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Introduction

This document is a summary of the recommendations for the future direction of the Southeast Research and Extension Center (SREC), as prepared by the faculty and administration of the unit. These recommendations are based on an in-depth self study through surveys and focus group interviews with Southeast Research and Extension Center faculty, Extension agents of the Southeast Extension District, department heads of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources; University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and citizens of the Southeast Extension District. These recommendations are presented for the consideration of the comprehensive review team visit scheduled for October. This is the first comprehensive review of the Southeast Research and Extension Center.

Role and Mission of the Southeast Research and Extension Center

The role and mission of the Southeast Research and Extension Center is to extend lifelong, continuing educational opportunities to the residents of the area, generally encompassing the Southeast Extension District, in those subject areas in which the faculty has the competence based on scientific research.

The Southeast Research and Extension Center has program responsibilities in the areas of the Cooperative Extension Service, the Nebraska Forest Service, and the Agricultural Research Division. The mission of the Southeast Research and Extension Center must consider the mission of these three parts of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources.

The boundaries of the educational programs defined by the Cooperative Extension Service include the development of skills, attitudes, and understanding of people which will enable them to: conserve and effectively use natural resources; efficiently produce range, farm and forest products; increase effectiveness of the marketing distribution system; optimize their development as individuals and as members of the family and community; improve their community organization, services, and environment; develop as informed leaders in a democratic society; and raise their level of living through wise resource management to achieve family goals.

The mission of the Nebraska Forest Service is to provide:

1. Technical forestry services to citizens and agencies as needed.
2. Tree and shrub seedlings, at cost, for reforestation and afforestation.
3. Training, equipment, and services for the protection of Nebraska's forest and range resources.

The research aspect of our mission is to encourage and cooperate with the scientists in the departments of the Institute of Agriculture and
Natural Resources (IANR), which will result in the conducting of appropriate research contributing to the establishment and maintenance of a permanent and effective agricultural industry, as well as, improving the home and family living of the residents of southeast Nebraska.

With this role and mission for the Center, it is necessary to have a continuous communication link between the Center staff, county staff, and clientele, to identify the current needs of the clientele we serve. The input from clientele is accomplished by interchange of staff with county extension boards, commodity groups, and a district citizens advisory committee.

The Center is the administrative headquarters for the Cooperative Extension Service and the Nebraska Forest Service in southeast Nebraska. The faculty associated with the Center in Lincoln have affiliation with the departments of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources. The Center does not have administrative responsibilities for the Agricultural Research Division but serves in a liaison role to the departments.

The Extension agents are also faculty members of the University of Nebraska. The agents and Extension assistants (managerial/professional staff) are administered by the District Director, cooperatively with the county Extension board. The Extension boards are elected representatives from the area who have responsibility for: securing county funding; providing overall program direction; providing adequate office space, equipment, and supplies; establishing general county operating policy; and maintaining strong public relations with county commissioners and leadership groups. The Extension boards, cooperatively with the University of Nebraska, employ Extension agents and Extension assistants and evaluate Extension agents and programs.

Several approaches were used to gain input from faculty and clientele for this review. The faculty of the Southeast Research and Extension Center participated in a retreat at a Lincoln motel on March 19 and 20, 1987. Our discussion included the future direction of the Southeast Research and Extension Center within the campus structure; the role and management of joint appointments between the Southeast Research and Extension Center and the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources departments; the importance of the programming role of Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists to Southeast District extension agents; the need for visibility of the Southeast Research and Extension Center to staff and public; the future role of the Southeast Research and Extension Center as a representative of the total University of Nebraska-Lincoln; the major program priorities of the Southeast Research and Extension Center for the next five years; and the futuristic programming direction for the urban counties (Douglas, Lancaster, Sarpy). Recommendations from these discussions are included in the Supplemental Document for this review.

Similar retreats were held for the Extension agents at the Cooperative Extension Service office in Lancaster County on April 14, 1987 and for the department heads at the Nebraska East Union on May 18.
Prior to these retreats, a questionnaire was sent to Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists, Extension agents, and department heads. The results of these surveys were available to the participants prior to the retreats.

Focus group interviews were conducted with three different citizen groups by Dr. Robert Florell, Extension Program Evaluation Specialist. Questionnaires were sent to citizens groups prior to the focus interviews.

The complete results of all questionnaires, retreat discussion groups and focus group discussions can be found in the Supplemental Document for this review available at the Southeast Research and Extension Center central office.
WHAT MAKES COMPREHENSIVE REVIEWS MOST EFFECTIVE?
Irv Omvedt
Agricultural Research Division
University of Nebraska, Lincoln

The following observations relative to what tends to make some program reviews more effective than others are based on personal experience from serving on review panels and from being involved in coordinating comprehensive departmental reviews in the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources. What you get out of a review is directly proportional to effort put into planning the review.

1. When faculty foresee a need for program improvement and to plan ahead.

2. When the review process is not viewed as merely meeting an administrative requirement.

3. When an opportunity for change exists in the administrative unit. Particularly effective if unit has a new administrative head, new staff, open positions, faculty turnover expected, or when a need exists for a new program area.

4. When faculty are involved with the administration in planning the review. Staff should be involved in establishing program objective for the review and in identifying questions, developing alternatives, and preparing information so visiting panel will clearly understand the current situation. Should not expect visitors to come in cold and ask the "RIGHT" questions and provide useful suggestions.

5. When unit has sufficient time to plan and prepare an in-depth, objective self study. Self study should be tailored to address the unit's situation. Process should start a year in advance of the review. Panel members need to receive the self study report at least a month in advance.

6. When agenda is carefully developed involving unit staff, ANR administration and panel chair. Agenda should meet specific needs of the unit situation. Review should be directed toward mission of unit -- keeping clientele you are serving in mind and addressing scientific significance of programs as well.

7. When participants on the review panel are carefully chosen. Staff should be involved in suggesting possible participants. Usually not a problem to get effective reviewers if requested early enough.

8. When visiting panel are used as reactors to future plans and alternatives generated by resident staff. Reporting present status and recent progress of projects should be kept to a minimum.

9. When a free exchange takes place among staff and review panel during the review. Mini-seminars with interaction only between staff member reporting and the panel are discouraged. Highly desirable for entire staff to sit through the review discussions to gain an understanding of what is going on in all areas and to enhance internal communications.

