

VIRGINIA
DIVERSITY ANNUAL REPORT

1922

Index

Page

1 c 3.35	Milk Producers' Association	6
1 c 3.32	Apples	6
1 c 3.64	Beef cattle	6
1 c 3.91	Tobacco Association	6
1 c 3.10	Truck	6
1 c 3.10	Truck - cabbage	6
1 c 3.103	Beans	6
6 a 2	History	1
6 a 6.3	County plans	17
6 a 6.4	State	17
6 a 6.71	Correlation to program	8
6 a 6.75	Subject matter assistance	7-8
6 a 6.1	Analysis	2-3
6 a 6.5	Conferences	17
6 a 6.4	Finances	9-10
6 a 6.6	Personnel	7, 10 to 17
6 b 4	Relationship to other organizations	8



ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

VIRGINIA AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION DIVISION

July 1, 1921 - June 30, 1922

Blacksburg, Virginia.

-0-

John H. Hatcheson, Director.

ANNUAL REPORT - EXTENSION DIVISION

July 1, 1921 - June 30, 1922.

John A. Hutchison, Director.

Notwithstanding the fact that prices of farm products have continued low for the last several months, the fiscal year 1921 - 22 has been one of encouragement and progress. In many ways it has been the most successful year in the history of agricultural extension work in this State. There has been considerable increase both in the number of extension workers and the quality and amount of work done. During the past year we have been able to add to our forces 6 additional county farm demonstration agents, 5 additional home demonstration agents, 3 negro agents, and 3 specialists. We have had to add these workers because the farm men and women of the State are continually calling for additional help along many lines.

In the early history of extension work in Virginia much time was spent in what may be called propaganda work. In other words, we had to teach the farmers that the Extension Division could really render them services that would pay in dollars and cents. In the last few years this has been so well demonstrated that the propaganda work is no longer necessary and it takes a larger force than we can possibly keep in the field to answer the calls of the farm men and women of the State. This is a healthy sign and an indication that extension work is meeting a real need.

A study of the last census and figures from the Bureau of Crop Estimates will show that Virginia is making real progress in agriculture and is rapidly taking the lead in both crop and livestock production in the South Atlantic Division. For instance, the latest census figures show that in 1920 Virginia was the largest producer of early Irish potatoes, third largest producer of tobacco, and fourth largest producer of peanuts and apples among the States of the Union. While there are 28 States that have more acres under cultivation than the Old Dominion, only 20 are ahead of her, in the total value of all crops.

The census figures for livestock are even more encouraging. Virginia now has

more purebred horses, sheep, beef and dairy cattle than any other State in the South Atlantic Division. The last census shows a total of 8,191 purebred beef cattle, 9,586 purebred dairy cattle, 20,867 purebred hogs, 3,785 purebred sheep, and 1,809 purebred horses on Virginia farms. While accurate figures for purebred livestock are not available from the census of 1910, close observation leads us to believe that the number of purebred livestock in Virginia has been increased more than 100% since agricultural extension work was started in the State. In the Pure Bred Sire Campaign, which has been going on all over the United States for the past two years, Virginia has more members pledged to the use of purebred sires than any other State in the Union.

To those interested in dairying the latest census figures in regard to Virginia should also prove gratifying. These figures show that in 1919 Virginia produced 110,942,113 gallons of milk. During the same year, Virginia dairymen sold 8,007,298 pounds of butter, 556,583 gallons of cream, and 1,165,064 pounds of butter-fat. In comparing these figures with the production for Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Florida it is gratifying indeed to note that Virginia has a greater production of milk than any of the States mentioned. It is also of interest to find from a recent report of the Dairy Division of the United States Department of Agriculture that Virginia has more active cow testing associations than any other Southern State. In 1916 Virginia had 2 associations; in 1918, 4, in 1919, 5, in 1920, 8, in 1921, 10, and in 1922, 12 associations. There are at present approximately 5,000 cows on test in these associations in Virginia. This means that people who wish to buy dairy animals in Virginia can be assured of getting animals from tested dams.

