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FOREWORD

The University of Missouri Extension Division represents a concept of informal teaching, the foundation for which had its beginning with passage of the Morrill Act, signed by President Lincoln, July 2, 1862. This division of the University of Missouri, which was formally authorized by the Board of Curators May 13, 1960, effective July 1, 1960, was an integration of two extension services that were in existence prior to that date. One of these, the Cooperative Extension Service, was associated with the College of Agriculture. It was a federal grant-in-aid program that was authorized by the Smith-Lever Act of May 18, 1914. The other extension service of the University of Missouri that existed prior to July 1, 1960, was a general extension service offering programs of adult education for divisions of the university other than the College of Agriculture. It did not have federal financial support. Its official name was the Division of Continuing Education.

The University of Missouri is the first of the state universities in the land-grant college system to establish a single extension program supported by the total resources of the institution. The success of this pioneer program, and the fact that it is the only land-grant university to have taken this bold step at this time, is of such historical significance that the events leading to development of the idea and the manner in which it has been accepted have historical significance.
The Land-Grant College System

The Land-Grant College Act, also known as the Morrill Act, was signed by President Lincoln July 2, 1862. It provided that each state should receive a land grant of 30,000 acres for each senator and representative it had in the national Congress, "in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."1

Prior to this act, education in the United States and other parts of the world had been primarily for those who came from families of wealth or prestige. The curricula of the institutions of higher education up until that time had been principally those offering the dead languages, philosophy, theology, and mathematics. In his chapter on the Background of Education, in the period prior to passage of the Land-Grant College Act, Edward Danforth Eddy, Jr., author of the book, "Colleges for our Land and Time", notes that at Harvard in the 1850's the curriculum was much the same as it had been for 200 years, narrow and tied to the concepts of the middle ages. He further states that "as late as 1850 not a single college had a laboratory or anything like a laboratory in its physical plant."2

Farmers wanted education for their children, but had no idea what it should include. A large number of manual labor schools were started during the 1830's. A school devoted to agriculture, which started in 1823 in Maine, was known as the Gardiner Lyceum. In 1837 Michigan passed an act chartering the University of Michigan specifically for instruction in practical farming. A number of agriculture schools were actually started during the 1850's, but they did not survive.

One of the major problems, following passage of the Land-Grant College Act and establishment of schools or colleges which it authorized, was finding answers to the questions, "What to teach? and Who would teach?" Original courses were the farm, the nursery, carpentry, cabinet making,

1The Land-Grant College Act, Approved July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503).
turning, wagon making, painting, black-smithing, telegraphy, photography, printing, dress making, and general agricultural practices.\footnote{Eddy, Edward Danforth, Jr., Colleges for our Land and Time, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1957, page 4.}

In 1887, federal legislation known as the "Hatch Act" was passed. It authorized the establishment of an agricultural experiment station in connection with each college that had been established under the Morrill Act. This was the beginning of efforts to search for new information in agriculture, information that until 1914 accumulated on the campuses of colleges of agriculture except when taken to meetings and institutes held out-state by members of the College of Agriculture faculty.

Cooperative Extension Service

The problem of taking information to farmers, farm wives, and farm youth in rural America was a primary topic of discussion for leaders in land-grant colleges and universities for a period of 10 to 12 years prior to 1914.\footnote{United States Department of Agriculture Miscellaneous Circular No. 59, County Agricultural Agent Work Under the Smith-Lever Act, 1914-1924, 1926.} The Board of Curators approved Dean F. B. Mumford's recommendation to establish a Missouri Agricultural Extension Service in 1912. The developing demand, nationally, led to legislation in 1914 known as the "Smith-Lever Act".\footnote{Approved May 8, 1914 (38 Stat. L., 372).} The object of this act was "to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States, useful and practical information on subjects relating to Agriculture and Home Economics, and to encourage the application of the same." This act further provided that: (1) this educational effort be known as Cooperative Extension Work; (2) it should consist of the giving of instructions and practical demonstrations in Agriculture and Home Economics to persons not attending or resident in said colleges in several communities; (3) it would furnish such persons information on said subjects through field demonstrations, publications, and otherwise; (4) also, that this work should be carried on in a manner mutually agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the state agricultural college or colleges receiving the benefit of the act.

A further provision of the Smith-Lever Act was that "no payment out of the appropriations provided should be made in any year to any state until an equal sum had been appropriated for that year by the legislature of such state, or provided by the state, county, college, local authority, or individual contribution, from within the state, for the maintenance of the Cooperative Agricultural Extension Service established by the Act."\footnote{Smith-Lever Act, Section 3.}
The Cooperative Extension Service was welcomed with enthusiasm by the Colleges of Agriculture and many of the rural communities in America. Federal and state appropriations to employ personnel to work in the counties, men who were known as county extension agents, were not adequate. This inadequacy of funds and the encouragement given by the provisions of the federal legislation requiring matching funds for the program, resulted in the formation of farmers into county groups. These county organizations carried the name, "Farm Bureau". Coinage of this name was attributed to a Chamber of Commerce in up-state New York which had created several bureaus for community and trade area development such as the credit bureau. When adding a program to serve agriculture in the area, the Chamber automatically named it their "Farm Bureau". This program involved the use of an individual later known as County Agricultural Agent, whose primary service was to visit farmers and assist them with information he had that might be useful to them. He obtained such information from agricultural publications and by observing farm practices used successfully on other farms visited.

Farmer groups known as Farm Bureaus were the county organizations that took the responsibility for sponsoring county extension agents, seeing that local funds were raised to help with their salaries, provide them offices, and pay other local expenses. In the early days of this program some county farm bureaus charged annual membership fees of as much as $50.00, most of which went to help with the salary of the agent. These groups came to be known as sponsoring organizations.

