

# 2007 Alabama A&M University and Auburn University Combined Extension Annual Report

Status: Accepted  
Date Accepted: 05/15/08

2007 Alabama A&M University and Auburn University Combined Extension Annual Report

## I. Report Overview

### 1. Executive Summary

#### REPORT OVERVIEW

The Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results for the Alabama Cooperative Extension System has been reviewed and approved by the 1862 Extension Director - Auburn University and the 1890 Extension Administrator - Alabama A&M University.

The Planned Programs contained in the FY2007 Alabama Cooperative Extension System Annual Report of Accomplishments and Results provide fiscal accountability for all Federal Cooperative Extension formula funds and the required matching funds for both Alabama A&M University and Auburn University. In addition, it should be noted that many of these same programs are subject to the benefits of fiscal inputs leveraged from other sources, to include additional state appropriations, county funds, and extramural dollars.

The Fiscal Year 2007 Annual Report of Accomplishment and Results documents impacts and outcomes associated with each of the eleven Planned Programs in the System's Plan of Work. It should be immediately noted that there exist some incompatibilities between the new CSREES web based reporting software and the planning and reporting methods employed by the Alabama Cooperative Extension System. To point, the Alabama Cooperative Extension System employs multiple 'Extension Team Projects' (ETPs) with a narrow programmatic focus as the primary programming tool to address the identified issues under each of the eleven Planned Programs. However, the new CSREES planning and reporting software is structured to allow minimal information/data to be input for each Planned Program. As such, the FY2007 Annual Report reflects 'selected' program accomplishments of the Alabama Cooperative Extension System (Alabama A&M University and Auburn University) associated with the eleven Planned Programs.

For each of the eleven Planned Programs contained in the System's Plan of Work this FY2007 Annual Report includes a single, exemplary, Extension Team Project that addresses a critical issue(s) associated with a given Planned Program and also documents the significant outcomes and impacts realized by the citizens of Alabama. It should be noted that the Alabama Cooperative Extensions System has additional Extension Team Projects associated with each Planned Program that clearly illustrate measurable impacts and outcomes. However, the limitations of the new planning and reporting software have greatly restricted the capacity to include additional results for each of the Planned Programs.

Another reason for inclusion of a single Extension Team Project for each of the Planned Programs is founded in the concept of project 'maturity' and the fact that States have been instructed to include in the Annual Report only those program efforts with measurable impacts and outcomes. Some System Extension Team Projects have not yet reached maturity and have not yet generated measurable impacts and outcomes; all such projects have been excluded from this report.

Given the fact that the Planned Programs as contained in the Plan of Work were written to reflect accomplishments across several Extension Team Projects, much of text imported (from the Plan of Work) (language/program descriptions, targets, etc.) do not accurately reflect the content and/or targets of the Extension Team Project selected to represent a given Planned Program. The reviewers are asked to remain cognizant of this issue and are requested to focus attention on the specific Extension Team Project and not the overall Planned Program descriptions. Where possible, such discrepancies are noted with clarification that the stated 'targets', for example, are only for the included Extension Team Project. It is anticipated that future Annual Reports will include a different array of Extension Team Projects associated with each of the Planned Programs, a reflection of the emergence of new Projects and the maturation/conclusion of others.

A listing of the eleven Planned Programs and the associated Extension Team Projects with measurable impacts / outcomes follows.

1. 4-H and Youth Development
  - a. ETP 22V: 4-H Volunteerism
2. Human Nutrition, Diet, and Health
  - a. Metropolitan Health, Nutrition and Wellness
3. Home Grounds, Gardening, and Home Pests

- a. Urban Nontraditional Horticultural Enterprises
4. Forestry, Wildlife, and Natural Resources
- a. ETP 18D: Natural Resource Education Program
5. Food Safety, Preparation, and Preservation
- a. ETP 17C: Food Processing and Entrepreneurial Food Businesses
6. Family and Child Development
- a. ETP 13 B: Educational Needs of Child Care Providers
7. Economic and Community Development
- a. ETP 21D: The Alabama Radon Education Program
8. Consumer Science and Personal Financial Management
- a. ETP 15C Family Financial Security and Consumer Education
9. Commercial Horticulture
- a. ETP 19C: Commercial Fruit Pest Management
10. Animal Sciences and Forages
- a. ETP 11B: Sheep, Goat and Rabbit Production
11. Agronomic Crops
- a. ETP 10G: Monitoring and Management of Soybean Rust in Alabama

In addition to the information contained in this Annual Report many other exciting programs recognized accomplishments in FY2007. These programs provided cutting-edge scientific and technical information to Alabamians from diverse racial, social and economic backgrounds. Highlights of other Alabama Cooperative Extension System program efforts included helping Alabamians strengthen their marriages, face global competition, cope with chronic drought conditions and eat healthier foods, to name only a few.

#### First State Cooperative Extension Program Wikipedia Article

Alabama Extension became the nation's first state Extension program with an article in Wikipedia, the world's largest and most widely viewed online encyclopedia. Still undergoing expansion since its debut, the article features summaries of Extension's major programs; information about the landmark federal court ruling in the mid-1990s that combined into one system Alabama A&M and Auburn university Extension programs; detailed biographies of Alabama Extension directors; information about the organization's diverse use of technology throughout the past century; and a comprehensive history of the organization dating back more than a century.

#### After 80 Years, Still a Technological Leader

More than 80 years after emerging as one of the national pioneers of educational radio, Alabama Extension still leads much of the rest of the nation in the use of electronic technology to educate its diverse audiences. Our Web site, [www.aces.edu](http://www.aces.edu), is one of the ten most heavily trafficked Extension sites in the nation, according to [www.alexa.com](http://www.alexa.com).

Some 3.7 million visitors worldwide accessed the site in 2007 — almost 8.8 million page views in all. Alabama also has led the way in Weblogging — blogging as it is popularly known — as a timely, cost-effective way to reach our audiences. Alabama Extension also is striving to reach a new generation of information users through resources posted on Wikipedia and YouTube. Additionally, Extension also has established 33 interactive videoconferencing sites in offices throughout the state, serving as accessible facilities where clients can view educational and certification programs via the Internet.

#### Radon Education Program Reaching New Audiences

Alabama Extension's Radon Education Program has reached more than a million people through numerous activities — efforts that have resulted in 1,628 mitigated homes, 2,236 homes tested before the completion of real estate transactions, 2,663 homes built radon ready and the distribution of more than 23,000 radon kits. Six cities also have added radon measures to their building controls. In addition to outreach efforts focused on homeowners, Extension targets contractors, realtors and others in the home-building industry. Radon educational materials and free testing kits also are distributed through newborn programs at county hospitals. Alabama was one of only four states to receive the EPA's Radon Leaders Saving Lives Award in 2007.

#### Speakers Bureau

Building on its long tradition of taking its message to diverse audiences throughout the state, Alabama Extension recently launched its Speakers Bureau, comprised of educators whose training and expertise reflect Extension's diverse educational programming. The Extension News and Public Affairs unit, which coordinates the effort, also works with members of the local media to publicize these visits in advance.

#### A Helping Hand for Sun-Parched Landscapes

Alabama is in the midst of one of the worst droughts of the last half century. But farmers are not the only ones reeling financially from the effects of this prolonged drought. Alabama Extension professionals have developed programs to reach another segment of the population that has invested immense efforts, if not fortunes, into their land — homeowners. Through workshops and demonstrations, Extension educators, aided by Master Gardener volunteers, are showing homeowners how mulching and drip irrigation can conserve water on sun-parched landscapes.

#### Assistance for Limited-Income Growers

Fresh fruit is big business in Alabama, generating some \$15 million annually, though the backbone of this agricultural sector tends to be small- and limited-resource producers. Alabama Extension educators routinely assist these small-scale producers in a myriad of ways, including variety selection, disease control and other management practices. Of special significance this year was the help Alabama Extension educators provided in helping growers weather an early spring freeze. Extension professionals not only monitored weather patterns but also provided modeling and forecasting to help growers reduce, if possible, some of the anticipated damage. In addition to fielding numerous calls from state and even national media, Extension educators also provided growers with help seeking disaster relief and managing their orchards to recover quickly from the freeze's effects.

#### Strengthening Marriages

Alabama has one of the highest divorce rates in the nation — a problem that exacts a heavy emotional toll not only on adults but also on children. Backed with the latest research-based information, the nationally acclaimed Alabama Community Healthy Marriage Initiative is building a grassroots presence throughout Alabama by providing marriage professionals and community leaders throughout the state with curricula and training to develop their own local efforts. In the coming year, one of the initiative's most noteworthy efforts, the Alabama Marriage Handbook, which garnered national media attention following its release, will be made available to couples seeking wedding licenses in every county probate office in the state. A federal grant of more than \$8 million will support the initiative's efforts during the next 5 years.

#### Drawing a Big Picture for Alabama Agribusiness Professionals

Every year, Alabama Extension economists associated with the Alabama Farm Business Management and Analysis Program take a financial pulse of each farmer and agribusiness professional served by the program. The result is the Alabama Farm Analysis Association Summary Report. In addition to providing a 5-year average of farm expenses, crop returns and profits, the report also enables farmers to compare their own profitability with counterparts in other regions of the state with the ultimate goal of helping them improve their operations' profitability.

#### Enhancing ATV Safety

More than 140 people died from all-terrain vehicle accidents in Alabama since 1982. A critical concern of Alabama 4-H educators is to reduce these fatalities. With this in mind, Alabama 4-H launched the Alabama Motorized Outdoor Adventures Program, with the goal of helping youth understand the importance of ATV training and safety gear and, most important, avoid unnecessary risk. A newly hired ATV coordinator implemented a seven-step training program aimed at prospective and current ATV users of all ages. Also, using Extension's time-honored train-the-trainer approach, she also instructed Extension personnel and volunteers in ATV safety. These trainers, in turn, shared their knowledge with almost 11,000 others.

#### Protecting Eastern Bluebirds

Urban sprawl not only threatens Alabama forestlands but also the animals that inhabit them, particularly eastern bluebird populations. Extension forged a partnership with other public and private individuals and entities to develop a bluebird trail in Montgomery County. Extension provided the management and monitoring plan for the trail, while other partners contributed funds to purchase nest boxes and other materials. Youth from Group Homes for Children also were enlisted to help with nest box placement. The effort is viewed as a critical first step in reintroducing bluebirds into threatened habitats.

#### Branching Out Beyond Livestock

Livestock programs always have been a mainstay of Extension educational efforts. But in an increasingly urbanized state, programming recently has focused on humanity's best friend. Extension educators are providing Alabama residents with publications and workshops to enhance their knowledge and confidence as dog owners — efforts that culminated in the 2007 North Alabama Dog Expo, an event that attracted participants from two states. Businesses and other partners in the region assisted with the effort.

#### Addressing Wildlife Management Issues

Extension has developed numerous wildlife management programs to reach the growing number of Alabamians who are

leaving the cities and suburbs to reclaim the pleasures of rural life. Members of the Alabama Extension Forestry and Wildlife team joined several public and private partners to hold an Advanced Deer Management seminar for north Alabama landowners — one attempt among many to correct erroneous information associated with wildlife management, particularly practices associated with white-tailed deer. Later in the year, team members also held the Deer and Turkey Expo in Birmingham, which attracted more than 1,200 people interested in managing their land for hunting. Team members also have worked with federal agencies to trap feral pigs in the Bankhead National Forest — an effort that has provided them and other wildlife professionals with a keener understanding of the most effective methods for controlling the spread of these pigs, considered an especially serious environmental menace.

#### Rendering Alabama Catfish Farms More Cost Effective

Global competition is a major preoccupation of most Alabama farmers and agribusiness professionals, and the state's catfish farmers are no exception. As one Extension fisheries expert has discovered, diversification will play a major role in helping Alabama catfish farms compete with their counterparts in other countries, particularly Southeast Asia, which, because of a number of factors including climate, enjoys several comparative advantages. The expert has demonstrated how small-scale producers with only seven acres can raise catfish and other particularly lucrative sources of income in a greenhouse powered by corn grown on the same land.

#### Coping with Herbicide Resistance

Herbicide-resistant pigweed is slowly but relentlessly extending its reach into Alabama — a dire threat because Alabama farmers are now deeply invested in weed control strategies that encompass glyphosate, a herbicide to which pigweed has developed resistance. Extension agronomists and researchers have developed a monitoring program to trace the spread of this highly adaptive weed, showing farmers in threatened areas what changes they must undertake in their weed-control regimen to cope with this weed.

#### Addressing a Threat to Alabama Poultry

Two Alabama Extension poultry scientists have developed more effective methods for dealing with Laryngotracheitis, commonly known as LP. This simple method involving windrow composting — heaping compost into long piles to induce a heating effect — deactivates the LP virus in a matter of hours rather than days. Described by the scientists as “practical Extension-oriented research,” the method could better prepare the poultry industry to cope with the even more threatening specter of an avian flu outbreak.

#### Raising Vegetables and Self-Esteem

Despite initially serious challenges — clay soil and rocks, watershed erosion and flooding problems — a gardening demonstration project at the Stewart Center for the Developmentally Disabled in Moulton turned out to be a textbook example of sustainable vegetable gardening, thanks to the work of several Extension Urban horticulturists. The garden produces vegetables that are sold or used by center residents. Perhaps more important, it has provided a means through which residents can contribute to the center, even while improving their sense of self esteem.

#### Enhancing the Fortunes of the Alabama Catfish Industry

Extension's Food Safety team members are working with the state's catfish industry to enhance the consumer appeal of its products through better packaging and marketing. The first step involved conducting eighteen surveys throughout the state to determine the industry's standing with consumers — results that proved especially positive. Team members plan to develop a cookbook in 2008 to further enhance the product's consumer appeal.

#### Fostering Financial Planning

Few Alabamians have developed plans to secure their financial futures. Extension educators in Consumer Science and Personal Financial Management coordinated an estate planning program and, along with other public partners, implemented workshops throughout the state. The workshops focused on estate planning basics, making informed investment decisions and other key considerations. Approximately 93 percent of the 820 participants reached through the 2007 workshops indicated that they would complete an estate plan.

#### 4-H Inaugurates State-of-the Art 4-H Environmental Center

Alabama 4-H inaugurated the \$5 million Alabama 4-H Environmental Science Education Center in 2007 — a 17,500-square-foot facility that sets a new standard in providing children with a deeper understanding of environmental principles and energy efficiency. Built through the contributions of more than 700 corporations, foundations, organizations and individuals, the facility was constructed based on the LEED green building rating system, a nationally recognized benchmark for green buildings.

**Assistance to Alabama's Horse Owners and Enthusiasts**

Although roughly one in twenty Alabama families has some connection to horses, access to pastures and knowledge of pasture and forage management remains limited. The 1-day Grazing Management School for Horse Owners, modeled after Extension's longstanding and highly successful grazing schools for cattle producers and held in two locations in north Alabama, attracted owners from other regions of the state. Held in cooperation with the Auburn University College of Agriculture, the Alabama Forage and Grassland Coalition and the USDA's Natural Resources and Conservation Service, the workshop covered all aspects of forage management.

**Extension Launches Lifestyle Modification Program**

To combat an epidemic of obesity and obesity-related diseases — especially serious problems in Alabama — Extension educators forged a partnership with the Alabama Department of Public Health to enhance lifestyle modification efforts throughout the state. The program, titled "New Leaf...Choices for Healthy Living," targets women between the ages of 18 to 64 and focuses on preparing healthy meals, making wise food choices and including more daily physical activity. The exclusive focus on women stems from the fact that they, as the primary caregivers in their families, exert the most influence over food choices and preparation. By reaching them, Extension educators hope to influence their entire families.

**Grants to Assist Rural Alabama**

The Rural Alabama Initiative, administered by the Extension-affiliated Economic and Community Development Institute, provided funding to forty-eight projects submitted from rural communities in more than forty counties. Funded projects included community and regional adult and youth development programs, workforce development academics, a technology camp for high school counselors, a high school robotics competition and rural tourism and entrepreneurship programs. In 2007, the grants, which ranged from \$5,000 to \$20,000, totaled almost \$500,000.

**Partnering with BET to Promote Weight Loss**

With the numbers of obese children approaching 20 percent, Extension's Urban and New Nontraditional Programs joined forces with Black Entertainment Television and the BET Foundation to sponsor a summer camp for obese and overweight girls. In addition to emphasizing weight loss and self-esteem building, the camp provided instruction in nutritional meal preparation and snacking, while providing a 1,600-calorie menu and fitness programs for 7 days. A total of 353.8 pounds was lost by the 107 girls who participated in the camp, an average of 3.65 pounds for each individual.

**Assisting Heir Property Owners**

There are disadvantages to being an heir property owner — a bitter reality that Extension is working to drive home to the thousands of individuals who lack clear ownership of their property. In fact, heir ownership is one of the leading causes of land loss for many families — a problem that often stems from misconceptions or confusion about legal ownership. In 2007, Extension professionals undertook training to provide these property owners with a better understanding of their rights and how to protect their land. Also in 2007, Extension published a booklet, "Heir Property in Alabama," as part of this expanding outreach effort.

For additional information on Alabama Cooperative Extension System programs please reference the ACES website: <http://www.aces.edu/>

**Total Actual Amount of professional FTEs/SYs for this State**

Year:2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	334.7	49.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	293.0	30.5	0.0	0.0

**II. Merit Review Process**

**1. The Merit Review Process that was Employed for this year**

- Combined External and Internal University External Non-University Panel

**2. Brief Explanation**

The review process for the Alabama Cooperative Extension System's FY2008-20112 Plan of Work included several phases. The first phase of review was conducted by the Co-Chairs of the Priority Program Areas (PPA). Each of PPA Co-Chairs reviewed their respective programs to ensure that they accurately represented and addressed critical needs of Alabama residents. In addition, each PPA team completed a through reexamination of the Extension Team Projects (ETP) associated with each of PPAs.

A second phase of review was conducted by the Assistant Directors. Working with the PPA Co-Chairs the Assistant Directors checked each program area and related ETPs for: relevancy, ability of Extension to adequately address the issues, duplication with other Extension Team Projects, potential for / inclusion of Multistate Extension Activities / Integrated Research and Extension Activities, and the inclusion of measurable impact / outcome indicators.

The third phase of Plan of Work review was conducted by the System Administrative Team. That team (Director / 1890 Administrator/ Associate Directors, CFO, HRO) reviewed the Plan relative to:

- Consistency with System / University missions
- The inclusion of approved PPAs (and related ETPs),
- The adequacy of fiscal / human resource allocations needed for successful implementation of included programs,
- The capacity to offer educational services to a broad spectrum of Alabama residents, rural / urban, and across diverse demographic parameters,
- The degree to which the Plan adequately reflected the consideration and inclusion of stakeholder and advisory inputs.

As the fourth phase of the review process, relevant University administrators (Alabama A&M University / Auburn University) were afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the FY2007-2011 Plan of Work. Deans, Department Heads, and others were critical to the review process given that many of the System specialists are housed in the Academic Departments.

The final phase of review centers on scrutiny of the Plan of Work by the various state-wide Priority Program Area Advisory Councils. These Advisory Councils assisted each Priority Program Area in the identification of critical issues and in setting specific System programming priorities. Specific roles for the Priority Program Area Advisory Councils included: 1) insured that the included programs address real needs of Alabama citizens; 2) promoted the System's programmatic efforts and accomplishments to key stakeholder / clientele groups / decision makers; 3) provided guidance and assistance in obtaining statewide support for included programs; 4) identified critical issues and problems which might be best addressed by System educational outreach; and 5) expanded the collaboration and networking capabilities of the System in support of existing and proposed programs.

