of other panelists. Then, rate each statement.
3. **Please provide supportive rationale for your position and clarification of your rating.**
4. Keep your focus on the future, what should be, not what is or what will hold Extension back.

Thanks!

**STAFFING**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

1. Urban county Extension programs are adequately staffed, based on the size of the county’s population and the community needs, to fulfill their mission.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 9, D 6, MD 0, MA 3, A 1, SA 1*

*Comments:*

Based on the focus on the future for this round, I'm not clear now on this question and wonder if people are looking at it the same way I am. My rating is based on thinking that to some extent staffing should be based on population. More importantly, it should also be based on community needs. (Kids). Staffing has not kept up with organizational expectations for urban staff efforts. (Hiram). With the funding challenges and potential reduced staffing, we will be even more at a disadvantage in the future - unless priorities change. (Scorpio). From my experience and perspective there simply is not adequate staffing across the four core program areas mentioned in some of the largest populated counties in the nation -- the situation is getting worse with state budget reductions over the past year and several urban counties are dealing with smaller staff teams to deliver comprehensive Cooperative Extension programs. (Saigen). Staffing must change if we plan to be a credible resource in urban communities. (September). It is unrealistic to expect significant impacts (and subsequent financial support) in the urban areas without adequate staffing. (Clare). Although staffing/clientele ratios will never be the same as for rural areas and they should not be. Along with staffing is having properly trained personnel with adequate support to meet the job needs. (Robin). As urban areas continue to grow and issues become more complex, staffing is a major concern. (Tahoe). Urban offices are poorly staffed. (2455). Currently urban counties are extremely understaffed. However, one indicator of the overall success of urban county administrators may be a county’s willingness to support additional staff. (Yellowjacket). If staffing is short, we should identify the needs of the area, and focus on the most urgent needs. (Sandy). This may be true only when times are good. Dwindling public resources play a major role for how programs are to be funded and staffed. Traditional way of funding programs is no longer applicable in many situations. (Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*
2. Urban county Extension offices have flexibility in staffing that allows them to address current and emerging issues.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 3, D 1, MD 5, MA 3, A 6, SA 2*

*Comments:*

*In some cases, we are not well versed in some urban problem areas.(Scorpio). Since resources have gotten more limited counties are often left to provide programs with the staff they have -- not always able to respond to newly emerging needs. An increase in cross-county or regional assignments has allowed Extension to broaden existing staff's coverage to address critical needs in more counties. Geographical distances and metro traffic issues limit the overall effectiveness of cross-county or regional assignments.(Saigen). They are staffed based on historical perspectives and political will.(September). Though titles may be consistent statewide, it is necessary to have variations in terms of numbers and focus areas in the urban counties.(Clare). Staffing should include current and future needs.(Robin). Most of our educational programs are based on local needs as determined by a very comprehensive process.(Tahoe). Currently, many of the urban staffs in our state are still staffed based on the traditional roles of ag, fca and youth. In the future we MUST staff according to the needs of the community - not our traditions.(Yellowjacket). Has there been a needs assessment done in all areas?(Sandy). Staff should be capable of meeting county needs.(Butterfly). Extension tries, but I sense a reluctance to address county needs and issues that may emerge which may not fit along traditional Extension service lines. Extension is working to match Extension programs with county needs, but they need to instead design Extension programs to match emerging needs.(OCbugs). This is what Extension would like to do and has been doing over the years. Programs are staffed based on number factors - one factor that is considered the most nowadays is programs that can secure local support whether it is financial, community involvement or other means of local support get the priority.(Mo).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

3. Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods as well as specific subject matter training. Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods as well as specific subject matter training. Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods as well as specific subject matter training.

4. Urban Extension educators have a strong background in skills needed for working in urban settings, such as human relations, grantsmanship, coalition building, mass media, and marketing.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 2, MD 4, MA 6, A 6, SA 2*
Comments:

We generally focus on subject matter expertise versus process, audience, and educational theory understanding. Urban Extension Educators of the future need many educational process skills as well as content— we hire on content. These personnel need to be strong in collaboration and network building, grantsmanship, and marketing. Most of our extension academics are highly qualified in their subject-matter expertise areas— few have strong backgrounds in educational theory or methods. There is a trend towards more advanced degrees, i.e. PhDs., however this often makes for simply more specialized Extension academics, not necessarily better “educators”. (Saigen). I continue to believe that often those hired for Urban Extension programs have a very limited understanding of the audiences they work with and are not prepared to be effective in this setting. (Greta). Subject matter less important than leadership, facilitation, methods, etc. (Kids). Applies to all staff and not just urban. (Clare). Today Most have strong subject matter backgrounds and lack skills in mass media and human relations for urban situations, and must learn on the job. There are other issues more important than educational theory. (Robin). The future urban agent must be aware and cognizant of the many and varied learning styles of clientele. Currently, too many county staff are excellent “technicians” but are not well-rounded as educators. (Yellowjacket). Rural educators would have trouble in an Urban setting. (Sandy). Educators should be grounded in techniques and methods ... that is why they are called “educators” (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

5. Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have an understanding of urban community development concepts and practices.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 4, MD 3, MA 4, A 6, SA 1

Comments:

Most Extension educators develop their backgrounds in Community Development “on the job” -- few are actually trained formally in this area other than very limited in-service training offered occasionally by our land-grant institution’s Community Development Department. There is only one statewide Extension Specialist in the Community Development area. (Saigen). Could be training provided after hire. (Kids). This is a training deficit that needs improvement. (Robin). Urban faculty must know urban life and issues. We select urban faculty using different criteria than most other faculty. (Tahoe). More and more, Extension is reaching out to those qualified individuals whose educational background is part of the requirement and more importantly we are looking at a combination of educational and community experiences before hiring. (2455). County educators must strive to be more holistic in their approach to programming. (Yellowjacket). The resource for training in an urban setting could be easily done by partnering with The UUP[Urban university Program] which includes Universities throught the state. (Sandy). this is a helpful fundamental (Butterfly). I think that most Extension Educators are very much aware that their role is to connect with communities, but only a specialize few have
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actual community development training or experience. (Ocbugs). This is true in many situations where Urban Extension Educators receive training in community development either through their field of study, short courses, conferences or through all of the above. (Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

6. Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 0, MD 2, MA 5, A 8, SA 3

Comments:

Our institution has 2 people per year participate in the NELD program and 2 participate in the WELD program each year. There is no consistent, coordinated or regular leadership development that is provided for Extension staff in our state. This is a critical need area -- especially as we face a loss of experienced leaders in our county offices throughout the state. (Saigen). This is an extremely important skill that has not been adequately addressed. (Robin). This is a basic skill that we must do our best to provide to urban faculty. (Tahoe). Again, when we hire we are looking for educational and community experiences for urban Extension personnel. (2455). As Extension Educators, we must not only be effective educators but we must provide leadership for clientele in communities throughout urban areas. (Yellowjacket). This is fixable. The resources are out there to train and make this work. (Sandy). Empowering communities is essential to make a program sustainable. (Butterfly). I see leadership development as a much more integral focus for Extension Educators than with community development. (Ocbugs). Urban Extension Educators have some training in leadership development. But their training vary with their specific subject matter, past leadership experience and how they participate in inservice trainings that are available to them. (Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

7. Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 1, MD 2, MA 4, A 10, SA 2
Although we are making progress in this area with our facilitation training and assistance efforts -- we still have many staff that are not using state-of-the-art facilitation theory and methods. (Saigen). These skills will be critical to urban extension's future. (September). This is another important component of an effective professional that has not been addressed systematically enough. (Robin). Most are and this is considered a basic skill for success of urban agents. (Tahoe). If it is working, leave it alone. However, where it's not working, fix it! (Sandy). This is a key skill for any educator, no matter what the discipline. (Butterfly). Group facilitation and leadership development are fairly universal skills as I have seen it. (Ocbugs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

8. Urban Extension educators are at ease working across the wide range of urban settings.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 2, MD 1, MA 2, A 9, SA 6

Comments:

I don't think all urban Extension staff are comfortable working in all urban settings -- some areas and groups are too challenging or appear too dangerous to work with. (Saigen). This is essential to move us forward in urban areas. (Clare). This very important however most employees are comfortable in familiar urban settings which is not the same as all settings. Most are not trained enough to be comfortable in high profile situations. (Robin). About 10 years ago we changed our hiring criteria for urban faculty to hire those who are comfortable in urban settings. (Tahoe). We all need lessons in "understanding other cultures". (2455). Perception is everything! Change the perception and find volunteers who are comfortable and understand the neighborhood. (Sandy). If they can't work "on the street" they will not be effective. (Butterfly). Field of study, experience, formal training and exposure of diverse urban audience are some of the factors that can determine how at ease they feel when working in urban settings. (Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:
9. Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 3, MD 1, MA 3, A 9, SA 3*

*Comments:*

*I still believe we are simply too small in size and have too few staff members in each county office to effectively represent the racial diversity of most if not all of our urban counties.* (Saigen). If we define diversity as far more than ethnicity and race; we are still challenged as an organization. It is not our assessment of how open we are to diversity, but the impression of those we serve that truly defines us. The work of the Diversity Taskforce is very telling about the Extension as a system. What does it say about us that we are not able to attract a diverse staff in diverse communities. (September). We need to consistently work toward this statewide. (Clare). This would be an ideal objective, but if staff is already limited other skills tend to get priority. We must be aware of what community leaders and supporters value. (Robin). This is a continuous challenge but we must continue to hire a diverse faculty. (Tahoe). Extension must reflect the population we serve. It does make a difference if our personnel is all of one race, ethnic background, same sex, age, etc. We can no longer hold on to the traditional WASP concept. Take a look at our country. This country is diverse and so should the people that serve the communities starting at the head of Extension on a federal level, state, and local level. We must diversify. (2455). Extension must continue to strive to be more diverse in its hiring policies, especially on the professional level. Too many county staffs in our state and in other states are still lacking in true diversity. (Yellowjacket). Concentrate more on English. Ultimately, they will all need the English skill to succeed in what they want to do in life. (Sandy). This is very helpful to help connect with the community. (Butterfly). Here in xx state and xx county, we have done a good job in this regard. (Ocbugs). Improving but still can be improved. (Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Comments:*

**PARTNERSHIPS AND EXTERNAL RELATIONSHIPS**

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

10. State specialists, in subject areas pertinent to urban programming, have adequate understanding of urban issues to work effectively with urban Extension educators to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 3, MD 4, MA 2, A 7, SA 4*
Comments:

Most specialists don't really have a clue and likely won't unless emphasis to hire some occurs. (Scorpio). I still don't think specialist support is adequate for our urban programmers -- there is a limited understanding of urban specific issues -- although there are some examples of specialists who understand and focus on urban issues. (Saigen). A bold stroke would be to explore different configurations of state specialists. Are there other faculty members, other colleges or other campuses that should be providing resources for urban programming? (Clare). Most Specialist are more equipped for rural issues and should get specific training just like agents for urban skills. (Robin). Agents must have their support if they are to be successful. (Tahoe). We have a good Urban Program [rated 2nd in the nation] by US News and World Report. However there are seven other programs in the state. They are all part of The University Urban Program. (Sandy). State specialists need to understand the needs of the communities that they ultimately serve. (Butterfly). Here in XX county we have actually used monies formerly dedicated to Extension to collaboratively hire a University/County liaison person to actively promote sustainable relationships between the two organizations throughout both...not just Extension. (Ocbugs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

11. State level Extension administration provides adequate resources for effective urban programs.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 2, D 2, MD 3, MA 4, A 4, SA 5

Comments:

Not happening and likely will not in the near future. Unfortunately, it may be the only hope of saving the system - long term. (Scorpio). Because we are getting so thin on staffing statewide -- we lack adequate resources in many urban areas. (Saigen). Funding is critical to the future of urban extension programming. (September). Although I don't think this is the case, it is important. It has been very difficult to convince administrators and traditional clientele in times of dwindling resources that the political influence and power is becoming more urbanized. After all most administrators have rural backgrounds and although the population may be predominantly urban/suburban, the vast majority of administrative advisors have rural backgrounds. I think XX is an example of a state administration truly embracing urbanization. (Robin). This is critical but must be balanced with other needs. (Tahoe). In our state, urban Extension is still something that no one is quite willing to address. Additional resources (i.e., personnel and programmatic) are still needed. (Yellowjacket). Get to know local legislators. Let them know about the programs. Meet with both Rural and Urban. (Sandy). No program can survive without support. (Butterfly). State level Extension administration funds effective urban programs but their efforts can be restrained unpredictable forces that are beyond their control. These forces are but not limited to federal, state or institutional budget constraints. (Mo).
Comments:

12. Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 3, MD 3, MA 2, A 6, SA 4*

*Comments:*

Still need to establish better networks across colleges within universities (Scorpio). Most Extension educators rely on a limited number of campus resources where they have had effective working relationships in the past. Few use the entire university system available in our state. Many use local university resources effectively whether land-grant institution or not (Saigen). This is essential if we are to adequately address urban issues (Clare). Another admirable objective but it appears mainly left up to individuals to develop resources rather than administrators developing relationships of mutual benefit and formalizing collaborations (Robin). This is an increasing trend in our state (Tahoe). Extension must become more visible within the university system. We must be seen as a partner with urban campuses (Yellowjacket). There does not seem to be agreement on this subject. Resources are there. It appears that in some cases they are not being accessed (Sandy). If we stay strong to our land grant mission to translate the research and activities of the university to the community, then we will not suffer from "mission creep". Our mission is that which makes us unique ... and everyone deserves a shot at being connected to the university ... the land grant college system was designed so that it would not become an ivory tower institution - but one for the people ... all the people (Butterfly). High tech. makes possible for Urban Extension Educators to use the entire university as resources when needed. And, this will improve with time (Mo).

Comments:

13. Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 0, MD 1, MA 5, A 10, SA 3*

*Comments:*

Need to continue to grow this (Scorpio). Most develop relationships and work with local institutions. More difficult to develop connections with institutions that are not in the
area. (Saigen). Seems to be an obvious strategy given those urban universities that are focusing on research on urban issues. (Clare). Commendable but largely left up to individuals instead of having administrative links. (Robin). It needs to happen but is difficult. (Tahoe). There is the problem of identity. (2455). We currently have little or no contact with our urban campuses. This is an area that must be addressed to increase the visibility and viability of both institutions (Extension and urban universities). (Yellowjacket). To my knowledge, no one has accessed our facility which is the flagship Urban College in the state. (Sandy). Yes - there is great strength that can be gained from partnerships with our sister institutions - resources, interns, grant opportunities, etc (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

14. Urban Extension office/s are strategically located within the urban core.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 2, MD 1, MA 2, A 10, SA 5

Comments:

critical that this occur. (Scorpio). How can we serve communities that we only "visit". (September). For some types of programming, a physical presence is critical. (Kids). It would be good to have some representation in these areas but most clientele and programs are focused in other areas of the community. (Robin). It depends. (2455). We need more offices in the inner-cities in our state. Too many urban offices are either in the business/government complexes or located outside of the central city area. (Yellowjacket). In most downtown areas today, it would seem that office space would be readily available. (Sandy). The offices need to be in or at least very near and accessible, so that educators are not wasting time with excessive driving. We need to be able to go to our clients and work in the field. (Butterfly). Most of the work is done in the field, not really at the office anymore. I like the idea of taking Extension to the people, not vice versa! (Ocbugs). Not yet but with time this may change as their need to have located in urban areas increases. (Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

15. Urban Extension has multiple offices in the county.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 5, MD 0, MA 5, A 7, SA 3
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Comments:

Not enough offices -- very few urban Extension programs have multiple offices -- many are not strategically located. (Saigen). This is a worthy goal but needs to be balanced with what's practical in terms of funding. Strategic and multiple may not mean the same thing. (Clare). This would be ideal. (Robin). Depends on the individual county situation. (Tahoe). Educators should be accessible to the people where the people are, either via an office location, or better yet, by working in partnership and through community-based organizations where Extension delivery should occur (where needed populations reside). (April). Again, this is an area that will require additional resources. We need to have easy access to our offices by all clientele within the county. (Yellowjacket). Is population the engine that decides how many offices in a county? (Sandy). If a county can afford this - this is important to meet the needs of the whole county geographically. There can be a loss of communication and coordination, but with some effort that can be overcome and may be worth the price. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

16. Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of collaborating organizations.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 2, MD 4, MA 6, A 5, SA 2

Comments:

There are costs and benefits to this; should be explored on an individual basis. (Clare). This appears a good way to facilitate collaboration. (Robin). Working together is more important than being housed together. (Tahoe). There are benefits to this, however, given scope and depth of Extension urban programming, there's value at having an Extension office and marketing the organization's presence, having it's own identity/image/visibility. (April). Currently, "collaborating organizations" is defined as traditional USDA agencies in our state. However, in urban counties, this collaboration must be re-defined to address the specifics of our programming needs. (Yellowjacket). Very helpful. When our office was renovated I was able to "camp out" in our housing authority offices for a while. It made it easier to see and hear what is really happening. It's not necessary forever ... but it did help to strengthen the partnership and understand needs better. (Butterfly). We could be doing so much more in this regard. (Ocbugs). Not common but there is possibility that it can happen in some situations. (Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
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FUNDING

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

17. Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for effective programming in the four program areas.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 3, D 5, MD 2, MA 2, A 4, SA 3*

*Comments:* 

Unfortunately, sustainable, public funding is in the hands of Extension administration. They will likely not reformulate distribution of those funds for the future. (Scorpio). None of our urban programs is adequately funded across all program areas. (Saigen). I think this should be based more on community needs. For example, in some urban areas, other agency may be meeting the needs in terms of community development or xx(Kids). I would emphasize effective programming - without characterizing it as in the four program areas. (Clare). This is probably rarely the case so the focus should be on developing partnerships, collaborations, and external grants to meet needs. (Robin). This is critical if we are to have successful urban programs. (Tahoe). Agree with statement that urban programs SHOULD be adequately funded with public funds, to be successful, however they reality is and will continue in the future that private funds will be critical in complementing public contribution. (April). Work with your university and take the time to know what is going on in the budget process, as it relates to your program. (Sandy). Extension dollars are very slim and we must seek grants, etc to function. (Ocbugs). If Extension could be seen as the 'Front Door' to the university for the many communities in the state and in urban areas, then funding is most certainly inadequate. (Ocbugs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

18. Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 1, MD 1, MA 5, A 10, SA 2*

*Comments:* 

Unfortunately this is the general trend for our society. (Scorpio). Urban Extension offices should operate in consistent manner with the rest of the state. I don't think it is logical or fair to assume people will/should pay in urban locations and not rural. (Clare). This is certainly an important...
means of getting proper support but it is not without risk. Models need to be developed to
determine cost for proper charging since overhead is seldomly considered.(Robin). This is
expected.(Tahoe). This is an area that we are proving to be our own worst enemy. Many staff
struggle with the concept of cost recovery. We have to think outside the box.(Yellowjacket). I
see no problem with public, private partnerships.(Sandy). User fees are fine and appropriate and
help build ownership for a participant.(Butterfly). Again, we need to look to this source of
revenue much more than we have in the past.(Ocbugs). User fees must be avoid at all times
unless otherwise there is no other way to be carried out that program without charging user
fees. It creates exclusions. And, once it is taken that root it is hard to stop. It will always go up
and up and program participants will be only those who can afford.(Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

19. Extension seeks funding for urban programming from other agencies of the federal
government, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Education,
Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Department of Defense.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 0, MD 2, MA 3, A 9, SA 6

Comments:

Due to time restraints this is not done near as much as it should be. We need people
developing programming ideas and talking with other agencies and selling our ideas on a
continuous basis. We must learn how to establish and maintain the relationships.(Blue I). The
way of the future.(Scorpio). Not consistently or extensively in our state.(Saigen). If we could
have a more cohesive statewide approach, this would be an excellent opportunity.(Kids).
Should be seeking funding but in a coordinated way with state administration. Urban counties
should not be left to fend for themselves.(Clare). This I think is a key to the future but is more
effective if pursued at an administrative level and the local level.(Robin). We SHOULD seek
funding from these national agencies, not just USDA.(April). Although this is being done in some
limited programming areas, there needs to be increased use of collaborative funding and
grants.(Yellowjacket). Have an in depth conversation about what is expected of you and your
project with federal funds. We are fortunate to have some powerful people on finance in
D.C.(Sandy). Any funding source that gets the job done is appropriate.(Butterfly). Let’s look
beyond the dept of Ag for sources of sustainable funding.(Ocbugs). Good idea. And many urban
programs do that. Just be careful for those agencies that their missions do not coincide or agree
with extension’s mission.(Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
20. Urban Extension offices work toward adequate funding by seeking to increase both traditional and new sources of funding.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 0, MD 2, MA 4, A 7, SA 7*

**Comments:**

*Emphasis on NEW. (Scorpio). What choice do you have if your traditional source is changing or shrinking and again is most effective is all levels of the organization or working towards, which often means providing proper training to facilitate this effort. (Robin). There are lots of potential resources in most urban counties but we must seek them out. (Tahoe). It might be a good idea to think outside the box. Some of these ideas suggest this. (Sandy). It is the wave of the future ... no going back. (Butterfly). We could do more, but I get concerned about grant chasing where we divert our attention from our mission to small buck chasing. It has most certainly happened! (Ocbugs). It is a matter of survival. Urban Ext. offices work toward the goal of seeking funding sources through diversification. (Mo).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

21. Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 1, MD 3, MA 3, A 8, SA 5*

**Comments:**

*Yes, as long as we include the local mission and not only that of the state organization (Scorpio). Yes, but be sure that the mission is not interpreted in the context of only supporting "traditional" programming (Clare). External funding can certainly become a distraction from our main mission and should be continually assessed. On the other hand if a need exist and resources are provided, if it meets Advisory directive, the mission may have to change. (Robin). Perhaps the mission needs to be reexamined. (Sandy). Mission creep will ultimately weaken an organization. (Butterfly).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments:

---

**Marketing**

**Please rate your agreement with the following statements:**

22. Urban Extension offices effectively market their programs.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 4, MD 3, MA 2, A 7, SA 3*

Comments:

We work very hard for state marketing tools and strategies that can be used locally. In many ways we are doing a much better job than traditional Extension. (Blue I). Will likely continue to lack resources to do this adequately. (Scorpio). As mentioned above -- Extension is still the best kept secret in most parts of our larger urban areas -- little awareness and no overall strategy to effectively market most programs. (Saigen). Although we currently don’t, this is a key to future success. (Robin). Difficult in urban areas but very important. (Tahoe). Marketing will be the key to the future success of urban Extension programs. We must be able to make sure that not only clientele but stakeholders are aware of our programs and opportunities. (Yellowjacket). This should be addressed locally and statewide. Interesting subject. (Sandy). Very important ... however, as Extension folks we never have a budget or infrastructure to support it ... think where McDonalds would be without their PR budget … Think where we might be if we had one ...(Butterfly). All of us in Education and in Government must get past the idea that "marketing" is a four letter word! It is essential that we get our message out to taxpayers who support our activities. (Ocbugs). In this day and age, without effective marketing, Extension programs will face great difficulty in securing funds. To address this challenge, Ext. programs use a wide variety of methods for marketing their programs whether it is at the local, state, or federal levels. Such methods include the electronic media, the mass media, and the traditional ways or methods. (Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

23. Extension has “brand name” recognition in urban areas.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 4, D 4, MD 0, MA 3, A 6, SA 3*
Comments:

The relative few familiar with us will continue due to lack of real funds to change it. (Scorpio). But we need to define for what ... it may or may not be for the same programs as the rest of the state. And it is important that that recognition continue to tie us to the university ... e.g. many people may know 4-H but may not associate it directly with the university. (Clare). Another key that should occur but currently is lacking. (Robin). Something we must continually work on. (Tahoe). This follows the marketing concept. For us to effective and a significant "player" in urban issues in the future we must have recognition. (Yellowjacket). Little recognition in urban areas. (Sandy). This is a should ... but our efforts are still quite small relatively speaking. (Butterfly). Extension's brand name recognition in urban areas will largely depend on visibility and involvement and how extension competes with dwindling resources with other competitors. (Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

24. Urban Extension offices are responsive to clients’ needs and attitudes when marketing programs.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 1, MD 1, MA 3, A 11, SA 3*

Comments:

Another extremely important component of an effective program. (Robin). We must work hard to ensure this happens. (Tahoe). Target population is where there will be real strides made, providing the need is there. (Sandy). Again, this is a should ... however, we may be hindered by attitudes of our volunteers or supporters who, while well meaning, may have a hard time letting go to meet current needs. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

25. Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 0, MD 4, MA 3, A 8, SA 4*
Comments:

As much as we can get away with - this will continue into the future. (Scorpio). Difficult to get major media coverage for most Extension work -- although at least one urban county has established a weekly column for CE Master Gardener program in a major newspaper. (Saigen). Media may not always be the best method. For example a physical presence and word of mouth can be important also. (Kids). If our goal is to reach a significant portion of the population, this is an important and realistic way to do it. (Clare). Effective use of media is very important and a skill where training is needed. (Robin). This is important but it varies from one urban area to another. (Tahoe). Mass media is the key to marketing, "brand name recognition" and informing public. We have only just begun to tap this resource in our state. (Yellowjacket). Invite a media person to M.C. an event. Get to know them. They will be more receptive the next time you call. (Sandy). This is a should, but reality is this takes time and staff support. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

26. Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 0, MD 3, MA 4, A 6, SA 6

Comments:

We need a strategy and targeted clientele groups to be really effective. (Blue I). Its pretty cheap - but limited. (Scorpio). Much more is needed and developing in this area. Name recognition is one of the challenges -- people don’t know where to go for information. (Saigen). If our goal is to reach a significant portion of the population, this is an important and realistic way to do it. (Clare). ditto 29. (Robin). Yes but we must get better at it. (Tahoe). Internet usage can be linked directly to mass media. (Yellowjacket). Ask a volunteer to keep your web-site updated. (Sandy). Again, need time and staff support. (Butterfly). We’re working on it!! (Ocbugs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:
ACCOUNTABILITY

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

27. Urban Extension offices effectively report program impacts.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 0, MD 2, MA 4, A 9, SA 4*

Comments:

Should continue to improve.(Scorpio). Local funding will be dependent upon this issue.(September). All offices should effectively report program impacts - not just urban.(Clare). Presently not the case but certainly a key to future success.(Robin). Effectively reporting impacts I think has been one of Extension's significant challenges...we should have appropriate techniques and tools to develop and measure relevant outcomes/impacts for Extension to be successful (competitive and fund-worthy) in the future.(April). Although urban counties do a better job of impact reporting, we still can and must do a better job of determining impact and reporting to significant audiences.(Yellowjacket). With a little more effort, the positive impact on the community could be better told.(Sandy). Staff often do not understand what is a good impact outcome that their programs should shoot for.(Butterfly). Lots of need for improvement here, but Extension is committed to improvement.(Ocbugs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

28. Extension has a statewide system to effectively report urban program impacts.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 1, MD 4, MA 3, A 7, SA 2*

Comments:

Doesn't make too much sense to we urbanites now nor will it in the future.(Scorpio). We have a state system to report impacts -- not sure if all connects to the Federal CSREES Impact system -- seem limited.(Saigen). Separating out urban impacts could be a good thing (e.g. communication with urban legislators) - or it could be divisive. We need to think through how to effectively use impact data.(Clare). ditto 31(Robin). Major challenge for states!!(Tahoe). Need the system along with the process (ie staff abilities).(April). There is no state-wide system for urban programming in our state. On the national level there has is some movement but there still must better coordination nation-wide.(Yellowjacket). Uniformity would be helpful.(Butterfly).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

29. Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data).

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 1, MD 1, MA 5, A 9, SA 3*

Comments:

*Not consistent across all program areas.* (Saigen). Applies to all staff, not just urban. (Clare). Important and training needed to improve. (Robin). Must do a better job of reporting impacts including those stories that show the "human" side of what we do. Antecdotal evidence is useful despite what some may say. Combined with quantitative data, these "stories" can build a very strong case for programming impact. (Yellowjacket). Seems it should be pursued in more depth. (Sandy). This is a good method. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comments:

30. Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 1, MD 2, MA 6, A 7, SA 2*

Comments:

*Should get better.* (Scorpio). Again, not consistent across all programs and in all urban areas. (Saigen). Applies to all staff, not just urban. (Clare). Another area in need of improvement and training. (Robin). As a whole, we are not properly trained in the effective collection and use of quantitative data. (Yellowjacket). This reporting should be monitored more closely. (Sandy). If we had enough staff, time and resources... (Butterfly). We are working on doing more in this regard. (Ocbugs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Comments:

31. Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 2, MD 1, MA 5, A 9, SA 1*

Comments:

*Our state requires customer satisfaction survey’s and I think this is an excellent indicator that should be continued.* (Hiram). *I see far more evaluation data that focused on inputs and outputs-what we did-- rather than the change that people make as a result of our programs.* (Seamstress). *Applies to all staff, not just urban.* (Clare). *Our state legislature requires it.* (Tahoe). *When it is positive, we should be sure everyone knows it.* (Sandy). *Academia never toots it's own horn.* (Ocbugs). *Again, this is a should that is tied to needing resources to make it happen.* (Butterfly). *Our funding sources are looking to us to provide 'outcome' measures.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

32. Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted population.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 1, MD 3, MA 6, A 9, SA 1*

Comments:

*Define increased empowerment.* (Clare). *Very important but difficult to report.* (Robin). *This should happen …* (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

33. Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 3, MD 0, MA 6, A 8, SA 2*
Comments:

I am not sure we evaluate the cost effectiveness of a program design at the time of planning and selecting an approach. It seems to be more gut feeling. (Seamstress). I am not aware of this happening in our state in urban programs. (Saigen). Seems to be a focus now but we don't have good tools to know how to do it with social type programs. (Kids). When appropriate. (Clare). Should be done but certainly is not as good as for rural programs, because we don't have adequate models. (Robin). I believe funders will continue to require more of this in the future. (Tahoe). Hard to quantify but should be considered. (Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

34. Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 4, MD 1, MA 8, A 3, SA 2

Comments:

We do have a formal reporting system that all Extension academics use -- not sure if it is nationally uniform -- in fact, doubt it. (Saigen). There are huge differences between urban programs across the country. We are far from a nationally uniform accountability structure. Is it even desirable? (Clare). Yes this is important but sometimes I question the resources used to develop, particularly given the present federal budget cuts. This needs to be done most effectively for our main supporters that happen to be our state government. (Robin). I understand that this is something that is being considered on the national level. It would certainly help improve our national impact if we could compare "apples to apples". (Yellowjacket). Should be more coordination on this issue. (Sandy). WE would be a stronger organization and more nationally recognized if we all had the same base logo with a spot for our state university that we are tied to ... and if we had a reporting system that had some uniformity to it. I wonder how McDonalds in Japan reports their earnings and management in comparison to a McDonalds in X City, XXstate???(Butterfly).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
TARGET AUDIENCES AND PARTICIPANTS

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

35. Urban Extension programs do not unnecessarily duplicate services provided by other organization in the community.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 2, D 0, MD 3, MA 4, A 8, SA 3

Comments:

If Bush continues his assault on domestic programs, we won't HAVE any competition - if we're around.(Scorpio). I don't see how you can't avoid some duplication, however it generally occurs because services are not adequately delivered. There is more than one way to serve and if we have the resources ... why not(Robin). Seems to me that more try to duplicate us.(Tahoe). Interesting area. Appears more can be done.(Sandy).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

PROGRAM PLANNING

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

36. Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are holistic.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 0, MD 2, MA 2, A 12, SA 3

Comments:

Even though it is hard to do ...(Clare). In theory maybe, but being Holistic often takes more effort and time than resources.(Robin). We must move beyond our approach of programmatic areas in program planning. Many times our programs would show more impact if we were able to use a holistic approach rather than traditional programming.(Yellowjacket).
37. Urban Extension educators use the logic model (planning programs by considering resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts) in program development.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 1, MD 2, MA 4, A 10, SA 2*

*Comments:*

*Other than 4-H YD I don't believe most Extension staff are not aware of the logic model. (Saigen). In some form or another. (Clare). It should be done but needs to be properly taught. (Robin). This somewhat unclear. (Sandy)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 Disagree</th>
<th>3 Mildly Disagree</th>
<th>4 Mildly Agree</th>
<th>5 Agree</th>
<th>6 Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

38. Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 1, MD 2, MA 3, A 11, SA 3*

*Comments:*

*We need to spend some time thinking about what that means. (Clare). It would be nice to affirm this but without partnerships and collaboration is very difficult to accomplish in an urban area. (Robin). Not like it could be! (Ocbugs).*
39. Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 1, MD 3, MA 8, A 6, SA 2*

*Comments:*

*This would be nice but is limited by the ratio of programs to population.* (Robin).

40. Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 2, MD 2, MA 3, A 9, SA 3*

*Comments:*

*This may be true, but many programs are targeted at client needs which are not necessarily related to community development.* (Robin).

41. Urban Extension educators address community development issues.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 1, MD 4, MA 2, A 12, SA 1*
Comments:

This is a define future growth area. (Scorpio). mostly like a small fish in a very big lake. (Robin).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

PROGRAMMING - YOUTH DEVELOPMENT / 4-H

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

42. The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H / youth development programs reflects the diversity of the youth population.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 0, MD 5, MA 4, A 9, SA 1

Comments:

This probably needs improvement. (Robin). Extension educators should be representative of the populations they work with. our urban staff should reflect that diversity. (April). Here's where we are lacking (Ocbugs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

43. Urban 4-H / youth development programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interests, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 0, MD 5, MA 2, A 11, SA 1

Comments:

This would be ideal. (Robin).
44. Urban 4-H / youth development uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 2, MD 1, MA 7, A 4, SA 3*

*Comments:*

*Don't really know.* (Robin).

45. Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 0, MD 3, MA 3, A 12, SA 2*

*Comments:*

*If we chose to, 4-H could compete successfully for funding traditionally going to "prevention" programs. Often we are doing the same thing, just using different language.* (Kids). *In conjunction with youth-serving organizational partners.* (Clare). *Certainly a need but not sure is done effectively now.* (Robin)

46. Urban 4-H / youth development staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development.
Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 1, MD 3, MA 4, A 9, SA 3

Comments:

Don't really know. (Robin). So much more could be done. (Ocbugs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>3 Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>4 Mildly Agree</td>
<td>5 Agree</td>
<td>6 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

47. Urban 4-H / youth development partners with other youth-serving organizations.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 1, MD 0, MA 2, A 7, SA 8

Comments:

Partnership is essential. Extension is not the only game in town. (Clare). gets at overlap (Ocbugs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2 Disagree</td>
<td>3 Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>4 Mildly Agree</td>
<td>5 Agree</td>
<td>6 Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

48. Urban 4-H / youth development uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs.

Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 3, MD 5, MA 3, A 6, SA 1

Comments:

We need to come up with several different models not just the 4-H club model... Way too restrictive. (Blue I). Conditions will continue to exist that will prove this to be challenging. (Scorpio). The "club" format is not always the best model. In some cases, it works. We shouldn't try to force it. (Kids). Depends on local preferences. (Clare). Flexibility can be important. (Robin). Our experience has shown that 'project specific' youth engagement/development is very effective, and is more aligned with 4-H special interest groups than clubs. (April)
TEACHING AND OUTREACH METHODS

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

49. Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 2, MD 1, MA 6, A 6, SA 4*

*Comments:*

*Some programs much better than others.* (Tahoe).

50. Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 2, MD 1, MA 4, A 11, SA 2*

*Comments:*

*When it is appropriate and technology is available.* (Mo).
51. Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners’ ability to solve problems and make decisions.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 0, MD 0, MA 7, A 7, SA 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

52. Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 0, MD 2, MA 6, A 9, SA 2*

Comments:

As well as campus faculty. (Clare). We could certainly increase our role in research. This could be enhanced by collaboration with urban universities. (Yellowjacket).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

53. Urban Extension educators minimize use of the expert model in teaching.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 1, MD 2, MA 7, A 8, SA 2*

Comments:

Not sure (Robin). There is no single method of teaching that suits all. Extension Educators try to understand their audiences and figure out the best possible method to use. (Mo).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGRAM EVALUATION

Please rate your agreement with the following statements:

54. Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 0, D 2, MD 2, MA 3, A 11, SA 1*

*Comments:*

*Define empowered.* (Clare). *Would be good, but not certain of present.* (Robin).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

55. Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community.

*Ratings from Round 2: SD 1, D 2, MD 0, MA 5, A 10, SA 2*

*Comments:*

*Maybe. How do we do this?* (Kids). *Need to improve this aspect by providing better information support, training.* (Robin). *Sometimes but we must become better at this.* (Tahoe). *Have not seen this. But there is talk!* (Ocbugs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comments:*

56. Please share any closing thoughts you have on the issues addressed or the process:
Comments:

Had to keep reminding myself that this is a future question. Pretty cool though. (Scorpio). Seems long and tedious. Many questions similar. Sometimes it is obvious that different members of the group are interpreting statements differently -- that may be inherent in this type of process. (Saigen). Thought provoking! (Clare). Very interesting, and enlightening but sometimes unclear. (Robin). Very good set of statements. It is hard to stay focused on what needs to happen versus what is currently happening. (Tahoe). Seems that panel members are responding as assessments of what is, not how important that indicator is for a successful urban extension office. My comment is based not as much on ratings, but on the comments panelists submitted. Please clarify for all, again, thanks. (April). This is a very long process and requires a great amount of time. (Sandy). long! (Ocbugs).
APPENDIX G

WRITTEN COMMENTS ROUND I
Statement 1: Urban Extension offices are adequately staffed in all four program areas (Family & Consumer Science, 4-H Youth Development, Community Development, and Agriculture/Horticulture & Natural Resources).

1. The four program areas may be represented, but the staff numbers are unrealistically small, given the population numbers in metro counties.
2. Professional to population ratios are inconsistent with the level of service provided to more rural counties.
3. I don't believe Cooperative Extension offices are adequately staffed in any area of our state -- urban offices are in some cases better off than some of our rural offices. In general, there is no urban extension office that I am aware of that is adequately staffed across the four program areas mentioned above.
4. It depends on how you define an office. In some cases, yes. In other cases, I think we will be successful with offices that may have a narrower focus. (e.g. Families and Youth in a specific neighborhood or Community Development through a center with that focus).
5. Usually not at all. But also it is too restricting to limit staffing to the four major areas.
6. Have not been in touch with offices recently. My recollection is that they were adequately staffed.
7. We have staff that are spread very thin across a large county.
8. Although we have specialty agents, we still have agents covering 2 or 3 subject areas. In an urban setting, need experts.
9. With Funding cutbacks, there have not been sufficient revenues to maintain services and service delivery as has been historically been the case. In Hennepin County Extension has been forced to cut back some educational services and to change from county to regional delivery bases.
10. Most are critically understaffed.
Statement 2: Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods.