10. When faculty and administration welcome constructive criticism and work together following the review to implement the recommended changes.
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Monday, October 26

Team members check in by 2:30 p.m. at the Nebraska Center

3:00 - 4:00 p.m. Team assembles and organizes, Nebraska East Union

4:00 - 5:30 p.m. Charge to the review team by IANR administration

5:30 - 6:30 p.m. Free time

6:30 p.m. Steak Fry, Lancaster Cooperative Extension Service Office; review team, IANR administration, Southeast Research and Extension Center faculty (SREC), selected field staff, and citizens; orientation and overview of the Center

Tuesday, October 27

7:00 a.m. Breakfast, Nebraska East Union

8:15 a.m. Continue overview of Center and existing program

10:00 a.m. Break

10:30 a.m. An overview of present and future research in southeast Nebraska; Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources department heads

INTERDISCIPLINARY GROUPS

Animal Production
Animal Science
Veterinary Science
Ag Economics
Agronomy
Ag Engineering
Entomology

Field Crop Production
Agronomy
Ag Economics
Ag Engineering
Entomology
Plant Pathology
Center for Ag Meteorology and Climatology
Tuesday, October 27 (Continued)

**Food Technology**
- Food Science and Technology
- Human Nutrition
- Animal Science
- Horticulture
- Ag Economics
- Ag Engineering

**Conservation and Natural Resources**
- Agronomy
- Ag Engineering
- Conservation and Survey
- Center for Ag Meteorology and Climatology
- Ag Economics
- Forestry, Fisheries and Wildlife
- Environmental Programs

**Horticulture Crop Production**
- Horticulture
- Ag Economics
- Agronomy
- Entomology
- Plant Pathology
- Food Science and Technology
- Ag Engineering

**Quality of Life**
- Consumer Science and Education
- Human Development
- Human Nutrition
- Textiles, Clothing and Design
- Horticulture

12:00 p.m. Lunch, NEU

1:00 p.m. Continue overview of research

3:00 p.m. Break

3:15 p.m. Begin review of objectives, process and reports

3:30 p.m. Objective 1: Future direction of SREC within IANR campus structure; (specialist and Extension agent; respondents)

4:15 p.m. Objective 2: Role and management of joint appointments between SREC and IANR departments; (specialist, Extension agent and department head; respondents)

5:00 p.m. Reports end

Evening free
Wednesday, October 28

7:00 a.m. Breakfast, NEU

8:00 a.m. Objective 3: Programming role of SREC specialist to extension agents; (specialist and Extension agent; respondents)

8:45 a.m. Objective 4: Need for visibility of SREC to staff and public; (specialist and Extension agent; respondents)

9:30 a.m. Break

9:45 a.m. Objective 5: Future role of SREC as a representative of the total University of Nebraska-Lincoln; (specialist and Extension agent; respondents)

10:30 a.m. Objective 6: Major program priorities 1987-1992; (specialist and Extension agent; respondents)

11:15 a.m. Objective 7: Futuristic programming in the urban counties; (specialist and Extension agent; respondents)

12:00 p.m. Lunch, NEU

1:00 p.m. Cooperative Extension Service Reorganization
    **JNP model
    **County clustering

2:00 p.m. Individual faculty appointments

3:00 p.m. Work session

6:00 p.m. Dinner

   Evening free
Thursday. October 29

8:00 a.m. Work session
11:15 p.m. Exit report to SREC administration
12:00 p.m. Working lunch, exit report to IANR administration
2:00 p.m. Exit report to SREC faculty
3:00 p.m. Conclusion of onsite review team activities

ARRANGEMENTS:

1. A room is reserved in the Nebraska East Union as the head­quarters for the review team to use Monday evening until Thursday noon.

2. Microcomputers available for draft report preparation throughout the week.

3. A nine passenger station wagon will be reserved for the team during the week.
An Introduction to Southeast Nebraska

The Southeast District is unique, diversified, and the most rapidly changing area in the state. The uniqueness is a result of such things as: a continuous increase in population, increased numbers of small acreages, a decline in number of farms, a loss of land to housing developments, and the addition of numerous small and medium sized businesses and industries to the region. The district is both an urban and a rural district.

Southeast Nebraska is composed of an aging population. Of the 950,000 residents of the district, 34 percent are over 40 years of age and 11 percent of the population is over 65. The median age of the district is 33 years.

The Southeast District’s population represents approximately 60 percent of the state’s population, and for 1983, the personal income of these residents was in excess of eleven billion dollars. However, while the total population continues to increase, the number of farm units continues to decrease. For 1984, there were approximately twenty thousand farm units in this district, a decrease of 8.5 percent since 1979.

The 26 percent of the state’s cropland located within the district contributes 27 percent of the agricultural products produced within the state. Corn, soybeans, wheat, and sorghum are the leading grain crops produced within the region.

The district also contributes significantly to the livestock industry with 33 percent of the hogs and 35 percent of the milk cows produced.

Most soils, within the district, are highly erodible through wind and water action. Therefore, soils must be protected through improved farming practices such as conservation tillage, no till, and construction of conservation practices such as dams, terraces, waterways and grass seeding. Based upon USDA data from 18 counties in the district in 1984, there were 2,060,288 million acres of cropland that is adequately treated or 45.07 percent. Land not treated accounts for 2,511,474 million acres or 54.93 percent.

Much of the focus of industry and manufacturing in Nebraska is centered in the southeast district. Approximately 1,200 manufacturers are located in the district with the majority of them being located in Lincoln and Omaha. In addition, Lincoln is the state capitol and houses the lead campus of the University of Nebraska and much government related employment with state, regional and federal government facilities.

There is wide diversity to the water supply in southeast Nebraska. In the southeast corner of the district, there is concern for the lack of an adequate domestic water supply. In the northern part of the district there is adequate water for domestic, agriculture and industrial usage. The Platte River divides the district and major cities of the area have their well fields in the river valley. There is an ongoing concern that a high level of water quality be maintained.
HISTORY of the Southeast Research and Extension Center

The southeast district was developed in the reorganization plan of the districts of the Cooperative Extension Service on January 1, 1967. The title of the administrator of the district unit was changed from District Supervisor to District Director at that time.

At this same time, the first steps were made to move the district directors from a central office on the Lincoln campus to offices in the districts. The district director for southeast Nebraska moved to the designated district office location in Miller Hall on the East Campus of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in October, 1970. The reason for the district director of southeast Nebraska remaining on campus is that Lincoln is the geographic center of the district.