### **III. Stakeholder Input**

#### **1. Actions taken to seek stakeholder input that encouraged their participation**

- Use of media to announce public meetings and listening sessions
- Targeted invitation to traditional stakeholder groups
- Targeted invitation to non-traditional stakeholder groups
- Targeted invitation to traditional stakeholder individuals
- Targeted invitation to non-traditional stakeholder individuals
- Survey of traditional stakeholder groups
- Survey of traditional stakeholder individuals

#### **Brief Explanation**

We sought stakeholder from multiple levels. Each of our county Extension office had a county-level Extension Advisory Council that provided grass-roots county-level stakeholder input. These county-level councils were required to meet at least twice annually. Each regional extension agent was expected to develop and implement a regional stakeholder input process. This could have be in the form of a either a face-to-face meeting with stakeholders or through some other method such as a survey. At the next level, each of our statewide priority program teams was required to implement a statewide stakeholder input mechanism specific for that priority program area (i.e., agronomic row crops, animal sciences, 4-H/youth development, etc.). Each of the three colleges and schools in which we have Extension-funded faculty also had advisory boards either specific to Extension or with sub-committees for Extension. In addition to the advisory groups described above, we also conducted formal listening sessions at various locations around the state on a periodic basis. The most recent of these were conducted in 2005. About every 10 years we do a formal survey of the general public and of specific targeted clientele to determine their knowledge of and general level of satisfaction with ACES.

**2(A). A brief statement of the process that was used by the recipient institution to identify individuals and groups stakeholders and to collect input from them**

**1. Method to identify individuals and groups**

- Use Advisory Committees
- Use Internal Focus Groups
- Use External Focus Groups
- Needs Assessments

**Brief Explanation**

Members of county extension advisory councils were selected by the county extension coordinators with input from the county staff. Data was collected on the membership of the county extension advisory councils to ensure these groups were diverse and represented the broad interest of the county. Each regional extension agent was also responsible for selecting members to serve on their subject-matter specific advisory board. Data was collected on these advisory groups as well to ensure they are diverse. Members of the REA advisory group were individuals who were recognized as local/regional leaders within their respective subject-matter area. The advisory groups for the statewide priority program areas/teams were most often commodity groups that operate at a statewide level such as the Alabama Cattlemen's Association. Etc. The listening sessions that were conducted on a periodic basis are well advertised through the public media and were open to any and everyone who wishes to attend. The members of the college and school advisory boards were selected and appointed by the respective deans with the advice of the faculty.

**2(B). A brief statement of the process that was used by the recipient institution to identify individuals and groups who are stakeholders and to collect input from them**

**1. Methods for collecting Stakeholder Input**

- Meeting with traditional Stakeholder groups
- Survey of traditional Stakeholder groups
- Meeting with traditional Stakeholder individuals
- Survey of traditional Stakeholder individuals
- Survey specifically with non-traditional groups

**Brief Explanation**

Methods for collecting stakeholder input are explained in the previous sections and they included meetings with individual traditional stakeholders as well as stakeholder groups, surveys of individual stakeholders and surveys of non-traditional groups.

**3. A statement of how the input was considered**

- To Identify Emerging Issues
- Redirect Extension Programs
- In the Staff Hiring Process
- In the Action Plans
- To Set Priorities

**Brief Explanation**

Our programs were planned by 13 different priority program teams. These teams included county agents, county coordinators (directors), regional agents and state specialists. The teams received input from the various levels of membership (county, regional, and state) based on the input from the advisory groups at each level. The teams were responsible for doing the strategic planning and operational programming planning for their specific subject-matter area based on the input received from all levels and the research being generated from the two universities involved (Alabama A & M university and Auburn University), as well as from other land-grant universities and reputable sources. Our goal was to have approximately 50% of the programming designed to be reactive to the needs identified by the stakeholders and the other 50% to be proactive programming based on new research finding that have potential for improving the quality of life for Alabama residents. We also collected data on the subject-matter areas for which we received the most requests for information and this data is used to drive staffing decisions.

**Brief Explanation of what you learned from your Stakeholders**

We learned that they are generally very pleased with the areas in which we conduct our educational programs and the content of our programs. An increasing number of our clientele are using the internet and our ACES websites to access information. We also learned that our traditional agricultural clientele are very pleased with our new regional programming structure which provides them with cellular and e-mail access to agents who are more specialized in the specific subject-matter areas (i.e., agronomy, animal science, horticulture, forestry/wildlife, aquaculture, etc.) in which they need information and assistance

**IV. Expenditure Summary**

<b>1. Total Actual Formula dollars Allocated (prepopulated from C-REEMS)</b>			
<b>Extension</b>		<b>Research</b>	
<b>Smith-Lever 3b &amp; 3c</b>	<b>1890 Extension</b>	<b>Hatch</b>	<b>Evans-Allen</b>
6510450	1722009	0	0

<b>2. Totaled Actual dollars from Planned Programs Inputs</b>				
	<b>Extension</b>		<b>Research</b>	
	<b>Smith-Lever 3b &amp; 3c</b>	<b>1890 Extension</b>	<b>Hatch</b>	<b>Evans-Allen</b>
<b>Actual Formula</b>	5604942	1818764	0	0
<b>Actual Matching</b>	6510450	1818764	0	0
<b>Actual All Other</b>	25373254	3203573	0	0
<b>Total Actual Expended</b>	37488646	6841101	0	0

<b>3. Amount of Above Actual Formula Dollars Expended which comes from Carryover funds from previous years</b>				
<b>Carryover</b>				
	5604942	96755	0	0

**V. Planned Program Table of Content**

<b>S. NO.</b>	<b>PROGRAM NAME</b>
1	4-H and Youth Development
2	Human Nutrition, Diet, and Health
3	Home Grounds, Gardening, and Home Pests
4	Forestry, Wildlife, and Natural Resources
5	Food Safety, Preparation, and Preservation
6	Family and Child Development
7	Economic and Community Development
8	Consumer Science and Personal Financial Management
9	Commercial Horticulture
10	Animal Sciences and Forages
11	Agronomic Crops

**Program #1**

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

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

4-H and Youth Development

**V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)**

**1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage**

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
724	Healthy Lifestyle	20%	20%		
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being	20%	20%		
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals,	10%	10%		
806	Youth Development	50%	50%		
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>		

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

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

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	47.0	32.2	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	84.0	3.7	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
1792021	219161	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
2004776	219161	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
5393974	386031	0	0

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

**1. Brief description of the Activity**

**4-H Volunteerism ETP**

4-H Volunteerism ETP trains and equips 4-H Regional Extension Agents (REA) to be effective volunteer administrators. This project trains 4-H REA's to work with county-based Extension personnel to establish and maintain an effective 4-H Youth Development program that is led by 4-H REA's and delivered by volunteers through community-based clubs, project clubs, school enrichment, and/or in-school programs. Volunteerism is pervasive throughout Alabama 4-H Youth Development and is year-round.

The focus during the current year has been on developing 4-H REA's as trainers, with a secondary focus on direct training and support of volunteers. Early success is determined by 4-HPlus data which records the numbers of trained volunteers, chartered clubs, and volunteer hours. We have begun to evaluate the impact of volunteers on the lives of youth. The ultimate goal of this ETP is to have a highly effective agent-led, volunteer-delivered 4-H Youth Development program. Projected outcomes and impacts include an increased number of screened and trained volunteers leading chartered 4-H clubs in which youth learn leadership, citizenship and life skills.

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

There are two target audiences: 4-H Regional Extension Agents and volunteers. The targeted audiences differ in experience, socioeconomic status, educational background, interest level and time commitment. These differences are in general throughout Alabama.

Our target audience reflects the demographics of the state. According to the most recent census data: Alabama has a population of 4,447,100 which includes 2,146,504 Males and 2,300,596 Females. The median age is 35.8 years. The populations is 72% White, 26.3% Black, 1% American Indian/Alaskan, .9% Asian, .1% Native Hawaiian & Other Pacific Islander, .9% Other.

The target audience also reflects the demographics of the individual community since volunteers are primarily involved at the local level and their involvement is based on the needs of young people in their community.

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

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	100000	300000	250000	500000
2007	29771	466838	31063	311223

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

**Patent Applications Submitted**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan:</b>	0
2007 :	0

**Patents listed**

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

**Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	46	0	46

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

**Output Target**

**Output #1****Output Measure**

- This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which a

Year	Target	Actual
2007	14	11

**Output #2****Output Measure**

- Annual Program Priority Team (PPT) Meeting: Each year 4-H PPT members attend a four-day training at the Alabama 4-H Ce

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	98

**Output #3****Output Measure**

- Volunteerism Training Tour to Montana and Wyoming: Eighteen 4-H Regional Extension Agents and Specialists traveled to M

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	18

**Output #4****Output Measure**

- 4-H Sci-Tech Training of Youth and Adult Teams: Adult volunteers attended 4-H Sci-Tech training along with youth teams and

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	70

**Output #5****Output Measure**

- Monsanto Volunteer Development Grant: \$3500.00 was provided for Volunteer Development training during State 4-H Congre

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	47

**Output #6****Output Measure**

- State 4-H Horse Show Volunteer Pilot Program: This model program empowered and trained volunteers to organize and facili

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	260

**Output #7****Output Measure**

- Volunteerism Training Tour, Iowa: A small delegation of 4-H Specialists visited the Iowa State Fair to observe that state's app

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	4

**Output #8****Output Measure**

- Extension Staff Training (September): Regional Extension 4-H Agents and County Extension Coordinators with 4-H responsib

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	42

**Output #9****Output Measure**

- Volunteerism Training - 4-H Regional Extension Agents (December): Regional Extension 4-H Agents and State Specialists rec

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	36

**Output #10****Output Measure**

- 4-H Golf Classic Volunteer Development: A wide array of private and corporate supporters were involved in a fund-raising and

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	154

**Output #11****Output Measure**

- Alabama 4-H Volunteer Forum: The Alabama 4-H Volunteer Leaders Association hosted a weekend-long educational retreat a

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	120

**Output #12**

**Output Measure**

- Southern Region Volunteer Forum: This annual forum is held in Georgia and supported by other southern 4-H programs. Two

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	27

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O No.	Outcome Name
1	A major outcome measure for 4-H and Youth Development for the 2007 – 2011 program cycle will be the growth in the number of registered and screened volunteer leaders.
2	<p>Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:</p> <p>Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed</p> <p>What: Specifically what was done and how it was done.</p> <p>When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.</p> <p>Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved.</p> <p>Who and how many: The “who” includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.</p> <p>So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to “success”. The basic question to be answered in this part is “what difference did this program make”. The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.</p> <p>Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.</p>
3	Annual Program Priority Team (PPT) Meeting: Each year 4-H PPT members attend a four-day training at the Alabama 4-H Center where they receive youth development updates, and programmatic updates and training. Attendees are provided with 4-H club kits and other community-club and volunteer resources and materials.
4	4-H Volunteers were trained in 4-H Sci-Tech program areas for greater program reach and diversity.
5	Volunteers attending the 2007 State 4-H Congress were provided with outstanding volunteer training opportunities.
6	4-H Volunteer Program Management Pilot - State 4-H Horse Show
7	Provided Volunteer Management training in a variety of programmatic areas and topics to Regional Extension Staff.
8	Provided educational opportunities for Alabama 4-H volunteers at the state and southern region level.
9	Success Story 1: Volunteers Leading the Way to the 'Big-M' of 4-H/Youth Development Programs
10	Success Story 2: Volunteer Led Clubs Making a Difference in Clarke County
11	Success Story 3: 2007 4-H Volunteer and Parent Forum
12	Success Story 4: 4-H at Work in Your Community

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

A major outcome measure for 4-H and Youth Development for the 2007 &dash; 2011 program cycle will be the growth in the number of registered and screened volunteer leaders.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	670	2122

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

As volunteer numbers and training increase, so does quality of the 4-H experience for young people. The essential elements of 4-H Youth Development are Belonging, Independence, Generosity, Mastery. All these essential elements are more successful the larger your base of volunteers become. The Alabama 4-H program received \$238,979.64 in volunteer service in 2007, responsibilities historically paid for by Extension funds.

**What has been done**

4-H Staff are being training as volunteer managers in order to learn effective ways to recruit, screen, train, and support volunteers so that they can provide a higher quality experience for youth therefore reaching and impacting a larger youth population.

**Results**

Results are shown as 2007 number, percentage increase:

#Community Clubs - 178, 47%  
 #Special Interest/Project Clubs - 128, 18%  
 #After School Clubs - 49, 158%  
 #Adult Volunteers - 2122, 12%  
 #Resource Volunteers - 170, 415%  
 #Direct Volunteers - 768, 7%  
 #Indirect Volunteers - 1184, 3.7%

As you can see, our goal was to increase volunteer involvement and therefore youth enrollment and quality of programming. All our target impact areas had tremendous increase in involvement. Most notably was the use of resource volunteers (415% increase), community clubs organized (47% increase) and afterschool clubs formed by volunteers (158% increase).

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being
724	Healthy Lifestyle
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities
806	Youth Development

**Outcome #2****1. Outcome Measures**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:

**Why:** Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed

**What:** Specifically what was done and how it was done.

**When:** If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.

**Where:** Specific location-- the county or counties involved.

**Who and how many:** The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.

**So what:** This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes.

Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.

Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	30	24

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
806	Youth Development
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being
724	Healthy Lifestyle
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities

**Outcome #3**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Annual Program Priority Team (PPT) Meeting: Each year 4-H PPT members attend a four-day training at the Alabama 4-H Center where they receive youth development updates, and programmatic updates and training. Attendees are provided with 4-H club kits and other community-club and volunteer resources and materials.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	98

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Staff must be continuously trained in university-based research on volunteerism and youth development. This is crucial for the effective delivery of programs and it brings consistent levels of quality to 4-H throughout the state.

**What has been done**

What has been done:

Staff received training in:

\*Energy Education For Youth

\*Youth and Adult Partnerships

\*Robotics & Rocketry

\*What's New in 2008 and Beyond

\*Healthy Lifestyles

\*Evaluation Techniques

\*4-H Curriculum

\* Teens in Community Service

**Results**

The 2007 team training had the highest levels of participation this training has ever had. Event evaluations were overwhelming favorable. Staff was trained, inspired, and provided with resources they judged beneficial in providing a consistently high-level of quality to community programming.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
806	Youth Development
724	Healthy Lifestyle
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being

**Outcome #4****1. Outcome Measures**

4-H Volunteers were trained in 4-H Sci-Tech program areas for greater program reach and diversity.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	70

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

There is a national shortage of young people involved in Science and Mathematics. 4-H Science, Engineering and Technology (4-H SET) stimulates young people's interest in applied mathematics and science through "hands-on, minds-on" experiences.

**What has been done**

Alabama 4-H promotes and supports training volunteers and staff to work with youth in robotics, rocketry and design solutions as well as in traditional animal, agriculture and natural resources education. Volunteers, staff, and youth teams attended a weekend-long training. An important aspect of this training was the development of local plans to support 4-H SET. Seventy volunteers attended the event and created take home plans.

**Results**

This training and the overall 4-H SET program has created tremendous volunteer participation and support. Twelve robotics kits were placed state-wide to give teams an opportunities for hands on application of training content. This success has led to high-profile publicity for 4-H SET programs and an increased demand for additional resources and training.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
806	Youth Development
724	Healthy Lifestyle
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities

**Outcome #5**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Volunteers attending the 2007 State 4-H Congress were provided with outstanding volunteer training opportunities.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	47

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Historically, numerous volunteers have attended State 4-H Congress, our state's highest-profile 4-H event. In the past, they only served as chaperones, with no opportunities for them to learn new skills or otherwise grow. We felt that State Congress was an opportunity for 4-H to better serve our volunteers and well as promote the overall 4-H philosophy of building and supporting our volunteer base.

**What has been done**

In 2007, we provided optional volunteer training tracks designed to involve, aid and encourage volunteers who desired additional 4-H club training. We provided four hours of workshops on Healthy Lifestyles in 4-H Clubs and Effective Risk Management. Volunteers received certificates of participation, their county received training verification, and they each received 4-H Club kits to use when they returned to their communities.

**Results**

Forty-seven volunteers received one-hundred and eighty-eight hours of training during the 2007 State Congress. Participation was optional, so adult who participated were self-selected so they were fully engaged and felt that their participation would be of benefit to them and to 4-H. Participants not only appreciated the training, but they felt that there were benefits in being able to share information with their peers from other sections of the state. Volunteers received excellent resources to use in their communities. The success of this program will lead to its expansion and further development during other state-wide youth events.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

<b>KA Code</b>	<b>Knowledge Area</b>
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being
724	Healthy Lifestyle
806	Youth Development

**Outcome #6****1. Outcome Measures**

4-H Volunteer Program Management Pilot - State 4-H Horse Show

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Quantitative Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	260

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Major Alabama 4-H events and activities have historically been planned and administered by Extension staff. Volunteers have not had an opportunity to feel ownership of 4-H programs, utilize their individual skills, or develop new abilities and responsibilities.

**What has been done**

The 4-H State Horse Show has a high level of participation by knowledgeable, enthusiastic adults. For that reason, it seemed an excellent platform for modeling what volunteers can achieve when trained and empowered. Extension personnel created a staffing grid for the five-day event. At the event, one staff member facilitated recruiting and scheduling volunteers.

**Results**

We learned that if asked, individuals will volunteer, and we discovered that volunteers have many different interests and different reasons for volunteering. The keys to the program's success were the diversity of volunteer opportunities and flexibility in scheduling. Two-hundred and sixty volunteer opportunities were on the grid, with an average time commitment of four hours. This pilot saved Extension an estimated \$7000 in salary and travel costs, equivalent to the reduction of six staff positions during the event. This pilot provided valuable insights on the use of volunteers during major events and will serve as a model we will use in the future.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
806	Youth Development

**Outcome #7**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Provided Volunteer Management training in a variety of programmatic areas and topics to Regional Extension Staff.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	78

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Although many Extension personnel are well trained and experienced in youth development, they have had little training to support their important new role as volunteer managers. They can only be successful if they have the skills and abilities needed to recruit, train and manage a cadre of volunteers who are working with youth.

**What has been done**

Two training sessions September and December were conducted to provide Volunteer Management Training. The following training topics were presented:

- \*4-H PLUS Enrollment Systems
- \*Volunteerism Update
- \*Terminology Review
- \*Updated Volunteer Screening Procedures
- \*Volunteer Application Review
- \*Introduction to the Written Reference Form
- \*Volunteer Resources On the National 4-H Brand Network
- \*ISOTURE model for Volunteer Management
- \*Recruiting Volunteers
- \*Understanding Volunteer Motivation

**Results**

All 4-H Regional Extension Agents received in-depth training on Volunteer Management. This included a clear and persuasive message on the importance of volunteer management and the importance of their role in the success of volunteer delivered programs. Members of the 4-H staff now have a clearer understanding of the "nuts and bolts" of volunteer screening and enrollment, as well as improved skills in building internal and external support.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
806	Youth Development
724	Healthy Lifestyle
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being

**Outcome #8**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Provided educational opportunities for Alabama 4-H volunteers at the state and southern region level.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	147

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Alabama 4-H Club Volunteers need additional opportunities to grow in their volunteer competencies. Having opportunities to interact with other successful volunteers around the state and to obtain the perspective of volunteers from elsewhere within the southern region provide opportunities for volunteer growth. Volunteers have an opportunity to network with and find their support system as a 4-H club leader. We are identifying and providing role models for 4-H club leaders.

**What has been done**

Twenty-seven volunteers attended the Southern Region 4-H Volunteer Leader Forum and one hundred and twenty attended the State 4-H Volunteer Forum. Both of these events are designed to support the 4-H club leader with educational workshops and programmatic resources.

**Results**

147 volunteers received additional educational opportunities through attending and participating in these two activities. Several 2007 participants are planning to share their outstanding programs by teaching an educational workshop at the 2008 Southern Region Volunteer Forum. We are seeing that our volunteers are becoming more competent and secure with their abilities and experiences. Increased confidence should equate to greater comfort at the club level leading to higher quality experiences with young people.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
806	Youth Development
724	Healthy Lifestyle
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being

**Outcome #9****1. Outcome Measures**

Success Story 1: Volunteers Leading the Way to the 'Big-M' of 4-H/Youth Development Programs

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	190

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Since the restructuring of the Alabama Cooperative Extension System, Alabama 4-H has moved quickly toward becoming a volunteer-led, staff-supported program. It is important that internal and external publics recognize that Alabama 4-H has a strong system in place to certify volunteers through a screening process. And it is important that 4-H volunteers be fully capable of enriching the youth development program through teaching, developing 4-H programs, projects, securing resources, and providing positive life experiences for youth.

