

Chapter 2

KSU Cooperative Extension II

The Developing Years—1914-1929

Contents

A New Beginning.....	32	Fairs Replace Institutes—1923	48
Smith-Lever Act—1914.....	32	Institute Numbers Decline—1920's	48
County Farm Bureau Law—1915.....	32	Agricultural Trains—1914-28	48
Extension Growth in Kansas—1915	32	Fairs and Shows—1920s-30s.....	49
Organization & Administration 1914-19.....	32	Extension Schools	49
Organization and Administration—1917	34	Early Schools—1914.....	49
Home Economics Work—1917.....	34	Schedule More Schools—1915	49
Other Outreach Programs—1914-17.....	34	Demand for Repeat Schools—1916.....	50
First Official Roster for Cooperative Ext.....	33	Winter Schools—1918.....	50
Personnel Selection Criteria—1914.....	35	Commodity Groups—1923	50
Emergency Co. Extension Agents, WWI	35	Community Organization—1923.....	51
State Specialist Staff—1919	35	County Farm Bureau Law	51
Organize County Extension—1920-51.....	35	Effect of County Farm Bureau Law—1915	51
First Horticulture Agent—1928.....	35	County Farm Bureau Law—1915.....	52
Finances—1915	35	Farm Bureau Organization—1915	52
Accept Smith-Lever Act—1915	35	County FB Memberships—1915-51	52
Plans for Smith-Lever Funds—1915	36	Men Memberships in County FB.....	53
Use of Initial Smith-Lever Funds—1914-15	36	Women Memberships in County FB.....	53
Budget/Staff Concerns—1911-27	37	County Farm Bureau Dues—1915-17	53
Careful Accounting of Funds—1915.....	37	Amend Farm Bureau Law—1919.....	53
Receipts & Disbursements Summary—1915	37	Review Constitution—1929	54
Sources of Revenue—1917	37	Farm Bureau Constitution Revision—1929.....	54
Initial Salary by Years—1912-21	38	Interpret Kansas Extension Law—1929	55
Length of Service—1920s.....	38	County Organization—1915-29	55
Salaries of County Extension Agents—1921	38	Farm & Home Week	56
Sources of Revenue—1921-22.....	38	Change in Date—1918.....	56
Legislative Appropriation—1922	39	Many Attend—1921	56
Outlook for Extension Work in Kansas.....	39	4-H Club Roundup—1923.....	56
Finances: Sources of Revenue—1924	39	Feature 10 Courses—1926.....	57
County Support—1925.....	39	New Program Framework—1927.....	57
Assistance to Counties—1924.....	39	Emergency Programs.....	57
Staff Meetings—1927	40	World War I—1917-18.....	57
Farm Bureau Organizers—1915-17	40	Emergency Extension Agents —1917-19.....	58
Farm Bureau Constitution & By-Laws—1914	41	Plan of County Defense Organization—1917	59
County Agent Work—1914-18.....	42	Emergency Farm Bureau—1917-18	59
Establish Extension Department—1918	43	Home Economics in War Effort—1917	60
Dept. of County Agent Work—1914-61	44	Special Campaigns—1918-19	60
Early Agent Work Supervision—1914.....	44	Federal Seed Wheat Loans—1918	60
Cooperative Agreement—1915-88	44	Grasshopper Campaign—1918.....	60
Department of County Agent Work—1917	44	Supply Feed to Southwest Kansas—1918.....	60
County Agent Work Personnel—1919.....	44	Jackrabbit Eradication—1918-19.....	61
Department of County Agent Work—1920-22	44	Harvest Labor—1919	61
Commemorate County Agent Work—1922	45	Thresher Schools—1919.....	61
Programs Following the Smith-Lever Act (1914)	46	Cutworm Campaign—1919	61
Women's Auxiliary—1914.....	46	State Farm Bureau—1918.....	61
Girls' Club—1914.....	46	Membership Campaign—1920.....	64
Changing Role of Institute—1915	46	Counties With Extension—1919	65
Name Change to Farm/Home Week—1915	46	Kansas Farm Bureau Finances—1919-30.....	65
Projects—1916.....	47	Low Incomes Affect Dues—1929-30.....	67
Demonstration Results—1916	47	Co. FB Membership & Dues— 1919-20	67
Hessian Fly Control—1916.....	47	County Levy/ Limitaions—1919-61.....	69
Hog Cholera—1916.....	47	Extension Funding Problems—1920	69
Boys' and Girls' Clubs—1916.....	47	Annual Meeting—1920's.....	70
4-H Projects—1916.....	47	New Organizations—1921-24	70
4-H Enrollment—1916.....	47	Problems Collecting Dues—1922	70
Epidemic Cancels Meetings—1918-19.....	47	Interpret State Law—1922.....	70
Some Institutes Quit—1919-20	47		

Reasons for Farm Bureau Drop-Out—1926	71	Assistant County Agents—1924-25	79
Personnel Improvements—1926	71	Home Demonstration Agents—1928	79
County/State Farm Bureau Membership—1924	71	Club Agents—1929	79
Annual Ext. Conference as Personnel Training	71	First County Agricultural Agents—through 1925	80
Annual Extension Conference—1919	71	Early Home Demonstration Agents—through 1925	82
Annual Conference—1924	72	Early County Club Agents—through 1925	83
Federal Inspector's Report—1920	74	Budget/Staff Concerns—1928	83
Programs from 1919 to 1929	74	Budget Problems—1928	83
Extension Programs—1919	74	Luncheon Meetings—1928	84
Define Specialists' Roles—1921	75	Club Agent Positions Lost—1929-32	84
State Fair Exhibits—1921-22	75	Growth of Central Staff—1929	84
Extension Projects—1925	75	Capper-Ketcham Act—1928	85
Methods of Procedure—1925	75	Finances—1926-31	86
Plan of Work—1925	76	Early Appropriation Amounts—1926-31	85
Scheduling—1925	76	Financial Situation—1928	85
Long-Time Projects—1925	76	Extension Projects—1929	86
Drop Home Ec Supervision Project—1926	76	Chronological Changes in Organization—1905-36	88
County Project Exhibit Contest—1927	76	1) Administration—1905-11	89
New Standards for Specialist Help—1929	77	2) Information	89
Study Leaders and Practicies—1929	77	3) County Agent Work—1915-62	89
Kansas Bankers Association	77	4) Extension Home Economics—1910-36	89
Banker-Farmer Project—1925	77	5) Boys' and Girls' Club Work	89
County Club Agents—1923	78	6) Supervision of Agricultural Specialists	89
County Home Demonstration Agents—1924	78	7) Engineering Extension—1912-14	89
Assistant County Agricultural Agents—1924	78	8) Continuing Education—1910-36	89
New Extension Positions—1924-29	79	9) Extension Supervisory Districts—1923-36	90
Employ Assistant Agents—1924	79		

A New Beginning—1914

Smith-Lever Act—1914

The second important era of Cooperative Extension work in Kansas began with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act by Congress in 1914.

The Smith-Lever Act provided a continuing Federal appropriation to states for further development of Extension programs.

County Farm Bureau Law—1915

In 1915, the Kansas legislature passed the County Farm Bureau Law. It authorized county appropriations to help support Extension work in the counties.

Extension Growth in Kansas—1915

At the end of his report for 1915, Dean and Director Edward Johnson made this comment:

This report would not be complete without a tribute to Dean J. H. Miller, who was in charge of the Extension work from 1905 to July, 1915.

His love for his state, sincerity of purpose, indomitable energy and organizing ability, coupled with the guiding hand of a President of wide vision and with a liberal administration made possible an organization capable and willing to render service to every last family on the Kansas farms.

Because of people's interest and legal provisions for financial support, the Kansas Extension Service gradually developed active programs in every county of the State.

Organization & Administration—1914-19

In his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, Extension Director Edward Johnson made this statement relative to Organization and Administration:

The Agricultural Extension Division is organized with a 'Dean of College Extension' at its head. For the fiscal year of 1914-15, the Division consists of the following departments: Institutes and Demonstrations, Rural Engineering, Home Economics, Home Study

Service, and Rural Service.

In the Department of Institutes and Demonstrations the Director of Extension is assisted by a County Agent Leader, a Superintendent of Institutes, an Assistant Superintendent who has charge of Extension Schools, a State Leader of Boys' and Girls' Club Work, a Farm Management Demonstrator, six Agricultural Specialists, four District Agricultural Agents, and 10 County Agents.

First Official Roster for Cooperative Extension

KANSAS STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE 1914-15

H. J. Waters, President

Board of Administration

E. T. Hackney

E. H. Hoch

Mrs. Cora G. Lewis

Division of College Extension

J. H. Miller, Dean and Director

Institute and Demonstration Department

Edw. C. Johnson, Superintendent

A. S. Neale, Ass't. Superintendent

P. E. Crabtree, Farm Management

Geo. O. Greene, Horticulturist

Chas. H. Taylor, Animal Husbandry

H. J. Bower, Soils

Thos. J. Talbert, Entomology

Ross M. Sherwood, Poultry Husbandry

*P. E. McNall, Farm Management
Studies

*C. A. McCall, Veterinary Education

*H. T. Nielson, Norton, Agricultural
Agent, Northwest Kansas

*W. A. Boys, Hays, Agricultural
Agent, West Central Kansas

*Lee H. Gould, Dodge City,
Agricultural Agent, Southwest Kansas

*Carl G. Elling, Parsons,
Agricultural Agent, Southeast Kansas

*P. H. Ross, Leavenworth, County
Agricultural Agent

*O. C. Hagans, Paola, County
Agricultural Agent

*C. K. Peck, Mound City, County
Agricultural Agent

*E. J. Macy, Independence, County
Agricultural Agent

*O. P. Drake, Winfield, County
Agricultural Agent

*F. P. Lane, Newton, County
Agricultural Agent

*H. L. Popenoe, Emporia, County
Agricultural Agent

*W. E. Watkins, Iola, County
Agricultural Agent

*Ambrose Folker, Mankato, County
Agricultural Agent

Highway Engineering and Irrigation and Drainage Department

W. S. Gearhart, Chief Engineer

H. B. Walker, Irrigation and
Drainage Engineer

A. R. Losh, Road Engineer

C. I. Felps, Bridge Engineer

W. S. King, Irrigation and
Drainage

Home Economics Department

Miss Frances L. Brown, Director

Miss Marion P. Broughten,
Movable Schools

Miss Florence Snell, Assistant
in Institutes

Miss Stella Mather, Assistant
in Institutes

Miss Louise Caldwell, Assistant
in Institutes

Miss Addie Root, Assistant
in Institutes

Correspondence Study Department

John C. Werner, Director,
Academic & Educational Subjects

Geo. E. Bray, Industrial Subjects

E. M. Tiffany, Agricultural Subjects

Rural Service Department

Walter Burr, Rural Service

*Otis E. Hall, Boys' and Girls'
Clubs

*U.S. Government Cooperating

The Rural Engineering Department is in charge of a State Engineer; the Home Economics Department has at its head a State Leader of Home Economics; a Director of Correspondence Study is in charge of the Home Study Service; and a Director of Rural Service has charge of the department of Rural Service.

The total number of persons giving full time to Extension work is 40, most of whom have offices with the subject matter departments of the College. They are administratively responsible to the Dean of the Extension Division and to the subject matter departments for the matter and methods of presentation. Field assignments are made by the Director of Extension to whom reports of the work done are made.

Organization and Administration—1917

The Organization and Administration project of Extension, in 1917, included:

- 1) Coordination of work conducted under the several projects, with the work of the Agricultural College and the Federal Department of Agriculture.
- 2) Approval of projects.
- 3) Selection and approval of the personnel of the division.
- 4) Coordination of Extension work with the State Board of Agriculture, the University, Normal Schools and other institutions.
- 5) Supervision of the expenditure of all funds used for Extension work, whether obtained from State or Federal appropriations.

Home Economics Work—1917

A concise insight into administration of the early home economics work was provided in Dr. Willard's History:

Work with rural women has always been a strong feature of the College Farmers' Institutes and Extension programs. By 1918, for its regular work in home economics the Division of Extension employed a State Director and 10 Assistants.

These were occupied with a great variety of lines of work. In 1917 and 1918, the program was reorganized with special reference to home life as influenced by the war.

November 1, 1917, a Department of Emergency Home Demonstration Agents was organized. Miss Frances Brown was transferred from the directorship of the regular force to the leadership of the new department. Miss Stella Mather was Assistant State Emergency Home Demonstration leader, and there were 20 other agents who worked in as many cities or counties.

July 1, 1919, the word "emergency" was dropped from the name, and the department was designated as Home Demonstration Work. The war had ended but work of this character was continued, but with a greatly reduced force.

The catalogue continued to indicate the maintenance of separate departments of Home Economics and Home Demonstration Work, although beginning with 1923, both departments were administered by Miss Amy Kelly.

For 1924-25, Miss Maude Finley was head of the department of home economics, but from 1925 to 1936 Miss Kelly administered both departments. Miss Kelly resigned February 15, 1936, and the two departments were consolidated under the name Home Economics.

Other Outreach Programs—1914-17

Professor Willard also noted activities in other area of Extension outreach in his History:

The Correspondence Study Department provided for in 1912 in the Division of College Extension was changed in designation in 1915-16 to be Home Study Service, and in 1935-36 it was changed to Home Study Department.

In May, 1914, the Department of Rural Service was established under the leadership of Walter Burr. Its principal purpose was the organization of social centers and community welfare clubs, and the strengthening of religious and social conditions in rural communities. This department was discontinued in 1922.

The Department of Agricultural Agent work was separated from the Department of Farmers' Institutes and Demonstrations in 1917-18. At that time much additional work fell upon this body of men, and the personnel was greatly expanded by the employment of Emergency Demonstration Agents. In 1920-21 the designation of this department was changed to County Agent Work.

Personnel Selection Criteria—1914

Emergency Co. Extension Agents, WW I

During World War I, 32 Emergency Agricultural Agents, 18 County Emergency Home Agents, and seven City Emergency Home Agents were employed.

State Specialist Staff—1919

By June 30, 1919, ten years after the first Extension Specialists were employed, 20 Extension Specialist positions had been established in the Department of Farmers' Institutes and Demonstrations; five leaders of Emergency Home Agents; three Specialists in Home Economics Extension; nine Workers in Boys' and Girls' Work; two in Rural Organization; and seven in Home Study Service.

World War I also heightened interest that resulted in funds for employment of County Club Leaders in 17 counties.

Organize County Extension —1920-1951

By June 30, 1920, 59 counties were organized for Extension programs. By June 30, 1936, 103 of the 105 counties had been organized, with Gove and Trego counties declining to do so.

However, on December 19, 1950, Trego County established a County Farm Bureau to sponsor the Extension program, and became the last county to be organized under the Kansas Farm Bureau Law.

Gove County established a County Extension program under the County Agricultural Extension Council Law, passed by the Kansas legislature in 1951 to replace the Kansas Farm Bureau Law.

First Horticulture Agent—1928

An Assistant County Agent, Henry Lobenstein, was employed in Atchison County as the first County Horticulture Specialist, effective January 1, 1928.

Finances—1915

In his report for the year ending June 30, 1915, Director of Extension Edward Johnson said:

The following funds were available for Cooperative Extension work for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915:

Smith-Lever funds	\$10,000
USDA States Relations Serv.	14,046
College of Agriculture	50,700
Local Communities	1,736
Organizations	13,412
Miscellaneous	<u>2,733</u>
Total	\$92,627

Accept Smith-Lever Act—1915

Information in Director John Miller's report for the 1914-15 fiscal year included:

Smith-Lever Act and Additional Legislation

When the Smith-Lever Bill was enacted into law, a great impetus was given to Extension work. The Governor of the State (George H. Hodges) approved its provisions almost immediately after its enactment and the Kansas Legislature soon thereafter passed resolutions approving the cooperative arrangement for Extension work which the Smith-Lever Act contemplated.

Those resolutions were approved by the Governor (Arthur Capper), March 1, 1915. The Legislature went further than this and passed an act to provide funds for the duplication of the Federal funds for Extension work in agriculture and home economics.

Appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, were \$14,566 for this purpose, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, \$26,696. This act became law March 24, 1916.

The interest in Farm Bureaus in Kansas also had grown very rapidly and the Legislature with very large majorities in both the House and the Senate, passed an act providing for state and county appropriations for the support of County Farm Bureaus.

This act became law March 12, 1915, and went into effect July 1, 1915. It provides that on the organization of a Farm Bureau in any county in the state consisting of not less than 250 bona fide farmers and the raising of an initial fund of \$800 to equip the Bureau, the County Commissioners of the county are required to appropriate not less than \$800 nor more than \$1,600 per year from county funds to help support the Farm Bureau, and that the Agricultural College will appropriate to each one of these Bureaus an equal amount from Federal and State funds in so far as such funds are available.

Plans for Smith-Lever Funds—1915

Also quoted from Director John Miller's report for 1915 was:

Tentative Plans for Smith-Lever Bill Funds

The funds provided by the Smith-Lever Bill for promoting agricultural demonstration work in the United States will be available, and provided there is sufficient interest on the part of local people and men with proper training and experience to do County Agent work are available, a part of the fund allotted to Kansas will be used as stated in the following paragraphs.

A maximum of \$1,000 per year of the salary of the County Agent in any county having a Farm Bureau will be furnished from this fund. This amount will be supplied to as many counties as possible in order of their application, the number in 1914 probably not to exceed six, such applications to be accompanied by a guaranteed subscription by local people of not less than \$1,500 per year for two years, to cover the remainder of the Agent's salary and the expenses of the Farm Bureau, the minimum for expenses being \$600 per year.

The application also is to be accompanied by a constitution and by-laws of the Farm Bureau satisfactory to the Agricultural College and adopted by the Farm Bureau organization, and by a list of officers of this Bureau.

It also must be accompanied by a further guarantee of an office and office equipment suitable for the work of the County Agent and satisfactory to the Agricultural College, and of an automobile for the use of the Agent in his work in the county.

It is also stipulated that before an application is given consideration, not less than 75 bona fide farmers must have subscribed towards the support of the Farm Bureau at the rate of not less than \$5 per year for two years, or until such time as a law is enacted, permitting the appropriation of county funds for the support of the Bureau; after which these regulations may be changed.

It is understood that as a part of the County Agent's salary is to be paid from public funds, his services are not limited to subscribers to the funds of the Bureau or to its members, but may be extended to non-subscribers and non-members as well.

Use of Initial Smith-Lever Funds—1914-15

The initial appropriation of \$10,000 from the Smith-Lever fund was used for Extension work in agriculture and home economics. As the Division of Extension already was well organized, there was no need for re-organization to meet the requirements of the Smith-Lever law.

The initial appropriation, therefore, was used in broadening and strengthening the Extension work already in progress. As there were certain limitations attached to the Smith-Lever fund the intent being that it be used largely for demonstrational purposes, this fund was used to pay in part the salaries of Agricultural Agents in districts and counties, the salaries of Home Economics workers when engaged in Extension school work, the salaries in whole or in part of the Farm Management Demonstrator and the Specialists conducting demonstration work from March to September, inclusive.

It was manifestly impossible, therefore, to differentiate closely the results of the work done under the Smith-Lever funds from the work accomplished with the Extension funds from the State and from the appropriations from Federal Department of Agriculture.

The fund was used as follows:

1) Agricultural County and District Agricultural Agents, (Salaries)	\$3,966.65
2) Agricultural Extension Spec.	3,250.66
3) Home Economics Extension, Salaries	2,646.70
Travel	<u>135.98</u>
Total	\$9,999.99

Detailed Statement of Disbursement of the
Lever Funds:

Agricultural Agents

Demonstration Supervisor, H. Umberger part salary, five months	\$250.00
District Agent, H. T. Nielson, full salary, six months, part salary, six months	1,149.99
District Agent, Carl G. Elling, full salary, six months, part salary, six months	1,350.00
District Agent, W. A. Boys, part salary, six months	300.00
County Agent, O. C. Hagans, part salary, three months	250.00

County Agent, C. K. Peck, part salary, two months	166.66	Irrigation and Drainage Specialist, H. B. Walker, salary two months	<u>250.00</u>
County Agent, Ambrose D. Folker, part salary, three months	250.00		Total <u>\$3,250.67</u>
County Agent, H. L. Popenoe, part salary, three months	<u>250.00</u>	Home Economics Specialists	
	Total <u>\$3,966.65</u>	Miss Frances Brown, part salary, ten months	\$666.68
Specialists		Miss Marion P. Broughton, salary, ten months	833.33
Farm Management Demonstrations, P. E. McNall, part salary ten months	\$200.00	Miss Stella Mather, salary, three months	333.35
Crops Specialist, P. E. Crabtree, salary for four months	666.67	Miss Florence Snell, salary, four months	333.34
Soils Specialist, H. J. Bower, salary for four months	666.67	Miss Louise Caldwell, salary, four months	300.00
Poultry Specialist, Ross W. Sherwood, part salary, three months	234.00	Miss Matilda Wilson, salary, four months	180.00
Horticulture Specialist, Geo. O. Greene, salary for four months	633.34	Traveling expenses, home economics specialists	<u>135.98</u>
Entomologist, T. J. Talber, salary for four months	600.00		Total <u>\$2782.68</u>
		Grand Total	<u>\$10,000.00</u>

Budget/Staff Concerns—1911-27

Careful Accounting of Funds—1915

The Smith-Lever funds were deposited with the State Treasurer and paid out on warrants issued by Kansas State Agricultural College.

All vouchers were made out in quadruplicate, one copy remaining with the Extension Service, one went to the Accounting Division of the College, and two copies were sent to the State Treasurer.

Original vouchers were filed with the State Treasurer, sub-vouchers were taken for all expenses over 25 cents. The U. S. Department of Agriculture cooperated by furnishing funds for the support in part of the following projects: County Agents, Boys' and Girls' Clubs, and Farm Management. A detailed financial report was received and approved.

Receipts & Disbursements Summary—1915

The receipts and expenditures of the Division of Extension for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, were as follows:

Receipts

State Appropriation	\$50,000.00
Smith-Lever Fund	10,000.00
Balance (appropriation) from previous fiscal year	700.63

Balance (fees) from previous year	39.85
Fees - for Correspondence Study Service	2,015.57
Engineering Service	256.81
Home Economics Service (Clubs)	234.40
Service of Specialists in Normal Institute work and movable schools	<u>234.08</u>
Total	<u>\$63,481.34</u>

Expenditures

Office of Dean	5,231.18
Department of Rural Service	3,135.11
Department Correspondence Study	6,999.63
Department Engineering (Highway, Irrigation and Drainage)	9,525.73
Department Institutes and Demonstrations including Agricultural Agents	31,645.40
Home Economics Agents	6,896.74
Balance (fees account)	<u>47.55</u>
Total	\$63,481.34

Sources of Revenue—1917

For fiscal year ending June 30, 1917:

State Appropriations	\$40,000.00
Federal Smith-Lever	36,685.00
State Smith-Lever Matching	26,685.00
County Appropriations for County Agent work	17,068.67
Farm Bureau membership fees	5,257.55
Miscellaneous fees (home study Ext. Schools)	<u>12,580.21</u>
Total	\$138,274.43

Additional details about financial guidelines for Extension was included in later Director's reports, such as the following:

It is understood, of course, that all appropriations by counties and membership fees in Farm Bureaus were used directly to further the County Agent work in the counties where the appropriations were made and the fees collected.

The only new laws relating to Extension work are those making the appropriations for the Agricultural College, a part of which appropriations are used for Extension work, and the law appropriating the state Smith-Lever fund, a copy of which law follows:

Section 1. That for the purpose of duplicating Federal funds for Cooperative Extension work in agriculture and home economics in Kansas to be carried on under the direction and supervision of the Kansas State Agricultural College, under the provisions of the federal Smith-Lever Act, there is hereby appropriated to the Kansas State Agricultural College for said purpose, out of any money in the state treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, \$38,816; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, \$50,946.

Initial Salary by Years—1912-21

Salaries for Extension personnel showed a gradual increase during the early years, reflecting, in part, the improving economic conditions of the time.

Year	New Employ.	Salary Range	Average
1911	1	\$1,400	\$1,400
1913	1	1,500	1,500
1914	5	1,400 to 1,700	1,560
1915	3	1,600 to 1,800	1,733
1916	7	1,500 to 2,000	1,700
1917	20	1,500 to 1,800	1,732
1918	27	1,500 to 2,400	1,759
1919	20	1,800 to 2,400	1,845
1920	23	1,800 to 2,400	1,973

1921	<u>10</u>	<u>1,900 to 2,400</u>	<u>2,030</u>
Totals	118	\$1,400 to 2,400	\$1,815

Length of Service—1920's

As the Extension Service continued into the 1920's, the tenure of the staff began to grow. However, the percentage with less than two years of service was more than half the staff at the time the following table was assembled:

Agents in Extension	
Length of Service	Number
Less than 1 year	25
From 1 to 2 years	13
From 2 to 3 years	6
From 3 to 4 years	5
From 4 to 5 years	3
Over 5 years	<u>2</u>
Total	54

Salaries of County Extension Agents—1921

In the 1921 report of the County Agent Leader, he stated:

Realizing that we had very little data regarding the salaries paid County Agents in this state, some little time during July, 1921 was devoted to summarizing and tabulating the records on file.

