

**Results of Organizational Change Survey  
2001**

**Report of Texas Cooperative Extension's Capacity to Support Programs for Children,  
Youth and Families at Risk**

**Pamela J. Brown, Ph.D.  
J. Rey Santos, Ph.D.**

## Table of Contents

Purpose .....	1
Method .....	4
Respondent characteristics .....	5
Component 1 .....	8
Develop and implement a common vision and strategic plan for programming for children, youth and families at risk.	
Component 2 .....	9
Train, support and reward Extension salaried and volunteer staff for implementing programs which accomplish the CYFAR mission	
Component 3 .....	10
Recognize Extension professionals as critical resources in research and education for children, youth, families and community issues.	
Component 4 .....	11
Promote diversity, inclusivity and pluralism in Extension programs and staff.	
Component 5 .....	11
Promote (internal) collaborations of Extension 4-H, Family and consumer Science, Agriculture, Community Development and other University departments in programming for children, youth and families at risk across the state.	
Component 6 .....	12
Promote and join (external) collaborations of community, county, state and federal agencies and organizations to strengthen programs and policy for children, youth and families.	
Summary and Recommendations .....	12
References .....	14
Tables and Figures	
Table 1 .....	4
Table 2 .....	6
Table 3 .....	15
Table 4 .....	16

## Introduction and Method

### Purpose of the survey

Background: Since 1991, USDA-CSREES has funded the Children, Youth and Families At Risk (CYFAR) National Initiative, which evolved to become base programming in 1999. The CYFAR program emphasizes a holistic approach to preventive educational programs that address **risk and resilience in children, youth and families and communities**. The goal of the CYFAR program is to facilitate the development and maintenance of healthy environments that enable those at risk to develop life skills necessary for contributing, fulfilling lives. (1998 Texas OCS report). The first Organizational Change Survey was implemented in 1997. This report summarizes the results of round two of the Organizational Change Survey of support for children, youth and families at risk.

One goal of CYFAR is to improve each state Extension system's capacity to support community-based programs for children youth and families at risk. Six organizational components are specified by CYFAR to help lead to the accomplishment of this task. The components are:

1. Develop and implement a common vision and strategic plan for programming for children, youth and families at risk.
2. Train, support and reward Extension salaried and volunteer staff for implementing programs that accomplish the CYFAR mission
3. Recognize Extension professionals as critical resources in research and education for children, youth, families and community issues.
4. Promote diversity, inclusivity and pluralism in Extension programs and staff.
5. Promote (internal) collaborations of Extension 4-H, Family and consumer Science, Agriculture, Community Development and other University departments in programming for children, youth and families at risk across the state.
6. Promote and join (external) collaborations of community, county, state and federal agencies and organizations to strengthen programs and policy for children, youth and families.

The *National Report of the 2001 Organizational Change Survey* is available online at <http://ag.arizona.edu/fcr/fs/cyfar/OCS/index4.htm>

The report indicates that Texas is one of four states that remained highly committed to the Organizational Change Components - a fact that we should be very proud of.

The report that follows conveys the results of the statistical analysis from the May 2001 Texas

Organizational Change Survey and compares the 2001 results with the 1997 results. The report is organized by organizational change components, and contains comparisons by tenure in position, area of responsibility, location, and percent of time devoted to CYFAR issues to a multitude of variables that relate to each of the six organizational components. The report provides a more detailed look at areas where Texas Cooperative Extension faculty believe we are strong and/or could improve. Throughout the narrative ‘children, youth and families’ may be abbreviated as CYF, and ‘children, youth and families at risk’ may be abbreviated as CYFAR. CYFARNet refers to the website for the national CYFAR program. The website address is <http://www.cyfernet.org/> Finally, recommendations are made based on the analysis of data.

### Method

The 70-item Organizational Change Survey covered topics ranging from vision and commitment, building relationships with others, diversity and pluralism, training and staff development, knowledge and expertise, and demographic information. The items assessed the six organizational components (Table 1).

TABLE 1. Organizational Components and Survey Item Numbers

COMPONENT	SURVEY ITEM NUMBER
Component 1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 49
Component 2	7, 8, 9, 10, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47
Component 3	48, 50, 52, 55
Component 4	25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 53, 54
Component 5	8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20
Component 6	16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 51
Respondent characteristics	56-70

The survey was administered via a specially designed web page housed on a server in Extension Information Technology. Dr. J. Rey Santos provided the statistical and web expertise using the Iowa State University template for web-based delivery of the survey. The 1997 OCS survey was administered by mail.