**What has been done**

4-H volunteers contribute time, energy and talent to the 4-H Youth Development program. Direct Volunteers may be leaders of Special Interest Clubs or Community Clubs and are often alone with youth without the presence of Extension staff. In-Direct Volunteers are volunteers who will be in the presence of Extension staff such as In-School Club Leaders, judges, facilitators, etc. Middle Managers are ACES employees who work with the 4-H/Youth Development programs in their county or region. Some of the 4-H volunteer roles may include Direct or Indirect volunteers.

**Results**

Colbert, Lauderdale and Limestone Counties have a total of 190 volunteers, sixty of whom have been trained, screened and received their "Acceptance Letters." These volunteers were entered in the 4-H Plus database as certified volunteers. There are sixty Direct Volunteers, 120 In-Direct Volunteers and ten Middle Managers. This is an on-going process in which volunteers will be trained on a need basis. The majority of the volunteers were trained as Overnight Chaperons or Special Interest/Community Club leaders.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
806	Youth Development
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being
724	Healthy Lifestyle

**Outcome #10**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Success Story 2: Volunteer Led Clubs Making a Difference in Clarke County

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	80

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

The Alabama 4-H program is evolving from a staff-delivered in-school program to a volunteer-delivered club program which utilizes school-based clubs and enrichment programs to complement the club program. This evolution has been slow, and Extension staff are having to learn to be volunteer managers instead of school teachers.

**What has been done**

Working from our existing base in rural Clarke County in Southwestern Alabama, we have worked to build a new 4-H program by developing a new mind-set among the many friends of 4-H and the many people committed to positive youth development. To a large degree, this has required informing people on the opportunities that adults can provide to 4-H and then training and empowering them to take advantage of the human resources that are available in the county.

**Results**

Currently, eighty new members have had the chance to participate in 4-H programming in Clarke County as a result of three new volunteer led clubs being formed. The newly formed clubs are Bassett Creek 4-H Club led by Deborah Harvell, Thomasville Middle School 4-H Club led by LeAnn Moore, and Clarke Prep Gators 4-H Club led by Mary Ellen Huckabee. The Volunteers have expressed the strong impact that the programs have had:

"As a volunteer leader, I'm getting to watch my children come out of their shells and take active roles in leadership. They are already beginning to organize committees and make phone calls to other members in the club. My daughter was in a 4-H in-school club last year, and I want her to be able to continue and enjoy it. I also want my son to be a part of 4-H. That's why I started my own club."

"My daughter was in 4-H last year and I would like for my younger daughter Emily to experience those same opportunities in 4-H too!"

"I'm impressed with the cooperation between the parents and school. Parents have even been making comments about their own experiences in 4-H. I have also seen enthusiasm build in kids from all walks of life who are in my club. The children are always asking me questions like... What can we do next? Can my friends join 4-H? What can I build next? Where are we going?"

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
806	Youth Development
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being
724	Healthy Lifestyle
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities

**Outcome #11**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Success Story 3: 2007 4-H Volunteer and Parent Forum

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	120

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

As Alabama 4-H utilizes a new volunteer-led model for delivering 4-H programs, the State 4-H Leader and PPT Team felt that it was critical to see this commitment reflected by a high-profile and valuable statewide event. To give the Alabama 4-H Volunteer Association more ownership of the event, they were given far more responsibility than ever before. Although ACES has historically coordinated the event in its entirety, it is technically an Association function. The goal of ACES was that the majority of the '07 Forum workshops and fun-shops would be volunteer-solicited and taught.

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

Recognizing that change cannot occur overnight, ACES partnered with the Volunteer Association Board to provide only minimal guidance and assistance. The 4-H Volunteers took ownership of the Forum and planned workshops and activities that relate to them as a volunteer instead of what the state 4-H office or Extension wanted them to learn. This ownership of the program allowed Extension staff to focus time on volunteer management and building relationships with their volunteers instead of planning events.

#### **Results**

Over 120 attendees from throughout the State participated in such technical and innovative workshops as "Protecting the Health of Your Animal Science Project" to creative "fun-shops" where 4-H Club leaders obtained an array of hands-on, minds-on activities to take back to their local clubs.

According to post-program evaluations, the program was overwhelmingly successful, with 100 percent of respondents indicating they received practical information and educational resources they would implement in their local 4-H Clubs; they enjoyed the interaction and idea-sharing with Club leaders and ACES professionals from throughout the state; and that they would like to participate in another similar professional development or 4-H training opportunity.

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

<b>KA Code</b>	<b>Knowledge Area</b>
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being
724	Healthy Lifestyle
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities
806	Youth Development

#### **Outcome #12**

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

Success Story 4: 4-H at Work in Your Community

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

•1862 Extension

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

Change in Action Outcome Measure

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

<b>Year</b>	<b>Quantitative Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

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

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

Residents of rural Greene and Sumter County in the "Black Belt" region of West Alabama believe that one of the biggest gaps in community life involve "Positive things for our young people to be involved in." Like families and communities everywhere, they hope that their children will be part of a group of kids who want to amount to something in life. They want them to develop the skills and the habits they need to succeed in a complex and challenging world.

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

A new Regional Extension Agent was hired who began actively talking to community residents about how young people needed them to be involved in their lives as 4-H volunteers. The REA discussed the opportunities that 4-H has to offer, and how -- working together - staff and volunteers can make a positive difference by teaching young people life skills like self-confidence, good communications, and responsibility. There were informational barriers to overcome, concerning the availability of 4-H opportunities and its applicability to the lives of contemporary youth.

### Results

The list of volunteers is growing, and 4-H staff and volunteers declare that they will be able to look back on 2007 as a great year for youth development in Greene and Sumter Counties. There are six newly-screened and trained adult volunteers. Two 4-H clubs have already been chartered, a Junior Master Gardeners Club is in the works, and another school-enrichment club will focus on robotics and technology. Also a Youth Leadership Club is being planned and organized. Community residents feel that this is a great start for 4-H Youth Development and just the beginning of an outstanding impact for youth in our communities. More people are welcoming 4-H back and asking what they can do to help the next generation be part of this great tradition. That reflects a healthy foundation for 4-H. It recognizes that 4-H doesn't belong to just the Extension office; it belongs to young people and families and communities.

#### 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities
724	Healthy Lifestyle
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being
806	Youth Development

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

##### External factors which affected outcomes

- Economy
- Competing Public priorities
- Populations changes (immigration, new cultural groupings, etc.)

##### Brief Explanation

Certainly the economy is affecting everything taking place in our communities. Because of increasing gas prices, parents are looking for opportunities for their children in their local communities. National trips and fee based programs have also seen a decrease as parents are being forced to make tough economic decisions for their families. The state of Alabama has a wide variety of population issues and varies so much from county to county. These differences include rural vs urban, socio economic status, access to and distance from community resources.

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

##### 1. Evaluation Studies Planned

- Before-After (before and after program)

##### Evaluation Results

Our main goal in 4-H Volunteerism is increased volunteer enrollment and training and staff training.

Impact Area

2007

2006

% Increase

# Community Clubs

178

121

47

# Special Interest/Project Clubs

151

128

18

# After School Clubs

49

19

158

# Adult Volunteers

2122

1890

12

# Resource Volunteers

170

33

415

# Direct Volunteers

768

716

7

# Indirect Volunteers

1184

1141

3.7

Economic Impact of Volunteer to Alabama 4-H:

2122 Volunteers Volunteer an average of 6 Hours/Year = 12,732 Total Hours = \$238,979.64 ECONOMIC IMPACT  
(2007 Value of Volunteer Time = \$18.77/hr as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics)

In addition to huge strides in volunteer enrollment and economic impact, we also had success in training our 4-H field staff that function at the local level. Three training opportunities took place in 2007 January, September and December. Never have we offered so many opportunities to address volunteer management or provided so many opportunities for staff to ask questions and communicate with their peers statewide. This training is why we had the successes identified in the above table and were able to provide economic impact at this level.

**Key Items of Evaluation**

Highlights Of Reported Accomplishments:

Economic Impact of 4-H Volunteers to Alabama = \$238,979.64 (More Information In Evaluation Results)

4-H Volunteerism Contacts: 40992 Direct & 389084 Indirect

4-H Volunteer Statistical Increases Noted in Evaluation Results (Based on 4-H PLUS ES237 Statistical Information)

Impact Area

2007

2006

% Increase

# Community Clubs

178

121

47

# Special Interest/Project Clubs

151

128

18

# After School Clubs

49

19

158

# Adult Volunteers

2122

1890

12

# Resource Volunteers

170

33

415

# Direct Volunteers

768

716

7

# Indirect Volunteers

1184

1141

3.7

**Program #2**

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

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

Human Nutrition, Diet, and Health

**V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)**

**1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage**

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
701	Nutrient Composition of Food	20%	20%		
702	Requirements and Function of Nutrients and Other Food Cor	20%	20%		
703	Nutrition Education and Behavior	20%	20%		
704	Nutrition and Hunger in the Population	10%	10%		
723	Hazards to Human Health and Safety	10%	10%		
724	Healthy Lifestyle	10%	10%		
805	Community Institutions, Health, and Social Services	10%	10%		
	<b>Total</b>	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
<b>Plan</b>	92.3	12.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	24.6	3.2	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
477137	191698	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
587282	191698	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
1775123	337656	0	0

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

**1. Brief description of the Activity**

The primary activities in this ETP21H - Metropolitan Health, Nutrition and Wellness - U&NNTP

#### Hand Washing

3900 students and young adults participated in 40 hand washing demonstrations presented at school programs, health fairs, and health conference exhibits. The demonstrations utilized an interactive mobile hand washing unit called Germ City. As a result of traveling through Germ City, more than 65% of the participants improved their hand washing techniques.

## Walking and Exercise Groups

365 older adults participated in low-impact exercises and nutrition education programs to improve their health, including mobility, flexibility, strength, and endurance while relieving stress and anxiety. 20 groups were formed statewide and walked and exercised for 6-10 weeks. 95% of participants who walked or stepped improved their mobility, strength, weight, blood pressure, and their intake of medication.

## Health, Nutrition and Wellness Groups

1400 teens and youth learned how to eat and exercise for better health. They attended 35 interactive classes on nutrition, health and controlling or preventing chronic diseases such as obesity, diabetes, hypertension, heart disease, stroke, and cancer. In addition, physical inactivity, exercise and the benefits of exercise were included. Dancing was the primary exercise of choice.

## Health Conferences

Nearly 800 women attended forums, conferences, and workshops on diabetes, hypertension, heart disease, cancer, obesity in women, avoiding strokes, consequences of physical inactivity, the benefits of physical exercise, healthy eating, and cooking healthy foods. Participants gained hands-on knowledge and skills, and received a health information kit to maintain their health.

#### Relay for Life Support

As part of its fundraising efforts, the American Cancer Society (ACS) offers the Relay for Life walk-a-thon to support the prevention, early detection, and treatment of cancer. Extension's Metro Knights Team has participated in the fundraiser for 4 straight years. While doubling participants, the team nearly doubled the amount of donations collected from \$1,500 in 2006 to \$2,660 in 2007, which earned the team recognition as a Bronze Team.

## BET GIRLS SUMMER CAMP

Alabama Extension collaborated with Black Entertainment Television (BET) and the BET Foundation (BETF) to sponsor a summer health camp for girls to teach them how to lose weight, build self-esteem, prepare nutritional meals, practice portion control, eat healthier, and increase physical activity. As a result of the weeklong camp, 107 girls lost 354 lbs total with an average weight loss of 3.65 lbs. each.

## Media and Health Fairs

Alabama Extension partnered with the University of Alabama-Birmingham's School of Public Health and radio station WHMA 1390 to bring "Body Love" (a radio soap) to its listening audience. Weekly topics include glucose monitoring, weight management, symptoms of diabetes, regular doctor visits, healthy eating, physical activity level and the consequences of unregulated diabetes. Also, through community outreach, 16,090 brochures, pamphlets, educational kits on current health, nutrition and wellness issues have been disseminated to the target audiences, as well as 17,000 diabetes newsletters.

### 2. Brief description of the target audience

The primary target audience is the general public.

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

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	160000	340000	50000	100000
2007	14940	233040	6830	0

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

**Patent Applications Submitted**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan:</b>	0
2007 :	0

**Patents listed**

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

**Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	0	0	0

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

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

- This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which a

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	10	0

**Output #2**

**Output Measure**

- ETP 21H Metropolitan Health, Nutrition and Wellness

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O No.	Outcome Name
1	<p>Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:</p> <p>Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed</p> <p>What: Specifically what was done and how it was done.</p> <p>When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.</p> <p>Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved.</p> <p>Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.</p> <p>So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.</p> <p>Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.</p>
2	<p>Major outcome measures in Human Nutrition, Diet, and Health will be the decrease in diseases which are directly related to nutrition, and the decrease in the percent of obese adults and children. The yearly targets below are percentage decreases in diseases.</p>
3	<p>ETP 21H Metropolitan Health, Nutrition and Wellness</p>
4	<p>ETP 21H Metropolitan Health, Nutrition and Wellness</p> <p>Held 40 hand washing demonstrations; conducted 20 groups for older adults for 6-10 weeks; 35 interactive classes for 1400 youth and teens on nutrition, health, and exercise; and a seminar for 65 senior companions on nutrition and food preparation; disseminated information on chronic diseases; and 10 major health conferences, forums, and workshops for 800 women on chronic diseases, exercise, and health eating.</p>

**Outcome #1**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:

Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed

What: Specifically what was done and how it was done.

When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.

Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved.

Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.

So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes.

Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.

Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	9	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
702	Requirements and Function of Nutrients and Other Food Components
805	Community Institutions, Health, and Social Services
723	Hazards to Human Health and Safety
701	Nutrient Composition of Food
703	Nutrition Education and Behavior

704	Nutrition and Hunger in the Population
724	Healthy Lifestyle

**Outcome #2****1. Outcome Measures**

Major outcome measures in Human Nutrition, Diet, and Health will be the decrease in diseases which are directly related to nutrition, and the decrease in the percent of obese adults and children. The yearly targets below are percentage decreases in diseases.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	5	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
703	Nutrition Education and Behavior
805	Community Institutions, Health, and Social Services
701	Nutrient Composition of Food
724	Healthy Lifestyle

**Outcome #3****1. Outcome Measures**

ETP 21H Metropolitan Health, Nutrition and Wellness

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Proper hand washing is the best defense against spreading germs and causing infectious diseases. Nutrition education and exercise reduce the incidences of chronic diseases, including youth by 25%. As chronic diseases increase the quality of life decreases and health care costs increase by billions of dollars. American Cancer Society fundraising efforts lessen fears and provide inspiration to those affected by cancer.

**What has been done**

To improve health and wellness among participants in ETP 21H Metropolitan Health, Nutrition and Wellness, 40 hand washing demonstrations, 20 exercise groups for older adults, 35 interactive, nutrition, health and exercise classes, 10 health conferences, summer health camp for obese girls, 25, 30-minute radio program on chronic diseases, and disseminated 35,000 pieces of health literature, and participated in walk-a-thon.

**Results**

65% of the participants improved their hand washing techniques; 95% of older adults who walked or stepped improved their mobility, strength, weight, blood pressure, and reduced their intake of medication; 1400 youth learned how to properly eat and exercise for better health; 800 women gained hands-on knowledge of good nutrition practices and food preparation; Relay for Life team raised \$2,660, doubling their team members and funds; 99.5% among 107 girls that attended a summer camp lost a total of 354 lbs., while a 3-month follow-up found that 26% continued to lose 1-36 additional lbs.; and 90 diabetic kits were distributed to newly diagnosed diabetics.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
703	Nutrition Education and Behavior
723	Hazards to Human Health and Safety
724	Healthy Lifestyle

**Outcome #4****1. Outcome Measures**

ETP 21H Metropolitan Health, Nutrition and Wellness

Held 40 hand washing demonstrations; conducted 20 groups for older adults for 6-10 weeks; 35 interactive classes for 1400 youth and teens on nutrition, health, and exercise; and a seminar for 65 senior companions on nutrition and food preparation; disseminated information on chronic diseases; and 10 major health conferences, forums, and workshops for 800 women on chronic diseases, exercise, and health eating.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Proper hand washing is the best defense against spreading germs and causing infectious diseases. Nutrition education and exercise reduce the incidences of chronic diseases, including youth by 25%. As chronic diseases increase the quality of life decreases and health care costs increase by billions of dollars. American Cancer Society fundraising efforts lessen fears and provide inspiration to those affected by cancer.

**What has been done**

To improve health and wellness among participants in ETP 21H Metropolitan Health, Nutrition and Wellness, 40 hand washing demonstrations, 20 exercise groups for older adults, 35 interactive, nutrition, health and exercise classes, 10 health conferences, summer health camp for obese girls, 25, 30-minute radio program on chronic diseases, and disseminated 35,000 pieces of health literature, and participated in walk-a-thon.

**Results**

65% of the participants improved their hand washing techniques; 95% of older adults who walked or stepped improved their mobility, strength, weight, blood pressure, and reduced their intake of medication; 1400 youth learned how to properly eat and exercise for better health; 800 women gained hands-on knowledge of good nutrition practices and food preparation; Relay for Life team raised \$2,660, doubling their team members and funds; 99.5% among 107 girls that attended a summer camp lost a total of 354 lbs., while a 3-month follow-up found that 26% continued to lose 1-36 additional lbs.; and 90 diabetic kits were distributed to newly diagnosed diabetics.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
703	Nutrition Education and Behavior
724	Healthy Lifestyle
723	Hazards to Human Health and Safety

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

**External factors which affected outcomes**

- Economy
- Competing Programatic Challenges
- Populations changes (immigration,new cultural groupings,etc.)

**Brief Explanation**

- Greater agent program involvement statewide would have allowed for a broader outreach
- Increased literacy- friendly educational resources and transportation accessibility would have allowed for a greater audience participation
- Due to the increasing diverse Alabama population, expanded educational opportunities are needed to include other ethnic groups

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

**1. Evaluation Studies Planned**

- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)
- Comparisons between program participants (individuals,group,organizations) and non-participants

**Evaluation Results**

ETP 21H Metropolitan Health, Nutrition and Wellness

- Improved hand washing techniques among Alabama citizens.
- Improved mobility, strength and blood pressure, and reduce weight and intake of medication.
- Gained knowledge on eating and exercising for better health.
- Raised funds for breast cancer research.
- Reduced risk factors associated with chronic diseases in young girls.

**Key Items of Evaluation**

ETP 21H Metropolitan Health, Nutrition and Wellness

- About 2,535 of program (Germ City) participants improved their hand washing techniques.
- About 347 older adults who participated in "Walking and Exercise" improved their mobility, strength, weight, blood pressure, and reduced their intake of medication.
- About 1400 teens and youth gained knowledge on healthy eating and exercise.
- Nearly 800 women gained knowledge and skills on diabetes, hypertension, heart disease, cancer, obesity, avoiding strokes, consequences of physical inactivity, benefits of exercise, healthy eating, and cooking healthy foods. The prior information was contained in a health information kit given during the conferences.
- Through American Cancer Society "Relay for Life" program, 26 participants nearly doubled the amount of donations collected from \$1,500 in 2006 to \$2,660 in 2007, which earned the team recognition as a Bronze Team.
- Results from the summer health camp for girls, sponsored by ACES and Black Entertainment Television (BET), showed that 107 girls lost 354 lbs total with an average weight loss of 3.65 lbs. each.

