

VIRGINIA

1959

NARRATIVE REPORT

J. B. Flora

District Agent

West Central District

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. TITLE PAGE	
II. TABLE OF CONTENTS	
III. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES	1
A. Assigned Administrative Responsibilities	1
B. Supervisory Responsibilities	1
C. Other Responsibilities	1
IV. MAJOR SUPERVISORY ACCOMPLISHMENTS	2
A. Budgets	2
B. County Extension Agent Training	5
C. Extension Office Equipment and Working Conditions	6
D. 4-H Club Work	8
V. FOR SPECIAL CONSIDERATION	10
A. Program Projection	10
B. Significant Achievement of Extension Work	12
VI. EVALUATION	12

III. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES.

This report includes the supervisory activities of West Central District composed of sixteen counties: Alleghany, Bath, Bedford, Botetourt, Campbell, Craig, Floyd, Franklin, Halifax, Henry, Highland, Montgomery, Patrick, Pittsylvania, Roanoke and Rockbridge. In the district, there are 16 county agent, 20 assistant county agent, and 19½ secretary positions.

A. Assigned Administrative Responsibilities.

The supervisor's assigned administrative functions include personnel, budget and finance, promotion, transfer, dismissal and coordination.

B. Supervisory Responsibilities.

Supervisory responsibilities include program development, agent training, building morale, relationship and evaluation.

C. Other Responsibilities.

Coordinating the Extension program with state agencies, chambers of commerce, publicity, civic groups, farm organizations, and developing congenial public relations.

IV. MAJOR SUPERVISORY ACCOMPLISHMENTS.

A. Budgets.

Due to the low percentage of county appropriations for the Extension Service, the administration felt that the county appropriations should be increased. In the past several years, county Extension appropriations have not increased in proportion to other appropriations administered by the county.

Increasing the county appropriations would strengthen the possibility of getting more state appropriations; impress the county governing bodies, and the increased cost and responsibilities of the Extension program would create closer relationship with the county governing body and the Extension Service.

The district agents went over the appropriations in each county and suggested the increase. This was approved by the administrative staff. The approved form was signed by Mr. Daughtrey and a letter drafted by the district agents to the key people in each county. The increase in appropriations for 1959 indicated that this method was appreciated by the Boards of Supervisors. We hope the same will be true in the future.

These increases were for the total Extension program in the county regardless of what individuals were credited with the increase. The response was very favorable. There was an increase in appropriations of \$2565 for nine county agents and six assistant county agents in ten counties.

Each county presented a different problem. Individual members of the Boards of Supervisors and county officials were informed of the present situation and encouraged to adjust. It was great help to get an additional appropriation included in the proposed budget for the coming year. District agents then met with the Boards of Supervisors to justify, request and secure approval.

The results varied. Some Boards of Supervisors allotted the full request; others reduced the request, but increased the appropriation; and others rejected. All county governing bodies expressed themselves as being favorable toward the Extension program but the lack of funds was their reason for not making any increased appropriations.

Financial support for county agents and assistant county agents:

<u>County</u>	<u>1955</u>	<u>1956</u>	<u>1957</u>	<u>1958</u>	<u>1959</u>
Alleghany					
County Agent	2200	2200	2400	2600	2600
Bath					
County Agent	1500	1500	1500	1500	1600
Bedford					
County Agent	1800	1800	2040	2140	2340
Assistant Co. Agt.	1400	1400	1400	1600	1800
Botetourt					
County Agent	1800	1800	1800	1800	2000
Asst. Co. Agent	1400	1400	1400	1400	1500
Campbell					
County Agent	1800	1800	1800	2000	2000
Asst. Co. Agent	1400	1400	1400	1600	1600
Craig					
County Agent	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200
Floyd					
County Agent	1200	1200	1200	1300	1400
Franklin					
County Agent	1800	1800	2000	2000	2000
Asst. Co. Agent	1400	1400	1400	1500	1600
Asst. Co. Agent				600	600
Halifax					
County Agent	2200	2200	2200	2200	2400
Asst. Co. Agent	1200	1200	1600	1600	1600
Asst. Co. Agent	935	936	1187	1187	1187
Asst. Co. Agent	936	936	936	1435	1600
Henry					
County Agent	2000	2000	2000	2100	2300
Asst. Co. Agent	1600	1600	1600	1700	1700
Highland					
County Agent	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200