The Cooperative Extension Service was supervised by the State College of Agriculture. The county extension agent was employed by the college and put in a county, subject to the approval of a board representing the local group. Later, when home demonstration agents were added as part of the staff of the Cooperative Extension Service, they were employed and placed in counties under the same policy.

In Missouri the food program of World War I was promoted and administered through the Cooperative Extension Service. This greatly strengthened it because it forced the formation of many county groups that perhaps otherwise would not have been organized.

Passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in the Roosevelt administration gave additional emphasis to the Cooperative Extension Service because it was supervised and organized in its beginning by the county extension agent in each county. Counties that did not have agents were provided with one even in the absence of more than token support locally. Counties that did not have farm bureaus organized county extension associations, which had dues as low as 50 cents or $1.00 per year.

---

In 1953, the state law\(^1\) pertaining to sponsoring organizations for extension work in Missouri counties was amended. The revised statute required county courts to appropriate sums for support of the cooperative extension programs, the minimum being determined by the classification of the county. At that time the word Farm Bureau was dropped from the state legislation and it was written in such manner that units of the Missouri Farmers Association could also sponsor or be responsible for a cooperative extension program at the county level. In instances where more than one group was interested in being sponsor, the farmers in the county that were cooperating with the Cooperative Extension Service were allowed to recommend the organization which they wanted to be sponsor.

State legislation formalizing county sponsoring groups for cooperative extension programs in counties was again amended in 1955.\(^2\) At that time the sponsorship of extension work was completely disassociated from farm organizations in Missouri. The result was a county committee known as the County Extension Council, composed of a man and woman elected from each political township to serve as a board in supervising the cooperative extension program.

**Balanced Farming**

The organization of the Cooperative Extension Service has been developed through an evolutionary process. Changes have been made, after careful consideration and testing, directed toward educational programs that are more effective in disseminating useful and practical information to people.

Subject-matter specialists were included in the cooperative extension staff early in the development of the Service. Each specialist is a member of the staff of a subject-matter department, such as Agricultural Engineering, Home Economics or Soils, and is primarily a teacher of county extension workers. Specialists also disseminate information among farm people and others by direct discussion, radio, television, published material, visual aids, demonstrations, and other methods of communication.

Because each specialist deals with one subject-matter area in agriculture, the information presented to farmers by each specialist usually did not relate to other subject-matter areas in agriculture. Each farm family, however, must plan a program for the entire farm, using the capital, soil, equipment, labor, animals, and other facilities to produce for a particular market.

The obvious solution was to develop an extension program which would coordinate all the subject-matter areas involved in each farm operation. The Balanced Farming Program developed from this background.

---

\(^{1}\) Missouri Revised Statutes, Cumulative Supplement 1953, "County Farm Organization", Section 262.580, page 409.

\(^{2}\) Missouri Revised Statutes, Cumulative Supplement, 1955, "County Agricultural Extension Programs", Section 262.551, page 539.
J. W. Burch, Director of the Cooperative Extension Service, strongly supported the Balanced Farming idea. He appointed a committee of subject-matter specialists, with A. W. Klemme, Soils Specialist, as chairman. This committee developed the general plans for organization, policies, and methods.

Farmers were informed about the program and Balanced Farming Associations were organized, on a voluntary basis. Each member of an association paid an annual fee which paid a part of the costs of conducting the association program. An assistant county extension agent, known as the Balanced Farming Agent, was appointed to work with the members of the association. The association plan was an effective implement in effecting the Balanced Farming approach. This program was widely accepted by farmers.

Eventually Balanced Farming became a major division of the cooperative extension program. The payment of fees in the association plan gradually became less important and increasing numbers of farm families are assisted in developing Balanced Farming plans by the Cooperative Extension Service. Today many associations do not require fees, yet more farm families are using Balanced Farming plans than in any previous year.

This program, which is highly valuable to Missouri farmers, met and overcame vigorous resistance in its early years by some subject-matter specialists who feared their programs would be submerged in the broader program and hence rendered less effective. A number of farmers and representatives of industry who had benefited in specific subject-matter areas also objected to a program which they feared would restrict the value of the extension program for them. These objections have nearly ended and the program is used by more farm families than in any previous year.

General Extension Service

Dean Frank F. Stephens, in his "History of the University of Missouri" published in 1962, has several references to Extension Service Programs. He states that a standing committee on extension work was appointed in 1897.¹ It had "rather big ideas" of making every approved high school in the state a center for extension work. Associated with this idea, he indicates, was the thought that members of the University of Missouri faculty who could give interesting lectures on educational or professional topics would travel over the state to points where arrangements could be made beforehand for the delivery of lectures. In one of President Jesse's addresses before the Missouri Press Association,² he proposed that a force of about 10 lecturers be appointed to lecture in every town in the state. Critics thought this proposal a clever advertising scheme for the University and referred to it as a chautauqua

educational system. As no legislative appropriations to support it were forthcoming, nothing came of the suggestion, according to Dean Stephens.

A. Ross Hill, who Dean Stephens in his history indicates was most interested in an Extension Division when the idea was first originated, secured an allotment of $150.00 from the Board of Curators in 1903, the first year he was Dean of the Teachers College, for the purpose of paying the travel expenses of members of the faculty who agreed to deliver lectures on the various subjects to the teachers of Kansas City. Although examinations were to be given, no college credit was to be secured by the teachers for their work. The Kansas City Teachers' Club petitioned the academic faculty of the University of Missouri for a regular extension center in Kansas City, and during the years 1905 and 1906, eight classes in education were established in Kansas City by four members of the faculty. In 1908, when Hill became president, extension centers were established in Joplin, Carthage, Mexico, Nevada, and St. Joseph, in addition to those that had been in existence in Kansas City and St. Louis.