1. Same background as rural/other staff.
2. Requirements for hiring new Extension Educators have been constantly changing with time and as a result of this, today's Extension Educators have higher degrees and great deal of experience.
3. Although many of our urban extension educators are well versed and capable in the use of sound educational theory and methods I believe this is an area where in general we are focused more on subject-matter expertise over effective educational methodologies. By and large extension educators in urban settings still rely on lectures, written materials and classroom type educational approaches. There is very little going on in the use of modern educational technology. Some 4-H youth development programs are the exception with the use of effective experiential and hands-on, discovery-based learning approaches in after school and other innovative youth programs.
4. Usually staff are subject matter based and trained versus trained in educational principles.
5. This has always impressed me.
6. I have an MAT and many years of working with the public in partnership with a variety of agencies.
7. There has been a recent 'brain drain' of very experienced Extension educators..as a result of funding problems and boomers reaching retirement age. The new educators will grow into their responsibilities, but it will take time.
8. In most instances, Urban Extension Educators are "pulled from the ranks" with little or no background in urban issues. Many have degrees in traditional agriculture. Such backgrounds do not readily lend themselves to working effectively in urban situations.

Statement 3: Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have a background in community development.

1. This applies to all staff and not just urban.
2. If when the educators were hired they had previous urban experience, your statement is valid.
3. It is an area that can be improved, but each recognize their responsibility.
4. Our urban extension educators often conduct community development work by default. There are only a handful of urban extension people in our state that actually focus on community development -- in fact community development is under supported by our land-grant institution. With shrinking public resources community development has become one of the lower priority programs in our organization. Community development does seem to be a thread that is woven through every extension educators' program. I believe it is an area that we as an
organization or extension nationally should provide more leadership and training so that extension educators have more capability in the community development area.

5. New hires may/may not have this background but certainly will acquire it on the job, regardless of program area.

6. Knowledge of community development has been developed through on the job training and some opportunities for in service training (weak). My career in environmental education has given me this exposure.

7. Currently, this is not the practice.

Statement 4: Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development.

1. This applies to all staff and not just urban.

2. Again -- leadership development is something that is not addressed in any coordinated or comprehensive manner in our organization. Although many of our leaders recognize the value and importance of leadership development it is only addressed sporadically through conferences or special seminars added to other meetings. We are in the midst of trying to develop a statewide, systematic leadership development campaign that will support leadership development in all land-grant academic appointees. This is an especially critical area in the urban areas where community engagement and involvement depend on effective leadership capacities in our extension staff. Here again -- our organization seems more focused on subject-matter expertise in hiring and advancing our extension academics.

3. This is key to success.

4. Once again, the background of many urban educators is such that local administrators (i.e., County Directors, Coordinators, etc.) have little administrative training. In an urban setting, this position should be filled with individuals that have been through more than just a rudimentary "leadership" development program.

Statement 5: Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation.

1. This applies to all staff and not just urban.

2. Many of our urban extension educators have been trained in group facilitation. This is an area where our institutions leadership has supported staff development. Over the past 10 years we have adopted and trained over 200 individuals in the Interaction Associates (IA) Essential Facilitation (EF) model and techniques. We have 8 individuals trained and licensed as trainers by IA to provide the EF training -- which is typically a 3 or 4 day long workshop. This has been well received and many of our urban extension people use this approach to plan and conduct more focused and effective meetings and events.
3. Bringing people together on the same page is crucial.
4. Formal training re teaching and group facilitation is weak.
5. Formal training re teaching and group facilitation is weak.

Statement 6: Urban Extension educators are at ease in working with diverse audiences.

1. Great improvements in recent years, though some challenges remain.
2. I believe most of our urban extension educators are comfortable working with diverse audiences. There are still many challenges in our state regarding working with diverse audiences. I worked in a high school in an urban county where there were 28 different languages spoken -- this presents a major challenge in terms of simply communicating with clientele. Many of our urban county extension offices have a diverse staff which helps bring all staff along in terms of understanding and appreciating diversity.
3. This is more important in urban settings. The problem is not as great in rural offices.
4. There are only two of us and I think I can speak for both of us.
5. this is an area of real focus for Minnesota Extension as Minnesota has become home to a large and diverse immigrant group.
6. Urban Extension Educators MUST be open minded and willing to reach out and openly embrace diversity. The is especially true of the local administrator. They (local administrator) must set the example.

Statement 7: Urban Extension educators are at ease working in urban settings.

1. Some urban educators continue to focus most efforts in suburban areas.
2. I think most of our urban extension staff members are at ease working in the safer urban settings. There are still many neighborhoods that are perceived to be to risky for most extension staff to work in.
3. To my knowledge this is the case. However this should be carefully scrutinized.
4. There are only two of us and I think I can speak for both of us.
5. I agree, though sadly, many Minnesota legislators see Extension as only a rural educational service.

Statement 8: Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population.

1. But getting better ...
2. I see an improvement over a period of 10 years ago. However, there is much room for improvement.
3. It is an area we continue to work on, but each year we get closer.
4. We are sorely understaffed in all areas of our state, that in most cases our staff does not reflect the diversity of the local urban population. In one of our major
urban areas there is only one advisor and four program representatives - they
simply cannot reflect the diversity of the area. As a result, I think our programs
often reflect the interests and ethnic/racial background of the staff who often
have excellent programs in certain areas of an urban county or with certain
populations. In some cases staff have been selected to work with a particular
segment of the population.
5. In an ideal world this is a good goal. I think other factors are much more
important like personality, etc.
6. I am not sure. My question would be, does this really make a difference? The
quality of the educators is more important.
7. New Hampshire has a high white population with a changing demographic of
refugee and immigrant families from around the world. We do have an EFNEP
educator who is Hispanic. I am white, of Yugoslav descent, so I have been able
to have some commonality with our Bosnian families. However, I find I can
relate to all folks well. I do need more language skills ... Hispanic, Bosnian,
arabic.
8. More so than their rural counterparts, but not at an acceptable level.

Statement 9: Urban Extension educators welcome diversity.

1. I think we are further along with urban extension educators welcoming diversity
than we were 20 years ago, however we still have work to do in this area. Some
of our urban extension people have developed some excellent programs that
have helped other staff and clientele welcome and celebrate diversity.
2. This has always been the case.
3. We have a duty to serve all americans, new and old.

Statement 10: Urban Extension educators work with state specialists to provide
appropriate programming for urban audiences.

1. This works in some program areas but not others. A challenge is that state
specialists are not located in urban areas so have limited knowledge of specific
urban challenges.
2. Often the specialist are not "up" on urban methodology. Have had some good
success in FCS & Youth, Natural Resources, limited in Ag.
3. There is somewhat of a disconnect between our county-based staff and state
specialists that limits the amount of assistance provided by campus-based
specialists, especially in urban programs. There are examples of excellent
specialist support -- e.g. a fisheries specialist has worked with urban coastal 4-H
youth development staff to develop salmon and steelhead projects that work
with Latino youth and families. Another specialist in entomology and IPM has
provided assistance for urban forestry projects in several cities around our state.
In general there is more specialist assistance available for traditional agriculture
and natural resources programming than urban programming. Water quality and
invasive species as well as coastal and marine resources are other areas where there is specialist support for county-based staff. NF&CS programs in nutrition and consumer education do have fairly good specialist support. There are only two state specialists left in 4-H YD.

4. Over the years the resources have been there to meet the need.
5. I have never had that experience.
6. Specialist are not always prepared to address urban needs.

Statement 11: Urban Extension educators collaborate with colleagues outside of Extension to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.

1. The development of partnerships and collaborative efforts is essential in urban areas. We are not the only game in town.
2. This is an area where I think our urban extension educators excel -- they are generally very effective developing strong, long-term collaborative relationships with local agencies and other organizations to help plan and conduct effective programs for urban audiences. Many extension people really leverage their efforts by serving on boards and advisory groups providing leadership and guidance in providing programs for youth, families, community economic development, improved water quality, etc. in their local areas.
3. Hopefully this is happening. If not it should be.
4. I can only do my work through partnerships with those agencies that are "on the street" - Housing Authority ... Salvation Army, etc.
5. More work needs to be done in this area to work the partnerships and collaborations...to truly make Extension the 'Front door to the University'...to all University resources available to all elements of the community.

Statement 12: Urban programs have the support of state level Extension administration.

1. Good experiences in this state.
2. While I agree that urban programs have state level extension administration support, I think there is more support for traditional agriculture and natural resources programming in our state. Agriculture is a major economic engine in our state and traditionally our institution has served this interest more than urban interests. This has been changing and there is growing recognition of balancing our efforts and providing support for both urban and rural programs.
3. Varies by state.
4. To my knowledge this seems to be the case.
5. I have moral support ... no funding specifically, though my new supervisor is much more proactive on grant writing where I was all on my own before.
6. They respond to direction from the legislature...see #11.
Statement 13: Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.

1. Urban and non-urban educators continue to rely primarily on a limited number of academic departments, where state specialists are housed. There are examples of other campuses and colleges being involved, but not enough.
2. Only when the system makes this possible.
3. Our urban extension educators use any resources they can access of the entire land-grant university system in our state. They also access local state universities and community colleges. Local extension staff will often develop effective working relationships with other institutions in their areas using their facilities to provide seminars, working with their faculty, etc. to get research-based information that may not be available through our own organization.
4. We talk this a lot but in practice it is not developed at all. It is a goal to strive for...
5. If not, they should be reaching out to this great resource.
6. I try to since I believe strongly in our mission to translate the research and activities of the U to the community.
7. Not at all as they should.

Statement 14: Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming.

1. Limited involvement, but much more needs to happen. Some good successes with extension educators with offices on urban university campuses.
2. See above for comments. (Saigen). Hopefully!
3. I have had partnerships with faculty at U of New Hampshire, but also with other U's in the region to provide interns or faculty for training/occasional direct delivery.

Statement 15: Urban Extension staff has close working relationships with local communities and agencies.

1. To a good extent, thought more needs to be done. This question brings us back to the issue of staffing and challenges of a small staff in a big county.
2. See comments Question 11.
3. Networking is important.
4. Can't work without them. Don't need to reinvent the wheel ….
5. More work needs to be done here.
Statement 16: Urban Extension office/s are located within the urban core.

1. Though staff numbers are small.
2. It depends - some of our urban offices are in the urban core, most are in outlying areas where facilities are often more economical and available. In many cases the county agriculture facility houses our Cooperative Extension offices and these facilities are usually not in urban core areas.
3. They do a good job.
4. One office is in the city. Mine is 10 minutes away. But all my work is in the field anyway.
5. We are working on this.

Statement 17: Urban Extension has satellite offices throughout the county.

1. Only one office exists.
2. If funding is available.
3. Not all, but some.
4. There are three or four very large counties that have urban areas and maintain satellite offices in outlying areas. I would not say there are offices "throughout" the counties however.
5. I'm not sure what you mean by this. We have only two offices in our county.

Statement 18: Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of collaborating organizations.

1. A few isolated cases of this, but not many.
2. There are a few examples of our urban extension staff being co-located in the offices of collaborators. For example, a marine science educator is located at a community college that co-sponsors the extension education program.
3. In some locations by not universally.
4. Am not sure. However it is a good idea.
5. We are in a county admin building and the other office is in an office rental in the mill area.

Statement 19: Urban Extension staff maintains positive working relationships with governmental funding partners.

1. Some contact and working relationship with governmental departments, but more is needed, especially given budget challenges. Concern that governmental administrators and policymakers have very little knowledge of extension.
2. In general this is true -- urban extension staff interact with local policy makers, e.g. boards of supervisors through both formal and informal meetings and
presentations. Many urban extension programs produce newsletters and/or annual reports specifically for boards of supervisors -- in one case specifically focused on extension programs in a particular supervisor's district.

3. The presentation in the last budget process was a brilliant presentation. It focused on what happens in a urban setting. The presentation was before the senate finance committee.

4. Very little time and political structure prevents us from getting to know our reps and county commissioners.

Statement 20: Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for sustaining base programming in the four program areas.

1. We may be able to sustain current programming, but is that the appropriate goal? We are not doing enough now, so we should work to do more and not just sustain.
2. Each county has a different level of commitment, but overall, we have excellent support.
3. As mentioned earlier, none of our extension programs have adequate public support these days. Urban extension offices vary across our state in terms of the local (county) funding provided -- in some cases it is adequate, in most not.
4. While I agree, I think there may be cases where community need is not high for strong base programming in one area.
5. Enough is never enough. However the funding has been better than most in these tight budget years.
6. This is New Hampshire ... sigh. We have lost 14 staff in the state in the last two years.

Statement 21: Urban Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming.

1. Staff still struggle with this concept.
2. Plans are for the organization to do more of this in the future.
3. This is a growing trend in many areas. One largely urban county has taken a lead in our state in terms of developing cost recovery efforts for their programs that largely serve private good. Many counties have relationships with other agencies that provide additional funding for extension programs that conduct special research or provide specific training or other services. An example is an very urban county that several years ago cut the extension budget to zero -- in this case one of the farm advisors negotiated an agreement with a local water quality control board to conduct applied research related to run off affecting water quality in the county. The county extension office was awarded a grant for more than $150,000 for the advisor to conduct the research. In another case, a farm advisor contracted with the county parks and recreation department to provide IPM and urban forestry training including tree hazard assessment and
monitoring for the agencies staff -- in exchange, the advisor received an annual award of several thousand dollars to support other program activities. I think this trend will continue to grow in the future. This may help support urban extension programs in the future, but it raises some concerns about public good activities that seldom have funding behind them. Also there is concern about programs evolving to the point that they are simply driven by whoever provides a source of funds. Finding the right balance between fees for service and public support for extension programs may be a challenge for us in the future.

4. If not, they should providing they are only charging a portion of the cost to them.

5. We can do this. But my programs are difficult to totally fund this way since I am working with poor people who are working with struggling non-profits.

6. More could be done here if Extension does truly offer services of value, which I feel it does.

Statement 22: Urban Extension offices maximize resources by partnering with other agencies and organizations.

1. A strength.

2. I think we have a good deal to learn about maximizing resources through partnering in the future. I think we still need to find more efficient and effective ways to work collaboratively. There are problems with wasting resources in some partnerships -- I think the challenge is finding better ways to apply resources to the actual problems in our local communities. Often there is waste and mismanagement in partnerships and lots of up front investment of time and effort to get partnerships established. Our own administrative systems are not conducive to formalizing partnerships since there are often reams of paperwork and miles of red tape to work through before actually getting programs on the ground.

3. This works in not duplicating services.

4. I try to team with whoever I can.

5. More could be done.

Statement 23: Urban Extension offices seek effective funding partnerships with other agencies of the federal government, such as the Dept. of Health and Human Services, Dept. of Education, Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, and Dept. of Defense.

1. Funding partnerships with state agencies are handled by state administration, with the exception of a limited number of small local partnerships.

2. Unfortunately, this effort should be more systemic rather than relying on individual efforts.
3. I don't think we have taken advantage of this very well in our state. Most of our partnerships have been with state or local agencies. One exception is the military -- we have partnered effectively providing programs for military families and youth in urban areas.
4. They may explore grant opportunities not lasting partnerships.
5. These partnerships are great as it is a win, win situation for everyone.
6. We have not sought funding from these sources - mainly for lack of time ….

Statement 24: Urban Extension offices seek funding from non-tax dollars.

1. Some foundation or donor support.
2. The problem with foundations, however, is that it is not sustainable money. Good for projects that produce a product or need transitioning.
3. Many offices seek and find private support from individuals, foundations, etc. Several counties have established their own foundations to raise funds to support local urban programs -- especially in the 4-H youth development area.
4. I am not sure.
5. We seek funding from private foundations regularly, tho again, I am a one person operation so time constraints hamper me.

Statement 25: Urban Extension offices maintain a balance between existing traditional sources of funding and new alternative sources.

1. State programs are consistently relying more on alternative sources; the urban areas are getting better but have far to go. Given the state budget challenges, I would question what the "balance" should be.
2. Traditional sources are at a much lower level - as a ratio of funding - compared to more rural county programs.
3. I would guess the balance still favors traditional governmental funding sources.
4. I think our urban extension educators and urban extension office leaders spend a lot of time figuring out strategies to support their programs. They work with local governments, state extension leaders, private funders, grants, etc. I'm not sure we have found the right balance yet. I believe there is a need for additional public support for extension activities. One idea that is being explored is to re-tool our local extension offices as the "storefront" for the entire university and combine university academic outreach and student recruitment with extension programming -- if the university bought into this approach it may be able to concentrate enough resources in each county to ensure adequate, healthy funding for extension programs across our state.
5. Since we don't have enough dollars to begin with, I am not sure that "balance" is the right word. But, yes we do seek both sources.
Statement 26: Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if there are plans for sustainability of programs when this funding ends.

1. Some consideration but not always a well defined plan.
2. Although staff consider long term sustainability of programs, I think they often will seek outside funds for programs they believe will be effective -- in the hopes that after the program gets going and proves itself other sources of support will be found.
3. Funding is sought even when plans for sustaining programs are not in place, however efforts are made to sustain relevant outcomes of programs.
4. What source of funds are being referenced here?
5. We do seek ways to make programs sustainable, but the reality of time and lack of dollars make this difficult.
6. While there is an interest in sustainability, we've not developed an infrastructure to support such.

Statement 27: Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension.

No comments

Statement 28: Urban programs are effectively marketed.

1. But that is a big challenge in a metropolitan area.
2. Strongly disagree in that there is little state wide marketing effort. Most effort is locally initiated and supported. If question was, " Urban programs are effectively marketed using local sources." - the response would be different closer to #5.
3. Perhaps not on a state level, but they are definitely on a local level.(2455). Need for internal and external marketing of urban.
4. Sometimes effective at local level, rarely beyond that.
5. We do what we can.
6. Still the best kept secret and the best deal, financially, that a county government has going!

Statement 29: Extension has “brand name” recognition in urban areas.

1. Confused with the other universities in the area. Little name recognition.
2. OR "Agree" but for the wrong programs/reasons.
3. There is a general lack of public awareness although specific clientele served know us they often don't connect us with the broader university.
4. More could be done.
5. Lots of people moving in and out ….
6. Yes, for 4-H and Master Gardeners.
Statement 30: Urban program marketing is responsive to clients’ needs and attitudes.

1. Again - not from state sources. Would respond @ #5 if question was "local source".
2. The Needs assessment process is very involved and is the basis for programming.
3. Urban program marketing also is responsive to available/limited resources.
4. We have so little marketing ....
5. Just need to identify better our target 'clients'.

Statement 31: Urban Extension targets clientele with relevant messages and programs.

1. What clientele? Existing? Potential?
2. Again - not from state sources. Would respond @ #5 if question was "local source".
3. I don't think we do our homework enough with general public.
4. THEY ARE GOOD AT THIS.
5. Our partners help us see what is needed ....

Statement 32. Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing.

1. Good attempts, but not always with much success.
2. Media is much more difficult to penetrate in urban markets. Too many house fires and homicides.
3. The urban media market is tough. Have some outstanding successes however. Personality of agent seems to be a key factor.
4. Am not sure.
5. Lack of time ....
6. It seems we've done better in the past.

Statement 33: Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing.

1. More should be done.
2. Room for improvement.
3. Little being done with the web for urban extension. Most county programs have web sites -- but use is often limited.
4. So much can and should be done in this area...Customized email should be a top priority.
5. Lack of time ... also our clientele often does not have access to internet.
Statement 34: Urban Extension staff effectively reports that programs provide public good in the local, state, and/or national interest.

