

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

Program # 17

1. Name of the Planned Program

Global Food Security and Hunger

Reporting on this Program

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
102	Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships	0%	20%	0%	0%
205	Plant Management Systems	0%	20%	0%	0%
211	Insects, Mites, and Other Arthropods Affecting Plants	0%	20%	0%	0%
301	Reproductive Performance of Animals	0%	20%	0%	0%
703	Nutrition Education and Behavior	40%	20%	0%	0%
704	Nutrition and Hunger in the Population	20%	0%	0%	0%
801	Individual and Family Resource Management	40%	0%	0%	0%
	Total	100%	100%	0%	0%

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2013	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	10.0	12.0	0.0	0.0
Actual Paid Professional	8.0	4.0	0.0	0.0
Actual Volunteer	0.0	70.0	0.0	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
109543	241035	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
109543	136442	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
898847	0	0	0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

AgriLife Extension

Nutrition education was conducted using a variety of methods including group, individual, media, and newsletters. Group methods were single education events that focus on a very specific concept/behavior (e.g. washing fresh produce to reduce the risk of a foodborne illness) as well as a series of lessons that focused on broader concepts such as label reading or food resource management. Networking with agencies and organizations audiences also occurred to expand outreach, identify new audiences, and leverage resources.

Cooperative Extension Program

Provided one-on-one consultations
 Conducted on-site food demonstrations
 Provided train-the-trainer opportunities
 Conducted educational programs and classes
 Taught a series of nutrition classes to special interest groups
 Exhibited educational displays at various sites

2. Brief description of the target audience

AgriLife Extension

The target audience for the Better Living for Texans program continues to be SNAP recipients, applicants, and other groups who qualify for program benefits. These groups includes women receiving WIC benefits, children attending schools in which 50% or more of the children receive free or reduce meals; children and parents in Head Start programs; individuals receiving food at a food bank or food pantry; children who participate in the Summer Food Service Program; and individuals living in census tracks where 50% or more of the population is at 130% of the poverty level or below.

Cooperative Extension Program

Minority families and individuals
 Senior adults
 Single parents
 Persons coping with and at risk for chronic illnesses
 Small farmers

Limited resource farmers
 Family farmers and socially disadvantaged farmers

3. How was eXtension used?

Agents and Specialist were able to download publications customized with PVAMU-CEP logo to share with Producers. Agents also direct producers to the eXtension website to search for information.

Texas A&M AgriLife Extension did not use eXtension.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

2013	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Actual	115037	391102	118780	0

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

Patent Applications Submitted

Year: 2013

Actual: 0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

2013	Extension	Research	Total
Actual	0	0	0

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

- # of group educational sessions conducted (1862).

Year	Actual
2013	11012

Output #2

Output Measure

- # of group educational sessions conducted (1890).

Year	Actual
2013	12

Output #3

Output Measure

- # of one-on-one technical assistance/consultations.

Year	Actual
2013	54

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O. No.	OUTCOME NAME
1	Amount of monthly out-of-pocket food expenses reported saved by program participants.
2	# of participants understand and use MyPyramid in meal buying and preparation, become aware of diet related diseases, understand the connection between diet and exercise. Participants increase consumption of fruits and vegetables. Expectant teen mothers adopt healthy eating habits. Participants modify recipes to decrease amount of calories.
3	# of producers adopting best management practices on sustainable agriculture.

Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

Amount of monthly out-of-pocket food expenses reported saved by program participants.

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Actual
2013	0

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

For low-income audiences, the cost of food can use a larger percentage of a household's resources when compared to those categorized as middle and upper class. Helping families stretch food resources (including cash and SNAP benefits) can help reduce the need for emergency food assistance and can help families utilize their cash for other non-food expenses.

What has been done

Agents implemented the Better Living for Texans program and offered the Back to Basics series which focused on meal planning, tips for saving money and stretching food resources, and food safety. Low-cost recipes are featured at the programs and participants learn how to plan and prepare foods that are low in cost and high in nutrition.

Results

Of the 1158 participants who estimated their out-of-pocket food expenses, 42% (n=483) reported lower out-of-pocket food expenses 30 days (average reduction was \$75) after the program compared to when the program began. Nineteen percent (n=215) saw no significant change in out-of-pocket food expenses while 40% (n=460) saw out-of-pocket food expenses increase.

