4-H and CASA Reporting

David Dumble

When it comes to the CASA reporting system, there are a number of ways in which the 4-H Youth Development program is treated differently than any of the other UCCE programs. 4-H Advisors and County Directors should be familiar with these differences.

The biggest difference is that 4-H Youth Development programs do not have to report contacts with their clientele. Whether a 4-HYD program is “in parity” is determined by looking at the program’s club enrollment figures. As the current year’s figures are not available from the 4-H reporting system through Chris Hanson until November, County Directors filling out their CASA reports in July or August will have to use the previous year’s data (presumably there will not be much variation from year to year).

Many 4-HYD Advisors do not report any contact data at all. Some make use of CASA to input the demographics of volunteers or leaders to compare them to their county’s demographics. In other cases 4-HYD Advisors report contact data on CASA because their county uses the CASA report to distribute information to interested parties, such as County Boards of Supervisors. These are all acceptable ways to make use of the CASA system, but not required.

While contact data need not be reported, out-reach data must be. As many 4-HYD programs are not in parity, outreach must be reported if the program is to be in compliance by All Reasonable Effort. Outreach for a 4-HYD program means all outreach performed by the advisor as well as outreach done by leaders and volunteers on behalf of the program. As was mentioned in the previous AA Newsletter, the 4-HYD Advisor is responsible for reporting all outreach efforts on behalf of the program and for retaining documentation of these efforts for three years.

In counties where there is a Program Representative in charge of the program on behalf of an Advisor, it is up to the County Director’s discretion to decide if the Program Representative should have his or her own CASA account.

CASA Deadlines Set for 2002/2003

David Dumble

The deadlines for submitting information on CASA for the 2002/2003 year have been determined. Advisors have until 5 PM on Monday, July 7th to input their contact and outreach information on CASA. The system will then be shut down for a week while the information from 2001/2002 is purged, replaced with the 2002/2003 data, and the “current file” set to 2003/2004.
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Every county office should have a complete set of “necessary documents” in their Affirmative Action file. These documents are a collection of laws, regulations, and policies that can sometimes assist advisors in determining what is legally required in implementing a program. Although some of the documents are legalistic, many are written in a way that is comprehensible to a layperson.

Here is a complete list of all the documents that should be in your county’s “necessary document” file:

1. Plans and Procedures for Administration and Implementation of Title IX
2. Federal regulations—Nondiscrimination based on sex
3. Federal regulations for Implementing Civil Rights Act of 1964—Title VI
5. Supplemental regulations for implementing Title VI in Cooperative Extension
6. USDA Administrative Regulations implementing Title IX
7. A Guide for State Cooperative Extension Service internal compliance reviews
8. Federal regulations—Nondiscrimination based on handicap
10. Federal regulations—Implementation of Equal Employment Opportunities Act
11. USDA Secretary’s Memorandum #1662, Supplement 3, Revised
12. Sex-Separate Events and Awards in 4-H Rodeo Contests
13. Applicability of Title IX to 4-H Programs
14. Civil Rights Act of 1964
15. USDA Secretary’s Memorandum #1662, Supplement 8
16. USDA Secretary’s Memorandum #1894
17. AA Plan for Meeting Nondiscriminatory Legal Standards by Cooperative Extension
18. USDA Secretary’s Memorandum #1662, Policy on Civil Rights
19. Strengthening 4-H Programs Through Affirmative Action
20. DANR Complaint Procedures
21. AA Requirements for Youth Development Programs
22. 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act

If your county office is missing any of these documents, please contact the Affirmative Action office for a replacement. We are currently investigating alternate ways of making these documents available, either through the web or on CD.
CASA will be reopened a week later on Monday, July 14th.

County Directors will have until 5 PM on Friday, August 15th to input their two reports—the Compliance Summary and the County-wide Narrative. Remember, to be in compliance by parity, advisors need only to be in parity for three of the four underrepresented groups (Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and American Indians). If one of those groups is not present in the advisor’s clientele, then they need only be in parity for two of the three that are present. Parity is defined as the percentage of contacts with a particular group being at least 80% of the percentage of that group’s proportion of the clientele.

UC Regents Vote to Oppose Ballot Initiative

The Board of Regents of the University of California voted overwhelmingly on May 15, to oppose a state ballot initiative that would prohibit the use of racial classification by local governments and public entities.

The board rarely takes positions on ballot initiatives. In the last 25 years, only nine ballot measures other than those for education facilities bond acts have come before the regents.

However, acting upon recommendations from UC President Richard C. Atkinson and the Academic Senate, the regents voted to oppose the initiative, originally known as the Racial Privacy Initiative, because of how it might limit the university’s ability to conduct basic and policy-related research.

The vote to oppose the initiative was 15 to 3, with one abstention. Regents Ward Connerly, John G. Davies and Peter Preuss voted against the regents’ resolution.

UC currently collects racial and ethnic data for numerous purposes, including the evaluation of the university’s application, admission and enrollment practices and assessment of the effectiveness of its outreach programs. Such data is also used to evaluate faculty and staff employment and contracting policies and to ensure compliance with federal and state regulations.

The ballot initiative, now known by the acronym CRECNO, was renamed by the Secretary of State’s office to better reflect its terms: Classification by Race, Ethnicity, Color or National Origin. It is scheduled to come before the state’s voters in March 2004.

A copy of the regents’ agenda item is available at: www.ucop.edu/regents/regmet/may03/lef.pdf.