Eligible respondents included all Extension paid professionals, including county, district (agents, DEDs, CEDs), and state (administrators, Extension specialists) faculty who work either *directly or indirectly* with issues related to children, youth and families at risk. Employees with both Texas Cooperative Extension and Prairie View A&M Cooperative Extension Program were

included in the survey (1,000 and 41 respectively) for a total eligible population of 1,041.

Email messages containing a letter from Dr. Chester Fehlis and Dr. Linda Willis were sent to all eligible participants. Dillman's (1971) Total Design Method was followed in implementing this survey. All eligible respondents were assigned a code number to protect the anonymity of respondents. Respondents were provided a web page address for the survey, a login ID, and directions to respond directly to the survey via the web site. Responses were logged in immediately on the server, then the project director removed respondents from the email list. An email message reminder was sent to each non-respondent three times. Each message contained the web address of the survey and instructions on logging in and responding to the survey. The survey was administered during an eight week period from April through May, 2001. Of the 1,041 eligible respondents identified, 626 responses were logged into the web survey, with 487 useable surveys returned, resulting in a response rate of 74.5%. Data were analyzed using SAS.

Two sets of data are reported in this document. The first, referred to as the Original set, (n=487) includes all useable responses to the survey in May 2001. The Subset (n= 366) includes more specifically oriented CYFAR related positions. To derive the Subset, 121 respondents' IDs were removed from eligibility following a request by the University of Arizona (center for analysis of the national data). When compared to other states' data sets, Texas data appeared to be skewed, possibly because of faculty included who had less than 25% CYFAR responsibility. Selected respondents (121) were removed who held positions which had very limited or no involvement with CYFAR issues, i.e., IPM agents, Marine CEAs, state administrators, etc. Most of those removed in the subset worked primarily in highly technical areas as listed above. A detailed list of titles of those removed to create the subset is available.

The decision was made to include ALL professional, paid Extension faculty in the population to be surveyed because of Extension's commitment to CYFAR and the phrase "directly or indirectly". An independent t-test revealed no significant difference between the two sets of data. Therefore all data discussed in the following pages uses the Original data set, n = 487.

### **Respondent Characteristics**

The first nine figures relay the characteristics of respondents in both the Original (n=487) and Subset (n=366) for comparison purposes. The legends in these nine figures refer to the Original as *Total Agency* and the Subset as *Work w/at-risk*.

Figure 1 represents the age of respondents. In the Original and Subset sets of data set, the majority of respondents (41%) were in the 45-55 age range, with the fewest in the 61 and over and 25 and under categories. Respondents in the 25-45 age groups represented 44% (210) of respondents.

Figure 2 illustrates the gender make up of Texas Extension, with 51% and 47% respectively of males and females. The Subset (work w/at-risk) have slightly more females (55%) and fewer males (43%) likely due to the types of positions deleted from the subset as male-dominant

professions.

Thirty-six percent(175 Original and 131 or 36% of the Subset) of Texas Extension employees have over 20 years of experience in Extension (Figure 3). Twenty-seven percent have 5 or fewer years of experience with Extension in Texas. This is an increase of 1% over the 1997 survey, while the number of employees having between 11 and 20 years decreased 4%, those with 20 or more years increased 1%.

Eighty-three percent of both data sets reported their ethnicity as White or Caucasian, 5-6% as African-American, 6-8% as Hispanic, and less than 1% as Asian, Native American or Other (Figure 4). These figures reflect a decrease in African-American and no change in Hispanic percentages from the 1997 data.

Over 70% of the Original set and 67% of the Subset hold graduate degrees. Twenty-eight to 31% have a bachelors degree (Figure 5). These figures are 3-7% higher in the number of employees holding graduate degrees than in 1997.

Extension Assignments

Five questions asked participants about their responsibilities in Extension. Though only 40 (8%) of respondents (35% Subset) work w/at-risk audiences in the CYFAR State Strengthening Grant in Texas, 66 (14%) indicated that 76-100% of their time is devoted to CYFAR issues, while 266 (55%) reported less than 25% time spent on CYFAR issues (Figure 6).