Beginning in 1908, a statement in regard to University Extension was regularly included in the annual catalog of the University and in January, 1910, the Board of Curators authorized the establishment of an Extension Division even though no appropriation had been made for it. It was authorized as the 10th division of the University. Its program was administered by a committee composed of President Hill, Deans F. B. Mumford, W. W. Charters, and N. M. Trenholme. An appropriation of $25,000 from the General Assembly was requested in 1911, but for the third time was refused. An appropriation of $25,000 was forthcoming, however, in 1913, and the first director for the division was named. He was Samuel D. Gromer, a former instructor in history at the University, and carried the title of secretary. He resigned after one year and was replaced by Charles H. Williams, who gave special attention to the development of correspondence courses.

In April, 1946, the Extension Division was reorganized as the Adult Education and Extension Service. The work under its administration included both credit and non-credit courses. Amos J. Snider was appointed director of the Service at that time. It had an immediate explosive growth, due to the fact that the Adult Education Courses authorized under the GI Bill of Rights for Veterans of World War II were administered under this division insofar as on-the-farm training was concerned.

---

2 Ibid, page 415
3 Ibid, page 415
4 Ibid, page 416
5 Ibid, page 416
Amos Snider continued as director of the Adult Education and Extension Service, which later became the Division of Continuing Education and was popularly referred to as the General Extension Service of the University.

PROBLEMS OF THE TWO EXTENSION SERVICES

Administration

Dr. Thomas A. Brady, Vice President of the University, and the executive officer of the University in charge of the Adult Education and Extension Program, has made this comment regarding the union of the Extension Services:

"As early as 1945, when we were reorganizing the University Extension Division into the Adult Education and Extension Service, I had several conversations with President Middlebush about the possibility of unifying this service with the Agricultural Extension Service (Cooperative Extension Service). He encouraged me to discuss the matter with E. A. Trowbridge, who was very much in favor of this, and we carried on talks and explorations for the next two years trying to find ways in which it could be done.

"There were several administrative obstacles to be overcome, of course, but we finally agreed, about 1947, that we would have to wait on it largely because we thought it better to move when new personnel at the top had to be added and try to secure a man who was interested in doing what we thought should be done - combine the services." His successor, Dean Longwell followed in the conversations that Trowbridge had started and when we had to get a new (Cooperative Extension Service) director, that is exactly what we tried to do - get a broad-gauged educator who was interested in this policy. I was in on all these conversations for 10 to 12 years."

Dean J. H. Longwell, of the College of Agriculture, states that soon after he assumed office in 1948, discussions were held concerning consolidation of the two extension programs, Cooperative Extension Service and the Adult Education and Extension Service. He recalls that Dr. Brady was chairman of the committee in charge of the Adult Education and Extension Service Program and that Amos Snider was Executive Officer of the Division. The program was supervised by a committee including Dean L. G. Townsend of the College of Education, Dean Luther Mott (later replaced by Dean Earl English) of the School of Journalism, Dean H. O. Croft of the College of Engineering, Dean Elmer Ellis (who became president and was replaced by Dean W. Francis English) of the College of Arts and Science, and himself. The committee met perhaps six times a year. One of its primary responsibilities was to review the division's budget, recommend changes, and recommend fees, since fees were an important source of income in addition to legislative appropriations.

1 Then Dean of the College of Agriculture.
Programs developed by the Division were: The firemanship program, police training program, the veterans on-the-farm-training program, correspondence courses, off-the-campus courses for credit, Conference and Short Course Program, Executive Development Program, an explosive development of the educational film library, The Rural Journalism Program, The Educational Television Program known as "Showcase", The Speech and Hearing Clinic Program, The Program of Education, and the beginning of a Community Development Program.

Programs

One of the developments that intensified interest in consolidation of the two programs was the interest of communities in improving their programs, such as parks, swimming pools, industrial surveys, and similar activities. Inasmuch as a variety of interests were involved, the divisions that developed separate programs on community improvement were the School of Social Work in the College of Arts and Science, the College of Engineering, the College of Agriculture through its Rural Sociology Department, and the Public Affairs Section of the Cooperative Extension Service. These disconnected developments made the need for a more coordinated program at the university level quite obvious.

As an example of the situation that began to exist, Dean Longwell recalls that the committee in charge of the Division of Continuing Education decided it should employ someone to do community work for it. The first man was employed for only a short time. The School of Social Work was also interested and needed staff to do field work for it. Three such staff members were added, but not enthusiastically, by the Director of the School. The Engineering School was interested and employed an Engineering Experiment Station man. His assignment was to cultivate industry to support the Engineering Experiment Station, but he did do some work that could be classified as extension.

Dr. Amos Snider, Director of the Division of Continuing Education, was also aware of the problems presented by lack of coordination of the various off-campus teaching programs of the University. His analysis is perhaps best presented by the following quotation on the "Situation" in a memorandum by him to Dean Longwell, February 5, 1960:

"The Present Situation

"For fifty years the University of Missouri has had in operation a general University Extension Division which has been known variously as University Extension Division, the Adult Education and Extension Service, and the Division of Continuing Education. Likewise, for nearly fifty years the University has had in operation a vigorous Cooperative Extension Service known as the Agricultural Extension Service.

"These two groups have operated in complete harmony, serving in a general sense two completely different phases of community and professional life of the total population of Missouri. On the one hand, the Agricultural
Extension Service has traditionally been concerned with the mission of extending the results of research and acquired knowledge from the College of Agriculture to the interested people of the state. Until the last few years this large group of interested people were largely the farmer or agricultural group. This mission was and is carried out effectively through the media of printed bulletins and circulars, conference and short courses, and radio and television presentations. No attempt to teach through formal classes or courses has been made.

