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Abstract

Knowledge about women who have pioneered positions in agricultural and extension education can provide valuable information for upcoming generations of female educators. The purpose of this study was to create a profile of women employed by the Cooperative Extension Service with agricultural program responsibilities at the county level (N = 488). A mail questions was sent and a final response rate of 79% was received. Female county agents with agricultural program responsibilities are significantly under-represented, comprising only about 11.4 percent of the total population. In establishing this profile, women agricultural agents were found to be predominately Caucasian, between the ages of 26-30 and 41-50, are married, have children and had previous work experience in agricultural related areas. Although subjects reported being in regular contact with other women in the profession, few women identified other women as their primary role models. Despite a high level of job satisfaction, almost 60% of the women felt they had experienced barriers and challenges in their profession as a result of gender. Barriers most commonly cited were: lack of acceptance from peers and clientele, the “good old boy network; the need to “prove oneself”, limited mentors and role models, and balancing work and family.
Introduction

“If the college woman is a mistake, Nature will eliminate her.”

—David Staff Jordan
Stanford University President, 1906

Who could anticipate the plethora of choices and careers open to the educated woman in 2004? Fields and professions once monopolized by men now open their arms to the throngs of educated and enthusiastic young women. Even the most traditional and conservative fields have found value in the acceptance of gender diversity. In 1991, The Council on Diversity in Extension submitted their strategic plan “Valuing Differences and Celebrating Diversity,” emphasizing the need to strengthen diversity and pluralism in the Cooperative Extension Service (CES). However, in 1996, an analysis of CES professional staffing data showed that only a slow and minimal process of change in recruitment, selection and retention practices had occurred. Further findings, indicate that women and minorities were significantly under represented in all levels of management and all areas of CES. While CES has long utilized women in the areas of family and consumer education, agriculture remained the domain of men. In determining the population for this 2003 study, the researchers found that little progress had been made. Less than twelve percent of all CES agents with agricultural responsibilities nationally were women.

Theoretical Base

Like any other institution, the American labor force continues to experience multiple changes. In 1997, women accounted for 46% of the labor force as compared to only 29% in 1950. Other changes are more interesting. For example, 90% of male executives under 40 are fathers, yet on 35% of female executives under 40 are mothers (National Multicultural Institute, 1997). The U.S. Department of Labor also reports that the ratio of women’s earning to men’s earning is still unbalanced. In 1970, women averaged 59.7% of men’s salaries in similar positions. In 2000, women an averaged 76% of the male counterparts’ salaries. (Women’s Bureau, 2001). This does demonstrate a 20% increase in 30 years, but still leaves a 24% disparity.

Today’s generation of women have quality educations. They are committed women with ambition and drive. They are not only extremely competent they are confident in their abilities. Unlike their grandmothers, they realize they have unlimited opportunities and they place high expectations on themselves. They also expect equal treatment in the workplace. In 1986, the mythical “glass ceiling” was first label by two Wall Street reporters in reference to the invisible barriers that block women from top jobs (Catalyst Report, 1993). The U.S. Department of Labor (1991) defines the “glass ceiling” as artificial barriers based on attitudinal or organizational bias that prevent qualified women from advancing into mid- and senior level administrative positions. According to Maddy (1991, p. 1), the glass ceiling may exist at different levels in different organizations. “Many women have paid their dues, even at a premium, for a chance at a top position, only to find a glass ceiling between them and their goal.”

Similar patterns in attitudes, barriers and bias are seen when women desire to take on
nontraditional occupations. The US Department of Labor lists over 110 nontraditional occupations for women. Nontraditional is defined as any occupation where one gender comprises 25% or less of the total employees (USDOL, 2001). Women in agricultural and extension education are considered a minority population or nontraditional. In a study by Foster (2001), the number of female secondary agricultural education teachers nationally was 16%. This number had not changed in more than 10 years. At the university level female agricultural and extension educators (faculty in agricultural and extension education academic departments) comprised only 14.7% of the total population (Seevers and Foster, 2003).

Maddy’s qualitative study (1991) using a census of female CES directors or associate directors had only a population of eight.

Despite reports and recommendations from strategic plans such as CES’s “Valuing Differences and Celebrating Diversity,” or the passage of non-discrimination legislation, reality as experienced by women involved in agricultural and extension education dictates that legislation and strategic plans do not mandate cultural change. Thomas (1991) suggests that those who try to force today’s reality into yesterday’s management can only jeopardize the viability of that enterprise. He concludes that diversity is a commitment to all employees regardless of race or gender. Diversity is about empowering whoever is in the workforce: it is not an attempt at preferential treatment.