The poultry industry in Virginia is also developing rapidly. The census figures for 1910 show that Virginia had a total poultry population of 5,664,703, while the figures for 1920 show that the number of poultry has increased more than 2,000,000 and the present poultry population is 7,660,488. Virginia has more poultry than any other State in the South Atlantic Division. Both the quantity and quality of the poultry in

the State has been rapidly improved by boys' and girls' club work, calling demonstrations, and poultry exhibits put on by the Extension Division.

Another encouraging fact is that at the present time Virginia farmers come nearer feeding themselves, their city brothers and their livestock than the farmers in any other State in the South. This information was gathered from statistics recently sent the Director of the Extension Division by the Division of Crop Estimates. The total food and feed needed to supply the people and livestock of this State is estimated to cost \$436,336,000 annually. The total value of the food and feed produced in the State during an average year is \$346,178,000. There are approximately 2,309,000 people in the State. These figures show that for each inhabitant of the State, together with the livestock owned by this inhabitant, there is a deficit of only \$39.00 per capita in food and feed production. Similar figures for other Southern States show that in North Carolina there is a deficit of \$75.00 per inhabitant, in South Carolina \$71.00, Georgia \$61.00, Florida \$98.00, Alabama \$91.00, Mississippi \$93.00, Louisiana \$69.00, and Maryland \$75.00. These figures show that Virginia has an unusually high standing among the Southern States in food and feed production. In fact the agriculture of Virginia is practically self-sustaining. There has been great progress in the production of food and feed crops in Virginia since the introduction of agricultural extension work in the State.

Marketing Work.

The agricultural crisis of the last few years has taught farmers a good many things about their own condition. It has taught them that they were hit first, hardest and longest because they were the least protected and poorest organized class of people in the country. It has taught them further that if this condition is ever remedied they must take the initiative themselves. For a long time farmers were prone to think that the only remedy for their troubles was through legislation. The crisis mentioned has taught them that though proper legislation is important, proper organization and

cooperation among themselves is more important. During the last two years a great wave of cooperative effort has swept over the United States and Virginia has not been behind the other States in the Union in efforts along this line. The farmers of the State have come to the Extension Division for help and help has been given in every possible way.

The marketing work started by the Extension Division of Virginia two or three years ago has gradually increased until at present almost as much time is given by employees of the Extension Division to questions of distribution and marketing as to questions of production. The officials of the Extension Division of Virginia have taken the stand that the function of the Extension Division is to teach farm men and women more economical methods of production, better methods of distribution and marketing, and better methods of living. All of these things are necessary and the neglect of any one of them means a one-sided development. However, we realize that the Extension Division in this State is an educational agency and we have helped set up marketing organizations as demonstrations in methods of improving rural life.

We think that the first duty of the Extension Division in relation to marketing organizations is to get in touch with groups of farmers who are experiencing difficulties in distributing their products and to help these farmers make a survey and see if a cooperative marketing organization will be of assistance. If it is determined by such a survey that a marketing organization is needed, it is the duty of the Extension Division to see that the best plans are furnished and that the organization is set up along the lines that experience has taught to be most successful. However, the duty of the Extension Division does not end here. The wise county agent will keep in close touch with the officers of the association, attend every county meeting, and see that local and county units of the association are organized and that his extension program is put on through these units.

A brief account of the work of some of the cooperative marketing organizations now operating in Virginia is given below:

The most successful truck marketing association in the United States of long standing is located on the Eastern Shore of Virginia. This organization has been in operation for practically twenty years and in one year recently marketed over \$19,000,000 worth of products for the farmers of Northampton and Accomac Counties. The Extension Division had no part in the organization of the Eastern Shore Produce Exchange, but it is at present cooperating with this Exchange in every way possible and trying to get it to extend its activities to other counties and truck producing sections.

The peanut growers of Eastern Virginia two years ago began the first large single commodity organization in this State. It has had to blaze the path for this type of organization in Virginia and has made many costly mistakes, but it is now re-organizing and getting on its feet in a safe business way and bids fair to do much for the 5,000 peanut growers who compose its membership in Eastern Virginia and North Carolina.