Over three-fourths (76%) of Extension employees in 1997 reported their primary role as county level. In 2001 (Figure 7), 65% (318) reported their role as county level. Thirteen percent (63) reported their role as multi-county while in 1997 that figure was 10%. Administrative responsibilities (Figure 8) account for 0-25% of time allocation of 353 (72%) of Extension paid employees compared to 78% in 1997, 8% (38) have 26-50% devoted to administration, while 4% (19) devote 51-75% and 6%( 30) devote three-quarter to full time to administration. These parallel figures in 1997.

Extension employees were asked to define the work area for their Extension programs (Figure 9). Twenty-five percent characterized their program as urban/suburban/rural (an increase of 13% from 1997), 9% as suburban/rural (increase of 2% from 1997), 6 percent as urban (decrease of 6% from 1997), 37% as rural/small town (decrease of 47% from 1997 data)

Table 2. Extension program work area

<b>Work Area</b>	<b>Year 2001</b>	<b>Year 1997</b>	<b>% Change</b>
Urban	6%	12%	- 6%
Suburban	< 1%	1%	No change
Rural/small towns	37%	47%	- 10%

Urban and rural	16%	19%	- 3%
Urban and suburban	2%	2%	No change
Suburban and rural	10%	7%	+ 3%
Urban/suburban/rural	25%	12%	13%

Note: From “Component 1” through the end of the report data will reflect only the Original data, n = 487.

### Component 1

According to the CYFAR initiative implemented in 1994, the national vision espouses that “children and youth lead positive, secure and happy young lives while developing skills, knowledge and competencies necessary for fulfilling, contributing lives and that all children and youth live in families and communities which promote their positive development” (Texas Organizational Change Report, April 1998, p. 11).

Seven questions addressed respondents understanding of Texas’ vision for CYFAR, the congruency of that vision with the national vision, the statewide commitment to children, youth and families at risk, their own understanding and commitment to that vision. Respondents were also asked whether they believed Extension’s programs for CYFAR were research-based or not. Figure 10 illustrates Extension personnel responses by number of years employed in Texas Extension.

Sixty-five percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that Texas had a vision for CYFAR, while 22% were unsure, and 12% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Eighty-four percent of respondents believe that ideally Texas should have a CYFAR vision. These are almost identical figures to the 1997 data demonstrating very little change in the understanding Extension personnel have of Texas’ CYFAR vision. Sixty-two percent personally understood Texas’ CYFAR vision, but 83% believed that ideally they should have a personal understanding of that vision, while 15% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the need to personally understand the Texas vision. Twenty-one percent were unsure.

Forty-two percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the Texas CYFAR vision was congruent with the national vision, yet 50% were unsure. Twenty percent remained unsure when asked if in the ideal situation the two visions should be congruent, while 66% believed they should be congruent.

Figure 10 illustrates that even as tenure increases for respondents, levels of understanding of the CYFAR vision Texas has remained the same.. Mean scores on the seven items varied little. Extension personnel support the belief (52% agreed or strongly agreed) that a strong research base undergirds programming with children, youth and families at risk. Thirty one percent were unsure. Extension personnel work from strategic plans (59% agreed or strongly agreed, 20% disagreed with the need to work from a personal strategic plan, while 69% believed they should).

Respondents believe that Texas Extension does the same (51% agreed or strongly agreed, 36% were unsure, 79% believed that Extension should). There is less understanding of the commitment of Texas Extension to CYFAR (78% believed Texas is committed to CYFAR, 12% unsure, and 7% disagreed or strongly disagreed. Eighty-five percent believed Texas should be committed to CYFAR.

## **Component 2**

Regardless of the percentage of time devoted in their positions to CYFAR issues, Extension faculty are less sure that they are recognized and promoted for their work with children, youth and families at risk programming (Figure 11) (33% agree or strongly agree; 36% are unsure and 26% disagree or strongly disagree). Ideally, 75% believe that personnel should be recognized for their work in this area. These responses have changed little since the 1997 survey. There is more agreement that campus faculty support Extension CYF programming issues (55% versus 72% in 1997 data), while 22% were unsure and 17% disagreed, up 3% from the 1997 data.

Allocation of resources to support children, youth and families at risk is supported by 54% of respondents, an increase of 15% from 1997. Thirty-two percent remain unsure (43% in 1997) and 11% disagree or strongly disagree (an increase of 5% over 1997). Ideally 79% of Extension personnel believe that Extension resources should be allocated to the CYFAR effort.