The following tables were prepared:

Period of Employment	No. of Agents	Initial Salary	Present Salary
Less than 1 year	15	\$2,086.66	\$2,086.66
From 1 to 2 years	17	1,905.88	2,288.23
From 2 to 3 years	18	1,806.25	2,371.87
From 3 to 4 years	7	1,714.29	2,671.43
From 4 to 5 years	4	1,780.00	2,862.50
Over 5 years	<u>5</u>	<u>1,620.00</u>	<u>3,030.00</u>
Totals	64	\$1,867.19	\$2,397.65

Sources of Revenue—1921-22

The source of Federal and State funds for Extension in the early 1920's are identified below:

1920-21

State appropriations	\$34,000.00
Federal Smith-Lever	83,206.20
State Smith-Lever	73,206.20
Supplementary Smith-Lever	36,386.65
USDA appropriation	13,600.00

1921-22

State appropriations	33,500.00
----------------------	-----------

Federal Smith-Lever	90,641.37
State Smith-Lever	80,641.37
Supplementary Smith-Lever	33,600.57
USDA appropriation	11,400.00

Legislative Appropriation—1922

The Kansas Legislature, in 1922, added to the appropriation in maintenance of Smith-Lever work the following provision:

Provided: That not less than \$10,000 of the appropriation made for the fiscal year 1922 shall be used exclusively in establishing new Bureaus for Cooperative Extension work in agriculture and home economics when application is made therefore; that not less than \$15,000 of the appropriation made for the fiscal year 1923 shall be used exclusively in establishing new bureaus for cooperative extension work in agriculture and home economics when application is made therefor.

This legislation might work a hardship against County Agent work in the state should this tendency be followed. In fact, the average of figures is showing the number of Extension specialists in proportion to County Agricultural Agents indicates that Kansas now has less than the average.

While this legislation is intended to further County Agent work geographically, there is a serious question as to whether or not it might, by crippling related Departments of Extension, ultimately be a serious disadvantage to it.

Outlook for Extension Work in Kansas

The Director's report of 1923 noted:

It will be necessary in the main to support the County Agent work in all counties by means of strong, well-balanced, educational programs made very promptly available to the County Agents by means of Specialist assistance.

There has been a tendency on the part of some to consider funds expended for specialists as a diversion from the purpose for which they were appropriated although the percentage spent in this respect is less in Kansas than the average expended for this purpose by other States, as shown by the following comparative statistics:

Project	Percent of Funds Used	
	Kansas	All States
Administration	3.3	5.4
County Agent Work	60.8	52.8
Printing	1.2	1.7
Home Demonstration Work	6.7	16.2
Boys' and Girls' Clubs	4.0	6.7

Home Economics Specialists	4.0	2.1
Extension Schools	1.9	.4
Agricultural Specialists	12.3	11.4
Rural Organization	0.0	.2
Marketing	0.0	1.9
Exhibits and Fairs	0.0	.1
Farmers' Institutes	0.0	.2
Correspondence Study	4.6	.2
Miscellaneous Specialists	<u>1.2</u>	<u>.0</u>
	100.0	100.0

The maintenance of an adequate and effective corps of Specialists is only highly desirable in order that County Agents may be able continually to supply farmers with the latest information derived from the experimental work of the United States Department of Agriculture and the State Experiment Stations.

The Specialist also renders a service almost equal to that of the County Agent in reaching the farmers themselves directly with sound recommendations.

Finances Sources of Revenue—1924

Federal Smith-Lever	\$101,841
State Smith-Lever	82,500
Supplementary Smith-Lever	29,120
U. S. Department of Agr.	15,140
College Extension	31,000
(Additional for Radio)	<u>600</u>
Total Financial Support	\$260,202

County Support—1925

Annual dues in Kansas counties from county Extension organizations in 1925 totaled \$86,216, in 64 counties. The average dues per county were \$1,347, the highest was \$5,281, and the lowest \$500.

County appropriations for Extension work in 1925, totaled \$154,447. The average was \$2,618, the highest \$6,120, and the lowest \$1,200.

The total membership of County Farm Bureaus was 16,398 men and 6,493 women in 1925.

Assistance to Counties—1924

Each county was visited by supervisory Extension personnel at least three times during the year:

- 1) In December to attend the Annual meeting of the County Farm Bureau.
- 2) In January to outline projects to be carried during the year.
- 3) In May and June to prepare a budget as the law provided.

Staff Meetings—1927

Monthly meetings of the administrative officers were initiated in 1927. The meetings were used to develop plans for improvement of administrative methods and coordination of County Agent and Specialist work.

The Extension supervisory officers were brought

in closer contact with the real problems of the entire organization, making it possible to locate and correct those weaknesses in the Service which had to be jointly handled by the administrative officers.

The monthly administrative conferences have continued, for the most part, to the present time.

Farm Bureau Organizers—1915-17

The increase in County Agent and Farm Bureau work made necessary an increase in the supervisory staff. H. J. C. Umberger was appointed Demonstration Supervisor and Assistant County Agent Leader, February 1, 1915, and made County Agent Leader on July 1, 1917. A. F. Turner was appointed temporary Assistant County Agent Leader on August 1, 1916.

G. E. Piper was appointed Assistant County Agent Leader on November 15, 1917. Karl Knaus, County Agent in Cloud County, was appointed assistant County Agent Leader on December 1, 1917 and County Agent Leader on July 1, 1920.

Turner's principal work was to assist with the organization of new County Farm Bureaus. The other assistants helped with the general supervision problems in the counties.

Director Edward Johnson's annual report for the period ending June 30, 1916, included the following:

County and District Agricultural Agents

H. J. Umberger, Assistant County Agent Leader, has been in charge of this work. In as much as a full report of the work under this project is submitted by him, the details will be omitted. It may be said as a result of the 'Farm Bureau Law' which took effect July 1, 1915, a great impetus was given to the organizing of Farm Bureaus in the State.

Eight out of ten of the existing Farm Bureaus increased their membership during the year and met the requirements of the new law, so that they were ready to avail themselves of its provisions.

In two of the counties where the petitions for County Agents were presented, the petitions were refused, the Commissioners being opposed to the use of county funds for this purpose. The refusal was made in spite of the fact that the law is mandatory.

The matter is in the courts at the present time in one county. It is aggressively pushed by the Executive

Committee of the Farm Bureau, organized in the other county. A change in Commissioners will probably relieve the situation so that court proceedings will not be entered into.

Six new Farm Bureaus were organized and six County Agents appointed during the year. All of these Bureaus were organized under the provisions of the new 'Farm Bureau Law'. (At the time of preparing this report, November 27, 1916, the interest in Farm Bureaus and County Agents is far beyond the expectations of those in charge.)

Four new Bureaus, namely in Bourbon, Chase, Geary, and Washington, have recently been organized and will have County Agents as soon as eligible men can be secured, while Doniphan, Douglas, Saline, Barton, and Shawnee counties are aggressively promoting Farm Bureau organization.

Such opposition to the Farm Bureau and County Agent movement as was found at its inception in the state is at present manifested only in those localities where for some reason, certain leaders are opposed to it. Practically all opposition, where found, is based on the fact that county funds may be used to help support the work.

However, the interest in County Agent work is so general and so many inquiries have come to the College concerning it that far more Bureaus could be organized than could be assisted with Federal and State funds at this time, provided the College would adopt the policy of placing an organizer in the field.

This has not been done up to the present time as it has been felt that if these Bureaus are organized only as fast as the people understand them and really want them, the work in future years will be stronger than if they are organized before the people have any desire for them or are ready for them.

On the other hand where there is a well defined desire for these Bureaus more assistance in organizing will be given from the Division than here-to-fore.

The progress in organizing new County Farm Bureaus and maintenance of those already in operation was not always easy. In his report for 1917, the Director of Extension wrote:

In two counties, namely, Linn and Allen, although Farm Bureaus were fully organized and County Agents at work, the County Commissioners refused appropria-

tions for County Agent work. This resulted in dropping the work temporarily in both counties.

The reactionary tendency of the Commissioners in these two counties is not confined to Farm Bureau work but it is reported they take the same attitude toward road work, county fairs, and other progressive movements involving the use of county funds.

Farm Bureau Constitution & By-Laws—1914

The following is a copy of the Constitution and By-Laws for a County Farm Bureau, included with the 1914 annual Extension report:

Constitution and By-Laws of the County Farm Bureau

ARTICLE I - NAME

The name of this organization shall be the County Farm Bureau.

ARTICLE II - OBJECTS

The objects of this Bureau are to develop the agriculture of _____ County, Kansas, and to foster all interests, commercial, social, moral, and material, having a bearing on the development and improvement of agriculture and of life on the farm.

ARTICLE III - MEMBERSHIP

All persons are eligible to membership in this association on payment of the membership fee and subscription to the constitution and by-laws of this association.

ARTICLE IV - FEES AND DUES

An annual fee of _____ shall be charged for active membership in this Bureau, but there shall be no restrictions on voluntary subscriptions authorized by the association for special purposes.

ARTICLE V - OFFICERS

Section 1 - The officers of the Bureau shall consist of a President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer, County Agricultural Agent, and an Advisory Council. The President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer shall be elected at the annual meeting of the Bureau for a period of one year and shall serve without compensation until their successors shall be elected and qualify. The County Agricultural Agent and Advisory Council shall be elected as hereinafter provided.

Section 2 - The Advisory Council shall be composed as follows: the President, Vice-President, Secretary-Treasurer, and County Agent shall be members ex

officio, and one member, known as a Township Vice-President shall be elected annually from each township by the members of the Bureau from that township to serve one year, the meeting for such election occurring at least one week before the annual meeting of the Farm Bureau. The first township delegate from each township may be appointed by the President of the Bureau.

ARTICLE VI - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

There shall be an Executive Committee, consisting of seven members elected as follows: the President and Secretary-Treasurer shall be members ex officio, and the other members shall be elected by majority vote at the annual meeting of the Bureau from the members of the Advisory Council, the term of office being one year. The President and Secretary-Treasurer of the Bureau shall serve in the same capacity for this committee.

ARTICLE VII - ADDITIONAL COMMITTEES

The following committees shall be appointed by the President from the members of the Bureau, each committee to consist of not less than three nor more than five members to serve without compensation: finance, membership, livestock, cooperation, and such others as in the opinion of the Executive Committee may be deemed advisable.

ARTICLE VIII - DUTIES

Section 1 - The President shall perform such duties as usually pertain to the office of the President. He shall have the power to fill such vacancies as may occur in any office, advisory council or committee. He shall make requisition on the Treasurer for such sums of money as may be required for disbursement. He may call meetings of the Bureau, of the Advisory Council, or any of the committees whenever he deems it advisable, or on the application of any 25 members of the association.

Section 2 - The Vice-President shall perform the duties of the President in case of his absence or disability.

Section 3 - The Secretary-Treasurer shall perform such duties as usually pertain to the office of Secretary, and shall have general charge of the funds of the association and, upon the written requisition from the President, shall draw all checks and vouchers for the disbursement of the funds. He shall give bonds to the amount determined by the Executive Committee, the cost of these bonds to be paid by the association.

Section 4 - The advisory Council shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Executive Committee and to the County Agent, and each member shall act as the responsible representative of the Bureau in the township.

Section 5 - The Executive Committee shall have the power to make contracts and transact all the business of the association. On the recommendation and approval of the State Leader of Farm Bureau work in the State, it shall appoint the County Agent and fix his salary. His resignation shall be accepted by the Committee on the request or approval of the State Leader.

Section 6 - The County Agricultural Agent, who shall devote his time to the promotion of the work for which the Bureau is organized, shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Agricultural College, represented by the State Leader of the Farm Bureaus in the State, and shall be free at all times to carry on the work as directed by those in charge.

Section 7 - Cooperative demonstrations shall be carried on by special arrangement with the County Agent and the Executive Committee upon as many farms in the various parts of the County as may be intelligently supervised by the County Agent or his assistants.

ARTICLE IX - MEETINGS

Section 1 - The annual meeting of this association shall be held in December or January in the City of _____, the call for such meeting being issued through the County papers and by letter to the Bureau members, not less than two weeks before the meeting.

Section 2 - The Executive Committee shall hold monthly meetings at such times and places as they may determine.

Section 3 - Meetings of the Advisory Council shall be held at the call of the President.

Section 4 - Other committees shall meet at the call of the President of the Bureau or the chairman of the committee in question.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The order of business at all regular meetings of the Bureau shall be as follows:

- 1) Call to order by the President
- 2) Reading of the minutes of previous meetings
- 3) Reports of committees
- 4) Unfinished business
- 5) Reports of officers
- 6) Reports or recommendations of the County Agricultural Agent or State Leader
- 7) Suggestions for improving the efficiency of the Bureau
- 8) New business
- 9) Adjournment

AMENDMENTS

The constitution and by-laws of the Bureau may be altered or amended subject to the approval of the Agricultural College, by a two-thirds vote of the members of the association present at any regular meeting or at a special meeting called on request of 25 members, notice in writing of the proposed changes having been given to all the members of the association at least one week previous to the time of the meeting.

All proposed alterations or amendments to the constitution must be submitted to the State Leader at least 30 days prior to such meeting, for approval. Fifteen shall be considered a quorum.

County Agent Work—1914-18

In a report, "Agricultural Agent Work for 1914," Edward Johnson, State Leader of Demonstration Work, stated:

Introduction: Interested and helpful backing of farmers themselves has been the thing sought for in the Agricultural Agent work in Kansas for 1914. In order to get this backing it has been felt that a Farm Bureau of not less than 100 men paying a membership fee sufficiently large so as to be more than nominal is necessary in each county employing a county agent.

With this idea in mind a determined effort was made

through the year to strengthen those Farm Bureaus already organized by getting a strong farmer backing if such backing were not already secured...

Bureaus Organized: During 1914 four farm bureaus were organized; namely the Bureaus in Linn, Lyon, Miami and Jewell counties. All these were organized on the basis of having at least 100 farmers subscribing to the Bureau funds at the rate of not less than \$5 per year for two years. In Miami County the membership fee is \$7.50 per year...

Financing the Bureaus: In financing the Bureau for any county it has been the policy to insure an income of approximately \$5,000 for two years, that is \$2,500 a year. Of this amount approximately \$1,000 per year is furnished from Government funds towards the salary of the County Agent in each county.

This together with approximately \$500 per year from the farmers makes a total of \$1,500, leaving in the neighborhood of \$1,000 to be subscribed by townspeople and business concerns, such as banks, commercial clubs, mills, wholesale houses, retailers, etc., in the various towns. Businessmen, particularly the bankers, have as a rule been liberal in their support.

\$1,500 to \$1,800 per year of the funds goes to the salary of the Agent. (The average salary undoubtedly will be above this for the next few years.) Approximately \$800 is necessary for the equipment of the Bureau at the start and \$600 to \$1,000 for the running expenses of the Farm Bureau for the next two years.

Necessary Equipment for Farm Bureaus: Each Bureau now organizing is required by the Agricultural College to supply approximately the following equipment: a satisfactory office furnished with a desk, table and typewriter; necessary filing cases and two or three units of a sectional bookcase; demonstration tools such as Babcock tester, pruning tools, soil augers, caponizing tools, and seed tester; an automobile for the transportation of the Agent while on his work in the county.

Seven of the 10 counties in the State have Ford cars for the use of the Agent. Cameras are used by some Agents and will be used by all bureaus in 1915. Stereopticons are not now owned by any of the Bureaus, but will probably be required of all organizing hereafter. In at least three Bureaus a small library of agricultural books is on hand.

Motorcycle Transportation: The Western Kansas district men travel by railroad and motorcycle. Transportation by motorcycle, however, is not as cheap in the long run as one would expect it to be and is exceedingly hard on the rider.

It would be far better to equip each man with an automobile if this could be done, either by the State or by the State's paying mileage sufficient to cover expenses and depreciation of a machine owned by the Agent. The latter method is perhaps preferable.

Policy of Agricultural Agent Work in Kansas: It has been the policy in the County Agent work in Kansas to conduct it so as to make every County Farm Bureau which has once commenced work a success. By the success of these, demonstrate to the State that Farm Bureaus and County Agent work deserve the most

loyal support financially and otherwise both from the counties in which the work is done and the the State at large. . .

That the State might become educated as to what the Bureaus stand for and the work that is being accomplished, numerous short pointed items have been sent to the newspapers of the State practically every week for the last two years.

These have emphasized some particular thing that has been accomplished through the County Agent Work, the county, the Farm Bureau, and the Agent himself always being mentioned.

The Agricultural College has rarely been mentioned in these items. . . That this campaign has been successful, even more so than was anticipated, was shown by the fact that when a County Agent bill, making it obligatory upon counties to appropriate not less than \$800 nor more than \$1,600 per year to help support County Agent work when a Bureau has been organized having a membership of 25 percent of the bona fide farmers of the county or as many as 250 farmers in a county, was introduced in the present session of the legislature (1915).

It met with little or no opposition in the agricultural committees of either House or Senate.

When the bill was finally voted upon it was passed in the Senate by a vote of 20 to 10 and in the House by a vote of 80 to 22.

It received the signature of the Governor (Arthur Capper) March 11, 1915. The bill was amended considerably from the original introduced at the suggestion of the Agricultural College, but there was no organized fight against it and the legislature, which is composed largely of farmers, seemed to appreciate fully of what great moment a bill of that nature might be to the State.

As a result of this legislation the Farm Bureau work in Kansas is now upon a firm foundation.

Establish Extension Department—1918

In 1917-18, the supervision of County Agent work was separated from the Department of Farmers' Institutes and Extension Schools and made the "Department of Agricultural Agent Work," under the leadership of Karl Knaus, Assistant County Agent Leader.

At that time much additional work fell upon the Supervisors, as personnel were greatly expanded by employment of Emergency Demonstration Agents. On July 1, 1920, the name of the department was changed to "County Agent Work."

Department of County Agent Work—1914-61

Early Agent Work Supervision —1914

There were five departments in the Division of College Extension at Kansas State Agricultural College in 1914. They were:

- Rural Engineering.
- Home Economics.
- Home Study Service.
- Rural Service.
- Institutes and Demonstrations.

County Agent Work was one of five projects in the Department of Institutes and Demonstrations as recorded in the report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, by John Miller, Dean and Director, Division of College Extension. The Director also served as County Agent Leader.

The other four projects in the Department of Institutes and Demonstrations, in addition to County Agent Work, were:

- Boys' and Girls' Club Work.
- Extension Schools.
- Farm and Home Institutes.
- Agricultural Specialists.

County Agent Work, Home Economics, and Agricultural Specialists were supported in part by the newly appropriated Smith-Lever funds.

The following quotation is from Director Miller's report for the year ending June 30, 1915:

On June 30, 1914, there were nine County Agents and four District Agents covering an average of eight counties each and on June 30, 1915, there were 10 County Agents and four District Agents.

During the fiscal year 1914-15, the County Agent work was financed by Smith-Lever funds, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the College of Agriculture funds; and by contributions from individuals and organizations. The county organizations, usually called Agricultural Improvement Clubs, of 75 to 200 members.

Cooperative Agreement—1915-88

Employment of County Extension Agents was by cooperative agreement between the College and the county since the first Agents were employed. A portion of the salary was paid directly to the Agent from College Funds. This amount varied through the years.

Additional aid was given to counties with valuations so low that the maximum levy permitted by law did not provide sufficient funds for the County Extension Board to employ the number of Agents desired to give professional leadership to the County Extension Program.

Department of County Agent Work—1917

At the time Umberger was appointed County Agent Leader, July 1, 1917, the project of County Agent Work was made the "Department of County Agricultural Agent Work."

It had been in the "Department of Institutes and Demonstrations." Three years later, on July 1, 1920, the name of that department was changed to "County Agent Work."

As the activities in 1917 and 1918 associated with World War I developed, the work of this department was greatly expanded. Emergency Demonstration Agents were employed with special Federal appropriations for that purpose.

Three Assistant County Agent Leaders were employed: A. F. Turner, G. E. Piper, and Karl Knaus.

County Agent Work Personnel—1919

In 1919, the staff of the County Agent Work project consisted of:

H. Umberger, County Agent Leader.

A. F. Turner, Assistant County Agent Leader, had general charge of organization work. He was assisted by J. M. Kessler, C. A. Scott, and F. A. Dawley.

George E. Piper, Assistant County Agent Leader, assisted with general administration and had special charge of county finances.

Karl Knaus, Assistant County Agent Leader, had general charge of the project work in the counties and helped place new Agents.

By 1921, the supervisory staff consisted of the following men:

H. Umberger, Dean, Division of Extension.

Karl Knaus, County Agent Leader.

A. F. Turner, Assistant County Agent Leader.

F. A. Dawley, Assistant County Agent Leader.

A. L. Clapp, Assistant County Agent Leader.

G. W. Salisbury, Assistant County Agent Leader.

Dept. of County Agent Work—1920-22

H. C. Umberger described the organization of the Department of County Agent Work from 1920 to 1922.

The County Agent Department is one of seven departments in the Division of Extension. It is charged with the responsibility for the supervision of County Agricultural Agent work.

This department also handles to a large extent the county financial matters for the Department of Boys' and Girls' Club Work and the Department of Home Demonstration Work.

Financial reports from the counties, covering the above lines of work, are received and checked. County budgets are prepared and a certain portion of the organization work prior to the establishment of a Club Agent or a Home Demonstration Agent in a county is handled by this department.

Mr. Knaus as County Agent Leader has general charge of the department, keeping closely in touch with, and assisting the assistant county agent leaders with their work as outlined below.

He also handles matters of cooperative relationships with other organizations and departments affecting County Agent work.

A. F. Turner has general charge of the organization work, the development of the local Farm Bureau programs and allied matters.

F. A. Dawley has charge of the county financial matters, supervises the budgets with the assistance of the County Agent Leader, and receives and checked financial statements before they are forwarded to the Director's office for final approval.

A. L. Clapp has general charge of the project work, the selection and location of applicants for county agent positions and allied work.

G. W. Salisbury has charge of the project reports, prepares the quarterly reports and the project section of the annual report.

Kansas has not found it advisable to district the state and charge an assistant county agent leader with the responsibility for all of the work in a given district.

It has seemed more advisable to give such assistant charge of a particular phase of the supervisory program for study and investigation but have him assist other members of the department with their work in the field.

The inspector from the Federal Extension Service in 1920, made the following comments about the County Agent Work project:

The chief problem is adequate supervision from the Central Office and this is more difficult when counties can pay more salary for Agents than the College can pay for Assistant County Agent Leaders.

Demands for County Agents in new counties are coming in faster than they can be met. Beginning July

1, 1920, the amount of money allotted to each county was reduced from \$1,200 to \$1,000. Even so, five more counties than funds can be provided for will be ready to undertake the work before January 1, 1921.

While there were only four counties in 1918 with some fashion of organization, by the end of 1919 there were 40 counties, most having better community organization with project leaders in at least several communities in each county.

Office Record System—1921

During the months of April and May 1921, members of the Central Office visited and checked up on the office filing system in the 49 counties.

A part of the system had been installed in the other farm bureau counties but the work could not be completed at the time as the counties did not have all the necessary equipment.

The system installed was exactly the same as advocated in U.S. Department Circular 107 entitled, "A System of Field and Office Records for County Extension Workers" by M. C. Wilson.

The Agents found it difficult to follow this system because they had not been in the habit of checking the field note book pads. Also, they had not been making regular use of their filing systems, as was necessary if a record was kept of all the calls.

The value and need for keeping these records was continually emphasized. The men who gave this system a fair trial realized its value.

Approximately 60 percent of the County Extension Agents reported the number of office calls and inquiries on each project at the conclusion of the write up.

It was reported that the summary brought information to the Agents regarding their work often was a surprise to them.

Commemorate County Agent Work—1922

On September 2, 1922, the Leavenworth County Farm Bureau held a Decennial Celebration (10 years) to commemorate the beginning of County Extension Agent work in Kansas. P. H. Ross started work as the Leavenworth County Agent on September 1, 1912.

The Kansas City Livestock Exchange furnished 5,000 pounds of beef for a barbecue. The Kansas Farm Bureau and the Leavenworth Chamber of Commerce cooperated with the Extension Service in the celebration.

A pageant, "The Awakening of the West," under the direction of Oeola Burr, daughter of Walter Burr, head of the Extension Department of Rural Service, was pre-

sent in the evening with 500 costumed actors from 12 communities within the county. More than 12,000

persons attended during the day and evening.

Programs Following the Smith-Lever Act (1914)

The report of the Director, John H. Miller, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, gave this summary of the most important work of the County Extension Agents:

Fifty-eight farm buildings planned or improved; 36 silos constructed; 22 water systems improved; 91 sanitary conditions improved; 552 farmers selecting seed corn in the fall; 6,705 acres of corn planted with selected seed; 28 farmers treating seed oats to prevent smut; 374 acres of oats seeded with treated seed;

One hundred three farms on which alfalfa was seeded according to recommendations; 1,283 acres of alfalfa seeded; 240 orchards cared for in whole or in part by the County Agents; 145 registered male animals secured on suggestion of County Agents; 172 registered female animals secured on suggestion of County Agents;

Two thousand forty animals treated for blackleg as suggested by Agents; 4,937 hogs vaccinated by Agents for prevention of cholera; 14,323 hogs vaccinated on suggestions by Agents vaccinated by Agents for prevention of cholera; 14,323 hogs vaccinated on suggestions by Agents; four anti-hog cholera clubs formed; 65 farmers advised on poultry disease control; 10 farmers reinforcing manure with acid phosphate or floats.