At that time, the first two specialists for the district joined the district director in Miller Hall. By the end of 1972, the district specialist staff included the fields of farm management, soils, urban youth, horticulture, and animal science.

In 1972, all specialist positions were 100% Extension appointments. Currently, one position, the horticultural position, has a research component (75% E/25% R). The research component of this position is administered by the Horticulture department because of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources budget reduction completed in 1983. The role of the Southeast Research and Extension Center in research for the past several years has been to serve as a liaison with the citizens of southeast Nebraska and assist in the determination of research topics that address needs of the area. Extension and forestry related programs for southeast Nebraska remain an integral part of the Southeast Research and Extension Center and programming for these two Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources programs are administered from the Center.

Presently, seventeen faculty positions have either partial or full 100% FTE appointments to the district. Positions with a 100% FTE appointment to the district are: farm management, soils, 4-H and youth, forestry (3), community resource development, and farm business (2). Partial appointments represent the subject matter departments of horticulture (75%), animal science (2 positions--35% and 25%), entomology (50%), weed science (25%), irrigation (40%), and crops (25%). Two administrators, a director, and an associate director oversee the programs of the Southeast Research and Extension Center and the county Extension programs of the 23 counties of the district.

On January 1, 1985, Mussehl Hall on the University of Nebraska's East Campus was designated as the permanent site of the Southeast Research and Extension Center. All faculty with 100% FTE of their appointments to the Southeast Research and Extension Center will be housed in Mussehl Hall after current renovation is completed. Extension specialists, with partial appointments, are housed in their subject matter departments on campus.
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March, 1987
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>EXTENSION AGENTS-CHAIR</th>
<th>EXTENSION AGENTS/ASSISTANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gage</td>
<td>Paul Hay, Ag</td>
<td>Larry Germer, Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Bob Stritzke, Ag</td>
<td>Kay McKinzie, Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNP Unit</td>
<td>Ken Burgert, Ag</td>
<td>Barbara Schmidt, Home Ec (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>Don Miller, Ag</td>
<td>Linda Buethe, Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jim Carson, Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kim Schilling, Ext Asst-Youth (50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maureen Burson, 4-H &amp; Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alice Henneman, EFNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Don Janssen, Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Twyla Lidolph, Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gus Shires, Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esther Wyant, Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lorene Bartos, Ext Asst-Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Christy Jensen, Ext Asst-Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kevin Kock, Ext Asst-Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vicki Wohlert, Ext Asst-Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Wolfe, Ext Asst-Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otoe</td>
<td>Gary Garey, Ag</td>
<td>Judy Schwab, Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platte</td>
<td>Bob Voboril, Ag</td>
<td>Duane Kantor, Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jane Munson, Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lynda Ohrt, 4-H and Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kelly Lant, Ext Asst-Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polk</td>
<td>Norm Brown, Ag</td>
<td>Susan Hansen, Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cheryl McKeeag, Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Gerald Hopp, Ag</td>
<td>Debra Stevens, Home Ec (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>Randy Pryor, Ag</td>
<td>Vl Damkroger, Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarpy</td>
<td>Dennis Bejot, Ag</td>
<td>Sharon Skipton, Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Monte Stauffer, Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saunders</td>
<td>Keith Glewen, Ag</td>
<td>Lynne Teaford, Ext Asst-Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nancy Urbanec, Ext Asst-Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seward</td>
<td>Dianne Zeilinger, Home Ec</td>
<td>Susan Williams, Home Ec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bob Meduna, Ext Asst-Youth/Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Jim Peterson, Ag</td>
<td>Marvin Sefnna, Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Large</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lorrie Pearson, Ext Asst-Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Becky Versch, Home Ec (60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duane Dalluge, Ag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Cooperative Extension Service Programs

The Smith-Lever Act of Congress, passed in 1914, established the Cooperative Extension Service as the arm of the land grant college system to provide educational programs in agriculture, home economics and related subjects for persons not enrolled in the land grant college. The Nebraska Legislature, in 1915, passed legislation authorizing extension work to be carried on with the counties in cooperation with the University of Nebraska and the United States Department of Agriculture.

Extension programs are in the broad area of agriculture and natural resources, home economics, 4-H and youth development, and community resource development. Twenty-three main county extension offices, staffed by Extension Agents and Assistants, serve as the focal point for the Southeast District. Extension specialists, at the Southeast Research and Extension Center located on the University of Nebraska East Campus, serve as the key interpretive link between research and the people.

The Extension programs reach farmers, agricultural industries, homemakers, families, and community youth and leaders through a variety of delivery methods.

Highlights of some of the recent Extension programs of the unit are as follows:

CONSERVATION TILLAGE - Over 2,800 farmers, 53% more than 1985, learned techniques of reduced tillage. The majority indicated they would make changes in farm operations. An example of impact is the 29,500 acres under conservation tillage in one county - a 436% increase since 1982. -- Loyd L. Young, Director, Southeast Research and Extension Center.

WOMEN IN AGRICULTURE - Ninety-seven percent of the 130 women who attended workshops to better understand the farm economy, to prepare financial statements and to cope with family conflicts said they would apply what they had learned. -- Elizabeth A. Birnstihl, Associate Director, Southeast Research and Extension Center.

IMPROVED NUTRITION FOR FAMILIES - Over 13,000 individuals during the past year, learned how to improve dietary habits and to save money on food purchases. Seventy-five percent of those learning how to reduce sodium, fat, or sugar in their diets documented how they would incorporate this information into their personal dietary practices. -- Elizabeth A. Birnstihl, Associate Director, Southeast Research and Extension Center.

1987 4-H HIGHLIGHTS - Nine counties in the district are currently working with a 4-H volunteer middle management program. A successful Key Leader Seminar presented by middle management volunteers from four pilot counties attracted representatives from five additional counties who are interested in the volunteer middle management program. Several other counties are in the discussion stage at this time.
A "Take a Friend - Make a Friend" promotional campaign attracted 1,043 youth to 4-H summer camps at the Eastern Nebraska 4-H Center in 1987. A camper wrote, "I learned a lot about myself and how to become a leader." Another teen wrote, "I found the leadership workshop a very valuable learning experience."

Results of a study on "Behavioral Changes in Youth as a Result of Summer Camp Experiences" showed that parents indicated improvement in their children after camp in several key areas. Over 70% of the parents saw improvement in self-confidence. Over 69% in independence and group experiences and 62.7% saw their children improve in self-concept. The study shows dramatically, the importance of an effective outdoor education program.