The responses to the 2001 survey indicate that supervisory support for time devoted to CYFAR issues is less available. Among those employees with greater than 25% time devoted to CYFAR the responses indicate that supervisory support could be stronger. Eleven percent of all respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, while 15% were unsure, and 64% agreed or strongly agreed that support exists. Yet 76% agreed or strongly agreed that supervisors should support time allocations to children, youth and families programming.

Sixty-four percent agreed or strongly agreed that supervisory support is present for CYFAR programming time. Ideally 76% agreed that they would like to see more supervisory support of time allocated to CYFAR programming. The mean for “supervisor support time to CYF” remains steady even as the percentage of time devoted to CYFAR increases. Those Extension personnel with less than 25% time allocated to CYFAR programming appear to have a better perception of three items, supervisor support, campus faculty support and recognition.

### **Training**

Training takes up a great deal of Extension’s time and resources. Personnel were asked to indicate if they had participated during the past year in 10 training topics representing areas critical to CYFAR. Figure 12 and 13 represent the responses and the sufficiency of training in meeting Extension personnel’s needs. Between 42% and 75% reported receiving training in all areas. Figure 12 indicates 52% or less received training in finding resources to support, impact of values on programming, empowering communities, recruiting volunteers, organizational change.

When considering the sufficiency of training (Figure 13) in the 10 topics fewer than 26% and 41% felt the training was sufficient in meeting employee needs. The percentage of respondents indicating that there was too little training ranged from 14%(impact of own values - pluralism) to 28% (computers and electronic communication). Overall the rating for staff development training was adequate, with those employed 11-15 years rating staff development training the highest (mean = 3.86; Figure 14). Forty-seven percent indicated good to excellent rating, with 32% giving a rating of fair, and 8% poor. There is minimal change from 1997 data.

Correlations on the above 10 items in each of the 1997 and 2001 data (see Table 3) that concerned receiving training and sufficiency of training, indicated eight items were significant at the  $p < .0001$  in both the 1997 and 2001 data. Eighty-two percent and 73% of the variance was explained in the relationship between finding resources and collaboration, respectively, in 1997. However, the items in the 2001 data account for between 41 and 55 percent of the variance in significantly correlated items. These results may indicate that employees in Texas Cooperative Extension may benefit from additional or strengthened training in all of the areas questioned or that benefit would be gained from training explaining the relationship of these items to strengthening programming across the agency in children, youth and family issues.

#### Internet use

Extension personnel utilize the electronic capabilities of the system for many purposes (Figure 15). Though fewer than 13% use the online technology for tutorials, 53% to 60% use the online capabilities to locate information for program development, articles or presentation material, and sharing of information. Communicating with colleagues in Texas is performed by 39% of respondents, while out-of-state communication is used by fewer than 19%. Only 24% use the web for evaluation information. Extension employees are using the web (Figure 16) by accessing non-Extension web pages (19%), other Extension web sites 10%, and CYFERNet web pages 2% at least once a week. Between 30% and 33% never access any Extension or non-Extension web site and 67% report never accessing CYFAR resources on the CYFERNet web site. Usage of web access have increased since 1997 when between 52% and 76% reported never using any of the web resources listed in Figure 16.

### **Component 3**

Seven questions asked respondents to assess their knowledge of principles of development, risk and resilience, programming, obtaining resources, and their role in evaluation, and policy and legislation affecting issues related to children, youth, families and communities at risk. Work with diverse audiences and frequency of being called upon for expertise were also addressed.

Extension employees (30%) are called upon monthly for their expertise (Figure 17) related to issues in children, youth and families. This is a 50% decrease over the 1997 study (66%). Seventeen percent reported never being called upon for expertise in this area, while 22% responded to inquiries every 6 months, and 9% once per year. Twelve percent are called upon weekly, a decrease of 11% from 1997.

When asked about principles of positive child, youth, and family development, 60% believed their knowledge was good to excellent, 19% fair and 5% poor. Figure 18 illustrates the range of knowledge in the six areas explored. Risk and resiliency knowledge is fair to good in 74% of respondents opinions (an increase of 15% from 1997). The majority of respondents (80%) feel knowledgeable in programming for CYF audiences. Knowledge of policy and legislation was ranked lowest by respondents with 23% reporting good to excellent knowledge, 40% fair and 28% poor. Yet, 71% believed that it is the role of Extension personnel is to educate policy makers concerning CYF issues and programming.

