

**V(A). Planned Program (Summary)**

**Program # 2**

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

Global Food Security and Hunger: Economics Marketing 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
602	Business Management, Finance, and Taxation	80%		40%	
603	Market Economics	20%		50%	
606	International Trade and Development	0%		10%	
	<b>Total</b>	100%		100%	

**V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)**

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

Year: 2010	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	4.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
Actual	3.1	0.0	6.6	0.0

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

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c	1890 Extension	Hatch	Evans-Allen
80473	0	36677	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
80473	0	36677	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
303024	0	461548	0

**V(D). Planned Program (Activity)**

1. Brief description of the Activity

Research studies  
Workshops

Conferences  
 Individual Consultations  
 Business Guide written

**2. Brief description of the target audience**

Agricultural producers  
 Agricultural service providers  
 State agency personnel  
 Commodity organizations

**V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)**

**1. Standard output measures**

2010	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
<b>Plan</b>	600	1500	0	0
<b>Actual</b>	2100	43300	50	2500

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

**Patent Applications Submitted**

Year: 2010  
 Plan: 0  
 Actual: 0

**Patents listed**

**3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)**

**Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

2010	Extension	Research	Total
<b>Plan</b>	0	4	
<b>Actual</b>	1	8	9

**V(F). State Defined Outputs**

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

- Web sites developed

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2010	1	4

**Output #2**

**Output Measure**

- Media articles

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2010	3	10

**Output #3**

**Output Measure**

- Workshops and conferences hosted

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2010	5	17

**Output #4**

**Output Measure**

- Presentations and short courses

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2010	15	12

**Output #5**

**Output Measure**

- Books and monographs

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2010	0	8

**Output #6**

**Output Measure**

- Conference abstracts
- Not reporting on this Output for this Annual Report

**Output #7**

**Output Measure**

- Fact sheets, bulletins and newsletters

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
-------------	---------------	---------------

2010

5

10

**V(G). State Defined Outcomes**

**V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content**

O. No.	OUTCOME NAME
1	Natural resource management policies adopted and/or amended at national, state, regional and local governmental levels
2	Number of new and/or strengthened partnerships with governmental agencies, NGOs and/or corporations resulting from research and Extension programmatic activities in the area of economics, marketing and policy
3	Acreage under crop insurance (% increase)
4	Adoption of recommended risk management strategies by defined target audience (% of audience)
5	New food policies adopted/amended at the national, state, regional and/or local level by governmental, non-profit and or corporate entities related to pricing, local buying, distribution and availability

### **Outcome #1**

#### **1. Outcome Measures**

Natural resource management policies adopted and/or amended at national, state, regional and local governmental levels

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

### **Outcome #2**

#### **1. Outcome Measures**

Number of new and/or strengthened partnerships with governmental agencies, NGOs and/or corporations resulting from research and Extension programmatic activities in the area of economics, marketing and policy

#### **2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1862 Research

#### **3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

#### **3b. Quantitative Outcome**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Quantitative Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2010	5	20

#### **3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement**

##### **Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Agriculture and related natural resources such as forestry have been undervalued in a state such as Connecticut that is often categorized as urban. Policy makers and funders needed accurate information on which to make decisions about the state's economic health and what contributes to it. Because the agricultural industry purchases goods and services from other industries and hires local labor, its economic importance cascades throughout the states economy beyond the visible segments of farms and direct marketing of farm products.

##### **What has been done**

A comprehensive study of the total economic impact of agriculture through three economic models was conducted. The agricultural industry was defined as encompassing crop and livestock production, forest products and the processing of the state's agricultural production. Twenty associations of stateholders provided input as well as financial resources. The results were widely disseminated through the media, the website, and printing of the report. The Governor's office, the legislature and the Congressional delegation and stakeholders of the agricultural industries in the state were briefed on the results.

## Results

The analysis revealed that the total impact of the agricultural industries in the state's economy was up to \$3.5 billion, with 20,000 jobs generated. In addition, the industry was found to contribute significant social benefits and ecosystem services. Qualitative outcomes include: (1) raising awareness of the importance of the agricultural industry for the economy and jobs; (2) provide bedrock information about the different subsectors that comprise the agricultural industry in the state; (3) clarify and define agriculture in the state; (4) galvanize the partnership between the University of Connecticut (College of Agriculture and Natural Resources) and stakeholders and policy makers.