Sixty-seven percent of the district's 4-H enrollment is school enrichment. A total of 22,805 members participated in school enrichment in 1986. Blue Ski Below My Feet and Wheat Science are two popular new school enrichment projects. -- Tom D. Leisy, Extension 4-H Youth Specialist.

LIVING RESOURCEFULLY which emphasizes the wise use of decision making skills, documented that during the past year, 5,000 persons learned skills and made changes in their lives to extend their personal resources of money, time, or energy. -- Elizabeth A. Birnstihl, Associate Director, Southeast Research and Extension Center.

NEBRASKA FARM BUSINESS ASSOCIATION (NFBA) - Three hundred fifty Nebraska Farm Business Association farmer members received individual assistance with farm records, business analysis, tax planning and management consultations in 1986. In addition, a small number of members required individual assistance with business restructuring and bankruptcy consultations. Group meetings provided for Nebraska Farm Business Association members included trend analysis seminars, marketing management and comparative farm business analysis review.

The Nebraska Farm Business Association operates through the Southeast Research and Extension Center but offers programs to all Nebraska farm and ranch operators. Current membership includes farm businesses in four of the five Extension Districts. -- Gary Bredensteiner, Extension Farm Business Consultant.

CHEMIGATION - The 1986 Nebraska Legislature passed a comprehensive chemigation law. The law, which became effective January 1, 1987, requires that all persons using chemigation be certified. To be certified, a chemigation applicator must attend a training session and pass a test. The law requires the Department of Environmental Control (DEC) to conduct the training sessions or contract with the Cooperative Extension Service. The Department of Environmental Control did contract with the Nebraska Cooperative Extension Service to conduct the training during 1987. A training notebook and a series of slide-tape sets were prepared to use in the training sessions.
In the Southeast Extension District, the training sessions were conducted by the irrigation and entomology specialists. Eleven sessions were held in the district with 644 people taking the training. The test pass rate in the Southeast District was 95% compared to 93% on a statewide basis. -- DeLynn Hay, Extension Agricultural Engineering Specialist/Steve Danielson, Extension Entomologist.

STRAWBERRY CONSUMER PICK OPERATIONS - Before 1980, there was no commercial production of strawberries in southeast Nebraska. In 1980, a major long term horticulture extension thrust program was set into action in the Horticulture Plant Selection, Propagation and Production area. This program was designed to provide commercial horticulturists, extension agents, and the citizenry of Nebraska with, 1) on-site horticulture field demonstrations in the counties, 2) open house(s) and field days of greenhouse and field plantings for the general public.

In the spring of 1981, seven geographic locations in southeast Nebraska were identified as sites and were planted to conduct strawberry evaluations. This thrust program helped ten strawberry pick-your-own operations get started with a total acreage of at least 100 acres. -- William A. Gustafson, Jr., Extension Horticulturist.

APPLE PRODUCTION ON THE INCREASE IN SOUTHEAST NEBRASKA - The Cooperative Extension Service has been well received by commercial fruit growers in southeast Nebraska. They have been the major consultant/resource for nine new/expanded orchard plantings since 1980 (total of 105 acres). These new plantings can easily have a total production value of $1,000,000. Nebraska now has approximately 400 acres in apple production. The Cooperative Extension Service in southeast Nebraska has advised farmers to sell all their apples on the farm to the general public rather than wholesaling them. Over ninety percent of the apple crop is now retailed on the farm by the orchardist(s), thus allowing the farmer to double his profit. -- William A. Gustafson, Jr., Extension Horticulturist.

RATION BALANCING AND FORAGE QUALITY FOR DAIRY AND BEEF CATTLE - Nutrition is one of the major factors limiting optimum production in both beef and dairy enterprises. Reduced production and herd health problems can be attributed to the poor nutrition programs. The major thrust of this program will be to focus on providing balanced rations to livestock, but also the production of better quality forage to feed to livestock which will result in greater potential profits to the producer.

The program will use the mobile Near Infared Scanner to demonstrate the new and quick method of feed analysis and the important and useful aspects of a feed analysis in a feeding program. -- Rick Rasby, Extension Beef Specialist.

INTEGRATED REPRODUCTIVE MANAGEMENT - A five year demonstration project monitoring management of labor, land, feed and financial
resources in ten cow/calf operations located across Nebraska. A cooperating herd is located in both Gage and Polk counties in the Southeast Extension District. The program is designed to develop a data base keying in on reproductive efficiency and associated financial costs.

A summary of three years of production data indicate an 8% increase in the numbers of cows weaning a calf and about a 25 pound increase in weaning weights. Information gained from the Integrated Reproductive Management program is being shared through meetings, field days, and news media. -- Rick Rasby, Extension Beef Specialist.

FIELD CROP INTEGRATED PEST MANAGEMENT IN SOUTHEAST NEBRASKA - Integrated pest management in southeastern Nebraska has involved the development and promotion of best field crop pest management practices. The use of field scouting and economic thresholds has been emphasized through educational delivery methods such as demonstration/research, publications, radio tapes, presentations at meetings, and scout training workshops.

The life stages and infestation levels of the alfalfa weevil, European corn borer, and bean leaf beetle were monitored twice weekly through the growing season. Computer models will be developed that will predict when the pests should be scouted for and when they will be vulnerable to control measures. Nineteen annual weeds were planted each month of the growing season. Stage of growth was recorded each week in an effort to correlate development with growing degree (temperature) units. The purpose is to develop computer models that will predict when weed species will be vulnerable to control.

Numerous radio tapes were produced to address current pest situations. Twenty-four issues of the Nebraska Insect Newsletter are published annually and distributed to over 1,500 clientele. I participated in twenty-four educational meetings and workshops with a total attendance of 1,873 people during FY87. Numerous telephone and personal consultations were conducted to assist clientele with pest problems of various types. -- Steve Danielson, Extension Entomologist and Integrated Pest Management Coordinator.

MANAGEMENT FOR PROFIT-SMALL BUSINESS education programs and materials have been prepared and taught on several topics, some of which include -- breakeven analysis, advertising, business promotion, retail sales leakage, business owner's stress, customer relations and financial management. Incidences of reported implementation are numerous and successes have been reported. As an example, a business owner called about a year after a program to report that he had put one of the program suggestions into place and as a result, had increased gross sales by $100,000.00, had added one and one-half FTE's to labor, and increased community service/product availability. -- Wanda M. Leonard, Extension Community Resource Development Specialist.
MID-AMERICA AND ITS FUTURE FOUR STATE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CONFERENCES have made contact with over 17,500 people. Results from workshops are numerous. Some example results include: a $300,000 housing development project, a $75,000 increase in investment of idle city funds, the development of three community foundations, business expansion through enterprise additions, multi-community promotion plans, and formation of a 4-state tourism development council. -- Wanda M. Leonard, Extension Community Resource Development Specialist.