Knowledge of obtaining resources is an area indicated as lacking by respondents with 56% reporting only poor to fair knowledge of how to gain resources for CYF programming. In 1997 84% reported fair knowledge of resources for CYFAR.

Evaluation knowledge was good to excellent in 32% of responses, fair for 34% and poor for 25%. However, respondents agreed or strongly agreed (57%) that they were actively involved in evaluating children, youth and families at risk programs.

#### **Component 4**

Component 4 assesses diversity, inclusivity and pluralism in Extension related to Extension programs generating positive and sustainable results for children, youth and families served throughout the state.

Texas Extension respondents were asked to rate the current status of diversity ranging from dominance of one culture to value added by inclusion of diverse cultures, styles, and groups (Figure 19). Fifty-eight percent of personnel strongly agreed or agreed that staff diversity was critical in addressing CYFAR issues. Only 7% felt there was a dominance of one group, 65% felt that there was tolerance in the system and 17% considered that value was added to the system with multiple diverse groups in staffing and programming. These figures are similar to 1997.

Diversity in programming with audiences occurs frequently in Extension (Figure 20). Responses ranged from 1 (none) to 5 (a lot) in reporting the extent that respondents work with single parent families, low-income families, and people at risk for problem behavior. Fewer than 3% reported no work with diverse audiences, though 16% reported a lot of work with diverse audiences. Ideally 36% believed a lot work is appropriate with such audiences. More frequent work occurs with low-income families (40%) than with single parent families (34%), and less with at-risk behavior audiences (19%). These figures are less than those reported in the 1997 survey (low-income 62%, single parent families - 59%, and at-risk problem behavior audiences - 41%). Extension personnel agree that more time should be devoted to all of these audiences (low-income - 53%, single-parent families - 49%; and at-risk for problem behavior - 36% respectively). Over 81% of personnel plan for programs for diverse audiences. Respondents with the greatest allocation of time to CYF programming are most supportive of working with diverse audiences. Figure 21 shows the comfort level of Extension personnel. Over 70% are

secure in their abilities to work with diverse audiences.

Recruitment and hiring of non-Extension staff and volunteers as well as experienced staff is important to Texas Extension personnel. Seventy-one percent believe that Extension is currently recruiting volunteers from non-traditional Extension groups; 86% believe this would be an ideal practice. Recruitment of staff who are not part of Extension is less apparent to respondents (54% agree or strongly agree that this practice is occurring, while 70% believe that ideally staff should be recruited who are not part of Extension.) Fifty percent of respondents agree or strongly agree that Extension is hiring staff with children, youth and families at risk experience; 73% believe this should be the practice.

### **Component 5**

This component focuses on the collaborations of professionals within Extension in strengthening CYF programming. The National Network for Collaboration categories for collaboration were used as response choices. These are hierarchical indicators of more intense working relationships as true collaborative work is conducted. The highest level, collaboration, is not necessarily the most appropriate level at which all efforts are conducted. Respondents were asked what their current working relationships were and what the ideal would be in those same relationships.

Figures 22, 23, 24, and 25 explain the current and ideal status of work with other Extension professionals. Over half (55%) of respondents agree or strongly agree that there is strong campus-based faculty support. Ideally, results indicate that more support is desirable (78%). By far the majority of work is conducted at the “network” level and proportionately less in other categories. Yet, there is an inverse relationship that respondents ideally desire in those work arenas. Collaboration and/or coordination is more ideal, except in multi-university department work (Figure 25). In that case, networking and cooperation are more ideal. Figures for work with other county professionals is currently at the networking stage, while collaborative relationships in CYF work are preferred (Figure 22). Greater cooperation is desired (20% ideally versus 10% current) in work with other program areas such as AG, 4-H, FCS (Figure 23).

In general there is less networking (26%) occurring in 2001 among Extension county professionals than in those taking part in the 1997 survey (35%). Among work with Extension professionals in other areas, there is less (25%) networking occurring in 2001 than in 1997 (33%) though the desired is collaboration (25%). Work with Extension professionals at the state level (Figure 24) showed a slight decrease (30% versus 33% in 1997). The ideal type of working relationship is dispersed nearly equally among cooperation and coordination.

Work with multi-departments at the university level (Fig. 25) is absent in 38% of responses. Ideally only 6% would choose no work with multiple departments, rather there is a desire to have these relationships with departments. There is strong agreement that work with Extension professionals improves children, youth and families programming with 72% agreeing or

strongly agreeing (Figure 26). This figure is 10% less than reported in 1997.