## 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
602	Business Management, Finance, and Taxation
603	Market Economics

## Outcome #3

### 1. Outcome Measures

Acreage under crop insurance (% increase)

### 2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension

### 3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Action Outcome Measure

### 3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2010	5	3

### 3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

#### Issue (Who cares and Why)

As part of a risk management plan, agricultural producers need to understand how crop insurance can be an important strategy. Despite limitations on what crop insurance is available in Connecticut, farmers need information on current crop insurance programs available, how to apply, what records are needed, etc. Crop insurance helps farmers cover loses due to weather, natural disasters, etc. In tight economic times, such loses have major implications for farm viability.

#### What has been done

Information on crop insurance programs, deadlines, eligibility, etc. were provided by postal mail and the web, as well as through face to face programs. Extension educators reached producers

through presentations and staffed exhibits at most commodity or farm association meetings in the state. Three farm tours included current information on crop insurance. Farm risk management counseling sessions reached 54 farm families.

### Results

There has been a slight but steady gain in the number of farms considering and/or applying for crop insurance. This is due to the certain crops being eligible for crop insurance in ONLY a limited number of counties - often not the counties with the largest acreage of a crop. However, farmers report having the information on which to make a decision on crop insurance, if it is available.

## 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
602	Business Management, Finance, and Taxation
603	Market Economics

## Outcome #4

### 1. Outcome Measures

Adoption of recommended risk management strategies by defined target audience (% of audience)

### 2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension

### 3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Action Outcome Measure

### 3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2010	15	25

### 3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

#### Issue (Who cares and Why)

Risk management is essential for farms in today's economy. In Connecticut, with high taxes, labor and land costs, managing other risks is essential to the bottom line. Risks include: human resources, production, legal, financial and marketing. Many farmers are not aware of the risks that they may be incurring.

#### What has been done

Through workshops, exhibits, on-farm tours, a comprehensive website, direct mail, and one-on-one advising sessions conducted by agricultural business professionals, Extension educators stressed the importance of addressing farm risk. Collaborative efforts with many traditional and

non-traditional farm organizations enabled Extension educators to reach a large segment of the agricultural community.

**Results**

Evaluations showed that farm producers and their families were more knowledgeable about estate planning, farm transfer, transition to organic production, crop insurance, new marketing strategies, dealing with local officials, as well as converting to different production/markets.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

<b>KA Code</b>	<b>Knowledge Area</b>
602	Business Management, Finance, and Taxation
603	Market Economics

**Outcome #5**

**1. Outcome Measures**

New food policies adopted/amended at the national, state, regional and/or local level by governmental, non-profit and or corporate entities related to pricing, local buying, distribution and availability

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1862 Research

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Quantitative Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2010	2	2

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement**

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

The permitting process has been identified as the primary constraint to new development and expansion of the aquaculture industry in Connecticut. Efforts to streamline the application and review process has the potential to improve the viability of aquaculture in the state. Aquaculture contributes not only the state's economy as a product, but also is a component of the tourism industry and provides jobs.

**What has been done**

A University of Connecticut Extension faculty member chaired the Connecticut Aquaculture Permitting Workgroup, comprised of the CT Dept. of Environmental Protection, US Army Corp of Engineers and the CT Dept. of Agriculture. The workgroup identified ways to improve and

streamline the permitting process.

### **Results**

A new permitting process for low impact marine aquaculture projects is being implemented. It drastically reduced paperwork and time from 12 to 6 months. This is a cost savings for both aquaculture producers and local, state and federal resource managers. An outline and technical content were created for a website directed to aquaculture producers and resource managers by UConn faculty, is operating under the auspices of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service Aquaculture Program.

### **4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

<b>KA Code</b>	<b>Knowledge Area</b>
602	Business Management, Finance, and Taxation
603	Market Economics

### **V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)**

#### **External factors which affected outcomes**

- Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programmatic Challenges

#### **Brief Explanation**

{No Data Entered}

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

#### **1. Evaluation Studies Planned**

- After Only (post program)
- Before-After (before and after program)
- Time series (multiple points before and after program)

#### **Evaluation Results**

{No Data Entered}

#### **Key Items of Evaluation**

{No Data Entered}