1. Again - not from a state perspective. Could be at a #5 or #6 if the questions asked should the state/fed reporting system included more urban programming alignment.
2. We started a process two years ago that has improved reporting of actual impacts of programs. But it is not comprehensive enough.
3. Programs are great.
4. I think I understand the question ....
5. We could do a much better job.

Statement 35: Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data).

1. Again - not as much from a state perspective. Could be at a #5 or #6 if the questions asked through the state/fed reporting system included more urban programming alignment.(Scorpio). See Q. 34.
2. I do. I was trained with Sea Grant.
3. More needs to be done.

Statement 36: Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data.

1. Quantitative data does not always fall into the state/fed reporting system easily.
2. Sporadic -- some programs do a decent job, most not.
3. I work with written evaluations.

Statement 37: Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs on a cross section of county audiences including the urban poor.

1. Data does not always fall into the reporting system easily.
2. Urban poor hard to reach, least educated and least motivated.
3. This is dependent on the target of their outreach. is it targeted to urban areas of the entire county?
4. Also special needs people.
5. I assay my users.

Statement 38: Urban Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs.

1. We tend to focus more on impact rather than satisfaction evaluations.
2. Although this data is often collected -- not sure how it gets reported.
3. I assay my users.
Statement 39: Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the value of the programs they support.

1. Except for base extension funding.
2. Program's success determines funders positive perception and value of the program.
3. Most funders are supportive and believe the programs they support are valuable.
4. My small grant requests are often funded.
5. Sometimes amazing but true!!

Statement 40: Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the impact of the programs they support.

1. This is especially true of our youth program.
2. Not sure we are able to always communicate impacts as well.
3. I have not heard them express that.

Statement 41: Urban extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program planning.

1. We engage our partners in the process whenever possible.

Statement 42: Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program evaluation.

1. Not much of this reported.
2. Legislatively this happens. Don't know about this generally.
3. We're not doing a better job of this than in the past.

Statement 43: Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted populations.

1. When it occurs.

Statement 44: Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs.

1. Some money losers are quite effective. Not sure this is the most relevant view.
2. Focus to do more of this in the future.
3. Not sure about this.
4. For those where data is available.
5. I have not.
6. Lots of focus on this right now in Minnesota.
Statement 45: Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure.

1. The same structure is used for all staff - urban and non-urban - in this state.
2. As much as the reporting system allows.
3. Are you talking about the Federal Report of Work? Is there a national extension program evaluation system?
4. Does the cooperative extension system have one?
5. I participate in ECI.
6. This is a critical need.

Statement 46: Urban Extension educators focus on those populations with the greatest need, specifically the urban poor.

1. ... though there are some program areas that focus on the public "at large."
2. We do program to all populations, however, being driven by significant grant and contract funding, these tend to be more targeted towards people in need.
3. Urban poor are often targets, but not always.
4. And people with special needs.
5. I do.
6. I think that there is still a "comfort zone" when working with target audience. Many times we steer away form those groups/clientele that are outside of that comfort zone.

Statement 47: Urban Extension educators do programs for the suburban populations.

1. Struggles with the appropriate balance between urban and suburban. The majority of the metro population is suburban, but the "need" is urban.
2. Suburban and rural often come together.
3. I serve both pop's through After school/Out of School time programming.

Statement 48: Urban Extension staff maintains programming for traditional clients.

1. Less than in other counties in terms of 4-H, etc.
2. What is meant by traditional? is this reference to rural?
3. Teammate does that.
Statement 49: Urban Extension programs do not duplicate services provided by other organizations in the community.

1. It happens occasionally, thought staff make a good effort to cooperate rather than duplicate.
2. Sometimes we improve existing programs.
3. We work together to provide what they cannot.
4. This is the area where the most work needs to be done in my opinion.
5. We are still the only program in our location that utilizes a true "grass-roots" approach to programming.

Statement 50: Urban Extension educators use research-based information.

1. That is our mission.

Statement 51: Urban Extension educators involve representatives of target populations in program planning.

1. I do.

Statement 52: Urban Extension educators use program planning processes that are inclusive.

1. Limited diversity of clientele and advisory groups impact program planning.
2. I do.
3. We have to be careful that we do not slip back into our comfort zone of clientele selection.

Statement 53: Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are holistic.

1. I do.

Statement 54: Urban Extension educators use program planning that is based on the realities of the urban environment.

1. I do.
2. Many times the approach that is used is based on state-wide recommendations that are not applicable or effective for urban program planning.
Statement 55: Urban Extension educators develop programs based on the positive attributes of the community (assets based) instead of the deficits.

1. Still some needs assessment efforts out there.
2. There are times when the deficits are considered so that the programs can be relevant to the needs.
3. NOT CLEAR.
4. Growing trend -- especially in the human resources program areas. Not sure in the more traditional areas.
5. I do.

Statement 56: Urban Extension educators use program planning that crosses academic and program boundaries to address community issues.

1. But not enough ….
2. It really depends on individuals and the issue they are working on. In some cases there are examples of excellent cross-disciplinary work.
3. They do use this in program planning, but then to develop a program response they may run into difficulty….
4. This is needed.
5. I do.
6. We still program based on traditional programming areas - FCS, Ag, 4-H/Youth.

Statement 57: Urban Extension educators use the logic model in program development.

1. Some extension staff in 4-H youth development area use logic model because it has been taught by one of the state specialists.
2. I do.
3. ???

Statement 58: Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties.

1. There are some areas where this is true, but not overall.
2. While one may say that they strongly agree, the magnitude of change is only as much as resources can allow and in urban extension that tends to be lean.
3. There are some programs that have done this -- e.g. school gardens.
4. We COULD be much more of catalyst.
Statement 59: Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties.

1. While one may say that they strongly agree, the magnitude of change is only as much as resources can allow and in urban extension that tends to be lean.
2. Resources are too limited to effectively serve as change agent.

Statement 60: Extension is a catalyst for environmental change in urban counties.

1. While one may say that they strongly agree, the magnitude of change is only as much as resources can allow and in urban extension that tends to be lean.
2. More so in the past than now.

Statement 61: Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach.

1. Though not sure all would acknowledge that.

Statement 62: Urban Extension educators address family issues, such as financial challenges, health, nutrition, disruption of the family structure, parenting, and issues of aging.

1. Some human resources advisors -- it is not systematic across the urban areas of our state.
2. All of the above are needed.

Statement 63: Urban Extension educators address environmental quality, such as air and water quality, brownfields, development of green space, and landscaping.

1. Less work in this area because of limited staffing and staff changes.

Statement 64: Urban Extension educators teach job preparation skills.

1. Not a significant, consistent focus.
2. In some cases.

Statement 65: Urban Extension educators address economic development.

1. Depends on how economic development is defined.
2. This is a huge area and requires significant expertise to have real impact in urban areas.
Statement 66: Urban Extension educators address community development.

1. While one may say that they strongly agree, the overall impact is directly affected by the amount or resources brought to bear in an environment where magnitude may drown out even very effective programming.
2. Community Development is often neglected due to a lack of programming resources.

Statement 67: Urban Extension educators extend their outreach through volunteers.

1. Most urban 4-H programs still use volunteers in some capacity.
2. This is a great part of the program.
3. Volunteers are very hard to come by. I rely on interns and americorps.
4. Here's one of the real strengths of Extension.

Statement 68: Urban Extension educators provide train-the-trainer programs for professionals.

1. Our experiences have shown that a modified train-the-trainer strategy that includes monitoring for quality and ongoing support is far more effective than straight train-the-trainer professional development.
2. Great concept.
3. Hard to implement in hi stress areas.

Statement 69: Urban 4-H targets urban youth who have multiple risk factors.

1. Staff is not always equipped, but does a good job of working with/through other agencies.
2. Your statement, Urban 4-H is misleading. Extension uses traditional 4-H. However, the urban educators modify the programs to make them relevant for the urban youth.
3. As well as interested youth.
4. The same is true for rural youth.
5. Should be strong within the community.
6. I do.
7. Yes, but we could do much more.

Statement 70: Urban 4-H effectively programs with both urban “at-risk” youth and suburban, low-risk youth.

1. Not sure it is effectively if output and impact is small in size.
2. As well as interested youth for 4-h programs. M
3. Many of the suburban youth are at greater risk in some of our communities.
4. All of our 4-H youth development outreach is with inner-city youth, most all at risk.
5. A great need is met.
6. We do as a team.
7. See #69.

Statement 71: The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H youth programs reflects the diversity of the youth population.

1. A large suburban contingent.
2. May or may not but 4-h programs try to be inclusive.
3. We're not there yet…
4. It should.
5. Interns.
6. We are still working within our comfort zone with 4-H/Youth adult leadership.
   We need more diverse adult leadership.

Statement 72: Urban 4-H programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interest, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation.

1. That is why we partner with agencies.
2. More diversity in staff - both on local and state levels.

Statement 73: Urban 4-H gives youth, especially teenagers, a significant voice in the programs offered.

1. 2 staff for over 250,000 kids of 4-H age.
2. This helps keep them interested.
3. Hard to reach teen pop since we have only one staff.

Statement 74: Urban 4-H programming includes exploring careers.

1. This depends on how this is approached on a local level.
2. Very helpful.

Statement 75: Urban 4-H uses authentic civic involvement to provide a setting for developing skills such as writing, public speaking, networking, collaborating, teamwork and leadership.

1. Limited opportunities.
Statement 76: Urban 4-H provides opportunities for youth to experience mentoring or apprenticeships to enhance technical, personal and social competence.

1. This is key to their future.

Statement 77: Urban 4-H provides enrichment programs during school.

No comments.

Statement 78: Urban 4-H provides out-of-school time programs.

1. That is our focus …

Statement 79: Urban 4-H uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education.

No comments.

Statement 80: Urban 4-H uses service learning as an authentic way of connecting youth to their community through interdisciplinary, collaborative, engaged learning.

1. Service is a component.

Statement 81: Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk.

1. Working with other youth-serving organizations.
2. Very limited.

Statement 82: Urban 4-H staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development.

1. Not very often.
2. One of our true strengths!
3. Our 4-H/Youth staff is severely undermanned. We cannot meet the demands of our own program let alone train other agencies.

Statement 83: Urban 4-H shares 4-H program materials with staff of other youth-serving organizations.

No comments.
Statement 84: Urban 4-H partners with other youth-serving organizations.

1. So much more could be done.

Statement 85: Urban 4-H uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs.

1. All urban youth and agencies serving those youth do not accept the club format.
2. In some cases -- not universally successful model in urban settings.
3. While we use the club format for some outreach, we have had positive experiences with 'special interest group' and 'individual(s)’ youth participating in programs. Clubs require ongoing management and support.
4. The 4-H program limits what can be done and is restrictive.
5. Where appropriate.
6. Agree, but maybe some different models would work better in an urban setting. Dysfunctional families is a factor to contend with in supporting urban extension.

Statement 86: Urban 4-H works with a wide diversity of youth, including those of different races, ethnicities, sexual orientations, and physical and mental abilities.

No comments.

Statement 87: Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities.

1. Opportunities for information are available via Internet for those with access. However, this does not mean that ALL individuals seeking our assistance have access to us 24/7.

Statement 88: Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods.

No comments.

Statement 88: Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods.

No Comments:
Statement 90: Urban Extension educators use transformative learning methods to help learners examine the assumptions on which and the frame of reference within which their decisions are made.

No comments.

Statement 91: Urban Extension educators use a variety of learning techniques, such as self-directed learning, group learning, peer teaching, and collaborative learning techniques.

No comments.

Statement 92: Urban Extension educators use service-learning to enhance participants’ learning.

No comments.

Statement 93: Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community.

No comments:

Statement 94: Urban Extension educators minimize the use of the expert model in teaching.

No comments.

Statement 95: Urban Extension uses formative evaluation so improvements are possible as programming is developed and delivered.

No comments.

Statement 96: Urban Extension’s program evaluation measures multiple competencies, such as social, emotional, behavioral, cognitive, and/or decision-making.

No comments.

Statement 97: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered.

No comments.
Statement 98: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes changes in critical thinking and problem solving.

No comments.

Statement 99: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes social impacts on the community.

No comments.

Statement 100: Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community.

No comments.

Statement 101: Please comment on this process.

1. A good tool for measuring the impact of Extension in the urban setting.
2. Very interesting, easy to follow and took about 45 minutes. Thanks!
3. Let us wait until the end of the whole process.
4. Urban Program evaluation is undergoing a shift to more emphasis on economic impacts because the funders are demanding it and because we can better justify our programs, especially during times of tight budgets.
5. Interesting -- however overall too long and many questions overlap. Tedious and too time consuming.
6. Excellent statements - please provide them to me, thanks! Process is simple, straight forward, requiring a manageable amount of time to complete comfortably.
7. The process seems good.
8. This is a well developed survey.
9. I use debriefing, and written evaluation.
10. Minnesota is doing much more lately in evaluating their program outcomes.
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1. County Extension programs are adequately staffed to fulfill their mission based on the size of the county’s population.

1. Based on the focus on the future for this round, I'm not clear now on this question and wonder if people are looking at it the same way I am. My rating is based on thinking that to some extent staffing should be based on population. More importantly, it should also be based on community needs.
2. Staffing has not kept up with organizational expectations for urban staff efforts.
3. With the funding challenges and potential reduced staffing, we will be even more at a disadvantage in the future - unless priorities change.
4. From my experience and perspective there simply is not adequate staffing across the four core program areas mentioned in some of the largest populated counties in the nation -- the situation is getting worse with state budget reductions over the past year and several urban counties are dealing with smaller staff teams to deliver comprehensive Cooperative Extension programs.
5. Staffing must change if we plan to be a credible resource in urban communities.
6. It is unrealistic to expect significant impacts (and subsequent financial support) in the urban areas without adequate staffing.
7. Although staffing/clientele ratios will never be the same as for rural areas and they should not be. Along with staffing is having properly trained personnel with adequate support to meet the job needs.
8. As urban areas continue to grow and issues become more complex, staffing is a major concern.
9. Urban offices are poorly staffed.
10. Currently urban counties are extremely understaffed. However, one indicator of the overall success of urban county administrators may be a county's willingness to support additional staff.
11. If staffing is short, we should identify the needs of the area, and focus on the most urgent needs. This may be true only when times are good. Dwindling public resources play a major role for how programs are to be funded and staffed. Traditional way of funding programs is no longer applicable in many situations.
2. County Extension programs are staffed based on program areas that address current county needs and issues.

1. In some cases, we are not well versed in some urban problem areas.
2. Since resources have gotten more limited counties are often left to provide programs with the staff they have -- not always able to respond to newly emerging needs. An increase in cross-county or regional assignments has allowed Extension to broaden existing staff's coverage to address critical needs in more counties. Geographical distances and metro traffic issues limit the overall effectiveness of cross-county or regional assignments.
3. They are staffed based on historical perspectives and political will.
4. Though titles may be consistent statewide, it is necessary to have variations in terms of numbers and focus areas in the urban counties.
5. Staffing should include current and future needs.
6. Most of our educational programs are based on local needs as determined by a very comprehensive process.
7. Currently, many of the urban staffs in our state are still staffed based on the traditional roles of ag, fca and youth. In the future we MUST staff according to the needs of the community - not our traditions.
8. Has there been a needs assessment done in all areas?
9. Staff should be capable of meeting county needs.
10. Extension tries, but I sense a reluctance to address county needs and issues that may emerge which may not fit along traditional Extension service lines. Extension is working to match Extension programs with county needs, but they need to instead design Extension programs to match emerging needs.
11. This is what Extension would like to do and has been doing over the years. Programs are staffed based on number factors- one factor that is considered the most now-a-days is programs that can secure local support whether it is financial, community involvement or other means of local support get the priority.

3. Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods as well as specific subject matter training.

1. We generally focus on subject matter expertise versus process, audience, and educational theory understanding.
2. Urban Extension Educators of the future need many educational process skills as well as content-- we hire on content. These personnel need to be strong in collaboration and network building, grantsmanship, and marketing.
3. Most of our extension academics are highly qualified in their subject-matter expertise areas -- few have strong backgrounds is educational theory or methods. There is a trend towards more advanced degrees, i.e. PhDs., however this often makes for simply more specialized Extension academics, not necessarily better "educators".
4. I continue to believe that often those hired for Urban Extension programs have a very limited understanding of the audiences they work with and are not prepared to be effective in this setting.
5. Subject matter less important than leadership, facilitation, methods, etc.
6. Applies to all staff and not just urban.
7. Today Most have strong subject matter backgrounds and lack skills in mass media and human relations for urban situations, and must learn on the job. There are other issues more important than educational theory.
8. The future urban agent must be aware and cognizant of the many and varied learning styles of clientele. Currently, too many county staff are excellent "technicians" but are not well-rounded as educators.
9. Rural educators would have trouble in an Urban setting.
10. Educators should be grounded in techniques and methods ... that is why they are called "educators"

4. **Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have a background in community development.**

1. Most Extension educators develop their backgrounds in Community Development "on the job" -- few are actually trained formally in this area other than very limited in-service training offered occasionally by our land-grant institution's Community Development Department. There is only one statewide Extension Specialist in the Community Development area.
2. Could be training provided after hire.
3. This is a training deficit that needs improvement.
4. Urban faculty must know urban life and issues. We select urban faculty using different criteria than most other faculty.
5. More and more, Extension is reaching out to those qualified individuals whose educational background is part of the requirement and more importantly we are looking at a combination of educational and community experiences before hiring.
6. County educators must strive to be more holistic in their approach to programming.
7. The resource for training in an urban setting could be easily done by partnering with The UUP[Urban university Program] which includes Universities throughout the state.
8. this is a helpful fundamental.
9. I think that most Extension Educators are very much aware that their role is to connect with communities, but only a specialize few have actual community development training or experience.
10. This is true in many situations where Urban Extension Educators receive training in community development either through their field of study, short courses, conferences or through all of the above.
5. Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development.

1. Our institution has 2 people per year participate in the NELD program and 2 participate in the WELD program each year. There is no consistent, coordinated or regular leadership development that is provided for Extension staff in our state. This is a critical need area -- especially as we face a loss of experienced leaders in our county offices throughout the state.
2. This is an extremely important skill that has not been adequately addressed.
3. This is a basic skill that we must do our best to provide to urban faculty.
4. Again, when we hire we are looking for educational and community experiences for urban Extension personnel.
5. As Extension Educators, we must not only be effective educators but we must provide leadership for clientele in communities throughout urban areas.
6. This is fixable. The resources are out there to train and make this work.
7. Empowering communities is essential to make a program sustainable.
8. I see leadership development as a much more integral focus for Extension Educators than with community development.
9. Urban Extension Educators have some training in leadership development. But their training vary with their specific subject matter, past leadership experience and how they participate in in-service trainings that are available to them.

6. Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation.

1. Although we are making progress in this area with our facilitation training and assistance efforts -- we still have many staff that are not using state-of-the-art facilitation theory and methods.
2. These skills will be critical to urban extension's future.
3. This is another important component of an effective professional that has not been addressed systematically enough.
4. Most are and this is considered a basic skill for success of urban agents.
5. If it is working, leave it alone. However, where it's not working, fix it!
6. This is a key skill for any educator, no matter what the discipline.
7. Group facilitation and leadership development are fairly universal skills as I have seen it.

