1987

Comprehensive Review Supplemental Document 1987

Southeast Research & Extension Center
Southeast Research and Extension Center & the Southeast Extension District

Comprehensive Review Supplemental Document 1987

Serving Southeast Nebraska Through the
- Nebraska Cooperative Extension Service
- Nebraska Agricultural Research Division
- Nebraska Forest Service

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA—LINCOLN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Specialist Survey</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Specialist Survey Summary</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Agent Survey</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Agent Survey Summary</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head Survey</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head Survey Summary</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Survey</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Survey Summary</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report of Extension Specialists Retreat</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report of Extension Agents Retreat</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report of Focus Group Interviews with Citizens</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary Report of Department Heads Meeting</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction
Supplemental Document
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This supplemental document contains material to which referral may need to be made during the comprehensive review.

In preparation for the review, survey questionnaires were completed by Southeast Research and Extension Center faculty, Extension agents of the southeast district, clientele and department heads of the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources. The survey questionnaires to which these four groups of participants responded were developed to address the seven objectives of the Southeast Research and Extension Center comprehensive review. Copies of these surveys and the accompanying summary reports follow this introduction.

For convenience of review, the survey questionnaires and summary reports are color coded. The report for each of the survey questionnaires is presented in its entirety.

In addition to the completion of survey questionnaires, Southeast Research and Extension Center specialists and Extension agents of the southeast district participated in retreats to discuss the objectives identified for the comprehensive review. Reports from each retreat summarize the discussions which addressed the objectives. Note that the Extension agents did not discuss Objective II during their retreat.

Approximately thirty citizens were asked to participate in focus group interviews. A summary report from each of the three focus discussion groups was compiled by Dr. Robert Florell, Extension Evaluation specialist. Attached are copies of the reports.
Program Survey for the  
Southeast Research & Extension Center  
Institute of Agriculture & Natural Resources  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

I. FUTURE DIRECTION OF SREC

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln is one of three components of the University of Nebraska system. The Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources (IANR) is a separate component of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. IANR is headed by a Vice Chancellor.

The programs of IANR are carried on through thirteen agricultural departments, four home economics departments, three field laboratories and five district research and extension centers. The research and extension centers (REC) are located off campus. The faculty, which are housed at the centers, have joint research and extension appointments. Applied research is conducted at the centers to meet the needs of the area served by that center. Extension specialists, with county staff, conduct extension programs for the area served by the center.

The Southeast Research and Extension Center's (SREC) organizational structure is different from the other Research and Extension centers in Nebraska in four ways:

A. The headquarters for SREC is located on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus rather than at (a Research and Extension Center) an off-campus location.

B. There is no research component at SREC. (The research appointments of two specialists are located in the subject matter departments.)

C. Some SREC specialists have appointments with time divided between SREC and campus departments.

D. Some SREC Extension specialists are housed in departmental facilities, some at SREC headquarters.

As you think about the future direction of SREC, please respond to the following statements: (CHECK ONE RESPONSE.)

A. The organizational structure of the Southeast Research and Extension Center should:

1. Remain as it is described in the four statements A through D above

2. Change the structure (If this response is chosen, explain how the structure is to be changed.)
B. The mission of SREC should include: (CHECK ONE)

- 1. Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and the Nebraska Forest Service, as it is at the present time

- 2. CES, Nebraska Forest Service and Agricultural Research Division (ARD) component

- 3. Other

(Please specify)

II. ROLE AND MANAGEMENT OF APPOINTMENTS BETWEEN SREC AND IANR DEPARTMENTS:

A. Some of the SREC specialists have joint Cooperative Extension Service and Agricultural Research Division appointments (the CES appointment is within SREC and the ARD appointment is within the subject matter department) while some SREC specialists have 100% CES or Nebraska Forest Service appointments. (Home Economics subject matter support from specialists is provided by Home Economics departments.)

Do you feel a joint ARD/CES appointment is: (CHECK ONE)

- 1. The most desirable appointment

- 2. Not highly desirable, but is acceptable

- 3. Is not acceptable

B. Should SREC have specialists on staff representing those subject matter departments who have major program influence on the economy and well-being of southeast Nebraska?

- 1. Yes

- 2. No

If yes, what specialists should be added to cover subject matter areas?

(Please specify)

C. SREC specialist staff should be housed in: (CHECK ONE)

- 1. SREC headquarters

- 2. Subject matter departments

- 3. Other

(Please specify)
III. PROGRAMMING ROLE OF SREC SPECIALISTS

A. Are specialists housed in SREC more likely to be aware of county and district needs and thus, more effective in program development than those housed in departments?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No

B. Please explain your answer to question #A.


C. How important is it to have specialists housed at SREC for answering questions of Extension agents and the general public of southeast Nebraska? (CHECK ONE)

____ 1. Very important
____ 2. Important
____ 3. Somewhat important
____ 4. Of little importance
____ 5. Of no importance

D. Please explain your response to the previous question.


E. Does having specialists in SREC headquarters provide the opportunity for more effective multi-discipline programs?

____ 1. Yes
____ 2. No

F. Please rank the most important clientele for SREC specialists from 1 (Most Important) to 4 (Least Important)

____ 1. Extension agents
____ 2. Farmers/ranchers, businesses, etc. in specialized production and marketing areas
3. General farmers/ranchers/businesses

4. Other (Please specify)

IV. VISIBILITY OF SREC

How important do you feel awareness and understanding of SREC'S purpose is to the general public (public visibility)? (CHECK ONE)

1. Very important

2. Important

3. Somewhat important

4. Not important

V. FUTURE ROLE OF SREC

A. SREC has traditionally delivered information on Agriculture and Natural Resources, and Home Economics. Should it also be the responsibility of SREC and county staff to serve as centers for other University activities such as business programs, and assisting with other University-wide activities in the community?

1. Yes

2. No

B. If response was yes in #A, please describe other areas of service for SREC and county offices.

VI. MAJOR PROGRAM PRIORITIES OF SREC

A. List the three highest program priorities for SREC for the next five years.
B. List three program priorities of SREC that should be dropped during the next five years.

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------


VII. FUTURISTIC ROLE FOR URBAN COUNTIES

What should be the role of the SREC in the urban area during the next five years?

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------


VIII. List any other comments about staffing, programming or the future role of SREC you wish to make.

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------

-----------------------------------------------
Extension Specialist Survey
for
SREC Program Review

Findings

Table 1 shows that over half (57.1%) of the SREC Extension specialists favor the present organizational structure. Comments in regard to organizational structure follow immediately after Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Structure</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure to remain as it is now</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the structure</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on Organizational Structure:

It would be appropriate to have research appointments within SREC. Consider making the Director of SREC, the Director of the AG Research and Development Center.

Either the station should get an identity or become only an administrator for county offices. Now it is halfway between.

Research in SREC. All SREC specialists housed in SREC.

Continue to combine strategic counties to make the operation more efficient. Develop regional centers with satellite offices. Make better use of specializations.

Go for off-campus location, specialists with SREC research and extension appointments. etc.

Need more support, however, 0.25 FTE in crop production for SREC is too little!

Should have a very active research program.
Table 2 shows the SREC specialists thoughts on the mission of SREC. The majority (57.1%) suggest the addition of the Research Division (ARD) as a component of SREC.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES and Nebraska Forest Service as it is now</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES, Nebraska Forest Service and Research Division (ARD)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About half (46%) of the specialists feel that a joint ARD/CES appointment is the most desirable arrangement (Table 3). Also, approximately half, (46%) feel that the joint appointment is acceptable, but not highly desirable. Only one specialist feels the joint appointment is not acceptable.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint ARD/CES appointment</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the most desirable&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not highly desirable, but acceptable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is not acceptable&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The most desirable appointment is when the CES appointment is entirely in SREC.

<sup>b</sup>It is not acceptable when the CES appointment is split between SREC and a subject matter area.
In Table 4 the majority of the specialists (91%) feel that SREC staff should include subject matter specialists who represent departments that will have major program influence on the economy and well being of southeast Nebraska. Comments on subject matter specialties needed follow Table 4.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should SREC staff specialists represent subject matter departments with major program influence?</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on specialties needed:

- Probably difficult to justify at this time. In the future should consider Ag Engineer-Conservation, Structures and Grain Drying.
- Crop production (3)
- Weeds (2)
- Move Entomology and Animal Science to SREC
- Plant Pathology (3)
- Sociologist (people interaction)
- Entomology (2)
- Human Development and the Family
- 100% Extension Livestock (Beef emphasis)
- Political Scientist (county/city government)
- Youth Specialist
Half of the SREC specialists feel that the specialist staff should be located at the SREC headquarters. Two feel that specialists should be located in subject matter departments. Other housing suggestions are stated in the comments following Table 5.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of SREC Specialist Staff</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SREC Headquarters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter departments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on Housing Location:

- Combination depending on percent appointment, Specialists should make commitment to SREC regardless of where located. Special effort must be made by Director to maintain SREC "espirit de corp" when specialists are housed separately.

- Both (2) (depending on percent of appointment)

- Where they can best serve the District

- If appointment is split, the person should be located in the building of the subject matter department.

- SREC headquarters, if there is to be an identity for SREC.

Table 6, shows that 69 percent of the specialists feel that specialists housed at SREC are more likely to be aware of county and district needs and thus are more effective in program development than those housed in subject matter departments. Comments follow Table 6.
Table 6

Effectiveness of Specialist Housed in SREC Compared with Specialists Housed in Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are specialists housed in SREC</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments about effectiveness of specialists housed at SREC vs subject matter department:

-The specialists would be together as a group (SREC) for agent to use rather than scattered all over campus.

-The key is not where the specialist is housed, but rather is the specialist committed to the district program and willing to take an active part, ie. district planning and program development activities.

-More contacts with agents and more interchange across department lines and subject matter areas.

-Grouped together for agent to use.

-Department specialists could do much better if encouraged to do so. Extension could have more specialized expertise that way. Center specialist are spread too thin with one person/department to cover many, many department topics.

-Being in a department tends to isolate the specialist in the subject matter area and he/she tends to have a statewide orientation.

-But sometimes it helps to be "out among the masses" to get a better feel for their wants and needs. Being distant can create barriers.

-It helps but is not necessary. If a building keeps a person from keeping up with needs of the county then we are very narrow minded. It is important that the lines of communication be open between Lincoln and the counties to keep up with needs in the county. This can be done from a phone located in the office in SREC, departmental office, or for that matter, at home.
-They need interaction with researchers and other state level extension people.

-Yes, should be, but depends on detail and specific job descriptions written and how effectively their responsibilities are carried out. Extension agents would need to be indoctrinated to the use of specialists in Departments. SREC specialist are too close to department to say definitely yes.

-It depends on the specialist and their involvement in our program planning process, in District and staff conferences. Those housed in SREC may tend to be more involved, however, that in not always the case.

Over one-fourth (28%) of the specialists thought it was important, or very important, to have specialists housed at SREC for answering questions of Extension Agents and the general public of Southeast Nebraska. Twenty-eight percent thought it was of little importance and fourteen percent thought it was of no importance to house specialists at SREC for that reason.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of housing specialists at SREC to answer Agent's and the general public's questions.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of little importance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of no importance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments about housing specialists at SREC and answering questions:

-Again housing is not the important key.

-The important factor is that the specialist provide adequate responses in a timely and effective manner.

-I do not know what degree the SREC is important to the Agents. I suspect many contact University specialists directly.

-More chance for program coordination and exchange of ideas.

-Questions can be answered also as well in departments.

-General public and agents seek the answers from the most knowledgeable person regardless of location.

-If specialists were located at SREC and a full complement of them were available—agents would call them instead of other "state" specialists.

-Agents should be able to have the majority of resources needed located in one place i.e. one phone call—one visit.

-It's not good P.R. to continually transfer calls for the public.

-If the specialist is housed elsewhere, away from Lincoln, calls and questions can be easily referred.

-As long as your phone number is available to extension agents and the general public, then there is little problem.

-Assuming you mean physically at SREC—we get all the extension calls in the department anyway.

-For identity purposes only! Actually the specialist is in a better position to answer questions—where there are more resources in the department.
Most (72%) of the specialists indicated that specialists housed at SREC headquarters have more effective multi-disciplinary programs (Table 8).

Table 8

**Effectiveness of Multi-discipline Programs of specialists housed at SREC Headquarters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do specialists have more effective multi-disciplinary programs?</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes(^a)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No(^b)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Being housed together would make it easier, but the same thing can be accomplished if the specialist will take the extra effort required.

\(^b\)It hasn't in the past due partially to scattered staff and split assignment in the Department.
In Table 9 it shows that Extension Agents are ranked as the most important clientele for SREC specialists. Following the agents, in order of importance, the farmers/ranchers, businesses etc. who are in specialized production and marketing areas were considered important as well as general farmer/ranchers and businesses.

Table 9

Most Important Clientele for SREC Specialists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is the most important clientele for SREC specialists?</th>
<th>Most important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Least important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Rating scale: 1 = Not important, 2 = Important, 3 = Somewhat important, 4 = Least important)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension agents (n=13)</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer/ranchers, businesses etc. in specialized production and marketing areas (n=13)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General farmers/ranchers/businesses (n=13)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other(^a)(n=13)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)-Public in other districts

- Forestry concerns are a bit different
- Youth, young adults, volunteers
- Teachers, other interested in Agriculture
- General public
- State and federal agencies with similar missions
Most (69%) of the specialists indicated that it is important that the general public are aware of and understand SREC's purpose. One third of the specialists felt that it was somewhat important (Table 10).

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of General Public Understanding of SREC's Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important is the general public awareness and understanding of SREC's purpose?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important(^{a})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Most important is an understanding of the county program.
Table 11 shows that slightly over half (54%) of the specialists thought that it also should be the responsibility of SREC and county staff to serve as centers for and to assist with other University activities.

### Table 11

**Expanding Areas of Service for SREC and County Offices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should SREC serve as a center for other University activities and assist with other University activities in the community?</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>-Government (county/city)

- business and economic development (people and establishment) (2)
- social change (school reorganization/consolidation, elderly needs)
- resource center—food processing, alternative crops, high school teachers (ag and science), computer link to national data banks

<sup>b</sup>-Probably difficult with current budgetary restraints to pick up any additional programs.

-Unless available resources change considerably. If resources are available, I can see "University centers" replacing Extension offices.
VI. MAJOR PROGRAM PRIORITIES OF SREC

A. List the three highest program priorities for SREC for the next five years.

- Alternative to traditional agricultural production (4)
- Soil and water conservation (3)
- Small community development (4)
- Nutrition
- Wellness programs... physical fitness, mental fitness
  (Lincoln-Fremont) small towns could use help.
- To meet the program resource need of Extension Agents in SE
district and to direct educational effort to commercial
producer/farmer who will be in business 5 years from now.
- Aid and assist farmers in transition to leave farm, if
  Extension is truly "problem oriented" and dedicated to
  the general public.
- Urban and farm financial problems
- CRD if effectively carried out
- Survival of family farm (2)
- Small scale farming practices
- Families in crisis
- Move SREC off campus
- Human development--elderly, individual self assessment,
  economic goals direction
- Economic development-business, industry, processing (2)
- Volunteer leadership development
- Building and developing human and economic capital
- Youth development
- Ground water quality
- Urban development and alternative to attract new business.
- Profitability of agriculture
- Urban understanding of agriculture
- Efficiency in crop production--low cost
- Horticulture
- Farm and small business financial management (2)
- Farming, livestock development and alternatives.