The Tobacco Growers' Cooperative Association is perhaps the most outstanding cooperative marketing organization now in operation in the State. In the last eighteen months it has enrolled a membership of 60,000 tobacco growers in Virginia, North and South Carolina, all of whom have signed a legally binding contract to market all the tobacco produced by them through one association for a period of five years. There are approximately 40,000 tobacco growers in Virginia and 31,000 of these have signed this contract. Over 200 warehouses have been leased or bought by the association, arrangements have been completed for securing finances for operation up to about \$40,000,000, an efficient set of officers have been employed, and the association is now handling between 10,000,000 and 20,000,000 pounds of tobacco per week. The Virginia Extension Division was called upon early in the history of this movement and helped the association in making surveys, getting plans, contracts, etc, helped in the organization by advertising meetings and educating growers as to the purpose of the association, and is now rendering valuable assistance in maintaining loyalty among the members of the association and by helping form local and county units of the association. The county agents

have played such an important part in this organization from an educational standpoint that they have greatly strengthened extension work throughout the tobacco territory and are invited to put on their regular extension programs through the locals of the tobacco association.

The cabbage and potato growers' association of Southwest Virginia, which did such a successful business last year, was confronted with an overproduction this year and has had many difficulties, but in spite of these has been able to secure a better price for the members of the association than was secured by growers outside of the pool. The county agents in this section have rendered the same kind of assistance that was rendered to the tobacco growers by the agents in the tobacco counties.

The Extension Division has assisted the dairymen in Northern Virginia who belong to the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers' Association in reorganizing this association on a much firmer basis than that on which it was organized heretofore. Our specialist in farm economics and marketing has rendered valuable assistance in helping work out the contract, and the county agents have done much in calling meetings and in organizing county and local units of the association. The dairy farmers in the vicinity of Richmond, in the Valley of Virginia, and in the vicinity of Norfolk, have also been given considerable help by the Extension Division.

The beef cattle and hog raisers have been assisted in organizing cooperative shipping associations for their livestock. About 15 of these associations are now in active operation in counties where there are agents.

The apple and poultry producers of Virginia are both being assisted in making preliminary surveys for marketing organizations. These organizations will very probably be started within the next year if the present organizations of other commodities continue to succeed.

The remainder of this report will show how the Extension Division of Virginia is organized and how it operates to help farm men and women in problems of economical production, efficient marketing and better living.

Project 1-A

Administration

There were no changes in the plan of organization for the administration of extension work in Virginia from July 1st, 1921, to June 30th, 1922. The Director of the Extension Division is administrative head of all agricultural extension work done in the State. He reports directly to the Chief of the States Relations Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture and to the Dean of the Agricultural College of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The Director has associated with him an Assistant Director in charge of Farm Demonstration Work, and a State Agent in charge of Home Demonstration work. The Assistant Director has direct supervision of the farm demonstration work and has associated with him 4 white district agents and 2 negro district agents. The men district agents in charge of farm demonstration work have headquarters in the various districts throughout the State where they can keep in close touch with the county agents. The State Agent of Home Demonstration Work has associated with her 3 white district agents and 1 negro district agent. The women district agents are located in the same way as the men. The district agents help the county agents in making up their plans of work and keep in close touch to see that the plans are carried out. They also meet the County Boards of Supervisors and get the local appropriations for helping finance the work. They are responsible not only for the adult work in their territory but also for the boys' and girls' club work. The State Agent in charge of Boys' Club Work has no administrative authority and reports directly to the Assistant Director in charge of Farm Demonstration work. The State Agent in charge of Girls' Club Work has no administrative authority and reports directly to the State Agent of Home Demonstration Work.

During the past year the Virginia Extension Division has had field specialists in agronomy, animal husbandry, agricultural engineering, dairy husbandry, farm economics, horticulture, plant pathology, poultry husbandry, vegetable gardening, and home economics. These specialists are under the administrative supervision of the Director of Extension Work. Most of them have headquarters at the College and work with and through the county

agents to help carry to the farmers the best information in their respective lines. They have no administrative authority over the county agents. For subject matter they are responsible to the subject matter heads of their respective departments in the Division of Resident Instruction of the College.

These plans of administration have been working splendidly and we see no reason for change as long as this continues.