7. Urban Extension educators are at ease in working with diverse audiences.

1. Urban areas tend to weed out those who can't hack it and attract those who like the challenge.
2. Although growing diversity is a major challenge for education in general -- my experience is that our urban Extension educators are aware and sensitive to the needs of diverse groups and have the commitment and intention to work effectively with different audiences in their programs.
3. This is essential to move us forward in urban areas.
4. This is very important and closely linked with skills in leadership and facilitation, the stronger these skills the easier it is to work with diverse groups.
5. The diversity of urban areas requires faculty to be comfortable with diverse audiences.
6. Rural Extension personnel should become more at ease because the population shifts' are based on the job market. Some of your respondents need to read the latest census.
7. The first step would be to help them speak and understand English.
8. This is a key skill for any educator who is working in the 21st century. This is the trend that we need to respond to.
9. I am really proud of our Educators as they work so effectively with an increasingly diverse 'customer' base.
10. Urban Ext. Educators are at ease in working with diverse audiences. However, the degree of easiness vary with their exposure to diverse audience as well as their formal training and field of study.

8. Urban Extension educators are at ease working in urban settings.

1. I don't think all urban Extension staff are comfortable working in all urban settings -- some areas and groups are too challenging or appear too dangerous to work with.
2. This is essential to move us forward in urban areas.
3. This very important however most employees are comfortable in familiar urban settings which is not the same as all settings. Most are not trained enough to be comfortable in high profile situations.
4. About 10 years ago we changed our hiring criteria for urban faculty to hire those who are comfortable in urban settings.
5. We all need lessons in "understanding other cultures".
6. Perception is everything! Change the perception and find volunteers who are comfortable and understand the neighborhood.
7. If they can't work "on the street" they will not be effective.
8. Field of study, experience, formal training and exposure of diverse urban audience are some of the factors that can determine how at ease they feel when working in urban settings.

9. Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population.

1. I still believe we are simply too small in size and have too few staff members in each county office to effectively represent the racial diversity of most if not all of our urban counties.
2. If we define diversity as far more than ethnicity and race; we are still challenged as an organization. It is not our assessment of how open we are to diversity, but
the impression of those we serve that truly defines us. The work of the Diversity Taskforce is very telling about the Extension as a system. What does it say about us that we are not able to attract a diverse staff in diverse communities.

3. We need to consistently work toward this statewide.
4. This would be an ideal objective, but if staff is already limited other skills tend to get priority. We must be aware of what community leaders and supporters value.
5. This is a continuous challenge but we must continue to hire a diverse faculty.
6. Extension must reflect the population we serve. It does make a difference if our personnel is all of one race, ethnic background, same sex, age, etc. We can no longer hold on to the traditional WASP concept. Take a look at our country. This country is diverse and so should the people that serve the communities starting at the head of Extension on a federal level, state, and local level. We must diversify.
7. Extension must continue to strive to be more diverse in its hiring policies, especially on the professional level. Too many county staffs in our state and in other states are still lacking in true diversity.
8. Concentrate more on English. Ultimately, they will all need the English skill to succeed in what they want to do in life.
9. This is very helpful to help connect with the community.
10. Here in Minnesota and Hennepin County, we have done a good job in this regard.
11. Improving but still can be improved.

10. Urban Extension educators welcome diversity.

1. Urban Extension professionals do a much better job of this than the rest of the organization. They are the leaders in welcoming diversity in the organization.
2. Most of our urban Extension staff welcome diversity -- however we still have much to learn in really understanding our diverse audiences and educating them effectively.
3. Essential.
4. We should welcome diversity but again if training is not provided and resources are limited I think this gets moved down the priority list.
5. This is an important criteria for success in urban counties.
6. As our communities become more diverse, so must Extension. However, it is not enough to be more diverse, we, as educators, must understand and embrace the opportunities that diversity can bring to our jobs.
7. We agree that we encourage diversity. I would hope people from a foreign country would not forget their customs and pass them down to each generation. However they should learn English.
8. The attitude sets the tone ...
9. The focus in Minnesota is now on Rural Extension, so I have some concerns in this regard.
10. This is extension's mission. Extension programs welcome diversity and Extension Educators work with the old, the young, the rich, the poor and people of different ethnic/racial and religious beliefs.

11. **State specialists, in subject areas pertinent to urban programming, have adequate understanding of urban issues to work effectively with urban Extension educators to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.**

1. Most specialists don't really have a clue and likely won't unless emphasis to hire some occurs.
2. I still don't think specialist support is adequate for our urban programmers -- there is a limited understanding of urban specific issues -- although there are some examples of specialists who understand and focus on urban issues.
3. A bold stroke would be to explore different configurations of state specialists. Are there other faculty members, other colleges or other campuses that should be providing resources for urban programming?
4. Most Specialist are more equipped for rural issues and should get specific training just like agents for urban skills.
5. Agents must have their support if they are to be successful.
6. We have a good Urban Program [rated 2nd in the nation] by US News and World Report. However there are seven other programs in the state. They are all part of The University Urban Program.
7. State specialists need to understand the needs of the communities that they ultimately serve.
8. Here in Hennepin County we have actually used monies formerly dedicated to Extension to collaboratively hire a University/County liaison person to actively promote sustainable relationships between the two organizations throughout both...not just Extension.

12. **State level Extension administration provides adequate resources for effective urban programs.**

1. Not happening and likely will not in the near future. Unfortunately, it may be the only hope of saving the system - long term.
2. Because we are getting so thin on staffing statewide -- we lack adequate resources in many urban areas.
3. Funding is critical to the future of urban extension programming.
4. Although I don't think this is the case, it is important. It has been very difficult to convince administrators and traditional clientele in times of dwindling resources that the political influence and power is becoming more urbanized. After all most administrators have rural backgrounds and although the population may be predominantly urban/suburban, the vast majority of administrative advisors have rural backgrounds. I think Minnesota is an example of a state administration truly embracing urbanization.
5. This is critical but must be balanced with other needs.
6. In our state, urban Extension is still something that no one is quite willing to address. Additional resources (i.e., personnel and programmatic) are still needed.
7. Get to know local legislators. Let them know about the programs. Meet with both Rural and Urban.
8. No program can survive without support.
9. State level Extension administration funds effective urban programs but their efforts can be restrained unpredictable forces that are beyond their control. These forces are but not limited to federal, state or institutional budget constraints.

13. Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.

1. Still need to establish better networks across colleges within universities.
2. Most Extension educators rely on a limited number of campus resources where they have had effective working relationships in the past. Few use the entire university system available in our state. Many use local university resources effectively whether land-grant institution or not.
3. This is essential if we are to adequately address urban issues.
4. Another admirable objective but it appears mainly left up to individuals to develop resources rather than administrators developing relationships of mutual benefit and formalizing collaborations.
5. This is an increasing trend in our state.
6. Extension must become more visible within the university system. We must be seen as a partner with urban campuses.
7. There does not seem to be agreement on this subject. Resources are there. It appears that in some cases they are not being accessed.
8. If we stay strong to our land grant mission to translate the research and activities of the university to the community, then we will not suffer from "mission creep". Our mission is that which makes us unique ... and everyone deserves a shot at being connected to the university ... the land grant college system was designed so that it would not become an ivory tower institution - but one for the people ... all the people.
9. High tech. makes possible for Urban Extension Educators to use the entire university as resources when needed. And, this will improve with time.

14. Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming.

1. Need to continue to grow this.
2. Most develop relationships and work with local institutions. More difficult to develop connections with institutions that are not in the area.
3. Seems to be an obvious strategy given those urban universities that are focusing on research on urban issues.
4. Commendable but largely left up to individuals instead of having administrative links.
5. It needs to happen but is difficult.
6. There is the problem of identity.
7. We currently have little or no contact with our urban campuses. This is an area that must be addressed to increase the visibility and viability of both institutions (Extension and urban universities).
8. To my knowledge, no one has accessed our facility which is the flagship Urban College in the state.
9. Yes - there is great strength that can be gained from partnerships with our sister institutions - resources, interns, grant opportunities, etc.

15. **Urban Extension office/s are located within the urban core.**

1. critical that this occur.
2. How can we serve communities that we only "visit".
3. For some types of programming, a physical presence is critical.
4. It would be good to have some representation in these areas but most clientele and programs are focused in other areas of the community.
5. It depends.
6. We need more offices in the inner-cities in our state. Too many urban offices are either in the business/government complexes or located outside of the central city area.
7. In most downtown areas today, it would seem that office space would be readily available.
8. The offices need to be in or at least very near and accessible, so that educators are not wasting time with excessive driving. We need to be able to go to our clients and work in the field.
9. Most of the work is done in the field, not really at the office anymore. I like the idea of taking Extension to the people, not vice versa!
10. Not yet but with time this may change as their need to have located in urban areas increases.

16. **Urban Extension has multiple offices in strategic locations in the county.**

1. Not enough offices -- very few urban Extension programs have multiple offices -- many are not strategically located.
2. This is a worthy goal but needs to be balanced with what's practical in terms of funding. Strategic and multiple may not mean the same thing.
3. This would be ideal.
5. Educators should be accessible to the people where the people are, either via an office location, or better yet, by working in partnership and through community-based organizations where Extension delivery should occur (where needed populations reside).
6. Again, this is an area that will require additional resources. We need to have easy access to our offices by all clientele within the county.
7. Is population the engine that decides how many offices in a county?
8. If a county can afford this - this is important to meet the needs of the whole county geographically. There can be a loss of communication and coordination, but with some effort that can be overcome and may be worth the price.

17. Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of collaborating organizations.

1. There are costs and benefits to this; should be explored on an individual basis.
2. This appears a good way to facilitate collaboration.
3. Working together is more important than being housed together.
4. There are benefits to this, however, given scope and depth of Extension urban programming, there's value at having an Extension office and marketing the organization's presence, having it's own identity/image/visibility.
5. Currently, "collaborating organizations" is defined as traditional USDA agencies in our state. However, in urban counties, this collaboration must be re-defined to address the specifics of our programming needs.
6. Very helpful. When our office was renovated I was able to "camp out" in our housing authority offices for a while. It made it easier to see and hear what is really happening. It's not necessary forever ... but it did help to strengthen the partnership and understand needs better.
7. We could be doing so much more in this regard.
8. Not common but there is possibility that it can happen in some situations.

18. Urban Extension staff maintains positive working relationships with governmental funding partners.

1. It is a huge challenge in an urban area, but it is also absolutely essential.
2. Extremely important but training should be provided to assist offices. The climate has become very competitive so we must continue to improve.
3. Very important.
4. You need to know your Senators and House members. They are a major funding source.
5. This is important ... but often difficult due to time constraints and to some degree the skills/comfort levels of the staff. There should be open communication, but you also can't have loose cannonballs on the deck - whether you are talking about urban or rural settings.
6. I agree, and especially during the past year or so, when the Minnesota Extension office has been reorganizing around Regional service deliver rather than more costly county by county service delivery.
7. It can be improved but Extension Educators maintain positive working relationships with governmental funding partners. This is important in urban settings especially in poor neighborhoods.

19. **Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for effective programming in the four program areas.**

1. Unfortunately, sustainable, public funding is in the hands of Extension administration. They will likely not reformulate distribution of those funds for the future.
2. None of our urban programs is adequately funded across all program areas.
3. I think this should be based more on community needs. For example, in some urban areas, other agency may be meeting the needs in terms of community development.
4. I would emphasize effective programming - without characterizing it as in the four program areas.
5. This is probably rarely the case so the focus should be on developing partnerships, collaborations, and external grants to meet needs.
6. This is critical if we are to have successful urban programs.
7. Agree with statement that urban programs SHOULD be adequately funded with public funds, to be successful, however they reality is and will continue in the future that private funds will be critical in complementing public contribution.
8. Work with your university and take the time to know what is going on in the budget process, as it relates to your program.
9. Extension dollars are very slim and we must seek grants, etc to function.
10. If Extension could be seen as the 'Front Door' to the university for the many communities in the state and in urban areas, then funding is most certainly inadequate.

20. **Urban Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming.**

1. Unfortunately this is the general trend for our society.
2. Urban Extension offices should operate in consistent manner with the rest of the state. I don't think it is logical or fair to assume people will/should pay in urban locations and not rural.
3. This is certainly an important means of getting proper support but it is not without risk. Models need to be developed to determine cost for proper charging since overhead is seldom considered.
4. This is expected.
5. This is an area that we are proving to be our own worst enemy. Many staff struggle with the concept of cost recovery. We have to think outside the box.

6. I see no problem with public, private partnerships.

7. User fees are fine and appropriate and help build ownership for a participant.

8. Again, we need to look to this source of revenue much more than we have in the past.

9. User fees must be avoid at all times unless otherwise there is no other way to be carried out that program without charging user fees. It creates exclusions. And, once it is taken that root it is hard to stop. It will always go up and up and program participants will be only those who can afford.

21. Extension seeks funding for urban programming from other agencies of the federal government, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Education, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Department of Defense

1. Due to time restraints this is not done near as much as it should be. We need people developing programming ideas and talking with other agencies and selling our ideas on a continuous basis. We must learn how to establish and maintain the relationships.

2. The way of the future.

3. Not consistently or extensively in our state.

4. If we could have a more cohesive statewide approach, this would be an excellent opportunity.

5. Should be seeking funding but in a coordinated way with state administration. Urban counties should not be left to fend for themselves.

6. This I think is a key to the future but is more effective if pursued at an administrative level and the local level.

7. We SHOULD seek funding from these national agencies, not just USDA.

8. Although this is being done in some limited programming areas, there needs to be increased use of collaborative funding and grants.

9. Have an in depth conversation about what is expected of you and your project with federal funds. We are fortunate to have some powerful people on finance in D.C.

10. Any funding source that gets the job done is appropriate.

11. Let's look beyond the dept of Ag for sources of sustainable funding.

12. Good idea. And many urban programs do that. Just be careful for those agencies that their missions do not coincide or agree with extension's mission.
22. **Urban Extension offices work toward adequate funding by seeking to increase both traditional and new sources of funding.**

1. Emphasis on NEW.
2. What choice do you have if your traditional source is changing or shrinking and again is most effective is all levels of the organization or working towards, which often means providing proper training to facilitate this effort.
3. There are lots of potential resources in most urban counties but we must seek them out.
4. It might be a good idea to think outside the box. Some of these ideas suggest this.
5. It is the wave of the future ... no going back.
6. We could do more, but I get concerned about grant chasing where we divert our attention from our mission to small buck chasing. It has most certainly happened!
7. It is a matter of survival. Urban Ext. offices work toward the goal of seeking funding sources through diversification.

23. **Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if there are plans for the sustainability of programs when this funding ends.**

1. Even if funds are not sustainable, we are not in the position to turn down even temporary funds.
2. Every issue that we program for does not require sustainability. Programs can begin and end yet successfully meet citizen needs.
3. It depends. Sometimes sustainability is important. Other times, a program with outside funding is a specific length by nature and does not need sustained.
4. Sustainability should not guaranteed but should be approached such that effective programs will generated it.
5. Sometimes we must demonstrate success and then pass the program to others.
6. The impact on clientele when programming stops due to loss of funds can be significant. We need to insure that there is some mechanism in place to continue programming efforts, especially when working with at-risk or low income clientele.
7. This concept is interesting and deserves more discussion.
8. Not all programs should continue since needs change, and sometimes a new initiative - while not sustained in its original state will lead to another appropriate initiative. While we should be judicious about our fundraising, we should not be overly stringent.
9. I really support the concept, but I'd like to see more of a commitment to this.
10. It is part of their job's responsibility for many if not all urban Extension Educators to seek outside funding which has its advantages as well as its disadvantages.
24. Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension.

1. Yes, as long as we include the local mission and not only that of the state organization.
2. Yes, but be sure that the mission is not interpreted in the context of only supporting "traditional" programming.
3. External funding can certainly become a distraction from our main mission and should be continually assessed. On the other hand if a need exist and resources are provided, if it meets Advisory directive, the mission may have to change.
4. Perhaps the mission needs to be reexamined.
5. Mission creep will ultimately weaken an organization.

25. Urban Extension offices effectively market their programs.

1. We work very hard for state marketing tools and strategies that can be used locally. In many ways we are doing a much better job than traditional Extension.
2. Will likely continue to lack resources to do this adequately.
3. As mentioned above -- Extension is still the best kept secret in most parts of our larger urban areas -- little awareness and no overall strategy to effectively market most programs.
4. Although we currently don't, this is a key to future success.
5. Difficult in urban areas but very important.
6. Marketing will be the key to the future success of urban Extension programs. We must be able to make sure that not only clientele but stakeholders are aware of our programs and opportunities.
7. This should be addressed locally and statewide. Interesting subject.
8. Very important ... however, as Extension folks we never have a budget or infrastructure to support it ... think where McDonalds would be without their PR budget ... Think where we might be if we had one ...
9. All of us in Education and in Government must get past the idea that "marketing" is a four letter word! It is essential that we get our message out to taxpayers who support our activities.
10. In this day and age, without effective marketing, Extension programs will face great difficulty in securing funds. To address this challenge, Ext. programs use a wide variety of methods for marketing their programs whether it is at the local, state, or federal levels. Such methods include the electronic media, the mass media, and the traditional ways or methods.
26. Extension has “brand name” recognition in urban areas.

1. The relative few familiar with us will continue due to lack of real funds to change it.
2. But we need to define for what ... it may or may not be for the same programs as the rest of the state. And it is important that that recognition continue to tie us to the university ... e.g. many people may know 4-H but may not associate it directly with the university.
3. Another key that should occur but currently is lacking.
4. Something we must continually work on.
5. This follows the marketing concept. For us to effective and a significant "player" in urban issues in the future we must have recognition.
6. Little recognition in urban areas.
7. This is a should ... but our efforts are still quite small relatively speaking.
8. Extension's brand name recognition in urban areas will largely depend on visibility and involvement and how extension competes with dwindling resources with other competitors.

27. Urban Extension offices are responsive to clients' needs and attitudes when marketing programs.

1. Another extremely important component of an effective program.
2. We must work hard to ensure this happens.
3. Target population is where there will be real strides made, providing the need is there.
4. Again, this is a should ... however, we may be hindered by attitudes of our volunteers or supporters who, while well meaning, may have a hard time letting go to meet current needs.

28. Urban Extension targets clientele with relevant messages and programs.

1. Who is (and isn't) our clientele?
2. We have to improve our targeting and understanding of clientele needs. County level staff are doing a much better job of this at the present time. State level staff are still mired in more traditional programming.
3. Some polling would help.
4. Again, if we are doing our job - then we are meeting needs ... while introducing new things thoughtfully. It's sort of like kids and spinach ...
5. with existing clients, 'yes'; with prospective clients, 'not enough'
29. Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing.

1. As much as we can get away with - this will continue into the future.
2. Difficult to get major media coverage for most Extension work -- although at least one urban county has established a weekly column for CE Master Gardener program in a major newspaper.
3. Media may not always be the best method. For example a physical presence and word of mouth can be important also.
4. If our goal is to reach a significant portion of the population, this is an important and realistic way to do it.
5. Effective use of media is very important and a skill where training is needed.
6. This is important but it varies from one urban area to another.
7. Mass media is the key to marketing, "brand name recognition" and informing public. We have only just begun to tap this resource in our state.
8. Invite a media person to M.C. an event. Get to know them. They will be more receptive the next time you call.
9. This is a should, but reality is this takes time and staff support.

30. Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing.

1. We need a strategy and targeted clientele groups to be really effective.
2. Its pretty cheap - but limited.
3. Much more is needed and developing in this area. Name recognition is one of the challenges -- people don't know where to go for information.
4. If our goal is to reach a significant portion of the population, this is an important and realistic way to do it.
5. ditto 29.
6. Yes but we must get better at it.
7. Internet usage can be linked directly to mass media.
8. Ask a volunteer to keep your web-site updated.
9. Again, need time and staff support.
10. We're working on it!!