B. List the three program priorities of SREC that should be
dropped during the next five years.

- 4-H camp (contract with private party)
- Some of the 4-H programs (3) (example: Social functions as
  opposed to developing skills.)
- Youth camp responsibilities (2)
- Home Economics-except those programs that fall in the
  National priorities--nutrition.
- Animal Science
- Eliminate service programs (unless self-supporting) and
  county fairs.
- Possibly consider shifting soils program to general agronomy,
  crops and soils.
-Traditional agricultural products production—shift energies
to alternative production and value added concept and
maintain current production levels—no increase
-Programs that help 96% of the population in SREC geographic
area that do live on farms
-Horticultural and forestry programs that could be handled by
private sector businesses.
-Internal meetings and conferences
-Evaluate CRD program
-Heavy involvement in chemigation and pesticide applicator
training
-Summer field tours
-Pecan research (not SREC)
-Custom rate survey (to be done in department)
-IRM, FMRA

VII. FUTURISTIC ROLE FOR URBAN COUNTIES

What should be the role of the SREC in the urban area during
the next five years?

-CRD
-Small business
-Horticulture
-Very limited: offer training to staff employed by city in
areas where IANR has research base.
-Education on importance of agriculture (2)
-Expand youth programming
-General factual information on water quality.
-Economic development (2)
-Continue serving the urban audience (3)
-Increased visibility, and identifying urban clientele needs.
-Urban gardening, alternative land use
-People building
-processing and transportation for new agricultural products,
and technical communications.
-Establish programs geared to the development of otherwise
under-developed skills of urban youth.
-Anti-drug programs
-Gardening for everyone
-Continue to act as a resource for Home Ec and natural
resource type information. Conform programming to fit
the schedules of clients. Extension means taking the
programs out.
-To service the Extension agents assigned to and responsible
for urban needs SREC should not expect to cover all bases
for all people. There should be department responsibility
to many of these urban areas.
VIII. LIST ANY OTHER COMMENTS ABOUT STAFFING, PROGRAMMING OR THE FUTURE ROLE OF SREC YOU WISH TO MAKE.

-The questions are difficult to answer because it depends upon the identity level desired by the University of SREC. It appears their present policy is to have SREC function as an administrator of county agents and let the University specialist provide Southeast citizens with the research, etc.

-I really think we need to take a total look at programs and personnel and give consideration to consolidating at regional offices and maintain smaller offices with one or possibly two people where demand isn't as strong.

-Whatever program delivery in subject matter is done could be done by subject departments if department head and staff would accept the concept of geographical designation of staff.

-Agents need to understand the specialists' role with regard to applied research plots. There is little incentive to do these under our present system. Also, certain agents take undue advantage of specialists' time for meetings and tours.

-Extension in general will change. The traditional "County agent" and traditional "specialist" particularly district (center) specialist will be replaced by an agent/specialist combo. The agents need to take a larger role in teaching. The out-state centers will become research centers. County and district extension staff will meld into "one person", with units of one (Lancaster and Douglas) to 4-8 counties per pod. Each pod will have several to "be named" combo persons-each combo person will be very specialized. Eventually there will be "pod people" and state program developers/leaders. Pod people will teach, state people will develop and train pod people, but will not travel and conduct programs for general public.

-Major impact on programs in the next five years will be budgetary restraints and resulting low staff morale.

-We can't be all things to all people. County staff must specialize in subject matter areas to gain respect of their clientele.
I. FUTURE DIRECTION OF SREC

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln is one of three components of the University of Nebraska system. The Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources (IANR) is a separate component of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. IANR is headed by a Vice Chancellor.

The programs of IANR are carried on through thirteen agricultural departments, four home economics departments, three field laboratories and five district research and extension centers. The research and extension centers (REC) are located off campus. The faculty, which are housed at the centers, have joint research and extension appointments. Applied research is conducted at the centers to meet the needs of the area served by that center. Extension specialists, with county staff, conduct extension programs for the area served by the center.

The Southeast Research and Extension Center's (SREC) organizational structure is different from the other Research and Extension centers in Nebraska in four ways:

A. The headquarters for SREC is located on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus rather than at (a Research and Extension Center) an off-campus location.
B. There is no research component at SREC. (The research appointments of two specialists are located in the subject matter departments.)
C. Some SREC specialists have appointments with time divided between SREC and campus departments.
D. Some SREC Extension specialists are housed in departmental facilities, some at SREC headquarters.

As you think about the future direction of SREC, please respond to the following statements: (CHECK ONE RESPONSE.)

A. The organizational structure of the Southeast Research and Extension Center should:

1. Remain as it is described in the four statements A through D above
2. Change the structure (If this response is chosen, explain how the structure is to be changed.)
B. The mission of SREC should include: (CHECK ONE)

_____1. Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and the Nebraska Forest Service, as it is at the present time

_____2. CES, Nebraska Forest Service and Agricultural Research Division (ARD) component

_____3. Other _____________________________ (Please specify)

II. ROLE AND MANAGEMENT OF APPOINTMENTS BETWEEN SREC AND IANR DEPARTMENTS:

A. Some of the SREC specialists have joint Cooperative Extension Service and Agricultural Research Division appointments (the CES appointment is within SREC and the ARD appointment is within the subject matter department) while some SREC specialists have 100% CES or Nebraska Forest Service appointments. (Home Economics subject matter support from specialists is provided by Home Economics departments.)

Do you feel a joint ARD/CES appointment is: (CHECK ONE)

_____1. The most desirable appointment

_____2. Not highly desirable, but is acceptable

_____3. Is not acceptable

B. Should SREC have specialists on staff representing those subject matter departments who have major program influence on the economy and well being of southeast Nebraska?

_____1. Yes

_____2. No

If yes, what specialists should be added to cover subject matter areas?

______________________________________________________________

C. SREC specialist staff should be housed in: (CHECK ONE)

_____1. SREC headquarters

_____2. Subject matter departments

_____3. Other ____________________________________________ (Please specify)
III. PROGRAMMING ROLE OF SREC SPECIALISTS

A. Are specialists housed in SREC more likely to be aware of county and district needs and thus more effective in program development than those housed in departments?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

B. Please explain your answer to question #A.

C. How important is it to have specialists housed at SREC for answering questions of Extension agents and the general public of southeast Nebraska? (CHECK ONE)

____ 1. Very important

____ 2. Important

____ 3. Somewhat important

____ 4. Of little importance

____ 5. Of no importance

D. Please explain your response to the previous question.

E. Does having specialists in SREC headquarters provide the opportunity for more effective multi-discipline programs?

____ 1. Yes

____ 2. No

F. Please rank the most important clientele for SREC specialists from 1 (Most Important) to 4 (Least Important)

____ 1. Extension agents

____ 2. Farmers/ranchers, businesses, etc. in specialized production and marketing areas
3. General farmers/ranchers/businesses

4. Other

(Please specify)

IV. VISIBILITY OF SREC

A. How familiar are you with the programs of the Cooperative Extension Service and Nebraska Forest Service of the Southeast Research & Extension Center?

   _____1. I know programs are offered, but I am not aware of details

   _____2. I am aware of some programs

   _____3. I am very familiar because of frequent contacts

B. How important do you feel awareness and understanding of SREC'S purpose is to the general public (public visibility)? (CHECK ONE)

   _____1. Very important

   _____2. Important

   _____3. Somewhat important

   _____4. Not important

V. FUTURE ROLE OF SREC

A. SREC has traditionally delivered information on Agriculture and Natural Resources, and Home Economics. Should it also be the responsibility of SREC and county staff to serve as centers for other University activities such as business programs, and assisting with other University-wide activities in the community?

   _____1. Yes

   _____2. No

B. If response was yes in #A, please describe other areas of service for SREC and county offices.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
VI. MAJOR PROGRAM PRIORITIES OF SREC

A. List the three highest program priorities for SREC for the next five years.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

B. List three program priorities of SREC that should be dropped during the next five years.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

VII. FUTURISTIC ROLE FOR URBAN COUNTIES

What should be the role of the SREC in the urban area during the next five years?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

VIII. List any other comments about staffing, programming or the future role of SREC you wish to make.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
Table 1 indicates that most of the Agricultural Agents (69%) and most of the Extension Agents-Home Economics (70%) felt that the organizational structure of SEREC should remain as it is.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Structure of the Southeast Research and Extension Center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Agent-Agriculture Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should remain as it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be changed(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Agent-Home Economics Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should remain as it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should be changed(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)How structure is to be changed.

-A research component should be added to SEREC with a trend towards fewer joint SEREC and campus department appointments. Most specialists should be housed at SEREC headquarters on campus.

-Should be changed to house SEREC ext. specialists at SEREC headquarters.

-Have all extension specialists housed at SEREC headquarters.

-SEREC specialists not have appointments divided between SEREC campus department.
-Include research; Consider a separate off-campus location.

-Include research responsibilities as established in other four districts.

-Try to have all subject matter specialists in one location or building.

-Would like to see more specialists at district level.

-Unless interdepartmental relations are improving - that is the bonus of district offices the "unit taskforce" solution to problems and handling of emerging technology.

-Research - extension appointments located in SEREC unit and specialists in county centers.

-A research component be established in SEREC and a research and extension center be established at Mead.

-Not necessary to have research appointment with SEREC. Either have specialists all with department or all with SEREC.

-Research component necessary if CES, SEREC to retain expertise in subject matter, put specialists in departments.

-If facilities became available at the Mead laboratory, that should be considered as a location for SEREC.
About half of the Agricultural (48%) and Home Economics agents (45%) felt the mission of SEREC should include the Cooperative Extension Service and the Nebraska Forest Service, as it is at the present time (Table 2). Likewise, over half of the Agricultural agents (52%) and nearly half (50%) of the Home Economics agents indicated that the mission should include the Cooperative Extension Service, the Nebraska Forest Service and Agricultural Research Division appointments.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission of SEREC should include</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES and Nebraska Forest Service</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES, Nebraska Forest Service and ARD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission of SEREC should include</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES and Nebraska Forest Service</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES, Nebraska Forest Service and ARD</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over three-fourths (76%) of the Agricultural Agents indicated that a joint Ag Research Division and Cooperative Extension appointment is the most desirable (Table 3). About half (45%) of the Home Economics agents indicated that a joint appointment was the most desirable.

Table 3

Appointments Between SEREC and IANR Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joint ARD/CES appointment</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Extension Agent-Ag Responses**
- Is the most desirable: 22, 75.9
- Is not highly desirable, but is acceptable: 7, 24.1
- Is not acceptable: 0, 0.0

Total: 29, 100.0

**Extension Agent-Home Ec Responses**
- Is the most desirable: 9, 45.0
- Is not highly desirable, but is acceptable: 8, 40.0
- Is not acceptable: 1, 5.0
- No response: 2, 10.0

Total: 20, 100.0

In Table 4 it indicates that almost all (93%) of the Agricultural agents and two-thirds (60%) of the Home Economics agents felt that SEREC should have specialists on staff representing those subject matter departments who have major program influence on the economy and well being of southeast Nebraska.
Table 4

Representation of Subject Matter Departments by Specialists on Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should SEREC have specialists on staff representing those subject matter departments who have major program influence</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Agent-Ag Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Agent-Home Ec Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Specialist that should be added:
- Crop production (9)
- Foods and Nutrition (5)
- Family life (4)
- Weeds (4)
- Family economics (3)
- Agronomy (3)
- Horticulture (3)
- Family financial management (3)
- Human development (2)
- Vegetable/alternative crops (2)
- Business and CRD (2)
- Computers (2)
- Soils (2)
- Livestock (2)
- Health and safety
- Ag Engineer
- Entomology

- Sheep
- Gerontology
- Home Economics
- Forages
- No need to add additional specialists
- Aren't we covered at least by joint assignments in most S.M. areas?
- Small business development for home based and community based positions.
- The well-being of family and home could be served more effectively by representing staff at SEREC level.
Over two-thirds (65%) of the agents indicated that the location of SEREC specialists should be at the SEREC headquarters rather than in subject matter departments (Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Agent-Ag Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEREC headquarters</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter departments</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Agent-Home Ec Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEREC headquarters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter departments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More Home Economics agents (70%) than Agricultural agents (69%) felt that specialists housed in SEREC are more likely to be aware of county and district needs and are thus more effective in program development than those housed in departments (Table 6). Explanation of the agents responses follow the table.

Table 6

Effectiveness of Specialists Housed in SEREC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialists housed at SEREC</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>are more effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extension Agent-Ag Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extension Agent-Home Ec Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explanation of answer:

-specialists housed in SEREC would have more opportunity to interact with county and district staff because of the closer proximity and one central location. Greater chance of multidisciplinary programs and more in tune to county problems. (12)

-Ability to discern county/district needs is largely a function of the specialists own desire and ability to check the pulse of each county; not where he/she is physically located. (7)

-More directly involved with district and county activities (3).

-Greater contact with agents and other specialists would allow the development of joint programs and more cooperation (2).
- "I feel the unit works as a "taskforce" on problems each specialist lends his effort to the teamwork approach."

- This could be the case, but not guaranteed... If housed in a dept. they still could be arranged in to a district.

- The individual and how well he knows the subject matter and the needs of the area is more important.

- Yes, they are closer to the farm operators - on the firing line.

- When your on campus it makes no difference what building you're housed in.

- They could benefit by being housed in the subject matter department.

- Campus based staff become shielded from real problems and more reactive to their peer group.

- They may be aware of county needs but because they feel more comfortable about it they both do programming that suits them whether it is of much value to the county or not.

- Intradepartment exchanges should supplement skills it should be easier for specialists to "find" each other; field agents can locate them as easily however, SEREC specialists need to retain SEREC identity and not get swallowed into their department.

- Staff tend to think of district staff in the district office and state specialist in the departments. District staff in the department do not learn of county needs on an on going basis as does district staff in the district office.

In Table 7 it indicates that less than half (45%) of the Agricultural agents felt it was important to have specialists located at SEREC for answering questions of the agents and the general public.

Half (50%) of the Home Economics agents felt it was important to have specialists at SEREC to answer questions.
Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of locating specialists at SEREC</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Agent-Ag Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of little importance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of no importance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extension Agent-Home Ec Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of locating specialists at SEREC</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of little importance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of no importance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Explanation of answer:*

-When specialists are scattered in different departments, it's difficult for the public and agents to locate them (6).

-Accessibility is the key—rather than just location (5).

-As long as agents have access to phone numbers and specialists will accept phone calls, having them housed in one location is not vital (4).

-They can easily be connected if in another department. We do this all the time with Dept. specialists.
-Too many people now go directly to UNL campus foe support and services best rendered by county agents and district specialists.

-Would be desirable to have specialists on the district level but may not be possible under current and future conditions.

-The specialist should: train agents; keep them informed; respond to needs; teach and provide time for exchange with farm clientele

-SEREC staff should support county staff, not try to run another extension service. Too many times we can not get answers to questions except from a campus researcher.