**Program #3**

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

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

Home Grounds, Gardening, and Home Pests

**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	20%	0%		
111	Conservation and Efficient Use of Water	20%	20%		
125	Agroforestry	0%	75%		
205	Plant Management Systems	20%	5%		
211	Insects, Mites, and Other Arthropods Affecting Plants	10%	0%		
212	Pathogens and Nematodes Affecting Plants	10%	0%		
215	Biological Control of Pests Affecting Plants	20%	0%		
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>		

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

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

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	25.9	6.3	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	27.2	4.3	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
577918	258446	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
649567	258446	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
2957482	455228	0	0

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

**1. Brief description of the Activity**

The primary activities in this area are 8 statewide Extension Team Projects. These are:

ETP20A Urban Horticulture Initiatives Program - U&NNTP

ETP20A1 - Horticulture Therapy Programs - Urban Horticulture Program - U&NNTP

ETP20B - Urban New Nontraditional Urban Horticultural Enterprises - Urban Nontraditional Commercial Horticulture Program - U&NNTP

ETP20D - Household and Structure pest Insects Management (with 3 sub-projects for home ground, urban forestry, and commercial horticulture)

ETP20E - Alabama Master Gardener Program

ETP20F1 - Pesticide Safety Education Program (PSEP)

ETP20G - Home Horticulture Hotline

ETP20H - Yard and Garden 101- Home Pest & Pest Management

Each project includes a variety of educational activities. Detailed descriptions of the activities of these projects are available on the ACES intranet.

Project 20B Urban New and Nontraditional Programs is described in detail in this and all other sections. The goal of this program is to improve the quality of life, provide training for viable new nontraditional horticulture enterprises, and increase farm income. Enterprises will include: beekeeping, vermiculture, mushrooms, water catchment system for irrigation of commercial crops, farmers' markets, others as requested by PAC or other stakeholders. Programs were initiated to train producers on production/marketing/harvesting of crops from selected enterprises, assist in the establishment of commercial enterprises, increase income of producers, encourage producers to reinvest some of profits into enterprise expansion, establish water catchment systems for irrigation, assist with establishment of Farmers' Markets.

- 7 shiitake demonstrations and tours were conducted.
- 2 water catchment tours were conducted.
- 1 water catchment training was conducted
- 1 proposal was submitted for water catchment funding
- 2 proposals were submitted for mushroom research.
- 3 farmers' market meetings were conducted
- 2 farmers' market days were held for the sale of produce.
- Continued vermiculture programming at Wetlands Edge Environmental Center
- Continued Apiculture project with 7 producers.
- Continued water catchment, shiitake and oyster mushroom research
- Newspaper and radio media on shiitake mushrooms production and water catchment programs.

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

The primary target audiences are the general public, farmers, Alabama Department of Agriculture, RC&D Council, County Commissioners (Lawrence), city council (Moulton) and Jones Valley Urban Farm. The target audience is generally over 21, male and female, and racial mix varies with location.

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

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	55000	600000	20000	200000
2007	829	65610	196	0

**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	1	0	1

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

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

- This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which a

Year	Target	Actual
2007	8	0

**Output #2**

**Output Measure**

- Outcomes and impacts anticipated are: increased knowledge of potential producers, establishment of new enterprises, increas

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	73277

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O No.	Outcome Name
1	A major outcome will be the number of regional horticultural hot-line centers that are created and staffed by Master Gardener Volunteers.
2	<p>Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:</p> <p>Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed</p> <p>What: Specifically what was done and how it was done.</p> <p>When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.</p> <p>Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved.</p> <p>Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.</p> <p>So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.</p> <p>Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.</p>
3	Outcomes were measured using surveys to determine: behavior changes, value of service or program, knowledge gained, program evaluation. Data collected during the program/project includes: yields, income, market sales, and number of catchment systems.

**Outcome #1**

**1. Outcome Measures**

A major outcome will be the number of regional horticultural hot-line centers that are created and staffed by Master Gardener Volunteers.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	4	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
212	Pathogens and Nematodes Affecting Plants
102	Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships
205	Plant Management Systems
215	Biological Control of Pests Affecting Plants

**Outcome #2**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:

**Why:** Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed

**What:** Specifically what was done and how it was done.

**When:** If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.

**Where:** Specific location-- the county or counties involved.

**Who and how many:** The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.

**So what:** This is the part that gives the real meaning to

"success". The basic question to be answered in this part is

"what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes.

Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.

Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

## 2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

### 3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

### 3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	15	0

### 3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

## 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
102	Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships
205	Plant Management Systems
215	Biological Control of Pests Affecting Plants
211	Insects, Mites, and Other Arthropods Affecting Plants
125	Agroforestry
111	Conservation and Efficient Use of Water
212	Pathogens and Nematodes Affecting Plants

**Outcome #3****1. Outcome Measures**

Outcomes were measured using surveys to determine: behavior changes, value of service or program, knowledge gained, program evaluation. Data collected during the program/project includes: yields, income, market sales, and number of catchment systems.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	73277

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Stakeholders include farmers, Alabama Department of Agriculture, Rural Development Councils, County Commissioners, City Council and Jones Valley Urban Farm. Programs were initiated to train producers on production/marketing/harvesting of selected enterprises, establishment of commercial enterprises, increase income, encourage reinvestment into enterprise expansion, water catchment systems for irrigation, Farmers' Market establishment.

**What has been done**

- \* 7 shiitake demonstrations and tours
- \* 2 water catchment tours
- \* 1 water catchment training
- \* 1 proposal for water catchment
- \* 2 proposals on mushroom waste for pest control
- \* 3 farmers' market meetings
- \* 2 farmers' market days for the sale of produce
- \* Vermiculture programming at Wetlands Edge Environmental Center
- \* Apiculture project with 9 producers
- \* Water catchment, shiitake and oyster mushroom research
- \* Newspaper and radio media on shiitake mushroom production and water catchment.

**Results**

- \* 3 shiitake mushroom demonstrations--15 participants, 500 logs inoculated.
- \* 4 mushroom farm/research tours.
- \* 4 water catchment tours, one presentation.
- \* 1 research paper in internal review.
- \* 1 mushroom publication
- \* 1000 logs inoculated for agroforestry production with water catchment.
- \* Vermiculture projects: \$109 in worm, fertilizer and potting soil sales.
- \* 3 apiculture projects: 32 gallons of honey, \$1280.
- \* Bees pollinated about 15 acres of watermelons, vegetables, soybeans and cotton. Increasing returns \$3900/10 acres.
- \* Fruit and vegetable growers organized two temporary farmers' market events. Growers sold \$18,000 for both market days. Sales increased hourly returns by \$156/hour compared to other markets.
- \* County commissioners and the city obtained \$50,000+ to build a new facility available in 2008.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
205	Plant Management Systems

111	Conservation and Efficient Use of Water
125	Agroforestry

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

### External factors which affected outcomes

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

### Brief Explanation

Fungus destroyed major worm producer crop.

Drought destroyed 16 bee hives.

Drought destroyed 1000 mushroom logs inoculated in 2006.

Program priorities for energy have reduced funding resources for water management.

## 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)

### Evaluation Results

- 77% knowledge gained about shiitake mushroom production
- 62% likelihood participants will grow shiitake mushrooms.
- 75% increase in knowledge of fruit production.
- 71% increase in knowledge of rainwater catchment systems.
- 73% likelihood participants will collect rainwater for irrigation.

### Key Items of Evaluation

The Urban New and Nontraditional Enterprises Extension Team project had a \$74,000 impact in 2007. The greatest contribution to this impact is the development of a farmers market in Moulton, AL. The temporary farm-to-market days resulted in not only \$18,000 in income for farmers, but also a resource for local residents to obtain locally grown fresh produce and the establishment of a permanent market that is almost completed. Farmers sold their produce in one-fourth the time, reducing the number of hours they had to spend at the market and the labor they had to pay for marketing. Other project activities represented by this program include:

- 3 shiitake mushroom hands-on demonstrations for 15 participants were conducted in Birmingham, Tuscaloosa and Mobile. 500 logs were inoculated.
- 4 mushroom farm/research tours were conducted. Results of one post-program survey indicate there was a 77% knowledge gain about mushrooms and a 75% increase in knowledge about fruit production. There is a 62% likelihood that the responding participants will start growing shiitake mushrooms.
- 4 water catchment tours were conducted and one water catchment presentation. Post tour surveys indicated a 71% increase in knowledge of rainwater catchment systems. There is a 73% likelihood that the responding participants will collect rainwater for irrigation.
- Water catchment demonstration system that collected over 2,000 gallons of water for irrigation.
- 1 research paper is currently in the internal review process.
- 1,000 logs were inoculated for agroforestry production with water catchment.
- Vermiculture projects generated \$108.86 in worms sales, fertilizer and potting soil. A fungus destroyed the major worm producer this year, significantly reducing yields.
- 3 apiculture projects produced 32 gallons of honey worth \$1,280. Four producers had no honey and 16 hives were lost due to drought.
- Bees were used to pollinate about 15 acres of watermelons, vegetables, soybeans and cotton. Yield increases of 25-30% and improvement of melon quality are normal. Yields were not compared to non pollinated crops due to the size of the acreage and farms. Assuming an average yield of 800 melons per acre, a 30% increase in yield would improve returns by about \$336/acre or \$3,360 for 10 acres. Average cotton yields in Alabama are 645 pounds per acre. A 15 to 20% increase due to pollination would result in yields of 741 to 774 pounds per acre. At a price of \$0.55 per pound, that is a total increase in returns of \$52.80/acre or \$528.00 for 10 acres.
- A series of meetings were conducted to organize fruit and vegetable growers into a cohesive group that resulted in two temporary farmers' market events. The growers sold an average of about \$750 per grower in about two hours for a total of \$18,000 for both market days. Sales at this market provided producers with a \$187.50/hour return compared to an hourly return of \$31.25 at other markets.
- As a result of the success of these two market days, the county commission and the city have obtained in excess of \$50,000 to construct a new facility for growers. This facility will be available for producers in 2008.

**Program #4**

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

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

Forestry, Wildlife, and Natural Resources

**V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)**

**1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage**

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
123	Management and Sustainability of Forest Resources	30%	30%		
124	Urban Forestry	10%	10%		
125	Agroforestry	10%	10%		
134	Outdoor Recreation	25%	25%		
135	Aquatic and Terrestrial Wildlife	15%	15%		
136	Conservation of Biological Diversity	10%	10%		
	<b>Total</b>	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
<b>Plan</b>	20.7	4.3	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	20.4	4.2	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
424151	248989	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
487294	248989	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
2824862	438569	0	0

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

**1. Brief description of the Activity**

The Forestry, Wildlife and Natural Resources Extension Team Project is a statewide program dedicated to developing citizen volunteer monitoring of Alabama's lakes, streams and coasts. Information is organized using the major watersheds of the state as a template. Involvement in the Alabama Water Watch Program (AWW) included promotion of AWW, serving as a resource center for water testing kits, coordination of workshops, and training as AWW monitors and trainers. New volunteers were provided with training through water chemistry, bacteriological, and stream biomonitoring workshops; existing volunteers were provided with recertification training. Experienced monitors were also provided additional training allowing them to become certified trainers. Water quality data collected by volunteers is available to the public on a list serve that is regularly updated. AWW participated in 18 outreach activities, 11 group meetings and events such as the Save Our Saugahatchee E. coli sampling blitz, and 13 miscellaneous meetings; attended and presented papers at 17 Conferences and Seminars. AWW publications and data were distributed to six states and other organizations; attended four AWW Association Meetings and several Clean Water Partnership and AWW group meetings. Approximately 60 people attended the AWW Annual Meeting and Picnic. Provision of natural resources education to the general public and educational programs targeting professional land managers was provided as a separate effort. These programs provided an overview of the wetland delineation process and related regulations, information on wetland and stream mitigation, and general information on water resources. Exploring Alabama's Living Streams curriculum workbook was printed; Citizen Volunteer Water Monitoring at Wolf Bay was published along with two newsletters and three brochures. Two editions of the Global Water Watch brochure was translated into Spanish and Portuguese, the AWW Association brochure was revised and printed and the AWW website was updated and maintained.

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

The Forestry, Wildlife and Natural Resources Extension Team Project is intended to provide information to the general population of Alabama and to provide educational material to professional land managers. The people who participated in activities related to this Project reflect a broad cross-section of the population. Sixty-five groups participated in AWW and submitted water quality data from nine of ten major watersheds. Eleven groups (17% of total) were formed by teachers and students, and five groups (8%) were formed mainly by professionals. The remaining 74% of groups were primarily composed of citizen volunteers. About nine percent of the groups sampled on the coast, while 19% sampled on lakes and 71% on streams across Alabama. Most AWW groups were located on the Tennessee Watershed followed closely by the Warrior, Tallapoosa, Coosa Watersheds. The most active groups were in the Coastal Plain (24% of data received), Tennessee (23% of data) and Tallapoosa (17% of data). Nine new monitoring groups were established. About 820 citizens held current AWW certifications during the report period. The professional land managers attending educational programs on wetland delineation and wetland and stream mitigation included loggers, land managers, master gardeners, employees of NGOs, and were predominantly male. General public attending natural resources education programs were predominantly youth (boy scouts, high school students) and a mix of roughly equal Caucasian and African-American.

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

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	45000	162000	23000	83000
2007	6000	80000	300	10000

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

**Patent Applications Submitted**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>
Plan:	0
2007 :	0

**Patents listed**

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

**Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	4	2	0

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

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

- This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which a

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	6	3

**Output #2**

**Output Measure**

- 87 training sessions, 420 people certified, 28 water chemistry workshops involving 262 people, 30 recertification sessions invo

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O No.	Outcome Name
1	<p>A major outcome will be the increase in active, viable county forestry and wildlife committees.</p>
2	<p>Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:</p> <p>Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed</p> <p>What: Specifically what was done and how it was done.</p> <p>When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.</p> <p>Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved.</p> <p>Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.</p> <p>So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.</p> <p>Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.</p>

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

A major outcome will be the increase in active, viable county forestry and wildlife committees.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	30	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
135	Aquatic and Terrestrial Wildlife
123	Management and Sustainability of Forest Resources
136	Conservation of Biological Diversity
124	Urban Forestry

**Outcome #2****1. Outcome Measures**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:

**Why:** Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed

**What:** Specifically what was done and how it was done.

**When:** If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.

**Where:** Specific location-- the county or counties involved.

**Who and how many:** The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.

**So what:** This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes.

Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.

Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	6	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Alabama is experiencing growth in population and a shift from rural to urban-based population. This puts increasing pressure on natural resources, especially water. Water quality and quantity are two issues that are of great importance to everyone in the state.

**What has been done**

Development of programs to education the general public about water quality and related resources. Training of the general public in water monitoring techniques which empowers people to watch over their water resources.

**Results**

Wolf Bay Watershed has been monitored by AWW volunteers for 10 years and this has led to it being upgraded to 'Outstanding Alabama Water' classification. One volunteer was able to resolve a leaking sewer line in a matter of weeks through bacteria monitoring. Alabama Water Watch has received a grant for phase 1 implementation of a nine-year plan to clean up a polluted creek in the Auburn/Opelika metropolitan area, and aThe Third Annual State of Our Watershed Conference—The Tallapoosa River Basing was held in April and was attended by about 70 people including business representatives, environmental citizen groups, post-secondary education-research personnel, and representatives from municipal, state and federal agencies, real estate and public schools. Professionals who attended educational programs ranked them as very useful and indicated an interest in related programs in the future.

#### 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
123	Management and Sustainability of Forest Resources
135	Aquatic and Terrestrial Wildlife
134	Outdoor Recreation

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

##### External factors which affected outcomes

- Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)
- Appropriations changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities
- Populations changes (immigration, new cultural groupings, etc.)

##### Brief Explanation

The widespread drought conditions that existed in most of the state, and the southeast in general, increased the interest in water-related issues. This created an environment in which people who might not have been interested suddenly found that water was an important issue for them.

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

##### 1. Evaluation Studies Planned

- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)
- Comparisons between program participants (individuals, group, organizations) and non-participants

##### Evaluation Results

In general, programs from this Extension Team Project have been well-received and the information generated by the participants of the AWW program are widely sought after as illustrated by the significant use of the list serve and requests for this information made by other states and agencies. Participants in the programs targeting professional land managers rated the programs as above-average and requested additional programming in related areas for the next year.

##### Key Items of Evaluation

87 training sessions, 420 people certified, 28 water chemistry workshops involving 262 people, 30 recertification sessions involving 110 people, 13 bacteriological workshops involving 132 people, 2 stream biomonitoring workshops involving 34 people, 10 new trainers certified during 4 Training-of-Trainer workshops, 65 citizen groups submitted data from 9 of 10 major watersheds, approximately 800 people subscribe to AWW listserve where 80% of data collected was entered; 60 professionals participated in continuing education workshops focused on wetland delineation and stream and wetland mitigation. Approximately 125 youth participated in hands-on natural resource education programs that included field exercises, introduction to natural resource on-line resources, and conventional classroom delivery of material.

**Program #5**

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

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

Food Safety, Preparation, and Preservation

**V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)**

**1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage**

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
501	New and Improved Food Processing Technologies	10%	10%		
503	Quality Maintenance in Storing and Marketing Food Products	10%	10%		
504	Home and Commercial Food Service	10%	10%		
711	Ensure Food Products Free of Harmful Chemicals, Including	35%	35%		
712	Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorgani	35%	35%		
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>		

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

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

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	11.2	0.0	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
217919	0	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
268224	0	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
853319	0	0	0

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

**1. Brief description of the Activity**

The primary activities in this area are 3 statewide Extension Team Projects.

However we will only be reporting the below listed ETP this year:.

ETP17A - Food Safety Training for Food Service Workers

A total of 57 Intensive Food Safety Certification classes have been taught to a total of 692 individuals. This training course has a very tough evaluation at the end of the course and once the individual has passed the test they become certified for 5 years. Five HACCP classes were taught to Child Nutrition Workers for a total of 148 individuals trained. Nine Serving It Safe classes that train nearly 200 individuals were also offered to food service workers. This course is offered to line workers to advance their food safety education when the ServSafe certification is not required of all employees.

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

The primary target audience is Food Service workers through out the state of Alabama. This includes food service workers in restaurants, school lunch programs and day care facilities.

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

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	34000	142000	21000	87000
2007	3074	622106	0	120542

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

**Patent Applications Submitted**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan:</b>	0
2007 :	0

**Patents listed**

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

**Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	3	0	0

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

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

- This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which a

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	3	3

**Output #2**

**Output Measure**

- Workshops: 57 ServSafe certification classes, 9 Serving it Safe classes, 3 Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point workshops w

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	1040

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

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

O No.	Outcome Name
1	A major outcome will be the number of food service workers who participate in Extension sponsored Food Safety Training.
2	<p>Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:</p> <p>Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed</p> <p>What: Specifically what was done and how it was done.</p> <p>When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.</p> <p>Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved.</p> <p>Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.</p> <p>So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.</p> <p>Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.</p>

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

A major outcome will be the number of food service workers who participate in Extension sponsored Food Safety Training.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	200	692

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Food Service facilities serve safer food and consumers that frequent the facility consume safer food

**What has been done**

Employees have been trained on the correct procedures to serve food safely.

**Results**

Food Serve workers were trained in an intensive Food Safety Certification course. Of the 692 taking the course, 568 passed the tested used as the evaluation instrument. Only 124 did not pass the exam but gain in food service safety was gained by the participants. Less intense workshops were offered to over 200 food service workers with a gain in food safety knowledge. Hazard Analysis Critical Control workshops were also offered with a gain in knowledge and behavior. Some, one on one trainings, were offered to assist the food service facilities on writing their individualized HACCP plans.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
504	Home and Commercial Food Service

**Outcome #2****1. Outcome Measures**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:

**Why:** Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed

**What:** Specifically what was done and how it was done.

**When:** If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.

**Where:** Specific location-- the county or counties involved.

**Who and how many:** The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.

**So what:** This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes.

Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.

Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

## 2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension

### 3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

### 3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	9	692

### 3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

#### Issue (Who cares and Why)

Food Service facilities serve safer food and consumers that frequent the facility receive safer food.

#### What has been done

Workshops were taught and safer food is being served.

#### Results

Of the 692 individuals trained 568 passed the test, therefore completing the evaluation instrument. Knowledge gain was measured on different food service topics.

Only 124 did not pass the exam but gain in food service safety was gained by the participants.

Less intense workshops were offered to over 200 food service workers with a gain in food safety knowledge.

Hazard Analysis Critical Control workshops were also offered with a gain in knowledge and behavior. One-on-one trainings were offered to assist the food service facilities on writing their individualized HACCP plans.

## 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
504	Home and Commercial Food Service

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

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

- Government Regulations

### **Brief Explanation**

We trained less individuals than we had planned because we changed to an intensive Food Service Training program which took more time to teach and therefore the intensity resulted in us training less individuals. The outcome from an intense Food Safety exam gave us excellent evaluation for the program.