31. Urban Extension offices effectively report program impacts.

1. Should continue to improve.
2. Local funding will be dependent upon this issue.
3. All offices should effectively report program impacts - not just urban.
4. Presently not the case but certainly a key to future success.
5. Effectively reporting impacts I think has been one of Extension's significant challenges...we should have appropriate techniques and tools to develop and measure relevant outcomes/impacts for Extension to be successful (competitive and fund-worthy) in the future.
6. Although urban counties do a better job of impact reporting, we still can and must do a better job of determining impact and reporting to significant audiences.
7. With a little more effort, the positive impact on the community could be better told.
8. Staff often do not understand what is a good impact outcome that there programs should shoot for.
9. Lots of need for improvement here, but Extension is committed to improvement.

32. Extension has a state and federal system to effectively report urban program impacts.

1. Doesn't make too much sense to us urbanites now nor will it in the future.
2. We have a state system to report impacts -- not sure if all connects to the Federal CSREES Impact system -- seem limited. (Saigen). Separating out urban impacts could be a good thing (e.g. communication with urban legislators) - or it could be divisive. We need to think through how to effectively use impact data.
3. ditto 31
4. Major challenge for states!!
5. Need the system along with the process (ie staff abilities).
6. There is no state-wide system for urban programming in our state. On the national level there has is some movement but there still must better coordination nation-wide.
7. Uniformity would be helpful.

33. Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data).

1. Not consistent across all program areas.
2. Applies to all staff, not just urban.
3. Important and training needed to improve.
4. Must do a better job of reporting impacts including those stories that show the "human" side of what we do. Anecdotal evidence is useful despite what some may say. Combined with quantitative data, these "stories" can build a very strong case for programming impact.
5. Seems it should be pursed in more depth.
6. This is a good method.

34. Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data.

1. Should get better.
2. Again, not consistent across all programs and in all urban areas.
3. Applies to all staff, not just urban.
4. Another area in need of improvement and training.
5. As a whole, we are not properly trained in the effective collection and use of quantitative data.
6. This reporting should be monitored more closely.
7. If we had enough staff, time and resources...
8. We are working on doing more in this regard.

35. **Urban Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs.**

1. Our state requires customer satisfaction survey's and I think this is an excellent indicator that should be continued.
2. I see far more evaluation data that focused on inputs and outputs-- what we did-- rather than the change that people make as a result of our programs.
3. Applies to all staff, not just urban.
4. Our state legislature requires it.
5. When it is positive, we should be sure everyone knows it. Academia never toots its own horn.
6. Again, this is a should that is tied to needing resources to make it happen.
7. Our funding sources are looking to us to provide 'outcome' measures.

36. **Funders of urban Extension express positive perceptions of the impact of the programs they support.**

1. There is a strong push for more documentation of program impact by funders at all levels.
2. Applies to all programs, not just urban.
3. Important but uncertain we are always effective.
4. If impact is happening, then funders will respond with funding.

37. **Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program planning.**

1. There is no consistent mechanism for this to happen across the state.
2. Community participation is important. I'm not clear on how this would be reported.
3. Applies to all staff, not just urban.
4. Should be more.
5. This is a should ... if we are talking about meeting needs, then we need to engage our audiences and not just assume ...

38. **Urban Extension staff effectively reports the level of community participation in program evaluation.**

1. Same as in 37 above.
2. Applies to all staff, not just urban.
3. Probably not as well as satisfaction, but certainly needed.
4. We must strive harder to understand the overall impact of programs - how does this impact the community not just the individuals involved. This will add credence to our programming with stakeholders and local governments.
5. Needs doing.

39. **Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted population.**

1. Define increased empowerment.
2. Very important but difficult to report.
3. This should happen ...

40. **Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs.**

1. I am not sure we evaluate the cost effectiveness of a program design at the time of planning and selecting an approach. It seems to be more gut feeling.
2. I am not aware of this happening in our state in urban programs.
3. Seems to be a focus now but we don't have good tools to know how to do it with social type programs.
4. When appropriate.
5. Should be done but certainly is not as good as for rural programs, because we don't have adequate models.
6. I believe funders will continue to require more of this in the future.
7. Hard to quantify but should be considered.

41. **Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure.**

1. We do have a formal reporting system that all Extension academics use -- not sure if it is nationally uniform -- in fact, doubt it.
2. There are huge differences between urban programs across the country. We are far from a nationally uniform accountability structure. Is it even desirable?
3. Yes this is important but sometimes I question the resources used to develop, particularly given the present federal budget cuts. This needs to be done most effectively for our main supporters that happen to be our state government.
4. I understand that this is something that is being considered on the national level. It would certainly help improve our national impact if we could compare "apples to apples".
5. Should be more coordination on this issue.
6. WE would be a stronger organization and more nationally recognized if we all had the same base logo with a spot for our state university that we are tied to ... and if we had a reporting system that had some uniformity to it. I wonder how McDonalds in Japan reports their earnings and management in comparison to a McDonalds in X City, New Hampshire???
42. **Urban Extension educators focus on those populations with the greatest identified needs.**

1. Perhaps better stated that we focus on the greatest needs.
2. Theoretically this is nice, but the reality is that we should follow or properly lead advisory council recommendations which should be closely tied to funding.
3. Defining greatest identified need is difficult and probably not consistent.
4. I am not sure this should be the focus...we should be 'extending' the resources of the University to all residents, but with an emphasis on those with the greatest need.

43. **Urban Extension programs do not duplicate services provided by other organizations in the community.**

1. If Bush continues his assault on domestic programs, we won't HAVE any competition - if we're around.
2. I don't see how you can't avoid some duplication, however it generally occurs because services are not adequately delivered.
3. There is more than one way to serve and if we have the resources ... why not
4. Seems to me that more try to duplicate us.
5. Interesting area. Appears more can be done.

44. **Urban Extension educators involve representatives of target populations in program planning.**

1. Do we involve enough decision makers though?
2. They should.

45. **Urban Extension educators use program planning processes that are inclusive.**

1. Even though it is hard to do ...
2. We must increase our input especially with minority groups. We tend to rely too much on groups and individuals from populations with which we are most comfortable.

46. **Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are holistic.**

1. Even though it is hard to do ...
2. In theory maybe, but being Holistic often takes more effort and time than resources.
3. We must move beyond our approach of programmatic areas in program planning. Many times our programs would show more impact if we were able to use a holistic approach rather than traditional programming.
47. **Urban Extension educators use program planning that is based on the realities of the urban environment.**

1. Yes, if there is a agreed-upon way to determine those realities ...
2. This is very important but often underserved because of our lack of skills. For example, storm water management is a huge issue in which we have little expertise.
3. More needs to be done in this regard. I have noted in a number of instances, rural success have simply been imported to the urban area without the same level of success.

48. **Urban Extension educators develop programs build on the positive attributes of the community (assets based) when addressing identified needs.**

1. I'm not sure I understand this. For the most part I think this should be done but if school dropout or water pollution are very important issues, should we not get involved. Was not Extension developed to improve service for an underserved segment.

49. **Urban Extension educators use program planning that crosses academic and program boundaries to address community issues.**

1. Essential.
2. This should be the case, but is individually driven.
3. This is why we went outside Extension to hire a liaison person.

50. **Urban Extension educators use the logic model (i.e., resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts) in program development.**

1. Other than 4-H YD I don't believe most Extension staff are not aware of the logic model.
2. In some form or another.
3. It should be done but needs to be properly taught.
4. This somewhat unclear.

51. **Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties.**

1. We need to spend some time thinking about what that means.
2. It would be nice to affirm this but without partnerships and collaboration is very difficult to accomplish in an urban area.
3. Not like it could be!

52. **Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties.**

1. This would be nice but is limited by the ratio of programs to population.
53. Extension is a catalyst for environmental change in urban counties.

1. This would be nice but is limited by the ratio of programs to population.
2. We have seen involvement of Extension in the urban environmental area.

54. Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach.

1. This may be true, but many programs are targeted at client needs which are not necessarily related to community development.

55. Urban Extension educators address community development.

1. This is a definite future growth area.
2. Mostly like a small fish in a very big lake.

56. Urban 4-H/youth development targets urban youth who often have multiple risk factors.

1. My comment remains the same, misleading statement (Urban 4-H).
2. In our state, this is a clientele group that many agents do not feel comfortable working with. We will need to hire individuals with non-traditional degrees that are comfortable working with at-risk youth.

57. Urban 4-H/youth development effectively programs with both urban and suburban youth.

1. Assuming that there are adequate resources to do that.
2. Urban and suburban youth do not always have similar programming needs. Extension educators must have the ability to adjust programming to meet the needs of both groups.

58. The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H/youth development programs reflects the diversity of the youth population.

1. This probably needs improvement.
2. Extension educators should be representative of the populations they work with. Our urban staff should reflect that diversity.
3. Here's where we are lacking
59. Urban 4-H / youth development programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interests, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation.

1. This would be ideal.

60. Urban 4-H / youth development gives youth, especially teenagers, a significant voice in the programs offered.

1. Would be nice but probably not effectively done because of scarce resources.

61. Urban 4-H / youth development programming includes exploring careers.

1. Consistent with statewide programming.

62. Urban 4-H / youth development uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education.

1. Don't really know.

63. Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk.

1. If we chose to, 4-H could compete successfully for funding traditionally going to "prevention" programs. Often we are doing the same thing, just using different language.
2. In conjunction with youth-serving organizational partners.
3. Certainly a need but not sure is done effectively now.

64. Urban 4-H / youth development staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development.

1. Don't really know.
2. So much more could be done.

65. Urban 4-H / youth development partners with other youth-serving organizations.

1. Partnership is essential. Extension is not the only game in town.
2. gets at overlap

66. Urban 4-H / youth development uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs. I agree, but should it use this exact model?

1. We need to come up with several different models not just the 4-H club model... Way too restrictive.
2. Conditions will continue to exist that will prove this to be challenging.
3. The "club" format is not always the best model. In some cases, it works. We shouldn't try to force it.
4. Depends on local preferences.
5. Flexibility can be important.
6. Our experience has shown that 'project specific' youth engagement/development is very effective, and is more aligned with 4-H special interest groups than clubs.

67. Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities.

1. Some programs much better than others.

68. Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods.

1. When it is appropriate and technology is available.(Mo).

69. Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners’ ability to solve problems and make decisions.

No comments.

70. Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community.

1. As well as campus faculty.
2. We could certainly increase our role in research.
3. This could be enhanced by collaboration with urban universities.

71. Urban Extension educators minimize use of the expert model in teaching.

1. Not sure
2. There is no single method of teaching that suits all. Extension Educators try to understand their audiences and figure out the best possible method to use.

72. Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered.

1. Define empowered.
2. Would be good, but not certain of present.
73. Urban Extension's program evaluation includes changes in critical thinking and problem solving.

No comments.

74. Urban Extension's program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community.

1. Maybe. How do we do this?
2. Need to improve this aspect by providing better information support, training.
3. Sometimes but we must become better at this.
4. Have not seen this. But there is talk!

75. Please comment on this process:

1. Had to keep reminding myself that this is a future question. Pretty cool though.
2. Seems long and tedious. Many questions similar. Sometimes it is obvious that different members of the group are interpreting statements differently -- that may be inherent in this type of process.
3. Thought provoking!
4. Very interesting, and enlightening but sometimes unclear.
5. Very good set of statements. It is hard to stay focused on what needs to happen versus what is currently happening.
6. Seems that panel members are responding as assessments of what is, not how important that indicator is for a successful urban extension office. My comment is based not as much on ratings, but on the comments panelists submitted. Please clarify for all, again, thanks.
7. This is a very long process and requires a great amount of time.
8. long!
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Statement 1. Urban county Extension programs are adequately staffed, based on the size of the county’s population and the community needs, to fulfill their mission.

1. We need a whole new definition of adequately staffed! In urban areas what is a traditional Extension definition is totally inadequate and the type of positions we have must be innovative and responsive to the real needs of the urban setting.
2. By utilizing innovative funding and increasing the usage of impact statements that combine qualitative and quantitative results we will be better prepared to enter the funding arena where resources will shrinking and demand increasing.
3. Staffing of urban extension programs should more accurately reflect the size of the population in urban areas.
4. This is very important but there can be many interpretations of "adequately staffed".
5. Appropriate staffing is critical to our future.
6. It is important that there is some proportionality in the staffing pattern in order to reach the high population density areas of the state. Staffing should not just look like the rural areas. Specialized subject matter agents will be able to "compete" in a metro area.
7. Staffing according to population size AND community needs is essential.
8. Budgets have not allowed urban counties to be adequately funded therefore theses counties will be at a disadvantage going into the future.
9. I think that is as good a formula as any, although 'based on community' is rather vague.
10. Urban Extension Offices are not adequately staffed in all 4 program areas. Besides funding availability being a major factor in program staffing, it has to do also a lot with extension losing it's focus by not considering their efforts towards those 4 program areas where they have proven their success over the years. Change is important only when it brings prosperity but to change focus and program staffing for short-term gains can be risky business and may hurt extension rather than help extension programs for the long run. For extension to succeed, it cannot depend on temporary workers, and volunteers to do some of the primary functions of extension work. Extension programs go through long process and their continuity need permanent extension staff.
11. In our state, there has been a significant shift of population from rural areas to urban, according to the 2000 census. If we think that staffing should follow population, then the current shift of Extension staff from rural to urban areas just hasn't happened. It needs to now and especially in the future. And, if you look at needs, it is increasingly evident in my state that needs seem to cross rural/urban lines and complex issues such as immigration of minority populations are impacting both. Programs developed for Urban target populations are increasingly appropriate for rural populations.

Statement 2. **Urban county Extension offices have flexibility in staffing that allows them to address current and emerging issues.**

1. We still remain too traditional and don't have the flexibility to build staff for emerging needs. We need traffic engineers, hydrologists, physicians, etc. on our staffs.
2. Flexibility to hire and staff according to needs rather than tradition will be the key to success.
3. We cannot use traditional staffing patterns but must have a dynamic staff that adjusts to the needs of the clientele.
4. Local governments will not have an interest in funding positions that are not representative of their needs. This will require changes in the manner in which we currently make decisions.
5. After a sound needs assessment process, the priority programs must be addressed, therefore there must be flexibility in staffing in order to be most effective.
6. Must have either flexibility in staffing or staff that are flexible in how they interpret their responsibilities.
7. Flexibility is important, and I assume this infers a combination of hard and soft funds.
8. It is necessary for urban extension offices to have flexibility in staffing if they want to succeed in this competitive world. We do not have the flexibility to day but this has to improve in the future.
9. In my State, Extension is shifting to a more regional educational service base...in addition to county base of service delivery. This should help meet future needs and address emerging issues as they shift or develop geographically.

Statement 3. **Urban Extension educators have a strong background in the application of sound educational theory and methods as well as specific subject matter training.**

1. No comments.
Statement 4. **Urban Extension educators have a strong background in skills needed for working in urban settings, such as human relations, grantsmanship, coalition building, mass media, and marketing.**

1. The Extension agents of the future will need to be very savvy in media skills and will have to depend on the media to get their messages out.
2. The perception is that urban clientele are more "savvy" and thus require a higher degree of expertise in program presentation. With this in mind, Extension Educators must be on the front line of educational theory AND application.
3. This relates to having the right people in the right jobs.
4. These are critical skills for a successful urban agent. In the urban setting, more demands are made for this type of expertise than in other Extension settings.
5. This is one of the keys to success!
6. These skills are most important if Extension is to improve the lives of families.
7. These areas are more important than educational theory.
8. Their skills needed for working in urban settings vary with their field of expertise and their experience. But I believe most of the urban extension educators do have some skills and they can improve their skills with time.
9. More work needs to be done in training staff in coalition building and the use of media and marketing. We need to leverage resources more than ever before and we need to get the word out.

Statement 5. **Urban Extension educators, regardless of program area, have an understanding of urban community development concepts and practices.**

1. We must be holistic in our approach to programming - programming for the community in all areas identified as needing our expertise.
2. Most of our programs should be built on these concepts.
3. The community development process is important to all agents, regardless of their subject area expertise. If they do not have this understanding when hired, the organization should make training available to new employees.
4. ditto last round, that we need to improve in this area.
5. Urban Extension Educators have an understanding of urban community development but their degree of understanding would depend largely on their experience in this field or area and their field of expertise.
6. This is so important for future development of Urban Extension Services. Ok for now, not ok for the future.
Statement 6. **Urban Extension educators are trained in leadership development.**

1. This should be a part of the initial orientation and training of every urban staff person.
2. Leadership on the community level can be the key not only to effective programming but is also a key component in overall effectiveness.
3. These skills are critical for success.
4. Urban agents are working in the most complex field setting in Extension and therefore should be a "pool" for organizational leadership in the future. It is important that urban agents have leadership skills as they are expected to work/lead groups/coalitions to meet organizational objectives. Extension should have organized leadership programs locally.
5. This is an extremely important skill that has not been adequately addressed.

Statement 7. **Urban Extension educators are trained on group facilitation.**

1. Staff are good at this but probably don't keep up to date with the latest techniques or how to fine tune their current skills.
2. As our communities continue to grow and our resources stay level, the increased use of group facilitation will be vital to our continued success.
3. These are basic necessary skills.
4. Urban agents are put into a facilitator role in many collaborations and each should have these skills.
5. We need to strengthen and reinforce this as essential both in terms of our work in the community and within our own organization.
6. This is another important component of an effective professional that has not been addressed systematically enough.
7. Urban extension educators must have this skill. It is prerequisite for any program planning and implementation.

Statement 8. **Urban Extension educators are at ease working across the wide range of urban settings.**

1. I believe most are and they have to be to be successful. Otherwise we have little credibility.
2. A basic truism of urban life is that it is diverse and dynamic not a monoculture and static.
3. They must be aware of the diverse working opportunities in the urban setting.
4. Our programs, staff and audiences should be diverse and agents should be comfortable with that diversity.
5. Most are not trained enough to be comfortable in high profile situations.
Statement 9. Urban Extension educators adequately reflect the level of ethnic/racial diversity in the local urban population.

1. Perception is reality. We must be a diverse faculty in order to work in the urban environment. If not we have little creditability.
2. We must be very active in recruiting and hiring professional staff that is mirrors our communities. This will demonstrate to our clientele that we desire to meet their needs and are willing to make adjustments in our traditional hiring practices to do so.
3. This is critical to our success and often difficult to attain.
4. We will never serve citizens well, if we cannot recruit and support a diverse (in many ways) staff. If we can't find people to hire and provide a responsive workplace; how could we expect to attract the interest of citizens with diverse needs for whom we provide no salary.
5. All efforts should be made to have staff reflect the audiences they work with. Our clientele should be able to identify with Extension.
6. This would be an ideal objective, but if staff is already limited other skills tend to get priority. We must be aware of what community leaders and supporters value.
7. This is really a moving target for my state as immigrant populations are constantly changing. We simply don't know, for example, if there will be a surge of mid-eastern immigrants in the coming years as we have seen with Somali's or Latinos. So, we need to prepare as best we can with what little we know right now.

Statement 10. State specialists, in subject areas pertinent to urban programming, have adequate understanding of urban issues to work effectively with urban Extension educators to provide appropriate programming for urban audiences.