COMMUNITY ECONOMIC ANALYSIS SURVEY/STUDIES have been conducted in cooperation with state agencies, city councils, chambers of commerce and private citizens. Results of these studies have resulted in projects such as a $400,000.00 Adult Health and Recreation Center funded through the development of a Community Trust/Foundation, feasibility studies of a cooperatively owned grocery, community block grant eligibility and application procedures, street improvement programs, housing developments and similar community improvement projects. -- Wanda M. Leonard, Extension Community Resource Development Specialist.

CRIME PREVENTION MATERIALS and programs for the business, farm, community and person were prepared. Pre and post-test evaluations demonstrated an increase in knowledge as high as 88% on selected business crime prevention programs. A six-month post evaluation on shoplifting prevention showed that 40% of those responding had changed one or more practices in their place of business to thwart shoplifting. -- Wanda M. Leonard, Extension Community Resource Development Specialist.

FARM MANAGEMENT - Farm financial management has been a primary thrust area for the specialist and many extension agents of the Southeast Extension District. The agricultural economy has directed an increasing amount of attention to farmers financial well being.

Extension has responded with educational programs which assist the farm family to assess their resources, set goals for the farm and family and determine how the goals or objectives can be achieved. This was done by a series of four day workshops followed by on farm visitations in the program -- Management For Tomorrow.

Spin-off of the Management For Tomorrow programs have been three day workshops in reducing risk by cashflow management, farm records meetings, and Women in Agriculture seminars. Individual counseling has been available for severe financial problem cases. Production economics and farm management decisions have been the mainline of specialist requests by the extension agents in the district. Estimated costs of production, leases, enterprise analysis, and custom rates are subjects most called upon. These are conveyed by individual consultation, publications, press releases, newsletters and radio programs. -- Douglas D. Duey, Extension Economist-Farm Management.
Nebraska Forest Service Programs

COMMUNITY FORESTRY - During the year community forestry began to grow at a much greater pace than in years past.

Activity in Southeast Extension District increased with several communities beginning tree management programs. They include Fairbury, Falls City, Springfield, Gretna, Schuyler, Clarkson, and Liberty. A total of thirty Nebraska cities attained Tree City USA status this year.

Perhaps the most interesting project is the contract work that the Nebraska Forest Service is doing with Offutt Air Force Base. The base has asked for a comprehensive community forest management plan that will cover both the operations area and the living quarters. Until now, Offutt has managed their tree resource on a reactionary basis and as funds were available. The new plan, when completed in October of 1987, will call for more professional input and making management decisions before the trees fall into a crisis situation.

The plan has required the listing of every tree on the base and locating them on a master map. When complete, there will be a map showing all existing trees overlaid with markings for recommended tree planting. In addition, recommendations will be made for maintenance of existing plants and budget guidelines.

The Offutt plan will be rather unique and could quite possibly be the first of its kind in the country. Offutt will apply for Tree City USA status later this year. Only two other military bases have attained this honor (both Army). -- Dave Mooter, Community Forester.

BLACK WALNUT VIDEOTAPE - Black walnut is the premier timber tree in Nebraska. To help landowners better manage their black walnut trees, Southeast Research and Extension Center foresters developed a videotape cassette entitled "Pruning Black Walnut Trees For Profit." The forty minute video thoroughly explains the principle of pruning black walnut to produce high-quality timber trees. The videotape has been used extensively in Nebraska and throughout the eastern United States. -- Dennis Adams, Extension Forester.

TREES AND CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM - The 1985 Farm Bill contains the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP), which is designed to reduce soil erosion by retiring highly erodible land from crop production. Land enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program must be planted to permanent vegetative cover such as trees, shrubs, or grasses.

Southeast Research and Extension Center foresters provide technical planning assistance to landowners for Conservation Reserve Program tree planting practices. Twenty tree planting plans involving over 180 acres were developed for southeast Nebraska landowners by Southeast Research and Extension Center foresters in 1986. -- Dennis Adams, Extension Forester.
Research Programs

The Agricultural Research Division is the research division of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources. The Nebraska Agricultural Experiment Station was established by the Hatch Act of 1887 and receives state and federal appropriations for research in agriculture, home economics, and natural resources. Research is conducted in several departments on the Lincoln East Campus and at several University research facilities throughout Nebraska. Most of the research faculty are on joint appointments in the College of Agriculture, the Cooperative Extension Service, or the College of Home Economics.

The expansion of urban areas and relocation of farm families displaced from their farms is challenging the research system in ways not previously seen. Urban consumers are asking challenging questions related to needs in their life style while displaced farm families are asking for ways to assimilate what has happened in their lives. At the same time, the agricultural research needs are still prevalent. The research needs of southeast Nebraska are a complex, interrelated group.

With the redirection of research funds for the Southeast Research and Extension Center in 1983, an ad hoc Southeast Research Advisory Committee was named by the director of the Center. The committee was composed of farmers, homemakers, agri-business representatives, bankers, Extension agents, and Southeast Research and Extension Center Extension/research specialists. This committee met over a two year period - July 1984 through July 1986, and attempted to identify the research needs for southeast Nebraska in agriculture and home economics.

After the committee completed its assigned task, a written report was presented to the dean and director of the Agricultural Research Division. Upon the suggestion of Dean Omtvedt, the report was presented and discussed with interdisciplinary groups of department heads in June, 1987.

From the ad hoc committee's report and the follow-up discussions with department heads, the following areas of needed research were identified for, but not limited to, southeast Nebraska.

Animal Production

1. Factors affecting the economics of livestock production and marketing.

2. The role of diversified crop/livestock farms (several different crops and species of livestock on family farms) in the future.

3. Production practices and the economics of the poultry production (turkeys, broilers, layers).
4. Cow/calf production with close interaction with pasture/forage production.

5. Calf growing systems with close interaction with pasture/forage production.


7. Beef feedlot production.

Field Crop Production

1. Continue crop breeding efforts to develop lines which are resistant to diseases, drought and insects.

2. Soil erosion control including:
   a. The need for soil erosion control practices
   b. Cost-benefit ratio of soil conservation practices
   c. The effect of erosion on land values.