-There is a need to develop a cohesive group of specialists that can work on S.E. Neb. problems and I believe this will only take place if they are housed together.

-The specialist is our back up and the first we contact for answers to questions.

-Available to county staff.

-Clientele and agents can contact specialists at either location as long as the are made aware of specialists area of expertise.

-Needed by agent and as more producers call for help.

-It's handy to call just one telephone number for all specialists, but questions are so varied that you couldn't house enough personnel in one location.

-Since SEREC is in Lincoln, the specialist can perform their duties in any location on campus. They need to remember, though, that they have district time.

-Extension agents need to be able to consult with SEREC specialists about latest UNL research - General public should work through their local agent.

-Didn't know general public was to contact SEREC specialists direct. As long as you're calling the university it doesn't make much difference whether it's to a department or SEREC.

-Telephone contacts want the person, not the unit housing them; clientele/agents probably will not involve "team" problem solving (a.k.a., I.R.M.) when initial contacts are made and thus subject matter cab be apart.

-If their answers can be covered by "state" specialists and not overload the specialist, the SEREC position may not be needed.
Most of the agricultural agents (80%) and the Home Economics agents (70%) indicated that locating specialists at SEREC provides the opportunity for more effective multi-disciplinary programs (Table 8).

Table 8

Effectiveness of Multi-discipline Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialists housed at SEREC have more effective multi-disciplinary programs</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Agent-Ag Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>79.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Agent-Home Ec Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agents ranked themselves most often as being the most important clientele of SEREC specialist (Table 9). Specialized farmers/ranchers, businesses, etc. in specialized production and marketing areas were the second most important clientele. General farmers/ranchers and businesses and other clientele were ranked the least important.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clientele</th>
<th>Most important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Agent-Ag responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Agent</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized farmers/</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranchers, businesses, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General farmers/ranchers,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and businesses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Extension Agent-Home Ec responses      |               |           |                    |               |             |       |
| Extension Agent                        | 19  | 55.0  | 1  | 3.0  | 0  | 0.0  | 0  | 0.0  | 0  | 0.0  | 20  | 100.0 |
| Specialized farmers/                   | 1  | 3.0  | 11  | 33.3 | 6  | 20.0 | 0  | 0.0  | 2  | 10.0 | 20  | 100.0 |
| ranchers, businesses, etc.             |               |           |                    |               |             |       |
| General farmers/ranchers,              | 0  | 0.0  | 0  | 0.0  | 12  | 40.0 | 0  | 0.0  | 2  | 10.0 | 20  | 100.0 |
| and businesses                         |               |           |                    |               |             |       |
| Other                                  | 0  | 0.0  | 0  | 0.0  | 18  | 60.0 | 0  | 0.0  | 2  | 10.0 | 20  | 100.0 |

More agricultural agents (83%) than Home economics agents (45%) were very familiar with the programs of the Cooperative Extension Service and Nebraska Forest Service of SEREC. Over half (40%) of the Home Economics agents were aware of some programs (Table 10).
Table 10

Familiarity with the Programs of CES and Nebraska Forest Service of SEREC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity of programs</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extension Agent-Ag Responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know of programs offered, do not know of details</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of some programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar because of frequent contacts</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>82.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Extension Agent-Home Ec Responses** |    |      |
| Know of programs offered, do not know of details | 3  | 15.0 |
| Aware of some programs | 8  | 40.0 |
| Very familiar because of frequent contacts | 9  | 45.0 |
| **Total** | 20 | 100.0 |
In Table 11 it indicates that 73% of the agricultural agents felt that the general public's awareness and understanding of SEREC's purpose and mission is important. Over half (60%) of the Home Economics Agents felt public visibility was important.

Table 11

Awareness of Public Visibility of SEREC's Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance of awareness and understanding of SEREC's purpose</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extension Agent-Ag Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Agent-Home Ec Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over two-thirds (66%) of the Agricultural Agents and over half (55%) of the Home Economics Agents felt that it should also be the responsibility of SEREC and county staff to serve as centers for other university activities and to assist with other University wide activities in the community (Table 12).

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of SEREC</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEREC should serve as centers for other University activities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEREC should not serve as centers for other University activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extension Agent-Ag Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of SEREC</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SEREC should serve as centers for other University activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEREC should not serve as centers for other University activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other University departments and activities:**

- Business and economic development (9)
- Community resource development (4)
- Staff and budget must increase accordingly
- Because of our close location to the University campus, we could better serve the small town and small businessman, if we would make use of more of the University resources. This would not duplicate programs.
-Good idea but difficult to do with current staff. Serve as local contact for other University of Nebraska programs and assistance. Engineering only for discrimination of information.

-Increase 4-H programs.

-If we are all part of the University, the county and district staff should be aware of and part of other University programs. Particularly if it ties in with present Extension responsibilities. Coping with stress, financial planning, problems of families where both parents work (latch key children).

-President Roskens says yes, so do other administers, but here In the county front I see only a few examples where the desire, cooperation and effort has been effective.

-Industrial development, community improvement, small business training, long range planning, specific programs for select audiences such as low income.

-The total university off campus extension division.

-Medical center.

-We need one center for all university activities in the area.

-Programs that could support persons in Omaha and Lincoln.

-I have difficulty with this. We are certainly busy enough with Ag. and Home Ec. however, there are opportunities occasionally when we can serve as centers for other types of university programs. If those opportunities arise, I believe we have and obligation to follow through.

-SEREC and extension in general can provide information on all university activities.

-Need more coordinated effort in this area.

-Rural revitalization - communities and small business; Adult education.
Major Program Priorities for SEREC

List the three highest program priorities for SEREC for the next five years.

Farm financial management; food and nutrition; family well being; ground water purification.

Train and support of county staff; Develop staffing systems, personal and equipment to carry out program efforts; Provide adequate specialist services either at district or departmental levels.

Conservation tillage; Agriculture Economic development; Cost effective agriculture production; Continued growth in 4-H programs close evaluation of cost effective delivery systems.

Economical agricultural production practices; Data base for agricultural business expansion; Home economics information based upon research.

Revitalization of rural Nebraska; Increasing Nebraska's share of the total dollars spent for food and fiber; Expand the agricultural base - new crops etc.

Crop productions; Economics; Government programs.

To maintain and increase the enrollment of the 4-H youth programs; To make timely and early decisions regarding consolidation of offices in the county; To maintain and increase participation in adult education in Ag. and Home Ec.

Providing, marketing strategies; Information on feasibility of producing alternative crops; Increase profitability in agriculture.

Soil and water conservation - conservation tillage; Profitable crop and livestock production; 4-H and youth programs.

Older citizens and their quality of life product marketing - effective strategies administratively restructuring the SEREC.

Develop volunteer management system with middle management of volunteers; How to generate more resources from business and private sector to overcome reduced and restricted budgets.

Economic development - business, farming, family; Youth development - leadership, citizenship (4-H); Conservation of natural resources; Health issues - diets.
Alternative crops for Southeast Nebraska Including horticulture sales, distribution and processing of alternative crops, helping businesses start and succeed.

Strengthening the business community in small towns; enriching family relationships; adapting the 4-H program to meet the needs of changing family demands.

Food and nutrition; personal and family financial management; family life.

Continued to quality, relevant subject matter programming - whatever we do, do it well; CES visibility; keeping agents updated and coordinate programming efforts.

Economic and community development; profitability in agriculture; stress management; water quality.

Financial (family) economics consumer education, small business development.

I'm not aware of what priorities are? visibility and impact are important whatever priorities are chosen.

Family life; building strong family; community resource dev.; Ag. Economics; youth program.

Nutrition - expand on "eating today for a healthier tomorrow"; Agriculture - increase efficiency and profitability; Increase CRD programs - particularly to increase "a sense of community" among the people and expand from there.

Growing and marketing alternative crops; 4-H and youth development to include drug and career education; Inter-relationships of agriculture from production to consumption including forestry.

Combining efforts of specialists and Co. staff for more vital, effective programming at less time and cost (multi. - Co.); Revitalization of economics, communities though industrial growth, food marketing new crop production.

Retirement information; Estate planning; health problems; information for women improving nutrition diet.

People and community survival; alternate enterprises for rural areas; family strength bombardment.

Nutrition/health/diet; How to be financially sound in retirement role of mind and body interaction.

Helping agents market county programs: water and natural resources conservation, working with legislature.
Communicating clear cut mission to counties; Streamlining paperwork so agents can spend time with people in counties; Commitment to follow through for urban uniqueness and different needs; Organized programs.

Profitability crop and livestock production; financial management; Physical and mental wellness.

Economic conditions of farm families; Economic conditions of the small town; Problems of family life - Divorce, etc.

Farm financial management and computer usage; Effective crops and livestock production; Stress control among agricultural family members.

Efficient crop production - Practical marketing; Proper nutrition - youth, adult, elderly, etc.; Market development for non-traditional crops (fruits, vegetables, oil, crops, fish, etc.).

Agriculture Economics - living in today's economics; Agronomy - crop production, conservation tillage etc.; Youth - 4-H programs.

Farm financial planning.

Improving farm income - farm financial planning; Water quality and resources; Conservation tillage.

Provide research based information to farm operators; Work with producers to maximize production with a least cost approach; Work with producers to improve farm management skills.

Ag. financial management; Profitable crop and livestock production; Commercial horticulture.

Agriculture economic crisis; Water quality; Soil conservation related to crop production.

Rural revitalization - Ag., CRD, family bare bones Ag. production - cost effective management living and working with the Govt. programs (sodbuster).

Gain real support of a larger % of clientele (PR); Financial management for farm and small town business; Agricultural efficiency; Alternative business options.
List three program priorities of SEREC that should be dropped during the next five years.

Forestry - no trees left; Nutrition - everybody eats at fast food outlets - no matter if poor nutrition.

Craft programs for adults; Managing for tomorrow in present form; Home structures and energy conservation.

Advanced marketing - more on basic marketing (pricing).

Horticulture as it is now; Less reports and time in program planning.

I am not aware of significant programs that could be dropped; Programs that would have an impact on staff time or dollars.

? community resource development; Possible consolidation of extension efforts in county areas.

I'm sure there are some, you list them for me and I'll rank them for you but I don't have any prime examples.

Excessive support of the county and state fair system; Soil testing all becomes evaluations.

Reduces the role of community resource development program.

Community crime programs; Marketing - managing and financing #401; Commercial Floriculture.

Emphasis on continued increase in agricultural production type programs.

Clarke - McNary - sell to provide enterprise farm programs and policies - leave to ASCS, etc. Reduce/eliminate field staff time/commitment at fairs/shows - year parents leaders, youth to manage state fair and Ak-Sar-Ben, etc.

Clergy Training; Women in agriculture; Reduce the amount of time the 4-H specialist participates in camping activities.

Clergy Workshops.

Conservation Tillage.

Home based businesses, conservation tillage.

Dairy, clothing, housing.

Clothing construction.
Help agents get councils (4-H - ext. club, etc.) and committees to handle more of their program by themselves; Agents should not be staffing (judging etc. the state fair - we should help but shouldn't replace paid fair staff or volunteers.); Be more selective with agents time for strong committees - we are gone from county too much.

Health; wellness.

Organizing and holding administrative type gatherings of all staff in the SEREC district; District training of home extension club personnel; Extension Bd.,Tr. meeting annually.

Energy; Housing renovation; Handling of home chemicals.

Not sure what program priorities are.

Clergy training; Women in agriculture; Less resources devoted to Eastern Nebraska 4-H center.

Futuristic Role for Urban Counties

What should be the role of the SEREC in the urban area during the next five years?

Continued emphasis on family and 4-H.

Youth and 4-H; Residential horticulture; Home extension programs designed for family living.

Help the urban counties develop programs directed more to total urban audiences.

Be the administrative center for a unified extension program in home based businesses, health ed., and family living.

Horticulture - commercial and homeowner.

Urban residents pay taxes and are entitled to services even though the economic importance may be bus.

Ag Information delivery to Ag business corporations; Ag. lender standing to urban audience.

More response to the total community; More support for Agri-business and trades expansion. Value - added projects.

Structured programs which enhance urban life - environment garden lawn etc., and design a modern delivery system; Expand this present program and develop new programs to assist the urban poor.
The main goal is to meet the needs of the people as they change. I do not feel qualified to project what they will be in SEREC.

I believe that SEREC should continue to emphasize areas such as horticulture and Home Ec. that extension is involved in. I see little need in getting into areas that we are not familiar with, in the urban areas.

Provide support to agents and information to small land owners.

Continue to expand role to educate and serve urban clientele - economics, diets, conservation. This is critical for political survival. Also reach non traditional audiences as well as traditional audience.

Urban pesticide impact research need to be done -- assessment of plant/people interaction as well.

Understand what urban programming is all about.

To ease transition of rural/small town residents into urban sites probably, more resources should be committed.

Increase number of staff working in horticulture; Provide people and materials for average owners; improve Extension public relations in S.E. Nebraska.

Assist with livestock and horticulture production on acreages and public elations and promotion for extension. relations and promotion for extension.

Development of more community resources; promote a better understanding between rural and urban people.

Provide information and progress to help small business, home based business, families with small children and teens, food and nutrition information.

Continue to provide a supporting role for all county staff.

Helping people cope with stress and change.

Provide direction to help individuals and existing small based businesses; establish and maintain their own private economic ventures be a clearing house for non-biased information in areas of Ag. Home Ec., etc. for business.

As this is where most of Nebraska's citizens are visible it is probably important in some phase of extension programming, to give visibility to extension.

Promoting strong families, CRD.

Place more emphasis on the CRD area; Place more emphasis on
families - communication, financial management, nutritious and low cost meals.

Home Ec. including EFNEP; Horticulture and forestry; youth development.

Family economics; family well-being, family relationships; nutrition and health.

Increase contact with horticulture clientele; a role of information dissemination capitalizing on all the high tech. afforded are urban area.

Educational center - would like to see "Educational center" added after county name and drop the word "service".

Help urban programs grow to meet the large clientele needs - (more staffing at a time when it isn't popular).

Realizing and making changes in quantities available, timing, etc. for urban needs; Flexibility in policies and procedures for urban; Listen to urban input.

Continue and increase staff and funds in Home Ec., Horticulture, media, public relations, and creative programming.

Let Douglas and Lancaster counties be increasingly independent, but act as the mediator between them and other SEREC counties.

Other comments about staffing, programming or the future role of SEREC:

The county staff will still be needed.

Bring Douglas county back into SEREC - the organizational structure of large counties and multi-county staff should be changed with all evaluations and supervision responsibilities belonging to the agent chair of those larger staffs. This would relieve the DD of an overburden and place it into hands of the person working directly with staff members.

We will need more assistance to small community and small towns as they try to survive.

I would like to see specialization at the rural level however, I doubt if economic conditions will allow this to happen unless at the expense of county staff. County staff members can not be reduced greater without resulting in loss of public support for all extension programs.
We need to cluster our counties turning to extension centers in four or five places, specialize most of our staff and reduce the middle staff, that support is needed directly with clientele and at the point of research.

Need to bring all the county programs in the SEREC directly into the district administrative set up.