In a traditionally male dominated field, like agricultural and extension education, the concept of the “glass ceiling” is a real and dominant force. Barriers inhibiting women in nontraditional fields are complex and inter-related. Often women do not receive appropriate education and training, and are provided only limited information about opportunities in the field. In addition limited role models, unsupportive family and friends and society’s vision of traditional roles pose as ongoing obstacles (GenderWatch, 2001). According to a 1999 survey by Catalyst, the barriers to women’s advancement as seen by successful women included: 1) male stereotyping and preconceptions about women, 2) exclusion from informal networks of communications, and 3) lack of significant experience (Catalyst, 2001). In more recent studies, the top barriers facing women in agricultural education at the secondary level (Foster, 2001) and university women in agricultural and extension education (Seevers and Foster, 2003) were 1) acceptance by peers and other males in the agricultural industry, 2) balancing family and career, and 3) acceptance by administrators. Also of concern, was acceptance from students/clients. According to USDA (ECOP-PODC, 1997), barriers facing women and other minorities in CES include lack of commitment from senior managers and university administration, resistance of some clientele groups to work with staff from diverse backgrounds and lack of specific goals and targets for attaining a diverse workforce.

The Cooperative Extension Service began in 1914 with the passage of the Smith-Lever Act. Despite being 90 years old, women being hired as female county agents with agricultural responsibilities is still a relatively recent phenomena. The total number of female agriculture agents is still low today. Due to the late entrance of women into the field of agriculture and extension education, there have been few role models for women who advocate these roles and positions. Young women entering the profession need to feel that their hard work and educational fortitude has not been completed in vain. They need to know they can follow their dream and be successful at it. Determining a profile of female extension agents with agricultural responsibilities will provide needed background for constructing environments that will lead to their continued success.
**Purpose and Objectives**

This study was designed to create a profile of women involved in Cooperative Extension as county agents with primary responsibility for agricultural programs for adult audiences. Knowledge about women who have pioneered positions in Extension education provides valuable role model information for upcoming generations of female educators. Additionally this study sought to describe the unique challenges regarding personal lives, barriers unique to women in agricultural extension and existing mentoring and support systems for women in the field. Specific research objectives for the study were:

1. Describe women on selected personal characteristics of age, ethnicity, marital status, number of children.

2. Describe women on selected professional characteristics including employment history, prior extension experience, current employment according to type of appointment, division of responsibilities, professional rank and salary.

3. Describe the educational background of subjects by type of degree, major area of study, and participation in agricultural and extension education programs during middle/high school.

4. Identify perceived barriers/challenges experienced as a female agricultural extension agent.

5. Identify level of satisfaction with current position.

6. Describe experiences and roles as both a mentor and mentee in agricultural extension.

**Methods and Procedures**

This descriptive study sought to develop a profile of women in the Cooperative Extension Service employed as county extension agents with agricultural program responsibilities. The population of this study was a census of female county extension agricultural agents in 49 states. One state declined to participate in the study. The population was identified using the 2002-2003 County Agents Directory, the reference directory of Agricultural Extension and University Personnel. A list identifying only county agents with agricultural programs responsibilities was purchased from Doane Agricultural Services, the company that publishes the directory. Since the study only investigated female agricultural agents and gender was not specified, the final list was determined in several ways. To address error in the frame, the first step involved sorting by name and removing those that appeared to be obviously male. Recognizing the potential error in this process, additional methods were also employed. Those methods included contacting states to obtain or verify information and/or using state developed websites. Despite the multiple efforts a few questionnaires were returned because they had been received by male agents. The final
accessible population was N = 488.

The instrument created by the researchers contained five sections designed to address the objectives of the study. Section one included open ended and categorical questions about the educational and professional background of the subject. Section two sought information related to the subject’s current professional status. Sections three and four addressed roles and mentors and mentees within the profession as well as any perceived barriers and challenges that might have been experienced as a female county agricultural agent. Section five used both open ended and categorical items to gather demographic information about the subjects.