3. Long-term physical effects of the use of pesticides on the user.


5. Continue the research of cropping alternatives.

6. Alternatives to the use of pesticides in crop production.

7. Impact of various tillage and soil conservation practices toward reaching no-point pollution.

Food Technology

1. With the increased activity in horticulture crop production, research is needed on packaging and marketing of the crops at the field production point.

2. The nutritional aspects of horticultural crops.

3. Properties of crops for processing such as tomatoes for paste, canning, fresh, etc.


5. Continue research with individual businesses and processors in developing the processing and marketing of new food products.
Conservation and Natural Resources

1. Development of tillage and planting methods that will be highly acceptable to farmers. Adequate research has been done on how to control soil erosion. It is the challenge to have farmers employ such practices to meet the requirements of an approved and implemented soil conservation program by 1995.

2. Continue research studies on reducing the use of agricultural chemicals in crop production, including the economics.


4. The use of chemicals by urban residents on their lawns and gardens and their long term effect on the urban environment.

Horticulture Crop Production

1. Depending on the interest of potential growers and processors and the potential growth in fruit and vegetable production, research may be needed in the harvesting, handling, packaging, and marketing of horticulture crops.

2. Cut flower production has a potential for the area. If there develops a strong interest and potential market, research will be needed on producing, harvesting, handling, and marketing of cut flowers. Related to cut flowers and other horticulture plants, studies are needed on the profitable operation of greenhouses.

3. Other issues identified:
   a. Turf
   b. Cultivar selection
   c. Organic production
   d. Economics of production

Quality of Life

1. The quality of life is probably one of the more complex areas in considering areas of research emphasis, with the limited resources of the University in this area. Overall, the major areas identified for possible research are nutrition, housing, and clothing.
2. A major long term concern effecting the quality of life is the AIDS disease. The impact of this disease is unknown when considering the potential number of people that could contact the disease, the cost of treatment and care of AIDS patients, subsequent increases in health insurance, public reaction, and family understanding. In the future, the role of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources research programs may not apply to this problem; however, it is identified as a potentially serious problem effecting the quality of life.

3. The major problem areas for research identified earlier are the basic needs areas of the elderly -- nutrition, housing, and clothing. Personal budgets for the elderly will become critical as the amount of available disposable income decreases in the next five years, and fewer dollars are available to cover medical and nursing home costs as well as basic needs such as food and housing. Fewer volunteers and family members will be available to assist the elderly in the future.

4. Continue research in human development and the family. Areas of concern identified:
   a. How to reduce or stop families from teaching unacceptable behaviors to the next generation, i.e., need to learn to reward behavior that is acceptable in today's society.
   b. Dealing with the emotional stress on the farm family with varying economic situations.
   c. Rewarding acceptable behavior.
   d. Factors affecting the extended family.
Objectives of the
Southeast Research and Extension Center
Comprehensive Review

Several items have been addressed as part of our review. Our self study has been designed to look to the future. Specific issues addressed during the self study process and for further consideration by the review team are:

1. To determine the future direction of the Southeast Research and Extension Center within the campus structure.
2. To determine the role and management of joint appointments between the Southeast Research and Extension Center and the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources departments.
3. To determine the importance of the programming role of Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists to Southeast District extension agents.
4. To determine the need for visibility of the Southeast Research and Extension Center to staff and public.
5. To determine the future role of the Southeast Research and Extension Center as a representative of the total University of Nebraska-Lincoln.
6. To determine the major program priorities of the Southeast Research and Extension Center for the next five years.
7. To determine the futuristic programming direction for the urban counties (Douglas, Lancaster and Sarpy).

As a result of our review, we hope that we can obtain recommendations that will be useful to the Southeast Research and Extension Center in the future.
OBJECTIVE I

Statement of Objective: As a result of the Southeast Research and Extension Center Comprehensive Review, the future direction of the Center within the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources campus structure will be determined.

Recommendations: Based on the surveys and group discussions, the following recommendations are being made for the future direction of the Southeast Research and Extension Center.

1. The Southeast Research and Extension Center becomes a strong Center located on the East Campus of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The Center develops an area of excellence.

2. All future appointments of Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists will have at least a 25% research appointment. The research appointment may be based in the subject matter departments for more efficient use of equipment, technicians and other resources but the research work will target the needs of southeast Nebraska but not be limited to the geographic area. The research should be applied research.

3. All future specialist appointments will have the total Cooperative Extension Service appointment in the Southeast Research and Extension Center.

Discussion: In the survey of the faculty of the Southeast Research and Extension Center, including the extension agents and the department heads of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resource (IANR), nearly 70% indicated the structure should remain as it is with the faculty of the Center having only Cooperative Extension Service or Nebraska Forest Service appointments (Table 1-1). This current structure includes being physically located on campus, no research appointments of Center faculty, and some Center specialists having Cooperative Extension Service time divided between the Center and Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources departments.

| TABLE 1-1 |
| Future Structure of the Southeast Research and Extension Center |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remain as it is</td>
<td>(8) 15%</td>
<td>(34) 64%</td>
<td>(11) 21%</td>
<td>53 (100%)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the structure</td>
<td>(9) 26%</td>
<td>(14) 61%</td>
<td>(3) 13%</td>
<td>23 (100%)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>&lt;14</td>
<td>&lt;48</td>
<td>&lt;14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three different groups give a different reaction in responding to the question if the Southeast Research and Extension Center should have Agricultural Research Division (ARD) appointments in combination with the current Cooperative Extension Service and Nebraska Forest Service appointments. Fifty-eight percent of the specialists and 50% of the agents indicated that Agricultural Research Division appointments should be added to those appointments of Southeast Research and Extension Center faculty according to Table 1-2, while only 21% of the department heads supported Agricultural Research Division appointments being added to the Southeast Research and Extension unit. In combining all three groups, slightly over half (53%) favored leaving the appointments as they are at the current time (Table 1-2).

**TABLE 1-2**

Future Mission of Southeast Research and Extension Center in Terms of Faculty Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of SREC Faculty Appointments</th>
<th>Department Specialists</th>
<th>Department Agents</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES &amp; NFS</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES, NFS &amp; ARD</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**OBJECTIVE II**

Statement of Objective: The Southeast Research and Extension Center (SREC) Comprehensive Review will determine the role and management of joint appointment between the Southeast Research and Extension Center and the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources' departments, and also between the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and the Agriculture Research Division (ARD).