Campaigns for the prevention of Hessian fly have been conducted in every county having an agent. In Leavenworth and Harvey counties practically all of the seeding was done after what is known as the fly-free date.

In Western Kansas, numerous demonstrations were made in the use of Sudan grass as a forage crop and the use of orange sorghum as a silage crop. A record as to the location of good pure-bred sires is kept in the office of the Farm Bureau.

When a sire has completed his period of usefulness in one county he may be transferred to another. During the current year, 1915, 20 sires were placed or transferred through the activities of County Agents.

Demonstrations in renovating and managing commercial and home orchards have been conducted in practically all counties where Agents are employed. Certain farms are selected in representative areas in which an orchard is pruned and sprayed by the Specialists in Horticulture from the Division of Extension.

As a result of a special effort by County Agents, 504 farmers have sown sweet clover during 1915.

Women's Auxiliary—1914

The 1915 report of Director of Extension contained the first mention of Women's Auxiliaries; the associations of wives and daughters of the men belonging to the Institutes. The Women's Auxiliaries held meetings in connection with the Farmers' Institutes.

In 1914, there were 92 auxiliaries in the state with a membership of 1,853. Many of the auxiliaries met once each month and conducted programs furnished by the Home Economics Department of the Extension Division of KSAC — either written materials, personal appearances, or both.

Girls' Club—1914

The Home Economics Department in Extension supervised 40 Girls' Clubs in cooking and sewing with an enrollment of 527 in 1914. That year Extension home economics personnel addressed 14 teachers' institutes, 14 Teachers' Normal classes, and 12 picnics and miscellaneous meetings.

Changing Role of Institute—1915

In 1915, the Superintendent of Institutes and Extension Schools was in charge of Farmers' Institutes. He helped plan the programs for the 440 Institute organizations then existing in the state.

Each organization had a constitution and by-laws, and was responsible for holding at least three meetings a year, in addition to the annual meeting.

The annual Institute meetings were held from October to March. During the winter of 1914-15, 397 Institutes were visited by one or more Specialists from Kansas State Agricultural College.

The total attendance at Institutes in Kansas was 93,712 people. The Agricultural Extension Specialists also made farm visits as they attended the annual Institute meetings.

Name Change To Farm/Home Week—1915

The name of the State Farmers' Institute was changed to "Farm and Home Week" in 1915. Further discussion

of that event for farmers and farm homemakers is listed under the heading, "Farm and Home Week."

Projects—1916

The main lines of work were:

- 1) Corn
- 2) Wheat
- 3) Pruning and spraying
- 4) Hog cholera control
- 5) Farm management
- 6) Alfalfa
- 7) Hessian fly control
- 8) Introduction of new crops such as sweet clover and sudan grass, etc.

Demonstration Results—1916

In 1916, a total of 1,237 Extension demonstrations were conducted; 729 meetings were held at demonstrations, with 19,398 persons attending.

Hessian Fly Control—1916

In Harvey County wheat fields sown before Oct. 4 yielded from 1.0 to 3.3 bu. per acre; sown after Oct. 11 yields were from 15.1 to 16.9 bu. per acre.

Hog Cholera—1916

Losses in Atchison County to hog cholera were 3,224 head in 1915. Veterinarians vaccinated 12,543 head of hogs. Only 14 cases reported in 1916, only 120 hogs lost. Estimated savings \$30,000.

Boys' and Girls' Clubs—1916

Work was carried on by the State Club Leader and one assistant in 1916. The cost in 1915 was \$3,370; in 1916 it was \$3,775.

The Director's report stated:

Leaders cooperate with the County Agricultural Agents, County Superintendent of Schools, rural school teachers, other institutions, and individuals interested in the work.

The Department of Public Instruction cooperates closely with the leaders in the promotion of the work by means of endorsing the work through public addresses, public newsletters, and by recommending to the County Superintendents and teachers that they take up the work effectively in the communities in connection with these schools.

The club work is arranged and carried on through club groups with a volunteer leader in charge in the usual manner.

4-H Projects—1916

The 4-H project clubs functioning in 1916 included:

- 75 garment making clubs.
- 55 corn clubs.
- 28 sorghum clubs.
- 23 bread making clubs.
- 21 pig clubs.
- 18 handicraft clubs.
- 18 poultry clubs.
- 16 home canning clubs.
- 16 mother-daughter clubs.
- 13 home garden clubs.
- 10 tomato clubs.
- 3 potato clubs.

4-H Enrollment—1916

Total youth enrollment, in 1916, was 5,062, of which 3,937 started work on their projects and 1,705 completed all work. Total value of all projects was \$26,766.96. Total cost to members in producing these products was \$9,523.26.

Epidemic Cancels Meetings—1918-19

In the winter of 1918-19, Kansas experienced a series of epidemics of influenza which resulted in making Extension schools, Farmers' Institutes, and other demonstration work of the Extension Specialists very uncertain from early winter to late spring.

Many of the annual Institute meetings were scheduled as many as four times, and then cancelled, because of influenza and weather conditions.

That situation, coupled with the increased number of County Farm Bureau organizations and the employment of County Extension Agents, began a decline in the number of Farmers' Institutes held in Kansas.

Some Institutes Quit—1919-20

In 1919-20, some Institute officers requested that their Farmers' Institute organization be discontinued, in which case the Superintendent of Institutes always complied with their request.

In other cases, the County Farm Bureau and the Institute organization worked together, permitting the County Extension Agent to do his most effective work in a community program. When Institutes were discontinued, Extension Schools were organized to replace them.

However, 30 new Institutes were organized in 1919-20. The total number of Institutes remained above 300 in Kansas. Programs presented at the Institutes were being modified to be more like those in demonstration work and Extension Schools.

Enactment of the Farmers' Institute law recognized the value of continued activity and required a demonstration of earnest intent as shown by the maintenance of an organization for at least one year before becoming eligible for drawing public funds for its support.

The number of Institutes held beginning in 1881, to and including 1905, as given by Dr. Willard in his History is as follows:

1881-82	6	1889-90	8	1897-98	29
1882-82	5	1890-91	11	1898-99	62
1883-84	7	1891-92	11	1899-00	134
1884-85	6	1892-93	10	1900-01	156
1885-86	6	1893-94	17	1901-02	102
1886-87	8	1894-95	22	1902-03	88
1887-88	8	1895-96	22	1903-04	58
1888-89	10	1896-97	19	1904-05	55

The number of Institutes in succeeding years were not always recorded. The following were:

1910-12—	642
1914-15—	397
1918-19—	304 (7,356 att.) ^a
1919-20—	55 (8,060 att.) ^a
1920-21—	57
1921-22—	18
1922—	17
1923-24—	19
1924-25—	18 (12,668 att.)
1925-26—	11 (4,632 att.)
1926-27—	16 (2,370 att.)
1927-28—	10 (5,381 att.) ^b
1928-29—	9 (11,280 att.)
1929-30—	8

1930-31—	7
1932-33—	2 ^c
1934-35—	4

^aThe State appropriations used for Farmers' Institutes were \$6,696.55; and other funds used amounted to \$9,263.65.

^bIn 1927-28, local institutes were held in Bourbon, Doniphan, McPherson and Shawnee counties; and County Institutes held in Clay, Cowley, Dickinson, Sherman and Washington counties

^cIn 1932-33, only Wakefield, in Clay County, and Watson, in Shawnee County, held institutes.

Fairs Replace Institutes—1923

In his annual report for 1923, the Director stated:

In a number of instances Fair Organizations have taken the place of Farmers' Institutes, and a number of Farmers' Institute organizations hold Fairs in connection with their annual institute meetings.

Where the Institute and Fair are combined, the attendance and interest is much better than where the Institute holds its annual meeting alone.

Institute Numbers Decline—1920s

The number of Farmers' Institutes, running from one to three days in length, decreased rapidly from the early 1920s onward.

As shown in the previous table, the number of Institutes held each year from 1920 through 1930 were: 55, 57, 18, 17, 19, 18, 11, 16, 10, 9 and 8.

In 1935, only four institutes were held—at Wakefield, in Clay Co., 1,303 in attendance; Hackney, in Cowley Co., 970; Altamont, in Labette Co., 493; and Watson, in Shawnee Co., 557.

By 1964, only Hackney and Wakefield continued their Farmers' Institute programs, probably only because of the historical interest manifest by a few local leaders.

County Extension programs replaced Farmers' Institute programs, and made them outmoded.

Many community and county-wide Extension programs, as organized and conducted in the 1960s, were similar in nature to the original Institute programs.

Agricultural Trains—1914-28

Agricultural trains continued to be a popular way to reach Extension audiences with special emphasis displays and presentations for many years.

Some of the major areas of emphasis during this period (1914-29) included:

1914 - Two Silo Trains, 114 stops, 29,440 in attendance.

1915 - Hessian Fly Train, in cooperation with the Santa Fe Railway. Six days, 6,906 in attendance.

1917 - Cow and Hen Special, in cooperation with the Santa Fe Railway. 25 days, 190 stops, 39,883 in attendance.

1922 - Cow, Sow, and Hen Special, in cooperation with the Santa Fe Railway. Two weeks, 55 stops, 31,000 in attendance.

1922 - Kaw Valley Potato Train, in cooperation with the Union Pacific Railroad. March 20 to 25, 11 stops, 2,937 in attendance.

1925 - Opportunity Special (Wheat Train), in cooperation with the Santa Fe Railway. Forty-four stops, 117,000 in attendance.

1926 - Two Wheat Festival Trains, in cooperation with the Santa Fe Railway and the Rock Island Lines. Sixty stops, 158,300 in attendance.

1926 - Soil Improvement Special, in cooperation

with the Missouri Pacific Railroad. Twenty-eight stops, 45,000 in attendance.

1926 - Soil Improvement and Legume Production Special, in cooperation with the Santa Fe Railway. Fifty-seven stops, 96,287 in attendance.

1928 - Agricultural Train (Improved Farm Practices) operated by the Union Pacific Railroad. Fourteen stops, 9,389 in attendance.

Fairs and Shows—1920s-30s

During the years when a College exhibit was shown at the Free Fair at Topeka, the State Fair at Hutchinson, and the Wheat Show at Wichita, the Santa Fe and Rock Island Railroads provided the transportation from, and returning to, Manhattan.

In later years, the Santa Fe, the Union Pacific, the Rock Island, and Missouri Pacific railroads provided trips to the International Club Congress as awards for state project winners.

Extension Schools

Extension Schools were three to five days in length, each a series of lectures and demonstrations on selected subjects.

Extension Schools were initiated as independent from the Farmers' Institute programs. Extension Specialists, County Extension Agents, and Extension local leaders were usually responsible for the organization and implementation of the programs.

Extension Schools were not promoted to a great extent until 1914, when there began to be a demand for them from many communities in Kansas.

Early Schools—1914

Eight Extension Schools, in as many communities, were conducted in 1914. The schools were five days in length. Three Agricultural Extension Specialists and one Extension Home Economics Specialist constituted the teaching staff.

Each of the Agricultural Extension Specialists gave a series of ten lessons on the fundamentals of his speciality during the week. The lessons were illustrated with charts, and demonstrations were used, such as livestock judging.

Extension home economics instruction consisted of lecture and demonstration work. A lecture, followed by a

demonstration was given each morning and afternoon. The average attendance was 120.

The Extension schools proved so satisfactory that five of the eight communities in which they were held immediately requested that a similar school be held the next season.

Schedule More Schools—1915

Before July 1, 1915, eighteen Extension Schools were contracted for in the state, to be held during the winter season of 1915-16. It was the plan to make the Schools largely demonstrational.

Plans were to precede each Extension School with surveys on soil, farm management, and livestock, to obtain local data on the situation. There was then to be a follow-up with plans for field demonstrations, with farm visits, and with reading courses in agriculture.

In the winter of 1915-16, thirteen Extension Schools were conducted with an average attendance of 39 men and 34 women. At nine of the schools, courses in both agriculture and home economics were taught.

Two Extension Schools were conducted in cooperation with State Normal Schools; two with State Colleges; three with county high schools; and two with consolidated rural schools.

The demand for Extension Schools exceeded the financial resources available. Therefore, local sponsors were asked to pay a fee of \$75 to help pay the expenses of instructors, and pay local expenses.

Demand for Repeat Schools—1916

Many communities asked for repeat schools. In the winter of 1916-17, the Schools were designated as "first-year" and "second-year" schools.

The second-year schools were charged a fee of \$125 because a carload of livestock was furnished by the Kansas State Agricultural College for those schools. The additional fee was to pay most of the expense for care and transportation of the livestock.

The Extension Schools were five days in length, held from November to February.

The instructors for the first-year Schools were:

- A. S. Neale, Specialist in Dairying.
- F. S. Hagy, Specialist in Soils and Crops.
- D. H. Branson, Specialist in Animal Husbandry.
- Alice Poulter, Specialist in Domestic Science.
- Minnie Sequist, Specialist in Domestic Art.

Instructors for the second-year Schools were:

- F. W. Caldwell, Specialist in Animal Husbandry.
- H. J. Bower, Specialist in Soils and Crops.
- Marion Broughton, Specialist in Domestic Science.
- Mary Wright, Specialist in Domestic Art.

Thirteen first-year schools were held with an average attendance of 33 men and 34 women. Twelve second-year schools had an average attendance of 55 men and 39 women.

Winter Schools—1918

The winter of 1918-19 experienced many outbreaks of influenza. Many meetings were postponed or cancelled. Only nine Extension Schools were conducted.

Plans and programs had been made for 15 additional Schools but they were cancelled because of the epidemics. Of those held, eight were three-day and one a five-day school. The average attendance was 276.

The Schools included two lines of work for men and two for women. If the school was in a Farm Bureau county, the lines of work selected were coordinated with the county Extension program previously planned by the Farm Bureau.

In his report for 1919, Director Umberger wrote:

Cooperative demonstration work was handled by the Specialists assigned to this work. They devoted about half-time to intensive work in six to eight counties, and the other half of their time for study of the research work in their field and serving the various requests which come to them.

An effort was made to extend this program to counties without Agents, working with leaders, and certain successes were experienced depending upon the activity and interest manifest by the local leaders.

The Extension Schools of the period from 1914 to 1920 were characterized by their being conducted over a three to five-day period. Extension Schools increased in number as the number of Farmers' Institutes declined.

During the 1920s, however, a gradual shift to one or two-day Schools was experienced. The following data are from the annual reports:

Year	Length in Days					Tot	Attend.
	1	2	3	4	5		
1921-22	34	12	19	1	1	67	NA
1922-23	22	13	4	-	-	39	NA
1923-24	35	15	3	-	-	53	4,721
1924-25	66	14	2	2	4	88	5,137
1925-26	21	9	3	1	3	37	4,339
1926-27	59	13	4	2	5	83	10,081
1927-28	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	104	10,291
1928-29	222	21	2	-	-	245	20,596

The above data show the number of Extension Schools increased rapidly, and that the trend was largely to one-day schools. These trends corresponded to an increase in the number of County Extension Agents.

Extension Schools also changed from having much participation of local leaders on the program, to schools, for which the Extension Specialist and the County Extension Agent carried the major responsibility, with a local leader appearing on the program only occasionally.

However, officially these were still Extension Schools. In 1935, 597 Extension Schools were reported, although they served largely as training schools for local leaders.

Commodity Groups—1923

Organization of commodity groups was discussed in Director Harry Umberger's 1923 report:

There is developing at the present time a very strong tendency toward development of groups upon the basis

of interests rather than upon the basis of geography; to organize people in place of square miles.

While too young to measure safely its ultimate growth, this new tendency shows promise of admirable adaptability to both program development and execution.

The old neighborhood communities are being consolidated since the automobile has become common, and it may not be too much to expect that the county rather than the school district may become our logical community unit so far as county agents work is concerned.

During the past year, a large number of Crop Improvement Associations, Livestock Improvement Associations, Potato Growers Associations, Poultry Associations and like organizations have been formed and the tendency to develop within the entire program involved in the field of each has become very noticeable.

In the Kaw Valley, for instance, potato growing is an extensive industry. The first work undertaken in this project was the control of potato diseases. A careful study of the whole potato industry in the valley was made and the real problems were found to be economic production and proper grading for market.

This Association now has 160 members and includes all the commercial growers in Shawnee County. It has become a project of the County Farm Bureau, particularly in Shawnee County, and all problems pertaining to potato production and marketing are carried on through this subsidiary Association.

Community Organization—1923

In 1923, 534 community programs were conducted with 1,528 volunteer leaders assisting. The subject of community organization appeared in the Director's Report for 1924:

The desirability of "group" effort has been emphasized and the soundness of this policy is evidenced by the increase in organized communities.

The summary taken from the annual reports of the County Agricultural Agents shows 831 communities organized and cooperating in the development and execution of Extension programs. This summary also shows a total of 2,425 local leaders promoting Extension programs.

In 1922, there were 403 communities organized, and in 1923, 534 communities organized, with a total of 1,828 local leaders.

Director Umberger's Report for 1936 stated:

Extension Schools remained a part of the title of Project No. 6, the full name of which was: "Extension Schools in Agriculture and Home Economics and the Supervision of Agricultural Extension Specialists."

The purposes of the Extension Schools were:

- 1) To train project leaders.
- 2) To summarize project activities conducted during the previous year.
- 3) To plan future programs for areas and counties.
- 4) To secure demonstrators and other cooperators.

In 1926, the "Extension Schools in Home Economics and the Supervision of Home Economics Specialists" project was discontinued.

At the same time Agricultural Extension Specialists project was changed to, "Extension Schools in Agriculture and Home Economics and Supervision of Agricultural Specialists."

County Farm Bureau Law

Effect of County Farm Bureau Law—1915

John Miller, Dean and Director of the Division of Extension, in his Annual Report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, made these comments about the effect of the new Farm Bureau law, passed in March, 1915, on the organization of County Farm Bureaus:

The law necessarily made some changes in the form of the Farm Bureau organization then existing, as the Farm Bureaus up to that time had a membership of between 90 and 200 persons. The new law provided for a membership of not less than 250 bona fide farmers.

Further, it did away with the necessity of soliciting donations from private parties with the exception of providing the initial \$800 for the equipment of a new bureau. The increase in the required membership of the Bureau made necessary a membership campaign for those counties which wished to avail themselves of the provisions of the new law.

Three counties immediately conducted campaigns, namely, Leavenworth, Jewell and Harvey, and all of them qualified with the full membership by July 1, 1915. Two of the other Bureaus in the State pledged themselves to qualify under the new law at the expiration of the first three years' work, namely, Cowley and

Montgomery counties.

The new law gave an impetus to the Farm Bureau movement in the State in counties where the matter had been agitated before. Nevertheless, in some cases, leaders who attempt to promote the movement fear that it will be difficult to secure 250 members and, therefore, let the matter drop.

In other cases, a few leaders assume the responsibility for the organization without difficulty. Campaigns for Farm Bureaus were undertaken in several counties during the summer of 1915. (Three of these are fully organized and ready to commence work January 1, 1916, and it is believed that from now on Bureaus will be organized as rapidly as they can be effectively cared for.)

Change from Individual to Group Work

Under the old system, when Farm Bureau membership consisted of 75 to 200 members, it was possible for the County Agent to do considerable individual work.

The increase in membership tends to diminish the amount of individual work done and increases the group work. For such work it will be necessary to depend largely upon the Farm Bureau itself to help organize and advertise the work in each locality.

It requires also a definite outline of work or projects of work for each season. In the past, necessarily, the work was of a rather general nature, but as the work now develops and each Agent becomes more familiar with the requirements of the county which he serves, it is possible to adopt definite projects.

County Farm Bureau Law—1915

The Agricultural Improvement Clubs and other county organizations formed prior to the passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, were financed largely by private subscriptions, pledges by farmers, and a portion of the Agent's salary paid by the College.

The County Farm Bureau law passed by the 1915 Kansas legislature provided authorization for county appropriations to aid the County Farm Bureaus to support the county Extension program with funds available from a county levy, membership dues, and an allocation of the Agent's salary by the College.

The district agents were assigned the responsibility, however, of maintaining adequate finances and the maintenance of the legally required membership of bona fide farmers as required by the state law.

For 36 years the educational program of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service was conducted by County Farm Bureaus cooperating with the Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Sciences.

Farm Bureau Organization—1915

The county Farm Bureau organization in Kansas was outlined by an act of the legislature. This law, passed in 1915, provided for:

- 1) Membership consisting of not less than 250 or one-fourth of the bona fide farmers in a county.
- 2) An advisory council consisting of a vice-president from each township elected by the members residing in that township.
- 3) An executive board of ten members elected by the advisory council from their own number.
- 4) A president, vice-president, secretary-treasurer elected as the constitution of the Farm Bureau may provide.

An Annual Extension Report at that time said:

The election of vice-presidents by townships has never proven practical. Township lines are seldom, if ever, boundary lines of communities.

The township vice-president chosen was, in most cases, entirely unacquainted with the people and problems of the larger part of the township represented. Organization upon this basis was found purely artificial.

In the development of organization on the community basis this law has stood marterially in the way. The past year, however, when the community organization has been fully carried out in the county, and community chairmen elected, these chairmen have taken the place of the township vice-presidents provided for under the law.

The letter of the law has been complied with by suggesting the election of these community chairmen as township vice-presidents. Since the advisory council has no regular duties other than that of electing the executive board, the township vice-president is forgotten after this duty has been preformed and the work of the bureau is carried on entirely through the community chairman elected.

When this has been done it has resulted in a very much greater vitality and a greater interest in the work of the Farm Bureau.

County FB Memberships—1915-51

County Farm Bureau memberships were an impor-

tant financial resource as well as a legal requirement to permit a county appropriation for Extension, from 1915 to 1951.

The County Farm Bureau Law was repealed at that time and County Agricultural Councils became the county organizations that sponsored the County Extension program.

Membership data for years available were:

Men Memberships in County FB

Yr.	No.	Dues
1939	34,257	\$86,678.69
1940	34,773	92,259.66
1941	34,849	97,184.50
1942	35,578	103,033.00
1943	34,832	104,367.00
1944	36,623	95,614.50
1945	40,653	108,378.00
1946	50,061	140,786.50
1947	58,189	168,429.50
1948	52,644	381,099.25
1949	57,353	433,284.50
1950	59,494	N/A
1951	61,783	N/A
1952	N/A	N/A
1953	N/A	N/A
1954	N/A	N/A

Women Memberships in County FB

Yr	No.	Dues
1939	N/A	N/A
1940	N/A	N/A
1941	N/A	N/A
1942	N/A	N/A
1943	N/A	N/A
1944	22,227	\$22,863.50
1945	24,237	24,593.50
1946	27,722	27,988.50
1947	31,661	32,270.50
1948	33,733	35,447.50
1949	36,506	37,913.00
1950	39,047	N/A
1951	41,490	N/A
1952	30,401	N/A
1953	45,526	N/A
1954	46,565	N/A

County Farm Bureau Dues—1915-17

The amount of annual membership dues for men and women as members of a County Farm Bureau was stated in the County Bureau's constitution.

Beginning in 1915, the amount for dues varied from county to county, although in the late 1930s the amount for men was generally \$3 and for women \$1.

County Farm Bureaus that were members of the Kansas Farm Bureau paid an annual membership fee of \$1.50 per man member. The other \$1.50 of the men's dues was budgeted to help support the county Extension program. All of the women's dues remained in the county budget.

In 1947, the Kansas Farm Bureau raised the amount of dues for membership in that organization to \$5 per year. This action, of course, forced the County Farm Bureaus to increase membership dues for men.

During the late summer of 1947, many County Farm Bureaus held special membership meetings to amend their constitution to increase membership dues for men.

In general, county dues for men increased to \$10 per year. However, annual dues for some counties were \$6, \$7.50, and \$8. Membership dues for women usually remained unchanged.

Amend Farm Bureau Law—1919

In 1919, the Kansas Legislature amended the 1915 Kansas Farm Bureau Law in several respects:

- 1) The minimum appropriation required from the County Commissioners was raised from \$800 to \$1,200 per year.
- 2) A county appropriation was made mandatory on the part of the County Commissioners after the provisions of the law with respect to membership, constitution and by-laws and an equipment fund had been met.
- 3) The Commissioners were now permitted to make a tax levy against all the tangible property in the county to raise funds for the Farm Bureau.
- 4) A budget system governing the expenditure of funds was provided.

The new law became effective upon publication, June 17, 1919. Budgets were prepared by each Farm Bureau Executive Board and presented to the County Commissioners at their August meeting.

An encouraging feature in the development of Extension work was that 28 counties made appropriations equal to or greater than the maximum budget permitted by the old law.

A significant section of the revised law was the one specifying membership requirements and the purpose of the County Farm Bureau.

Section 2812 reads:

That whenever there shall be organized in any county in the State of Kansas a County Farm Bureau having a membership of twenty-five percent of the bona fide farmers of the county, or as many as two hundred and fifty farmers, and having for its purpose the giving of instruction in agriculture and home economics to the people of said county through practical demonstrations or otherwise, and the employment of a County Agricultural Agent or Agents to prosecute this work, the Kansas State Agricultural College shall contribute, from Federal and State funds granted for demonstrations in agriculture and home economics, not less than twelve hundred dollars, as far as such funds are available, toward the salary of such County Agricultural Agent or Agents.