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

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

- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)
- Comparisons between program participants (individuals, group, organizations) and non-participants
- Comparison between locales where the program operates and sites without program intervention

### **Evaluation Results**

Of the 692 taking the intensive food safety training course, 568 passed the test used as the evaluation instrument.

Only 124 did not pass the exam but gain in food service safety was gained by the participants.

Less intense workshops were offered to over 200 food service workers with a gain in food safety knowledge.

Hazard Analysis Critical Control workshops were also offered with a gain in knowledge and behavior. One-on-one trainings were offered to assist the food service facilities on writing their individualized HACCP plans.

### **Key Items of Evaluation**

Food Safety Certification was taught with an intense evaluation instrument.

HACCP workshops were given with the result being a HACCP plan written by each Food Service Facility and the output was that knowledge was evaluated about the importance and use of a HACCP plan.

**Program #6**

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

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

Family and Child Development

**V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)**

**1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage**

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being	70%	70%		
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals,	10%	10%		
806	Youth Development	20%	20%		
<b>Total</b>		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
<b>Plan</b>	19.7	3.9	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	17.4	3.8	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
338126	223344	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
416180	223344	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
1254494	393399	0	0

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

**1. Brief description of the Activity**

With the steady rise in the number of working parents of children--from infancy through preschool-age--comes an increasing need for safe, affordable, quality child care. Parents must rely on child care providers to care for their children, and the need to know that their children will be well cared for. The ability of child care providers to meet State of Alabama licensing requirements and, most importantly, to provide children and families with high quality child care depends upon the accessibility and availability of quality education and training. Early childcare settings are increasingly responsible for the care and early learning opportunities that young children need in order to be ready to succeed in school.

The purpose of this project is to address the educational needs of child care providers licensed to care for children in center-based or home-based businesses. Research shows that providers who are well-trained are more effective at providing the early learning and care experiences that contribute positively to young children's healthy development. In this project, Extension agents provide training intended to produce a gain in knowledge and understanding of child care practices in 6 key areas designated by the Alabama Department of Human Resources: Health and Safety, Child Development, Language Development & Learning, Discipline, Quality Child Care, and Caring for the Professional and the Family.

Between January 1 and December 31, 2007, agents conducted training workshops using one or more of the following facilitative, group-session formats: The Alabama Child Care Training Manual (ACCTM), the Better Kid Care satellite/video series (BKC), the Caregivers Caring for the Future workshop series (CCF) and the Right from Birth video series. In addition, 20 mentors working statewide with the Family Child Care Partnerships program, under the direction of the Family and Child Development (early childhood) Specialist, conducted one-on-one educational sessions, as well as group workshops, using a combination of ACES, CYFAR, and other research-based resources.

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

The target audience for the educational programming provided in this area includes child care providers licensed to care for children in center-based or home-based businesses, as well as other individuals pursuing specialized knowledge as participants in the early childhood care and education profession. This audience includes Center Directors, Center Teachers, Center Support Staff, Family child care home providers, Group child care home providers, Group child care home assistants, prospective child care licensees, and others, such as providers' family members, substitutes, and State licensing agents.

Our purpose in targeting this audience is based in extensive research which connects the quality of care (in the home or in child care settings) that children experience prior to entering the formal educational environment with their subsequent academic and social trajectories. Much of this research shows that the average child care setting in the United States provides mediocre care. With the increasing number of parents of young children entering the workforce and requiring child care in order to work, training and education initiatives are key to increasing the quality of care being provided to children.

A particular target of our programming is the family child care provider. Briefly defined, family child care settings are privately-owned enterprises offering paid, non-relative care in the care provider's home. The externally funded program, Family Child Care Partnerships (FCCP), FCCP focuses on Alabama's family child care providers because large segments of this audience have limited exposure to opportunities for training and professional networking. Family child care providers are some of the lowest paid workers in our economy. They find it challenging to consider doing "more" than the minimum, when doing so requires time and money to drive long distances to training on weeknights or weekends or to make arrangements to attend workshops offered only during the workday. The path to moving family child care providers beyond the minimum to the highest standards of child care requires creating opportunities for frequent, accessible, specialized training as well as professionalism experiences. Through its in-home mentoring approach, FCCP aims to create such opportunities and to overcome the relevance, time, and distance barriers that limit provider participation in professional development activities associated with the ability to provide high quality care.

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

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	42000	165000	20000	75000
2007	3597	69275	0	0

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

**Patent Applications Submitted**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>
Plan:	0
2007 :	0

**Patents listed**

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

**Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	1	1	2

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

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

- This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which a

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	9	0

**Output #2**

**Output Measure**

- Group training workshops. Agents and grant-funded mentors address multiple educational needs of licensed and potential chil

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	222

**Output #3**

**Output Measure**

- One-on-one mentoring visits to the homes of individual family child care providers. Mentoring visits are scheduled on a weekly

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	5430

**Output #4**

**Output Measure**

- Training hours. Certificates officially numbering completed training hours are issued quarterly to group training participants and

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	16985

**Output #5**

**Output Measure**

- Collaborations. Relationships with other organizations and agencies who support the development of a high quality early childl

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	58

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O No.	Outcome Name
1	A major outcome will be the number of parents who participate in Extension sponsored parenting training.
2	<p>Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:</p> <p>Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed</p> <p>What: Specifically what was done and how it was done.</p> <p>When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.</p> <p>Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved.</p> <p>Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.</p> <p>So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.</p> <p>Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.</p>
3	For 208 group-based workshops, indicators of change in knowledge were administered through a retrospective pre/post-test format, each containing 8 questions based on the specific workshop content. The average percentage increase in participant knowledge across all 208 workshops is reported under 'actual' and reflects the responses of the 1634 participants who completed these evaluations.
4	Assessment of quality in the caregiving practices of family child care providers enrolled in the Family Child Care Partnerships (FCCP) program was carried out a minimum of two times per year with 190 providers enrolled in the Family Child Care Partnerships program. The initial assessment was conducted using a nationally standardized instrument, the 32-item Family Day Care Rating Scale (FDCRS; Harms & Clifford, 1989). Mentors assessed items on a 7-point scale, with 7 being the highest quality rating. The final assessment in 2007 was a revision of this instrument, the 38-item Family Child Care Environments Rating Scale (FCCERS; Harms & Clifford, 2007), also assessed on a 7-point. Information about change in aggregated provider scores between Time 1 and the final assessment in 2007 is provided in the qualitative outcomes section below.

**Outcome #1**

**1. Outcome Measures**

A major outcome will be the number of parents who participate in Extension sponsored parenting training.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	200	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
806	Youth Development
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being

**Outcome #2**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:

**Why:** Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed

**What:** Specifically what was done and how it was done.

**When:** If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.

**Where:** Specific location-- the county or counties involved.

**Who and how many:** The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.

**So what:** This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes.

Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.

Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	15	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities
806	Youth Development

**Outcome #3**

**1. Outcome Measures**

For 208 group-based workshops, indicators of change in knowledge were administered through a retrospective pre/post-test format, each containing 8 questions based on the specific workshop content. The average percentage increase in participant knowledge across all 208 workshops is reported under 'actual' and reflects the responses of the 1634 participants who completed these evaluations.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	27

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Changes in knowledge precede the ability to change one's behavior, although they do not guarantee it. For the child care professionals who attend these group-based workshops, an increase in knowledge is part of what is required before we can reasonably expect any change in caregiving behaviors. The knowledge and behaviors required to provide high quality caregiving practices are not a matter of simple "mothering" or "babysitting." The quality standards that child care providers are required to adhere to by state licensing standards are extensive, involving specialized knowledge in basic child care, health, and safety issues; space and furnishings for care and learning; child development issues and children's language and reasoning skills; planning and conducting learning activities; discipline and children's social development; and professional business practices and relationships with parents. When providers have this specialized knowledge, they are much more likely to employ high quality child care practices. Research is clear that academically and socially desirable developmental outcomes for children who experience high quality care are significantly better than for children who experience mediocre quality care.

**What has been done**

Changes in knowledge precede the ability to change one's behavior, although they do not guarantee it. For the child care professionals who attend these group-based workshops, an increase in knowledge is part of what is required before we can reasonably expect any change in caregiving behaviors. The knowledge and behaviors required to provide high quality caregiving practices are not a matter of simple "mothering" or "babysitting." The quality standards that child care providers are required to adhere to by state licensing standards are extensive, involving specialized knowledge in basic child care, health, and safety issues; space and furnishings for care and learning; child development issues and children's language and reasoning skills; planning and conducting learning activities; discipline and children's social development; and professional business practices and relationships with parents. When providers have this specialized knowledge, they are much more likely to employ high quality child care practices. Research is clear that academically and socially desirable developmental outcomes for children who experience high quality care are significantly better than for children who experience mediocre quality care.

**Results**

An average percentage increase of 27% in participant knowledge was seen across 1634 child care professionals who attended one or more of the 208 workshops presented. On an individual level, an increase of 27% in knowledge is substantial. In the classroom, any teacher would be thrilled to see a student move from doing C-level work to A-level work; that kind of movement is what is seen in these results. In addition, we know that a significant proportion of the participants in our programs have been in child care for over 5 years. The fact that these caregivers continue to learn new things suggests that our workshops are relevant to their current and emerging concerns.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being

**Outcome #4****1. Outcome Measures**

Assessment of quality in the caregiving practices of family child care providers enrolled in the Family Child Care Partnerships (FCCP) program was carried out a minimum of two times per year with 190 providers enrolled in the Family Child Care Partnerships program. The initial assessment was conducted using a nationally standardized instrument, the 32-item Family Day Care Rating Scale (FDCRS; Harms & Clifford, 1989). Mentors assessed items on a 7-point scale, with 7 being the highest quality rating. The final assessment in 2007 was a revision of this instrument, the 38-item Family Child Care Environments Rating Scale (FCCERS; Harms & Clifford, 2007), also assessed on a 7-point. Information about change in aggregated provider scores between Time 1 and the final assessment in 2007 is provided in the qualitative outcomes section below.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

A large body of high quality, longitudinal research in the child care field indicates that the quality of caregiving practices has direct implications for the developmental outcomes for children. The use of a standardized measurement tool to assess actual provider behavior is invaluable for identifying needs related to improving those outcomes. These assessments also offer insight into where improvements in the program itself would lead to increased effectiveness with the target audience.

**What has been done**

We used a nationally standardized family child care quality rating instrument (FDCRS, 1989) and its updated revision (FCCERS, 2007) to assess the practices of 190 providers in their child care homes at the beginning and end of the year. Scale authors have not yet proposed a method for comparing scores on the two measures, but indicate that an average of a half-point decrease should be expected on the FCCERS (personal communication, Harms, 2007).

**Results**

Mentor assessments during the first quarter of the project year showed that FCCP providers in the aggregate averaged 4.47 across all FDCRS items. Note that on the national level, the average score across all 32-items is 3. End-of-year assessments showed that FCCP providers in the aggregate averaged 4.10 across all FCCERS items. From initial to end-of-year assessment, within comparable (but not identical subscales), improvement can be seen in social development indicators, raising quality for the average provider almost one point (+0.80). A decline in scores of the same magnitude is seen for indicators of basic care and needs (-0.80). Similarly, the learning activities subscale saw a decline of about three-quarters of one point (-0.78).

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being

**V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)****External factors which affected outcomes**

- Other (Used updated, more stringent Time 2 assessment instrument.)

**Brief Explanation**

The standardized measure used to assess behavior changes in quality in family child care at Time 2 was revised and updated to reflect recent research

on high quality care. Thus, its assessment standards were more stringent, resulting in lower scores on the Time 2 outcomes, compared to Time 1.

Authors of the two scales, the Family Day Care Rating Scale (FDCRS; Harms & Clifford, 1989) and the Family Child Care Environments Rating Scale (FCCERS; Harms & Clifford, 2007) have not yet provided published data that scientifically evaluates differences in the scores between the two measures

but have indicated that scores on the FCCERS will be lower than those on the FDCRS, in part due to increased stringency in health and safety

expectations. Personal communication with one of the authors (Harms, 2007) suggested that a half-point decrease should be expected.

An examination of the results shows that, within comparable (but not identical subscales), improvement can be seen in social development indicators, raising quality for the average provider almost one point (+0.80). A decline in scores of the same magnitude is seen for indicators of basic care and needs (-0.80). We are not surprised by this, since the FCCERS now includes the most stringent health and safety practices adopted from the Centers for Disease Control and the American Academy of Pediatrics. Similarly, the learning activities subscale saw a decline of about three-quarters of one point (-0.78). With the FCCERS, there is now an emphasis on accessibility of learning materials, involving allowing children to choose what they want to play with and having age-appropriate materials accessible for much of the day. This is a new concept for many providers that we are adapting our materials and training our mentors to address. While the particular subscales described above decreased more than the .50 estimated by Dr. Harms, we note that the overall FDCRS total did not decrease by quite that much (-.37); however, it is unclear how to evaluate this change at the present time. Certainly, 2008 outcomes will be more interpretable as both the initial and final assessment will be done using the FCCERS.

**V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)****1. Evaluation Studies Planned**

- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)

**Evaluation Results**

Over 220 workshops were conducted to provide specialized knowledge over the broad range of categories of expertise required to meet child care licensing requirements for training (20 hours per year). A total of 3,498 training hours were awarded to workshop participants. An average percentage increase of 27% in participant knowledge was seen across the 1634 child care professionals who attended and filled out post-pretest evaluations.

The Family Child Care Partnerships program conducted 5,430 on-site mentoring visits in the homes (i.e., child care settings) of more than 220 providers statewide. A total of 13,487 training hours were issued to these mentored providers. Mentor assessments during the first quarter of the project year showed that FCCP providers in the aggregate averaged 4.47 across all FDCRS items (where a score of 7 reflects the highest quality care and 1 reflects unacceptable quality). Note that on a national level, the average score across all 32-items is 3. End-of-year assessments showed that FCCP providers in the aggregate averaged 4.10 across all FCCERS items. From initial to end-of-year assessment, within comparable (but not identical subscales), improvement can be seen in social development indicators, raising quality for the average provider almost one point (+0.80). A decline in scores of the same magnitude is seen for indicators of basic care and needs (-0.80). Similarly, the learning activities subscale saw a decline of about three-quarters of one point (-0.78).

**Key Items of Evaluation**

The ability of child care providers to meet State of Alabama licensing requirements and to provide children and families with high quality child care depends upon the accessibility and availability of quality education and training. The educational efforts we have undertaken in this specific area of focus have offered Alabama providers multiple group and one-on-one training opportunities, especially in rural areas of the state where training is often difficult to access. Evaluation results have demonstrated that the quality of these training opportunities is at a level capable of producing measurable differences in both the knowledge and behavior of child care providers.

With regard to changes in knowledge, over 220 workshops were conducted providing specialized knowledge over the broad range of categories of expertise required to meet licensing requirements. These included workshops in basic child care, health, and safety issues; space and furnishings for care and learning; child development issues and children's language and reasoning skills; planning and conducting learning activities; discipline and children's social development; and professional business practices and relationships with parents. When providers have this specialized knowledge, research indicates that they are much more likely to employ high quality child care practices.

An average percentage increase of 27% in participant knowledge was seen across 1634 child care professionals who attended one or more of the 208 workshops presented (at which post-pretest data were collected). A 27% increase in provider knowledge, on an individual level, is comparable to seeing a student in a classroom setting go from doing C-level work to A-level work. While changes in knowledge do not guarantee the ability to change one's behavior, such an increase in knowledge is part of what is required before we can reasonably expect meaningful change in caregiving behaviors.

With regard to efforts to improve actual caregiving behaviors, the Family Child Care Partnerships program conducted 5,430 on-site mentoring visits in the homes (i.e., child care settings) of more than 220 providers statewide. A total of 13,487 training hours were issued to these mentored providers.

Assessment of caregiving quality was carried out a minimum of twice per year with 190 mentored providers using a nationally standardized measurement tool. In mid-2007 our mentors were trained to 85% reliability in the use of the updated version of this tool, revised to reflect more stringent practice standards. A one-third point decline in overall quality scores (assessed on a 7-point scale) from the initial to final assessment was seen, in line with the estimated half-point decline predicted by the assessment's authors. In contrast, an average improvement of nearly 1 point (.80) was seen on the subscale measuring practices that promote children's social development. Outcomes in future years will be more clearly interpretable as a result of using the same assessment across time. Until this evidence is collected, steady quality gains assessed in prior years among participants argue for seeing these behavior changes in a positive light.

**Program #7**

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

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

Economic and Community Development

**V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)**

**1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage**

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
605	Natural Resource and Environmental Economics	0%	10%		
608	Community Resource Planning and Development	0%	50%		
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals,	0%	20%		
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, ;	100%	0%		
805	Community Institutions, Health, and Social Services	0%	20%		
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>		

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

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

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	18.7	3.9	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	17.5	4.1	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
332093	242987	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
417372	242987	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
1939913	427997	0	0

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

**1. Brief description of the Activity**

The primary activity described herein is ETP 21D – Alabama Radon Education Program. It does not encompass the full group of targets from the Plan of Work.

Radon is a national health risk that, according to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, is estimated to cause 21,000 lung cancer deaths per year in the United States. The EPA estimates that 1 in 15 homes across the U.S. have elevated levels of radon. Backed by extensive research, the U.S. Surgeon General has warned that radon is the second leading cause of lung cancer behind smoking in the U.S. today. It is the leading cause of lung cancer in nonsmokers.

Radon is called the "silent killer" because it is a colorless, odorless, tasteless gas that cannot be detected without specifically testing for it. It occurs naturally in most soils and is in the air we breathe. Although radon gas dissipates in the air outside, it can enter a home or building through foundation cracks and openings around pipes. Once inside, it gets trapped and can build to high levels. This build-up increases the risk of lung cancer. Testing is the only way to determine if a home has elevated levels of radon. The Surgeon General recommends testing all homes because the home is where families spend the most time.

The Alabama Radon Education Program has been a grant-funded program of the Alabama Department of Public Health and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency since October 1997. The program concentrates its efforts in 14 Zone 1 counties, Calhoun, Clay, Cleburne, Colbert, Franklin, Jackson, Jefferson, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Limestone, Madison, Morgan, Shelby and Talladega, that have the highest incidence for elevated radon levels.

The Radon Education Program seeks to

- Increase the public's awareness to the health risks of radon and encourage people to take action to reduce the risk of radon-related lung cancer.
- Encourage testing
- Encourage mitigating homes with elevated radon levels. While no amount of radon is considered "safe," the EPA recommends remedial action when tests indicate 4 picocuries per liter (pCi/l).
- Encourage building new homes radon-resistant
- Encourage testing in real estate transactions

To accomplish these tasks, the program

- Provides workshops, meetings and programs to civic and community groups, work-place safety meetings, school and youth groups, Realtor and homebuilder associations, senior and adult education groups, medical groups and local governmental entities.
- Works with the media
- Provides low-cost radon test kits to the public
- Partners with other organizations, libraries, medical groups
- Produces a quarterly newsletter

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

The Radon Program seeks to inform both adults and youth, without regard to race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, veteran status, or disability. Its target audience includes homeowners, homebuilders, Realtors, home appraisers, home inspectors, code officials, medical professionals, policy makers and the general public. Some of the areas that audiences are reached include schools and youth groups, civic and community groups, senior and adult education programs, Realtor and homebuilder associations, medical offices, libraries and local government entities.

The program promotes the radon message to anyone who lives in a home or works in an office building, as radon is a health risk when trapped in buildings.