Recommendations: Based on the surveys and group discussions of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resource department heads, the Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists, the Southeast Research and Extension Center agents, and two hundred and sixteen citizens from southeast Nebraska, the following recommendations are being made for the role and management of joint appointments between the Southeast Research and Extension Center and the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources departments and the Cooperative Extension Service and the Agriculture Research Division. In order that the Southeast Research and Extension Center will remain a viable unit:

1. In order to maintain subject matter expertise in the Southeast Research and Extension Center at the present time, joint Southeast Research and Extension Center department appointments are being used. **All future Extension specialists' appointments must have their total Extension appointments in the Southeast Research and Extension Center**.

2. The Southeast Research and Extension Center needs to be strengthened with more Extension specialists in order to have a strong interdisciplinary approach for Extension programs/problems.

3. The team approach is the best approach for a strong interdisciplinary approach. Thus, the specialists should be housed in the Southeast Research and Extension Center with the support dollars.

4. In the future, joint Agriculture Research Division and Cooperative Extension Service appointments are most desirable for Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists (Table 2-2).

Discussion: Half of the Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists and 65 percent of the Extension agents feel that the specialist staff should be located at the Southeast Research and Extension Center headquarters (Table 2-1). Joint appointments can be either between the Southeast Research and Extension Center and a UN-L Department (including Nebraska Forest Service) or between the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and the Agriculture Research Division (ARD). In the survey of the Southeast Research and Extension Center Extension agents and Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources department heads, over 64% indicated that a joint Agriculture Research Division and Cooperative Extension Service appointment is the most desirable.
**TABLE 2-1**

Location of Southeast Research and Extension Center Specialist Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SREC Headquarters</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter Departments</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2-2**

Desirability of a Joint ARD/CES Appointment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the most desirable</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not highly desirable, but acceptable</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not acceptable</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBJECTIVE III

Statement of Objective: The importance of the programming role of Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists to southeast district Extension agents.

Recommendations:

1. The Southeast Research and Extension Center should include specialists from all subject matter departments in those disciplines of major program activities conducted within the district.

2. Specialist staff should be housed within the district headquarters rather than departments.
   a. Specialists housed in the Southeast Research and Extension Center are more aware of program needs in the district and, thus, more effective in program development than those housed in departments.
   b. Specialists housed in the Southeast Research and Extension Center are more effective in developing multi-disciplinary programs.
   c. Primary clientele for the Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists are county Extension agents.

Discussion:

Table 3-1
Southeast Research and Extension Center Specialists on Staff Representing Subject Matter Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over ninety percent of the specialists and ag agents and over 60 percent of the home economics agents and department heads felt that the Southeast Research and Extension Center should have adequate specialist staff.
Table 3-2
Housing of Southeast Research and Extension Center Specialist Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Heads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SREC</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One half of the specialists and two-thirds of the agents favored housing specialists within the Southeast Research and Extension Center headquarters; whereas, only 29% of department heads felt this way. Almost half of the department heads said it should depend on the type of appointment.

Table 3-3
Specialists Housed in SREC are More Effective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 70% of the specialists and agents felt that specialists housed in the Southeast Research and Extension Center headquarters are more effective. Most felt that these specialists tend to be more aware of district program needs and feel more responsibility to those needs. Others indicated that involvement in program development is necessary, regardless of where housed.
Table 3-4

Importance of Specialists Housed at SREC for Answering Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Heads</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of Little Importance</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of No Importance</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fifty percent or less of the respondents felt that having specialists at Southeast Research and Extension Center was important or very important for answering questions. Most frequent comments suggest that accessibility of specialists is important, regardless of location.

Table 3-5

Specialists in SREC Headquarters Provide the Opportunity for More Effective Multi-discipline Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Heads</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy percent or more of the respondents (specialists and agents) said that having specialists in the Southeast Research and Extension Center headquarters provided the opportunity for more effective multi-discipline programs.
### Table 3-6
Most Important Clientele for SREC Specialists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extension Agents</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>Agents AG</td>
<td>Agents HE</td>
<td>Total n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Important</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Important</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Farmer/Ranchers, Businesses etc. in Specialized Production and Marketing Areas</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>Agents AG</td>
<td>Agents HE</td>
<td>Total n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Important</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General Farmers/Ranchers/Businesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Agents AG</th>
<th>Agents HE</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Important</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Agents AG</th>
<th>Agents HE</th>
<th>Total n</th>
<th>Total Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most Important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Important</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over three-fourths of the specialists and agents agreed that the most important clientele of the Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists are the agents. The specialists rated specialized producers and general producers nearly equal; whereas, agents felt that specialized producers were important clientele for Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists and general producers are not. This suggests that agents feel the general producers are their clientele and not clientele of the specialists.
OBJECTIVE IV

Statement of Objective: As a result of the Comprehensive Program Review, the need for visibility of the Southeast Research Extension Center to the staff and public will be determined.

Recommendations: It is important to increase the University staff and general public awareness of the role, resources, and accomplishments of the Southeast Research and Extension Center. As with other institutions supported by public funds, we have an obligation to inform the taxpayer of the services that we can provide. The increase in visibility should allow continued financial support and also stimulate increased use of our services and programs. The following three recommendations will help accomplish this task:

1. Create a Marketing/Communication position within the district staff to help develop materials in support of interdiscipline programs, multi-county and district-wide programs. This person would also make the public aware of the results and accomplishments of these programs.

2. Continue to utilize citizens advisory groups. These groups and other selected support groups (such as 4-H Councils, Extension Boards, Council of Extension Clubs, etc.) should be invited to special activities and field days.

3. Continue to promote UNL, the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Cooperative Extension Center, and the Southeast Research and Extension Service by making sure the public and other University staff members are aware of the resources and quality programs we have available. There should be a united effort to promote the total University as a viable resource for the state of Nebraska.