The staff is very dedicated and work long hand hours. Even though times are tough we need to move forward to be the best as people will support a winner.

The SEREC headquarters staff is currently doing an excellent job.

Take a look at where the population is and implement a realistic staffing pattern based on personnel assignments according to so many thousand potential clients per FTE.

Residents of rural areas expect to see staff within their comfortable travel radius and any reorganizing must take this into account; investigate voice and video access by clientele to SEREC headquarters under (I'd think) great pressure to be absorbed by department; SEREC field staff still need administrative support - not sure if specialists need SEREC plus department administration.

More coordination of in depth workshops to reduce overlap and close proximity of area meetings; Emphasis on multi-county staffing and multi-county programming as funds are reduced.

Consolidation of county offices will be a future challenge.

All SEREC staff should be housed in Mussehl Hall; Home Ec. specialists should help prepare a leader's letter for 4-H leaders - meetings, don't work like they used to for leader training; Clarify the role of extension and other organizations - should we continue with the horticulture programs if garden centers, etc. are hiring horticulturists; How do we coordinate with community college programs in our locations.

Stronger support is needed for family life ( Home Ec. ) Programs... Ag. related businesses, farmer etc. are on the decline but family members remain constant; With limited funding staffing at the district, level may need to be reduced. State specialists at county/area staff may play a more important role.

Must continue the search for excellence.

SEREC needs to remain strong for coordinated efforts of multi staff programming in district.
There still exists a great desire on the part of many local clientele to have contact with a "generalist" agent who can tap into specialist resources.

Horticulture and nutrition are extremely important to urban audience - need innovative ways to meet the needs in these areas with high population.

Seriously look at needs of CES and how SEREC is really needed or if personnel could be better utilized at county or state level.

Things are going good. Keep up the good work!

It is important to keep a 4-H District Specialist - I don't think district business should be handled through the state office.
I. FUTURE DIRECTION OF SREC

The organizational structure of the Southeast Research and Extension Center (SREC) is different from the other Extension and Research centers in Nebraska in four ways:

A. The headquarters for SREC is located on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus rather than at (a Research and Extension Center) an off-campus location.
B. There is no research component at SREC. (The research appointments of two specialists are located in the subject matter departments.)
C. Some SREC specialists have appointments with time divided between SREC and campus departments.
D. Some SREC Extension specialists are housed in departmental facilities, some at SREC headquarters.

As you think about the future direction of SREC, please respond to the following statements: (CHECK ONE RESPONSE)

1. The organizational structure of the Southeast Research and Extension Center should:
   a. Remain as it is described in A through D above
   b. Change the structure (If this response is chosen, explain how the structure is to be changed.)

2. The mission of SREC should include:
   a. Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and the Nebraska Forest Service, as it is at the present time
   b. Cooperative Extension Service, Nebraska Forest Service and Agricultural Research Division (ARD) component
   c. Other
      (Please specify)
II. ROLE AND MANAGEMENT OF APPOINTMENTS BETWEEN SREC AND IANR DEPARTMENTS:

3. Some of the SREC specialists have joint Cooperative Extension Service and Agricultural Research Division appointments (the CES appointment is within SREC and the ARD appointment is within the subject matter department) while some SREC specialists have 100% CES or Nebraska Forest Service appointments. (Home Economics subject matter support from specialists is provided by Home Economics departments.)

Do you feel a joint ARD/CES appointment is:

_____ a. The most desirable appointment
_____ b. Not highly desirable, but is acceptable
_____ c. Is not acceptable

4. Should SREC have specialists on staff representing those subject matter departments who have major program influence on the economy and well-being of southeast Nebraska?

_____ a. Yes
_____ b. No

If yes, what specialists should be added to cover subject matter areas?

5. SREC specialist staff should be housed in:

_____ a. SREC headquarters
_____ b. Subject matter departments
_____ c. Other _________________________________

(Please specify)

III. PROGRAMMING ROLE OF SREC SPECIALISTS

6. How important is it to have specialists located at SREC for answering questions of Extension agents and the general public of southeast Nebraska? (CHECK ONE)

_____ a. Very important
_____ b. Important
_____ c. Somewhat important
_____ d. Of little importance
_____ e. Of no importance
7. Please explain your response to the previous question.

IV. VISIBILITY OF SREC

8. How familiar are you with the programs of the Cooperative Extension Service and Nebraska Forest Service of the Southeast Research and Extension Center?

   _a. I know programs are offered, but I am not aware of details
   
   _b. I am aware of some programs
   
   _c. I am very familiar because of frequent contacts

V. FUTURE ROLE OF SREC

9. SREC has traditionally delivered information on Agriculture and Natural Resources, and Home Economics. Should it also be the responsibility of SREC and county staff to serve as centers for other University activities such as business programs, and assisting with other University-wide activities in the community?

   _a. Yes
   
   _b. No

10. If response was Yes in #9, please describe other areas of service for SREC and county offices.

   __________________________________________________________________________
   
   __________________________________________________________________________
   
   __________________________________________________________________________
Completed questionnaires were returned by 14 Unit Heads of the Institute for Agriculture and Natural Resources. Their responses to the questionnaire follow:

When asked about the organizational structure, most of the Department heads (78%) suggested that it remain as it is. This is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Organizational Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remain as it is</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the structure*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Only question is whether any specialists need to be housed with SREC, if they have time divided between Department and Center.

*The only way this could be done effectively would be to move to a different location, off campus. Perhaps SREC should move to some other city.

*Separate location and facility.
Table 2 shows that the majority of the Department Heads favor the present mission of SREC which includes CES and the Forest Service.

Table 2
Mission of SREC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of SREC</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES and Forest Service as it is presently</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES, Forest Service and ARD*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If move (to another location) as suggested above, then SREC should be like the other research and Extension Centers.

Some of the SREC specialists have joint Cooperative Extension Service and Agricultural Research Division while other specialists have 100% CES or Nebraska Forest Service appointments. Table 3 shows 85.7% of the respondents felt the joint ARD/CES appointment is the most desirable.

Table 3
Extension Specialist Appointments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of appointment</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint ARD/CES appointment is most desirable</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint ARD/CES appointment is not highly desirable, but is acceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint ARD/CES appointment is not acceptable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4 shows that 64.3% of the respondents felt that SREC should have specialists on staff who represent subject matter departments who have major program influence on the economy and well-being of southeast Nebraska.

Table 4

Subject Matter Specialists Who Represent Program for Southeast Nebraska

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forage production and pasture management

*Because of location, not necessary.
*Probably not needed for all subject matter departments especially if covered already.
*No more so than any other Center, probably less so.

In regard to housing location, Table 5 shows the necessity of making this decision on an individual basis.

Table 5

Housing Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SREC Headquarters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter departments*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other**</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If they have joint appointments with the department.
**Six Heads indicated that it depends on the individual appointment.
There was no consensus on the importance of SREC specialists answering questions from Extension Agents and the general public as indicated in Table 6. An explanation of the answers provided follow Table 6.

Table 6
Programming Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answering Questions</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of little importance*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of no importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Under present situation (of little importance)
Under separate organization "very important".

Explanation of Answers in Table 6

Agents and the general public need access to the broad expertise offered by specialists at SREC.

If the specialist is 100% with SREC, then it is important and probably more so for urban clients. But if the specialists is 50% or more in the department, then it is probably not critical.

Answering questions is the fundamental role of a specialist.

I am not as familiar with SREC as I should be although they have some very capable staff.

The general public doesn't know enough about the University usually to call specialists in the departments. The agents would know this.

Access is critical.

I have not had concerns expressed about problems where SREC personnel are in departments.
Specialists are available in subject matter departments who can answer these same questions.

UNL - IANR Departments can handle.

Most of the department heads (92.9%) had some awareness but were not very familiar with SREC programs as shown in Table 7.

Table 7
Familiarity with SREC Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know programs are offered, but not the details</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of some programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very familiar because of frequent contacts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SREC has traditionally delivered information on Agriculture and Natural Resources, and Home Economics. Table 8 shows that 78.5% of the Department Heads responded no or uncertain to the question of expanding the role of SREC. Written responses to these question follow Table 8.
Table 8

Future Role of SREC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No**</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown***</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Community development activities.
*You must be more innovative to service. Look for new opportunities to "market" programs.
*Probably would be a good effort but may be difficult to support expertise that would be required. Business and urban population of SE Nebraska is the unique characteristic of this region that should be addressed by SREC.
**Unless other parts of the University besides IANR wants to provide budget and program support.
***I am not sure although there may be opportunities. Perhaps, subject matter departments would offer possibilities here also.
***Uncertain because of example.
***No different from NE, South Central, West Central or Panhandle.

Prepared by: Robert J. Florell
Program Survey for the
Southeast Research & Extension Center
Institute of Agriculture & Natural Resources
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

I. VISIBILITY OF SREC

A. Are you familiar with the University of Nebraska Southeast Research & Extension Center?

___1. Yes
___2. No

B. How familiar are you with the programs of the Cooperative Extension Service and the Nebraska Forest Service of the Southeast Research & Extension Center?

___1. I know the programs are offered, but I am not aware of the details
___2. I am aware of some programs
___3. I am very familiar because of frequent contacts
___4. I'm not familiar with programming at SREC

II. FUTURE DIRECTION OF SREC

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln is one of three components of the University of Nebraska system. The Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources (IANR) is a separate component of the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. IANR is headed by a Vice Chancellor.

The programs of IANR are carried on through thirteen agricultural departments, four home economics departments, three field laboratories and five district research and extension centers. The research and extension centers (REC) are located off campus. The faculty, which are housed at the centers, have joint research and extension appointments. Applied research is conducted at the centers to meet the needs of the area served by that center. Extension specialists, with county staff, conduct extension programs for the area served by the center.

The Southeast Research and Extension Center's (SREC) organizational structure is different from the other Extension and Research centers in Nebraska in four ways:

A. The headquarters for SREC is located on the University of Nebraska-Lincoln campus rather than at (a Research and Extension Center) an off-campus location.
B. There is no research component at SREC. (The research appointments of two specialists are located in the subject matter departments.)

C. Some SREC specialists have appointments with time divided between SREC and campus departments.

D. Some SREC Extension specialists are housed in departmental facilities, some at SREC headquarters.

As you think about the future direction of SREC, please respond to the following statements: (CHECK ONE RESPONSE)

E. The organizational structure of the Southeast Research and Extension Center should:

   ___1. Remain as it is described in A through D above

   ___2. Change the structure (If this response is chosen, explain how the structure is to be changed.)

F. The mission of SREC should include:

   ___1. Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and the Nebraska Forest Service, as it is at the present time

   ___2. Cooperative Extension Service, Nebraska Forest Service and Agricultural Research Division (ARD) component

   ___3. Other (Please specify)

III. MAJOR PROGRAM PRIORITIES OF SREC

A. List the three highest program priorities for SREC for the next five years.

B. List three program priorities of SREC that should be dropped during the next five years.
C. Rank in order of importance, the specific area in each of the program areas starting with 1 (Most Important) to (Least Important)

1. Production Agriculture

   Rank   Specific Area
   ______a. Crop production efficiency
   ______b. Livestock production efficiency
   ______c. Pest control (insects, weeds, disease)
   ______d. Farm management
   ______e. Horticulture

2. Economic Development

   Rank   Specific Area
   ______a. Food processing
   ______b. Ag by-products
   ______c. Small business development

3. Conservation of Natural Resources

   Rank   Specific Area
   ______a. Soil erosion control
   ______b. Water conservation
   ______c. Water quality maintenance

4. Home Economics

   Rank   Specific Area
   ______a. Foods and nutrition
   ______b. Clothing, housing and interior design
   ______c. Family life/health
   ______d. Consumer education
   ______e. Financial management
5. Youth Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Specific Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>a. Development of specific project skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>b. Development of communication skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>c. Development of self-confidences &amp; self awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>d. Leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>e. Learning to work with others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. What should be the role of the SREC in the urban areas during the next five years? (Please respond if you reside in Dodge, Douglas, Lancaster, Platte or Sarpy counties.)

---

---

IV. List any other comments about staffing, programming or the future role of SREC you wish to make.

---

---

---
Program Survey for the Southeast Research and Extension Center

Five hundred citizens from southeast Nebraska who had some familiarity with the Southeast Research and Extension Center were surveyed about the future direction for SREC. Questionnaires were completed by 216 respondents for a 43.2 percent return.

VISIBILITY OF SREC

When asked about their familiarity with the University of Nebraska Southeast Research and Extension Center, 189 (88.3%) indicated they were familiar with SREC. Table 1 shows the degree of familiarity with the programs offered by SREC. Almost half of the respondents (48.6%) were aware of some programs. One comment was that "the visibility of SREC is poor. Visibility could be improved by moving SREC to Mead. However, in my notion visibility would be the only plus. I think more efficiency can be achieved by leaving the headquarters on campus. Thus, I feel efficiency and effectiveness are more important to the clientele being served than visibility."

Table 1

Familiarity with SREC Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of familiarity</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know the programs are offered, but I'm not aware of the details</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of some programs</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar because of frequent contacts</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm not familiar with programming at SREC</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FUTURE DIRECTION OF SREC

Of the 196 who responded to the question about the organizational structure of SREC, 181 (92.3%) felt the structure should remain as it is at the present time. Of the 15 who indicated the structure should be changed, 13 indicated they felt a change was necessary, but they were not knowledgeable enough to offer suggestions. Two suggestions were offered. One suggestion was, "no research component is necessary on a district basis."
It should be statewide to avoid duplication". The second suggestion was to move SREC headquarters to the Mead Field Laboratory and house all SREC Extension specialists at the SREC headquarters".

In regard to the mission of SREC, 93 (47.4%) felt the Cooperative Extension Service and Nebraska Forest Service should be the primary thrusts of the program while 90 (50.0%) felt the Agricultural Research Division should be added to the existing mission. The five who selected other varied in the comments from no opinion, to eliminate Forestry, to all of the above plus Community Development, urban planning, Economic Development, and small business assistance.

MAJOR PROGRAM PRIORITIES FOR SREC

A. List the three highest program priorities for SREC for the next five years.

01 Fruit; nut and windbreak trees; erosion control and water.

02 Changing family roles; money management both farm and home and changing agricultural practices.

03 Strengthen the individual county's program; helping Nebraska communities add ways to boost their economy and growth; maintain programs to help people live resourcefully.

04 Economic development; conservation of natural resources; and the youth program.

05 Farm management - working with banker - manage way through difficult times; economic development - small business, etc; and continue research in production agriculture.

06 Quality family life; economic stability in the state; financial management.

07 Marketing of crops and livestock; financial counseling and accounting.

09 Farming in the future; computer techniques; new farming techniques; alternate crops; health programs; living with stress and practical physical fitness.

10 Conservation tillage, crop protection clinics and research for these.

11 Agriculture; and 4-H.

12 Agricultural profitability, forestry; horticulture, soil and water conservation - tillage etc.

13 4-H programs, conservation tillage; and living resourcefully.
14 Enhance profitable family farm operations; alternative agricultural income sources; develop regional understanding between urban and rural families.

15 Farm family economic problems and management; 4-H programs and improved nutrition for families.

16 Conservation of resources; development of farm management and farm related business and family life including 4-H program.