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

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	130000	530000	25000	100000
2007	8790	666302	6416	0

**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**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	22	1	23

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

**Output Target**

<b><u>Output #1</u></b>			
<b>Output Measure</b>			
• This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which a			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
2007	4	0	
<b><u>Output #2</u></b>			
<b>Output Measure</b>			
• Test kits offered for purchase			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
2007	{No Data Entered}	2388	
<b><u>Output #3</u></b>			
<b>Output Measure</b>			
• Number of TV programs			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
2007	{No Data Entered}	5	
<b><u>Output #4</u></b>			
<b>Output Measure</b>			
• Number of Radio spots submitted			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
2007	{No Data Entered}	10	
<b><u>Output #5</u></b>			
<b>Output Measure</b>			
• Number of News articles submitted			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
2007	{No Data Entered}	19	
<b><u>Output #6</u></b>			
<b>Output Measure</b>			
• Newsletters with Radon information			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
2007	{No Data Entered}	17	
<b><u>Output #7</u></b>			
<b>Output Measure</b>			
• Number of exhibits			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
2007	{No Data Entered}	120	
<b><u>Output #8</u></b>			
<b>Output Measure</b>			
• Medical Professionals contacts			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
2007	{No Data Entered}	41	
<b><u>Output #9</u></b>			
<b>Output Measure</b>			
• Homebuilder contacts			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
2007	{No Data Entered}	103	
<b><u>Output #10</u></b>			
<b>Output Measure</b>			
• Home Inspector contacts			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
2007	{No Data Entered}	17	
<b><u>Output #11</u></b>			
<b>Output Measure</b>			
• number of Realtor programs			
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
2007	{No Data Entered}	18	

**Output #12****Output Measure**

- Adult Group meetings

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	102

**Output #13****Output Measure**

- 4-H and other youth meetings

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	162

**Output #14****Output Measure**

- Club leaders trained

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	22

**Output #15****Output Measure**

- Homeowners referred to mitigators

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	64

**Output #16****Output Measure**

- Proclamations acquired

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	9

**Output #17****Output Measure**

- Total literature distributed

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	47876

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O No.	Outcome Name
1	<p>Outcomes from this program area include: a) Number of community and economic development programs conducted, b) Community and economic development training resources developed, c) Number of community and economic development projects conducted</p>
2	<p>Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:</p> <p>Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed</p> <p>What: Specifically what was done and how it was done.</p> <p>When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.</p> <p>Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved.</p> <p>Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.</p> <p>So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.</p> <p>Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.</p>
3	<p>Number of test kits purchased as a result of a program, activity or media report</p>
4	<p>Number of people who actually use a test kit compared to the number who purchased or received a kit</p>
5	<p>Number of homes that were mitigated</p>
6	<p>Number of new homes built radon-resistant</p>
7	<p>Number of homes tested during a real estate transaction.</p>
8	<p>Number of municipalities that adopted the radon control Appendix F with their building code.</p>
9	<p>Success story 1: The annual Huntsville/Madison County Building, Home, and Remodeling Show took place March 2-4 at the Von Braun Civic Center. The Alabama Radon Program, in its seventh year of participation, provided an educational display booth, complete with a radon system, publications and test kits. A seminar was offered on Sunday. The show drew 15,057 attendees. Three hundred seventy-four test kits and more than 3,300 pieces of literature were distributed.</p> <p>Extension staff members who worked at the show included Patricia W. Smith (Radon Regional Extension Agent), Walter Harris (Madison County Extension Coordinator), Walter Rodgers (Regional Extension Agent-REA), Shirley Whitten (REA), Clarene Johnson (Extension District Director), Teresa McDonald (Colbert County Extension Coordinator), Karen Thompson (REA), Laura Booth (Extension Associate), Holly Cannon (Radon Assistant) and Susan Roberts (Assistant Program Director). Assistance was provided by certified mitigators and testers, who helped answer technical questions.</p> <p>About 170 people (45%) who purchased test kits at the home show have tested their homes and 26% of the homes have indicated high radon levels.</p> <p>The Radon Program is a member of the builders association. Members include the program's target audience: builders, remodelers, developers, subcontractors, suppliers, financial institutions, Realtors and other trades that are connected with the home building industry.</p>

<p>10</p>	<p>Success story 2: The Alabama Radon Program exhibited a display at the 2007 Shoals Home Builders Association's annual Spring Building and Remodeling Show Feb. 24-25, in Florence.                  ACES staff members involved were Radon REA Patricia W. Smith, Teresa McDonald, Colbert County CEC, Katrina Cole, Colbert County 4-H Extension Agent, Melanie Allen, Lauderdale County 4-H Extension Agent, Francine Creecy, Lauderdale County Extension Reporter, and Mary J. Andrews, Lauderdale County REA. Certified mitigator Leon Singletary was also on hand to answer technical questions.                  The booth highlighted the dangers posed by radon and emphasized methods of removing radon where high levels exist. One attendee said 'For 15 years I have been meaning to get around to doing this (test his home for radon). Okay, talk to me about radon and how do I do this?' The attendee purchased and used the test kit and found negligible levels of radon in his home.                  The ACES Alabama Radon Education Program booth was one of 81 booths at the show. Over 2,000 individuals attended the home show. Over 650 pieces of literature were distributed. In addition to distributing literature and explaining the dangers of radon and mitigation techniques, radon test kits were sold to interested citizens. More than 40 test kits were sold at this two-day event. Twenty-six (62%) test kits were used and five homes out of 22 valid tests (22%) indicated a need for mitigation.                  The Alabama Radon Education Program is a member of the builders association which has a membership of over 400 business firms from the Shoals area of northwest Alabama. Its membership includes the program's target audience of builders, remodelers, developers, subcontractors, suppliers, financial institutions, Realtors and other trades that are connected with the home building industry.</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>Success story 3: The Radon in Alabama Web site, introduced in July 2000, offers a multitude of resources for those wishing to learn more about radon in Alabama. Alabama citizens can order test kits through Extension on the web site. Since its inception, 139 test kits have been purchased from the site, with 76 (54%) of the test kits used. Eight of 40 homes (20%) tested had elevated levels of radon, indicating a need to mitigate.</p>

- 12 Success story 4: Throughout the year, the Alabama Radon Program actively promotes radon education, but in January, special emphasis is made to pick up the pace with increased awareness emphasis for National Radon Action Month (NRAM).
- This year's activities took on a national flavor, with EPA offering a special web site of NRAM activities featured in each state: [www.epa.gov/radon/rnactionmonth.htm#Radon\\_Events\\_in\\_Your\\_Area](http://www.epa.gov/radon/rnactionmonth.htm#Radon_Events_in_Your_Area), where citizens, radon industry, radon state programs and others could view the events, get ideas and/or join in the activities.
- In Alabama, national media interest for NRAM provided an added stimulus for local media interest in radon health risk promotions.
- News report headlines such as 'What you don't know about radon gas could kill you,' and 'Agent says radon a problem in the area,' helped draw attention to the radon message, resulting in a dramatic increase in radon test kit purchases and testing.
- Radio talk show hosts took a special interest in our message. Pat Smith, Radon Regional Extension Agent, and Teresa McDonald, Colbert County Extension Coordinator (CEC), were featured on the radio program, 'A Look at the Shoals,' and Deborah Mathews, Cleburne CEC, was featured several times during NRAM on WPIL FM Radio and WTDR FM Radio. In addition to the talk shows, numerous radio stations in north Alabama played the EPA-provided national PSAs which were localized for Alabama.
- We were also able to appear in several TV programs during the month. Pat Smith was on 'For Your Information,' a Shoals Community College TV show that was shown continuously in January and February, and 'Talk of the Town on the Light Side of the News' on WYAM TV 56. In Cleburne County, Mathews was fortunate to appear on the Wake-Up Alabama show on WJXS TV.
- In addition to county media efforts, the Alabama Department of Public Health sent out a statewide press release that generated awareness among health department associates as well as the news media.
- On the local level, the program's radon agents brought the radon health risk message to many local government officials, resulting in nine proclamations declaring January as National Radon Action Month within their communities, including a state proclamation signed by Governor Riley. The proclamations came from the Madison County Commission, Clay County Commission, Talladega County Commission, City of Killen, City of Sheffield, City of Muscle Shoals, Colbert County Commission, and the City of Tuscumbia.
- Many events were scheduled within each county. Highlights from each county include a Community Radon Awareness Forum arranged by Agent Walter Rodgers and Radon REA Pat Smith in Madison County with several community and business leaders discussing the importance of radon testing and prevention. In Clay County, CEC Marsha Moorehead distributed Radon Activity Books, Radon Ranger comic books and test kit coupons to 22 4-H Clubs and other youth groups in the county. In Cleburne County, CEC Deborah Mathews presented programs to Cleburne High School's anatomy and physiology classes and provided special radon informational assistance to home school groups at the Anniston Museum of Natural History. In Colbert County, CEC Teresa McDonald included NRAM information in the January/February 2007 Home Economics Newsletter distributed to 439 households. In Limestone County, CEC Betty Ann Broman presented a radon program to a local civic group as well as met with officials at Athens/Limestone Hospital to implement the Newborn Program. In Lauderdale County, Agent Melanie Allen provided a special reading activity at the Florence Public Library featuring well known children's literature character, Arthur, reading from the Radon Activity Book. In Lawrence County, 39 youth programs on radon awareness were provided to area youth by CEC Linda Robinson. In Talladega County, CEC Wanda Jurriaans provided a radon program to an RSVP seniors group.
- Pat Smith provided two Lunch and Learn seminars at Helen Keller Hospital for nurses who received one CEU for attending. She conducted numerous community group programs including the Cedar Garden Club, Cloverdale Community Center, Helen Keller Hospital, Killen Lions Club, Lawrence County Rotary Club, and the East Colbert Senior Center. A total of 74 radon test kits were sold during the group meetings.
- Exhibits were featured in a variety of locations: Helen Keller Hospital (Colbert County) and Athens-Limestone (Limestone) hospitals featured radon displays and brochures in each of their waiting rooms; the Cleburne County Library in Heflin and the Anniston Museum of Natural History (Cleburne and Calhoun counties); a radon display and test kits for sale at the Shades Mountain Baptist Church Health Expo (Jefferson); radon materials and the radon tabletop display at the Limestone County Market Street Office Building (Limestone); radon posters and a test kit display at the Florence Public Library (Lauderdale); community health fairs in Courtland, county health departments, and the local Moulton and Courtland libraries (Lawrence); and a radon display at the Homemakers Achievement Program and FCE multi-county planning meeting (Talladega).
- As a direct result of the media reports, exhibits and numerous NRAM programs, more than 900 test kits were purchased from county offices, the radon web site and by mail order during the quarter, and 478 tests were used. More than 400 homes were tested as a result of hearing the radon message during NRAM, with 22% of the homes indicating a need for mitigation.



**Outcome #1**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Outcomes from this program area include: a) Number of community and economic development programs conducted, b) Community and economic development training resources developed, c) Number of community and economic development projects conducted

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	67	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

**Outcome #2**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:

**Why:** Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed

**What:** Specifically what was done and how it was done.

**When:** If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.

**Where:** Specific location-- the county or counties involved.

**Who and how many:** The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.

**So what:** This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes.

Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.

Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

## 2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

### 3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

### 3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	20	0

### 3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

## 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

## Outcome #3

### 1. Outcome Measures

Number of test kits purchased as a result of a program, activity or media report

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	2388

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Radon is called the "silent killer" because it is a colorless, odorless, tasteless gas that cannot be detected without specifically testing for it. When people are educated about the health risks of radon and that the only way to know is to test, then if we are doing our job, people will be moved to 1) purchase a test kit, then 2) use the test kit.

**What has been done**

Test kits are offered for purchase at programs and meeting, health fairs and homeshows, at the Zone 1 radon county Extension offices, and on the Radon in Alabama web site, [www.aces.edu/radon](http://www.aces.edu/radon).

**Results**

In 2007, 2388 test kits were purchased from county offices, programs, health fairs, homeshows and online.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

**Outcome #4****1. Outcome Measures**

Number of people who actually use a test kit compared to the number who purchased or received a kit

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	1416

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

When people purchase a test kit, they have exhibited a change of behavior as a result of their increased knowledge. When people use their test kit, there is another action result associated with their increased knowledge.

**What has been done**

We encourage people to test their homes and 1416 people tested their homes for radon in 2007

**Results**

We compare the number of people who used their test kit to the number of people who actually used it and the resultant percentage shows how effective we were in our message. Our results show that 1416 test kits were used out of 2388 test kits purchased, for a 59% success rate.

#### 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

#### Outcome #5

##### 1. Outcome Measures

Number of homes that were mitigated

##### 2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

##### 3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

##### 3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	146

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

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

While no amount of radon is considered "safe," the EPA recommends remedial action when tests indicate radon levels of 4 picocuries per liter (pCi/l) or more. Mitigation involves installing a radon system in the home to prevent radon gas from entering a home and is done by a certified radon mitigator. The mitigator has been specifically trained for the installation and diagnostic process that is involved in retrofitting a home.

###### What has been done

Test results indicate that 176 homes had elevated radon levels, and 146 homes were reported to have been mitigated in 2007.

###### Results

We compare the number of homes mitigated to the number of homes that tested above the EPA Action Level and the resultant percentage shows the effective rate of mitigations, another measure of our success. Results for 2007 show that 146 homes were reported mitigated in 2007 and our data shows that 176 homes were in need of mitigation, for an 83% success rate.

#### 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

#### Outcome #6

##### 1. Outcome Measures

Number of new homes built radon-resistant

##### 2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	715

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Our message is that radon entry into homes can be eliminated with the use of a radon system. Installing a radon system in a new home, as it is being built, will cost two-thirds LESS than the cost of retrofitting or mitigating an existing home. Radon systems also prevent other soil gases and moisture from entering the home. Municipalities can adopt the radon control Appendix F with their building code, thereby ensuring radon-resistant homes to their community.

**What has been done**

In 2007, 715 radon systems were reported to have been installed in new homes. Most of these homes were built in the 6 municipalities that adopted the radon control Appendix F with their building code and there are a few builders who have committed to build all of their homes with radon systems.

**Results**

We do not have any comparison data as to how many new homes were built in 2007, but 715 homes is a very small percentage. Most of these homes were built in the 6 municipalities that adopted the radon control Appendix F with their building code.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

**Outcome #7**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Number of homes tested during a real estate transaction.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	379

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Testing a home for radon is purely voluntary in the state. However, consumers can be protected when purchasing a home if they have a radon test done as a condition of their contract, and then mitigated if elevated radon levels are found. Many relocation companies require radon tests in their home purchases and people who move here from other states also ask for radon tests. Some states require a radon test as part of the real estate transaction.

**What has been done**

In 2007, 379 homes were reported as tested during a real estate transaction.

**Results**

We do not know how many homes were purchased in the state in 2007, but we do know that at least 379 homes were tested for radon.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

**Outcome #8**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Number of municipalities that adopted the radon control Appendix F with their building code.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	1

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Municipalities can adopt the radon control Appendix F with their building code, thereby ensuring the protection of their citizens when purchasing new homes radon-resistant. There are currently 6 municipalities in the state that adopted the appendix: Decatur, Hartselle, Falkville, Trinity, Muscle Shoals and Sheffield.

**What has been done**

Extension offers information and education to local government officials and building code officials.

**Results**

The city of Trinity adopted Appendix F with the building code in 2007.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

**Outcome #9**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Success story 1: The annual Huntsville/Madison County Building, Home, and Remodeling Show took place March 2-4 at the Von Braun Civic Center. The Alabama Radon Program, in its seventh year of participation, provided an educational display booth, complete with a radon system, publications and test kits. A seminar was offered on Sunday. The show drew 15,057 attendees. Three hundred seventy-four test kits and more than 3,300 pieces of literature were distributed.

Extension staff members who worked at the show included Patricia W. Smith (Radon Regional Extension Agent), Walter Harris (Madison County Extension Coordinator), Walter Rodgers (Regional Extension Agent-REA), Shirley Whitten (REA), Clarene Johnson (Extension District Director), Teresa McDonald (Colbert County Extension Coordinator), Karen Thompson (REA), Laura Booth (Extension Associate), Holly Cannon (Radon Assistant) and Susan Roberts (Assistant Program Director). Assistance was provided by certified mitigators and testers, who helped answer technical questions. About 170 people (45%) who purchased test kits at the home show have tested their homes and 26% of the homes have indicated high radon levels. The Radon Program is a member of the builders association. Members include the program's target audience: builders, remodelers, developers, subcontractors, suppliers, financial institutions, Realtors and other trades that are connected with the home building industry.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	374

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

374 test kits were purchased; 170 test kits were used; 26% of the homes had elevated radon levels, indicating a need for mitigation.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

**Outcome #10**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Success story 2: The Alabama Radon Program exhibited a display at the 2007 Shoals Home Builders Association's annual Spring Building and Remodeling Show Feb. 24-25, in Florence.

ACES staff members involved were Radon REA Patricia W. Smith, Teresa McDonald, Colbert County CEC, Katrina Cole, Colbert County 4-H Extension Agent, Melanie Allen, Lauderdale County 4-H Extension Agent, Francine Creecy, Lauderdale County Extension Reporter, and Mary J. Andrews, Lauderdale County REA. Certified mitigator Leon Singletary was also on hand to answer technical questions.

The booth highlighted the dangers posed by radon and emphasized methods of removing radon where high levels exist. One attendee said 'For 15 years I have been meaning to get around to doing this (test his home for radon). Okay, talk to me about radon and how do I do this?' The attendee purchased and used the test kit and found negligible levels of radon in his home.

The ACES Alabama Radon Education Program booth was one of 81 booths at the show. Over 2,000 individuals attended the home show. Over 650 pieces of literature were distributed. In addition to distributing literature and explaining the dangers of radon and mitigation techniques, radon test kits were sold to interested citizens. More than 40 test kits were sold at this two-day event. Twenty-six (62%) test kits were used and five homes out of 22 valid tests (22%) indicated a need for mitigation.

The Alabama Radon Education Program is a member of the builders association which has a membership of over 400 business firms from the Shoals area of northwest Alabama. Its membership includes the program's target audience of builders, remodelers, developers, subcontractors, suppliers, financial institutions, Realtors and other trades that are connected with the home building industry.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	42

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

42 test kits were sold; 26 (62%) were used; 5 of the homes had elevated radon levels indicating a need for mitigation.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

**Outcome #11**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Success story 3: The Radon in Alabama Web site, introduced in July 2000, offers a multitude of resources for those wishing to learn more about radon in Alabama. Alabama citizens can order test kits through Extension on the web site. Since its inception, 139 test kits have been purchased from the site, with 76 (54%) of the test kits used. Eight of 40 homes (20%) tested had elevated levels of radon, indicating a need to mitigate.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	139

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

139 test kits have been purchased from the site, with 76 (54%) of the test kits used. Eight of 40 homes (20%) had elevated levels of radon, indicating a need to mitigate.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

**Outcome #12**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Success story 4: Throughout the year, the Alabama Radon Program actively promotes radon education, but in January, special emphasis is made to pick up the pace with increased awareness emphasis for National Radon Action Month (NRAM).

This year's activities took on a national flavor, with EPA offering a special web site of NRAM activities featured in each state:

[www.epa.gov/radon/rnactionmonth.html# Radon\\_Events\\_in\\_Your\\_Area](http://www.epa.gov/radon/rnactionmonth.html#Radon_Events_in_Your_Area), where citizens, radon industry, radon state programs and others could view the events, get ideas and/or join in the activities.

In Alabama, national media interest for NRAM provided an added stimulus for local media interest in radon health risk promotions.

News report headlines such as 'What you don't know about radon gas could kill you,' and 'Agent says radon a problem in the area,' helped draw attention to the radon message, resulting in a dramatic increase in radon test kit purchases and testing.

Radio talk show hosts took a special interest in our message. Pat Smith, Radon Regional Extension Agent, and Teresa McDonald, Colbert County Extension Coordinator (CEC), were featured on the radio program, 'A Look at the Shoals,' and Deborah Mathews, Cleburne CEC, was featured several times during NRAM on WPIL FM Radio and WTDR FM Radio. In addition to the talk shows, numerous radio stations in north Alabama played the EPA-provided national PSAs which were localized for Alabama.

We were also able to appear in several TV programs during the month. Pat Smith was on 'For Your Information,' a Shoals Community College TV show that was shown continuously in January and February, and 'Talk of the Town on the Light Side of the News' on WYAM TV 56. In Cleburne County, Mathews was fortunate to appear on the Wake-Up Alabama show on WJXS TV.

In addition to county media efforts, the Alabama Department of Public Health sent out a statewide press release that generated awareness among health department associates as well as the news media.