All applications for such funds must be made by Farm Bureaus to the Extension Division of the Kansas State Agricultural College, on or before June 1 and December 1 of each year.

A portion of Section 2814 read:

...The Executive Committee of the Farm Bureau shall be required to prepare and present to the Board of County Commissioners, on or before the first Monday in August, a budget or budgets showing clearly the amounts needed from year to year, which budgets shall be used as the basis for the appropriation by the County Commissioners, and the County Commissioners shall be empowered to make a tax levy against the property of the county, real and personal, sufficient to raise the funds needed for the Farm Bureau work, which levy shall be in addition to all other levies authorized by law.

The revised law further provided:

- 1) That two adjacent counties in the western part of the state could jointly organize a Farm Bureau.
- 2) That the existing Farm Bureaus could avail themselves of the provisions of the new law.
- 3) That the members of the Farm Bureau in the several townships of a county should elect from their number a vice-president and that the several vice-presidents so elected should elect from their number an Executive Committee of ten members.
- 4) That the Agents should be selected by the Executive Committee, or Board, and that their work should be under the general direction and supervision of the Kansas State Agricultural College

- 5) That the constitution and by-laws of each Farm Bureau, and all accounts and expenditures of funds were subject to the approval of the Director of Extension.

Review Constitution—1929

A survey of constitutions under which the Farm Bureaus were operating revealed that:

- 1) Some did not comply with the law.
- 2) Some did not give the privilege of voting to women.
- 3) They did not allow for the proper expansion of women's work.
- 4) There were many variations between constitutions. This was not illegal but it showed an undesirable lack of uniformity in operation.
- 5) Some did not have an Executive Board of 10 members because they had less than 10 townships.

Farm Bureau Constitution Revision—1929

A revision of the proposed county Farm Bureau Constitution was made October 28, 1929. Since the Director of Extension was authorized and required to approve each county Farm Bureau constitution, he was in a position to have the revised constitution adopted.

Article II-Purpose read as follows:

In harmony with the Smith-Lever Act and the Kansas Farm Bureau law providing for the support of the Farm Bureau work this organization shall have for its purpose, "The giving of instruction in agriculture and home economics to the people of said county through practical demonstrations and otherwise, and the employment of a County Agricultural Agent or Agents to prosecute this work."

The efforts of this organization and its employees shall be to prosecute the most profitable and permanent system of agriculture; the most wholesome and satisfying living conditions; the highest ideals in home and community life; and a genuine interest in the farm business and rural life on the part of young people.

The 1929 revision also gave the women Farm Bureau members the same opportunity as the men to hold any office in the organization.

In 1929, the County Commissioners in Cloud County refused to appropriate the minimum of \$1,200 as required by law. The County Farm Bureau officers brought a case to the Supreme Court which held that the appropriation was mandatory.

Interpret Kansas Extension Law—1929

Decisions on Extension had been rendered by district courts, but no point covered under this law had been interpreted by the Supreme Court of Kansas until the case of the Cloud County Farm Bureau vs. the Board of County Commissioners of Cloud County.

The court's 1929 decision settled permanently the question of whether County Commissioners had to appropriate the minimum of \$1,200.

The decision, in the discussion by Justice Johnson, was that Farm Bureaus were under the supervision of the Dean of the Extension Division of Kansas State Agricultural College.

This was the policy followed by the Extension Service, and the law was interpreted as giving the Director of

Extension supervision and control of the expenditure of all Extension funds, including county funds.

This opinion was supported by the Attorney General of Kansas in a letter of May 23, 1928, as follows:

Dean Umberger has inquired from me whether or not he had authority to withhold Federal, State, and County funds from expenditure to pay the salary and expenses of a Farm Agent in any county when, in Dean Umberger's opinion, the County Farm Agent was not a suitable person to hold that position.

After an examination of the statutes, I have advised Dean Umberger and am advising you that in my opinion he does have this authority.

County Organization—1915-29

County funds for Extension work were first available on July 1, 1915, in Leavenworth, Harvey, and Jewell counties; on June 1, 1916, in Montgomery, and Miami counties and on Feb. 1, 1917, in Atchison county.

Cowley, Allen, and Linn county organizations were discontinued in 1916 and 1917.

Other counties organized before June 30, 1920, by year were:

Cloud Co.	Nov 11, 1915
Wilson Co.	Apr 6, 1916
Marshall Co.	Apr 6, 1916
Morris Co.	Feb 24, 1916
McPherson Co.	Jun 1, 1916
Nemaha Co.	Jun 1, 1916
Pawnee Co.	Jun 20, 1916
Washington Co.	Dec 11, 1916
Doniphan Co.	Jan 15, 1917
Chase Co.	Feb 3, 1917
Marion Co.	Mar 21, 1917
Franklin Co.	May 15, 1917
Ness Co.	Jul 1, 1917
Shawnee Co.	Jul 1, 1917
Anderson Co.	Jul 6, 1917
Johnson Co.	Sep 1, 1917
Wyandotte Co.	Oct 15, 1917
Douglas Co.	Nov 27, 1917

Clay Co.	Dec 13, 1917
Greenwood Co.	Dec 22, 1917
Finney Co.	Jan 1, 1918
Sedgwick Co.	Jan 3, 1918
Ford Co.	Jan 12, 1918
Jackson Co.	Jan 20, 1918
Barton Co.	Jan 22, 1918
Hodgeman Co.	Jan, 1918
Sumner Co.	Jan, 1918
Bourbon Co.	Feb 8, 1918
Rawlins Co.	Feb 8, 1918
Neosho Co.	Feb 14, 1918
Meade Co.	Mar 4, 1918
Cheyenne Co.	Mar 4, 1918
Comanche Co.	Mar 17, 1918
Labette Co.	Apr 8, 1918
Cherokee Co.	Apr 15, 1918
Barber Co.	May 15, 1918 (discont. Jun 30, 1920)
Kingman Co.	May, 1918
Pratt Co.	May, 1918
Jefferson Co.	Jun, 1918
Osage Co.	Jun, 1918
Gray Co.	Jun, 1918
Wichita-Greeley	Nov 28, 1918 (discont. Jun 30, 1922)
Coffey Co.	Feb 15, 1919

Rush Co.	Apr 3, 1919 (discont. Jun 30, 1921)
Rooks Co.	May 27, 1919 (discont. Apr 30, 1922)
Allen Co.	Jun 11, 1919 (reorganized)
Clark Co.	Jul 4, 1919
Ellis Co.	Mar 15, 1920 (discont. Jan 8, 1924)
Reno Co.	May 29, 1920

Additional counties organized during the 1920's were:

Rice Co.	Jan 22, 1921
Butler Co.	Feb 5, 1921
Lincoln Co.	Feb 5, 1921
Crawford Co.	Apr 4, 1921
Sherman Co.	Jan, 1922

Ottawa Co.	Aug 10, 1923
Dickinson Co.	Mar 1, 1924
Harper Co.	Apr 13, 1924
Smith Co.	Sep 27, 1924
Brown Co.	Feb 12, 1915
Gear Co.	Apr 15, 1925
Riley Co.	Aug 4, 1925
Saline Co.	Dec 7, 1926
Linn Co.	Feb 1, 1927 (reorganized)
Edwards Co.	Feb 24, 1928
Cowley Co.	Mar 12, 1928 (reorganized)
Lane Co.	Feb 21, 1929
Woodson Co.	Mar 11, 1929
Stafford Co.	Apr 11, 1929
Sheridan Co.	Apr 13, 1929
Russell Co.	Apr 18, 1929

Farm & Home Week

The State Farmers' Institute was renamed, "Farm and Home Week," in 1915. State Farmers' Institutes had been conducted at Kansas State Agricultural College during the Christmas vacation period each year beginning in 1907-08.

Change in Date—1918

In 1916, it was decided that the Christmas vacation period was not the best time for holding Farm and Home Week. It was difficult for farm people to leave home during that season, and it also required faculty members to nearly relinquish their vacation activities.

In 1917, Farm and Home Week was scheduled in February. In 1918 it was held the last week of January. Starting in 1919, the date became the first week of February. The County Farm Bureaus voted in favor of the February date.

The Farm and Home Week programs continued with well over 1,000 people in attendance each year. During the week several state associations, such as the Sheep Breeders' Association, the Crop Improvement Association, the various associations of hog breeders, the dairy cattle breed associations, the Horse Breeders' Association, and other agricultural associations of the state held their annual meetings as part of Farm and Home Week.

Programs for the various sections were prepared by the department concerned, and were so organized to reinforce the Extension work done throughout the state during the year.

Many Attend—1921

In his report for 1921, H. C. Umberger, Director of Extension, made this comment about Farm and Home Week:

The Fifth Annual Farm and Home Week program was held February 7-12, 1921. A reduced railroad fare of one and one-half fare for the round trip was secured. A very extensive publicity campaign was started in September.

Actual registration was 1,780, and in addition, many attended only one day and did not register. These included agricultural teachers, their classes and others. The estimated total attendance was 2,200.

The annual banquet on Thursday evening was a great success. Committees started work early in the week to develop interest in the banquet. Four hundred twenty-five attended.

The keynote on the program was "Marketing." J. R. Howard, President of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and C. H. Gustafson, Chairman of the Committee of Seventeen, were secured as speakers for the week.

4-H Club Roundup—1923

In 1923, after several years of conducting a "Club Week" program for boys and girls during Farm and Home Week, it was decided to hold that program at another time—May 5-12.

A special appeal was made to grade school club members to attend. Attendance in 1923 was 255 as compared to 121 boys and girls at the Farm and Home Week program the previous year.

The new event for 4-H club members was called "4-H Club Roundup." In 1925, the date was shifted to the first week in June, after schools were out. The 4-H Roundup was held annually at that time until the title was changed to Discovery Days.

Feature 10 Courses—1926

In 1926, Farm and Home Week consisted of ten courses attended by 1500 registered persons.

New Program Framework—1927

In 1927, an important change was made in the Farm and Home Week program format. Prior to 1927, programs in dairy, animal husbandry, poultry, home economics and others were scheduled for the entire week.

Participants found that many of the lectures they wanted to attend were given at the same hour. To solve the problem certain days were selected on the program to emphasize certain topics.

The schedule was:

Tuesday—Poultry Day

Wednesday—Dairy Day and Home Economics

Thursday—Livestock Day and Home Economics

Friday—Agronomy Day and Home Economics

The Home Economics program was scheduled for Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, permitting women to attend the Poultry Day program on Tuesday.

More than 1,600 persons from 77 counties attended Farm and Home Week in 1927.

Emergency Programs

World War I—1917-18

In his report for 1917, County Agent Leader H. Umberger stated:

There were no changes in the general plan of organization necessary in order to meet the war emergency, except the creation of the Department of Emergency Home Demonstration Agents.

The Emergency County Agent work was handled as an integral part of the regular County Agent work, and except for the placing of a number of Emergency Demonstration Agents in districts of two or more counties and a few Demonstration Agents in one county each without thorough preliminary organization of farmers, the organization in no way differed from that used in peace time.

Emergency Measures

In the work done by the Division, however, the war emergency measures recommended by the Federal government were emphasized above all others.

Such, for instance, as the organization work to meet the harvest labor situation, the seed and labor surveys, the campaigns for increased wheat production, increased hog production, increased poultry production, the control of crop and orchard insects, and the growing of gardens.

More or less of this work is done every year by the Extension Service and the war emergency only inten-

sified and increased the amount of work done along these lines and special emphasis was placed on those lines recommended by the Federal government.

In May (1917) it was announced that an appropriation bill was pending in Federal Congress which would provide an additional fund for demonstrations in agriculture and home economics to augment the Smith-Lever appropriation.

It was decided, since the appropriation was not sufficient to place an Agent in every county, to canvas those counties not already having regular agents or a Farm Bureau, offering them the services of an Agent, if \$800 would be raised by the county, either from private subscriptions or preferably by appropriation from county funds, and the services of both a man and a woman agent if \$1200 were appropriated.

Council of Defense

Prior to this time and after the declaration of war, a Council of Defense had been organized as follows:

Organization of Kansas Council of Defense, President and one Vice-President in each congressional district, and among the committees a Committee on Agricultural Production consisting of fourteen members with state sub-committees as follows:

Field Crops, Seed & Soils, 14 members.

Horse and Machine Power, 5 members.

Livestock, 13 members.
 Dairying, 8 members.
 Potatoes and Truck Crops, 8 members.
 Fruit, 8 members.
 Plant Diseases, 4 members.
 Gardening and Canning, 8 members.
 Poultry, 7 members.
 Insects, 8 members.
 Injurious Mammals (Gophers, Rats, etc.) 8 members.

This organization was supposed to be extended to all counties where a president and a secretary was to be appointed by the Governor (Arthur Capper). The Emergency Agent work was undertaken through the cooperation of the County Council of Defense.

In many cases these county organizations were not interested in the Agricultural Development and it was found necessary to detail members of the Extension Division to visit each county for the purpose of explaining fully the purpose of the movement to the County Council of Defense and County Commissioners.

The following men were detailed for this work:

A. F. Turner, Assistant County Agent Leader.

P. E. Crabtree, Dist. Agricultural Agent, West Central.

Walter Burr, Director Rural Service.

C. G. Elling, Dist. Agricultural Agent, Southeast.

G. E. Thompson, Crops Specialist.

This work was completed about June 1, 1917.

The following table gives the results:

County	Demo Agent	Date	Amount
Ford	John V. Hepler	Jun 8, 1917	\$800
Hodgeman	Neil L. Rucker	Jun 8, 1917	800
Finney	Chas. E. Cassel	May 18, 1917	1,200
Ness	W. J. Yeoman Millie Lindsay	May 22, 1917	1,200
Cowley	E. E. Isaac Juanita Sutcliff	Jun 2, 1917	1,200
Rush	L. E. Willoughby	Jul 2, 1917	800
Pratt	A. V. Norlin	Jun 14, 1917	800
Kingman	H. L. Hildewein	Jul 2, 1917	800
Seward	L. C. Christie Ellen Nelson	Jul 14, 1917	1,200
Stevens	R. F. Hagans Bertha Boyd	Jul 14, 1917	1,200

Emergency Extension Agents—1917-19

During World War I, County Emergency Extension Agents were employed from Federal funds provided for that purpose for the following counties:

County Emergency Extension Agents:

Clark:

Albert B. Kimball Aug 20, 1918 to May 31, 1919

Cowley:

E. E. Isaac Jan 1, 1918 to Jun 30, 1918

Finney:

Charles E. Cassel Aug 16, 1917 to Jun 30, 1919

Ford:

John V. Hepler Aug 20, 1917 to Jun 30, 1919

Hodgeman:

Neil L. Rucker Jan 1, 1918 to Jun 15, 1918

J. W. Thornburgh Jul 5, 1918 to Sep 30, 1919

Johnson:

Harry S. Wilson Nov 5, 1917 to Jun 30, 1919

Kingman:

H. L. Hildwein Sep 1, 1917 to Oct 4, 1918

Lincoln:

A. W. Brumbaugh Sep 1, 1918 to Nov 1, 1918

Pratt:

Edward Larson Dec 15, 1917 to Dec 21, 1918

Rush:

L. E. Willoughby Aug 15, 1917 to Dec 11, 1918

Seward:

L. C. Christie Dec 10, 1917 to Mar 10, 1918

C. W. Shull Aug 30, 1918 to Dec 21, 1918

Theodore F. Yost Jun 11, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919

Sheridan:

G. H. Kinkel Sep 1, 1918 to Dec 15, 1918

Ness:

W. J. Yoeman Jan 1, 1918 to Jun 30, 1918

Stevens:

R. F. Hagans Jan 1, 1918 to Jun 30, 1918

District Emergency Demo Agents—1918-19

Russell-Ellsworth:

E. L. McIntosh Jun 20, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919

Riley-Geary:

Ralph Kenney Dec 15, 1917 to Aug 31, 1918

Rice-Ellsworth:

Arthur I. Gilkison Jan 1, 1918 to May 30, 1918

Elk-Chautauqua:	
T. W. Allison	1917 to Dec 31, 1918
J. H. McAdams	Jan 1, 1919 to Jul 14, 1919
Jefferson-Jackson:	
Ralph Snyder	Jan 1, 1918 to Jul 1, 1918
Osborne-Mitchell:	
D. H. Gripton	1917 to Jul 1, 1919
R. W. Kilbourn	Jun 2, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919
Pottawatomie-Wabaunsee:	
Blaine Crow	Dec , 1917 to Sep 9, 1918
Neosho-Labette:	
Fred T. Rees	Jan 1, 1918 to Apr 1, 1919
Kearney-Hamilton:	
Price H. Wheeler	Jan 1, 1918 to Apr 1, 1919
Greeley-Wichita:	
George W. Sidwell	Jan 1, 1918 to Jun 30, 1919
Crawford-Cherokee:	
E. J. Willis	Jan 7, 1918 to Jul 1, 1918
Decatur-Norton:	
Charles L. Zoller	Aug 20, 1918 to Nov 1, 1918
Sheridan-Decatur:	
Henry B. Bayer	Jan 1, 1918 to May 31, 1918
A. F. Whisnant	Jun 1, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919
Norton-Phillips-Smith:	
A. B. Richmond	Jun 7, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919
Ottawa-Dickinson-Saline:	
W. R. Bolen	Feb 16, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919
Thomas-Logan-Wallace-Sherman:	
Ralph B. Medlin	Mar 16, 1918 to Jun 30, 1919
Thomas-Logan:	
G. H. Kinkel	Jun 10, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919
Rooks-Graham:	
E. F. Tinker	Apr 10, 1918 to Jun 1, 1919
John A. Clarke	Jun 11, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919
Allen-Woodson:	
H. T. Corson	May 20, 1918 to May 15, 1919
Cloud-Republic:	
Charles Lagasse	Sep 1, 1918 to Nov 1, 1918
Cheyenne-Rawlins:	
E. I. Maris	Jan 1, 1918 to Jun 20, 1918
Gove-Trego:	
E. A. Kirkpatrick	May 20, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919
Ness-Lane:	
F. A. Billhimer	May 20, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919
Kiowa-Edwards:	
J. L. Lantow	May 20, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919

Stevens-Grant-Haskell:

J. F. Gardner Jun 1, 1919 to Jun 30, 1919

Plan of County Defense Organization—1917
 Organization in the counties for the emergency program began with the selection of a county chairman for an Agricultural Committee. This was done by the County Council for Defense or the Emergency Extension Agent.

In a similar manner two County Committees were established, one for home economics and one for labor. The three county committees, of three each, then became a nine member County Advisory Council for the emergency program. That group, with the County Extension Agent assisting, developed a County Program for Food Production and Conservation.

The committee of three—the chairs of the County Advisory Council, the Committee for home economics, and the Committee for Labor— then appointed one a vice-president in each township.

Meetings were held in each township or community. Township organizations were completed by adding members to represent home economics, labor, livestock, crop production and any other interest that needed consideration. Each township adopted a township program.

The county committee coordinated the community programs that had been planned.

Emergency Farm Bureau—1917-18

The entire organization was considered to be an Emergency Farm Bureau. Later, a number of the emergency county organizations became regularly organized Farm Bureaus for conducting the Extension program.

Counties not having either a County Farm Bureau, an Emergency Council, or service by a District Agricultural Extension Agent, were grouped into districts of two counties each in so far as possible. Emergency Agents were paid from the emergency funds.

Project areas selected by these emergency counties included:

- 1) A labor bureau.
- 2) Farm equipment.
- 3) Household conveniences.
- 4) Sanitation.

Immediate projects included: wheat varieties, Hessian fly control, control of volunteer wheat; seedbeds

for all crops; seed selection; conservation of feed for livestock; conservation of foods by canning, drying, storage and avoiding waste; use of fertilizers including straw and manure; fall and winter plowing; livestock feeding; dairying; control of insects and diseases; tenant-landlord relations; cooperatives; pastures; fruit production and many others.

Most of the personnel appointed were employed too late in the year to help in increased crop production for 1917. A few, however, were able to help farmers secure seed wheat, and in other ways contributed to increased wheat production.

Home Economics In War Effort—1917

Because of the importance of Home Economics in the war effort, on November 1, 1917, a Department of Emergency Home Demonstration Work was established. Frances Brown was transferred from the leadership of

the regular Home Economics Extension program to the headship of the Emergency Department. Stella Mather was assistant to Frances Brown.

During the winter of 1917, the Emergency Extension Agents devoted time to perfecting the temporary County Farm Bureaus.

Early in 1918, additional District Extension Emergency Agents were employed, until each county of the state had the services of a County Extension Agent or a District Extension Agent. Twenty one additional County Farm Bureaus were organized that year.

The organized program of production for the war effort continued through 1918 and into 1919. Food conservation, food preservation, farm machinery repair, conservation, and farm labor were all given adequate attention.

All emergency positions were discontinued June 30, 1920 when Federal emergency funds were terminated.

Special Campaigns—1918-19

During the war emergency, several special campaigns were carried out by Extension, all designed to increase agricultural production in Kansas.

Federal Seed Wheat Loans—1918

Early in July, 1918, the drought conditions brought about a need for aid to western Kansas farmers in securing seed wheat for planting that fall. Bankers had extended credit to the limit in many cases. County Extension Agents in the area provided information on the situation.

Data were submitted to authorities and in August an appropriation was secured from the President, providing funds to be loaned to wheat farmers for buying seed wheat.

County Extension Agents were made administratively responsible for the farm loan program. In counties that desired wheat loans but did not have Extension Agents, Special Agents were appointed. These counties were Clark, Decatur, Norton, Sheridan, and Lincoln counties.

A loan and inspection committee was appointed in each county securing loans. The result: 3,700 applications were inspected and 3,500 approved, for loans totaling \$860,000. This enabled farmers to purchase seed wheat to plant over 500,000 acres.

In the spring, 1919, many field inspections were made of drought stricken fields. Some were released in order that the fields could be planted to other spring crops. In June and July the County Extension Agents helped the farmers close out the loans.

Grasshopper Campaign—1918

About the middle of September, 1918, grasshoppers appeared in western Kansas by the millions. County Extension Agents and Emergency Agents took the lead in a poisoning campaign. In most counties with grasshopper problems the County Commissioners purchased the poison to be used.

County committees aided in the organization of county campaigns and in the distribution of the poison. Agents conducted demonstrations for applying poison bran mash to 1,598 farms. These activities were followed with a campaign urging farmers to disk their unworked fields in the fall to destroy grasshopper eggs.

Supply Feed to Southwest Kansas—1918

A heavy snow storm that came late in December, 1918, and covered the ground for three months, caused a serious cattle feed shortage in southwest Kansas counties.

Through the efforts of the County Agents and Emergency Agents, 137 carloads of straw, alfalfa and prairie hay were shipped into southwest Kansas counties.

Individual farmers also shipped in feed from sources located by the County Extension Agents. This program enabled many farmers to keep livestock that would otherwise have had to be sold.

Jackrabbit Eradication—1918-19

At least 258,000 jackrabbits were killed in western Kansas and a greater part of them shipped and sold as food, as a result of a campaign carried on by County Extension Agents during the winter of 1918-19. That program, although carefully organized, was handicapped by influenza and severe winter conditions.

Harvest Labor—1919

In 1919, eleven million acres in wheat produced the greatest wheat crop in Kansas history. Because of the heavy wheat harvest in all parts of the state and Oklahoma, a shortage of labor developed. The state was short 90,000 laborers. The straw was heavy and lodging was common. Railroad passenger fares made it unprofitable for laborers to travel far.

Areas surrounding Kansas also needed labor, so there was no migration from surrounding states. On May 3, 1919 a conference of 44 counties was held in Hutchinson.

E. E. Frizell of Larned, was employed as the Farm Help Specialist and placed in charge of the Labor Program. He was cooperatively employed by the Extension Division and the U. S. Department of Labor. Wages of \$5 per day for farm laborers were agreed upon.

The larger cities in Kansas were visited and Chambers of Commerce asked to help recruit labor for the wheat harvest.

There was some tendency to pay wages at the rate

of 60 cents per hour. Businessmen, women and children were drafted. Advertising in southern Missouri and Arkansas brought many men to Wichita from where they were distributed to counties most needing labor.

Some farmers traveled to Wichita and hauled out what men they could find. Others agreed to pay the transportation from Wichita to their farms.

In the final report, 52 counties reported 42,964 men used. Some wheat was lost.

Thresher Schools—1919

During May, 1919, Thresher Schools were conducted by the Extension Division, in cooperation with the Office of Public Roads, the U. S. Department of Agriculture, various threshing machine companies, and the Engineering Division of the Kansas State Agricultural College.

The object was to increase the efficiency of threshers by acquainting thresher operators with their machines and the adjustments to be made.

Schools were held at Wichita with an attendance of 150; Abilene, 125; Norton, 31; Dodge City, 65; Hays, 56; Great Bend, 60; and Mankato, 235.

Cutworm Campaign—1919

In the spring, 1919, an unusual and very destructive epidemic of cutworm occurred. The first damage occurred about the first of June. Due to the lack of parasitism, evidence indicated that the total damage would be very serious.