1. This is often not a top priority of specialists. They are so focused on subject matter that the location is very secondary.
2. We must have the state level backup via specialists to assist us in the development and presentation of programming that meets the needs of our target clientele.
3. State specialists must become aware of urban issues in their specific discipline.
4. It is important that specialist give leadership to the total organization. They should be expected to be able to contribute to the urban agents in a useable, effective way. It may mean extra training on their part, but its important.
5. Most Specialist are more equipped for rural issues and should get specific training just like agents for urban skills.
6. State specialists may or may not have adequate understanding of urban issues just like any one else. People are not the same but it is true that people are
becoming more specialized in different fields and they try to be the best in their area of expertise. However, I believe people can work together through sharing their knowledge as it pertains to specific urban issues.

Statement 11. **State level Extension administration provides adequate resources for effective urban programs.**

1. More than 80 percent of our population live in urban areas of the state, but we certainly don't have 80 percent of the resources. Probably less than 10 percent of the resources...so that does not demonstrate a conviction or understanding. We need to get to where administrators understand we must fund where the people/clients are....
2. Extension will have to adequately fund urban Extension programs if Extension is to survive into the foreseeable future.
3. Adequate resources for urban and other important programs must be a priority.
4. Working as a real partner with local government will help to make this possible.
5. Urban programming is the future of the total Extension program. It is important that resources to support urban efforts be available.
6. More Extension funds should go to the urban areas where most of the population lives.
7. Urban programming needs to be a complete partner in the program. Although I don't think this is the case, it is important. It has been very difficult to convince administrators and traditional clientele in times of dwindling resources that the political influence and power is becoming more urbanized. After all most administrators have rural backgrounds and although the population may be predominantly urban/suburban, the vast majority of administrative advisors have rural backgrounds. I think XX (Minnesota) is an example of a state administration truly embracing urbanization.
8. I simply do not see the commitment yet of resources to Urban Extension in my State as future population shift continues from rural to urban areas or as populations age differently depending on geographical areas. For example, new population growth in our urban areas is younger than state averages and yet in some rural areas with growth, it would appear that the growth is in aging retirees. This has tremendous impact for Extension programming for both rural and urban areas.

Statement 12. **Urban Extension educators use the entire university as a resource for their outreach.**

1. Because the problems are so diverse with our clientele this must be our vision for the future.
2. As our programming expands so will our need for additional assistance from various components within the land-grant system. Almost without exception,
Extension is the only state-wide university outreach program that is already in place with staff familiar with a variety of communities.

3. The entire University is a tremendous resource and we must learn how to utilize it.

4. That is the land-grant philosophy and should be implemented so that more of the resources of the university can be brought to bear on key issues.

5. We must get to this stage if we are to truly address community needs and priorities in urban areas. We cannot rely on only a few academic departments.

6. Another admirable objective but it appears mainly left up to individuals to develop resources rather than administrators developing relationships of mutual benefit and formalizing collaborations.

7. Urban extension educators have the opportunity to use the entire university as a resource. Better communication makes easy to explore distant places without even leaving your office. This will improve with time.

8. I just haven't seen the commitment yet for Extension to tap into the larger University resource base. Appears to be unfortunate 'turf' issues to be dealt with.

Statement 13. **Urban Extension educators work with urban universities in Extension programming.**

1. They can and should be viable resources for urban programming.

2. Although the identity problem is real, we must remember that we have been in place conducting outreach much longer than other units with our systems. We need to step-up and take the lead rather than be the follower.

3. Another resource we must learn to call upon.

4. Where mutual goals exist, there should be coordinated programming efforts.

5. Urban residents view local universities as their most suitable resources. It is important that we make the connections to work with urban universities.

6. Commendable but largely left up to individuals instead of having administrative links.

7. When ever it is needed and this will improve with time.

8. I see an increasing commitment to working with other Universities.

Statement 14. **Urban Extension office/s are strategically located within the urban core.**

1. Yes, we must be close to where the people are.

2. We need multiple offices - many of our urban counties are diverse in their demographics AND geography. Multiple offices will allow us to meet the needs of all our clientele not just the suburban or inner-city.

3. With technology and our focus on outreach to the communities, the location of the office is not as important as it has been.

4. An urban office should be an integral part of the urban setting.
5. This is important for staff to be accessible and for symbolic reasons ... but we need to explore creative ways to locate staff in a variety of locations that don't strain budgets.
6. It is important to have physical presence to provide the best opportunities for clientele.
7. It is true some times and that is extension's goal but it is not practical some times due to forces beyond extension's control.
8. We are working on it with a new 4-H office right in the midst of our largest urban city. Don't know what is planned for the future, however.

Statement 15. **Urban Extension has multiple offices in the county.**

1. Yes, this should be a priority. Again we must have a presence close to the population. We need to be creative in thinking about offices in schools, other agencies, shopping malls, post offices, etc. Places where people go for other business.
2. See my comments from question 15.
3. Again, I think it is how we serve audiences that is more important than where we are located.
4. This is especially important in urban areas where transportation (for agents & clientele) is a key issue. It is a challenge to "manage" satellite offices, but they have many advantages.
5. When practical. We should be open to possibilities of co-locating staff with other organizations, etc ... but need to balance this goal with what's practical in terms of funding, staff relationships, etc.
6. It would be unwise use of Extension money to have more then one office.
7. While not essential it would enable easier access.
8. This would be ideal but partnerships would need development to share costs.
9. This is not true due to mainly financial constraints.
10. Not enough if we look to locating offices in areas of largest population growth.

Statement 16. **Urban Extension staff is co-located in the offices of collaborating organizations.**

1. Not really necessary but may be useful. Could be an answer to rising costs of delivery.
2. It is a good thing but not critical.
3. Staff must be adept at positioning Extension and maintaining an identity while working collaboratively with others.
4. In theory this is good, but there are some challenges in maintaining our identity if we are not careful. Branding will continue to be a key role for urban offices.
5. When appropriate. Costs and benefits needs to be examined.
6. while it may help stretch our resources, i think it could further challenge our market exposure.
7. This appears a good way to facilitate collaboration and offset expenses, provide multiple locations if needed.
8. This is true only very few occasions.

Statement 17. **Urban Extension offices have adequate public funding for effective programming in the four program areas.**

1. Yes, this should be a goal....but it may not need to be evenly distributed across the four areas. It should be flexible and so money flows to where the needs are greatest.
2. Funding must target the needs of the community. This can vary from community to community.
3. We must have several sources of funds including public funds.
4. I don't think we'll continue to want to think in "4 program areas". Do these program areas reflect the language or interest of local and state governments and if not, why would they want to fund them. We will need to define program areas as state and local priorities if we are to be successful.
5. Public funds are an important component of urban program funding but must be combined with other sources in order to support the total program. I think it is important to have all program areas in an urban setting.
6. Monies will have to come from many sources.
7. This would be ideal but not practical so developing partnerships, collaborations, and external grants to meet needs is more likely.
8. Urban extension offices do not have adequate public funding all across 4 program areas. Public funding will make extension programs more inclusive.

Statement 18. **Extension offices charge user fees for programs that provide private good or highly personalized or customized programming.**

1. People are willing to pay for information/education that they feel will benefit them. Too often we are not willing to even ask.
2. We are already doing this with several of our programs. It certainly offers us an opportunity to recover costs.
3. This will become more important in the future.
4. This may be a long-term goal.
5. All Extension programs statewide should be evaluated for their sale potential. It will be important to work with other organizations to ensure that a fee does not limit a specific audience’s participation.
6. Though we need to guard against doing too much of this so that we don't have time for the public good work.
7. the same standards should be used that are applied to the ag production side of our programs. private producers enjoy all of extension's tech expertise at no charge.
8. We should be good enough that our clients are willing to pay. This is certainly an important means of getting proper support but it is not without risk. Models need to be developed to determine cost for proper charging since overhead is seldom considered.

9. I am against the user fees because I have seen over the years how some programs became so expensive. Extension programs will not be able to serve all people. Only few occasions may be!

10. We need to look more to this source of funds as we move forward in the coming years.

Statement 19. **Extension seeks funding for urban programming from other agencies of the federal government, such as the Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Education, Department of Housing and Urban Development, and Department of Defense.**

1. This is very important and we must learn to develop relationships with other governmental units. We often do what they are very interested in but we never make the connections!
2. We are already utilizing several federal grants. This is a great opportunity to seek more. In fact we should be active in seeking out Community Development Block Grant funds when and where possible.
3. We must diversify our funding sources.
4. There are other funding possibilities, we will just need to "get ahead" of the process to ensure that we can compete.
5. The seeking should be more systemic and sustainable rather than just grant writing.
6. This I think is a key to the future, but relationships and grant training will be needed.

Statement 20. **Urban Extension offices work toward adequate funding by seeking to increase both traditional and new sources of funding.**

1. This is our future.
2. New funds - endowments?
3. More emphasis should be made on seeking NEW sources of funding.
4. This must be a priority.
5. Securing additional funds (from all sources) will be a major part of urban agents job responsibility.
6. Special grants should be used as supplement rather than core programming
7. What choice do you have if your traditional source is changing or shrinking and again this is most effective if all levels of the organization are working towards this.
Statement 21. **Urban Extension staff seeks outside funding only if within established mission of Extension.**

1. Must be flexible and broad in our definition of the mission of Extension. Often we forget how broad it really is.
2. I understand that there may be some pitfalls in spreading our human resources too thin in areas that we are not really prepared to address. Should be on a county by county basis.
3. Provided there is a modern view of the mission of Extension.*
4. If we are to establish ourselves in a competitive environment, it is important that our efforts support the organizations mission. Otherwise, we will not be understood for who we are.
5. Yes, but be sure that the mission is not interpreted in the context of only supporting "traditional" programming.
6. If there is a need and there are resources, why shouldn't this be done.
7. Yes, but should they in the future?? Only if the mission reflects changing needs.

Statement 22. **Urban Extension offices effectively market their programs.**

1. We must begin with understanding that Marketing is an integral part of our budgets....it is not an add-on...
2. Marketing will be the key to our overall success.
3. We must do all we can to market our programs.
4. Each program area should have a "marketing" component included within the program plan. Again, urban is a highly competitive environment and Extension needs the branding.
5. They will have to do a good job in marketing to receive funding.
6. It will take significant resources.
7. This is critical for any success in the future. We must market ourselves like every other enterprise.
8. Yes, this is huge for all public sector organizations esp in the future.

Statement 23. **Extension has “brand name” recognition in urban areas.**

1. It does where we are providing relevant programming.
2. We must be as recognizable to the general public as any other community agency.
3. This is a difficult challenge.
4. It is imperative for our future.
5. Branding appears to be a key to marketing.
6. It really needs to have urban recognition as we move forward.

Statement 24. **Urban Extension offices are responsive to clients’ needs and attitudes when marketing programs.**
1. Our clientele are what we are all about. We must be sensitive to their diversity.
2. This is important and could be helped along if the staff and volunteers are diverse and can identify some of the issues to be considerate of when marketing programs.
3. Marketing programs can only be focused so much, not indefinitely for every client group.
4. Urban extension must be responsive to client's needs when marketing in order to be successful.
5. Important for the future.

Statement 25. **Urban Extension offices effectively use media in marketing.**

1. Yes, we need to think how we can use mass media news programming in our marketing efforts.
2. Urban media can be the key to name recognition.
3. Since we have little or no money for marketing, we must rely on the media.
4. This is highly competitive and our agents who work in media must be skilled.
5. Another key that is based on developing and maintaining relationships as an unbiased source of information.
6. When marketing programs extension must use the media. Recognition is important and this can be achieved through the media.

Statement 26. **Urban Extension offices effectively use the Internet in marketing.**

1. This can be one of our most cost effective delivery systems!
2. Within urban there tends to be a higher degree of Internet usage. However, this in only true within middle and upper class communities. Low income and limited resource individuals families still have challenges in accessing Internet.
3. This is a very important tool for urban counties.
4. In the future, it will become even more important to better utilize the Internet as that will continue to be a key source of information.
5. Just as important as media relationships.
6. This will improve with time and we are much better off than yesterday.

Statement 27. **Urban Extension offices effectively report program impacts.**

1. We need to do a much better job of this and think about reporting in a journalistic fashion.
2. Effective reporting of our impacts will provide the "proof" of our effectiveness to key stakeholders.
3. Still needs improvement.
4. We must be able to answer the "so what" question.
5. If we expect support we need to provide real impact.
6. Extension offices are doing good in reporting program impacts.
7. Future funding will depend on this.

Statement 28. **Extension has a statewide system to effectively report urban program impacts.**

1. Again, in the future our state leadership will have to openly support urban Extension and give it all the support of our more rural cohorts. Lip service will not keep us in business!
2. It is important to separate out the urban efforts so that the different techniques/approaches can be better evaluated for impact and future programming.
3. Local impact reporting is probably more important on an individual basis but holistically, statewide would be better.

Statement 29. **Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with stories (qualitative data).**

1. Qualitative AND quantitative impact data is much more impressive. the combination of the two provides a rich level of insight.
2. Still needs improvement.
3. Training for staff is as important as having a system to collect the data.
4. Stories can convey a strong impact and should be incorporated and better utilized as a part of the organization's interpretation efforts.
5. Important and training needed to improve. I think part of good marketing is showing a personal touch.
6. There is always a room for improvement but I believe most urban extension educators are doing great.

Statement 30. **Urban Extension staff effectively reports impacts of programs with quantitative data.**

1. We need to improve on this and allot time to reporting impact.... Too often we are exhausted by the time we get to reporting or else on to something else and so it doesn't get done like it should.
2. Quantitative data will show the numbers that will be vital for key stakeholders.
3. We are not as good here but we must become better trained to collect and report this data.
4. Economic impacts will continue to be a strong indicator understood by administration and stakeholders.
5. Extremely important, how else would you expect long term funding.
Statement 31. **Extension staff reports customer satisfaction ratings of programs.**

1. This is a positive direction and should be done.
2. Customer satisfaction is good but doesn't always give a real picture of the true impact of programming.
3. We are fortunate that we have required this for some time.
4. This is currently required by our state legislator and expect it to continue in the future.
5. Certainly good but not as important as impact information.

Statement 32. **Urban Extension staff effectively reports increased empowerment of targeted population.**

1. Again time must be devoted to this. We have wonderful empowerment stories to tell but don't take the time to tell them.
2. Empowerment is a great indicator but we will need to develop better instruments for measuring.
3. Important but we will need more training.
4. This should be done by both qualitative and quantitative data, especially in the community development and family areas.
5. How do we define and measure increased empowerment?
6. important but difficult to report.
7. Not certain about this one. May very well vary by program.

Statement 33. **Urban Extension staff uses cost-benefit evaluation of programs.**

1. Not all programs should use this. Rather a specific proportion of all programs.
2. I agree that is a great evaluation tools but as with empowerment, I am not sure how we can effectively do this without additional resources and training.
3. Will become more important in the future.
4. This should be developed at the beginning of the program, before implementation, to ensure that agents are expending time/money most effectively.
5. We need to work with staff to do this, acknowledging that there are other considerations beyond financial costs and benefits.
6. Important even if difficult to do.
7. It might be hard for some programs to do this but at same time some programs can use this method effectively.

Statement 34. **Urban Extension staff uses a formal, nationally uniform accountability structure.**

1. This would be great!!! But can we get everyone to agree on one reporting system?
2. Reporting results nationally is important but I'm not sure about a national accountability system.
3. There should be a national uniform structure for key programs in urban areas in order to better reflect our impact nationally and to our national stakeholders.
4. I question whether this is realistic.
5. Extension reporting must be compatible with local government's reporting system.
6. This could happen within 5 years.
7. Having consistency would be good but providing the right report for the group is more important.

Statement 35. **Urban Extension programs do not unnecessarily duplicate services provided by other organization in the community.**

1. I agree other groups try to duplicate us rather than the other way around.
2. For the most part we are the originators of most community-based delivery systems. We can provide the training and the expertise for many of the other community agencies that are floundering in their delivery. Although the statement about the future of domestic programs may turn out to be reality.
3. We are duplicated often, because we fail to invest enough to take program markets for ourselves. Other programs see our limited success and recognize that they can then invest enough to take the market.
5. We will need to focus on collaboration with other organizations and meeting needs not served by other groups or programs.
6. the key is Unnecessarily
7. Future funding sources will be increasingly critical of us if we duplicate services or fail to collaborate.

Statement 36. **Urban Extension educators use program planning approaches that are holistic.**

1. We have to strive to develop interdisciplinary teams that will offer more holistic programming.
2. We have to move away from the traditional "Big 3" program areas.
   Programming based on needs of the community will usually incorporate all areas of Extension expertise.
3. Important to have the "bigger picture".
4. Very important!
Statement 37. *Urban Extension educators use the logic model (planning programs by considering resources, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts) in program development.*

1. The challenge is to do way more.
2. We will need training to do this effectively.... but certainly is needed.
3. This is a great model to follow.
4. If used, stronger impact would result.
5. Important in the future.

Statement 38. *Extension is a catalyst for social change in urban counties.*

1. But not just Extension - we must partner to truly be a catalyst.
2. Extension has a unique role to play in identifying needed change and putting the key organizations together to help address change.
3. Not sure if our goal should be catalyst or to support a catalyst.

Statement 39. *Extension is a catalyst for economic change in urban counties.*

1. But not just Extension - we must partner to truly be a catalyst.
2. This is often where Extension can "shine" and it is important to have economic impact related to our program efforts to be able to interpret our value to urban audiences.
3. Not sure if our goal should be catalyst or to support a catalyst.

Statement 40. *Urban Extension educators use community development as an underlying concept for all Extension outreach.*

1. Certainly we do this at the neighborhood level....
2. We are not always trying to develop the community although that maybe an additional outcome.
3. It is a natural approach for programming in all areas.
4. Depends upon program.

Statement 41. *Urban Extension educators address community development issues.*

1. The key word is community as opposed to city or county. A better word might be neighborhood development for Extension Educators.
2. Should be done in as a collaborative effort for best impact.
3. This would be good to be in a position to work on this.
4. Essential for those programs appropriate.
Statement 42. **The diversity of adult leadership in urban 4-H / youth development programs reflects the diversity of the youth population.**

1. We must be a reflection of our communities to become truly effective within those communities.
2. If we expect diverse 4-H membership, we must have a diverse volunteer corps.
3. This should be a goal for each urban office.
4. Ideally yes, but practically ????
5. We'd best concentrate on this if we are to succeed!

Statement 43. **Urban 4-H / youth development programs are provided by persons (paid staff or volunteers) with whom the youth involved can identify because of common characteristics such as interests, culture, racial/ethnic background, gender, or sexual orientation.**

1. With youth this is extremely important. Extension must mirror the diversity that our urban counties exhibit.
2. This should be a goal continued into the future.

Statement 44. **Urban 4-H / youth development uses an assets-based rather than a needs-based approach in education.**

1. If we begin programming based on what we have rather than what is needed by our clientele, then we will quickly become a dinosaur, and like the dinosaurs, we will become extinct.
2. We must work towards more needs-based programs.
3. This is a more relevant basis for programming for urban youth.
4. I think it is a combination.
5. both should be taken into consideration but delivery should be heavier on the asset side.
6. I think it should be needs based.
7. Agree for the future, though this may not the case now for urban 4-H.