On the local level, the program's radon agents brought the radon health risk message to many local government officials, resulting in nine proclamations declaring January as National Radon Action Month within their communities, including a state proclamation signed by Governor Riley. The proclamations came from the Madison County Commission, Clay County Commission, Talladega County Commission, City of Killen, City of Sheffield, City of Muscle Shoals, Colbert County Commission, and the City of Tuscumbia.

Many events were scheduled within each county. Highlights from each county include a Community Radon Awareness Forum arranged by Agent Walter Rodgers and Radon REA Pat Smith in Madison County with several community and business leaders discussing the importance of radon testing and prevention. In Clay County, CEC Marsha Moorehead distributed Radon Activity Books, Radon Ranger comic books and test kit coupons to 22 4-H Clubs and other youth groups in the county. In Cleburne County, CEC Deborah Mathews presented programs to Cleburne High School's anatomy and physiology classes and provided special radon informational assistance to home school groups at the Anniston Museum of Natural History. In Colbert County, CEC Teresa McDonald included NRAM information in the January/February 2007 Home Economics Newsletter distributed to 439 households.

In Limestone County, CEC Betty Ann Broman presented a radon program to a local civic group as well as met with officials at Athens/Limestone Hospital to implement the Newborn Program. In Lauderdale County, Agent Melanie Allen provided a special reading activity at the Florence Public Library featuring well known children's literature character, Arthur, reading from the Radon Activity Book. In Lawrence County, 39 youth programs on radon awareness were provided to area youth by CEC Linda Robinson. In Talladega County, CEC

Wanda Jurriaans provided a radon program to an RSVP seniors group. Pat Smith provided two Lunch and Learn seminars at Helen Keller Hospital for nurses who received one CEU for attending. She conducted numerous community group programs including the Cedar Garden Club, Cloverdale Community Center, Helen Keller Hospital, Killen Lions Club, Lawrence County Rotary Club, and the East Colbert Senior Center. A total of 74 radon test kits were sold during the group meetings.

Exhibits were featured in a variety of locations: Helen Keller Hospital (Colbert County) and Athens-Limestone (Limestone) hospitals featured radon displays and brochures in each of their waiting rooms; the Cleburne County Library in Heflin and the Anniston Museum of Natural History (Cleburne and Calhoun counties); a radon display and test kits for sale at the Shades Mountain Baptist Church Health Expo (Jefferson); radon materials and the radon tabletop display at the Limestone County Market Street Office Building (Limestone); radon posters and a test kit display at the Florence Public Library (Lauderdale); community health fairs in Courtland, county health departments, and the local Moulton and Courtland libraries (Lawrence); and a radon display at the Homemakers Achievement Program and FCE multi-county planning meeting (Talladega).

As a direct result of the media reports, exhibits and numerous NRAM programs, more than 900 test kits were purchased from county offices, the radon web site and by mail order during the quarter, and 478 tests were used. More than 400 homes were tested as a result of hearing the radon message during NRAM, with 22% of the homes indicating a need for mitigation.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	901

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

During January to March 2007, 901 tests were purchased; 488 test kits were used (54% usage rate) in 340 homes; 21% of the tests revealed elevated radon levels and the need for mitigation.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures

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

**External factors which affected outcomes**

- Government Regulations
- Other (Financial inability of clientele to pay for mitigating their homes.)

### **Brief Explanation**

The lack of state regulations for testing homes in real estate transactions and municipal building codes requiring the installation of radon systems detracts from the true picture a radon risk assessment in the state. Many people are reluctant to test their homes since real estate transactions might require them to disclose a previous radon test. Since there are no regulations, they don't want to impede the sale of their home. Also, we only know a small portion of the actual number of radon tests in a real estate transaction. If testing in a real estate transaction were regulated, we would have access to an accurate number.

If radon systems were required in new homes built, more Alabama citizens would be protected from the radon health risk. Currently, outside of the six municipalities that require radon systems, and the few builders who voluntarily install systems in all of their new homes, education by our program and the media are the only means to inform people about protecting their families from radon.

Many people who test their homes and find elevated radon levels cannot afford to fix their home, with the cost of mitigation between \$1200 to \$3000. Many homes are not even tested because they know they cannot fix their home even if they have a radon problem.

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

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

- Other (Use of radon testing and test kit distribution data)

### **Evaluation Results**

Evaluation of our individual programs, as well as our Radon Program as a whole, is determined by our measurable outcomes – number of tests used versus purchased. Our extensive radon database provides distribution information by program and date, as well as test results data which provide outcome measuring results for the program.

Our evaluation assessment involves a comparison between prior year's efforts.

### **Key Items of Evaluation**

Any increase in measured outcome numbers is a plus, as it is that many more people who have shown increased knowledge with a change of behavior (tested their home), reduced their radon health risk (mitigated homes), or prevented radon from entering their home (building new homes radon-resistant). All of these actions will increase lives saved as a result of our efforts to educate citizens of the radon health risk. However, by monitoring specific programs or activities through our data and measured outcomes, we can maximize our efforts in our Program as a whole, thereby producing a more efficient product for Extension and our grantors, ADPH and EPA.

Since October 1997, we have distributed more than 26,000 test kits with 55% of them used. Our data reveals that 10,794 homes, apartments or school rooms have been tested, with 2268 or 21% needing mitigation.

Our program has estimated 146 mitigations took place in 2007, as well as 715 homes built radon-resistant, and 379 homes tested in real estate transactions. However, these are only voluntary reports and not the actual results of the program's efforts.

**Program #8**

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

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

Consumer Science and Personal Financial Management

**V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)**

**1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage**

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
607	Consumer Economics	30%	30%		
801	Individual and Family Resource Management	70%	70%		
	<b>Total</b>	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
<b>Plan</b>	12.0	3.4	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	11.9	3.5	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
231491	207885	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
284930	207885	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
885333	366168	0	0

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

**1. Brief description of the Activity**

The Family Financial Security and Consumer Education project was selected to represent this planned program. Financial literacy programs were conducted in every county in Alabama to help individuals and families achieve financial security across the lifecycle. Goals were to: a) help adults develop and follow personal financial plans for budgeting, saving, retirement, and estate planning and improve overall financial management skills; b) increase financial literacy and promote adoption of healthy lifestyle choices among middle and high school students.

Financial literacy education is needed in Alabama due to high personal debt, low saving rates, overuse of credit, predatory lending practices and other factors that undermine family financial security. Nationally, Alabama ranked 27th in identity theft and 44th in consumer fraud cases in 2006 (Federal Trade Commission, 2007). Increasingly, Alabama families need training and support to manage financial issues effectively when caring for loved ones. The state's disability rate is among the highest in the nation and its senior population will increase to 79.2% by 2030. Most Alabama youth do not receive financial literacy education in school in spite of the importance of this life skill in everyday life.

Due to the conditions outlined above, financial literacy programs were conducted for youth and adults utilizing a variety of educational methods such as workshops, seminars, exhibits, consultations, simulations and competitions. Programs areas addressed include: estate planning, basic financial management, saving, investing, income tax education, family caregiving, heir property training, identity theft and fraud prevention.

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

Programs, activities and materials were targeted to youth, adults and senior citizens without regard for race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, veteran status, or disability. Financial management programs were marketed to the public and involved audiences associated with senior citizen groups, Habitat for Humanity, family members raising children, Americorp and AARP. Also reached were low income individuals, abused women, Head Start parents, and young African American fathers. The America Saves Campaign and Piggy Bank Pageant involved youth, adults and senior citizens. Consumer education programs were targeted to adults including senior citizens, low income adults, domestic violence victims and foster parents, Energy Star Program, Investor University and Family Caregiving Program was presented to adults, including senior citizens in rural communities. The VITA Program served low income individuals, seniors, disabled individuals and legal immigrants. Alabama's high school students were targeted with Reality Check and the High School Financial Literacy programs. Adults trained under the High School Financial Literacy program were affiliated with Air Force ROTC, Army Jr. ROTC, schools, credit unions and included local business leaders and retirees.

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

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	20000	80000	8000	40000
2007	6308	1104287	4106	706020

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

**Patent Applications Submitted**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan:</b>	0
2007 :	0

**Patents listed**

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

**Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	5	0	5

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

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

- This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which a

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	4	2

**Output #2**

**Output Measure**

- Activities include:

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

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

O No.	Outcome Name
1	Total number of people completing financial management education programs who actually adopted one or more recommended practices to decrease consumer credit debt, or increase investing and savings, and plan for retirement within six months after completing one or more of these programs.
2	<p>Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:</p> <p>Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed</p> <p>What: Specifically what was done and how it was done.</p> <p>When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.</p> <p>Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved.</p> <p>Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.</p> <p>So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.</p> <p>Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.</p>
3	Adults attending Estate Planning Seminars and Youth participating in the Reality Check Simulation

**Outcome #1**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Total number of people completing financial management education programs who actually adopted one or more recommended practices to decrease consumer credit debt, or increase investing and savings, and plan for retirement within six months after completing one or more of these programs.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	500	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
607	Consumer Economics
801	Individual and Family Resource Management

**Outcome #2**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:

**Why:** Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed

**What:** Specifically what was done and how it was done.

**When:** If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.

**Where:** Specific location-- the county or counties involved.

**Who and how many:** The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.

**So what:** This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes.

Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.

Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	9	1

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Participants consistently and overwhelmingly reported that the Estate Planning Seminar was a beneficial and valuable service to Alabama citizens. Examples of antidotal evidence collected includes: "Excellent source of information - very helpful," "Great service, lot of information, learned a lot, gives me motivation to go and get started on planning." "Outstanding presentation & a great service for all Alabamians!!"

An indication of the success of the Reality Check Simulation is the ever increasing number of requests for the program by teachers, parents and youth organizations.

**What has been done**

Estate planning seminars were conducted across the state to educate citizens about the importance of estate planning and the development process. In addition, Reality Check Simulations have been used to help teens gain insights into the relationship between education and employment and the importance of budgeting. Participants filled out written surveys at the completion of Estate Planning and Reality Check activities.

**Results**

Of the 13 financial management success stories written 2 were for Estate Planning activities and 2 were for Reality Check activities.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

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

**Outcome #3****1. Outcome Measures**

Adults attending Estate Planning Seminars and Youth participating in the Reality Check Simulation

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

An educational program was needed to help citizens understand the importance of estate planning and provide basic information about the development process. Extension's estate planning program provided a reliable source of unbiased information individuals could use to secure the financial future of loved ones. Additionally, The Reality Check Simulation was needed to help teens learn to make wise financial choices now and in future.

**What has been done**

Estate planning seminars were conducted across the state to educate citizens about the importance of estate planning and the development process. In addition, Reality Check Simulations have been used to help teens gain insights into the relationship between education and employment and the importance of budgeting. Participants completed written surveys at the completion of Estate Planning and Reality Check activities.

**Results**

Responses to estate planning surveys indicated that 98% of the 2007 participants gained a better understanding of the importance of developing an estate plan, an increase of 3% compared to 2005 data. Ninety-six percent reported they intend to develop an estate plan within six months to a year, an 18% increase since 2005.

A random sample of 217 survey respondents indicates that 61% were more aware of the importance of staying in school after participating in the Reality Check Simulation. Eighty-one percent were more aware of the connection between education and future salary. Sixty-six percent reported increased awareness of career choices. Seventy-five percent indicated increased awareness of the importance of making wise financial choices. Seventy two percent of the sample were more aware of the importance of budgeting as a result of the simulation. These results indicate that teens were more knowledgeable regarding the importance of staying in school, career choices and good money management practices after participating in the Reality Check Simulation.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
607	Consumer Economics
801	Individual and Family Resource Management

**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 Programatic Challenges
- Populations changes (immigration,new cultural groupings,etc.)

**Brief Explanation**

{No Data Entered}

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

**1. Evaluation Studies Planned**

- After Only (post program)

**Evaluation Results**

Responses to estate planning surveys indicated that 98% of the 2007 participants gained a better understanding of the importance of developing an estate plan, an increase of 3% compared to 2005 data. Ninety-six percent reported they intend to develop an estate plan within six months to a year, an 18% increase since 2005.

A random sample of 217 survey respondents indicates that 61% were more aware of the importance of staying in school after participating in the Reality Check Simulation. Eighty-one percent were more aware of the connection between education and future salary. Sixty-six percent reported increased awareness of career choices. Seventy-five percent indicated increased awareness of the importance of making wise financial choices. Seventy two percent of the sample were more aware of the importance of budgeting as a result of the simulation. These results indicate that teens were more knowledgeable regarding the importance of staying in school, career choices and good money management practices after participating in the Reality Check Simulation.

**Key Items of Evaluation**

**Program #9**

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

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

Commercial Horticulture

**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	25%	25%		
205	Plant Management Systems	50%	50%		
215	Biological Control of Pests Affecting Plants	10%	10%		
216	Integrated Pest Management Systems	15%	15%		
<b>Total</b>		<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>		

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

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

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	8.5	0.6	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	8.8	0.0	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
182166	0	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
209285	0	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
1439857	0	0	0

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

**1. Brief description of the Activity**

The activities described here and summarized in this report relate to (1) Extension Team Project, ETP19C Commercial Fruit Pest Management.

Conducted research related to plum curculio monitoring and insecticide use reduction. Set up pheromone traps for major fruit pest species. Products developed, IPM resources and updates. Conducted fruit grower meetings with IPM updates. Conducted agent training on fruit IPM. Partnered with Alabama Department of Agriculture to conduct Fruit IPM update at Chemical Dealer Meetings, Pesticide Recertification. Provided grower counseling and updates.

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

Primary target audience are educators and commercial fruit producers

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

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	41000	97000	4000	10000
2007	2237	18161	0	0

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

**Patent Applications Submitted**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>
Plan:	0
2007 :	0

**Patents listed**

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

**Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	5	0	0

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

**Output Target**

**Output #1****Output Measure**

- This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which a

Year	Target	Actual
2007	2	0

**Output #2****Output Measure**

- IPM Research and dissemination - Southeastern Professional Fruit Workers Workshop.

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	35

**Output #3****Output Measure**

- Educational meetings

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	250

**Output #4****Output Measure**

- Grower counseling

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	1959

**Output #5****Output Measure**

- Publications, Fruit IPM Guides

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	350

**Output #6****Output Measure**

- Agent training

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	6

**Output #7****Output Measure**

- Web Blog

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	6000

**Output #8****Output Measure**

- Newsletters, media

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	11805

**Output #9****Output Measure**

- Grower demonstrations

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

**Output #10****Output Measure**

- Freeze damage, crop loss, and economic assessment

Year	Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	250

**V(G). State Defined Outcomes****V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content**

O No.	Outcome Name
1	For ETP19A - Alabama Certified Landscape Professional (ACLP) Training and Testing, and ETP19B - Alabama Certified Nursery Professional (ACNP) Training and Testing, agents will keep participation records for training, test scores and continuing education certification points. They will monitor the testing and determine consistently weak areas that identifies opportunities for training. Agents will be expected to document the number of clientele that were trained or that were assisted with related questions. An annual report will be required. An annual report form will be developed and distributed to all participating agents by the Extension team project leader. This will be done on a fiscal year basis to be used in reporting to the ALNLA and will be due October 1, of each year.
2	Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements: Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed What: Specifically what was done and how it was done. When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began. Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved. Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served. So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.
3	Research to increase knowledge on behavior and management of plum curculio in peaches, data collection/reporting. Increase educator knowledge on research and use of monitoring techniques. Increase grower knowledge of fruit pests, resistance management, and on-farm monitoring.
4	Increase on-farm use of pest monitoring in pest management decisions.
5	Provide growers, state and federal officials, and general public accurate crop and economic losses.

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

For ETP19A - Alabama Certified Landscape Professional (ACLP) Training and Testing, and ETP19B - Alabama Certified Nursery Professional (ACNP) Training and Testing, agents will keep participation records for training, test scores and continuing education certification points. They will monitor the testing and determine consistently weak areas that identifies opportunities for training. Agents will be expected to document the number of clientele that were trained or that were assisted with related questions. An annual report will be required. An annual report form will be developed and distributed to all participating agents by the Extension team project leader. This will be done on a fiscal year basis to be used in reporting to the ALNLA and will be due October 1, of each year.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	200	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
102	Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships
205	Plant Management Systems
215	Biological Control of Pests Affecting Plants
216	Integrated Pest Management Systems

**Outcome #2****1. Outcome Measures**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:

**Why:** Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed

**What:** Specifically what was done and how it was done.

**When:** If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.

**Where:** Specific location-- the county or counties involved.

**Who and how many:** The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.

**So what:** This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes.

Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	6	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
102	Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships
215	Biological Control of Pests Affecting Plants
216	Integrated Pest Management Systems
205	Plant Management Systems

**Outcome #3**

**1. Outcome Measures**

Research to increase knowledge on behavior and management of plum curculio in peaches, data collection/reporting. Increase educator knowledge on research and use of monitoring techniques. Increase grower knowledge of fruit pests, resistance management, and on-farm monitoring.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Fruit pest management and use of chemicals is often guided by fear of one or two specific fruit damaging pests. The lack of specific pest knowledge increases likelihood of chemical overuse.

**What has been done**

Studies were set up to evaluate the effect of ground covers on survival of plum curculio, effectiveness of various baits and traps for monitoring plum curculio, and use of monitoring to direct targeted (reduced) chemical use on plum curculio control. Pocket guides, traps, pheromone, survey instruments were provided to commercial horticulture agents. Agents were provided in-service training covering IPM.

**Results**

Preliminary results have not shown major effect from ground covers on plum curculio emergence. Some improvement has been seen between baits and bait combinations on trap capture of plum curculio. The use of monitoring and targeting insecticide applications directed to plum curculio control and reduced fruit damage has shown good promise. Approximately an eighty percent reduction in chemical use has provided a seventy-five percent reduction in fruit damage. However, weekly applications have provided 100 percent reduction in fruit damage. Information from plum curculio and other pests monitored have been provided to growers through web blog, visits to this site have increased from 4,732 in 2006 to 12,661 in 2007. Personal contact with growers, 250, in 5 meetings increased knowledge. Research results have been disseminated to regional researchers resulting in collaboration for 2008.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
216	Integrated Pest Management Systems

**Outcome #4****1. Outcome Measures**

Increase on-farm use of pest monitoring in pest management decisions.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

•1862 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Action Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

**3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement****Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Calendar based sprays can be unnecessary, costly, and expose the producer and environment to higher levels of pesticides.

**What has been done**

Traps and pheromones were to be set up on farms and checked by agents on a weekly basis. Due to the severe freeze and loss of crops only the research site was used.

### Results

Visits to updated web blog with crop and pest conditions increased during 2007 from 4,732 to 12,661. Using information collected, growers were changing actions in their pest management approach. Approximately 600 acres of peaches received 25 percent fewer insecticide applications (personal communication).

#### 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
216	Integrated Pest Management Systems

#### Outcome #5

##### 1. Outcome Measures

Provide growers, state and federal officials, and general public accurate crop and economic losses.

##### 2. Associated Institution Types

•1862 Extension

##### 3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

##### 3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	{No Data Entered}	0

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

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

Fruit production in Alabama is made up primarily of small to medium sized farms but, accounts for approximately \$15 million dollars in farm cash receipts. Crop disasters affect the livelihood of families and the economy of state and local communities. In early April a strong cold front entered Alabama. Freezing winds were preceded by unusually warm conditions in March. These warm temperatures had fruit crops blooming and young fruit developing in almost every location throughout the state. On April 6, 2007 winds in excess of 15 mph and temperatures ranging from 24 to 30 degrees F. hit central and north Alabama.

###### What has been done

Weather models and forecasts were provided to growers. Temperatures monitored during freeze event. Fruit damage assessments were made over a three week period statewide. Meetings were arranged between growers and commissioner of agriculture. Visits were arranged with growers and state senator. Developed survey of affected crop acres, crop losses, and economic losses. .

###### Results

The crops affected were apples, blackberries, blueberries, peaches, plums, and strawberries. The following table shows the acreage affected, percentage of crop destroyed and estimated loss in cash receipts for the fruit crops impacted in the state.