"The Division of Continuing Education, on the other hand, has had as its mission the extending of the results of research and formal teaching from the other divisions of the University where appropriate. Formal teaching through classes, correspondence study, and the educational conference technique are the chief media through which the professional, semi-professional, and business groups and individuals are served. Medicine, engineering, education, business, those in the liberal arts, and some groups in Agriculture are served by this Division.

"In reviewing the scope of the present situation, it will be germane at this point to review the educational objectives of the University. The Curators of the University of Missouri have declared the intents and purposes of the University......:

Purpose of the State University: A true state university strives to be the intellectual, the cultural, and the professional center of the state.... A true state university purposes to make available to the state all the intellectual and cultural resources of that commonwealth.

Activities of the State University: In order to fulfill the purposes of a true state university it has become necessary to develop the following types of activity within the University of Missouri:
1. Instruction .... 2. Training .... 3. Research .... 4. Creative Endeavor....
5. Service....

"The Report of the Committee on University Policy (1944) states that, ....the people of Missouri and the personnel of the University have come to realize that no narrow concept of the University's functions will do. Its service is not complete when it merely teaches the students who come to the campus.... Its full responsibility has been met only when its service reaches all the people of the state.

"In view of the above stated declaration by the Official Board and the stated policy of the faculty, it behooves us to reexamine the sociological and economic trends which we now find to be gigantic factors influencing our way of life and thus requiring intensive efforts educationally. Shifts in population
from rural to urban centers, together with scientific advances affecting the production of food, are two of the basic causes which, when tied to the increase in the birth rate, have brought about the need for this reexamination.

"In recent years the Continuing Education Division of the University has been called upon to assist Missouri's cities and towns with problems of Water Purification, Sewage Disposal, Community Chest and United Fund Drives, Hospital Administration, Tax Assessment Inequities, Problems in Teaching Certification, Municipal Annexation, and many problems of Law Enforcement and Firemanship. The Agricultural Extension Service is now working in Marketing, The Conservation of Resources, and in areas related to 'Agri-business'. Both services have been working in various areas of Community Development.

"The Division of Continuing Education has a well trained staff in the areas in which it is now operating -- Extension Classes, Correspondence Courses, Educational Conferences, Community Development, Law Enforcement Training, Firemanship, and the operation of the large University Film Library. The Agricultural Extension Service has developed a competent field staff in each county as well as on the state level. They are operating in every county in Missouri and are in close touch with local problems and conditions. Their subject-matter specialists and specialists in other areas enable them to assist with the solution to many of Missouri's educational problems."

Financing

The Cooperative Extension Service, as previously stated, was a grant-in-aid program. Federal, State, and local funds supported it.

The Division of Continuing Education was supported by state appropriations and fees.

The decline in farm population and the growing interest of the non-farm population in extension programs were beginning to cause increasing concern among those responsible for financing and administering the Division of Continuing Education and the Cooperative Extension Service. Efforts to get federal financial support for general extension work had been intensified.

With these trends shaping up, the likelihood of the General Extension Service some day being as big a program as Cooperative Extension and even more successful in competing for financial support, appeared as a distinct possibility.

Inasmuch as both programs as then operated were under-financed, the efficiencies possible in combining them and operating one extension program for the University seemed to have many advantages.
CREATION OF THE UNIVERSITY EXTENSION DIVISION

Preliminary Actions

Discussions regarding integration of the Cooperative Extension Service and the Division of Continuing Education had been continuing over a period of several years as indicated by Dr. Brady, but were intensified in the fall of 1959, as indicated by this statement of Emeritus Dean Longwell December 29, 1962:

"One of my duties as dean was representing the College of Agriculture on the University committee which administered the Adult Education and Extension Service, later known as the Continuing Education Service. This Service conducted all University correspondence courses and all extension work outside of Agriculture and Home Economics.

"In the Post-World War II period, numerous requests came to the University from cities and towns for assistance in making community economic, business, and industrial surveys, planning parks, and other recreational facilities, and development of community organizations. Continuing Education expanded its short courses for firemen, police departments, prosecuting attorneys, and other public services. Continuing Education often made contacts in communities through County Agricultural Extension personnel.

"Disappearance of distinct separation of rural and urban communities was accelerated during this time. Non-farm rural residents and urban residents increased their demands on County and State Agricultural and Home Economics Extension workers for assistance in home planning, development and management, youth work, recreation, economic studies, and other subjects. Continuing Education employed specialists in community planning and development. These relationships led to discussion of the desirability and feasibility of coordinating the work of the Agricultural Extension Service and Continuing Education Service.

"In 1956, the program known as Rural Development was started in three Ozark counties. The Agricultural Extension Service served as the leader in assisting counties to make studies of their economic, social, educational, health and medical, industrial, recreational, religious, and other problems and in working out solutions to them. This became an amazingly effective program and soon spread to adjoining counties and to other areas in the state. From the program the University learned much valuable information about conducting educational programs which included the interests of all people in a community.

"During this time, the College of Engineering and the School of Medicine started some off-campus educational work.

"In 1959, informal discussions among representatives of Agricultural Extension and Continuing Education and with President Ellis, it became
evident that serious consideration should be given to effecting a coordinated University Extension program which would include all off-campus educational work conducted by the University. This eventually led to development of the University Extension Division."

Dean Longwell, in discussing this subject, related that before leaving for India in late 1959, President Ellis asked that a plan for combining the Division of Continuing Education and the Cooperative Extension Service be drawn up for him to present to the Board of Curators upon his return.