Publicity was prepared and distributed promptly, and demonstrations conducted on control of cutworms with poison bran mash.

Ninety-five demonstration meetings were held with an average attendance of 15 people. There were over 1,000 personal calls Extension Agents and more than 1,100 telephone calls.

State Farm Bureau—1918

On November 21-23, 1918, County Farm Bureau officers and County Commissioners met at the Kansas State Agricultural College to consider reconstruction measures following World War I.

The group also considered the need for State and County appropriations to adequately support the County Extension program.

Possible changes in legislation for County Extension work also received attention.

Action taken by the County Farm Bureau officers and County Commissioners at this meeting included:

- 1) Suggestions for amendment of the County Farm Bureau law as passed by the Kansas legislature in 1915.

2) A plan to provide assistance to demobilized soldiers and sailors in finding employment and farms for rent or for sale.

3) Ways to provide the labor needs of agriculture.

The County Farm Bureau officers expressed a desire for information pertaining to a State Farm Bureau organization.

Steps taken are explained in the 1920 annual report of County Agent Work prepared by Karl Knaus, County Agent Leader, and his assistants:

The Kansas State Farm Bureau

Action which resulted in the organization of the Kansas State Farm Bureau was taken in a conference of Farm Bureau officers and County commissioners held November 21-23, 1918, called by H. Umberger, Director of Extension of the Kansas State Agricultural College.

At this conference, it was recommended that a state wide committee be appointed to investigate, gather information and lay plans for the organization of a State Farm Bureau to be perfected when a majority of Farm Bureaus in the state had accepted the principles of the organization.

A committee consisting of F. O. Peterson of Burdick, D. E. Lauver of Paola, and H. N. Holdman of Meade was appointed to make investigations and report on the matter of organizing such an association.

The committee met after adjournment of the regular conference and requested Dean Umberger to obtain for it all possible data and information on state federations in the United States.

The committee then called a meeting to be held in Topeka February 20, 1919, for further consideration of this question. Ralph Snyder of Oskaloosa and Dean H. Umberger of the Extension division of Kansas State Agricultural College were present at this meeting on invitation of the committee.

Organizing Conference — 1919

A conference of Farm Bureau delegates was called for October 21, 1919, to consider the advisability of organizing a Kansas State Farm Bureau.

After listening to addresses by President Jardine, Walter Burr, Lloyd R. Simons of the States Relations Service, Chester Gray, President of the Missouri State Farm Bureau and member of the Organization Committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and John W. Coverdale, Secretary of the Iowa Farm Bureau, the question was thrown open for discussion.

Thirty-nine delegates, representing 38 counties, attended this conference. A list of the delegates is as follows:

J. C. Berry, Anderson Co.; W. N. Zieber, Barton Co.; R. S. Crane, Barber Co.; Wm. Campbell, Bourbon Co.; W. N. Schafer, Cherokee Co.; J. W. Collins, Cheyenne Co.

C. B. Vandever, Clarke Co.; G. W. McConahay, Cloud Co.; Over Gwin, Coffey Co.; Roy German, Comanche Co.; E. W. Smay, Franklin Co.

Leonard Thrall, Greenwood Co.; P. W. Enns, Harvey Co.; J. W. Ryan, Jackson Co.; Ralph Snyder, Jefferson Co.; John Kemmerer, Jewell Co.; Lloyd Ewing, Johnson Co.

W. H. Buttell, Kingman Co.; R. B. Williams, Labette Co.; Will Leak, Leavenworth Co.; L. R. Plumb, Lyon Co.; A. Shearer, Marshall Co.; H. N. Holdeman, Meade Co.

C. J. Woods, Miami Co.; Roy E. Long, Montgomery Co.; W. J. Harris, Morris Co.; F. O. Peterson, Morris Co.; S. P. Crumpacker, McPherson Co.; John McEnaney, Nemaha Co.

Chas. Horchem, Ness Co.; C. D. Resler, Neosho Co.; S. E. Colglazier, Pawnee Co.; J. E. Whitman, Pratt Co.; H. T. Simpson, Rawlins Co.; Ralph Button, Shawnee Co.

J. W. Finn, Sumner Co.; J. T. Martin, Washington Co.; J. E. Clark, Wilson, Co.; N. T. Corson, Wyandotte Co.

S. E. Colglazier of Pawnee County was made chairman of the committee. Ralph Snyder, Jefferson County; J. W. Ryan, Jackson County; C. D. Resler, Neosho County; H. T. Simpson, Rawlins County; and Walter Burr, Kansas State Agricultural College were appointed committee-men on constitution and by-laws.

A constitution and by-laws were drawn up and adopted by a majority of the delegates representing Farm Bureaus, to become effective when ratified by those bureaus.

The following temporary officers were elected:

President — Ralph Snyder, Oskaloosa

Vice-President — J. M. Ryan, Muscotah

Secretary — P. W. Enns, Newton

1st Congressional Dist.— John McEnaney, Corning

2nd Congressional Dist. — C. J. Woods, Paola

3rd Congressional Dist. — C. D. Resler, Chanute

4th Congressional Dist. — R. O. Peterson, Burdick

5th Congressional Dist. — Andrew Shearer, Frankfort

6th Congressional Dist. — L. M. Jorgensen,
Jewell City

7th Congressional Dist. — H. N. Holdman,
Meade

8th Congressional Dist. — S. P. Crumpacker,
McPherson.

By common consent, Dean H. C. Umberger of the Extension Division of Kansas State Agricultural College was named temporary Secretary. The constitution was submitted to the Farm Bureaus in counties where such bodies were organized, and was adopted by a majority of them.

Permanent Organization—1920

A meeting was then called for February 27, 1920, at Manhattan, for the purpose of effecting a permanent organization. The constitution drawn up by the temporary organization was thus effected and application was made for membership in the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The following were elected permanent officers:

President — Ralph Snyder, Oskaloosa.

Vice-President — J. M. Ryan, Muscotah.

Secretary — P. W. Enns, Newton.

Executive Committeemen were elected as follows:

1st Congressional District — William Leak,
Tonganoxie.

2nd Congressional District — O. O. Wolf,
Ottawa.

3rd Congressional District — C. S. Perkins,
Oswego.

4th Congressional District — F. O. Peterson,
Burdick.

5th Congressional District — H. W. Avery,
Wakefield.

6th Congressional District — J. A. Crawford,
Beardsley.

7th Congressional District — H. N. Holdmen,
Meade.

8th Congressional District — S. P. Crumpacker,
McPherson.

Dean H. Umberger of the Extension Division and Karl Knaus, County Agent Leader, both of Kansas State Agricultural College, were elected advisory members of the Executive Committee without right of ballot.

The following counties, having ratified the temporary constitution became charter members of the Kansas State Farm Bureau:

Anderson, Atchison, Barton, Bourbon, Chase,
Clark, Cheyenne, Coffey, Comanche, Finney, Franklin,
Greenwood, Harvey,

Jackson, Jefferson, Jewell, Johnson, Kingman,
Labette, Leavenworth, Marion, Marshall, Meade,
McPherson, Morris,

Neosho, Pawnee, Pratt, Sedgwick, Sumner, Wash-
ington, Wichita-Greeley, Wyandotte.

Charles R. Weeks, formerly Superintendent of the Hays Experiment Station and manager of the commercial farm, was elected secretary. Weeks began his work May 1, 1920.

The State Farm Bureau organization established membership dues of \$1 per paid up member in the County Farm Bureau. Since membership, with the exception of three counties, had been developed on the basis of \$1 per member, it became necessary to reorganize all the Farm Bureaus in the state that desired to become members of the State Farm Bureau.

The constitution adopted by the State Farm Bureau provided that when a majority of the organized Farm Bureaus cooperating with the Extension Division of the Agricultural College and Department of Agriculture should have ratified the constitution adopted, it should become effective.

The Dean of Extension was made temporary Secretary of the State Farm Bureau. While the general direction of the reorganization campaign was in charge of the Dean of Extension, the field work connected with carrying out the reorganization plan fell entirely to the force in the State Leader's office. (County Agent Leader)

The proposition was first presented to the Executive Board of the following counties:

Anderson, Atchison, Barton, Bourbon, Chase,
Cherokee, Cheyenne, Clark, Clay, Coffey, Comanche,
Doniphan, Ellis, Franklin, Finney, Ford, Gray, Green-
wood, Harvey, Jackson, Jefferson, Jewell, Johnson,
Kingman,

Labette, Leavenworth, Lyon, Marion, Marshall,
Meade, Miami, Montgomery, Morris, McPherson,
Nemaha, Neosho, Pawnee, Pratt, Rawlins, Sedgwick,
Shawnee, Sumner, Washington, Wichita-Greeley, Wil-
son and Wyandotte.

Officers of the temporary State Farm Bureau and a representative of the State Extension Leader's office, were present at each of those meetings.

In each case the State Farm Bureau constitution was approved by the County Executive Board, and its adoption recommended to Farm Bureau members at the annual county meeting.

The State Farm Bureau proposal was again pre-
sented at the annual meeting of the counties men-

tioned above. A representative of the State Extension Leader's office, and an officer of the State Farm Bureau, attended the meetings.

The membership dues adopted by the various Farm Bureaus ranged from \$1 to \$5. Reorganization of the Farm Bureau based on the new dues began in Lyon County on January 5, and continued until the second week in May, 1920.

Soliciting Membership

The tendency of Farm Bureau solicitors, to overlook the merits of the Farm Bureau educational program when soliciting membership in the reorganization campaign, was overcome by a meeting of solicitors on the first day of each membership drive.

A representative of the County Agent Leader's office presented an overview of the educational program of the County Farm Bureau to the solicitors and others present.

A plan was adopted of using Farm Bureau officers and leaders to solicit memberships. This method proved valuable, first because it further developed the interest of these leaders in Farm Bureau, and secondly, it gave the leaders a much clearer idea of the organization work of the County Farm Bureau. More than three hundred Farm Bureau leaders were used as solicitors in these campaigns.

In some cases, even with the best instruction, promises were made by over-zealous solicitors that were difficult or impossible to fulfill, but on the whole the plan worked out well and no serious reaction followed.

Membership Campaign—1920

In his report for 1920, H. Umberger, Director of Extension, made these comments relative to the membership campaign:

The Extension Director and the County Agent Leader are members ex-officio of the State Farm Bureau Executive Committee and, hence, are able to assist very materially coordinating and harmonizing the work of the State Farm Bureau and the Extension Division.

The Extension Director was elected as Acting Secretary and continued in this office for the entire period of the first membership campaign conducted by the State Farm Bureau during the winter of 1919 and 1920.

Campaigns were conducted in 43 counties (counting Wichita-Greeley as one). This campaign was conducted in cooperation with the County Farm Bureaus. The State Farm Bureau furnished paid solicitors, who were in all cases bona fide farmer members of other County Farm Bureaus.

The county in which the campaign was conducted furnished the drivers and was responsible for the general success of the campaign.

Farm Bureau Dues

The State Farm Bureau dues, during the year 1919-20, were one dollar. In addition to this each farmer solicited was asked to give an additional subscription to assist in defraying the expense of the campaign.

The Extension Director, continuing as Acting Secretary, was wholly responsible for the organization of the statewide campaign. That campaign resulted in 28,171 members and provided a fund of \$42,438.90.

After the organization had been completed the Executive Committee hired a Permanent Secretary, thus relieving the Director of Extension of that activity.

Good Cooperation

The cooperation with this organization is especially good. The policy of the State Farm Bureau will apparently be to develop educational work along marketing lines.

Those most influential in the organization in this state realize the relationship of the farmers, as a class, to other business associations and there is a relatively small tendency to create a definite class organization. This materially assists in harmonizing the progress of this association with that of the Extension Division.

It is quite evident that when the State and County Farm Bureaus realize that as educational institutions they must consider, not farmers as a class or counties as a unit, but communities as a unit, then the difficulty of harmonizing the program of the State Farm Bureau with that of the Extension Division will be much alleviated.

The County Farm Bureaus have been very successful in handling problems of production since the county unit is entirely large enough for this purpose.

Demand for Marketing Help

There is a very insistent demand on the part of farmers for a greater assistance in marketing and since the Extension organization at the present time is only on the county basis there was obviously a necessity for considering the organization of a larger unit than this when marketing problems were at issue.

This would seem to be the particular field for the State Farm Bureau and its development in this state seems to be in that direction.

The relationship of the State Farm Bureau as an organization will be the same with regard to the Director of Extension that the County Farm Bureau is to the

County Agent, naturally assuming that the national organization would function much the same in its relationship to the Department of Agriculture.

This relationship will, perhaps, be recognized when the county, state and national associations consider that they are serving, not a class or an individual, but a community. The community being spoken of as a unit may involve the state or even a larger territory.

Counties With Extension——1919

The County Agent Leader's report for 1919 stated:

Organization work has proceeded very satisfactorily regardless of both the serious influenza epidemic which prevented meeting during November, December and January, and the hard winter in the western part of the state.

At the beginning of 1919, there were 42 active Farm Bureau organizations in the state, in the following counties:

Anderson	Gray	Montgomery
Atchison	Greenwood	Morris
Barton	Harvey	McPherson
Bourbon	Hodgeman	Nemaha
Chase	Jackson	Neosho
Cherokee	Jefferson	Pawnee
Cheyenne	Jewell	Pratt
Clay	Johnson	Rawlins
Cloud	Kingman	Sedgwick
Doniphan	Leavenworth	Shawnee
Douglas	Lyon	Sumner
Franklin	Marshall	Washington
Finney	Meade	Wilson
Ford	Miami	Wyandotte

During 1919, Farm Bureau organizations were established in 15 additional counties:

Allen	Crawford	Pottawatomie
Barber	Labette	Rooks
Clark	Marion	Rush
Coffey	Ness	Wichita-Greeley
Comanche	Osage	Woodson

Wichita and Greeley counties formed a two-county Bureau with heads at Leoti, this being the first two counties in the state to take advantage of the provision in the Kansas Farm Bureau Law.

In addition, 10 of the older Farm Bureaus in the state were assisted in re-organizing during the year.

Of the counties, the following were with-

out County Agents because State and Federal funds were not available to be appropriated by the Agricultural College for county workers in these counties:

Allen	Pottawatomie
Cloud	Rooks
Crawford	Rush
Ness	Woodson
Osage	

Temporary work was discontinued in the following counties and districts at the expiration of the emergency agricultural appropriation June 30, 1919:

Seward	Stevens
Rush Ness	Scott-Lane
Elk-Chautauqua	Hamilton-Kearney
Pottawatomie-Wabaunsee	
Sherman-Thomas	Graham-Rooks
Wallace-Logan	

A two-county Farm Bureau was organized in Coffey and Osage counties and in Woodson and Allen counties. A Farm Bureau in Wichita and Greeley counties succeeded the emergency work in that district.

A Farm Bureau organized in Cherokee County left Crawford County without the services of a District Extension Agent. A Farm Bureau organized in Rooks County also left Graham County without the services of a District Extension Agent.

The only District Agent remaining was in the Central Kansas district—composed of Gove, Trego, Ellis and Russell counties.

District Agents to assist with Labor and Seed Grain Loans were appointed to the following counties for 30 to 60 days, beginning June 1, 1919:

Gove, Kiowa-Edwards, Lincoln, Ness-Lane, Norton-Phillips-Smith, Ottawa-Dickinson-Saline, Osborne-Mitchell, Rooks-Graham, Russell, Seward, Sheridan-Decatur, Stevens-Grant-Haskell, Thomas-Logan.

Kansas Farm Bureau Finances—1919-30

Notes from a review of Minutes of the Kansas Farm Bureau Annual Meetings showed some key decision made relating to the organization's finances:

February 27-28, 1920

Membership was to be on the calendar year basis.

The constitution which was drawn temporarily on October 21, 1919, was adopted with the provision for a membership fee of \$1 per year. Of this amount, 50 cents was for dues in the American Farm Bureau Federation.

March 19, 1920

Consideration was given to the publication of a newspaper.

Ralph Snyder, President, interviewed President Jardine relative to securing an office on the campus. Permission was granted.

H. C. Umberger was offered the job of Secretary for the Farm Bureau.

Charles Weeks and Harry Kent were interviewed for the secretary job.

Weeks was employed at a salary of \$4,500 and a stenographer, effective May 1, 1920.

September 20, 1920

The official paper was to be called Kansas State Farm Bureau Bulletin and changed from bulletin size to magazine type with 16 pages.

September 21, 1920

Special meeting of 40 Farm Bureau delegates held in the Community House in Manhattan. Forty counties were represented, and seven were absent.

The dues were raised to \$5 per year, due January 1, 1921. The vote was 31 for, 7 against.

Andrew Shearer offered a motion that the dues be as follows:

\$300 for 30 western counties

\$400 for 30 central counties

\$700 for the eastern counties. Motion lost.

Motion passed to recommend that the dues to be retained in the counties be \$5 per year, thus making total dues to be \$10 per year. Carried.

February 19, 1921

Second Annual Meeting in Manhattan — 52 delegates.

October 19, 1921

Executive Committee meeting.

A reduction of the dues to \$2.50 considered but no action taken.

Discussion brought out a reaction to paid solicitors— \$10 dues was too high.

Some counties would fail to meet their minimum membership requirement by law.

February 8-9, 1922,

Annual Meeting at Manhattan, during Farm and Home Week.

The Seventh District was divided into East Seventh and West Seventh, along the west line of Rush and Comanche counties.

The dues was reduced from \$5 to \$3 and the counties to be responsible for the membership solicitation work. Vote 45 to 6.

February 5, 1923

Annual Meeting in Manhattan.

The annual meeting time and place was changed from Farm and Home Week to such time and place as the Executive Committee may direct. Vote 28-7.

Dues were changed to \$500 for each county or an amount equal to \$2 per member for legal minimum plus 50 cents for each additional member.

Of this amount, 40 percent to be paid February 1, forty percent on March 1, and the balance on April 1. Carried 38 to 3.

December 18-19, 1923

Fifth Annual Meeting, Emporia State Teachers College.

Home and Community Chairman position created. Vote 25 to 0.

January 13-14, 1925

Sixth Annual Meeting, Topeka.

The Executive Committee name was changed to Board of Directors.

Changed term of office of President and Vice-President to two-year term. Directors to be elected for two-year term.

The Kansas Farm Journal (name of official publication by this time) was on a weak financial basis.

January 11-13, 1926

Seventh Annual Meeting

January 12, 1927

Eighth Annual Meeting, Topeka.

A county with 100 women members to be entitled to an additional delegate.

January 6, 1928

Ninth Annual Meeting, Dodge City

The dues were changed to:

- \$250 for a county with a valuation of \$20,000,000 or less.
- \$350 with valuation from \$20 to 30,000,000.
- \$400 with valuation from \$30 to 40,000,000.
- \$450 with valuation from \$40 to 50,000,000.
- \$500 with valuation from \$50,000,000 or over.

Dues to be paid, fifty percent on January 15 and the balance July 15. Carried 40 to 7.

In 1927, an agreement was made with the State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company of Bloomington, Illinois. J. C.

Russell became General Agent.

January 9, 1929

Tenth Annual Meeting, Topeka.

Mrs. Julia King Smith was employed as Secretary (not a field person).

April 17, 1929

Executive Board Meeting.

Discussion of investigate possibility of own insurance company.

January 14-16, 1930

Eleventh Annual Meeting, Great Bend.

Dues changed to \$1.50 for each paid-up agricultural member. Effective for 1930.

Dues to be payable the first of the month following the month in which collected.

January 6, 1931

Twelfth Annual Meeting, Wichita.

Home and Community Committee Chair men to be elected for each district for a two-year term.

October 16, 1935: 17th Annual Meeting

Proposal that dues be \$1 was defeated 96 to 3.

April 21, 1947

Special Meeting of Delegates, Manhattan.

Changed dues from \$1.50 to \$5 for each paid-up agricultural member. Dues to be paid the first of the month following collection. Carried, 184 to 32.

(The \$5.00 dues has remained in effect through 1964.)

Low Incomes Affect Dues—1929-30

The low farm incomes of 1929 and 1930 made the collection of Farm Bureau dues difficult in some cases. Deferred payments were accepted in order that the required membership could be met by the time the budget was filed for the county appropriation.

Some counties had a substantial percentage of the deferred payments that were never paid. Anyone was accepted if he would just pay his dues.

Farm Bureau leaders and the District Agents began to realize that the membership could be improved in quality; that many good farmers were not members of the Farm Bureau.

As a result, a membership procurement procedure was developed and suggested for use by each county. It was:

- 1) Collect dues on contracts as specified.
- 2) Instruct office secretary in collecting delinquent dues at the office.
- 3) Interview every member who resigns or fails to pay his dues.
- 4) Select list of men who ought to be members and whose membership would strengthen the Farm Bureau.
- 5) Send letter, over president's signature, explaining that he has been so selected and that a committeeman will see him soon to consider membership with him.
- 6) Distributed the membership as evenly as possible over the county.
- 7) See that every man on the above list is interviewed as many as three times if necessary.
- 8) Send letter to each new member, over president's signature, expressing gratification to be able to count him among the members and explaining the services he may expect and can give.

The foregoing indicates that the County Agents and District Agents devoted considerable time to the maintenance of Farm Bureau membership. This work continued until the formation of the County Agricultural Extension Councils in 1951.

The new Councils, established by law, did not require a paid membership.

Co. FB Membership & Dues—1919-20

County	Membership		Dues	
	1919	1920	1919	1920
Allen	New	567	\$2.00	\$10.00
Anderson	334	542	1.00	2.00
Atchison	550	872	1.00	2.00

Barton	501	746	1.00	2.00
Bourbon	379	506	1.00	5.00
Chase	256	429	1.00	2.50
Cheyenne	215	463	2.00	5.00
Cherokee	440	685	1.00	3.00
Clay	354	736	1.00	3.00
Clark	230	376	1.00	2.00
Cloud	255	627	1.00	1.00
Coffey	290	1124	1.00	3.00
Comanche	225	418	1.00	2.00
Doniphan	275	722	1.00	3.00
Douglas	308	332	1.00	1.00
Ellis	New	455	3.00	3.00
Finney	336	267	1.00	3.00
Ford	450	440	1.00	3.00
Franklin	275	882	1.00	2.00
Gray	236	310	1.00	2.50
Greenwood	318	634	1.00	2.50
Harvey	369	511	1.00	3.00
Hodgeman	336	316	1.00	2.00
Jackson	304	753	1.00	3.00
Jefferson	286	722	1.00	2.50
Jewell	338	653	None	10.00
Johnson	381	595	2.00	5.00
Kingman	340	549	1.00	2.00
Labette	314	1179	1.00	2.00
Leavenworth	625	902	1.00	3.00
Lyon	462	625	2.00	2.00
McPherson	547	434	1.00	2.00
Marion	264	503	1.00	2.00
Marshall	360	804	1.00	2.00
Meade	350	338	1.00	3.00
Miami	247	791	2.00	2.00
Montgomery	350	869	1.00	3.00
Morris	443	1048	1.00	2.00
Nemaha	291	553	1.00	3.00
Neosho	410	683	1.00	2.00
Ness	New	260	1.00	1.00
Osage	New	464	1.00	10.00
Pawnee	384	336	1.00	2.00
Pratt	546	561	1.00	3.00
Rawlins	334	502	1.00	5.00
Reno	New	304	1.00	1.00
Rooks	New	318	3.00	3.00
Rush	New	260	1.00	1.00

Sedgwick	393	1100	1.00	2.50
Shawnee	400	790	1.00	2.00
Sumner	307	1054	1.00	3.00
Washington	474	727	1.00	3.00
Wichita-Greeley	133	246	1.00	2.00
Wilson	396	932	1.00	2.50
Wyandotte	210	672	2.00	2.00
Totals	16,820	33,429		

H. J. Wilder, Inspector for the States Relations Service, wrote these comments in his report following his inspection of the program and financial records of the Kansas Extension Service on October 19, 1920:

The Farm Bureau Federation in Kansas was organized by Director Umberger, who was largely instrumental in framing its constitution and bylaws. The control of this organization has been largely in his hands.

The Federation itself does no preliminary organization for Extension work but enters those counties only that have already organized Farm Bureaus. The Extension Director is solely responsible for all preliminary organization. This prevents any friction.

The Federation is handicapped in financing. At the outset the Secretary of the Federation was told at a conference held in the Extension Director's office that he must cooperate with Director Umberger or his job would terminate.

Director Umberger and County Agent Leader, Karl Knaus, are ex-officio members of the Executive Committee. Director Umberger is also a member of their organization committee, and Knaus of their project committee.

The Federation is going to try to increase the membership fee to \$5, but as their secretary, Charles Weeks, is not a strong leader, he may not accomplish this.

While the cooperation of the State Farm Bureau Federation is very friendly, that organization is spending money too fast and is said to be 'smearing up the field.'

Their secretary is an organizer and jumps into many things that cannot be carried out.

Dean Umberger and Mr. Knaus are on the Executive Board of the Kansas State Farm Bureau. This board as a whole is very friendly and the College Extension force could probably control it if they made the effort.

The present Secretary is inclined to be visionary, but if he does not eventually get his feet on the ground he will probably be discarded. He is inclined to ignore the regular county work and stress only marketing.