17 Economic development, production agriculture and youth programs.

19 Farm management; water quality, and ag by-products.

20 Youth (RUY); water quality; and ag by-products.

21 4-H program and microcomputer education.

22 Financial advise for farmers (small); More efficient farming practices; More efficient Marketing.

23 Production Ag; Conservation of Natural Resources; Economic Development.

24 Financial Management (personal & Business); Small Business development; youth leadership.

25 Assisting farmers in transition; Providing information from university research; Assist in demonstrations.

26 Financial skills, both agriculture and consumer; Conservation of energy, soil, all natural resources; Expanding horizons-i.e.- alternate crops, small business.

27 Mutual health aspects of farmers/framing; Help prepare farmers for changing farms/times.

28 4H; Farm Economics; Livestock efficiency.

29 Conservation Tillage; Agricultural Profitability; Managing for tomorrow and financial counseling.

30 Farm management and accounting; Plant and livestock production; plant, water, and soil management.

31 Awareness of the extension programs; Economic development; Home Economics—(change the name).

32 Assistant to the farmers and their financial situation; Youth-expansion of the 4-H programs and projects; Assist working mothers and wives.

33 Horticulture; Home Ec.; Youth.
34 4-H; Conservation Tillage; Ag. Research.

35 4-H programs; Women in Business (whether it be ag-related, outside the home, self-employment.); Ag. related efficiencies (financial, production, marketability).

36 Information on farm programs; Continue support of marketing programs; Agriculture production.

37 Livestock and crop production; Financial Management.

38 Meet the needs of changing agriculture through local extension offices; Deal with stress.

39 Crop and Livestock production efficiency; Soil erosion control; Family life/health.

40 Continued emphasis on Agricultural Development; Increases youth education; Help to those who cannot handle normal daily living tasks because they have not been taught in their own homes - foods, childcare etc.

41 Marketing.

42 Youth programs; Home Economics; Economic Development.

43 Areas of expertise = Crops, growing, housing, selling, records, computers; Finance - tax laws, govt. programs, chap. 12 & 7; Consolidation of programs both within SREC and with other organizations in the area i.e. SECC UN-L etc. Finance - tax laws, govt. programs, chap. 12&7; 44 Increase public awareness amongst urban population.

45 Using Video tapes more extensively; Cooperate with businesses in producing them; Ex. Singer machine and Red Star yeast have some available to the public.

46 Women in agriculture; Ag. By Products; Improved nutrition for family.

47 Develop plans and market for diversified crops; Ways to make your dollars go farther; Develop foods from Red meat, corn, peas.

48 Research for the promotion of red meat as to it's importance in a balanced diet.

49 Managing for tomorrow and financial counseling; Computers; Improving farm records.

50 Efficient crop and livestock production; H-H.

51 Farm management (financial); Live stock efficiency; Commodities (future markets).
52 New product development (livestock); Finances, (enterprise analysis).

53 Conservation; 4-H; Financial Mgt.

54 Continuing managing for tomorrow and financial counseling; 4-H programs; Conservation tillage.

55 Ag. Services; Managing Information; Rural resources - community development.

56 Conservation of soil and water; Farm Mgt.; Economic development by more uses for our products.

57 Agricultural Diversification - Alternative income; Financial Management - cost cutting youth programs.

58 Education of consumers; Services to peoples needs at that point in time.

59 Food processing and horticulture - value added prod.; youth program; Research and development of product marketing systems.

60 All youth programs; Family life, with emphasis on health and nutrition; profitable farm management.

61 Food production; Water conservation; Financial Management.

62 Water; Leadership; 4-H.

63 Finding new ways to capitalize more effectively on our agricultural resources; More focus on rural community development efforts; Ways for southeast Nebraska to build on Omaha's and Lincoln's appetite for outdoor recreation.

64 Water quality; Chemical usage; Conservation farming.

65 Economic development and management; Home Economics; Youth programs.

66 Conservation Tillage; Beef Production; Forage production and marketing.

67 Economic development; Marketing; Genetic Engineering - The philosophical aspects - should it be promoted or not?

68 Research utilization of existing Ag products promote and help farmers make transition from todays agriculture to tomorrows agriculture "keep looking forward."

69 Livestock assistance; Crop assistance includes entomology; Home Ec.

70 Don't know.
71 Farm management; Efficiency of Ag operations; Specialization of farms/ranches.

72 Insects, seeds and diseases; Farm management including computes and "Managing for tomorrow"; Horticulture.

73 Farm management - including; crop, livestock production, marketing; Water/soil conservation; Consumer education.

74 Profitability and business management in farming/livestock; Food processing; Family/farm counseling information and guidance (rural and urban).

75 Livestock programs - Diseases - stress safety in eating our products; Home Ec. - Family life; Crop - profitability - Disease.

76 Farm management; Horticulture; Crops.

77 Crop production - experimental crops using the land efficiently; Health - food and physical fitness; More uses for corn and milo.

78 Consumer education; Horticulture; Human resources adult and youth.

79 Rural development, keep people in small towns and in rural areas; Work toward labor intense programs.

80 Farm business management; Alternative agriculture; Maximum Economic yields.

81 Consumer education; Natural resources (water - soil conservation); Human resources and development (youth - adult).

82 Develop markets for alternative crops; Develop a very basic program or marketing traditional crops for those of us with little experience (could there be a home study course - is that feasible?); Continue managing for tomorrow, financial counseling women in Ag. programs.

83 Ag.; 4-H; Econ.

84 Farm management; Record keeping; Business analysis.

85 Assisting transition to adapt to needed changes due to a continuing depletion of farm families in our state; Emphasis needed for farm families to provide leadership and adjustment.

86 More research; 4-H working with youth; Home extension projects for women.

87 Economic development; Production Agriculture; Conservation of natural resources.
Community development; Financial planning for rural families; Nutrition planning.

Conservation Ag.; Conservation of natural resources; Economic development.

Farm management; Economic development.

Farm management; Small business development; Water conservation and maintenance.

Conservation tillage; Least cost production of crops and livestock; keeping agriculture profitable.

Small Business; Marketing produce grains etc.; Conservation.

4-H programs; Conservation tillage; Agricultural profitability.

Farm finance and management - includes conserve tillage; main tillage; water quality; conserve.

Alternative farm methods; Reducing farm production costs; Community, family relations.

Somehow computer importance: Explain technical society to the public as changes occur; keep in touch with gross-nots.

Conservation tillage and water quality management; alternative cropping research economic development assistance in rural communities.

Programs need to serve the needs of families still farming all kinds of alternative crops including vegetables need to be reported; Improve "quality of life" (explained in 3.c4. and 3.d) (4-H program NFBA Ne. farm Bus. Ass. Man. for tomorrow low cost farming; cons. tillage.

Conservation tillage product marketing (puts call option, etc.)

To keep agriculture a visible industry in the state.

Protecting the family farm; marketing programs; supplementing farm income with "diversified" crops (onions, asparagus, christmas trees.).

Agricultural Marketing; Farm management; Ag. by products.

Publicity we need to reach more people to take advantage of services; Emphasis on programs for rural towns people and small business because farm families are decreasing but as yet our towns are trying to preserve a good way of life; Encourage better understanding between farm folks and town folks this is an old barrier that seems difficult to break.
105 Agricultural profitability; Financial counseling; Living resourcefully.

106 Crop and livestock production; Pest control; farm management.

107 Farm financial planning (also urban); Conservation - (water and soil); Youth programs.

108 Have more help and advice for Operators and gardeners; Help set up and continue farmer's markets (in town); Hold more training sessions for people to engage in fruit and vegetable production.

109 Continued assistance for farmers in financial difficulties; keep contacting young people for 4-H programs; Stress good nutrition for all people.

110 Stress management; financial management and counseling; Keeping our water safe.

111 Ag. by products; Crop efficiency; livestock efficiency.

112 Livestock Specialist; Crops specialist; Farm management.

113 Farm management; Consumer education; 4-H programs.

114 Low input Ag production; Conservation tillage or erosion control; A way to reduce the need of chemical use.

115 We especially need more Ag. Research for new crop for more small businesses and education of the urban farm areas for soil conservation.

116 Economic development; Production agriculture (esp. efficiency); Conservation of natural resources.

117 Debtor/farmer rights education program; Research and education program and FARM policy that leads to higher farm income; Mediation.

118 Community resource development; Helping people and families cope with change.

119 Agricultural research; Agricultural profitability; 4-H programs; Home based business.

120 Soil conservation; Water conservation; Farm management.

121 Financial management; Water conservation; food and nutrition.

122 Farm management; Crop specialty (new crops); Youth.
123 Water Quality and conservation; Farm management (financial and crop planning); Alternate farm crops.

124 Conservation tillage; Agricultural profitability; 4-H programs.

125 Production Ag.; Youth Programs; Economic development.

126 Financial Mgt Programs; Implementing and dealing with conservation provisions farm bill; Marketing and cow-calf management.

127 4-H; Women in Ag.; Ag. Profitability; all are important.

128 Marketing farm commodities and crops; Consumer education; New ways to utilize farm crops and Ag. products.

129 Natural resource use and awareness programs; Human enrichment programs; Ag. profitability and small business.

130 Community education - small business, new crops, women in Ag.; MFT; On going projects - Water quality; soil testing; conservation tillage; fertility.

131 Conservation tillage; 4-H programs; Agricultural Profitability.

132 Ag. profitability; Managing For Tomorrow and financial counseling; 4-H programs.

133 Production Ag.; Youth; Economic development.

134 Pesticide Awareness - pollution - safety; Conservation tillage; Ag. dollar management /marketing.

135 Financial management; Economical production (lower input); Alternate crop production.

136 As already in progress Alternate crops for Nebraska; Increase number of programs for the communities that serves agriculture.

137 4-H; Farm management and records; Marketing education.

138 Swine research (livestock); Crop research (varieties of fertilization, Insecticides);

139 Agricultural; Home extension; 4-H and Youth.

140 Water pollution.

141 Production agriculture efficiencies; Youth development.
B. List three program priorities of SREC that should be dropped during the next five years.

01 None.

03 Specialization that puts staff in Lincoln and takes staff away from the counties.

05 Programs with low participation or little interest.

09 I don't see SREC moving in a new direction until we have moved through the current depressed economic cycle. I don't see that happening for several years. A displaced farmer program is my only idea and it seems to be adequately handled by other agencies.

10 I'm sure there are programs that aren't used much and are not vital to the economic well being of this state, but I don't know which they are.

13 Women in agriculture; improved nutrition for families; forestry.

14 Programs in direct competition with the private sector and programs designed to benefit only a few individuals.

15 Perhaps women in agriculture might be reduced because there are fewer farms and women directly involved with agriculture.

21 Managing for tomorrow.

23 Don't know of any that should be dropped.

24 Don't feel that I can make that judgment; Don't know what your response to the different programs are.

25 Quit telling people chicken and fish are good for them; Tell them all the antibodies against them; Telling people how to beat their banker, this only makes higher interest for the rest of us; When agents hire judges for fairs quit hiring each other, they hire a judge that will hire them back.

26 Some of the 4-H programs; Some of the production programs.

27 Ag. programs are important.

28 Don't know of any that I would want to see dropped.

29 Financial Analysis; Farm business.

30 Not familiar enough with SREC program priorities to respond to this item.

31 Community resource development.
32 The SREC was designed for agriculture and rural areas, the past years I have seen a shift to more urban programming, don't foreshake those areas that SREC was created for.

33 Forestry; clothing, housing, interior design; Youth development of communication skills

34 Not sure what existing priorities are. I'm reluctant to say if any should be dropped completely.

35 Conservation, water resource, resource development since this is performed by other agencies.

36 I question if we can afford to drop any programs. If necessary we may have to scale a program down.

37 I'm not knowledgeable enough in all areas to be able to judge this.

38 I don't feel I know enough about all the programs to answer this.

39 Crop production - (yield).

40 Clothing.

41 Health wellness; crafts.

42 Drop programs that are not developing the worth of individuals. Such as demonstrations on pets that emphasizes the pets not the people.

43 Maximum crop and livestock yields.

44 Crafts; health/wellness (urban perspective).

45 I would need to review the present programs offered (in more depth) before I could feel confident in suggesting elimination of certain programs. Because I must work off the farm I don't belong to an extension club but that doesn't necessarily mean it should be eliminated. I believe the University should be more involved in finding overseas markets for our products rather than teaching other countries to be self-sufficient (the U.S. Imported more products then we exported last year.)

46 Textile and clothing; Energy saving programs; Interior and design.

47 I hesitate to say dropped but of lesser importance crop and livestock production; foods and clothing.

48 Home based businesses; women in agriculture.

49 Managing for tomorrow.
50 House Ext. club program.

51 I believe all of the present programs are good and need to be touched on in one way or another. Hopefully none will need to be dropped.

52 They are all good!

53 Small business development; housing and interior design.

54 Perhaps place less emphasis on "extension club" activities and more on individualized education.

55 Farm economy; conservation; home economics; 4-H.

56 Unsure of programs to cut. Possibly more users fees in the future.

57 County fairs; Agent time devoted to news releases and columns. Maybe some research programs (?) could be left for the private sector to finance -- I realize that SREC is not involved with research so this is a general comment. Maybe you could help farmers explore work in agriculture other than as individual entrepreneurs -- are there any corporate farm jobs?

58 Cut back on home economics programs.

59 Family life, health; Leadership development.

60 Research - leave to business and university; Ag. profitability - should be served by business; Conservation tillage.

61 Clothing, housing and Interior design.

62 Agriculture programs that maintain the status quo.

63 Less emphasis on home decorating and programs that are already met better by other organizations/businesses.

64 I don't know of any that should be dropped.

65 Home based businesses.

66 Forestry; Horticulture; community resource level.

67 This should be evaluated by those closest to the programs. If some programs are failing evaluate why and either change or drop.

68 Agents doing research locally on strawberries; No other programs eliminated; Let the commercial companies do the research. They are the ones who benefit financially.
69 No! Some programs could be trimmed but not cut; (Some 4-H and home Ec. overlap)

70 Chemigation - due to ground water contamination; All livestock programs as individuals - may need to be combined in some way; Lawn and garden area - may need to let or help garden centers take care of this.

71 Managing for tomorrow.

72 I am sure there are some but I have no specifics.

73 Staff who sit and write NEBguides.

74 In view of the difficulty and instability facing so many in Nebraska, these programs and resources are more necessary than ever before.

75 Forestry; Home based businesses.

76 Some of these programs that there is little interest; Some programs that cost more than the good they do.

77 I would Like to be more familiar with the attendance on some of your programs (and also acceptance) before I could say which ones should be dropped.

78 Consumer education; Development of youth project skills.

79 Extension technologist; Extension forester; Combine - farm business consultant and financial analyst.

80 Development of project skills.

81 School enrichment.

82 De-emphasized production research; More away from right-wing economic philosophy prevalent in most university projects.; Agriculture diversification.

83 Forestry.

84 All very important.

85 Forest.

86 Instead of dropping - consider blending together projects of activities with similar goals or objects.

87 I feel that almost all programs have some merit and don't really feel I can make judgment as to which programs are not going to be of any benefit to someone.