His first step in developing the plan, he says, was to meet in November 1959 with:

- Dr. T. A. Brady - Dean of the Extra Divisional Administration (under which the Division of Continuing Education was included)
- Dr. Amos J. Snider - Director, The Division of Continuing Education
- Dr. Elmer R. Kiehl - Chairman, Department of Agricultural Economics
- Dr. C. Brice Ratchford - Director of the Cooperative Extension Service
- Dr. R. A. Schroeder - Chairman, Department of Horticulture
- Dr. R. L. McNamara - Chairman, Department of Rural Sociology

They agreed to develop a plan for a University Extension Division that would include the Cooperative Extension Service and Continuing Education.

A drafting committee was appointed, composed of:

- Walter Heidlage, State Agent (District Supervisor, Cooperative Extension Service)
- Elmer R. Kiehl, Chairman, Department of Agricultural Economics
- Stirling Kyd, Extension Specialist, Entomology
- Margaret Mangel, Chairman, Department of Home Economics
- R. L. McNamara, Chairman, Department of Rural Sociology
- Carl Scheneman, Assistant to the Director of Cooperative Extension Service
- R. A. Schroeder, Chairman, Department of Horticulture
Minutes of the Committee meeting held
December 30, 1959, for coordinating the Agricultural
Extension Service and Continuing Education at the
University of Missouri

Those present were: Dean Longwell, Director Ratchford, Dr. Margaret
Mangel, Dr. Elmer Kiehl, Dr. R. A. Schroeder, Professor Stirling Kyd,
Professor Walter Heidlage, Dr. Carl N. Scheneman, and Dr. Robert L.
McNamara.

The meeting was called for the purpose of suggesting ways of coordi­
nating the Agricultural Extension Service and the Continuing Education Service
of the University of Missouri. Dr. Schroeder suggested that a complete merger
be made between Agricultural Extension Service and Continuing Education Service,
and be given the name "University of Missouri Cooperative Extension Service. Dr. McNamara also felt this most advisable.

Professor Stirling Kyd suggested that within a county there should be one
county director and three or more sub-divisions within his authority. Examples
of such sub-divisions were: Youth, Community Development and Instruction,
both formal and informal. Dr. Ratchford believed that an organization of this
type should have one administrative head and also one person at each college
responsible to the Dean. Dr. Mangel suggested a coordinated plan of this
type might be interpreted as merely meaning an increase in the present Agricul­
tural Extension Services. She felt a prejudice exists in this area but could be
overcome if communications depict that this is a total University of Missouri
program. Dr. Mangel raised the question on how the present County Agricul­
tural Extension Council fits into this plan. Director Ratchford explained the
present law may need to be revised. However, he felt that the present law was
broad enough to meet the present situation. Dr. McNamara stated additional
laws may need be initiated to cover situations that might exist in metropolitan
areas, such as Kansas City and St. Louis.

It was the general consensus of the group that the vehicle for starting
such a coordinated program in the counties would be through a Community
Development person. Several members suggested that if a program was to
gain momentum and acceptance it must be primarily the people's program
rather than a program initiated solely by professional people.

The key to success in getting the present rural development vocational
courses in action has been the technique of getting people involved through
community development methods. Dean Longwell stated that all professional
type programs had not met with too much success. He further suggested that
if the people are to successfully develop their own programs they will need a
coordinated guidance and advice through one branch of the University rather
than two.

All members of the committee unanimously felt that there must be only one
organization through which such a program could be directed. The committee
was also of the opinion that a unified proposal be presented to President Ellis
by February 10, rather than to develop a proposal based on piece-meal tactics, which would not meet the problems which we would be confronted with in another year or so.

**General summary of meeting**

It was the opinion of the group that one organization is needed to represent the Agricultural Extension Service and the Continuing Education Department, and that this organization be called the University of Missouri Cooperative Extension Service. Several administrative and organizational procedures were discussed as to the most effective way of extending the total University to the people of the state.

Dean Longwell appointed a committee of four consisting of Director Ratchford, Dr. Elmer Kiehl, Dr. R. A. Schroeder, and Professor Stirling Kyd, and instructed them to draft a proposal for President Ellis' consideration along the line of suggestions made by the over-all committee."

The drafting committee of four appointed December 30, 1959, prepared its report promptly, because on January 4, 1960 Dean Longwell notified those who met on December 30 that a meeting would be held in his office Saturday, January 9, 1960, to discuss the report of Director Ratchford, Dr. Kiehl, Dr. Schroeder, and Professor Kyd.

The report carrying the heading, "For Discussion Purposes Only" was:

"PLAN FOR COORDINATING OR MERGING THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION AT MISSOURI UNIVERSITY

1. **Situation**

The Agricultural Extension Service has operated for fifty years with the primary mission of carrying research results relating to agriculture and home economics to the people of the state. The organization has developed a competent field staff in each county and at the state level, and has developed considerable know-how in conducting a continuous informal educational program. In the early years, the Agricultural Extension Service was concerned primarily with agricultural production and the basic problems of family living. In more recent years the Service has moved into the broader problems of marketing, community development, public affairs, and resource conservation and use. The broadening was the result of specific legal mandates, and due to broadening problems of rural people. Within the last three years the Extension Service has received a mandate to be concerned with the total problems of the people in six pilot counties.

The University has been constantly, although slowly, expanding services in addition to resident teaching. A wide range of activities is now conducted both on and off the campus. Activities include correspondence courses, special
training conferences, short courses, and many other activities. Quite recently programs of community development have been initiated.

There is a recognized need within the state for extending the vast resources of knowledge within the University to all the citizens of the state.