<u>County</u>	<u>1955</u>	<u>1956</u>	<u>1957</u>	<u>1958</u>	<u>1959</u>
Montgomery					
County Agent	1500	1500	1500	1700	1800
Asst. Co. Agent	700	700	1400	1500	1600
Patrick					
County Agent	1300	1300	1800	1800	1800
Asst. Co. Agent	700	700	1000	1200	1200
Pittsylvania					
County Agent	1800	1800	1800	1800	2200
Asst. Co. Agent	1200	1200	1200	1200	1200
Asst. Co. Agent	1200	1200	1600	1600	1600
Asst. Co. Agent	1400	1400	1400	1400	1600
Roanoke					
County Agent	1720	17200	2000	2400	2400
Asst. Co. Agent	1400	1400	1600	2000	2000
Rockbridge					
County Agent	1800	1800	1800	1800	2000
Asst. Co. Agent	1400	1400	1400	1400	1400

B. County Extension Agent Training.

County agents rely too heavy on specialists to conduct meetings and demonstrations. Area training meetings were conducted to develop better knowledge, information and coordination between district agents, specialists, and county workers. Training meetings were held as follows: Five in 4-H Club work, five in poultry, nine in dairy, two in entomology, eight in livestock, two for wool

growers, four days were spent in district meetings and four days in Communications Training. Also available to agents was a fertilizer and agronomy school at Christiansburg, Vegetable Field Day at VPI, Field Day at Clatham Experiment Station, agronomy school at Brookneal, Meat Information School at Lynchburg and a tour to Front Royal and Middleburg.

Conferences of district agents with specialists were held in various departments to be able to better inform the agents and develop within the agents more confidence and responsibility.

The results were better informed county workers; local people had more respect for the agents' ability. This strengthens the Extension prestige in the counties.

C. Extension Office Equipment and Working Conditions.

There has been definite improvement during the year in office space in four counties, improved equipment in sixteen counties, and improved office layout in eleven counties. The objective was to supply each office with sufficient equipment and adequate space in order for them to disseminate information on time and provide better working conditions, especially for the secretaries.

Rating of office space and equipment in West Central

Districts:

<u>County</u>	<u>Office Space</u>	<u>Equipment</u>
Alleghany	Fair	Very Good
Bath	Good	Very Good
Bedford	Good	Very Good
Botetourt	Very Good	Very Good
Campbell	Good	Very Good
Craig	Very Good	Very Good
Floyd	Excellent	Very Good
Franklin	Fair	Excellent
Halifax	Fair	Very Good
Henry	Good	Very Good
Highland	Very Good	Very Good
Montgomery	Good	Very Good
Patrick	Very Good	Very Good
Pittsylvania	Very Good	Very Good
Rosnoke	Excellent	Very Good
Rockbridge	Good	Very Good

The approved state filing system was installed in Bath, Floyd, Montgomery and Roanoke Counties. The district agents spent two days in each county. Although the work was strenuous, the fellowship in working with the agents was most helpful and all of the counties where the system has been set up, the staff are very much pleased with the new system. We feel that this will be a great help in the entire district when it is completed.

D. 4-H Club Work.

Effort was made to get increased participation in membership, contests, junior leaders, adult leaders, camps, and to develop a program which would be of interest to older boys and girls, and to emphasize the importance of good relationship with sponsors and supporters of the 4-H program. One-half day at the fall district meeting was devoted to training and informing agents on 4-H Club work, especially on new projects available.