88 Home economics.
89 Reduced: Forestry; Horticulture; New swine specialist or changes in swine.

90 All to important to drop.

91 Crop production efficiency; Livestock production efficiency; Research to increase production and oversupply.

92 Managing main street; EFNEP; Continue consolidation, condensation of agents-counties: reorganization.

93 Any that is duplicated by another public or private entity; "Hobby" activities - your first priority should be helping production agriculturists survive!

94 I don't know of any that should be dropped.

95 Urban Horticulture; Does SREC have a role in economic development?

C. The following programming areas are ranked in order of importance. Numbers preceding the subject matter areas are scores. Larger scores indicate a higher ranking:

1. Production Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Specific area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Farm Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Crop production efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Livestock Production efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Pest control (insects, weeds, diseases)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Horticulture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Specific area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Ag by-products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Food processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Small business development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Conservation of Natural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Specific area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Soil erosion control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Water quality maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Water conservation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Home Economics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Specific area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Financial management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Family life/health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Consumer education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Foods and nutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clothing, housing and interior design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Youth Programs

153 Development of self-confidence and self awareness
100 Learning to work with others
77 Leadership development
71 Development of communications skills
22 Development of specific project skills

D. What should be the role of the SREC in the urban areas during the next five years? (Answered only by respondents from urban counties.)

01 Backyard farmer is best in U.S.; County agents help.

03 While it is true most people in Nebraska reside in urban areas, it is also true that more resources for learning self-help skills from a variety of sources are also available in urban areas. Persons in rural areas may be more directly helped from the SREC programs because our variety of resources for learning skills is less than in urban areas.

11 To promote projects that will bring urban and rural areas closer.

12 Continue much as in the past.

14 Liaison between urban areas and nearby rural area.

15 4-H programs to help youth deal with our changing society and their future role in it; providing information and assistance to economically disadvantaged persons/families.

16 Women in “home business”; nutrition; being aware of and willing to develop programs to meet the needs of urban areas. The needs of inner city Omaha are far different than Fremont or Columbus.

17 Counseling of displaced farmers and families.

18 The urban people should be made more of aware of the existence of SREC and it’s value to them.

19 Working with low income people to get them productive and off welfare roles.

20 Further increase in 4-H activities. Educating the needy, to using their resources efficiently.

21 Promotion of food processing plant locations for the products grown in our region.
22 Have programs to help the small urban framer, who may want to learn how to handle small numbers of livestock and small acreages of hay or pasture. Present home economics and 4-H programs should adopt.

23 To slow down in some of the needless spending!

24 To challenge the youth in very interesting projects.

25 More urban type work shops showing cause and effect of water quality degradation.

26 Lancaster Co.

27 Gage Co. resident = consumer education in agriculture.

28 There is a great need in urban areas as well as rural. Hopefully urban can be combined with urban and rural with urban.

29 4-H clubs - traditional projects; Horticulture; Forestry.

30 Consumer education, horticulture, financial planning, pest control and management human resources development youth and adult.

31 Consumer education; financial planning; human resource development; horticulture; pest management;

32 Try too promote the extension service too these people, a lot of them don't know what county extension can help them with.

33 Financial MGT.

34 Promote Agriculture and products.

35 Better education through mass media in urban cooperation with social services.

36 Financial management is a concern to the urban as well as the rural areas. Youth programs; nutrition.

37 Recognize horticulture is a "nice to have" not a "necessary" when funds are limited. Put more services on a fee basis to self support - you'll soon find out where you are needed.

38 Work with urban families on getting the most out of their food dollars.

39 I think the traditional role of SREC should be continued, plus the SREC role should be expanded to the fields of small business, finance, consumer information. SREC could become a clearing house for all areas of expertise.

40 Emphasis on Horticulture and gardening.
41 Financial management, 4-H and nutrition, the urban areas control spending in the legislature so you have to work for them, and if they spend money more wisely they might buy more farm products.

42 Youth development; Financial management; Small business development.

43 Assist families operating under severe times and budget restraints with programs that fit their schedules and needs.

44 With more families having mother working outside the home - traditional Ext./4-H programs just don't work. Must meet peoples needs rather than continue with traditional programs or projects. Make things quick and easy for all. Quality of programs does not have to be synonymous with quantity of time devoted. Times are changing and so must Extension programs and deliveries.

45 Continue to emphasize 4-H in the school programs. There will be good opportunities for inroad if omaha closes their school farm.

46 Family nutrition - use NE produced food for good health youth development - leadership and education; Horticulture - turf/landscape/fruits/vegetables.

47 The role of SREC should remain very active in the urban areas as these people often need your services more than the rural people.

48 Concentrate on youth/home relations values, encourage idea of goal setting through 4-H/extended educ./extension.

49 I see the role being that of as a liaison between rural and urban to educate urban people about rural problems and how they will affect urban people.

50 Perhaps more urban residents could be served in the areas of family life - health; ie. stress and time management workshops for young working mothers.

51 To provide information to keep the Ag. and Ag. related industries profitable.

52 Financial planning, family life and proper nutrition for lower income families; In order to reach the people we need to, these programs would have to be provided at no cost basis.

53 To acquaint the urban areas with problems of rural areas and teach people to work together.

54 Try to interest more children in opportunities of 4-H programs.

55 To provide programs for "people" in need in the urban area.
56 Develop youth programs and leadership development.
57 Consumer education.
58 Continuing programs for soil conservation and family oriented projects.
59 I reside in Platte - work whole heartily with 4-H water conservation by saving our water and land financial management.
60 Water quality; Marketing system for alternate farm crops.
61 I feel SREC is doing a fine job in the urban areas now and should just keep up the work their doing in the areas they're working with.
62 Support youth programs and activities such a 4-H and FFA.
63 Most of the programs are agricultural oriented, which mostly involves rural families. Maybe, urban development or maintenance programs or programs to both improve community area and educate residents.
64 Teen support; financial management; consumer education (Health, nutrition and safety).
65 Phase out urban programs. Urban areas have agencies and resources available to residents. Budget cuts could be made in this area.
66 Same as in the past.
67 Continued youth programs level, less emphasis on horticulture.

OTHER COMMENTS

List any other comments about staffing, programming or the future role of SREC you wish to make.

02 Keep up the excellent service.
03 Any additional staff should be added at the county level with major responsibility to the county and perhaps some specialization available to a few surrounding counties.
07 Although we use the local Extension office often, we really do not understand how SREC fits into the local Extension office.
08 I think "Planning for Tomorrow" was weak. We attended. An ongoing management skills program should be developed that should go way beyond "Planning for Tomorrow". I think this survey is poorly put together.
I use the Extension Service a lot. They are unbiased in their evaluations of seed, chemical and fertilizer. They are a key link for implementing research into active use. Much of this information can be worth millions of dollars if implemented statewide. Please don't allow budget cuts to restrict the flow of information to the county. If cuts must be made, they should be evaluated from a point of economic return to our state. For example, I think crop production efficiency is much more important than clothing, housing and interior design.

Give local boards more authority in these areas.

Put emphasis on agribusiness development. Youth programs focusing on agribusiness development and communication skills connected with agribusiness. Programming/staff funds should be channeled to the local level vs. district and/or administrative positions.

Become more visible in urban areas as not just an "ag" agent but as an Extension Agents with an agricultural background.

I feel that we have some excellent staff members. Budget limitations and cuts are a real concern for all. Programming will need to be carefully analyzed and volunteers used wisely. There is a limit to which volunteers will keep providing gratis services. The few remaining face burn-out.

It has become apparent that it is difficult to predict for a long-term; therefore staffing becomes a concern; and also budget. If Extension could move faster to help with problems of families, ex. farm crisis; family life changes. I believe Extension’s greatest strength is bringing accurate information based on research to people in the counties. I applaud the development of a new approach to the 4-H program and keep the traditional approach for those who desire it.

I truly believe we underestimate the image and respect Extension agents have throughout the area. We need to do a lot better job of telling our success story.

Keep up the good work!

Keeping working for your tax dollars.

For some of the newer alternative crops, the university is the only place to go for information - I'd like to see these areas beefed up - not necessarily with research but with general knowledge - how to go about getting started, who to call to get start up materials, stock, buildings, who to market to, how to market and where to get knowledgeable employees. I feel the SREC can work more with private industry on some of these areas.
21 My experience with Cooperative Extension has always been favorable. I feel Lancaster county is more aggressive and more sensitive to the needs for now and the future than many other counties.

22 I have a lot of good to say so don't take this like I'm mad at the whole judging dept. but, the way they trade judging fairs is no good. We have people in your staff who came up and judge who don't follow the 4-H manual while the kids make their projects according to the manual and they judge just the opposite. But they keep coming back because they hire someone up here to judge their fairs.

23 I would hope staffing would remain as it is and the cut backs in agriculture be in C.R.P, programs or the like.

24 We have been through the Managing for Tomorrow program but think it could have more follow-up. Help sow the seed for a Managing for Tomorrow (small groups) farm management support group where we could learn from one another because there is more than you can learn in those few sessions.

25 Keep good agents if budget dictates - reduce assistants.

26 Some instructor in farm management were, maybe, knowledgeable people but didn't relate their knowledge well to the pupils. (knowledgeable but not good teachers).

27 I think programming should take a more youth oriented approach. We need to think positive in our programming. So far we are on the right course to develop the needs as they change.

28 Despite all that's been accomplished over the years many farms are still washing down creek channels easily seen from the road, these farms should be sought out and options explained on an individual basis as the land is still our greatest resource.

29 It seems as though some programs have become stale with a lack of imagination and fresh ideas. It becomes a waste of time for staff and also for those using the programs.

30 My concern: programs meet the needs of all people within SREC capabilities. With funding at a premium, priorities within the system must be established.

31 SREC plays an important part in maintaining the vitality of many of the communities it serves!

32 Funding will undoubtedly be a continuing problem. Consolidate programs where possible. Have clientele pay small fees where feasible.

33 I as a past Ext. board member, and as a present council person. I think that the taxpayers of this state, are getting sick and tired of the university, and SREC, creating jobs for
those who can't find one! The sad part is it is at the taxpayers expense. Conservation tillage - your making money for the chemical company, one pass would save several dollars. Women in Ag.: Nutrition for families; home based businesses; managing for tomorrow and counseling living resourcefully. The university is half to blame for the reasons we need these programs. When the U. sent our men home with a diploma between ten and fifteen years ago, they said we had to buy the neighbors 160. Put up new buildings and if we didn't we wouldn't be in business. And a very big percentage lost every thing. The thing I am trying to get across, is when you do a project, make sure it is economically feasible.

34 Utilize leadership in private industry to a greater degree than you are now, to identify how the university of Nebraska, in general and SREC, in particular, can best serve southeast Nebraska.

35 Combining county offices will cause extension to loose much of it's tremendous support.

36 Quality is more important then quantity, keep up the good work.

37 Reduce overlap of youth programs with public school programs. Increase emphasis on beef and forage programs.

38 Refer to E.2. (Eliminate 50% of the positions, 100 people for this area is horribly excessive, a bloated bureaucracy.) Eliminate at least 50% or more of the positions. There is no need for specialists in all enterprises i.e. livestock specialist can cover for swine, cattle, sheep, etc., one forester is adequate, there is no need for water resource specialist - soil and water conservation people take care of this, etc. Extension service should take leadership in arranging for and conduction educational programs on the broad front of all aspects of the agriculture industry including Home Ec. - utilize other agency personnel where applicable and specialist as needed.

39 I was not aware there was such a place as SREC. I use the Co. agent often, but don't know much about you.

40 I suggest we don't "cut" anymore people and/or positions. We need to change our programs to meet with the changing times.

41 I would like to see it continue about as it is. Efficiencies of staffing and operations should be as high as possible.

41 Could use more visibility through public service announcements, etc.

42 Proper staffing in specific specialized areas is desperately needed. No balance. In our area the staff has too many programs to take care of which makes them over worked. Staff specializing would make them more efficient in a specific field.
43 Just continue research and be available for those who have questions.

44 Staff should make every effort to have stimulation programs. They should not just be available to answer questions as they arise.

45 Consider the large number of clientele in the urban areas and plan accordingly. You are on the right track to combine counties (rural and smaller) (only when cost effective) when other county units are talking about combining.

46 I strongly believe in the extension service, it has been a large contributor to my life ever since I was old enough to join 4-H but I believe a lot of extensions success was based on volunteerism and at least for myself I simply do not have the time to volunteer that I would like perhaps I'm the only one that feels this way but if not I'm concerned about extension's future.

47 Let more senators know how important SREC is to the people who use it.

48 Adjustments in these areas are likely to be unpopular. We must realize our states agriculture will continue to change at an accelerated pace. Hard choices need to be made to prepare our citizens for the environment we will have five to ten years hence.

49 Hope we can keep at least a part time home agent.

50 Would like to see an intense marketing program (along the lines of managing for tomorrow) where we could learn how to use the futures option and learn how to chart the 2 day extension meetings I've attended expose you to marketing but you never came away with any new skills.

51 I sincerely hope funding can remain adequate to carry out some of these really good programs - also the combining of counties under one office may become a real necessity and I hope if it comes to this, our country can make a transition with minimal problems and maintain the quality of extension - 4-H work that our county currently enjoys. Undoubtedly economics will increasingly become a factor until the economy does a reversal. I only wish people should be more motivated to enroll in some of the programs offered. With all due respect to all of the staff, they try very hard to meet requirements and cut budgets, to motivate, I guess it is a sign of the times.

52 When are we going to get a horticulture agent for Sarpy county?

53 In reviewing your staff on an attached sheet there are notable overstaffings. In case you are looking for areas to economize. Three foresters! Four in farm management, farm bus area. One livestock and one swine spec. seem some what
duplicative. To establish a research unit in each of the five districts would seem unnecessary, (duplicative - ?). How would you feel about going before a legislative committee to defend your programs and staffing? Could you adequately justify a Financial Analyst and Extension Technologist? At no time in the last forty years has there been more need to determine and distinguish wants from needs or "nice to have" vs. "necessary"! Are you too deep into social and welfare programs. We have welfare agency and churches to handle that area - yes, there is always more to be accomplished - can we afford it - wise?

54 Keep up the good work!

55 We must continue to make urban people aware of the role of our shrinking rural areas and our dependence upon each other.

56 I like the trend in programming - "Eating today for healthier tomorrow" and "Main street" educational, self help programs offered like a class for credit. I would like to see more cooperative involvement with other agencies - schools, health agencies, social service agencies, community organizations - to provide a leadership role in projects of mutual interest.

57 Keep up good work. Help people to be more aware of themselves and their communities.

58 Given today's economic climate, it seems important that SREC be concerned more with Ag. production and technology. SREC should be willing to change in order to preserve its niche within the university and the state.