### **Component 6**

This component focuses on the collaborations of professionals OUTSIDE Extension in strengthening CYF programming. The National Network for Collaboration categories for collaboration were used as response choices. These are hierarchical indicators of more intense working relationships as true collaborative work is conducted. The highest level, collaboration, is not necessarily the most appropriate level at which all efforts are conducted. Respondents were asked what their current working relationships were and what the ideal would be in those same relationships.

Working relationships with professionals outside Extension were conducted by respondents to the 2001 Organizational Change Survey. Currently fewer than 9% of Extension personnel conduct no work with community agencies, though the ideally less than 3% would not work with community agencies. Most of the work with community agencies occurs at the cooperation (22%) and network (20%) levels. Work with state and federal agencies occurs at the networking (26% and 29% respectively) and cooperation (22% and 17% respectively) level (Figure 27).

When asked if resources (time and money) are provided to engage in collaborative efforts to better serve children, youth and families at risk, respondents were not in agreement, though ideally 78% believed those resources should be provided. Currently though, 4% strongly agreed, 24% agreed that resources are provided. Twenty percent were unsure, and 45% disagreed or strongly disagreed. In the 1997 survey, 43% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that resources were made available. Other percentages remained similar.

Over 55% of respondents agreed that program participants are engaged in addressing CYFAR programming needs in Texas (Figure 28). When results were examined by years in Extension, the mean responses indicated that personnel with 11-15 years of experience (Figure 29) valued more highly the involvement of program participants in CYF program planning. Seventy-five percent of respondents agree or strongly agree that they take part in community task forces, 11 % disagreed or strongly disagreed. Year 1997 data revealed 85% took part in such task forces.

Asked whether collaboration enhances CYFAR programming 79% believed that it does enhance programming, though 89% agree that it should occur more often. Similarly, 76% agreed that collaboration is worth the effort. Figure 30 illustrates the current and ideal situations concerning issues of collaboration and whether perceptions exist that resources are available mto support the effort and whether working with outside groups is valued.

### **Summary**

There are strengths and weaknesses evident in the Texas 2001 Organizational Change Survey results.

**The strengths that are evident include:**

- Commitment of Extension personnel to programming planning for children, youth and families at risk. There is agreement among over 80% of respondents that Texas Extension should have a plan and that Extension personnel value and want to understand the state and national plans.
- Extension employees believe in and are committed to working with children, youth and families at risk.
- Extension personnel are excellent at working with and involving diverse audiences and establishing the groundwork for building collaborations.
- Personnel indicate they are being trained and are satisfied generally that the training is meeting their needs particularly related to computer technology.
- Personnel are much more web literate than 4 years ago.
- Extension employees agree that collaborations benefit programming for children, youth and families, communities at risk. They believe that working with county, district, and state professionals strengthens CYFAR programming.

**The study provided several opportunities for improvement.** Some of these parallel areas needing improvement in the 1997 results. They include:

- Though over 60% of respondents are knowledgeable of the State's vision for CYFAR, less than 51% knew of a state CYFAR strategic plan nor understood that plan. As in the 1997 report, Extension personnel may need more information and training on the CYFAR vision for Texas and the nation.
- Employees value recognition and promotion in conducting CYFAR programming, but are hesitant to agree that adequate recognition and promotion are afforded to those working in CYFAR.
- Supervisory support is believed to make a difference in programming. Extension personnel value the support and are asking for greater support in terms of approval as well as providing resources of varying types.
- Training in several areas would strengthen Extension personnel. These areas include collaboration that may well enhance the professional working relationships that Extension personnel believe are beneficial, educating policy makers on CYFAR issues, locating resources for use in CYFAR programming, equipping less tenured employees on the research base that undergirds Extension, empowering communities, the impact that personal values have on programming, recruiting volunteers, and organizational change.

- Even though Extension personnel are more computer literate they would benefit from learning more about the resources available through CYFARNet and other Extension web sites.
- Extension respondents indicate a willingness to address the needs of a more diverse audience beyond limited resource, including single-parent families and at-risk for problem behavior groups.
- The decrease in expertise requests may indicate a change in client needs or methods of obtaining expertise other than through Extension. This items warrant further inquiry.