In order to promote the best relationships between the Divisions of Extension, Research and Resident Instruction, regular quarterly meetings are held which are attended by all workers in the Experiment Station and the Division of Resident Instruction, and by the administrative officers and specialists of the Extension Division. At these meetings questions of general interest are discussed and the workers in the various divisions are kept thoroughly informed as to the work of the various divisions.

Cooperation with State Departments and Farm Organizations.

In order to bring about close relations with other state departments and farm organizations, a Virginia Agricultural Advisory Committee was organized during the past year. This committee is composed of a representative from the State Farmers' Union, State Division of Markets, State Farm Bureau, State Bankers' Association, Virginia Truck Experiment Station, Peanut Growers Exchange, State Farmers' Institute, State Dairyman's Association, State Horticultural Society, Virginia Experiment Station, Valley Milk Producers' Association, Eastern Shore Produce Exchange, Southwest Virginia Cooperative Exchange, Virginia Seed Growers' Association, Virginia Sheep and Wool Growers' Association, Virginia Livestock Shipping Association, Department of Agriculture, Southern Produce Company, Producers' Cooperative Exchange, and the Tobacco Growers' Cooperative Association.

The general purpose of this Advisory Committee is the exchanging of views on important agricultural questions affecting the farmers of the State of Virginia. The special purpose of the Advisory Committee at the present time is to give advice and

assistance to cooperative marketing associations which are now being organized. Virginia has a new cooperative law and many new associations will perhaps be organized within the next few years. The plan is for these associations to submit their plans of organization, contracts, etc., to the Virginia Advisory Committee for criticism and advice. After the Advisory Committee has gone over the plans they will be the best that can be drawn up under the light of present experience and will have the endorsement of all farm organizations and agricultural agencies in the State. This will not only give the cooperative a good plan but will prevent the opportunity for friction between farm organizations.

The Director of Agricultural Extension Work is Chairman of this committee. The committee meets regularly once each year during the summer session of the State Farmers' Institute and has additional meetings whenever the Chairman may think necessary. Though this committee has been in operation only a short while, it is destined to play a large part in the development of Virginia's agriculture.

The specialists in the Extension Division keep in close touch with such educational organizations as the State Dairyman's Association, State Crop Improvement Association, etc. In some cases they act as secretaries of such organizations.

Sources of Extension Revenue.

The Agricultural Extension Division of Virginia is financed by appropriations made: (1) Directly to the United States Department of Agriculture and Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work; (2) appropriations for cooperative extension work in accordance with the terms of the Federal Smith-Lever act; (3) appropriations for cooperative extension work in accordance with terms of the Federal Extension Act; (4) appropriations and contributions by counties and cities, and (5) appropriations from other sources such as farm organizations, chambers of commerce, etc.

The total appropriations for agricultural extension work in Virginia for the

year 1921-22 were as follows:

Farmers Cooperative Demonstration Work - - - - -	\$ 35,000.00
Federal Smith-Lever - - - - -	124,536.64
State Smith-Lever - - - - -	114,536.64
Federal Extension Fund - - - - -	47,723.52
State Extension Fund - - - - -	47,723.52
County Appropriations - - - - -	69,932.02
Local Appropriations from Farmers' Associations, etc. - - - - -	<u>12,470.92</u>
Total	\$ 449,922.95

The amounts shown above are the amounts budgeted for the year 1921-22. A number of slight changes were made throughout the year in the appropriations from the various sources. However, the amount of money received was approximately as set forth. A complete financial statement showing all receipts and expenditures has been prepared and submitted to the President of the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute and to the Chief of the States Relations Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. All information as to detailed expenditures for the year can be gotten from this report.

It can be seen from the above brief statement that a considerable sum of money is now being spent in doing agricultural extension work in the State, but it must be remembered that Virginia is a large State and if we are to follow out the original intention of the Smith-Lever Act and provide a farm demonstration agent and a home demonstration agent for each county, together with the proper amount of special help and administrative supervision, a much larger sum will be needed. It must also be remembered that Virginia, like all other Southern States, has to carry on a dual system of extension work on account of its negro population. It has been found that in order to do successful work among the negroes negro agents must be provided to do this work. In order to do the work contemplated under the Smith-Lever Act as it should be done in Virginia there should be a minimum of 90 farm demonstration agents, 75 home demonstration agents, 40 negro agents, 25 specialists, and 12 administrative officers, together with sufficient clerical and stenographic help to allow these employees to be of greatest service to the people. This means that there should be at least 50 more regular extension agents in the State