Membership Drive

The Kansas Farm Bureau is at the present time (1921) conducting its membership drives on the basis of \$10 dues to the County Farm Bureau; \$5 of which goes to the Kansas Farm Bureau.

This amount of dues, in most cases, will increase the resources of the County Farm Bureau and should handle all unforeseen financial difficulties during the coming year.

During the year (1920) additional Farm Bureaus have been developed in the following counties: Rush, Ness, Rooks, Ellis, Allen, Osage, Reno.

From 1930 to 1952, the following programs had an influence upon the increased numbers of Farm Bureau members:

1933— Agricultural Adjustment Act with its benefit payments.

1938— Organization of Farm Bureau Mutual Insurance Company with County Farm Bureau and State Bureau membership required.

1948— Kansas Farm Life Insurance Company. Membership not required but this was an added feature in the Farm Bureau program.

1951— Reorganization of County Farm Bureaus as County Farm Bureau Associations on the family membership basis.

County Levy/Limitations—1919-61

1919—The amendment to the County Farm Bureau law provided that the minimum county appropriation should be \$1,200. County Commissioners were authorized to make a tax levy against all tangible property to raise the amount appropriated, but not to exceed 1/2 mill.

A budget, showing the estimated expenditures, and a list of the members of the County Farm Bureau, were required to be filed with the County Commissioners each year by August 1.

Later—Levy limits were established for the various funds within the county budget. Such limits did not include the County Farm Bureau until the Farm Bureau levy was permitted to be outside the aggregate county levy.

1951—The County Agricultural Extension Councils were established by law and the County Farm Bureau law repealed, effective January 1, 1952. The levy for the Extension Council was limited to 1/2 mill in counties with more than \$30 million tangible valuation. Counties with less than \$30 million valuation could levy up to one mill but could not exceed \$15,000.

1959—The legislature passed two special laws pertaining to the levy for the Extension Council:

1) One pertained to Cherokee County which was permitted to increase their levy to one mill.

2) Counties adjacent to a military reservation were authorized to increase their appropriation to \$20,000.

1961— Another special law authorized Sheridan County to levy as much as one mill.

Extension Funding Problems—1920

The Director's report for 1920 stated:

All emergency work was discontinued July 1, 1920. This closed the chapter of District Agents in this state except that one district was maintained at Hays, Kansas, for the reason that a rather large territory in the sixth congressional district, is without the services of a County Agent.

At the beginning of the period (December 1, 1919) there were 47 Farm Bureaus in the state, none of which received an appropriation of less than \$1,200 per county from State and Federal funds.

July 1, 1919, it became necessary to reduce the appropriation to each county from those funds to \$1,000 except in the cases of those counties with whom the Extension Division had unexpired contracts.

This reduction was necessary because of increasing demands on the part of unorganized counties for their share of the funds available.

It was also necessary to divert funds from County Agent work to Extension Specialists in order that a corps of Specialists could be maintained that could make the work of the County Agent more effective.

Membership drives, conducted in cooperation with the Kansas State Farm Bureau early in the year, increased the funds available from dues approximately 625 percent.

The average paid up membership previous to these campaigns was very small, probably \$10,000 for the entire state.

The dues collected this past year were approximately \$91,000; \$28,000 of which go to the State Farm Bureau, leaving a net balance in the counties of \$63,000.

The average resources of each county from all sources are: Federal and State funds, \$1,000; County Appropriations, \$2,152; membership dues, \$1,080; or a total average budget of \$4,232. This does not include home demonstration work.

Field Organization: It has been necessary to give considerable time of both the supervising force and of the County Agents to the problem of maintaining the field organization and the membership of the Farm Bureau.

This is discussed elsewhere in this report under the general head "organization" and it is probably sufficient to say here that it seems to be desired by an increasing number of farmers to finance this work more largely from funds secured from public sources and less from membership fees.

This is probably due to a better understanding of the principles underlying Extension work more largely, and a growing realization of the fact that the work of the County Agent is for the whole public.

Membership was more difficult to secure this year than ever before and in many cases rather strenuous efforts had to be made to secure the required membership of 250, or one-fourth the bona fide farmers of the county, before appropriations were made in August.

An effort was made to get all counties to raise the funds for Extension work by the special tax levy. Only a few counties now appropriate from the general fund.

Annual Meeting—1920's

An Annual Report in 1920 stated:

The Farm Bureaus annual meeting is a distinct feature of Extension work in Kansas.

There are many types of annual meetings but usually it consists of any all day meeting with a lunch at noon either a basket dinner, a banquet where each participant pays his share, or a free dinner provided by the Farm Bureau, Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club, or other organization.

Annual meetings are held by each County Farm Bureau usually during December or January. The program consists of the election of officers, report of the work of the Extension agent, financial reports and then one or more addresses on interesting agricultural subjects.

Some representative of the Extension Division attends each of these meetings in order to keep closely in touch with the way Extension work is being received in that county.

These meetings provide an excellent opportunity for the Agent or Agents to present results of their work to a large number of people. Attendance ranged from 25 to 1,000.

Two counties, namely Pratt and Comanche, held annual meetings where the attendance was over 1,000 due largely to the fact that a free barbecue was staged in each case.

New Organizations—1921-24

A monthly report of Karl Knaus, the County Agent Leader, stated in 1922:

While considerable work has been done during the year, no county organizations were fully developed. A great deal of time was given to Decatur and Harper counties in which very active and violent opposition developed on the part of local organizations. This has, to a large extent, subsided.

New organizations were started in Kiowa, Seward, Stevens, Haskell, Gove, Graham, Dickinson, Geary, Brown, Russell, Salina, and Ottawa counties.

During 1921 and 1922, on account of lack of funds, no new organization work was done although one new county employed an Agent.

During the year, 58 counties had Agents regularly employed. In two counties, for at least the greater part of the year, work was suspended, owing to the fact that the County Commissioners refused to make the appropriation and it was impossible to continue the work until a settlement was reached. (These were Rooks, Wichita and Greeley).

The county appropriations for County Farm Bureau and Extension work averaged \$2,108 in 1922. By 1925 they had gone to an average of \$2,604.

In 1924, the total resources per county averaged \$4,583 and the total amount of dues collected averaged \$1,119.

Due to reduced farm incomes in 1924, three counties discontinued their County Farm Bureau organizations; Rooks, Ellis, and Wichita-Greeley counties.

That left 57 active counties. Farmers' Union organizations often expressed their opposition to County Farm Bureau appropriations by petition.

Problems Collecting Dues—1922

The County Agent Leader's monthly report for March, 1922, stated:

Membership dues collections have been poor. Practically all of the central and eastern counties felt that the membership dues should be lower and therefore, made no effort to collect then the first of January as had been planned.

Instead, they waited until the annual meeting of the Kansas State Farm Bureau on February 9 in order to know whether or not the State Farm Bureau dues would be lower.

The State Farm Bureau dues were lowered from \$5 to \$3 with the provision that all the work of getting new members be checked up entirely by the county.

After this action, the counties started working at once to increase their membership through clean up work, or a county wide campaign before the coming on of spring work on crops.

This work is being carried on at the present time (March 1922) and is expected to be completed before corn planting time.

Interpret State Law—1922

The County Agent Leader's Monthly Report, March, 1922, continued:

The County Commissioners of Miami, Rooks, and Nemaha Counties refused to appropriate soon after the first of January, their reason being based on the fact that the County Farm Bureaus did not have a paid up membership of 250 bona fide farmers as provided by the Kansas Law.

This question was referred to the Attorney General, Richard J. Hopkins, for his opinion, a copy of which is attached. With this opinion the Nemaha County Commissioners were willing to continue their appropriation but in Miami and Rooks counties it was necessary that mandamus proceeding be brought to force the appropriation.

In each case it was possible to settle the matter on the basis of a "Statement of Facts" prepared and agreed to by both parties.

The Attorney General held that the County Farm Bureau needed the required membership only at the time of its organization and not necessarily maintained each year.

Reasons for Farm Bureau Drop-Out—1926

The size of the membership dues, lost interest, no direct benefits, and dissatisfaction with the management were the chief reasons given by the men for dropping out of the Farm Bureau.

Other interests and inability to attend meetings accounted for more than half of the discontinued membership in the Farm Bureau by farm women.

The following table reflected the attitude of people toward Extension in 1926. Only 7 percent of the families contacted were opposed while 78 percent were favorable to the Extension program.

Item	No.	Percent
Families reported opposed	39	7
Families reported indifferent	78	15
Families reported favorable	415	78
Farm records obtained	532	100

Personnel Improvements—1926

During 1926, the betterment of financial conditions brought gradual improvement in the quality of County Agent personnel and also made available more adequate equipment.

The most important improvement, however, was in the attitude of the people toward Extension work. This was shown by increased membership in the County Farm Bureau and the early completion of membership campaigns in the counties.

Counties without County Farm Bureau organizations showed an increased interest in securing the benefits of such an organization and the employment of a County Extension Agent.

The Extension Service did not offer encouragement to establish new organizations because the lack of federal and state funds did not permit financial cooperation with the counties.

Several counties, however, proceeded with the organization of a County Farm Bureau with the idea that when cooperative funds were available they would be in a position to claim the cooperative funds.

During 1926, Johnson and Ford counties employed Home Demonstration Agents as additions to the county Extension Agent staff. Seven other counties organized for County Home Demonstration Agent work if funds became available by July 1, 1927.

County/State Farm Bureau Membership—1924

The Director's Report for 1924 stated:

There is some confusion regarding the difference between Farm Bureau membership as it applies to the County Farm Bureau and to the Kansas State Farm Bureau.

In Kansas, the County Farm Bureau is created by law as an Extension agency. The membership of the County Farm Bureau and its organization is governed by legislative act and, consequently, its maintenance is a responsibility of the Extension service.

The Kansas State Farm Bureau is not created by a legal status and its unit of membership is the County Farm Bureau and not the individual Farm Bureau member.

It is organized with other obligations than those of the Extension Service and the responsibility of maintaining its membership does not belong in any way to Extension Service.

Additional funds provided by the 1919 Law enabled Farm Bureaus to provide stenographic help and expenses for educational programs.

Annual Extension Conference as a Personnel Training Program

Annual Extension Conference—1919

The Annual Conference for all Extension workers, held at the College the week of October 13, 1919, was voted the best conference ever held.

Many new plans were made for the new season's work. The meeting was reported to have resulted in a better understanding of Extension work and its needs, a greater feeling of cooperation, unity and fellowship among the workers.

Annual Conference—1924

The 1924 program for the Annual Extension Conference was not built around any particular feature of Extension work. However, it was felt by many to be one of the most successful Annual Conferences held up to that time, probably because more of the time was devoted to discussion of everyday Extension problems.

There seemed to be a consensus that some of the Extension workers' time could be well utilized in a study of Extension methods. As a consequence, committees were appointed to handle the following three projects:

- 1) Fundamental value of a Paid-up Membership in the Farm Bureau.
- 2) Methods to use to obtain the best results with the existing organization.
- 3) Effectiveness of the Extension Organization.

An announcement was made at the general assembly about committee assignments.

Questions handed in by participants were assigned to the respective committees.

The committees, and questions to be reported on, at the 1925 conference follow:

COMMITTEE 1:

Fundamental Value of a Paid-up Membership in the Farm Bureau:

Committee Members: A. F. Turner, chairman, Ellen Batchelor, J. H. McAdams, C. R. Jaccard, H. F. Tagge, S. D. Capper, George Salisbury, Nina Hurlbert, Carl Howard.

- 1) What is the best method of collecting membership dues? —Brunson, Paul Gwin, Inskeep, Myers, Baird.
- 2) Membership as Farm Bureau work—For Extension work is followup work. —Howard.
- 3) The inactivity of County Farm Bureau officials in keeping up the county organization.
- 4) To get a Farm Bureau and a County Agent in Brown County.

5) What is the real effect of dues paid up members to the organization? —Paul Gwin.

6) How can we overcome the yearly variation in the County Commissioners' allowances? The changes, especially the reductions, give the work an unstable basis. —J. W. Farmer.

7) What percent of time can reasonably be devoted to membership and organization?

8) Getting local people to work for nothing, on membership work.—Taylor.

9) Should Farm Bureau members be given more service than non-members? This is our hardest thing we have to meet in securing members. —Leker.

10) What is the proper relationship between men's and women's membership dues?

11) Acquainting the people, especially Farm Bureau members themselves, with the function of the Farm Bureau and the County Agent.— McCall.

12) The present field condition that has held my work back this year more than any other has been the Farm Bureau membership which has required so much time of the Agents that they have not given the necessary time to Extension activities. — Morrish.

13) Handling of membership by chairmen who have solicited their townships several years in the past.

14) The greatest handicap I have had has been to teach local individual and group leaders what Extension work is. — Caldwell

COMMITTEE 2:

What Methods Now Used Obtain Best Results. With the Organization We Now Have?

Committee: L. C. Williams, chairman, R. W. Morrish, Ethel McDonald, L. Maude Finley, John Hepler, Edith Holmberg, E. A. Stokdyk, Cecil McFadden, John Inskeep.

1) The biggest and most permanent point is probably points of contact with individuals and groups of individuals. — Colglazier.

2) Our big problem is to find cooperators who are willing to or do stick to one line and refrain from jumping from one line to another. — C. D. Tompson.

3) How can we turn off a larger volume of business with our present organization: a) need of reaching more people, b) need of disseminating accurate information, c) need of offering a constructive educational program. — Amy Kelly.

4) To so plan and develop the projects of the program that the results obtained will furnish

the people some definite means of improving the conditions of the rural home.

- 5) How to conduct good, effective club work on the project basis with a heavy program of adult demonstration work. That is, how much should be carried and how much time given to same? — Metzger.
- 6) Granting that real success in any county depends upon the development and execution of a definite comprehensive county program— Who is responsible for the development and execution of this program? What should be expected from the Specialist and Central Office members. — How can we build this program?
- 7) The inability to put on projects in different lines with success. One or two main projects must be adopted and stuck to until completed. — McIntosh.
- 8) How to develop community organization in disinterested communities or lukewarm communities. — W. H. Robinson.
- 9) Selecting a Board entirely in sympathy with Farm Bureau as an organization for Extension work to work through. — Julia Kiene, Inskeep
- 10) How can you keep in close touch with your committees when you have 31 organized committees? — Nina Hurlbert.
- 11) Lack of definite and timely mimeographed material on the different projects. Could the membership dues be made more nearly uniform in the several counties?
- 12) Use of local leaders in all projects. Organization within a county.
- 13) Responsibility of local workers in reporting individual results.
- 14) My biggest problem is to develop a program with continuity and get the organization effective and permanent. — Sam Smith.
- 15) We soon will be holding our community organization meetings. One of our big problems is getting the people to take an interest in these meetings. What can be done to improve this condition? — Coe.
- 16) Can anything be done to get better cooperation between the Grange, the Union and the Farm Bureau?
- 17) Indifference of the County Agent as to choice of local leaders. — Pearl Martin.
- 18) My biggest problem (outside of three or four townships) is to organize into community organizations and work as such. — Biskie, Capper.
- 19) Overcoming indifference on part of too many of the people to the program of work.
- 20) How can we know that the major projects we select for the county really meets their needs?

This is now determined by the amount of Specialists' time available. — Ellen Batchelor.

- 21) Obtaining effective leadership.
 - 22) The greatest problem in Extension work is to stay by a Plan of Work until it is satisfactorily completed. It is too easy to do a little bit of work on a lot of things. — C. E. Graves.
 - 23) Getting rural people to accept the responsibilities which they would, which would be the biggest factor in developing leadership. — Cleland.
 - 24) Which is better, have a large number of meetings when a Specialist is in the county or have few meetings and let the Specialist line the Agent up on the stuff so as the Agent can hold meetings himself? — Goodwin.
 - 25) What is the best method of keeping up morale against continued indifference, not opposition, but just lack of interest or worse, an attitude of scorn?— Braum.
 - 26) Program of work carried through to definite results. Accomplish something that you can point out and say: "This is the result of our work."— Hepler.
 - 27) The building of a program that can be finished; it may take one, three or five years. Therefore, the program should be based on definite results obtained by the Experiment Station.— Kelly.
 - 28) What kind of work, educational or merchandising, builds up an organization with the best interest and morale? What kinds of contacts (farm visits, office calls, demonstration meetings, etc.) are the most valuable to the Agent?
 - 29) Organization.— Gibson.
 - 30) Locating and developing local leadership that is competent to carry on the Program of Work.— Merydith.
 - 31) Organization of committees and county on more definite basis for work.— R. L. Graves.
 - 32) Knowing human nature and the ability to get along with people.— R. E. Williams.
 - 33) How definite should be the duties of a local leader of an agricultural project? That is to what extent can those duties be standardized as to number of meetings called, amount of information to be distributed, etc.— L. C. Williams.
- COMMITTEE 3:
Effectiveness of the Extension Organization.
- Committee Members: Dean Umberger, chairman, W. H. Metzger, Maude Coe, Amy Kelly, Joe Robbins, Pearl Martin, Frank Blecha, R. W. McCall.
- 1) Extension Specialists, a majority of them, do make an attempt to correlate their lines and phases of work with the County Agents' chosen

projects. It is almost impossible for all Agents to get the specialists as timely as they would like to have them.

2) My biggest problem is securing help on subjects of which I am profoundly ignorant.— Kimball

3) Complete organization between specialists, the County Agent and the Farm Bureau in project work.— O'Connell.

4) Schedule arranged so as to accommodate all concerned.

Federal Inspector's Report—1920

The Federal Inspector's Report for 1920, speaking about the progress made in the Kansas Extension Service program under the direction of Dean H. Umberger, stated:

Director Umberger has the faculty of selecting people in his organization who can carry responsibility, and thus accomplish much more than he could otherwise. He has shown himself to be a sound administrator during his first year as Extension Director.

There are neither frills nor misunderstandings. If such appear, he characteristically goes to the bottom of the situation and decides everything on a practical, business basis. He is fair, and every member of the Extension force seems to know that his decisions will not be made until he has all the facts and that his ruling will be absolutely logical.

While such administration has made two or three Extension workers shiver temporarily, this policy has built up, in the brief time Director Umberger has been Dean and Director, a very strong esprit de corps.

Finances: As it was Mr. Umberger's first year as Director, he requested that the account be gone over as carefully as possible, and his attention called to everything that would help in keeping the accounts during the coming year.

Miss Steele, who had kept the books last year, resigned in February, and the Director took a great deal of care in selecting her successor. Miss Clara Siem was chosen.

She has had considerable experience, and has handled the work very effectively, even though she had to work out methods for herself. She worked with the

inspector most of the time, and so was able to readjust practically all questionable vouchers.

Salaries: The salaries paid the administrative and supervisory staff for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, were:

\$4,000 H. Umberger Director

1,260 Selma Foberg, Assist to the Dean (to April 15)

1,200 Delpha Hazeltine, Assistant to the Dean (after May 1)

2,700 Karl Knaus, Assistant County Agent Leader

2,700 A. F. Turner, Assistant County Agent Leader

2,200 F. A. Dawley, Assistant County Agent Leader

2,600 George Piper, Asst. County Agent Leader (to Aug 31, 1919)

Outlook: The Extension Work in Kansas had not been well coordinated before Mr. Umberger became Director, and apparently he little realized, upon taking his duties, that a good deal of instructive organization work was awaiting a Director possessing administrative forcefulness.

Meeting the problems as they were presented, he has come to realize the State's needs, and now seems to have the outlook for developing a good organization.

He has successfully met several difficult situations, seems competent to handle others, and under his direction, I feel good progress will be made, unless loss of funds prevents.

Programs from 1919 to 1929

Extension Programs—1919

The following projects were reviewed in the report for 1919:

Soils—Soil blowing, Irrigation, Drainage, Soil washing, Acidity, Soil fertility.

Crops—Variety tests, Corn variety tests, Sorghum variety tests, Wheat improvement, Government seed

loans, Potato improvement, Fertilizer tests, Orchard demonstrations, Acre orchards, Pasture demonstrations.

Plant Disease Control—Stinking smut of wheat, Oats smut, Potato disease control.

Miscellaneous Crops—Tractor demonstrations, Threshing schools.

Miscellaneous — Boys' and Girls' Club Work, Sale and Exchange (Feed & Livestock), Fairs, County exhibits, Questionnaires.

Livestock — Breeders' associations, Sales pavilions, Dairying, Cow testing associations, Cow associations (financing), Hogs, Beef cattle, Sheep, Poultry, Disease control, Hog cholera.

Miscellaneous Livestock — Feed inspection, Feed importation, southwest Kansas, Multiple hitch.

Insect and Rodent Pests — Grasshoppers, Cutworm, Hessian fly, Chinch bug, Jack rabbits, Pocket gophers, Prairie dog control.

Farm Management Demonstration — Assistance in income tax returns, Harvest labor.

Define Specialists' Roles—1921

The effectiveness of Specialists was given much consideration by Director Umberger after he became Dean and Director of the Extension Service. In his report for 1921, he said:

An effort was made to impress each Agricultural Extension Specialist with the fact that he is heading up the Extension work in his particular project...

Perhaps the most important measures regarding records, systematizing and unifying the work of the Specialists is in getting them to see that their main purpose is to reach effectively the County Agents, Home Demonstration Agents, Boys' and Girls' Club Agents and project leaders throughout the state.

If the Specialists are successful in teaching those leaders how to carry forward their various projects, they are most efficient in carrying their message to all farmers in the state. The Specialists, therefore, are becoming teachers of leaders instead of public speakers at general farmers' meetings as they were in times past.

State Fair Exhibits—1921-22

A fair exhibit prepared by the Kansas State Agricultural College was displayed at the Kansas Free Fair at Topeka, the Kansas State Fair at Hutchinson, and the International Wheat Show and Farm Products Exposition at Wichita.

Preparation of the exhibit was under the immediate direction of the Extension Division, with the cooperation of the Divisions of Agriculture, Home Economics, Engineering and Veterinary Medicine. A. F. Turner, Assistant County Agent leader, and L. C. Williams, Extension Horticulturist, were the committee in charge.

Funds to defray the expenses of the exhibit were appropriated by the three fairs previously mentioned. Each of them set aside \$400 for that purpose. This amount was

further augmented by an appropriation of \$600 from the Southwest Wheat Improvement Association to be used in preparing wheat improvement exhibits. The total amount received from outside sources was \$1,800.

The Extension Division paid the salary and travel expenses of the exhibit committee. The Rock Island and Santa Fe Railroads hauled the exhibit free of charge in a baggage car set aside for that purpose.

The 1922 fair exhibit was an outgrowth of one put on in 1921, for which an appropriation of only \$400 could be secured. The increased appropriation was considered a measure of the increased appreciation on the part of the fair managements.

The purpose of the exhibit was to show in a definite way the service the Agricultural College was extending to the people of Kansas in solving problems on the farm, in the shop and in the home.

A conservative estimate was that 259,000 persons were made acquainted with a portion of the service rendered by the College to the citizens of the state through this exhibit.

Attendance at the fairs in 1922 was: Topeka, 94,000; Hutchinson, 57,000; and Wichita, 107,000; for a total of 258,000 people.

Extension Projects—1925

In 1925, the following Extension projects were in effect:

- Administration
- Publicity
- County Agent Work
- Home Demonstration Work
- Boys' and Girls' Club Work
- Extension Schools in Agriculture and Supervision of Agricultural Extension Specialists
- Soil Management and Crop Production
- Plant Pathology
- Horticulture
- Animal Husbandry
- Dairy Husbandry
- Veterinary Extension
- Poultry Husbandry
- Entomology
- Eradicating Rodent Pests in Kansas
- Farm Management, Marketing

Extension Schools in Home Economics and Supervision of Home Economics Specialists
Foods and Nutrition
Clothing, Millinery
Home Health and Sanitation
Household Management
Rural Engineering
Home Study Service
Radio

Methods of Procedure—1925

Each Extension Specialist was expected to prepare a "Method of Procedure," which was an outline showing how the Specialist expected to accomplish the objectives stated in the project agreement.

Each project had a Method of Procedure Committee composed of the Extension Specialist in charge, a representative of the subject matter department, selected County Extension Agents most familiar with the project program, a representative of any department closely related to the project, and representatives of any agency concerned with the line of work.

The Project Method of Procedure Committee met at Annual Extension Conference time to review the method of procedure suggested by the Extension Specialist.

Plan of Work—1925

A "Plan of Work" was prepared and considered to be a report of progress on the Method of Procedure including:

- 1) Summary of the results of the last year's work.
- 2) Various stages of the work.
- 3) Provision for systematic progress according to the Method of Procedure.
- 4) New territory in which new work was planned.

Scheduling—1925

A "Schedule Committee" was composed of the heads of the relevant departments and the District Extension Agents. The committee received the requests for county visits prepared by the Extension Specialists, reviewed the requests and prepared a schedule of dates for the Specialists to visit the counties.

This work was completed following the Annual Conference in October, when the Extension Specialists reviewed their proposed visits, to the counties with the County Agents involved.

A District Agent at Large was responsible for organizing those counties that did not have an Extension office or Agents. He worked with the leaders in the unorganized counties, and with Extension Specialists,

to provide some program in at least one project for each of these counties that had an interest in organizing for Extension work.

Long-Time Projects—1925

"Long-Time" County Programs were encouraged. In 1925, 19 counties had adopted a Long Time (5-year) Program for one or more projects.

