

Economics, Markets, and Policy

Economics, Markets, and Policy

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

1. Name of the Planned Program

Economics, Markets, and Policy

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
601	Economics of Agricultural Production and Farm Management	15%		15%	
602	Business Management, Finance, and Taxation	8%		8%	
603	Market Economics	13%		13%	
604	Marketing and Distribution Practices	27%		27%	
605	Natural Resource and Environmental Economics	11%		11%	
606	International Trade and Development	11%		11%	
607	Consumer Economics	7%		7%	
609	Economic Theory and Methods	3%		3%	
610	Domestic Policy Analysis	4%		4%	
611	Foreign Policy and Programs	1%		1%	
	Total	100%		100%	

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	22.0	0.0	18.0	0.0
Actual	27.2	0.0	37.3	0.0

2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c 1507092	1890 Extension	Hatch 808045	Evans-Allen
	0		0
1862 Matching 678329	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
	0	912221	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
0	0	917098	0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

- The Center for Trade Policy Analysis conducted workshops with stakeholders on the expected economic impacts of trade and domestic agricultural policy.

- The New Ventures Team and staff in the Agricultural Innovation and Commercialization Center offered training programs throughout the state on entrepreneurship and starting new value-added businesses.

- Agricultural policy workshops were conducted with farm groups such as the Indiana Farm Bureau and the Farm Policy Study Group.

- Websites such as the Agricultural Economic Reports provided timely analysis on marketing, management, and policy issues.

- Econometric and simulation models were specified and validated to determine the socioeconomic impacts of proposed international trade and domestic agricultural policy proposals.

2. Brief description of the target audience

- Indiana farmers
- State and Federal government policy makers, especially the Indiana State Department of Agriculture and the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture
- Indiana general farm and commodity organizations such as Indiana Farm Bureau, Indiana Pork Producers, Indiana Soybean Alliance
- Agricultural input supply industry managers such as Monsanto, DuPont-Pioneer, John Deere, Beck Hybrids, Dow-AgroSciences
- Agricultural marketing firms such as Tate & Lyle, ADM, Countrymark, Cargill
- International trade organizations and officials including the Office of the U.S. Special Trade Representative and WTO in Geneva

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

Target for the number of persons (contacts) reached through direct and indirect contact methods

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
Plan	10000	25000	250	2000
2007	11788	306379	638	231

2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)

Patent Applications Submitted

Year	Target
Plan:	0
2007:	0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

	Extension	Research	Total
Plan			
2007	0	168	0

V(F). State Defined Outputs**Output Target****Output #1****Output Measure**

Number of programs with state and federal government officials on trade and farm policy development and impact assessment

Year	Target	Actual
2007	10	26

Output #2**Output Measure**

Number of programs offered to agri-business leaders by the Center for Food and Agricultural Business

Year	Target	Actual
2007	15	35

Output #3**Output Measure**

Number and quality of peer reviewed research publications in professional journals on economics, markets, and policy

Year	Target	Actual
2007	25	168

Output #4**Output Measure**

Number of programs with Indiana farmers on farm management and commodity marketing such as the annual Top Crop Farmer Workshop, Farm Management Tour, and the Outlook Campaign

Year	Target	Actual
2007	50	132

Output #5**Output Measure**

Number of programs on the economics of biofuels

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	31

Output #6**Output Measure**

Number of attorneys and farmers trained in estate planning and retirement

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	32

Output #7**Output Measure**

Number of tax schools offering updates on U.S. and Indiana tax law

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	15

Output #8**Output Measure**

Number of programs on women in agriculture

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	8

Output #9**Output Measure**

Number of programs on entrepreneurship

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	10

Output #10**Output Measure**

Number of programs on risk management in agriculture

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	8

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

O No.	Outcome Name
1	Number of participants who increase their knowledge of commodity markets and marketing contracts
2	Number of Indiana farmers who increase the use of commodity markets and marketing contracts to reduce price risk and increase profitability
3	Percentage increase in the productivity and profitability of Indiana farms
4	Number of farm and commodity organization members who increase their knowledge of the potential economic impacts of alternative farm commodity program provisions such as implications for exports, domestic utilization and price, farm income, and government farm program expenditures
5	Number of research-based studies, publications, and reports for policy organization members and legislators on the consequences of their international trade and farm commodity program choices in Farm Bill and related federal legislation
6	Provide research-based analysis of trade liberalization and market-oriented policies to guide government policy-makers as they draft appropriate legislation to increase the competitiveness of U.S. agriculture in a global market
7	Number of agribusiness firms, private investors, commodity organization leaders, and government officials who increase their knowledge of the economic potential to increase the number and size of new and current value-added agricultural industries such as grain and livestock processing.
8	Increase by 5% annually the number of new value-added agricultural associated small businesses in Indiana
9	Increase gross farm income of Indiana farmers by generating additional market opportunities for grain, livestock, and specialty crops
10	Number of bankers and farmers who increased their knowledge of agricultural finance and risk management
11	Number of farm women who increase their business knowledge
12	Number of attorneys and tax accountants who increased their knowledge of tax law and estate planning
13	Number of people more aware of agritourism opportunities

Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

Not reporting on this Outcome for this Annual Report

2. Associated Institution Types

3a. Outcome Type:

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
-------------	----------------------------	---------------

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

What has been done

Results

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
----------------	-----------------------

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)

Economy

Public Policy changes

Government Regulations

Competing Public priorities

Competing Programmatic Challenges

Other (Diffusion of new technology)

Brief Explanation

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)

1. Evaluation Studies Planned

After Only (post program)

Retrospective (post program)

Before-After (before and after program)

During (during program)

Time series (multiple points before and after program)

Case Study

Comparisons between program participants (individuals,group,organizations) and non-participants

Comparisons between different groups of individuals or program participants experiencing different levels of program intensity.

Comparison between locales where the program operates and sites without program intervention

Other (periodic assessment of policy)

Evaluation Results

Key Items of Evaluation