District contests were held in one day and sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce and others. District agents, in cooperation with agents, held meetings with commercial firms, various organizations and groups keeping them informed of

the value and importance of their support of 4-H Club work. The number of junior and adult leaders increased showing a more enthusiastic interest in the over-all 4-H and YMW programs. More older boys and girls were induced to continue with 4-H work. State and district contests increased as illustrated in the following table:

<u>County</u>	<u>State Awards 1957</u>	<u>State Awards 1958</u>	<u>State Awards 1959</u>	<u>Trips Cong. 1957</u>	<u>Trips Cong. 1958</u>	<u>Trips Cong. 1959</u>
Alleghany	0	0	1	0	0	0
Bath	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bedford	7	9	6	2	1	4
Botetourt	1	3	0	1	1	0
Campbell	9	5	3	0	0	1
Craig	0	2	0	0	0	0
Floyd	2	2	6	1	1	0
Franklin	2	4	6	1	1	1
Halifax	1	9	3	1	4	2
Henry	0	3	0	0	0	0
Highland	1	1	0	1	0	0
Montgomery	0	1	1	0	0	0
Patrick	1	1	0	0	0	0
Pittsylvania	1	1	1	1	0	0
Roanoke	3	9	7	3	1	2
Rockbridge	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
TOTAL	22	65	40	11	10	12

V. FOR SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.

A. Program Projection.

Acquaint key people of the county with information to help them recognize the needs and problems that existed in the county; clarify the role of Extension in helping to solve these problems; and supply background information to show the local people what the situation actually is in the county.

Informative meetings with key people of the county making them conscious of the intense interest of the Extension agents in helping them to solve their problems. Small discussion groups to increase participation on the part of the local people and develop more leadership.

District agents and county Extension personnel held office conferences to discuss feasible approach to the problem. Counsel with the key people and assist them in the selection of commodities or special interest committees to study the situation and possibilities.

Better informed public of the over-all Extension group; develop a genuine approach by the Extension agents. The local people were more aware of the actual situation, especially the role of the Extension workers. People more readily accepted the responsibility and were willing to actively go ahead.

The Public Relations Survey was discussed by Mr. P. H. Dehart and Mr. G. C. Herring at the district meeting. Each county was requested to send in two of their best public relations jobs and two of their greatest needs. Two of the best from this group was selected from West Central District and sent to the state office.

The table below shows the progress of program development and plans of work in the different counties:

<u>County</u>	<u>Program Development</u>	<u>Plan of Work</u>
Alleghany	Fair	Good
Bath	Fair	Good
Bedford	Good	Very Good
Botetourt	Very Good	Very Good
Campbell	Good	Good
Craig	Very Good	Very Good
Floyd	Very Good	Good
Franklin	Very Good	Very Good
Halifax	Very Good	Very Good
Henry	Very Good	Very Good
Highland	Fair	Good
Montgomery	Very Good	Very Good
Patrick	Very Good	Very Good
Pittsylvania	Very Good	Very Good
Roanoke	Very Good	Very Good
Rockbridge	Good	Good

B. Significant Achievement of Extension Work.

A meeting was held of the agents in West Central District, district agent and specialists from VPI to discuss the possibility of holding a West Central Dairy Show.

It was decided to hold this Dairy Show at the Virginia Artificial Breeding Association Center on August 4th. The following committees were set up: Chairman, W. F. Teel; vice-chairman, Larry Boitnott; secretary, C. C. Tucker; treasurer, Galen Brubaker; finance committee, Galen Brubaker, W. H. Armstrong, W. N. Patterson and J. B. Flora. H. S. Reynolds, N. A. Boone and E. S. Allen were appointed to work out the details for the show. Ninety-two animals were exhibited and between four hundred and five hundred people attended this event although it was a rainy day.

This show was well received by the dairymen in the counties and those participating were very much pleased and expressed the desire to make this an annual event. The agents who participated were also very much interested and a District Dairy Show is planned for 1960.

VI. EVALUATION.

During the year, the district agents jointly held a private staff conference with each county staff and went over the entire Evaluation form. This proved most helpful and was one of the best

conferences ever held with the county staff. They seemed to appreciate us taking the time to go over the form with them.

Since that, I have not been able to make evaluation of all individual workers, but I am working on it and plan to complete this in the near future.

This has meant a great deal in agent morale, understanding, interest and development to the Extension work in the district.

Agents created closer contact and relationship with county Boards of Supervisors and local governing bodies.

Developed better working relationship of the Extension agents in the counties. Coordinated the Extension program including specialists.

Was unable to give enough personal help in the counties on the local county program. Too lax on disbursing information to proper government officials. Not enough individual counseling with agents.