than are employed at the present time. The minimum salary and travel expenses for each agent will be around \$3,000 per year. Extra supplies, equipment and stenographic help will probably amount to \$25,000 additional per year. So, in order to complete an extension program reaching every part of the State, the Extension Division of Virginia needs at least \$175,000 additional annually. It is hoped that the various counties throughout the State will appreciate the importance of the work to the extent that they will be willing to raise a large part of this additional sum from county sources. The Virginia counties appropriate less for extension work than the counties in almost any other State. In many States large sums are received from farm organizations and associations. We would prefer, in this State, that all the money come from public sources, and for this reason we hope that the county Boards of Supervisors may appropriate the additional sums needed.

Changes in Personnel.

There have been quite a number of changes in the personnel of the Extension Division during the past year. However, we may always expect such changes until we are able to pay better salaries. At the present time the salaries of Virginia extension workers are among the lowest in the United States, hence, when an extension worker makes good and some other State makes him an offer it is a great temptation for the worker to accept the offer. In spite of the low salaries paid the extension workers in Virginia are very efficient and unusually loyal. This is the strength of the organization. Most of the workers love their work and are consequently rendering a real service.

The table given below shows the names of the extension workers in Virginia from July 1st, 1921, to June 30th, 1922, under the various projects, and gives the date of employment of new employees and the date of resignation of those who left the work.

Project 1-A Administration

<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>	<u>Date Employed</u> 1921-22	<u>Date Resigned</u> 1921-22
John E. Hutchison	Director		
E. R. Price	Editor		
Chas. I. Wade	Treasurer		
Pemberton Thacker	Accountant		
J. H. Graft	Assistant Treasurer		
Minnie Davidson	Secretary to Director		
J. S. Schaeffer	Supply Clerk		
Basel Swarley	Stenographer	March 15, 1922	July 1, 1922
Ruth Puckett	Stenographer		February 1, 1922
Louise Haley	Stenographer	July 1, 1921	
Mrs. A. H. Faulkner	File Clerk		
Mary Reynolds	Clerk		
Cora Phleger	Clerk	March 1, 1922	June 16, 1922
Leon Price	Janitor		
A. Wirt	Janitor		

Project 2 - Printing and Publications

Carrie Schaeffer	Clerk		
Estelle Kinser	Stenographer		
Annie Shafer	Stenographer		
Glenn Longworth	Clerk	June 1, 1922	

Project 3 - County Farm Demonstration Agents

W. P. Moore	Assistant Director		
J. G. Bruce	District Agent		
F. S. Farrar	District Agent		
J. H. Quisenberry	District Agent		
W. C. Shackelford	District Agent		
Anna Burton	Secretary to Assistant Director		
Birdie Smith	Stenographer		
Joe Sellinger, Jr.	County Agent	October 1, 1921	
F. S. Blandford	County Agent		November 1, 1921
E. Z. Sondurant	County Agent		
E. V. Breeden	County Agent		
W. L. Browning	County Agent		
T. D. Barfoot	County Agent		
W. H. Byrns	County Agent		
W. S. Campfield	Assistant County Agent	March 12, 1922	
O. H. Oakes	County Agent		
L. M. Cole, Jr.	County Agent		
S. L. Cole	County Agent		
J. Taylor Collins	Assistant County Agent		January 1, 1922
O. H. Cox	County Agent		
E. S. Crasford	County Agent	January 1, 1922	
B. H. Crosby	County Agent		
J. W. Delp	County Agent		
H. B. Derr	County Agent		
Jas. R. DuShane	County Agent	August 1, 1921	