These were:

Finney—Poultry and Dairy
Ford—Crops, Poultry and Livestock
Morris—Poultry
Reno—Livestock.
Sumner—Livestock
Comanche—Livestock
Harper—Livestock
Pratt—Livestock
Kingman—Livestock
Rawlins—Livestock
Washington—Dairy
Clay—Livestock
Sherman—Livestock
Ottawa—Livestock
Dickinson—Livestock
Bourbon—Crops, Soils, and Dairy
Osage—Livestock
Cherokee—Soils, Dairy, and Livestock
Allen— Soils, Animal Husbandry, and Poultry (for 10 years)

Drop Home Ec Supervision Project—1926

"Extension Schools in Home Economics and the Supervision of Home Economics Specialists" was discontinued as a project agreement with the Department of Agriculture in 1926.

As much as possible of the work in counties in this area was placed on a major project basis, of a long-time program of work. Goals were established in each of the Extension Specialists' plans of work and methods of procedure.

County Project Exhibit Contest—1927

The Superintendent of the Department of Agriculture of the Kansas State Fair announced that a contest of county exhibits would be conducted in connection with the State Fair at Hutchinson.

Some of the rules were:

- 1) Competition will be open to any county organization in Kansas.
- 2) No county may enter more than one exhibit.
- 3) The number of competing counties will be limited to five.
- 4) Detailed plans to be submitted to the General Superintendent of the Department of Agriculture by August 1, 1927.
- 5) A committee shall determine the five counties that will compete from plans submitted.
- 6) In so far as possible the district leaders and specialists will assist the counties in preparing the exhibits.
- 7) There will be allotted to each county scoring more than 75 points the sum of \$75. In addition there will be awarded to the three high scoring counties the amounts of \$100, \$75 and \$50 for first, second and third placing respectively.

The Superintendent, Dean L. E. Call, appointed a committee, composed of H. J. C. Umberger, Director of Extension; J. C. Mohler, Secretary, State Board of Agriculture; and H. W. Avery, Member of the State Fair Board, to select the counties to compete in the contest.

The counties selected, the projects, and the placing were:

Clay Co.	Poultry	First place
Geary Co.	Poultry	Second place
Dickinson Co.	Entomology	Third place
Rice Co.	Farm Accounts	Fourth place
Bourbon Co.	Lime/Legumes	Fifth place

Extension Specialists helped in preparing the exhibits where possible. An Extension score card was devised including the general headings:

- 1) Effectiveness in attracting attention, holding interest, and convincing individuals.
- 2) Success of project in County or Community.

- 3) General appearance, attractiveness, arrangement and neatness.

This contest continued for many years with County Agricultural Extension Agents assuming the responsibility.

New Standards for Specialist Help—1929

New Standards County Farm Bureaus asked for Extension Specialist assistance in 1929 to establish new standards for seeking assistance.

Because of an increased demand for help from Home Economics Specialists, and the limitations on funds, new standards were established for a county to qualify for Specialist's assistance.

Each county east of the west line of Sedgwick and the east line of Rice County was required to have at least 100 paid up members of the Farm Bureau organized into not less than ten home demonstration units.

In each county west of that line, each county was required to have at least 70 paid-up members organized into not less than seven units, with membership dues of not less than \$1 per year.

All counties previously receiving Extension Specialist assistance immediately qualified under the new requirements. That action determined the real interest of women in Extension programs in the counties.

Study Leaders and Practices—1929

During 1929, an analysis of the work of local leaders was made in two counties with these results:

	<u>Ag Ldrs</u>	<u>HE Ldrs</u>	<u>4-H Ldrs</u>	<u>Tot/Ave</u>
Number	36	72	63	117
Days of Work	10.8	20.5	22.2	19.1
Effective Info to others	86.1%	91.7%	80.9%	86.6%
Other farms/homes influenced	9.3%	15.8%	8.4%	11.7%

Kansas Bankers Association

One of the earliest projects with the Kansas Bankers Association was the publication and distribution of a Farm Account book prepared by Extension Specialists.

The Bankers Association liberally supported the 4-H Club program by giving awards in many programs.

Banker-Farmer Project—1925

In February, 1925, Dan H. Otis, Director of the Agricultural Commission of the American Bankers Association,

met with the Agricultural Committee of the Kansas Bankers Association at the College.

A program for effective cooperation between bankers and farmers was planned.

These projects were adopted:

- 1) Encourage the development of cow testing associations.
- 2) Prevent worms in hogs.
- 3) Promote boys and girls club work.
- 4) Encourage the production of alfalfa, sweet clover and soybeans.
- 5) Encourage sound methods of dairy production.
- 6) Help prevent the distribution of inferior livestock.
- 7) Encourage the wide use of radio for securing reliable information.
- 8) Improve Farm Accounting (Added July 21, 1926).

One banker was appointed in each county, later known as the Key-Banker, to work with the County Extension Agent and select at least one farmer with whom to work on one or more demonstrations.

Six district meetings were held for the bankers, County Extension Agents, and presidents of Farm Bureaus. Each county selected one or more projects it wanted to emphasize.

Director Umberger's observation was:

This project has considerable promise. It presents the possibility of working through another agency with individuals and with groups with whom we, perhaps, are not directly in contact through the County Agent and the Farm Bureau. It will be necessary, however, for considerable follow-up work to be done before it can be made effective in every Farm Bureau county.

County Club Agents—1923

In his report for 1923, Director of Extension, Harry C. Umberger, made this statement:

There has been no notable tendency to increase the number of County Club Leaders (as employed in past years). It is more logical, since the Agricultural Agent is employed in a county before any other Agent, that the second Agent in the county be a Home Agent who will function to strengthen the program in home economics.

So far not one county in Kansas has undertaken to finance an Agricultural Agent, a Home Agent, and a Club Agent.

In Leavenworth County, where a Club Leader is employed in addition to the Agricultural Agent, there is a strong insistence that assistance be given to adults in home economics as well as to Girls' Clubs, leaving the Agricultural Agent to assume the duties in connection with Boys' Club work, that is, the club leader at present (a woman) really does Home Demonstration work.

Increased demand for County Club Workers is not anticipated in this state. The interest in club work has not abated, it has increased and the demand for additional assistance in the organization of clubs must be met by increasing the corps of State Club Leaders.

County Home Demonstration Agents—1924

The report of Harry Umberger, Dean and Director, for 1924 stated:

When it was made known that an organized county (County Farm Bureau) desired the services of a County Home Demonstration Agent, a survey was made of the county by the Assistant Home Demonstration Leader to select the organization committee of five women.

That committee was assigned the work of organizing the communities, developing a program, and obtaining the required membership which is their responsibility as to the financial part of the work.

The membership fee varied from one dollar to two dollars per member. The organization committee could serve in a county without a Home Demonstration Agent by arranging for all organized groups to carry project work.

The committee was responsible for local project leaders for each group, who attended the training classes and carried the work back to their local group.

Seven counties were organized for Home Demonstration Agent work during 1924—Franklin, Douglas, Reno, Allen, Labette, Bourbon, and Greenwood.

Assistant County Agricultural Agents—1924

The first mention of Assistant County Agricultural Agents was in 1924, in the Director's report:

Assistant County Agricultural Agents have been employed in Kansas since July 1, 1924. A salary of \$125 per month and necessary traveling expenses are paid those workers by the Extension Service.

The Assistant Agent is assigned to the Central Office for a short time in order that he may become familiar with the general plan of the work and with reports required.

He was then sent to a county to work with a successful County Agricultural Agent. His training period may be spent in two or three counties.

The variation provides an opportunity to gain information on the ability of the candidate to succeed in a County Agent position. Johnson County has a permanent Assistant Agricultural Agent on County Farm Bureau funds.

Fourteen Assistant Agricultural Agents were employed in 1924.

In 1926, Director Umberger reported an increasing interest in the employment of Extension Home Demonstration Agents. Johnson and Ford counties added Home Agents in 1926.

At least seven more counties were organized for the employment of an Extension Home Demonstration Agent but had to wait until funds were available from the College.

In 1926, counties demanded more help in Boys' and Girls' Club work and it seemed that the requests could never be filled. Extension Specialists were incorporating club work into their regular project program.

The Extension Supervisory Staff reported that the entire State of Kansas had never been in a more receptive mood for promoting Boys' and Girls' Club work.

Yet in 1926, Leavenworth County was the only county employing a Club Agent and that position was discontinued at the end of the calendar year to employ an Extension Home Demonstration Agent.

New Extension Positions—1924-29

Employ Assistant Agents—1924

On July 1, 1924, funds became available to employ Assistant County Agents for training. A salary of \$125 per month and necessary travel expenses were paid by the Extension Service.

A new Assistant County Agent devoted a week in the Central Office to become familiar with some of the procedures, reports and records. The Agent was then assigned to work with an experienced, successful, Agent(s) in a county, sometimes in two or three counties, during the training period.

One county, Johnson, employed an Assistant County Agricultural Agent on a permanent basis using County Farm Bureau funds. The position was discontinued in 1927 due to the lack of funds.

Assistant County Agents—1924-25

Assistant Agents employed under the above plan, in 1924 and 1925, were:

C. A. Jones	Jul 1, 1924 to Sep 1, 1924
C. F. Gladfelter	Aug 11, 1924 to Nov 1, 1924
E. C. Scott	Aug 11, 1924 to Sep 18, 1924
J. D. Buchman	Aug 4, 1924 to Oct 1, 1924

L. L. Perry	Sep 9, 1924 to Oct 1, 1924
H. L. Gibson	Sep 22, 1924 to Oct 1, 1924
Leonard F. Neff	Nov 1, 1924 to Feb 2, 1925
L. B. Reynolds	Nov 5, 1924 to Dec 17, 1924
J. J. Moxley	Dec 11, 1924 to Apr 7, 1925
D. Z. McCormick	Jan 15, 1925 to Jul 1, 1925
H. F. Moxley	Feb 1, 1925 to May 15, 1925
J. E. Norton	Jan 26, 1925 to Feb 5, 1925
H. E. Ratcliffe	Feb 1, 1925 to Mar 10, 1925
George S. Atwood	Apr 6, 1925 to Jun 8, 1925
W. J. Daly	Jun 1, 1925 to Oct 19, 1925
Earl C. Smith	May 29, 1925 to Jun 16, 1925

Each of the above Assistant Agents was employed as a County Agricultural Agent, with the exception of L. B. Reynolds.

On January 1, 1928, H. L. Lobenstein was employed as an Assistant Agent in Atchison County and served as a Specialist in Horticulture among the fruit growers in that area.

Home Demonstration Agents—1928

New Home Demonstration Agent positions were established in:

Greenwood and
Neosho Counties Jan 1, 1928
Kingman County Jan 3, 1928
Riley County May 15, 1928

The Home Demonstration Agents employed in these positions were:

Glyde Anderson, Greenwood Co., Jan 1, 1928
Sara Jane Patton, Neosho Co., Jan 1, 1928

Leana C. Peterson, Kingman Co., Jan 3, 1928
Grace M. Henderson, Riley Co., May 15, 1928

Club Agents—1929

In 1929, new Club Agent positions were established as follows:

T. R. Warren in Douglas County, June 1, 1929
R. N. Lindberg in Butler County, January 11, 1929

First County Agricultural Agents—through 1925

County	Agent	Date Assigned	County	Agent	Date Assigned
Allen	W. E. Watkins	May 1, 1913	Clark	A. B. Kimball	Aug 20, 1918
Allen-Woodson				F. M. Pickrell	Jun 1, 1920
	H. T. Corson	May 20, 1918		R. W. McCall	Jun 6, 1921
Allen	James A. Milham	Oct 11, 1920		R. R. McFadden	Jul 16, 1924
	Roy E. Gwin	Jul 1, 1924	Clay	Orville B. Burtis	Feb 1, 1918
Anderson	Roy M. Phillips	Jul 6, 1917		Robert E. Curtis	Jun 16, 1919
	F. S. Turner	Nov 5, 1917		C. R. Jaccard	Apr 1, 1924
	A. W. Foster	Jan 20, 1922	Cloud	Karl Knaus	Jan 10, 1916
	C. E. Agnew	Feb 1, 1923		C. D. Thomas	Dec 1, 1917
	C. F. Gladfelter	Aug 23, 1924		Charles J. Boyle	Mar 10, 1920
	J. A. Hendriks	Nov 1, 1924		T. J. Yost	Mar 12, 1922
Atchison	C. H. Taylor	Feb 3, 1915		Sam J. Smith	Oct 22, 1923
	O. C. Hagans	Mar 16, 1918		Leonard F. Neff	Feb 1, 1925
	H. F. Tagge	Feb 1, 1920	Coffey-Osage		
	Joe M. Goodwin	Jan 1, 1923		J. A. Scheel	Nov 15, 1917
Barber	Thos. E. Clarke	Mar 11, 1919	Coffey	J. H. McAdams	Jul 14, 1919
	Homer B. Willis	Feb 10, 1920		C. R. Jaccard	Jan 1, 1922
Barton	Clyde W. Mullen	Apr 16, 1918		Dan M. Braum	Jun 1, 1924
	Ward S. Gates	Sep 9, 1918	Comanche	E. L. Garrett	May 22, 1919
	T. W. Thordardson	Mar 15, 1919		J. B. Peterson	Jul 10, 1922
	Ward R. Miles	Jun 3, 1920		L. L. Perry	Oct 1, 1924
	Robert E. Williams	Apr 1, 1922		Harry Ratcliffe	Mar 10, 1925
Bourbon	Avery C. Maloney	Jul 10, 1918	Cowley	O. P. Drake	Mar 1, 1913
	C. O. Grandfield	Nov 1, 1923		J. C. Holmes	Aug 1, 1915
Brown	J. J. Moxley	Apr 7, 1925		E. E. Isaac	Jul 1, 1917
Butler	H. S. Wise	May 15, 1921	Crawford	W. L. Taylor	Apr 4, 1921
	Charles E. Cassell	Feb 1, 1923	Dickinson	H. W. King	May 16, 1924
Chase	Preston O. Hale	Feb 1, 1917	Doniphan	William R. Curry	Mar 15, 1917
	J. A. Hendriks	Feb 1, 1920		W. W. Wright	Jan 4, 1918
	C. F. Gladfelter	Nov 1, 1924		H. F. Tagge	Apr 16, 1918
Cherokee	E. J. Willis	Jul 1, 1918		F. H. Dillenback	Apr 1, 1919
	B. F. Barnes	Jan 15, 1920		Charles E. Lyness	Mar 16, 1923
	Roy E. Gwin	Jan 1, 1921	Douglas	T. E. Moore	May 1, 1918
	H. L. Gibson	Oct 1, 1924		Fred T. Rees	Jul 16, 1918
Cheyenne-Rawlins				E. H. Ptacek	Apr 1, 1919
	E. J. Maris	Jan 1, 1918		R. O. Smith	Jan 1, 1920
Cheyenne	A. C. Hancock	Jun 24, 1918		Harry C. Colglazier	Oct 16, 1922
	A. I. Gilkison	Mar 15, 1920	Ellis	C. L. Howard	May 1, 1920
	E. Bruce Brunson	Mar 16, 1923		E. A. Herr	Sep 22, 1922

County	Agent	Date Assigned	County	Agent	Date Assigned
	J. Scott Stewart	Oct 10, 1923	Kingman	H. L. Hildwein	Oct 5, 1918
Finney	Charles E. Cassell	Jul 13, 1917	Labette-Neosho		
	Charles E. Cassell	Jul 11, 1919		Fred T. Rees	Jan 1, 1918
	F. M. Cardwell	Feb 3, 1923	Labette	Geo. W. Salisbury	Feb 1, 1919
	Glenn M. Reed	Nov 1, 1925		R. F. Olinger	Sep 6, 1920
Ford	John V. Hepler	Aug 20, 1917	Wm. H. Metzger	Jun 5, 1923	
	John V. Helpler	Jul 1, 1919	E. H. Moss	Apr 16, 1924	
	Harry C. Baird	Feb 1, 1920	Harry F. Moxley	May 15, 1925	
Franklin	F. Joe Robbins	May 17, 1917	Leavenworth		
Geary-Riley	Ralph Kenney	Dec 13, 1917		P. H. Ross	Aug 1, 1912
				Ira N. Chapman	Sep 1, 1916
Geary	Dewey Z. McCormick	Jul 1, 1925		Edward H. Leker	Dec 1, 1922
	Paul B. Gwin	Oct 1, 1925	Lincoln	A. W. Brumbaugh	Sep 1, 1918
Gray	Henry J. Adams	Jun 27, 1918		Clell A. Newell	Apr 15, 1921
	Chas. H. Stinson	Jun 11, 1921		S. D. Capper	Jun 16, 1923
	Louis M. Knight	Feb 1, 1923		Walter J. Daly	Oct 19, 1925
Greenwood	W. W. Wright	Mar 15, 1918	Linn	H. B. Fuller	Jun 1, 1914
	F. J. Peters	Jun 1, 1920		C. K. Peck	Sep 1, 1914
	E. H. Willis	Feb 1, 1923	Lyon	H. L. Popenoe	May 15, 1914
	J. W. Farmer	Oct 17, 1923		H. F. Tagge	Jan 1, 1918
Harper	A. H. Aicher	Mar 10, 1925	Gaylord Hancock	Mar 1, 1919	
Harvey	Frank P. Lane	Jun 1, 1913	Cecil L. McFadden	Nov 10, 1920	
	William A. Wunsch	Sep 12, 1917	McPherson	V. M. Emmert	Jun 1, 1916
	A. B. Kimball	Jun 1, 1920		Henry J. Adams	Aug 15, 1917
	Ray L. Graves	May 1, 1925			
Haskell	Albert Norlin	Aug 20, 1917	Marion	J. L. Garlough	May 5, 1919
Hodgeman	Neil L. Rucker	Aug 16, 1917		R. F. Olinger	Sep 15, 1919
	J. W. Thornburgh	Jul 5, 1918		Arthur L. Myers	Sep 1, 1920
	Theo. F. Yost	Jun 1, 1920		Earl C. Smith	Jun 16, 1922
	Duke D. Brown	Mar 25, 1922	Marshall	F. B. Williams	Jun 20, 1916
	J. Farr Brown	Aug 10, 1922		A. E. Person	Nov 15, 1917
	Ray L. Graves	Jun 1, 1923		W. C. Calvert	Apr 15, 1918
	J. L. Farrand	May 15, 1925		Robert L. Barnum	Aug 20, 1918
Duke D. Brown	Oct 20, 1925	Orville T. Bonnett	Nov 10, 1919		
Jackson-Jefferson			John J. Inskeep	Jun 10, 1921	
	Ralph Snyder	Nov 1, 1917	O. L. McMurray	Feb 15, 1923	
Jackson	C. W. Vetter	Mar 25, 1918	W. O'Connell	Mar 15, 1924	
	Edward H. Leker	Aug 12, 1918	Meade	Carl L. Howard	Jul 16, 1918
	H. F. Tagge	Jan 1, 1923		Carl V. Maloney	Sep 1, 1919
		C. S. Merydith		Dec 16, 1921	
Jefferson	Joe M. Goodwin	Jan 1, 1919	J. E. Norton	Feb 5, 1915	
	W. H. Robinson	Jan 10, 1923	Miami	O. C. Hagans	Oct 1, 1914
Jewell	A. D. Folker	Oct 1, 1914		J. L. Lantow	Aug 20, 1917
	A. E. Jones	Jul 1, 1917		L. R. Alt	Sep 16, 1918
	C. D. Thomas	Sep 1, 1917		J. V. Quigley	Mar 16, 1919
	E. C. Thurber	Nov 26, 1917		W. H. Brooks	Feb 1, 1920
	A. E. Jones	Feb 1, 1919		E. H. Walker	Aug 16, 1922
	T. R. Pharr	Feb 10, 1920		J. D. Buckman	Oct 1, 1924
	W. W. Houghton	Sep 1, 1920		Montgomery	E. J. Macy
	Kyle D. Thompson	May 16, 1922	Hayes M. Coe		Nov 25, 1918
Johnson	Dwight E. Hull	Nov 24, 1924	Morris	A. L. Clapp	Apr 1, 1917
	Harry S. Wilson	Nov 5, 1917		W. L. Taylor	Jul 7, 1919
	Chester E. Graves	Feb 9, 1921		Paul B. Gwin	Feb 1, 1921
	C. A. Wood	Oct 22, 1923		Dewey Z. McCormick	Oct 1, 1925
J. B. Peterson	Aug 15, 1924				

	County	Agent	Date Assigned	County	Agent	Date Assigned	
Nemaha	John D. Lewis		Jun 1, 1916		Arthur I. Gilkison	Mar 16, 1923	
	R. S. Hawkins		Jan 15, 1918	Riley-Geary	Ralph Kenny	Dec 15, 1917	
	J. M. Murray		Jan 1, 1919		Riley	S. D. Capper	Oct 15, 1925
	E. L. McIntosh		Feb 1, 1920	Rooks	Kyle D. Thompson	Jun 1, 1920	
	Herman A. Biske		Sep 1, 1923	Rush	Luther E. Willoughby	Aug 16, 1917	
Neosho-Labette	Fred T. Rees		Jan 1, 1918		Carl Carlson	Apr 1, 1920	
					R. J. Silkett	Feb 27, 1922	
Neosho	C. D. Thompson		May 24, 1918		Donald B. Ibach	Jul 1, 1923	
Ness	W. Y. Yeoman		Aug 16, 1917	Sedgwick	E. J. Macy	Jan 15, 1918	
	George W. Sidwell		Jul 1, 1920		Shawnee	A. D. Folker	Jul 1, 1917
	J. M. Dodrill		Jan 1, 1921			Frank O. Blecha	Feb 10, 1919
	Leo D. Ptacek		Jan 1, 1922			W. W. Wright	Jan 1, 1924
	Ray Felton		Feb 1, 1923			W. H. Metzger	Apr 18, 1924
		George Sidwell		Jun 1, 1923	Sherman	Arvid Nelson	May 1, 1922
Osage-Coffey	J. A. Scheel		Nov 15, 1917		G. L. Cleland	Oct 20, 1923	
				Smith	A. B. Kimball	May 1, 1925	
Osage	H. S. Wise		Jun 1, 1920	Stevens	R. F. Hagans	Aug 1, 1917	
	Louis N. Rockford		May 15, 1921	Sumner	W. A. Boys	Aug 1, 1918	
	E. L. McIntosh		Aug 7, 1923			H. D. Crittenden	Jan 1, 1923
Ottawa	Robert E. Curtis		Jan 15, 1924		John J. Inskeep	Feb 12, 1923	
Pawnee	Ralph P. Schnacke		Jun 20, 1916	Washington	R. W. Shafer	Feb 1, 1917	
	Carl L. Howard		Oct 1, 1922		John V. Hepler	Jan 3, 1921	
Pratt	Edward Larson		Dec 15, 1917	Wichita-Greeley	George W. Sidwell	Jan 1, 1918	
	Louis E. Howard		Jan 6, 1919			F. A. Billhimer	Dec 22, 1919
	Vernon S. Crippen		Jun 1, 1920		J. F. Eggerman	Jul 1, 1920	
	Chas. H. Stinson		Jan 16, 1923	Wilson	R. O. Smith	Apr 6, 1916	
Rawlins-Cheyenne	E. I. Maris		Jul 1, 1918		C. O. Grandfield	Mar 1, 1920	
					Thomas Cross	Dec 1, 1923	
					C. E. Agnew	Mar 3, 1924	
Rawlins	E. I. Maris		Jul 1, 1918	Wyandotte	A. G. VanHorn	Nov 1, 1917	
	Carl Carlson		Feb 27, 1922			A. D. Folker	Jul 1, 1919
					C. A. Patterson	Jul 10, 1920	
Reno	Sam J. Smith		Aug 10, 1920		Chester E. Graves	Oct 1, 1923	
	Vernon S. Crippen		Jan 1, 1923				
	R. W. McCall		Sep 22, 1924				
Rice	Walter B. Adair		Mar 11, 1921				
	A. F. Kiser		Feb 15, 1923				

Early Home Demonstration Agents—through 1925

County	Home Agent	Assigned	County	Home Agent	Assigned	
Allen	Florence Syverud	Feb 1, 1925	Cherokee	Sara Jane Patton	Nov 15, 1918	
Anderson	Elsie Baird	Oct 6, 1917		Frances Smith	Sep 1, 1924	
Atchison	Avis Talcott	Oct 15, 1917	Clay	Elizabeth Rothweiler	May 20, 1918	
	Ellen M. Batchelor	Sep 1, 1919			Sue V. Hemphill	Feb 1, 1919
Bourbon	Isa Allene Green	Feb 1, 1918			Maude E. Deeley	Dec 31, 1924
	Ethel McDonald	Jan 5, 1925			Elizabeth Quinlan	Jan 12, 1925
Butler	Maude E. Coe	Aug 1, 1925	Cowley	Juanita Sutcliffe	Sep 15, 1917	
Chase	Floring Fate	Feb 9, 1918	Douglas	Mildred Smith	Jan 15, 1925	
	Effie May Carp	Jan 4, 1919	Franklin	Nina Hurlbut	Feb 1, 1924	
				Ella M. Meyer	Nov 9, 1925	