Discussion: In Table 4-1, more agricultural agents (83%) than home economics agents (45%) are very familiar with the programs of the Cooperative Extension Service and Nebraska Forest Service of the Southeast Research and Extension Center. Forty percent of the home economics agents were aware of some programs. When asked about their familiarity with the University of Nebraska Southeast Research and Extension Center, 29% of the citizens indicated they were very familiar with the Southeast Research and Extension Center because of frequent contacts. Almost half of the respondents (48.6%) were aware of some programs. Most of the department heads (92.9%) had some awareness but were not very familiar with the Southeast Research and Extension Center programs.
Table 4-1

Familiarity with Programs of CES and Nebraska Forest Service of SREC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Citizens</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Familiar Because of Frequent Contacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Some Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know of Program Offered Do Not Know Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Familiar With Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2 indicates that 73% of the agricultural agents felt that the general public’s awareness and understanding of the Southeast Research and Extension Center’s purpose and mission is important. Over half (60%) of the home economics agents felt public visibility was important. Most (69%) of the specialists indicated that it is important that the general public is aware of and understand the Southeast Research and Extension Center’s purpose. One third of the specialists felt that it was somewhat important.

Table 4-2

Importance of Awareness and Understanding of SREC’s Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specialists</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Important</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The citizens, department heads, and agents felt that visibility is the result of quality programs. Agents and specialists suggested that leadership from a marketing/communication position could help co-ordinate publicity for district-wide or multi-county programs. This person could also help communicate the results of the program to the public. One citizen group also recommended increased publicity of programs and news media coverage.

The department heads, citizens, and agents felt that physical visibility could be improved by a location off campus. None of these persons supported such a move because they felt the advantages of the campus location far outweighed a gain in visibility. They mentioned creditability, efficiency, and effectiveness as advantages to the campus location. All three groups felt that the public doesn't care about University organizational structure as long as quality programs are delivered and accurate information is available to the public. Agents, specialists, and department heads felt that improving visibility was important for the entire University.

Agents, citizen groups, and specialists felt that select groups should be informed of programs, and invited to special district activities -- field days. The citizens felt that we should utilize citizens groups to help protect and represent the Southeast Research and Extension Center.

Specialists and citizens groups suggested the use of a Southeast Research and Extension Center sign on campus. The specialists listed several other ways to obtain visibility, including signs in county offices, signs on cars, caps and jackets, wider distribution of annual reports, awards program, and podium signs.
OBJECTIVE V

Statement of Objective: Determine the future role of the Southeast Research and Extension Center as a representative of the total University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Recommendations: Implement a joint programming effort utilizing the Cooperative Extension Service model to deliver one or two well defined cooperative programs with colleges or departments of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln who are not a part of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources. This recommendation has the following qualifiers:

1. Such an effort would not duplicate other programs currently under way.
2. Work would be undertaken only in those areas supported by a research base.
3. Current program efforts of the Southeast Research and Extension Center would not be reduced to fulfill this recommendation.
4. Funding of these programs would come only from new monies, not from current operating budgets or staff.

Discussion: Differing levels of support for this recommendation were given by groups who responded to surveys in preparation for the comprehensive review.

Table 5-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Department Specialists</th>
<th>Department Agents</th>
<th>Department Heads</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (n)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general public did not respond to this question in a survey but did address this issue in small discussion groups. Their concerns included: (a) if an expansion of programming with other units would interfere with the ongoing program of the Southeast Research and Extension Center, and (b) if programming would be in opposition to the governing laws of the Cooperative Extension Service.
Positive aspects of branching out with cooperative efforts include:
(a) a method to develop a total University approach to programming,
(b) a way to broaden beyond traditional Cooperative Extension Service programs, (c) a method to take advantage of the University brainpower, (d) a method to utilize the unique campus location, and (e) with this Center's location in the high population area of Nebraska, this is a method to benefit more people by providing more access to University programs.
OBJECTIVE VI

Statement of Objective: Determine the major program priorities of the Southeast Research and Extension Center for the next five years.

Recommendations: The program priority areas identified for the Southeast Research and Extension Center are as follows:

1. Profitable crop and livestock production: This program area should address the following topics:
   a. Efficient input use in crop and livestock production.
   b. Crop production management and cropping alternatives.
   c. Farm financial management, marketing, and planning.

2. Rural and urban soil and water conservation, natural resources, and environmental quality: Specific programs include:
   a. Protection of the soil resource base in southeast Nebraska and compliance with the 1985 Food Security Act soil loss requirements.
   b. Minimize the impact of plant nutrients and pesticides in water quality.
   c. Protection of the water supplies (quantity and quality) used by residents and communities.
   d. Consider alternative land uses such as parks, forests, recreational facilities, etc.

3. Community economic development: Concerns include:
   a. Community economic well-being including local business enhancement and community development projects.
   b. Industrial development based on local resources and adding value to farm products.

4. Building human capital: Programs should include:
   a. Health and nutrition.
   b. Family life and financial management.
   c. Building life skills for youth.
   d. Leadership development for both adults and youth.
   e. Building human capital through research base.

It is recommended that the Southeast Research and Extension Center establish an area of program excellence. The four program priority areas listed above should be considered as candidates for the area of excellence. Other program areas that might be considered include:

2. Diverse agriculture and evaluation of farm enterprises.
3. Agricultural production enterprises associated with off-farm employment.

4. Food science and technology.

5. Training for public officials.

6. Youth programs.

These program priority recommendations were developed using input from the Southeast Research and Extension Center Extension specialists, Southeast Research and Extension Center agents, an invited citizens group, the Southeast Research and Extension Center Citizens Advisory Committee, and the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources department heads.
OBJECTIVE VII

Statement of Objective: Futuristic programming direction for the urban counties of Douglas, Lancaster, and Sarpy.

Recommendations:

1. Address needs and concerns of small businesses and agribusiness as a means of promoting growth in "value added" processing of agricultural products.

2. Develop a long range youth curriculum for adoption in the urban school systems, making maximum use of our science base.

3. Address environmental issues of the urban communities including critical problems in waste management, handling of chemicals, use of pesticides, and water quality.

4. Promote direct marketing of horticultural and other products which may have market value in an urban community.

5. Define long range educational versus service role of the Cooperative Extension Service.

6. Provide leadership training on networking with other county and city agencies with similar goals.

7. Develop satellite television conferencing with other urban communities. Broad audience bases provide opportunities for programming with medical and other professions.

8. Develop a new and broadened administrative system with Douglas, Lancaster, and Sarpy counties. Staff size, different expectations from extension boards, and interactions with other levels of county, state, and national government are principle causes.

9. Explore total University interdisciplinary appointments to address new clientele needs and to strengthen ties between campus based programs or personnel and Cooperative Extension Service programs and staff, e.g. split appointments with county, assistantships, credit course work, or summer appointments and contracts.