61 The over emphasis on Extension clubs should be corrected as it is an absolute need. The 4-H program is in error in directing to much attention at and toward competing, grooming, showmanship, construction of projects and too little attention toward teaching principles of the subject covered. Extension specialists should be cooperative, helpful, and loyal to people from all areas of the state not just their own area of the state. A case in point: A short time back I attempted to find some information on growing turnips and specially dried edible beans from the extension service. I was finally referred to a horticulture specialist in the panhandle. He spent the whole while trying to discourage me from attempting it. Apparently he thought dry beans and vegetable production are and should be the sole right and opportunity for growers in the western 1/4 of nebraska. Thanks for nothing!! In less than two hours on the telephone I obtained much, if not all the information I was looking for by calling Iowa State at Ames and Kansas State at Manhattan. They gave what information and opinions they had and gave names and phone numbers of individuals at Oklahoma, California and New York along with commercial outlets which gave me valuable information. Again, thanks for nothing!!! What is the chief reason to
maintain the local county extension agents? About one year ago it appeared I would need to grow and alternative crop because of a peculiarity of the feed grain program. I called our local county agent, and asked for any possible names of companies I could contract with to grow popcorn. He said he would call back. Two weeks later I called again, he was not in his office but his secretary said she knew of the matter but would call his attention to it and get back to me within a couple days as it was getting close to planting time. Five or six days later I still had not heard anything so I called your office in Lincoln. In five minutes time a very helpful and much appreciated secretary gave me a list of commercial companies. I contracted with one of them. What is his chief reason for drawing his salary?

62 SREC does a good job just as it is. We appreciate it.

63 Evaluate all programs and eliminate programs that are served by business. Staff will have to be more specialized. Probably regional instead of county - emphasize efficiency. Budget will be cut will have to put dollars in the programs where the most people are served. Hard to cut out programs but, with reduced budget, cannot continue to do everything we have in the past. May have to charge fees on programs to make self-supporting. Many times if one pay's for a service they are definitely going to get more out of it than if it is free.

64 You will be lucky to keep your present funding because of state fiscal problem.

65 Even with budget cuts I hope the extension offices remain open. They help us as farmers a lot. Keith is the best agent around.

66 Extension programs for youth and families must not duplicate or infringe on existing programs of schools and other agencies. Tax payers won't stand for it!

67 May need to consolidate more county extension offices.

68 Need more up dates on what is going on in the department of my interest. Greater access to needed information when extension people can't provide the answer.

69 At this time, programs in the areas of farm and youth should be emphasized.

70 Continue the good staff training and solution they are the key to your program success.

71 I think it is very important to keep this program's diversified as it is with county agents, etc. as our main resource people. They're availability is what makes this and other extension programs work!
We have been very satisfied with our programs. We feel that
the need for extension service increases as the farm economy
declines. It has been of tremendous help to us over the years.
We commend our local agents and hate to see them with more
responsibilities and more traveling between the counties.

Definitely need to maintain county extension affairs (may need
to combine three our four counties) to to justify total expenses
of personal and office expense. The local county agent and home
extension agent are a key individual in our county. He's looked
to for leadership and direction.

We need staff that can dream of new uses for or NE resources,
we need programs that can put those resources into agriculture
and consumer good for the year 2,000, and we need to educate all
ages to better nutrition/ health through uses of NE resources.

Perhaps the new age of agriculture could be better - more
awareness of programs offered by IANR and SREC.

Most staff reflect excellence and dedication. Be aware of
danger of "hanging on" to what is known and secure at the expense
of preparing for change, future needs, flexibility.

I see a need to consolidate cooperative extension offices in
order to be able to keep this service. If agents are specialized
this is going to effect different areas.

Judging on the past encouragement and constructive ideas SREC
has provided for the past three generations - given reasonable
funding it seems they can identify and implement all there areas
extremely well, as is.

Have been very satisfied with the programs and staff in our
county. Would resist staff reduction or changing our boundaries.

Funding continues to be a major concern.

I believe there is a need to increase the staff in some
counties (probably assistant positions) to address some of the
concerns stated alone.

Our state needs to put out a spray schedule for fruits. Our
neighboring states do - and we need the help in Nebr. to keep up
our new developments, we have many orchards here along the
Missouri River.

If we have to cut maybe staff at the SREC is the place.
Enrollment at the Ag. college is down and maybe people with
teaching responsibility could also do extension work.

Although I do not reside in one of the above mentioned
counties I believe there is a need for a program in urban areas
that educates urban people about the importance of Ag. income to
the entire state.
I think you are doing a great job. Please keep up the outstanding work in agriculture education and 4-H programs.

We need a second Home Economist desperately to carry on our 4-H program and advance it. Our Home Extension is going great and would like the same of 4-H. Duane's job is very important and impressive to our farmers. He helps all over. Of course our agents, Bob and Jane are super. The whole staff is very efficient and right there when needed.

Spend less time managing Co. agents and more working with people.

Develop methods for funding of programs research into Govt. waste disposal products on state lands.

More effort should be made to help farmers get a fair price for their production instead of telling them to get more efficient and cut costs all of the time. We've been hearing this same story for at least the last 20 to 25 years and if that was the answer farmers wouldn't be in troubles that they are today. The problem is price - not better management or becoming more efficient. Yet we constantly hear about new ways to get more production or increase yields or more milk form the same number of cows.

Get rid of programs going nowhere MFT (is: was) a great program, MMS is redundant - the same situations can be used for each. ie. interchangeable. Continue reorganization of staff, this is the only way to make major budget cuts. One suggestion in this county was to keep only office personnel and a hot line for problems open to the university at all times. Way out, maybe, but this is an alternative.

We participate in managing for tomorrow and found it very rewarding.

Do fewer things well. Don't try to be all things to all people. Make certain there is a real need to programs - one that isn't being addressed by other resources.

Plan for change with creative vision.

Excellent programming and staff assistance in Butler Co.

I think there is a lot of very good programs but a high percentage of the rural people do not know about them. I know your dollars are limited but the word is not getting to enough of the people. I go to a lot of extension and university sponsored programs an it seems the attendance is usually low. I have asked people about this and they say they didn't know about it.

Maintain local extension office with proper staffing.
Two programs that I feel will do the most good are "Managing For Tomorrow" and "Managing Mainstreet". These two show the need of looking at farming and "mom-pop" operations, is truly a business above a simple way of life. I also feel we need to expand on the industrial agriculture related things as we are doing in food processing. I believe just in the poultry industries we need more information available, (maybe more experts).

To much stress on financial management.

There is a great need for programs that will move agriculture away from the costly petro-chemical, high input methods back to the natural, cleaner, more healthful ways of farming.

Extension service needs to completely review it's relationship to production agriculture. It seem to me the current information delivery system is not meeting the need.

I feel that SREC is going to have to be flexible enough to react to changes in the agriculture field. In both education and training for different types of agriculture related jobs. As times change in the farming community and jobs are available in the area, we need help in securing small industry in the rural area.

Prepared by: Robert J. Florell
Question: What is the future direction of SREC within the campus structure?

The discussion tended to focus on three themes: 1) split appointments (center/departments and extension/research) and whether there should even be a center, 2) location of center, and 3) the vision of Extension 10-15 years hence.

Based on the written survey responses, the majority of those responding indicated that the role of the Center should be to continue to serve the agents and people of Southeast Nebraska.

Taking that as a "given," the discussion turned to the structure that would provide the best atmosphere to carry this forward. There were two distinct opinions that surfaced. On the one hand, there are those (both full-time and split appointments) that believe there is a need for a strong interdisciplinary, integrated organization. The district programs need to have a common direction which will aid program delivery. A center that houses all specialists allows for development of programs with a unified thrust. If housed in the center, the specialists "feel" direct responsibility to the district.

On the other hand, there are those that believe that all specialists should be housed in their departments and see little purpose
for a center. They contend that by being housed in their departments, they can keep abreast of new research and get that "new" information to the ultimate user quicker. Split appointments are not a problem for agents. The agents contact the specialist as needed regardless of where housed.

There was discussion on where the Southeast Research & Extension Center should be located. Often the agents and clientele direct their questions to a state specialist or a center specialist, dependent upon whom they believe can provide the most appropriate answer. The advantage of being housed on campus permits the center's specialists to draw upon resources that specialists in other districts may not feel as free to access.

There was discussion that in the future administrators may be located in Lincoln, with specialists located within the state where their discipline is most needed or where most of his/her clientele reside. These specialists would also serve the rest of the state/area needs in their respective specialty area. This would lead to "pods" within the state, with a specialist/agent specialized in a certain segment of extension.

The sub-committee, with very diverse opinions and beliefs was unable to come to agreement on the future of the Center. During discussion presentation to the entire center membership (full appointments and split appointments) and total staff discussion, recommendations were brought forward. To reach final recommendations, proposals were suggested and the entire group voted.
Those proposals receiving majority approval read as follows (exact wording):

Recommendations

1. SREC remain as a strong center located on campus.
2. SREC should add a research component back into the specialists assigned to the district. This would put split appointments back into district center.
3. The SREC will remain separate from ARDC but research may be conducted at Mead.

Note:

In retrospect, it becomes apparent that those diverse, conflicting opinions and beliefs regarding the future of the center can be partially attributed to the split (center/department) appointments. These torn allegiances could be alleviated by following recommendations as presented.
OBJECTIVE II

GROUP II-JOINT APPOINTMENTS

The issue of joint appointments within SREC was discussed among a specialist committee and before the entire SREC specialist staff. The following is a summary of staff comments/suggestions:

First, the issue of joint appointments must be defined. Joint appointments can be either between SREC and an UN-L Department (including Nebraska Forest Service) or between the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) and Agricultural Research Division (ARD).

SREC - DEPT. APPOINTMENTS

ADVANTAGES

1. Possibility of more subject matter areas represented within SREC which would provide a larger "team effort".
2. Specialists would be more aware of district needs.
3. More potential for interdisciplinary programs.
4. Better establishment of roles and responsibilities for specialists.

DISADVANTAGES

1. Budgeting considerations.
2. Specialist allocation/division of time between SREC and Dept.
3. Time inconveniences.
4. Split housing.
5. Administration, e.g. two unit administrators, two staff meetings, etc. and the time involved with each.

RECOMMENDATIONS

First, assumptions were made that SREC will remain a viable unit that will include specialists. Also, it is assumed that we will see more Agent specialization in the future.

1. In order to maintain subject matter expertise in SREC, we must use joint SREC-Dept. appointments.
2. SREC should receive budget support for joint appointments.
3. Job descriptions for specialists must be specific in defining SREC-Dept. responsibilities and job descriptions must be kept current.

CES-ARD APPOINTMENTS

ADVANTAGES

1. Research and Extension programs can be developed specifically for southeast Nebraska.
2. Better opportunity for feedback on needed research.
3. More rapid transfer of research results to end users.
4. Might be better opportunity for personal recognition and professional advancement.
5. Helps keep specialist current in the field.
6. Clientele acceptance may be greater.
7. SREC administration would have better working relationship with ARD.
DISADVANTAGES

1. Specialist allocation/division of time between CES and ARD.
2. Administration, e.g. two unit administrators, meetings, etc.
4. Potential for 3-way split, e.g. SREC Extension, Dept. Extension, ARD.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. SREC should have a research component.
2. Support joint CES-ARD appointments in appropriate specialized areas within SREC.
OBJECTIVE III

Group III SPECIALISTS - AGENTS ROLE

Edwin Penas, Leader
Wanda Leonard, Recorder
Doug Duey
Steve Danielson
Dennis Adams
DeLynn Hay

Question: What should be the Specialist-Agent role?

Selected responses from the Extension Specialists Survey were reviewed. Those responses particular to this group were:

Survey results identified the agents as the most important clientele for SREC specialists. The second most important group is the general public, followed by specialized groups.

Over one-fourth of the specialists responding thought that it was important, or very important, to have specialists housed at SREC for answering questions of the Extension Agents and general public in Southeast Nebraska.

The discussion group considered whether the specialists work "for" the agent or "with" the agent. There are those in the group that believe that the agent is the primary program planner and without agent input and requests for service, there would be minimal function for the specialist. At the other extreme, there are those who believe that agent input is minimal and often non-existent. Their requests come directly, usually as a result of meetings, and also by referrals other than county extension agent.

Numerous associations with agents via sub-district spring and fall meetings, Admin Day and the many reasons for agents to be at SREC headquarters provide increased opportunities to plan programs. When
specialists from several disciplines are housed together, there is greater
opportunity for multi-discipline, broader program development. The program
process can be accomplished if housed separately, but it is more difficult
and requires a greater commitment by the specialists. For example: If an
agent has reason to be at the center headquarters, there is incentive and
opportunity to contact specialists and blend and tie together several
disciplines. This can be accomplished as easily as stepping around the
corner, two doors down or across the hall.

In the current SREC setting, it takes more effort to blend, as the
cross discipline programs often require multi-building, across campus
coordination, and the spontaneous opportunity to create "the really big
one" is not readily available.

With regard to the future, it is believed that agents will need to
take a more direct role in teaching. If we are to move to "pods" or
"quads" or "clusters" with specialized agents in the groupings, the center
specialists will be more involved with training these specialized agents,
rather than conducting public meetings. Since various regions of the state
are different, each region different from another, each center would have
specialists specific to the area. This would reduce the need for some
statewide specialists, with emphases placed on the center staff. In some
cases, however, the subject matter is universal and could be provided
appropriately from the state level.

Recommendations:

-- Increased opportunities to program plan with agents

-- Increased specialization at all levels

-- Increased multi-discipline, specialist/agent program
development.
OBJECTIVE IV

GROUP IV: SREC VISIBILITY

Bill Gustafson - Leader
Rich Lodes - Recorder
Dave Mooter
Tom Leisy
Richard Rasby
Charles Francis

A bit of past history was discussed. At one time, each district had a separate identity but the University has adopted a strategy of a uniform image. This will affect the degree the SREC is able to increase its visibility.

Increased visibility isn't a panacea. There are some apparent advantages which can also be viewed as disadvantages, but, the discussion group believed the advantages of increased visibility far outweighed the disadvantages.

The major reason for increasing visibility of the SREC is to increase the other university staff and the public's awareness of SREC's resources and the SREC role. With this as a goal, the discussion group listed a large number of ways to increase visibility of SREC.

The discussion group recommends all of the methods for increasing SREC visibility included on the list be considered. Special attention was recommended for the news/media position.

List of Ways to Increase SREC Visibility

- sign on campus indicating the location of SREC
- SREC sponsor field days or special events
- annual report with wider distribution
- magnetic signs on cars
- county offices identify their connection to SREC
- be sure all staff have SREC letterhead (especially the split appointment specialists housed in their departments)
- change "SREC" to an acronym
- business cards
- podium signs
- slides with specialist title and SREC
- 4-H membership cards should include SREC
- awards program/recognition sponsored by SREC
- caps/jackets/uniforms
- use SREC in radio tapes, TV, etc. rather than specialist title
- office door signs
- bumper sticker
- use a professional advertising company (or have advertising class)
- new staff position (News/media)
- signs for "Cooperating Farms" within SREC
OBJECTIVE V - Future Role

V. The Future Role of SREC as a Representative of the Total University System.

Panel presentation by Rudy Lewis, Vice President for University Relations System Wide, and Dr. Donald Swoboda, Associate Dean and Director, Nebraska Cooperative Extension Service.