2. Purpose of the Plan

The purpose of the plan is to extend the total resources of the University of Missouri on a continuing and coordinated basis to the citizens and business firms of the state, to the end that the people are happier and prosperous, and the economy of the state is more fully developed.

3. Scope

All current activities of the Agricultural Extension Service and the Continuing Education Division, plus such additional Extension programs that might be developed.

4. Plan of Operation

There will be a single office in each county or city. The local offices will take the lead in planning programs with the local people. Requests for assistance from local areas will be sent to the University from the local offices, and program suggestions from the University will be funneled through the local offices. Each College will accept the responsibility of conducting a continuous Extension program. Personnel employed at the University for the work will be under the direction of the administrative head of the particular College.

The President, or a person he appoints, will be responsible for over-all coordination of the program.

5. Functions of Continuing Education and Agricultural Extension

Continuing Education will be responsible for all on-campus Extension activities and all non-resident course work. Agricultural Extension will handle all off-campus activities and take the lead in the planning and operation of the continuous informal educational programs. These programs can mutually support each other. As an example, the Agricultural Extension Offices could publicize and encourage enrollment in correspondence courses, and publicize and encourage attendance at conferences held on the campus.

6. Requirements for Making the Plan Operational

The plan can be made operational with existing resources. Additional resources will be needed, however, for accomplishing the objectives.
In most counties, at least one additional man should be added to take the lead in what might be called Community Development. In a few counties, a person with training in a particular field should be added to the staff. In the two large urban centers, the permanent staff should include at least one person from each College.

The name of the Agricultural Extension Service should be changed to Cooperative Extension Service of the University of Missouri.

Continuing Education will be called __________________________.\(^1\)

Better facilities will be needed in most counties. Minimum facilities should include adequate offices, meeting rooms and conference rooms.''

While these discussions and work on a plan to combine the Cooperative Extension Service and the Division of Continuing Education were under way in the College of Agriculture, similar planning was taking place in the Division of Continuing Education as indicated by the following memorandum to Emeritus Dean Longwell, June 8, 1962:

"Dear Dean Longwell:

The old Minutes of the Committee on Adult Education and later the Committee on Continuing Education do not show any discussion of the union of the two services. In talking with Dr. Brady, however, I asked him to write a little memorandum for you and I am enclosing it.\(^2\)

In addition, I remember that in December of 1960, just before Dr. Brady had a heart attack, the President requested that I write up a plan for the reorganization and union of the two services. I found out later that Brice was also requested to do this.

Dr. Brady went to the hospital during the Christmas holidays of that year and after a few days I took my plan to him in the hospital and we had quite a discussion about it. Both plans were changed somewhat because of various considerations on the President's part. I am sure that Dean Ratchford did not clamor for this change but rather was willing to accept whatever responsibilities came his way. I, likewise, agreed wholeheartedly in advance with Tom and the President that I would be willing to accept any responsibilities in connection with the union that were in the interest of the University. You know what has developed.

I hope that this bit of information is the type that you had in mind.

Yours very truly,

Amos J. Snider
Director"

\(^1\) No name was suggested.

\(^2\) See reference, footnote 2, page 10.
January 19, 1960, Dean Longwell transmitted to Dr. Brady and to Dr. Snider a copy of a proposed plan prepared by the committee with which he had met December 29. This plan, of course, was the one which had been prepared on the basis of discussions at the January 9, 1960 meeting where the sub-committee's report had been considered. In his memo of transmittal of January 19, Dean Longwell stated to Drs. Brady and Snider that he would be glad to discuss the plan with them at their convenience.

February 5, 1960, Dr. Snider wrote the following memorandum to Dean Longwell:

"Attached you will find an outline for a PLAN FOR UNIVERSITY-WIDE DIVISION OF CONTINUING EDUCATION SERVICE (or other appropriate title) written with the hope that it will assist with the thinking that is going on about drawing the teaching divisions closer to the educational problems of the people of our state.

"I do not feel that the plan is perfect, but I am sure that it is workable and, I feel, sensible. We will discuss it and the other plan soon, I am sure. I have placed a copy in the hands of Dr. Brady."

Dr. Snider's proposed plan differed from the one which had been prepared by the College of Agriculture committee. The differences are not as important, however, as the attitude of Willingness to cooperate which was presented.

Dean Longwell, on the basis of the reports submitted to him and after personal conferences with the administrators of the Cooperative Extension Service and the Division of Continuing Education, was ready to submit his recommended plan to President Ellis.

The proposed plan for a University of Missouri Extension Division was:

"PLAN FOR A UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI EXTENSION SERVICE

Plan of Operation

All extension services will be coordinated and administered under a Chief Administrative Officer responsible directly to the President. This officer will have sufficient authority to plan and execute the program. He will have several assistants to help in such functions as program planning and coordination, arranging on-campus Extension activities, and for handling administrative management."
Each College of the University will employ one or more persons who will devote full time to Extension work. Such personnel will function in a capacity similar to that of the present Agricultural Extension Service subject-matter specialists. This includes assisting the county units when requested, training county workers, developing suggested programs with county staffs, and conducting direct Extension programs on and off the campus.

As an illustration, the Extension person assigned by the School of Veterinary Medicine will help veterinarians directly with their problems and will provide training situations for them. He will also help county extension staffs develop programs useful to farmers and the general public.

All Extension personnel within a College will be hired by the Dean of that College. They will work under the direction of the Dean, or a Director of Extension for that College appointed by the Dean.

A single administrative office will be established in each county and/or appropriate metropolitan area. These offices will take the lead in planning programs with local people and in requesting assistance from the University. Program suggestions from the University will be channeled through these offices.

The local offices will be called University of Missouri Extension Centers. One person will be designated as Director of the Center. Other personnel assigned to local offices will be called Advisors, with their specialty preceding this title, i.e., Community Development Advisor.