Name	Position	Date Employed 1921-22	Date Resigned 1921-22
Gordon A. Alcan	County Agent		
K. H. Ellis	County Agent		
C. E. Fisher	County Agent		
J. E. Gish	County Agent		
R. H. Gist	County Agent		
E. C. Grigsby	County Agent		
E. W. Grubb	County Agent		
G. C. Harris	Assistant County Agent		
H. J. Holberton	County Agent		
J. D. Hutchinson, Jr.	County Agent	August 1, 1921	
J. B. Inskip	Assistant County Agent	October 1, 1921	November 1, 1921
B. V. Jones	County Agent	January 1, 1922	
J. Nick Jones	County Agent		
W. L. Kirby	County Agent		
Claude S. Leffel	County Agent		
J. B. Lewis	County Agent		
M. C. Lewis	County Agent		
W. H. Linthicum	County Agent		
J. Ross Lintner	County Agent		
H. S. Lippincott	County Agent	May 1, 1922	
H. F. Motehee	Assistant County Agent	August 1, 1921	July 1, 1922
H. A. McSwain	County Agent		
F. C. Manley	County Agent		
W. O. Martin	County Agent		
Frank Michaux	County Agent		
V. E. Miller	Assistant County Agent		September 1, 1921
J. F. Monroe	County Agent		
J. L. Montague	County Agent		
H. L. Moore	Assistant County Agent	June 15, 1922	
H. B. Oliver, Jr.	County Agent		
H. W. Oslin	County Agent		
D. I. Painter	Assistant County Agent	October 20, 1921	
W. T. Parker	County Agent		
G. W. Patterson, Jr.	County Agent		
Y. S. Perry	County Agent		
W. M. Perry	County Agent		
Chas. W. Phillips	County Agent		November 22, 1921
J. W. Ponce	County Agent		
W. H. Porter	County Agent		
F. L. Portlock	County Agent		
C. W. Richards	County Agent	July 25, 1921	
J. W. Rogers	County Agent		
O. B. Rose	County Agent		
W. P. Sadler	County Agent		November 1, 1921
W. E. Schmidt	Assistant County Agent	May 1, 1922	
W. S. Shelton	Assistant County Agent		August 13, 1921
E. M. Slauson	County Agent	November 1, 1921	
W. I. Smith	County Agent		
J. C. Stiles	County Agent		
H. C. Stokes	County Agent		
S. J. Teel	County Agent		
T. J. Thompson, Jr.	Assistant County Agent	January 1, 1922	
J. A. Trevathan	County Agent	February 1, 1922	
L. E. Walker, Jr.	County Agent		

Name	Position	Date Employed 1921-22	Date Resigned 1921-22
A. R. Wall	County Agent		January 1, 1922
C. W. Wampler	County Agent		
B. A. Warriner	County Agent		
J. A. Wesson	County Agent		
D. V. Wiley	County Agent		
H. L. Wiley	County Agent		
W. W. Wilkins	County Agent		
B. F. Williams	County Agent		
H. H. Williams, Jr.	County Agent		
J. D. Willis	County Agent		
F. C. Wilson	County Agent	November 10, 1921	March 15, 1922

Project 4 - County Home Demonstration Agents

Mrs. E. E. Davis	State Agent		
Miss L. T. Walker	Food Specialist		
Miss Belle Hughes	Girls' Club Agent		
Miss Aldona Oliver	Clothing Specialist		
Miss Belle Burke	District Agent		
Miss Mary Helen Ferris	District Agent		August 10, 1921
Miss Elizabeth Rossion	District Agent		
Miss Sylvia Clocum	District Agent		
Margaret Walker	Secretary to State Agent		
Miss Mary Ambler	Home Dem. Agent		April 1, 1922
Mrs. John A. Barker	Assistant Home Dem. Agent	April 1, 1922	May 1, 1922
Mrs. W. V. Armstrong	Assistant Home Dem. Agent	June 16, 1922	
Miss S. A. Birmingham	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Ruth Jarrass	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Nessie Byer	Home Dem. Agent		
Mrs. E. A. Campbell	Home Dem. Agent		
Mrs. Jennie F. Carter	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Yashti Cove	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Lucie Cleaton	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Harriet Cocke	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Martha C. Cook	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Gally Guy Davis	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Emma de Corse	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Martha Minwiddie	Home Dem. Agent	January 1, 1922	
Miss Bessie Dunn	Home Dem. Agent		
Mrs. W. W. Edwards	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Belle Ferguson	Home Dem. Agent		
Mrs. C. S. Ferguson	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Carrie Fitzgerald	Assistant Home Dem. Agent		December 15, 1921
Miss Angie Garrett	Home Dem. Agent	February 1, 1922	
Miss Lillian Gilbert	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Claudia Hays	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Ruth Hammerly	Home Dem. Agent		October 1, 1921
Mrs. C. E. Jacobs	Home Dem. Agent	September 17, 1921	July 1, 1922
Miss Annie Hayer	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Grace Hoel	Assistant Home Dem. Agent	June 15, 1922	
Miss Eleanor Hubbard	Home Dem. Agent	July 18, 1921	
Miss Ann W. C. Jones	Home Dem. Agent		January 1, 1922
Mrs. Margaret King	Home Dem. Agent	April 1, 1922	
Miss Blanche Lindwood	Home Dem. Agent		