Crop	Est. Ac.	Pct.Crop Destroyed	Est.Loss	Cash Receipts
Apples	280	100%	\$ 760,000	
Blackberries	20	95%	\$ 74,000	
Blueberries	140	95%	\$ 520,000	
Peaches	2,465	80%	\$ 6,850,000	
Plums	30	60%	\$ 48,000	
Strawberries	50	30%	\$ 96,000	
Total	2,985		\$ 8,348,000	

This information was provided to state officials for seeking disaster relief.

#### 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
205	Plant Management Systems

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

##### External factors which affected outcomes

- Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)
- Economy
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programmatic Challenges

##### Brief Explanation

Some of the goals that were planned were not realized and other priority activities, outputs, and outcomes developed early in the year as a result of a devastating spring freeze damage to fruit crops in the major fruit growing regions of Alabama. In addition to the loss of fruit crops due to the freeze, one of the worse droughts close to 100 years occurred throughout 80% of Alabama.

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

##### 1. Evaluation Studies Planned

- After Only (post program)
- During (during program)

##### Evaluation Results

Research results were analyzed following all data collection during the season. Results of orchard ground cover on plum curculio emergence was inconclusive and is being repeated. Targeted insecticide applications based on "in-season" trap captures and fruit monitoring of plum curculio and biological activity such as first peak, first egg deposition, first fruit fall revealed promise in reduction of calendar based insecticide applications. The use of web blog for dissemination of IPM and fruit orchard conditions doubled in visits during the year.

Results of fruit crop evaluation following severe winter freeze revealed that 2,985 acres of fruit crops were affected. Largest losses occurred in peaches, 2,465 acres at 80%, and apples, 280 acres at 100% loss. Economic impact results showed \$8,348,000 in lost revenue to growers due to crop losses of all fruit surveyed.

##### Key Items of Evaluation

**Program #10****V(A). Planned Program (Summary)****1. Name of the Planned Program**

Animal Sciences and Forages

**V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)****1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage**

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
301	Reproductive Performance of Animals	10%	10%		
302	Nutrient Utilization in Animals	20%	20%		
303	Genetic Improvement of Animals	20%	20%		
307	Animal Management Systems	20%	20%		
311	Animal Diseases	20%	20%		
315	Animal Welfare/Well-Being and Protection	10%	10%		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>		

**V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)****1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program**

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	22.6	2.3	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	23.9	3.8	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
497475	226254	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
571533	226254	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
3279119	398525	0	0

**V(D). Planned Program (Activity)****1. Brief description of the Activity**

## ETP 11B – Sheep, Goat and Rabbit Production

In the North Alabama Area, four regional goat workshops were conducted. The first workshop was held on Saturday, February 3, 2007 at the Dekalb County VFW Fairgrounds in Fort Payne. This workshop focused on meat goat selection and evaluation and on fecal egg count and FAMACHA as management tools in strategic deworming. The second workshop, which was held on Saturday, March 24, 2007 at the Lauderdale County Cooperative Extension Office, focused on reproductive management options such as artificial and laparoscopic insemination and embryo flush and transfer in meat goats. The third workshop, which was held on Thursday, May 31, 2007, took place at the Marshall County VFW Fairgrounds in Boaz. This workshop also focused on fecal egg count and the FAMACHA system as effective tools in the control of gastrointestinal parasites in goats. The fourth workshop, held on Saturday, September 22, 2007 at the Blount County Cooperative Extension Office, focused on the manufacture of cheese and soap from dairy goat milk. All events relied greatly on both seminars and hands-on demonstrations.

In Southwest Alabama, one particular workshop relied greatly on hands-on training. A large number of meat goat producers from the Blackbelt region were trained on the use of the FAMACHA system and microscopic examination of gastrointestinal parasites. The educational activity, which was held on Thursday, May 17, 2007 at the Perry County Agriculture and Youth Farm in Uniontown, focused on approaches to strategic deworming of goats. The activity provided hands-on training to both adults and youth.

In a series of workshops conducted throughout the state, Extension Animal Scientists housed at Alabama A&M University also provided hands-on training to adults and youth. These specialists gave demonstrations on the flotation or McMaster technique used to identify and count internal parasite eggs, the use of FAMACHA charts, and artificial insemination. Audiences included goat and sheep producers from Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi and Tennessee, and missionary students from Africa, Asia, Central and South America.

Other activities conducted by educators of the Urban Affairs and New Nontraditional Programs (UANNP) unit of the Alabama Cooperative Extension System (ACES) included producer tours to Tennessee State University's Research Farm in Nashville and Fort Valley State University's Small Ruminant Technology Center in Georgia on Saturday, February 24 and Wednesday, May 9, 2007, respectively. Furthermore, the UANNP unit held its First Annual Spring Small Ruminant Symposium and First Annual Conference on Small Ruminants.

The First Annual Spring Small Ruminant Symposium was held on Saturday, March 17, 2007 at Alabama A&M University's Agribition Center in Huntsville. The event focused mainly on herd health management and meat quality assurance. The First Annual Conference on Small Ruminants was held on Thursday, August 23 and Friday, August 24, 2007 at Shocco Springs Baptist Conference Center near Talladega. The activity focused mainly on nutrition and grazing management of sheep and goats.

Besides carrying out the previously described outreach activities, UANNP staff lend its expertise to the Goat and Sheep Producers of Alabama and the Small Farms Research Center of Alabama A&M University. The 3rd Annual Goat and Sheep Festival held on Saturday, June 2, 2007 at the MGH Equestrian Arena near Talladega and the 5th Annual Community Outreach Conference held on Thursday, November 15, 2007 at the Holiday Inn Hotel in Huntsville included presentations by UANNP Extension Animal Scientists. These presentations focused on feeding and nutrition, breeding and reproduction, and health management of small ruminants.

## 2. Brief description of the target audience

ETP 11B – Sheep, Goat and Rabbit Production

The primary target audience was meat goat and sheep producers developing profitable, sustainable animal production systems. Secondary target audience was consumers of lamb and goat meat products concerned with dietary cholesterol and other health issues.

## 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	92000	320000	12000	40000
2007	11559	201291	1239	21573

**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**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	17	0	17

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

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

- This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which a

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	5	9

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

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

O No.	Outcome Name
1	<p>For ETP11J the National Animal Identification Educational Program, the outcome measure will be The number of premises numbers registered for the State of Alabama due to our educational efforts.</p>
2	<p>For ETP11G the Alabama Master Cattle Producer Training Program, the outcome measure will be the number of graduates.</p>
3	<p>Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:</p> <p>Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed</p> <p>What: Specifically what was done and how it was done.</p> <p>When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.</p> <p>Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved.</p> <p>Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.</p> <p>So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.</p> <p>Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.</p>

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

For ETP11J the National Animal Identification Educational Program, the outcome measure will be The number of premises numbers registered for the State of Alabama due to our educational efforts.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	2000	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
315	Animal Welfare/Well-Being and Protection
311	Animal Diseases

**Outcome #2****1. Outcome Measures**

For ETP11G the Alabama Master Cattle Producer Training Program, the outcome measure will be the number of graduates.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	200	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done****Results****4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

<b>KA Code</b>	<b>Knowledge Area</b>
301	Reproductive Performance of Animals
315	Animal Welfare/Well-Being and Protection
302	Nutrient Utilization in Animals
307	Animal Management Systems
311	Animal Diseases
303	Genetic Improvement of Animals

**Outcome #3****1. Outcome Measures**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:

**Why:** Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed

**What:** Specifically what was done and how it was done.

**When:** If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.

**Where:** Specific location-- the county or counties involved.

**Who and how many:** The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.

**So what:** This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes.

Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.

Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Condition Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Quantitative Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	6	497

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

ETP 11B - Sheep, Goat and Rabbit Production

Consumer demand for lamb and goat meat is rising and many farmers are raising small ruminants as a way to diversify their products and bring additional income to their operations. Given that there are not enough sheep and goats produced in the U.S., farmers in Alabama have a tremendous potential to expand and supply some of the growing demand for lamb and goat meat. However, to ensure that farmers improve the efficiency of lamb and goat production and enhance their profitability and competitiveness in the national and world markets, educational resources in alternative animal production and technological advances was needed.

**What has been done**

ETP 11B - Sheep, Goat and Rabbit Production

In an effort to help Alabama small ruminant producers manage their animals and improve the profitability of their operation, the UANNP unit of ACES provided broadly-based and objective information about small ruminants and their impact on Alabama's economy and natural resources. Besides carrying out an array of outreach events (See Planned Program Activities), UANNP specialists developed 16 new numbered publications on sheep, goats and rabbits. These publications, which are available in print and on our ACES website ([www.aces.edu](http://www.aces.edu)) under Urban Affairs and New Nontraditional Programs (Urban and Nontraditional Animal Science), are listed below:

UNP-0060 Digestive System of Goats  
 UNP-0080 Guidelines for Entry into Meat Rabbit Production  
 UNP-0081 Ensuring Nutrition for Goats  
 UNP-0082 Summer Heat and Rabbit Production  
 UNP-0083 Increasing Successful Reproduction Among Goats  
 UNP-0085 Caseous Lymphadenitis (CL) in Goats and Sheep  
 UNP-0087 Foot Rot and Foot Scald in Goats & Sheep  
 UNP-0088 Keratoconjunctivitis (Pinkeye) in Goats  
 UNP-0089 Enterotoxemia (Overeating Disease) in Sheep and Goats  
 UNP-0090 Vaccination Protocol for a Goat Herd  
 UNP-0091 Bacterial Pneumonia in Goats  
 UNP-0092 Injection Site Blemishes  
 UNP-0096 Direct and Indirect Marketing Options for Small Ruminant Producers  
 UNP-0098 Niche Marketing for Small Ruminants  
 UNP-0099 Performance Evaluation for Small Ruminants  
 UNP-0100 Winter Challenges for Rabbit Producers

Additionally, Extension Animal Scientists housed at Auburn University developed the publication titled "Reproductive Management of Sheep and Goats" (ANR-1316).

**Results**

ETP 11B - Sheep, Goat and Rabbit Production

Alabama small ruminant producers have become more knowledgeable and stayed open to new and different management practices that allowed their operations to be more productive and profitable. Registration records showed that a total of 994 sheep and goat producers attended educational activities carried out by ACES. Post surveys indicated that 835 participants (84%) gained knowledge as a result of the educational activities. Moreover, 676 participants (68%) reported improvements in herd health and production efficiency, and 497 participants (50%) reported increases in profitability ranging from 2 to 15%.

The small ruminant industry, in particular the meat goat segment, is one of the fastest growing enterprises of the Alabama agriculture economy. In 2007, there were nearly 48,000 goats in Alabama, more than an 11% increase since 2006.

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
301	Reproductive Performance of Animals
307	Animal Management Systems
303	Genetic Improvement of Animals

---

311	Animal Diseases
315	Animal Welfare/Well-Being and Protection
302	Nutrient Utilization in Animals

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

### External factors which affected outcomes

- Competing Programatic Challenges

### Brief Explanation

ETP 11B – Sheep, Goat and Rabbit Production

Although USDA has certain “ear-marked funds” available for livestock producer groups seeking federal help, goat producers constitute a minority group with few and less vocal supporters. Consequently, they are critically under-represented at decision-making levels.

Goat producers are locally impacted by Extension via its’ County and Regional Extension Agents, who handle questions, supply information, and conduct training in a wide variety of subject matter areas. To have a statewide comprehensive meat goat program, additional training activities focusing on breeds, feeding, pasture management, parasite control, marketing, and economics must be made available to all interested persons across Alabama. Hence, future plans include promoting participation of other ACES personnel and increasing the number of outreach education activities in South Alabama.

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

### 1. Evaluation Studies Planned

- After Only (post program)
- During (during program)

### Evaluation Results

ETP 11B – Sheep, Goat and Rabbit Production

- Increased knowledge of key production management practices.
- Improved forage management.
- Improved efficiency of production.
- Improved animal health and well-being.
- Increased marketing and profitability.

### Key Items of Evaluation

ETP 11B – Sheep, Goat and Rabbit Production

- As a result of the activities, 835 program participants gained knowledge of key production management practices.
- As a result of the activities, 676 program participants observed improved production efficiency.
- As a result of the activities, 676 program participants observed improved animal health and well-being.
- As a result of the activities, 497 program participants reported increased profitability rates ranging from 2 to 15 percent.

**Program #11****V(A). Planned Program (Summary)****1. Name of the Planned Program**

Agronomic Crops

**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	25%	25%		
205	Plant Management Systems	50%	50%		
215	Biological Control of Pests Affecting Plants	10%	10%		
216	Integrated Pest Management Systems	15%	15%		
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>		

**V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)****1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program**

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	22.9	0.5	0.0	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	25.7	0.0	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
534445	0	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
614007	0	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
2769778	0	0	0

**V(D). Planned Program (Activity)****1. Brief description of the Activity**

The objective of this program was to assist soybean farmers in Alabama and other soybean growing areas of the U.S by monitoring the spread of Asian soybean rust in 2007, and informing growers about timely and effective management of the disease.

Soybean Rust Activities conducted by the Alabama Cooperative Extension System (ACES) Field Crops team in 2007:

\*Education: Grower education was made a priority by members of the Field Crops Team prior to the growing season. Eight county and regional soybean production meetings were conducted with over 300 growers attending, with updates and lessons learned from the 2006 season. In addition to in-state programs, Team members were also invited to speak about their experiences with ASR to growers in Chiapas, Mexico, as well as present information at the National Soybean Rust Symposium in Louisville, Kentucky.

\*An Extension circular "Asian Soybean Rust in Alabama," (ANR-1310) <http://www.aces.edu/pubs/docs/A/ANR-1310/ANR-1310.pdf> was published in 2007. The circular focuses on identification and management of the disease.

\*The Auburn University Soybean Rust Hotline: (1-800-446-0388) was updated regularly during the season to keep growers and their advisors informed about soybean rust.

\*The Alabama Soybean Rust Sentinel Plot Network: A sentinel plot network for early detection of ASR was established with support from the USDA-APHIS and the Alabama Soybean Producers (checkoff funds), in coordination with the USDA National Soybean Rust Sentinel and Monitoring Network. Twenty soybean sentinel plots were planted in Alabama. In addition, 15 kudzu patches were also monitored weekly for the disease. Sentinel plots were scouted weekly Extension Agents County Agent Coordinators, Specialists and other Extension trained scouts. Over 25,000 soybean leaves were examined at the ALFA Agricultural Services Building, in addition to the large number of leaves that were examined by Extension crops team members in the field.

\*Four ASR spore traps were also checked weekly by Extension personnel, in cooperation with the University of Arkansas and Syngenta agricultural company, to determine if this method could give Alabama producers an even earlier warning of ASR movement into their area.

\*All monitoring information was regularly updated on the USDA National Soybean Rust Sentinel and Monitoring Network public website [www.sbrusa.net](http://www.sbrusa.net), keeping growers across the U.S. informed of ASR's movement.

## 2. Brief description of the target audience

The primary target audience is commercial producers, pesticide applicators and extension educators.

### 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	56000	210000	4500	16500
2007	2261	27141	1	0

#### 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**

	<b>Extension</b>	<b>Research</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Plan</b>			
2007	10	0	10

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

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

- This program area will include numerous output activities and methods as part of the Extension Team Projects (ETPs) which a

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	4	0

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O No.	Outcome Name
1	<p>For regional or county production meetings: determine producer numbers, acreage represented, overall economic interests represented from the participating farming operations, and predict the economic impact of the information presented (note: this will be based on the following: (acreage represented X average yield/acre X average cotton and program price received X predicted percent yield increase or savings in inputs based on the agent's or specialist's knowledge). Targets below represent millions of dollars.</p>
2	<p>Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:</p> <p>Why: Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed</p> <p>What: Specifically what was done and how it was done.</p> <p>When: If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.</p> <p>Where: Specific location-- the county or counties involved.</p> <p>Who and how many: The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.</p> <p>So what: This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes. Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.</p> <p>Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.</p>

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

For regional or county production meetings: determine producer numbers, acreage represented, overall economic interests represented from the participating farming operations, and predict the economic impact of the information presented (note: this will be based on the following: (acreage represented X average yield/acre X average cotton and program price received X predicted percent yield increase or savings in inputs based on the agent's or specialist's knowledge). Targets below represent millions of dollars.

**2. Associated Institution Types**

- 1862 Extension
- 1890 Extension

**3a. Outcome Type:**

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	100000000	0

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
215	Biological Control of Pests Affecting Plants
216	Integrated Pest Management Systems
102	Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships
205	Plant Management Systems

**Outcome #2****1. Outcome Measures**

Each ACES employee is required to provide a success story on the program activity which they felt best demonstrates the impacts of their work. These success stories contain the following elements:

**Why:** Explain the reason the program was done, or the situation or problem that the program addressed

**What:** Specifically what was done and how it was done.

**When:** If this was a one-time event, the date it occurred. If it is was a series of events, or an on-going program, when it began.

**Where:** Specific location-- the county or counties involved.

**Who and how many:** The "who" includes both who did the program and who were the clients of the program, as well as how many people were served.

**So what:** This is the part that gives the real meaning to "success". The basic question to be answered in this part is "what difference did this program make". The difference may be measured in terms of dollars, or in changes in habits, lifestyles or attitudes.

Whenever possible use numbers to show the effect of the program. If it is not possible to use numbers, provide a qualitative measurement like client comments or another type of testimonial about the program.

Since this program area is very broad in scope and contains multiple Extension Team Projects which have different outcomes measures, the impacts for this program area are best measured in the number and quality of the success stories generated by the individuals who work on these projects. Therefore, one very significant outcome measure is the number of success stories generated.

## 2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension

### 3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

### 3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2007	6	0

### 3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

## 4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
216	Integrated Pest Management Systems
102	Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships
205	Plant Management Systems
215	Biological Control of Pests Affecting Plants

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

### External factors which affected outcomes

- Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)

**Brief Explanation**

Because of intense monitoring by team members, and the severe drought, few fungicide applications were made by Alabama growers for rust control in 2007. A fungicide application for soybean rust would typically cost about \$20/acre. Prior to the season, we anticipated that most growers would spray at least once for the disease during 2007. With approximately 150,000 acres of soybeans planted in 2007 we estimated the cost of spraying at about \$3 million. Because of our educational programs prior to the season and the intense monitoring program conducted during the growing season we were able inform growers that fungicide applications in the majority of counties were not justified to control soybean rust in 2007. Confidence in Extension monitoring and educational efforts by soybean producers resulted in a significant number of growers not spraying for the disease, with estimates of less than 15% of the soybean acres sprayed. This resulted in a grower savings of over \$2.5 million in application costs, while still protecting the soybean crop from damage from ASR. An even greater impact of the program was felt nationally, as growers in Midwestern and other states with much larger soybean acreages closely tracked the Alabama and national monitoring efforts. Assuming that 50 million acres in the U.S were not unnecessarily treated for ASR, because of grower confidence in monitoring efforts, over \$1.0 billion in fungicide application costs were potentially saved by U.S. soybean growers in 2007.

**V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)****1. Evaluation Studies Planned**

- Before-After (before and after program)

**Evaluation Results**

Because of intense monitoring by team members, and the severe drought, few fungicide applications were made by Alabama growers for rust control in 2007. A fungicide application for soybean rust would typically cost about \$20/acre. Prior to the season, we anticipated that most growers would spray at least once for the disease during 2007. With approximately 150,000 acres of soybeans planted in 2007 we estimated the cost of spraying at about \$3 million. Because of our educational programs prior to the season and the intense monitoring program conducted during the growing season we were able inform growers that fungicide applications in the majority of counties were not justified to control soybean rust in 2007. Confidence in Extension monitoring and educational efforts by soybean producers resulted in a significant number of growers not spraying for the disease, with estimates of less than 15% of the soybean acres sprayed. This resulted in a grower savings of over \$2.5 million in application costs, while still protecting the soybean crop from damage from ASR. An even greater impact of the program was felt nationally, as growers in Midwestern and other states with much larger soybean acreages closely tracked the Alabama and national monitoring efforts. Assuming that 50 million acres in the U.S were not unnecessarily treated for ASR, because of grower confidence in monitoring efforts, over \$1.0 billion in fungicide application costs were potentially saved by U.S. soybean growers in 2007.

**Key Items of Evaluation**