There will be Area Administrators to supervise county staffs and Advisors assigned on an area basis. The Administrator will be directly responsible for coordinating programs within his supervisory area. The number of Administrators will be adjusted to the work load as the program develops."

Board of Curators Approval

April 21, 1960, the following memorandum was submitted to the President and the Board of Curators by Dr. Thomas Brady. It was approved by the signature of Elmer Ellis who was President.

"Date: April 21, 1960

To the President and Curators

RECOMMENDED THAT:

Effective July 1, 1960, all extension services and extension activities of divisions of the University at Columbia and Rolla be combined in one
signed: Thomas Brady

Approved: Elmer Ellis Date: ____________________________

April 28, 1960, Elmer Ellis, President, submitted the following memorandum to the Board of Curators.

"Columbia, Missouri
April 28, 1960

TO THE BOARD OF CURATORS
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

I recommend that effective July 1, 1960, all extension services and extension activities of divisions of the University at Columbia and Rolla be combined in one administrative unit to be located in the central administration of the University and called the University Extension Division; that all departments and divisions of the University be required hereafter to channel all activities of an extension nature, both teaching and service activities, through this division, and that all teaching and research departments, as funds are made available, appoint staff members through proper channels, to furnish professional knowledge and advice for programs directed by or to be established and directed by the University Extension Division; and that the administrative officer responsible for the operation of the University Extension Division be called Dean of the University Extension Division and that he be a member of the Committee of Deans; and that the University Extension Division consist of the present Agricultural Extension Service and the Division of Continuing Education, and such activities of this nature conducted at present by any division of the University at Columbia and Rolla, and such as may be established in the future in any division of the University.

Elmer Ellis"
Action taken by the Board of Curators May 13, 1960, was as follows:

"At a meeting of the Board of Curators held on May 13, 1960, the following action was taken, effective July 1, 1960:

BE IT RESOLVED that there be and is hereby established a Division of the University to be designated as the 'University Extension Division' and located at Columbia and that the administrative officer responsible for the operation of the University Extension Division shall be a Dean responsible to the President as other Deans; that the University Extension Division shall consist of the present Agricultural Extension Service and the Division of Continuing Education and such activities of this nature conducted at present by any division of the University at Columbia and Rolla and such as may be established in the future in any division of the University.

Hereafter all departments and divisions of the University shall channel all activities of an extension nature, both teaching and service activities, through this division and all teaching and research departments as funds are made available shall appoint staff members through proper channels to furnish professional knowledge and advice for programs directed by or to be established and directed by the University Extension Division.

Mary Robnett
Secretary"

Administrative Structure

The integration of the Division of Continuing Education and the Cooperative Extension Service was accomplished by the Board of Curators naming the Director of the Cooperative Extension Service also Dean of the University of Missouri Extension Division.

The pattern of operation that was established in the College of Agriculture by subject–matter specialists in the subject–matter departments being used to train extension workers and participate in other informal teaching situations, was extended to all other academic divisions of the University including the School of Mines at Rolla.

County Agents were made administratively responsible for all University of Missouri Extension educational programs in their respective counties.

State Agents who had been district supervisors for the Cooperative Extension Service were made District Directors for the University Extension Division.

The Director of the Continuing Education Division was given the title, Assistant Dean of the University Extension Division.
CHANGES THAT HAVE BEEN MADE

Titles and Procedures

The county extension offices were renamed "County University Extension Centers".

County extension agents were given the title, Director of County University of Missouri Extension Center.

County home agents were changed to the title of Extension Home Economist; associate agents and assistant agents to titles based on their specialized subject-matter area, such as:

1. Balanced Farming Agent
2. Agricultural Agent
3. Youth Agent
4. Community Development Agent
5. Livestock Agent
6. Dairy Agent
7. Horticulture Agent
8. Entomology Agent
9. Soils Agent

The prefix "Extension" has been dropped from the professorial titles held by extension workers.

The 4-H specialists have been named Youth Specialists and their responsibility for training is made available to leaders of all youth groups, such as Scouts, church youth leaders, etc. Formerly they restricted their educational services to 4-H leaders.

Stationery was re-designed with the slogan "the state is our campus". A symbol was adopted to illustrate this slogan. It is an outline map of Missouri with the columns of the Red Campus depicted thereon.

Metal office signs have been designed and placed at each county university extension center to identify the office in keeping with its new name and this new concept.

Directors of the county university extension centers have been given responsibility for supervising examinations of students taking courses by correspondence.

Whitten Hall, on the University of Missouri campus, was remodeled for the University Extension Division administrative personnel, to accomplish
efficiency, proper identity, and as much coordination and personal acquaintance as possible on the part of the diverse personnel assembled by the integration of the two programs.

County Extension Councils

With the expanded responsibility of work at the county level, it was thought that membership on the county extension council should be changed to give representation thereon to all of the interests of the county in addition to agriculture.

As a result, legislation was proposed in the 71st General Assembly and passed as House Bill No. 153, providing for county councils to be officially designated as the University of Missouri Extension Council of _______ County.

This act, House Bill 153, provided for not less than 10 or more than 20 elected members on the council. It provided for two nominees for each township or district, for an election to be held in January at which all citizens could vote, and other similar details regarding organization of the council and its responsibilities.

Membership on the council is stipulated by House Bill 153 for a member of the county court, for a representative from each general farm organization in the county with over 25 members, one representative for each incorporated town in the county having a population of 10,000 or more, or one member appointed by the mayor of the largest town in the county if there are none over 10,000 population in size according to the last decennial census.