Face and content validity were assessed using a panel of experts in research/statistics, agricultural education and Cooperative Extension county 4-H agricultural agents or state specialists with CES in agriculture. Minor changes were made in the wording of some items. The slightly modified instrument has been used in two previous studies (Foster, 2001 and Seevers & Foster, 2003). Reliability assessment for those two studies was high. Reliability was not reassessed for this study.

Data were collected April through June, 2003 following a modified Dillman’s(1978) procedure for a mail questionnaire. Instruments were coded with an identification number to track and follow up with non-respondents. The first packet mailed contained the instrument, and a postage paid return envelope. Follow-up reminders were made through postcards and email. Two complete mailings were administered. A follow-up appreciation gift was sent to all respondents. To control for nonresponse error, responses from early and late subjects were compared. No differences were found to exist and the results were generalized to the target population (Miller & Smith, 1983). The final usable response rate was 79% (N = 386).

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data: frequencies, percentages, and other measures of central tendency and variability.

Results/Findings

Objective 1: Describe women on selected personal characteristics.

Table 1 indicates that the majority of female county agricultural agents are married (68.1%), or have never been married (21%). Less than 10 percent of the respondents indicated they were divorced or widowed. Only slightly more than 50 percent of the subjects reported having children. Ages of children ranged greatly from infants to grown adults. The majority of women fell in three age categories: 26- 30 (18.5%); 41-45 (18.8%); and 46-50 (18.5%). A drop in age categories appeared to occur in what typically could be described as the prime child bearing and raising ages of 31–40. Very few respondents reported being under the age of 25 or over the age of 50. Ethnicity reported was overwhelmingly Caucasian with 93.2% (N - 359). Minority populations of Hispanic, African-American and Native American all reported between 1.3 and 1.8 percents of the total population.

Table 1
Summary of Selected Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (N = 384)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56+</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (N = 379)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (N = 378)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Married</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/Widowed</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children (N = 380)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 2: Describe women on selected professional characteristics.

Women working with agricultural programs within CES have been employed from one to 32 years with a mean of 8.6 years. Sixty percent of the respondents indicated their position title to be that of state (4.4%), area (45.7%) or district specialist (9.9%). Areas of speciality ranged widely to include the common areas of livestock and crop production to more uncommon areas of marine science and maple syrup production. Over 42 percent of the subjects reported their professional duties involved serving clientele in more than one county. Table 2 describes annual salary ranges. Salary ranges varied greatly with the largest number of respondents reporting an annual salary between $40,000 - $44,000. Salaries over $65,000 were rarely reported.
Annual Salary Reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salary Range</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25,000 - $29,000</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 - $34,000</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 - $39,000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $44,000</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 - $49,000</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $59,000</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$60,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several questions related to job responsibilities and division of time. Slightly less than 50% of the respondents reported holding administrative responsibilities in relation to their position. The percentage of time spent on administrative tasks ranged from 2 - 100% with a mean of 13%. Subjects reported spending the greatest percent of their time working with adults in agricultural programs (70%), followed by 4-H and youth programs (18%) and other duties (9%). Only 30% of the respondents reported supervision of interns are part of their job responsibilities. The number of interns supervised varied, but the majority had supervised only one student intern.

Additionally, subjects were asked the degree of comfort they felt with current job responsibilities and the degree of preparedness they felt to address the content areas in their current position (Table 3). Responding to a 5 point Likert-type scale where 5 = Very Comfortable (Prepared), 3 = Neutral, and 1 = Extremely Uncomfortable (Very Unprepared) the majority of respondents were very comfortable or comfortable (90.5%) while over 85% felt prepared or very prepared to address content areas within their position.

A summary of major job responsibilities associated with the position of agricultural extension agent from 384 individuals addresses almost every process and subject area possible. Agents were involved in needs assessment, planning, teaching, evaluation, serving on boards and committees, making farm/ranch visits, conducting research, working with clients, volunteers, media, and the larger community. They addressed every topic between Agronomy and Zoology. Common areas of expertise were livestock, crop production, horticulture, and agri-business. Despite the content area, the primary responsibility reported was meeting the needs of clientele served.

Table 3
Expressed degree of comfort and competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate your degree of comfort with your current job responsibilities.</th>
<th>Very Comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Un-Comfortable</th>
<th>Extremely Uncomfortable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(42.2%)</td>
<td>(48.3%)</td>
<td>(6.7%)</td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you feel prepared to address the content areas your position is responsible for?</th>
<th>Very Prepared</th>
<th>Prepared</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Unprepared</th>
<th>Very Unprepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29.1%)</td>
<td>(56.4%)</td>
<td>(10.1%)</td>
<td>(3.4%)</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective 3: Describe the educational and work background of subjects.