**Recommendations to address improvements and make them opportunities for Organizational Change:**

- Host sessions at next statewide faculty conference to address at-risk audiences, collaboration, and others. These could be facilitated sessions that are focused on one topic per session and allow participants to share ideas or ask questions of others in the group. At the National CYFAR Annual Conferences these sessions are called “Interact Sessions” and have proven useful to participants.
- Assign an interdisciplinary committee to examine our strategic plan for children, youth, families and communities at risk, similar to the Community Development committee, Spirit Committee, or Professional Development Trust that would identify strategies and methods to provide training where identified as a need or weakness in our agency.
- Feature workshops that demonstrate interdisciplinary programming with at-risk communities.

Recommendations on a third round of the OCS survey should this opportunity arise:

Appoint a team to implement the survey, perhaps engaging professional associations as an avenue of encouragement, have more than one specialist and a statistician involved in the analysis and reporting to insure that interpretations are well represented and to generate more solutions if improvements are needed, as well as disseminate results more widely and in a more timely manner.

References:

Betts, S. C., Marczak, M. S., Peterson, D. J., Lipinski, J., Tepper, S. S., Sewell, M. (1998). Texas Cooperative Extension’s capacity to support programs for children, youth and families at risk, Result of the Organizational Change Survey. Tucson, AZ: Institute for Children, Youth and Families, University of Arizona.

Dillman, D. A. (1978). *Mail and Telephone Surveys*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

**Table 3. Correlation between Received Training and Sufficiency of Training**

Comparison correlations from 2001 (n= 487) and 1997 (n=222) organizational change survey - all significant at  $p < .0001$

<b>Item type</b>	<b>2001 data r coefficient</b>	<b>1997 data r coefficient</b>
Finding resources	.445	.823
Collaboration	.465	.731
Impact of values	.418	.577
Empowering communities	.485	.589
Growth and development	.554	.59
Recruiting volunteers	.501	no significance
Evaluation	.508	.284
Organizational change	.472	no significance
Use of computers	.558	.375
Electronic communication	.491	.423

**Table 4. Change in selected variables from 1997 to 2001 survey**

Independent t-tests of 2001 variables (n= 487) and 1997 OCS variables (n = 222) resulted in the following significant differences from the 1997 to 2001 data sets. It is important to note that the survey was designed to illuminate experiences, viewpoints of Extension faculty, not to determine the causes of variance in experiences varying opinions. The following questions in the survey resulted in significant differences in variance at  $p = .01$  and  $p = <.0001$ .

<b>OCS SURVEY QUESTIONS</b>	<b>Level of Significance indicating change between 1997 and 2001 respondents</b>
Q2 - I personally have a clear understanding of our state Extension's vision for working with children, youth and families at risk	p = 0.0021
Q3 - Our state's Extension system's vision is congruent with the national vision.	p = 0.0065
Q4 - Our state Extension system has a clear, long-term commitment to work with children, youth and families at-risk.	p = 0.0052
Q7 - My supervisors support my allocation of time and priorities to work with children, youth and families at risk when there are conflicting demands.	p = 0 .0069

Q 9: Our paid staff who work with child, youth and family development are given appropriate recognitions and promotions for outstanding work.	p = 0 .0009
Q10: Our Extension Service has allocated financial resources specifically for work in children, youth and families at risk programming.	p = 0.0009
Q12: Extension professionals from other program areas...asking about relationship with other Extension professionals.	p = 0 .0020
Q14: In your work with at-risk children, youth and families, you have a working relationship with professionals from multiple university departments.	p = <.0001
Q15: In your work with at-risk children, youth and families you have a working relationship with other Land-grant universities.	p = <.0001
Q18: In your work with at-risk children, youth and families, you have a working relationship with federal agencies and organizations.	P = 0.0004
Q19: We actively participate in community task forces working child, youth and family issues.	P = 0.0047
Q20: Working with other Extension staff has improved our programs for children, youth and families.	P= 0.0017
Q21: Work with outside groups influences how Extension works with children, youth and families at risk.	P= 0.0022
Q22: We are provided the resources (time and money) necessary to engage in collaborative efforts to better serve children, youth and families at risk.	P= <.0001
Q23: Collaboration with other community, state and federal organizations enhances Extension's experience and credibility in work with at-risk audiences.	P= 0.0046
Q27: Recruit staff from populations not historically a part of Extension.	P= 0 .0046
Q28: Hire new staff members with experience serving children, youth and families at risk.	P= 0.0003
Q29: Treat staff diversity as critical to the success of children, youth and families at risk efforts.	P= 0.0016