Name	Position	Date Employed 1921-22	Date Resigned 1921-22
Miss Jessie Logan	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Eleanor Earlin	Home Dem. Agent	August 12, 1921	
Miss Edith Minor	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Sisie Moffett	Home Dem. Agent		August 1, 1922
Miss Roberts Monroe	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Marguerite Montgomery	Home Dem. Agent	April 1, 1922	
Miss Mary Mooren	Home Dem. Agent	June 1, 1922	
Miss Helen Ricks	Home Dem. Agent	February 1, 1922	
Miss Laura Rutherford	Home Dem. Agent	June 19, 1922	
Miss Helen Tass	Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Anna L. Walker	Home Dem. Agent		

Project 5 - Cheese Making

Wayne G. McCowan	Cheese Specialist		April 1, 1922
I. G. Gibson	Cheese Specialist	May 21, 1922	
H. F. Irwin	Asst. Cheese Specialist		

Project 6 - Animal Husbandry

J. F. Keen	Animal Husbandman		
G. C. Herring	Assistant Animal Husbandman		
Mary Gray	Stenographer		

Project 7 - Horticulture

G. S. Halston	Horticulturist		
F. A. Metz	Assistant Horticulturist		
Kent Apperson	Assistant Horticulturist		
C. S. Littlejohn		April 21, 1922	May 25, 1922
L. B. Robinson		May 20, 1922	
Margaret Coleman	Stenographer		

Project 7-A - Gardening

A. G. Smith, Jr.	Garden Specialist		
J. F. Rheart	Assistant Garden Specialist	September 1, 1921	

Project 8 - Dairying

W. D. Saunders	Dairy Specialist		
F. A. Buchanan	Dairy Husbandman		
Elizabeth Glenn	Stenographer		

Project 9 - Marketing and Farm Economics

G. F. Barber	Farm Economics Specialist		
--------------	---------------------------	--	--

Project 10 - Drainage

Chas. A. Seitz	Agricultural Engineer		
John S. Glenn	Assistant Agricultural Engineer		
H. B. Boynton	Assistant Agricultural Engineer		
Helen Hughes	Stenographer	January 1, 1922	

Name	Position	Date Employed 1921-22	Date Resigned 1921-22
<u>Project 11 - Negro Women</u>			
Miss Lizzie Jenkins	District Agent		
Mary Greene	Stenographer		
Mrs. B. J. Pierce	Clerk		
Mrs. M. C. Allen	Local Home Dem. Agent		
Miss Rachel Carter	Local Home Dem. Agent		
Mrs. G. C. Crowder	Local Home Dem. Agent	November 1, 1921	
Mrs. Youtha S. Flagg	Local Home Dem. Agent		
Mrs. Elda C. Fletcher	Local Home Dem. Agent	December 1, 1921	
Mrs. Ava G. Sanders	Local Home Dem. Agent		
Mrs. S. V. T. Smith	Local Home Dem. Agent		