Most female agricultural agents reported their highest educational degree as a masters (68.1%). Some reported only a bachelors degree (21.6%), while 8.3% had a doctorate or equivalent. Degree areas were almost exclusively in specialized agricultural disciplines including animal science, agronomy & horticulture, natural resources and agri-business. Thirty-six percent of the women did express an interest in achieving a higher degree. Previous experiences in agricultural and extension education while in high school were high, although more subjects participated in 4-H (34.8%) than FFA (20.5%). Those that did not participate in either event identified the primary reasons as agricultural education classes were not available or not having an interest.

Almost 80% of the respondents reported an average of 5.5 years of agriculture related work experience prior to entering work with the Cooperative Extension Service. Type of work experience varied greatly and included such jobs are working on a farm, nursery manager, teaching and veterinary assistant. In addition, many subjects complete professional internship experiences prior to being hired by CES. Common types of internships included: extension (20.2%); industry (9.4%); teacher preparation (12.7%) and other (18.2%).

Objective 4: Identify perceived barriers/challenges experienced as a female agricultural extension agent.

When asked if they felt they had experienced any barriers or challenges in their profession due to gender, 57% of the women responded positively. Common themes emerged in the identification of these challenges. The most common were: lack of acceptance from male colleagues and clients; the need to “prove yourself;’ no mentoring or inclusion by male peers; and the “good ‘ole boy system” One woman was quoted as saying, “Peers don’t seem to give the same level of respect for subject matter knowledge. Clients are at times hesitant to talk to a woman.” Others recognized the challenges and coped the best they could. This
A woman was quoted as saying, “Folks still call and say, “is the man in?” I laugh and say that the man is now a woman!”

Women were also asked to identify what they perceived to be the greatest barrier faced by female agents with agricultural responsibilities whether or not they had experienced them or not. Many responses were similar to the ones previously mentioned, but additional comments included new topics such as personal attitude, balancing work and family and lack of mentors or role models. One woman stated, “The greatest barrier is their [the woman’s] own attitude of not being good enough.” Another respondent stated, “there are not many women as mentors/examples; it’s still a bit of a man’s profession.” And finally this individual summed it up by saying, “the typical sexist barriers - lower pay; glass-ceilings; harder to get promoted; having to do it better than our male co-workers; not having “someone like me” to work with; It’s very difficult during pregnancy or with young children.”

When asked to identify any sacrifices made to reach a current level of achievement in their career, the number of responses was significant. Common sacrifices noted included time away from family; lack of personal or social time; the decision to not have more children or to delay having a family, and a firm commitment that the pay offered is too low for the educational requirements of the job. When asked if they would make the same sacrifices again, 42.0% said yes, 13.7% said no, and 25.1% were unsure. Many subjects agreed that sacrifices were made but also felt that other careers also demanded decisions and sacrifices.

Objective 5. Identify level of satisfaction with current position.

Women extension agents in agricultural programs are satisfied with their jobs. Almost 85% of all respondents reported being satisfied or very satisfied. Additionally more than 81% would encourage other women to pursue the same career, in CES. However, when asked to support why they would support or encourage others, the responses varied greatly and were not as overwhelmingly positive. One negative comment stated that, “until we are paid our worth and are treated with respect, there’s no need to encourage anyone to go into this discipline.” Others responded positively without hesitation, “It is valuable, productive work. We make a difference in people’s lives and environment. I could be their mentor and help them.” Still others had a positive experience themselves but were reluctant to encourage others due to unique circumstances. One woman wrote, “Not in the current budget and political climate. I have a feeling that Extension’s days are numbered.”

Objective 6: Describe experiences an roles as both a mentor and mentee

Women in agricultural CES are active members and leaders in professional associations. Nearly 67% of the subjects reported membership in the National Association of County Agricultural Agents while 12% were members of the National 4-H Agents Association. Individuals (38.1%) not a member of either of these two primary associations for CES employees reported membership is other related professional associations. Ninety-five percent of the respondents were not only aware of other women in their region and profession they maintained regular contact (once a week) with them in many ways. Most
frequent contacts were made by email and telephone followed by in person and at professional meetings. Over 75% of the women felt they had both encouraged other women in agricultural extension and received encouragement. The majority (91%) felt they had never purposefully discouraged another woman while slightly less (85%) felt that other women had not discouraged them. The majority of women believed their professional mentors were predominately male (51%) or a combination of both males and females (41.2%). Predominantly female mentors were reported by only 6.2% of the subjects. Although women felt they were in frequent contact with one another, little to no structured mentoring was occurring.