Statement 45. **Urban 4-H provides prevention programs for youth-at-risk.**

1. We must be careful with our programming in this area. It is certainly needed, but will we have staff that is adequately trained to address this special needs group?
2. Important priority for urban youth programs.
3. In cooperation with youth-serving organizations.
Statement 46. **Urban 4-H / youth development staff trains staff of other youth-serving organizations in positive youth development.**

1. Here is where we can offer training in program delivery methods that focus on the experiential system of learning (Learning by doing).
2. As youth educators, should be seen as an expert in youth development and could serve as a resource for other agencies.
3. It would be great to be in this position.
4. Again collaboration will be increasingly essential.

Statement 47. **Urban 4-H / youth development partners with other youth-serving organizations.**

1. We must utilize our resources in the most effective way possible BUT we MUST be certain that Extension 4-H/Youth is seen as a full partner and not lost in the background!!!!
2. Avoids duplication and extends Extension outreach to other youth. Makes sense.
3. Again collaboration will be increasingly essential.

Statement 48. **Urban 4-H / youth development uses the 4-H club format as an important component of urban youth development programs.**

1. Different models will serve us much better and offer the kind of flexibility that is needed.
2. 4-H Clubs are a great way to get inner city youth involved. However, we have to be open to the definition of what is a club. Allow for many variations that meet the needs of the youth.
3. There are opportunities for the 4-H Club model, but it is not the only model that is effective.
4. When appropriate, but this should not be mandatory. We need to be open to other opportunities.
5. only one of many delivery methods. the magnitude of metro areas would require this
6. Not sure if this format is essential for future urban 4-H programming. We need to develop some creative approaches.

Statement 49. **Urban Extension provides 24-7 availability of information and educational opportunities.**

1. With the use of web sites we can easily be a 24/7 organization.
2. Use of the Internet will open many doors.
3. This will be essential in the future.
4. With the application of innovative technology it should be a reachable goal.
5. Internet would allow for this coverage.
6. This may become essential in the future, but for the immediate future there seems to be so much else for us to concentrate on.

Statement 50. Urban Extension educators use technology-supported teaching and learning methods.

1. This is very important if we are to stay competitive.
2. We have to be seen as current and up-to-date. Technology is just one way of doing this.
3. Especially true with newer staff.
4. It will be important in the future that adequate resources are allocated by administration to ensure that technology is available in order for urban educators to successful implement programs using this technology.
5. This is how we will best reach folks in the future at a cost that is reasonable.

Statement 51. Urban Extension educators use critical thinking techniques to increase learners’ ability to solve problems and make decisions.

1. Audience and age appropriate methods should be utilized when and wherever possible.
2. To me this is a key component in designing programs. This helps the client in many other situations, once they improve their critical thinking and decision making skills.

Statement 52. Urban Extension educators do research on community issues in partnership with people in the community.

1. Yes, and it will give us more credibility with clientele plus add value to the communities.
2. But don't let the research get in the way of providing clientele-based programming!
3. Potential should be explored.
4. This is important now and will be so increasingly.
Statement 53. **Urban Extension educators minimize use of the expert model in teaching.**

1. Expert model can work with some urban audiences but with others can quickly alienate.
2. At times the expert model is appropriate, but should have options of teaching available in order to best deliver a specific topic.
3. May not be the best as we move ahead.

Statement 54. **Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes the degree to which participants have been empowered.**

1. But not sure if we really know how to use the information.
2. This should become an integral part of our evaluation efforts.
3. How do you define and measure empowerment?

Statement 55. **Urban Extension’s program evaluation includes economic impacts on the community.**

1. Yes, we must incorporate this in our initial program planning.
2. We are probably better at measuring impact to some degree than anything else we measure.
3. We still have lot's of work to do on this.
4. This will be a requirement for evaluation in the future.

56. **Comments:**

1. Urban Extension is the key to the future of Extension everywhere. If the majority of our population does understand or appreciate what and who we are, then support for Extension in ALL (rural, large ag, etc.) will eventually fail. Our job is not just to educate urban clientele and meet their needs. We must also foster and increase an understanding and awareness of the continued need for Extension.
2. Good luck!
3. well, it was nice to dream in the future. unfortunately our future reality will be much different than expressed.
4. Some areas still somewhat vague and somewhat repetitive to me, and is that not the key. How to interpret what is being said is organization dependent.
5. Addressing one section at time would have serve better. Staying in front of the computer for long is not easy.
6. I am glad to have been able to participate in this important work. Best wishes, Jack!
Letter to Validity Panel

Bonny Chirayath,  
Beverly M. Kelbaugh,  
Joseph Konen,  
Barbara G. Ludwig,  
Larry Miller, Ph.D.,  
Edrice Robinson-Wyatt,  
Glenn F. Welling, Jr.,

Dear Bonny, Bev, Barb, Edrice, Glenn, Joe, and Larry:

I am doing a Delphi Study of urban Extension and need your help with establishing content and face validity. If you agree to assist, I will send you a list of statements that I propose using in the Delphi study. The Delphi process will involve a group of experts who will respond to statements about urban extension. Your task will be to look at the list of statements and determine content and face validity. Do the questions make sense in light of the topic being studied (face validity)? Do the questions accurately and completely represent the issues that will be important for urban extension in the next two to five years (content validity)? This should take you no more than 30 minutes.

Please consider helping with my dissertation research by serving on the face and validity panel. If you would like to discuss this further, please do not hesitate to call. Thanks,

Jack

Jack Kerrigan  
County Extension Director  
OSU Extension, Cuyahoga County  
2490 Lee Boulevard, Suite 108  
Cleveland Heights, OH 44118  

216-397-6025  
216-397-3980 fax  
kerrigan.1@osu.edu
Nomination letter and form:

Re: Urban Extension Research

Dear Extension Director:

I am the County Extension Director of Ohio State University Extension in Cuyahoga County (Cleveland) and I am requesting your assistance with my doctoral dissertation. The topic is identifying current best practice in urban Extension and determining the quality indicators for urban Extension in the next 3 to 5 years. Identifying best practices will be done through a case study of an exemplary urban Extension office. The quality indicators will be identified through a Delphi study using a panel of experts.

I need your input on both the case study location and the panel of experts.

A. Please identify the three urban county Extension programs in the U.S. that you consider to be exemplary / cutting edge.
   1. _______________________________________________
   2. _______________________________________________
   3. _______________________________________________

B. Please nominate a maximum of three (3) individuals to serve on the panel of experts. These individuals should meet 2 or more of the following criteria:
   a. Have a high level of knowledge and experience in urban Extension education.
   b. Have experience in urban informal adult education or youth development.
   c. Have experience administering urban Extension programs at either the county, district, state, or national level.
   d. Have experience in research or scholarly work in the area of informal adult education or youth development.

The panel of experts should represent a diversity of perspective and can include Extension employees at the county, district, state, or national level, individuals who have expertise in urban informal adult and youth education and/or community development, and stakeholders outside of Extension, such as state legislators, county commissioners, county administrators, or agency directors. You may self nominate.

The Delphi study will consist of approximately 40 statements with Likert-scale responses indicating the degree of agreement with the statement. The goal will be to determine those factors that the panel believes should be quality indicators of urban county Extension programs. These will be determined by consensus. The study will be done on-line. The panel will be requested to justify / clarify their rating in writing. The
results of the first round of responses will be shared with the panel and those items where consensus was not reached will be included in the second round questionnaire. The results of the second round of responses will be shared with the panel and those items were consensus was not reached will be included in a third and final questionnaire. Panelists should be able to complete each questionnaire in less than 40 minutes. The entire Delphi process (three rounds) will be completed in 4 weeks, in October 2004..

Nominations:
Name:______________________________________________________________
Address: _____________________________________________________________
Telephone: ___________________________________________________________
Fax: _________________________________________________________________
E-mail: _______________________________________________________________

Name:______________________________________________________________
Address: _____________________________________________________________
Telephone: ___________________________________________________________
Fax: _________________________________________________________________
E-mail: _______________________________________________________________

Name:______________________________________________________________
Address: _____________________________________________________________
Telephone: ___________________________________________________________
Fax: _________________________________________________________________
E-mail: _______________________________________________________________

Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,
Jack Kerrigan
Ph.D. Candidate
County Extension Director
Ohio State University Extension

Keith Smith, Ph.D.
Associate Vice President, Agricultural Administration
Director of OSU Extension
Case Study Location Nomination form:

Re: Urban Extension Research

Dear National Urban Task Force member/previous member:

I am the County Extension Director of Ohio State University Extension in Cuyahoga County (Cleveland) and I am requesting your assistance with my doctoral dissertation. The topic is identifying current best practice in urban Extension and determining the quality indicators for urban Extension in the next 3 to 5 years. Identifying best practices will be done through a case study of an exemplary urban Extension office. I need your input on the case study location.

Please identify the three urban counties that you believe exemplify the best or most cutting edge programs in the U.S.

1. _______________________________________________
2. _______________________________________________
3. _______________________________________________

If you are interested in knowing what counties your colleagues select, please check here _____ and I will let you know the results.

Thanks so much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jack Kerrigan
Ph.D. Candidate
County Extension Director
Ohio State University Extension

Keith Smith, Ph.D.
Associate Vice President, Agricultural Administration
Director of OSU Extension
Letter of introduction (case study):

DATE

ADDRESSEE
MAILING ADDRESS

Dear :

My name is Jack Kerrigan. I am a graduate student in the Department of Human and Community Resource Development at The Ohio State University and I am also the County Extension Director of OSU Extension, Cuyahoga County (Cleveland, OH). I have been given permission by Dr. Daney Jackson and Deno DeCiantis to do a case study of Extension education practices in PSU Extension, Allegheny County. I am excited to learn about what programs you do and how you do them. I will be spending six to eight days observing and interviewing staff members, clientele, and funders.

The purpose of the study is to define the current practices of a typical urban county Extension program. Allegheny County was chosen because of the proximity to my home in Cleveland and Dr. Jackson’s and Deno DeCiantis’s willingness to allow Allegheny County Extension to participate as the cast study site. I will be focusing in on several factors identified in the literature as important to quality programming. This study will be an opportunity for us to learn about our practice of urban Extension education. The study will not be an evaluation of your programming efforts. The information gathered during this study will be used as baseline data for a second phase of my research addressing what the best practices in urban Extension should be for the next two to five years. This will be done through a panel of experts in the field, including national, state, and local urban Extension professionals. These experts will indicate their level of agreement with a series of statements of possible practices to determine which will be most important for successful Extension programming in urban centers across the United States.

As an Extension professional, I know that you will be keenly interested in the results of this study. I hope you are as excited about the possibilities for learning more about urban Extension as I am. Your help is essential to the success of this study. I hope that you will consider participating by allowing me to observe you in action or interview you, or both. The observations will be done so as not to inconvenience you or disrupt your practice. The interviews will take approximately one hour for the interview and a
second hour for reading over my transcription of the conversation. This second hour is important because it allows you the opportunity to edit the transcription and to make additions.

It is important for you to understand that this is a research project. I hope to use the findings in presentations at conferences and in journal articles. For that reason, you will be asked to sign an “informed consent” form indicating that you understand the purpose of the study, that your participation is totally voluntary, and that you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time with no negative effects. Also, your identity will be protected to the extent you wish it to be. You may choose to use an assumed identity, your own identity, or remain anonymous.

If you have any questions about this study, please feel absolutely comfortable in contacting me by telephone at 216-397-6025 or e-mail at kerrigan.1@osu.edu.

Sincerely,

Jack Kerrigan
Ph.D. Candidate
County Extension Director
Ohio State University Extension
URBAN EXTENSION CASE STUDY
DOCUMENT REVIEW PROTOCOL

Document title:

Document reviewed on date:

Document description:
  Type:
  Purpose:
  Audience:
  Background:

Specific issues:
  Program planning issues:
  Program delivery issues:
  Programming techniques/methodology issues:
  Program evaluation issues:
  Program impacts issues:
  Target populations served issues:
  Staffing issues:
  Funding issues:
  Marketing issues:
  Partnerships/external relationships issues:
  Other issues:
URBAN EXTENSION CASE STUDY
INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview #

Description of the study given to those being interviewed? Yes No
Verbal statement concern voluntary participation & right of withdrawal provided? Yes No
Written permission gotten from participant/s to be interviewed? Yes No

Interview date:
Interview time: Start: End:
Interview location:
Interview participant/s:
Interview setting:

How long have you worked for Extension?
How long have you worked in Allegheny County?

Tell me about the programs you do.
Probes for each program:
  What was the process you used in planning this program?
  Who was the target audience for this program?
  Where there any partner organizations or units that helped with this program?
  If yes, what were their contributions to this program?
  How was the program presented?
  What teaching techniques and methods did you use?
  How was the program evaluated?
  What do you think were the important impacts of this program?
  If partner organizations or units, how would you evaluate the partner’s participation in delivering this program?
    Would you work with them again?
    Are there things you would change?
How was the program marketed?
What would you change if you had the opportunity?
How was the program funded?

If there was anything you could change about how you do your programs what would it be?
If there was anything you could change about how you interact with other’s, within Extension or outside partners, what it they be?

Is there anything else you would like to add?

Statement read to participant/s at the end of the interview:
Thanks for sharing this information with me. I will be transcribing the tape recording (or notes). When the transcription is completed, I will provide you with a copy for your review. Please read it carefully and feel free to make any changes, deletions, or additions. Return the transcription with your changes to me. I will provide a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience. Your changes will be made on the final transcription. I want to make sure that you understand that this information will be used in my dissertation, which is a research study. I hope to share the findings of this study with others through conference presentations and/or journal articles.

May I quote your statements?  Yes  No
When I directly quote you, do you want to be identified by your own name?  Yes  No

If no, what pseudonym (assumed name) would you like to use?

I will keep all information, including the tape recording and transcripts for a period of 3 years. After that, the tapes will be erased. If you use an assumed name, I will destroy any evidence of your real identity as soon as the analysis for this study has been completed and I will not provide that information to anyone.
URBAN EXTENSION CASE STUDY
OBSERVATION PROTOCOL

Observation #

Description of the study given to those being observed? Yes No
Verbal statement concern voluntary participation & right of withdrawal provided? Yes No
Written permission gotten from participant/s to be observed? Yes No

Observation date:
Observation time:
Observation location:
Observation participants:
Observation setting (type of meeting/class, number participating, general description, etc.)

Program planning observations:
Program delivery observations:
Programming techniques/methodology observations:
Program evaluation observations:
Program impacts observations:
Target populations served observations:
Staffing issues observations:
Funding issues observations:
Marketing issues observations:
Partnerships/external relationships observations:
Other observations:
Letter of Introduction (Delphi Panel)

December 10, 2004

ADDRESSEE
MAILING ADDRESS

Dear :

My name is Jack Kerrigan. I am a graduate student in the Department of Human and Community Resource Development at The Ohio State University and the County Extension Director of OSU Extension, Cuyahoga County (Cleveland, OH). You have been nominated by NAME, POSITION to participate as an expert panelist on a Delphi panel study.

The purpose of the study is to identify the indicators of successor best practices for an urban county Extension office in the next two to five years. The Delphi technique is a series of three rounds of feedback from a panel of experts. It is designed to move toward a convergence of opinion on a topic where subjective group judgment rather than precise analytical methods are suitable for the problem and the problem is complex and requires a diversity of input based on experience and expertise.

Extension professionals from all levels of the organization, researchers/practitioners in the fields of adult education and youth development, and Extension stakeholders will serve on the Delphi panel. I hope the mix of panelists will result in a thought-provoking process.

If you volunteer to serve as a panelist, you will be responding to 3 questionnaires. You will indicate your level of agreement to a series of statements about urban Extension. The response will be on a 6-point Likert scale and you may also support your rating with written comments or questions. The questionnaires will be available on the Internet. It will take you 40 to 60 minutes to complete each questionnaire. If consensus is reached on a statement during the first round (questionnaire), the statement will be removed from the next round. Before you complete the second questionnaire, you will get a summary of your responses on the first round plus a summary of everyone else’s ratings for each question, plus their written comments. After reading and considering the responses of the other panelists, you will complete the second questionnaire. The
process will be repeated a third and final time. The items to be considered will come from a case study of a typical urban county Extension office and from the literature. Those items on which positive consensus is reached will be considered indicators of success or best practices for urban county Extension offices.

Each questionnaire will be posted on Zoomerang. Once a questionnaire is posted you will be notified and you will have 7 days to respond. It will be critical that you respond to each of the three questionnaires because of the statistical analysis and just as critically, for the continuity of the written discussions that will develop. The Delphi will take place from January 10 through February 28, 2005.

**Your help is essential to the success of this study.** I hope that you will consider participating as a panelist. As an Extension professional, I know that you will be keenly interested in the results of this study. I hope you are as excited about the possibilities for learning more about urban Extension as I am.

It is important for you to understand that this is a research project. I hope to use the findings in presentations at conferences and in journal articles. For that reason, you will be asked to sign an “informed consent” form indicating that you understand the purpose of the study, that your participation is totally voluntary, and that you have the right to withdraw from the study at any time with no negative effects. Responses may be quoted, but not tied to a specific panelist. However, you will be listed as one of the panelists in the study reports. This listing is important to demonstrate that validity of the study because of the knowledge and experience of the panelists.

Please respond by e-mail indicating your interest in serving as a panelist. If you have any questions about this study, please feel absolutely comfortable in contacting me by telephone at 216-397-6025 or e-mail at kerrigan.1@osu.edu. Thanks.

Sincerely,

Jack Kerrigan  
Ph.D. Candidate  
County Extension Director  
Ohio State University Extension
Email Invitation to Round I of Delphi

Round 1 of the Urban Extension Delphi Study, “Patterns of Success in Urban Extension County Offices” is ready for you. Please open the survey using the link below.

Your thoughtful input is critical. Please respond in the context of the wide variety of urban Extension offices in the U.S.A. You are invited and encouraged to make comments on the statements as well as provide your level of agreement to each statement. There are a total of 100 statements and it should take about 45 minutes to respond.

Please respond to the survey within 7 days of getting this message so that we may stay on schedule for completing the study by February 28, 2005.

You have been nominated to participate in this study by a leader in the Cooperative Extension Service system because you are considered to have insights that are important to the future of Extension. Please share your insights as we explore the patterns of success that will move urban Extension forward into the next five years.
Email Invitation to Round 2

Thank you for an excellent Round I. Your input is critical. You came to consensus on 26 statements and those have been dropped from Round II. Please complete Round II of the Urban Extension Study within 7 days to keep everyone on schedule. Those people who complete the questionnaire in 5 days (and follow the instructions at the top of the Instrument) will be included in a drawing for a gift certificate from Amazon.com.

If you wish to save your responses for reference when you complete Round 3, simply highlight each section of the survey prior to clicking “submit” and saving your responses as a Word document. Please remember there are four sections. You are not done until you complete the fourth section and get a “Thank you!” on your screen.

Thanks for you for responding with such thoughtful input.
Email Invitation to Round III

As you approach Round 3

Think in the **FUTURE**; the way things should be!

Are the statements ones that you think **should be the way urban Extension does business in 2007 to 2010**?

It may help if you think, “**SHOULD BE**” instead of “is” as you read each question.

Writing the statements in the present tense is a convention of the Delphi process. Hope this helps you think “**IN THE FUTURE**”

Those statements that are the most important descriptors of urban Extension in the next 5 years should be rated as “strongly agree.” While those statements that are not at all important for urban Extension in the next 5 years should be rated as “strongly disagree.”
In Round 3:

- **Do not** describe what currently is.
- **Do not** focus on Extension as a whole; focus only on urban Extension. Many of the statements may also be appropriate for all Extension, but that is not the purpose of this study.
- **Do not** focus on limitations to our activities, focus on what *should be!*