Project 12 - Negro Men

J. E. Bagley	Local District Agent		
John L. Charity	Local District Agent		
G. M. Oliver	Local District Agent		
Mary Greene	Stenographer		
G. C. Archer	Local Agent		
F. A. Bowman	Local Agent	October 1, 1921	
L. W. Bradley	Local Agent		
F. W. Callahan	Local Agent	January 1, 1922	
W. E. Craighoad	Local Agent		
J. T. Cross	Local Agent		
A. B. Doles	Local Agent		
W. E. George	Local Agent		
H. C. Green	Local Agent		
G. U. Greer	Local Agent		
H. D. Jones	Local Agent		
R. F. Jones	Local Agent		
J. W. Lancaster	Local Agent		
H. D. Lemon	Local Agent		
J. W. Logan	Local Agent		
M. D. Morse	Local Agent		
A. W. Pagan	Local Agent		
Randolph Ruffin	Local Agent		
Alexander Scott	Local Agent		
B. H. Smith	Local Agent		
W. H. Walton	Local Agent		
R. M. W. Washington	Local Agent		
J. T. Wilson	Local Agent		
R. L. Wynn	Local Agent		

Project 13 - Bee Club Work

F. S. Andrews	Bee Specialist
---------------	----------------

Project 14 - Boys' Club Work

Chas. C. Barr	State Boys' Club Agent
C. A. Montgomery	Asst. State Boys' Club Agent
Pearl Swocker	Secretary to Club Agent

Name	Position	Date Employed	Date Resigned
<u>Project 16 - Agronomy</u>			
W. G. Wyster	Agronomist		
G. A. Jackson	Assistant Agronomist	September 14, 1921	
Elizabeth Sprinkle	Stenographer		
<u>Project 17 - Plant Pathology</u>			
H. C. Thomas	Assistant Pathologist		
Glenn Glase	Assistant Pathologist	June 1, 1922	
<u>Project 19 - Poultry</u>			
A. J. Creakle	Poultry Husbandman		
A. L. Dean	Associate Poultry Husbandman		
Miss Bessie Hodsdon	Asst. Poultry Specialist		
Mrs. A. V. Creakle	Asst. to Poultry Husbandman		
Effie Blankenship	Stenographer		

Methods of Increasing Efficiency

Every effort has been made to increase the efficiency of the extension workers throughout the State. In addition to the annual conference, special sectional conferences have been held for the purpose of studying problems peculiar to certain sections. For instance, a number of special meetings were called of the county agents in the peanut and tobacco territories where marketing organizations were being started. Special dairy and poultry meetings for training the workers were also held during the year. The quarterly meetings of the administrative officers of extension work with the College and Experiment Station workers have been continued. Representatives from various farm organizations have been called in from time to time and out of these meetings has grown the Virginia Agricultural Advisory Committee mentioned in this report. This committee is composed of one representative from each farmers' organization and agricultural institution throughout the State. This State Advisory Committee is of special value in working out agricultural policies and in showing the officers of the Extension Division how they can best direct their energies.

The county agents during the past year have drawn up better plans of work than ever before. They are calling on the leaders of the various communities to help work

out these plans. There has been a larger response from the farmers along this line than heretofore. Instead of the county agent working out a plan based entirely on his own experience, he is trying to work out a plan based on the needs of the community. It is hoped that in the future we will have more county plans of work made up from the needs of the communities in the county, which plans have been drawn up with the assistance of the county agents, the district agents, the specialists, and the farm leaders.

The specialists have also continued to draw up definite plans of work for their departments. In each project where more than one specialist is employed, the ranking specialist is made head of the department and is held responsible for the work in that project. The plans of work of the specialists are based largely on the calls from the county agents and the needs of the State. At the end of the year a detailed report is made by the head of the specialist's department showing the work accomplished under his project.

Separate reports showing the detailed work done under each project are submitted herewith.

Project 1-B

College Men's Travel

A small sum is budgeted from extension funds each year under this project to pay the traveling expenses of certain employees of the College on field trips for the Extension Division. Extension work in this State has grown so rapidly it often happens that we do not have enough specialists to answer the calls for help from the county agents and the farmers throughout the State. When this happens, the Extension Division calls on the heads of departments of the College and Experiment Station for help in meeting these demands. The employees of the College and Experiment Station are very willing to make these field trips if the Extension Division will pay the travel expenses. During the past year the Extension Division has received help from practically all of the College departments along this line. The Departments of Agronomy, Plant Pathology and Dairying have been called on most often and have rendered special service.

The arrangement under this project works to the mutual advantage of the College and the Extension Division.