**Conclusions/Implications/Recommendations**

A profile of female county extension agents with agricultural program responsibilities reveals that most are between the ages of 26-30 and 41-50. There was a noticeable drop in the age category between 31-40. This age group is typically when women are having and/or raising their children. Many women struggling to balance work and family will choose to leave the profession or seek other employment. How do we recruit or retain quality employees in positions that demand extra time and irregular hours? Can jobs be modified? Are there some tasks that could be completed with properly trained community volunteers? Can jobs be shared? In the traditional patriarchal society, the male is the breadwinner and the female is the nurturer and care giver. Should women or any employee be forced to make a decision between a career and a family?

Extension agents are predominately Caucasian. This is consistent with previous studies of women in agriculture employed as secondary agricultural education instructors and women at universities in agricultural and extension education departments. It should be noted and of concern that not only are women in general under represented in these professions, but women of an ethnic minority background are severely under represented. A pressing issue with the Cooperative Extension Service is diversity and pluralism. What can be done to attract women and minorities in these roles?

The majority of female agents are married and more have children than those that do not. However, more extension agents fall into the never married category than do secondary agricultural education teachers (Foster, 2001) or university women faculty (Seevers & Foster, 2003). Extension agents are well educated with the majority possessing a masters degree. This is not a surprising finding as most states require a masters degree for hire or obtainment within a select period of time to maintain the job. However, average salary levels for the position were only between $30,000 - $40,000. Consistent comments from the subjects reported that the salary was too low and the hours too long for the education required for the job. Given low salaries and demanding hours, is CES able to attract the best and brightest? Previous studies have indicated these types of motivational distractors are common causes for high turnover.

Subjects were found to have more than five years of agricultural work experience prior to beginning a career with extension were likely to have been involved in either 4-H or FFA in high school. Coming from an agricultural background better prepares individuals for the roles and responsibilities they will be undertaking and well as assists them in
understanding the clientele they will be serving. Extension agents overall, were very satisfied with their current position in CES. They felt comfortable with expected job responsibilities and were prepared to address the content areas of the position they were hired for. Most women had completed at least one internship prior to working with extension. While, practical internships provide only a snapshot of an organization or job they are key experiences in helping to understand the organization, the career and the job. Many career decisions made are based on the quality of an internship experience. They can be a valuable tool in matching they right person to a profession and reducing turnover. Internships as pre-service experiences should be required and continued. Women were not only satisfied with their job, they also felt they were supportive and encouraging to other women in the profession or desiring to be in the profession.

Positive roles models, mentors, and mentoring have long been documented as important elements in career developments and transitions. Women reported being in frequent contact through email or phones. But few women identified other women as their primary mentors. In written comments, women stated that they experienced no mentoring or few role models. They desired someone to talk to who had a similar perspective. The University of Arizona, Department of Agricultural Education developed a website and newsletter targeted at secondary female agricultural education teachers called Desert Roses. Given it’s commitment toward strengthening diversity, the Cooperative Extension Service could benefit from a similar resource.

Despite a high level of job satisfaction, almost 60% of the women felt they had experienced barriers and challenges in their profession as a result of gender. These barriers are consistent with those previously identified in other disciplines as well as in agricultural education (Catalyst Report, 1993; GenderWatch, 2001; Williams, 2001, Foster, 2001 and Seevers and Foster, 2003). Barriers (perceived and real) can be addressed only through awareness and communication, but first there must be agreement that they do exist. Lack of acknowledgment of failure to address ultimately leads to conflict, job dissatisfaction, and high turnover rates. As educators we need to educate ourselves about perceived barriers and collaboratively develop strategies to overcome.

Educational Importance

The Cooperative Extension Service has made a commitment to understanding and expanding diversity within the organization. Developing a profile of the women currently employed in nontraditional roles helps to understand who these pioneers are, what they achieved, where they are coming from and ultimately where they would like to be. Providing a “snapshot” of the support systems, as well as the challenges and barriers can become a catalyst in managing change and building a stronger future through stronger employees.
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