Overall, out of pocket food expenses were not statistically significantly different after the program ended compared to when the program began. (pre: \$270.69; post: \$274.23).

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
704	Nutrition and Hunger in the Population
801	Individual and Family Resource Management

Outcome #2

1. Outcome Measures

of participants understand and use MyPyramid in meal buying and preparation, become aware of diet related diseases, understand the connection between diet and exercise. Participants increase consumption of fruits and vegetables. Expectant teen mothers adopt healthy eating habits. Participants modify recipes to decrease amount of calories.

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #3

1. Outcome Measures

of producers adopting best management practices on sustainable agriculture.

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1890 Extension
- 1890 Research

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Actual
2013	90

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

Livestock production, more specially cattle production is the number one enterprise on more agricultural operation in Texas. Most Small Scale landowners give very little thought to the management of their livestock. i.e. most small scale landowners do not consider the important role that forages play in producing cattle. They do not soil test, lime, fertilize or properly rotate pastures. Therefore not they are not maximizing their profits.

What has been done

The Cooperative Extension Program in partnership with several community based organization conducted three workshops targeted at cattle producers focusing on forages, and general cattle health management. A one day workshop on Artificial Insemination in small ruminants was conducted by International Goat Center for agents and producers. County Extension agents also conducted programs in their counties to address local issues. One-On-One interaction between extension staff and producers to conduct individual assessments on the ranches were also conducted.

Results

A total of 120 producers attended the three workshops conducted in 2013. Agents conducted nine local programs in their respective counties attracting 108 producers. Agents supported by Specialist made 45 one-on-one visits with Livestock producers to assist cattle producers on farm. Participant Surveys collected indicate that 75% of the producers attending these workshops would adopt practices and technology presented. Individual ranchers that agents worked with reported an average saving of \$15.00 per cow/calf unit in feed cost/ animal health cost after adopting practices and technology learned through interaction with our programs. This represents a conservative estimate of about \$180,000.00.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
102	Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships
205	Plant Management Systems
301	Reproductive Performance of Animals

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programmatic Challenges
- Populations changes (immigration, new cultural groupings, etc.)

Brief Explanation

AgriLife Extension

Although 42% of participants were able to reduce their out-of-pocket expenses, there was no significant change for the group as a whole. In addition, 40% saw an increase in their out-of-pocket food expenses. Reasons why some participants saw an increase in food expenses are not fully understood but may include a rise in food costs, the occurrence of an economic hardship such as unemployment, change in SNAP or WIC benefits, or some other unexpected/emergency expense. Upon further evaluation of the data, participants who reported an increase in food expenses also reported an increase in the participation of SNAP and free/reduced school meals programs. It is also possible that when participants were surveyed 30-days later, they were better able to estimate their out-of-pocket food expenses compared to when they entered the program.

Cooperative Extension Program

The clientele we work with are often very slow to adopt new or even different technology. Agents often times must use "Transformational Education" methods to help them realize the need for change; evaluate options, before they will adopt new behaviors. This process is often time consuming and takes a great deal of personal commitment.

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies)

Evaluation Results

AgriLife Extension

Although 42% of participants were able to reduce their out-of-pocket expenses, there was no significant change for the group as a whole. In addition, 40% saw an increase in their out-of-pocket food expenses. Reasons why some participants saw an increase in food expenses are not fully understood but may include a rise in food costs, the occurrence of an economic hardship such as unemployment, change in SNAP or WIC benefits, or some other unexpected/emergency expense. Upon further evaluation of the data, participants who reported an increase in food expenses also reported an increase in the participation of SNAP and free/reduced school meals programs. It is also possible that when participants were surveyed 30-days later, they were better able to estimate their out-of-pocket food expenses compared to when they entered the program.

Cooperative Extension Program

Agents conducted an initial participant survey to gauge producer's level of understanding and the likelihood of adoption of the information being presented. Each Participant was contacted using the enrollment list to follow up on their interest and adopting the information. Agents worked with one-on-one with those producers who were interested in adopting new practices. One-on-one evaluations were conducted to monitor progress of each producer and to determent economic impact.

Key Items of Evaluation

Cooperative Extension Program

Number of producers adopting new -practices and technology.
Number of producers reporting increased income or cost savings
Number of producers reporting increased understanding of subject matter.