County	Home Agent	Assigned	County	Home Agent	Assigned
Labette	Mabel Hinds	Jan 12, 1925	Reno	Edith Holmberg	Mar 1, 1924
Lyon	Ruth Wooster	Jul 1, 1918	Riley	Marjorie Kimball	Jan 1, 1918
Marshall	Edna Danner	Oct 1, 1917	Sedgwick	Ethel McDonald Laura Winter Willison	May 1, 1922 Jan 15, 1825
McPherson	Maude M. Coe	Sep 22, 1917	Seward	Ellen Nelson	Sep 5, 1917
Meade	Vera Goff	Apr 15, 1919	Shawnee	Clyda Green	Nov 1, 1917
	Ethel McDonald	Sep 8, 1919		Irene Taylor Chapman	Sep 1, 1918
	Florence Whipple	May 1, 1922		Julia Kiene	Nov 1, 1920
	Caroline Whipple	Feb 1, 1924		Mable McComb	Oct 1, 1925
	Mabel McMahan	Feb 1, 1925	Stevens	Bertha Jane Boyd Letty-Ham Baker	Sep 25, 1917 Jul 1, 1918
Montgomery	Lila S. Coe	May 1, 1923	Washington	Myrtle Blythe Helen Munger Anderson	Oct 4, 1917 Aug 1, 1918
Morris	Ruth Wooster	Dec 1, 1917			
	Edith Holmberg	Aug 1, 1918	Wyandotte	Ellen M. Batchelor	Sep 1, 1917
Ness	Mollie Lindsey	Sep 3, 1917		Maude Estes	Jul 5, 1918
Pratt	Edith Holmberg	Jul 1, 1922		Maude Coe	Feb 1, 1922
	Hattie Abbot	Jun 1, 1924		Nina Hurlbut	Sep 15, 1925
Rawlins	Esther May Huyck	Sep 20, 1925			

Early County Club Agents—through 1925

County	Club Agent	Assigned	County	Club Agent	Assigned
Anderson	Florence Scully	1916		Leonard Ram	Jan 1, 1918
Bourbon	George Campbell	Jan 1, 1918		Florence Snell Whipple	Jun 1, 1918
Brown	Florence Whipple	Mar 16, 1919		Eleanor Howe	Mar 2, 1922
	Mary Griffith	Apr 19, 1920		Mildred Leker	Jun 16, 1923
	Maude Faulkenberg	Jun 1, 1921		Helen Dunlap	Feb 11, 1924
	Hazel Scalapino	Mar 1, 1922	Lyon	Charles A. Boyle	Jan 1, 1918
	Eldora Mann	Mar 20, 1923		George R. New	Jun 1, 1918
Chase	Harry C. Baird	May 1, 1919	Neosho	Winifred Lewis	Jul 1, 1918
Coffey	Thelma O'Dell	Apr 19, 1920	Ottawa	Jessie Adee	May 1, 1918
Comanche	Floyd V. Brower	Jul 1, 1921	Republic	Floyd Hawkins	Jan 1, 1918
Dickinson	R. E. Frey	May 1, 1918	Rice	Bertha McCabe	N/A
Ford	Eulalis Nevins	Mar 1, 1918		Mabel Townley	Mar 1, 1918
Franklin	Hale B. Blair	Apr 1, 1918		Lola B. Thompson	Mar 1, 1919
Jefferson	Margaret Carr	N/A	Saline	H. P. Alexander	Jan 16, 1918
	Jessie McCafferty	Jan 1, 1918	Thomas	Edwin C. Mellick	Apr 1, 1918
Jewell	Jessie Cauthorn	Feb 1, 1918	Wabaunsee	Alva L. Sells	Mar 1, 1918
	Edna Metz	N/A	Woodson	Kathryn Bideau	Apr 1, 1918
Labette	Chas. L. Castineau	Apr 1, 1918	Wyandotte	W. F. Dewalt	N/A
Leavenworth	Thos. J. Cahill	N/A		George Campbell	Jan 1, 1918
				Grace Hannell	May 1, 1918

Budget/Staff Concerns—1928

Budget Problems—1928

In 1928, Director Umberger stated in his Annual Report that progress in every line of Extension work was

seriously handicapped by lack of funds.

The budget maintained the projects represented by the following workers:

- 1 Director of Extension Service
- 1 Extension Editor
- 3 District Agricultural Agents
- 67 County Agricultural Agents
- 1 Assistant County Agricultural Agent
- 1 Home Demonstration Agent Leader
- 1 Assistant Home Demonstration Agent Leader
- 1 Assistant in charge of Home Economics Specialists
- 23 Home Demonstration Agents
- 2 Foods & Nutrition Specialists
- 1 Clothing Specialist
- 1 Millinery Specialist
- 1 Home Health and Sanitation Specialist
- 1 Household Management Specialist
- 1 State Club Leader
- 2 Assistant State Club Leaders
- 1 County Club Agent
- 1 Leader in Charge of Agricultural Specialists
- 2 Specialists in Crops Production
- 1 Specialist in Soils Management
- 1 Specialist in Plant Pathology
- 1 Specialist in Horticulture
- 2 Specialists in Animal Husbandry
- 2 Specialists in Dairying
- 1 Specialist in Veterinary Extension
- 2 Specialists in Poultry Husbandry
- 1 Specialist in Entomology
- 2 Specialists in Rodent Control
- 1 Farm Management Demonstrator
- 1 Specialist in Marketing
- 1 Extension Architect
- 1 Rural Engineer
- 1 Head of Home Study Department
- 1 Instructor in Animal Husbandry
- 1 Instructor in Education
- 1 Instructor in Engineering
- 1 Instructor in English
- 1 Instructor in History and Civics
- 1 Instructor in Horticulture

Director Umberger further stated:

Permanent results come from programs of work

fitted to counties and localities on a long-time basis. The present limitations in personnel defeat this purpose.

Demand has necessitated Specialists being withdrawn from well-established programs of work in order to temporarily satisfy a demand in organized counties and in counties not provided with regular projects.

In non-Smith-Lever projects the funds appropriated by the Agricultural College to the Extension Division have decreased, not only in general maintenance of appropriation but in actual amount.

Luncheon Meetings—1928

Another activity began in 1928 was a luncheon for the Central Office staff. Those luncheons were held the first Saturday noon of each month except July and August, to discuss methods, policies, projects, reports, etc.

About 1940, luncheon meetings were replaced by a staff conference on a Monday morning each month.

Club Agent Positions Lost—1929-32

In 1932, because of limited finances, two county Extension Club Agent positions were discontinued.

The two County Extension Club Agents were: Ray L. Remsburg, appointed in Kingman County, July 15, 1929, resigned December 31, 1931; J. B. Taylor appointed in Saline County January 18, 1930, resigned December 31, 1931.

Two other Extension Club Agents were continued: R. N. Lindburg in Butler County and J. Harold Johnson in Sedgwick County. In many other counties salaries of the Agents were reduced to keep expenditures balanced with available resources.

Growth of Central Staff—1929

By 1929 the Central Extension Office staff consisted of the individuals listed below. The dates given indicate their first appointment to an Extension Service position.

Appointment Name and Position

Administration

Feb 1, 1915 H. Umberger, Dean and Director

Jul 1, 1915 L. C. Williams, Assistant Dean and Director

Apr 1, 1920 Clara M. Siem, Assistant to Director

Extension Publicity and Information

Jul 1, 1927 L. L. Longsdorf, Extension Editor and Radio Program Director

County Agent Work

- Aug 1, 1916 A. F. Turner, Field Agent
- Feb 1, 1919 Frank O. Blecha, District Agent
- Jan 10, 1929 Earl H. Teagarden, District Agent
- Feb 1, 1929 Harry C. Baird, District Agent
- Aug 1, 1923 M. L. Robinson, District Supervisor
- Apr 15, 1929 Otis B. Glover, District Supervisor
- Oct 15, 1924 Leonard F. Neff, District Supervisor

Boys' and Girls' Club Work

- May 20, 1922 M. H. Coe, State Club Leader
- Jul 1, 1927 J. Harold Johnson, Acting State Club Leader
- Sep 16, 1929 Mary Elsie Border, Assistant State Club Leader

Home Demonstration Work

- Dec 12, 1924 Georgiana H. Smurthwaite, State Home Demonstration Leader
- Sep 1, 1919 Ellen M. Batchelor, District Home Demonstration Agent
- May 20, 1929 Gertrude Allen, Foods and Nutrition Specialist
- Jun 15, 1919 W. Pearl Martin, Home Health and Sanitation Specialist

Agricultural Specialists

- Jul 1, 1915 L. C. Williams, In Charge (Also Assistant Dean & Director)
- Oct 1, 1914 C. G. Elling, Animal Husbandry Specialist
- Aug 16, 1917 L. E. Willoughby, Crops Specialist
- Apr 15, 1918 E. G. Kelly, Entomology Specialist
- May 1, 1924 James W. Linn, Dairy Husbandry Specialist
- Jun 14, 1927 Ray L. Stover, Dairy Husbandry Specialist
- Jul 1, 1924 J. W. Lumb, Veterinary Specialist
- Dec 11, 1924 J. J. Moxley, Animal Husbandry Specialist
- Sep 1, 1926 E. A. Cleavenger, Crops Specialist
- Aug 1, 1928 M. A. Seaton, Poultry Husbandry Specialist
- Jan 1, 1922 C. R. Jaccard, Agricultural Economics Specialist

Home Study Service

- Aug 1, 1918 George Gemmell, In Charge
- Dec 15, 1919 Floyd Pattison, Engineering
- Sep 1, 1921 Ada Billings, History and Civics
- Sep 1, 1921 B. H. Fleenor, Education

Capper-Ketcham Act—1928

In 1928, additional Federal legislation was passed to provide funds for further development of Agricultural Extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several states already receiving the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act of 1914.

This new legislation, entitled the Capper-Ketcham Act, provided an initial of \$20,000 to each state with the stipulation the most of it should be used for County Agent salaries.

Specific wording of a portion of the Act is as follows:

Section I. Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to further develop the Cooperative extension system as inaugurated under the Act entitled "An Act to provide for cooperative agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the Act of Congress approved July 2, 1862, and all Acts

supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture," approved May 8, 1914, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of paying the expenses of the cooperative extension in agriculture and home economics, and the printing and distribution of information in connection with the same, the sum of \$980,000 for each year, \$20,000 of which shall be paid annually, in the manner hereafter provided, to each State and the Territory of Hawaii, which shall by action of its legislature assent to the provisions of this Act.

The payment of such installments of the appropriations here-in-before made as shall become due to any State or Territory before the adjournment of the regular session of the legislature meeting next after the passage of this Act may, in the absence of prior legislative assent, be made upon the assent of the governor thereof, duly certified to the Secretary of the Treasury. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year following that in which the foregoing appropriation first becomes available, and for each year thereafter, the sum of \$500,000.

The additional sums appropriated under the provisions of this Act shall be subject to the same conditions and limitations as the additional sums appropriated under such Act of May 8, 1914, except that: 1) at least 80 percent of all appropriations under this Act shall be utilized for the payment of salaries of Extension Agents in counties of the several States to further develop the Cooperative Extension system in agriculture and home economics with men, women, boys, and girls; 2) funds available to several States and the Territory of Hawaii

under the terms of this Act shall be so expended that the extension agents appointed under its provisions shall be men and women in fair and just proportions; 3) the restriction on the use of these funds for the promotion of agricultural trains shall not apply.

Section II. The sums appropriated under the provisions of this Act shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, sums appropriated under such Act of May 8, 1914, or sums otherwise annually appropriated for cooperative agricultural Extension work.

Finances—1926-31

Early Appropriation Amounts—1926-31

Appropriations made by the counties during the years 1926-1931 to support local Extension work were:

1926	\$181,965.05
1927	199,529.33
1928	227,200.25
1929	268,172.52
1930	293,822.68
1931	296,480.08

Financial Situation—1928

The financial situation prevailing during the 1928 fiscal year was further explained in the report of the Director of Extension, Harry Umberger:

The situation with regard to financial support of the Extension Service has become more satisfactory in some respects during the year because of the passage of the Capper-Ketcham Act. It is important to note, however, that this act prescribes that, at least 80 per cent of all appropriations under this Act shall be utilized for the payment of salaries of Extension Agents in counties.

This bill will make available, therefore, for the coming year, 80 percent of \$20,000 available for County Agent work including Agriculture, Home Economics and Club Agents; the second year \$11,164.95 to be utilized in the same proportion for County Agents. This will leave 20 percent to carry administrative work and other overhead, which necessarily increases as additional county agents are employed.

Thus, the situation with regard to County Agent work is now satisfactory, and from the additional funds available from the Capper-Ketchum Act the employment of Agents in counties where they are not now employed may be resumed.

The situation, however, with regard to other lines of Extension work which cannot be supported by Smith-Lever funds is more serious than ever.

From the funds available from College appropriation, correspondence study, radio, farm and home week, Farmers' Institutes, Extension schools, and numerous other activities must be supported. While these activities have been greatly increased the funds have decreased from \$35,000 in 1921-22 to \$28,000 in 1927-28.

The natural expansion which has come on in radio and visual education, which includes the furnishing of motion pictures, films, slides and charts, has been supported by an increase in the amount of fees received from correspondence study registrations.

The fees paid by correspondence students were increased last year, but the result was no increase in revenue from this source, since the increased fees caused decreased enrollment.

It consequently is becoming necessary to adopt one of two alternatives, either secure an increase in the appropriations in support of College Extension work or curtail these services.

The rapid increase in the number of County Extension Agents, men and women, brought about the request for additional Federal funds for allocation to the states as provided in the Capper-Ketcham Act approved May 22, 1928.

Extension Projects—1929

The 1929 reports showed Extension Service programs organized into projects and subjects as follows:

- 1) Administration
- 2) Publicity
 - A. The Press
- 3) County Agent Work
 - A. Supervision of Agricultural Agents (three supervisors)
 - B. Organization in non-Farm Bureau counties
- 4) Home Demonstration Agent Work
 - A. Supervision of Home Demonstration Agents
 - B. Organization in non-Home Demonstration Agent counties
- 5) Boys' and Girls' 4-H Club Work
 - A. Club Work
 - B. Beef Project
 - C. Pig Project
 - D. Sheep Project
 - E. Dairy Project
 - F. Poultry Project
 - G. Corn Project
 - H. Sorghum Project
 - I. Potato Project
 - J. Garden Project Clubs
 - K. Clothing Project
 - L. Baking Project
 - M. Canning Project
 - N. Supper Project
 - O. Room Improvement Project
 - P. Misc. Clubs
 1. Colt Clubs
 2. Bee Clubs
 3. Farm Management
- 6) Extension Schools in Agriculture and Home Economics and the Supervision of Agricultural Specialists
 - A. Institutes and Extension Schools
 - B. Fair Judging
 - C. Fair Exhibits
 - D. Farm and Home Week
- 7) Soil Management and Crop Production
 - A. Crop Improvement (Seed shows, variety tests, certified seed growers, Kansas seed law, and germination and purity tests)
- B. Legume Production
 - C. Soil Improvement (Samples of soil tested, samples of limestone used, tons of limestone used, percent of high-grade fertilizer used, number of farms on which legume crops were seeded for soil improvement purposes, number of acres involved)
 - D. Soil Management (moisture tests, tillage tests, early tillage, fallow and wide-spacing, soil blowing prevention)
 - E. Bindweed Control
 - F. Corn Production
- 8) Plant Pathology
 - A. Vegetable Disease Control (Irish potatoes, sweet potatoes)
 - B. Grain Crop Disease Control (wheat smut, sorghum smut)
- 9) Horticulture
 - A. Orchard Management and Orchard Development (Home and Commercial)
 - B. Small Fruits (grapes, brambles, strawberries)
 - C. Permanent Fruit and Vegetable Gardens
 - D. Fruit and Vegetable Gardens and Nutrition
- 10) Animal Husbandry
 - A. Beef herd management (culling herds, purebred bulls, feeding, supplementary pasture, creep feeding)
 - B. Standard Cornbelt Ration
 - C. Beef Cattle Improvement
 - D. Draft Horse Hitches (Inactive in 1929)
 - E. Pork Production (Kansas County Pork Production Contest)
 - F. Brood Sow and Litter Management (hayloft farrowing quarters)
 - G. Ton Litter
 - H. Sheep and Wool Production (Annual Ram Sale and Exchange, wool pool)
 - I. Home Preparation of Pork
- 11) Dairying
 - A. General Dairy Program (Feeding schools, bull associations, pasture improvement)
 - B. Dairy Herd Improvement Associations
- 12) Veterinary Extension
 - A. Bovine Tuberculosis Control

- B. Poultry Disease Control (Parasites and clean brooding methods, coccidiosis, ovian tuberculosis, bacillary white diarrhea, other diseases)
- C. Swine Sanitation
- D. Veterinary Extension with Veterinarians (Organization of local associations, distribution of literature)
- E. Infectious Abortion Control
- 13) Poultry Husbandry
 - A. Poultry Housing and Housing Conditions (Flocks reduced to meet housing conditions, remodeled houses, new equipment)
 - B. Feeding for Egg Production (Demonstrations for chicks and layers)
 - C. Brooding and Rearing of Chicks (Worm control)
 - D. Breeding (Demonstration record flocks, accredited flocks, certified flocks, breeding pens)
 - E. Grading Eggs and Marketing on a Graded Basis (Produce houses buying on grade)
 - F. Turkey Production
- 14) Entomology
 - A. Staple Crop Insects (Hessian fly, chinch bugs, grasshoppers, false wireworms, corn root worm, cutworm)
 - B. Horticultural Insects (Codling moth, potato beetle, curculio, cucumber beetle, aphids, cabbage worm)
 - C. Livestock Insects (Chicken mites, ox warble, biting flies, sheep scab mites, screw worms, hog lice)
 - D. Leader Training (Adults and 4-H boys and girls)
 - E. Building and Lumber Insects (Termites)
 - F. Household and Sanitation Insects (Clothes moths, cockroaches, house flies, bed bugs, pantry pests, mosquitoes)
- 15) Eradicating Rodent Pests in Kansas
 - A. Pocket Gopher Control
 - B. Prairie Dog Eradication
 - C. Jack Rabbit Control
 - D. Rat Control
- 16) Farm Management
 - A. Farm Organization Through Accounts
 - B. Junior Farm Management Clubs
 - C. Farm Management Tour
 - D. Father-Son Contract Agreement
- 17) Marketing
 - A. Marketing of Livestock (Beef cattle schools, number of farmers using the Agricultural Situation, marketing demonstration)
 - B. Marketing of Fruits and Vegetables (Grading and inspection, marketing organization)
 - C. Marketing of Grain (District and County wheat schools, number of farmers receiving the Agricultural Situation)
 - D. Marketing of Hay (Demonstration of Federal grades)
- 18) None
- 19) Foods and Nutrition
 - A. Foods selection and preparation
 - B. Child feeding
 - C. Menu Planning
 - D. Gardens and Nutrition
- 20) Clothing
 - A. Simple dress construction
 - B. Study of silk and wool garments
 - C. Color and Design in theory and practice
 - D. Tailored garments
 - E. Textiles
 - F. Draped garments
- 21) Millinery
 - A. Foundation principles in construction of simple hats
 - B. Foundation principles in remodeling hats
 - C. Color
- 22) Home Health and Sanitation
 - A. Home Nursing
 - B. Sanitation
- 23) Household Management
 - A. Kitchen contest
 - B. Kitchen improvement based on personal efficiency
 - C. Home furnishings
 - D. Selection and care of small equipment
 - E. Household organization and accounts.
- 24) Rural Engineering
 - A. Farm Architecture (Farmstead planning, farm building plans, home utilities, community buildings)
 - B. Land Reclamation (Drainage, irrigation, soil and water conservation)
 - C. Farm Power and Farm Machinery

Some Chronological Changes in Organization—1905-36

A chronological record of some significant changes in the Extension departments is given below. These notations were condensed from the annual reports in the years indicated:

1912 — A Department of Highway Engineering, with a Highway Engineer in charge, was organized to give instruction to farmers and others as to the economic value of good roads and bridges.

Plans for permanent roads and bridges are prepared in the engineering office on the request of county commissioners. Inspection of bridges constructed according to the State Engineer's plans are also made.

Advice was given on the construction of 476 bridges in 76 counties. Lectures on drainage and irrigation are made at Farmers' Institutes and specific help is given to individual farmers.

1914 — The Department of Rural Service was established under the leadership of Walter Burr. The department was discontinued June 30, 1922.

1921 — The Milk Utilization Project, which was conducted from state funds subsequent to July 1, 1920, was discontinued July 1, 1921, and the work taken over by the Nutrition Project.

1921—An additional specialist was employed January 1, 1921, as Extension Plant Pathologist. This is a permanent project.

1921— An additional nutrition specialist was employed February 1, 1921 to July 1, 1921; a canning specialist was employed on a temporary basis on June 1, 1921; a horse specialist was employed for seven months; two specialists were employed for three months each to assist in a purebred sires campaign.

1921 — A millinery specialist was permanently employed on March 1, 1921.

1921 — Two assistant county agent leaders were employed on a permanent basis.

1. Administration—1905-11

October 10, 1905 — Field Secretary and Organizer of Farmers' Institutes employed (John H. Miller).

July 16, 1906 — Department of College Extension established (John H. Miller made Superintendent of Farmers' Institutes).

October 30, 1912 — Division of College Extension created; John H. Miller, Dean.

September 1, 1911— John H. Miller given title of Director of Extension.

Mr. Miller then carried the Title of "Dean and Director" which was the title for the future administrators until the Dean of Agriculture position was created in 1956 at which time the administrator of the Extension Service became "Director of Extension."

At the same time, the name of the Division apparently was changed from Division of College Extension to "Division of Extension."

2. Information

July 1, 1920 — The first "Extension Journalist" was employed (Mabel Caldwell) (John B. Bennett followed on 10-15-21, as Ext. Editor).

July 1, 1924 — Department of Extension Publicity and Information was established.

3. County Agent Work—1915-20

County Agent Work was one of five projects in the Department of Institutes and Demonstrations as recorded in the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. The Dean and Director served as the County Agent Leader.

February 1, 1915 — H. Umberger appointed as Assistant County Agent Leader.

July 1, 1917 — H. Umberger title changed to "County Agent Leader" and "Department of County Agricultural Agent Work" was created.

July 1, 1920 — Department name changed to "County Agent Work."

4. Extension Home Economics—1910-36

1910 — Department of Home Economics established with Miss Frances L. Brown, Director November 1, 1917 - Department of Emergency Home Demonstration Agent Work was established. Miss Brown was transferred from the Home Economics Department to be department head.

July 1, 1919 — The word "Emergency" was dropped from the name of the department.

July 1, 1925 — The two departments were administered by Miss Amy Kelly who was made head of each of the departments.

July 1, 1936 — The two departments were consolidated as "Home Economics in Extension."

5. Boys' and Girls' Club Work

September 1, 1914 — Otis Hall was employed as the first State Leader of Boys' and Girls' Club work and was assigned to the Rural Service Project.

1917 - Department of Boys' and Girls' Club Work was created.

6. Supervision of Agricultural Specialists

July 1, 1917 — Department of Institutes and Extension Schools created with A. C. Hartenbower as Superintendent of Institutes.

December 1, 1919 — Thomas Talbert appointed as Superintendent of Institutes and Extension Schools.

February 15, 1921 — Mr. Talbert was assigned to be In Charge of Agricultural Specialists.

July 1, 1924 — Supervision of Agricultural Specialists written as a project with L. C. Williams, in charge.

7. Engineering Extension—1912-14

October 30, 1912 — Department of Highway Engineering and Irrigation was established with W. S. Gearhart as Highway Engineer.

April 4, 1917 - Department name changed to "Department of Drainage and Irrigation" with H. B. Walker, in charge.

January 1, 1920 — Name changed to "Drainage, Irrigation and Farm Engineering."

July 1, 1921 — Name changed to Rural Engineering.

July 1, 1941 — Name changed to "Engineering Extension."

8. Continuing Education—1910-56

January 14, 1910 — The Board of Regents

authorized the giving of instruction by correspondence.

1911 — Harry L. Kent employed to give instruction by correspondence.

July of 1912 — Mr. Kent became Director of Correspondence Study.

September 25, 1913 — Department of Correspondence Study apparently created with John C. Werner as Department Head.

July 1, 1912 — Name changed to "Home Study Service."

July 1, 1935 — Name changed to "Home Study Department."

9. Extension Supervisory Districts—1923-56

The early supervision of County Agents was done by Assistant County Agent Leaders with no division of the state relative to responsibilities, rather, the division was made according to lines of work such as finances, programs, reports, and office supervision.

January 1, 1923 — The state was divided into four supervisory districts with the District Agents: Karl Knaus, F. A. Dawley, A. Clapp and George Salisbury.

July 1, 1925 — Number of districts changed to three.

July 1, 1932 — The district boundaries were realigned so that each district could have an equal number of County Farm Bureaus.

Contributing Author: The primary contributing author to this overview summary of the Kansas Cooperative Extension Service organization, administration, and program emphasis for this 1930-49 Era was Earl H. Teagarden, who first recorded his compilations in the publication, *Kansas Extension Service—from 1868-1964*. His observations have been revised, consolidated, and adapted to a new format for inclusion in this update publication.