Planning County Extension Programs

The annual extension program in each county is decided by agreement after discussions by the County Extension Council, the Director of the University of Missouri County Extension Center, and other staff members and University of Missouri Extension administrative personnel and subject-matter specialists.

In counties in which agriculture is the primary industry the extension programs will deal principally with agriculture; in counties which are principally urban, extension programs will be developed to meet the needs of the urban population; in counties where both farming and urban population are included, the extension program will be planned to provide for both groups.

Whatever the county situation, county people have a voice in deciding what kinds of extension work are carried out in the county.

Programs and Personnel

The educational programs of the University Extension Division have grown in response to the demands of people according to the philosophy of the
Smith–Lever Act and as envisioned by the founders of the Land–Grant College system.

The main focus of Cooperative Extension Service programs has not been altered as a result of the integration, but several refinements in methods and techniques of education have been used more extensively as a result of the combination. These changes have improved the quality of instruction.

Directors of County University Extension Centers are able to call on the total resources of the University. Programs under way range from graduate courses in Kansas City taught by professors of the School of Business and Public Administration for junior business executives to classes for illiterates in St. Louis taught by volunteer leaders who took training voluntarily to do such teaching.

That such programs will perhaps continue to grow as the University is able to respond to demands is illustrated by these remarks of Dr. John Schwada, Dean of the University Faculty, speaking at the annual conference of Missouri Extension workers, October 31, 1962:

"The School of Business and Public Administration has added three full-time persons, two of whom are to devote full time to Extension. Ten or 15 or 20 personnel with training to work on Extension may be required ultimately, and the same will no doubt be true in other divisions."

REACTIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS

Legislation by the United States Congress, authorizing federal aid to general extension programs, was almost passed in 1962. It was embodied in Senate Bill 3477. If and when passed, such legislation will permit federal assistance to cooperating educational institutions in much the same way that the Smith–Lever Act has functioned since 1914, on agricultural and home economics subjects.

Extension personnel, urban groups, rural groups, and administrative officers of the University are pleased with the University Extension Division and its provisions, as indicated by the following quotations. Quotation #1 is from a Newsletter by Dean Ratchford to Missouri Extension Workers, December 4, 1962. Quotation #2 is from a news release on a talk by President Ellis to the annual 1962 fall conference of Extension workers in the State of Texas.

Quote #1

"Discussions at the recent Land–Grant College meeting in Washington indicated that almost every state is deeply concerned about the relation of the several Extension enterprises within the University. Many of the states are in the process of working out some sort of coordination. I was indeed thankful that we had successfully made the major steps. Some states will have real
difficulty in achieving coordination, and much hard feeling will result. Questions were directed not only to Mrs. Zimmerman, Carl Scheneman, and me, who represented Extension, but also to President Ellis and all of the Deans who attended."

Quote #2

"In combining all extension enterprises into a single unit, Dr. Ellis said, "we encountered fewer difficulties, and received greater strengths, than we expected."

Dr. Ellis said the University is finding that rural people are delighted with in-depth education. They like credit courses, he said, some even taking graduate level work.

He listed these objectives drawn up in the combining of extension enterprises: To provide for efficiency of operation, to provide a vehicle for continuously extending the resources of the University to the people of the state in a coordinated manner, to provide opportunity for all citizens to obtain useful information from the University, and to combine the best methods and philosophy of both general and cooperative extension.

The re-organization has enabled agents in urban counties to help solve problems relating to such communities, Dr. Ellis said.

"This has resulted in a rather drastic departure from traditional programs. Our extension programs have become involved with teaching both actual and functional illiterates how to read and write.

"They are helping city officials and commissions to figure out how to keep the so-called gray areas (those which are becoming slums) from becoming candidates for a bulldozer. They are arranging short courses for teaching public school teachers how to use new processes for teaching mathematics in elementary schools. They offer courses ranging from the Hebrew language to computer programming.

"Fundamental to our basic organization was a principle which was nailed down at the time of the formation of the new Extension Division. The Extension Division is a normal and necessary part of the entire University. We believe strongly that we have just one University, with three functions: resident teaching, research, and extension teaching. The academic departments conduct the extension programs."
SUMMARY

It has been said that "nothing is so certain of being successful as an idea that has found its time". The idea of integrating the Division of Continuing Education and the Cooperative Extension Service of the University of Missouri was indeed timely in late 1959 and early 1960.

Contributing to the successful integration of the programs and their successful operation since have been factors such as these:

1. The Cooperative Extension Service and the Division of Continuing Education were a part of the same University, as compared to many states where they are with separate state universities on separate campuses.

2. The President of the University was familiar with the programs because of his relationship with them and he recognized advantages of their being combined.

3. The Dean of the College of Agriculture shared the President's views.

4. The Dean of Extra-Divisional Activities was in sympathy with the objectives of the two programs being combined as a result of a long experience in charge of the Division of Continuing Education, as was Dr. Snider, Director of the Division.

5. Director Ratchford of the Cooperative Extension Service was aware of the advantages of an extension program which would bring the total resources of the University to all of the people of the state. His vision and farsightedness was backed by his experience on one of the National Scope Committees of the Extension Service prior to joining the University of Missouri as Director of the Cooperative Extension Service July 1, 1959.

6. Dr. Kiehl, who served on the committees which developed the plan, became Dean of the College of Agriculture September 1, 1960, and gave his full support to implementation of the plan.

7. The idea was conceived and perfected by developmental discussions among the administrative officers involved with implementing the plan and making it work.

8. Following approval by the Board of Curators and before its announcement in the press or its becoming effective July 1, the leading farm organization boards of directors, members of the faculty, and extension workers had the plan explained to them.

9. Abrupt changes were avoided in developing the program and the idea which always prevailed in cooperative extension work of involving the people in development of their program needs has been preserved.