Rudy Lewis: Broadening the Role of SREC
- Carefully planned changes are good
- Role should be expanded because of changing needs and the valuable service we can provide
- Do not abandon current program - expand delivery system
- Work together with Continuing Ed to enhance each other
- Cooperative Extension is at a turning point and a logical choice for delivery of expanded services
- Don't limit ourselves - what are the needs - must bring together the resources to meet the needs of our public
- Commitment necessary for life long learning

Dr. Swoboda:
- It is appropriate for SREC to look at a total University scope
- Need to look at unique areas - coordinate services especially those outside INAR
- Watch duplication
- Assess changes necessary to broaden our scope
  Additional Staff
  Equipment
  Facilities
- Expand our role to fit the mission designated by regents
- Should we be dealing with credit and non-credit offerings
- Be prepared to restructure when adding programs

Discussion:
- Might have representatives at the Center without Extension or Research appointment
- Will expand and coordinate units of the University who already have a service function
- Accountability important for funding area of excellence
- Use people skills to mesh information explosion
- Must expand horizons beyond East Campus
- Need to promote an identity of the corporate University
- Potential is for life long learning - not classroom learning
- The "Nontraditional" learner is now the "Traditional" learner - need administrative support to articulate this
- Need to take calculated risks
- Be aware of politics involved

Recommendation:
That SREC explore broadening their scope to include other University components.

Submitted by: Tom D. Leisy
Extension 4-H Youth Specialist
OBJECTIVE VI

SREC PROGRAM REVIEW
Group VI Program Priorities

Group Members: Doug Duey, Chair
Chuck Frances, Recorder
Rich Lodes
Ed Penas
Bill Ahlschwede
Rick Rasby

The program of the Southeast Research and Extension Center needs to evolve within the context of changing farm, home and community needs in the district. Principal projected changes have been outlined; followed by a series of priority thrusts for extension. These priorities take into account the potential new directions for production agriculture and the social structure in Nebraska and the U.S., the 1987 district program planning emphasis as developed by an agent committee and specialists, and the program priorities from the extension specialist survey (March, 1987). Where appropriate, language from the National Extension Initiatives of the Cooperative Extension Service has been used to relate local priorities to those identified at the national level.

I. PERCEIVED CHANGES IN SOUTHEAST NEBRASKA

Although it is difficult to look into the future with any degree of accuracy, this list of projections represents an attempt to describe perceived trends in crop and animal production in Southeast Nebraska as a result of a changing economy and government policies.
Major projected changes in production agriculture and related areas, broad issues that include a 5 to 10 year perspective:

-- there will be further disappearance of export markets for major food crops

-- continued diversification of enterprises will be important for the individual operator and for each community

-- increased production efficiency and management will remain critical, especially in the use of inputs

-- even with diversification, the management of each enterprise will become more specialized and more skilled for profit

-- trends in livestock production: hogs will become more specialized, although feeding grain produced on the farm will provide the most value added to this enterprise

-- there will be an increase of beef produced on pastures which will replace row crops on marginal land

-- confined broiler production has potential on farms with capital and labor to supply limited processing facilities, profit margins will be close

-- changes in crop production will include greater efficiency, rotations, reduced inputs, and a trend away from high-input irrigated corn production with center pivot systems.
There may be a change in tenure of marginal land toward the public sector, be permanently seeded in grassland and trees, and used for recreation and preservation of a natural resource.

An aging population will require a review of new goals and programs for the extension service.

There will be a continuing need for involving youth in extension, and providing opportunities for training and experience with animals, crops, leadership, and urban activities.

II. PRELIMINARY IDENTIFIED PRIORITY THRUSTS FOR EXTENSION

These eight national priority areas, A through H, are not presented in order of SREC needs, but used as a framework to associate or cluster similar program thrusts. The original discussion resulted in the following itemizing of areas of perceived needs:

A. Alternatives to current production systems
   1. Non-traditional crops
   2. Rotations and less monoculture
   3. Crop-livestock integration, changes in practices
   4. Efficient input use in soil fertility, crop protection, tillage, hybrid/variety choice

B. Agricultural Based Economic and Industrial Development
   1. Increase value-added activities on farm and in communities
   2. Alternative used for crops, new products
3. Food processing facilities in communities
4. Local industry based on local resources and needs, using local capital, ideas, management, labor
5. Convert local problems or waste products into opportunities -- cedar trees, manure

C. Soil & Water Conservation -- Natural Resources
   1. Water quality and supply -- importance of rural water districts in Southeast Nebraska, nitrate & pesticide monitoring, fertilizer use
   2. Water capture and use -- conservation tillage, contours, terraces, other structures & practices
   3. Reduce soil and nutrient losses
   4. Tree plantings, wildlife areas, forest management
   5. Marginal land into parks, forests, alternative uses

D. Agricultural Competitiveness and Profitability
   1. Adoption of appropriate recommended technologies
   2. Vertical integration -- producing, processing, marketing
   3. Agricultural policies and programs
   4. Maximizing profits by matching production with resources
   5. Managing for Tomorrow and similar educational programs

E. Nutrition, Diet and Health
   1. Continue educational system and extension's role
   2. Current home economics programs

F. Family and Economic Well-Being
   1. Family problems associated with farm crisis
   2. Teen-age challenges and activities -- societal influences
G. Building Human Capital
1. Education, traditional and other
2. Building volunteerism, leadership and volunteer management
3. Challenges of an aging population
4. Youth direction and potentials for training
5. Leadership development -- eg. LEAD

H. Revitalizing Rural American/Southeast Nebraska
1. Managing mainstreet and similar programs
2. Community economic development projects
3. Community foundations
4. Value added activities with farm products on farm and in community or general area.

III. FINALIZED PRIORITIES OF PROGRAM THRUSTS
Each identified program thrust or need was later given a high, medium or low ranking by a mail survey of the fifteen staff specialists. To determine a numerical ranking, each preference of a high, medium and low were given a 3, 2 and 1 respectively. This summary of rankings were discussed at an all SREC specialist staff meeting. From this survey, ranking and discussion, a final district priority list, with numerical ranking, was developed under the broader national priorities as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Priority</th>
<th>List</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td><strong>Soil and Water Conservation - Natural Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C, C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduce soil and nutrient losses, conservation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Water quality and supply - rural communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Marginal land be converted into parks, forests, recreation, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Community Economic Development**

| B                |      | 4   | Industry based on local resources |
| H, H             |      | 1, 2| Local business enhancement, community development projects |
| H, B             |      | 4, 1| Value added activities with farm products on community level |
| B                |      | 2   | Alternate uses of crops, new products |
| B                |      | 5   | Convert local problems or waste into opportunities |

**Agricultural Competitiveness and Profitability**

| A, A             |      | 4, 3| Efficient input use in crop and livestock production, crop and livestock integration |
| A, A             |      | 2, 1| Crop rotations and less monoculture, non-traditional crops |
| D                |      | 4   | Maximizing profits - matching production with resources |
| D                |      | 2   | Vertical integration/value added |
| D                |      | 1   | Adoption of appropriate recommended technologies |

**Building Human Capital**

| G, G             |      | 5, 2| Leadership development, volunteerism |
| G                |      | 1   | Education, traditional and other |
| G                |      | 3   | Challenges of an aging population |
| F                |      | 1   | Family problems associated with farm crisis |
| G                |      | 4   | Youth direction and potentials |
IV. THE CENTER OF EXCELLENCE SHOULD BE PLACED IN

1. Conservation of Natural Resources
   - Soil and water
   - Use of marginal land not suitable for traditional production

2. Community Economic Development
   - Leisure/recreation developments
   - To utilize labor and other resources in rural communities
   - The need for economic stimulus
## APPENDIX

### Scoring of Identified Program Thrusts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparative Score</th>
<th>National Priority</th>
<th>List No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reduce soil and nutrient losses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Water quality and supply - water districts; monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Water capture and use - conservation measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Efficient input use in crop production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Industry based on local resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Crop rotation and less monoculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Managing Mainstreet and similar programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community economic development projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Value added activities w/farm products on farm and in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alternative uses for crops, new products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adoption of appropriate recommended technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase value - added activities on farms and in communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Maximizing profits/matching production with resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Non-traditional crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crop - livestock integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education, traditional and other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Challenges of an aging population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Leadership development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vertical integration, produce, process and marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family problems associated with farm crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Convert local problems or wastes into opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Marginal land into parks, forests, recreation, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those Thrusts with Score Less Than 30 Not Listed
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OBJECTIVE VII

Urban Programming

VII. Urban Programming in the Future

This objective addresses the special needs of Douglas, Lancaster, and Sarpy counties for future extension programs. The following issues were identified as being important to urban residents and are potential targets for future extension programming:

1) Youth Concerns -

There are a number of youth problems that seem to be increasing such as teen pregnancy, drug abuse, suicide, etc. In some cases, programs are available through other agencies to assist families in dealing with these problems. In other cases, programs are lacking and need to be developed. Extension can play a role here either as a program developer or as a referral agency to assist people in finding the help they need.

We need to work with youth in urban settings both in and out of the traditional 4-H membership mode. A tremendous potential exists for involvement of urban youth in extension-sponsored programs.

There is a need to avoid duplication of existing programs provided by other agencies. Also, we must evaluate the expertise available in extension before committing to programs that we are not prepared to deal with.

2) Awareness of Agriculture and Natural Resource Management -

All residents of Nebraska are affected by the agriculture and natural resources in our state. Also, the state's residents affect these resources by passing judgement on various practices, activities, etc. through direct votes and indirect selection of legislators.

Extension can play a key role in increasing the awareness of urban residents about the resources of the state and their management. Specific examples of such issues include pesticide use, soil erosion, water pollution, etc.

3) Development of Adult Leadership Skills -

It appears that a generation gap exists in terms of leadership skills. The older generation is turning the controls of our society over to middle aged people who generally lack leadership and confidence in their own ability to inspire others. The LEAD program works with young, agricultural leaders and 4-H works with youth leaders. It seems that there is a need for programs to assist urban (and non-urban) adults in leadership development.

4) Economic Development -

The general decline in the agricultural economy of the state and subsequent ripple effects throughout other dependent economic sectors has increased the need for economic development. It seems possible that Nebraska could develop additional industries that would process our raw materials prior to shipment elsewhere. This would add value to the products and create additional opportunities for employment in the state.

There is a need for increased emphasis on small business development. In-the-home work opportunities appear to be on the increase as well.
5) Horticulture -

A seemingly endless demand exists for information about gardens, ornamentals, lawns, and houseplants in the urban setting. With limited staffing and resources, it becomes necessary to attempt to serve selected segments of the public. This might involve a concentration on working with master gardeners or commercial horticulturists who then serve the public in a one-to-one relationship.

Programmers must be aware that educational activities may stimulate clientele to demand additional activities and problem-solving services. The situation may develop to the point where we need to protect ourselves from such excess demand.

6) Direct Marketing -

This issue primarily is concerned with small fruit and vegetable producers, but could also extend to Christmas trees and other commodities. Opportunities exist in the urban counties for direct sales of such commodities, if the producer understands the systems involved and has the proper contacts. Extension could serve as a clearing house for such information and could assist in the organization of such activities as "farmers' markets".

7) Networking -

With so many agencies involved in a multitude of activities, programs, and services, it becomes necessary for these organizations to communicate among themselves. Without such communication, the possibilities for duplication of services and missed opportunities are enormous.

Extension services in urban counties must network with other entities operating in the same environment.

8) Consumer Issues -

Everyone is a consumer in one way or another and there are the highest concentrations of consumers in the urban counties of Nebraska. These consumers have all sorts of needs for information and extension is prepared to provide much of this information, particularly in the home economics area.

9) Waste Disposal -

As more and more chemicals and by-products are being introduced into the environment, the public needs to be better informed about the how's and why's of waste disposal. Hazardous wastes can cause contaminated areas to become useless and even dangerous if improperly handled. Homeowners are not well enough informed about the hazards involved with flushing pesticides down toilets, pouring used oil into storm sewers, etc.
RECOMMENDATIONS

A) Strengthen awareness programming in all phases of extension (i.e. Horticulture, Forestry, Agriculture, Home Economics, etc.) Pay particular attention to youth (4-H and otherwise).

B) Strengthen direct marketing and small business programming.

C) Develop adult leadership programs.

D) Network with all available agencies to avoid duplication and to learn of new opportunities.
EXTENSION AGENT RETREAT
SOUTHEAST RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CENTER
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

AREA OF DISCUSSION: Future Direction (Objective #1)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

- Research is an important part of SREC and applied research conducted in the district is the most effective.
- District specialists should be closer to clientele needs and more responsible to District programs and needs.
- Monitor research at all levels to avoid duplication between District and Departments.
- Not enough research is being conducted (at any level) in Home Economics (especially in nutrition, family life, economics and management), Community Resource Development (rural revitalization) and 4-H and Youth (needs of youth and leaders and subject matter/projects).

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Maintain a research component as part of the function of the SREC, to address research needs of Southeast Nebraska. District Specialists have at least 25 percent research.
- Make Administrators more aware of the Specialist commitment to Extension programs, as well as research.
- Applied research must be done to address current needs and problems in all areas - Ag, Home Ec., 4-H and Youth, CRD.
- Create a District or State Research thrust in Home Ec., CRD and 4-H and Youth, as is currently being done in Ag. This shows more impact.
- Create a District Home Ec. Specialist position to review Home Ec. research findings (from all over) and make that information available to staff and clientele.
- Develop a library of video tapes by District Specialists on topics of concerns which can be used by field staff.
- Housing of District Specialist in SREC rather than in departments.

DISCUSSION LEADERS - Connie Ahlman -- Jim Novotny
DISCUSSION RECORDERS - Keith Glewen -- Robert Voboril
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW - S.R.E.C.

Combined Report - Program Role (Objective #3)

Summary of Discussion

- Extension Agents do not always use district level specialist first. They obtain the best person for the job whether it be a state assigned specialist, district assigned specialist or outside resource.

- The present system of SREC does not limit an agent to going to a district level specialist first as may be the case in other districts.

- Campus based staff become shielded from county problems and needs, and are more reactive to their peer groups on campus.

- The A.R.D.C. at Mead was discussed. It was felt that the A.R.D.C. does have an identification problem. This may stem from lack of an extension component at Mead, enhanced by the fact that the researchers are located in Lincoln.

- SREC specialists are very important to S.E. agents. Very useful.

- SREC specialists have a better understanding of S.E. problems and are more committed to help field staff.

- SREC specialists are generally more accessible.

- SREC specialists in general have a stronger allegiance to the District.

- SREC specialist located in departments tend to lose their identity as specialist with district assignments.

- When located in a department, SREC specialists are more available for statewide use.

- Agents tend to identify those in district office as SREC specialist. Those in subject matter departments are state specialists.

- 50% research, 50% extension is a good combination.

Recommendations: Not in order of importance

1. Joint research and extension appointments are needed; 50/50 would be ideal. There was concern that anything less than 40% extension appointment would result in a lack of commitment to extension work.

2. SREC should maintain a good basic group of specialists to concentrate on the major areas of program emphasis of S.E. Nebraska.

3. There is not an integrated approach within the SREC and campus based specialists in addressing needs to problems in S.E. Nebraska. A team approach is needed in analyzing and carrying out solutions to problems.

4. SREC specialists should be housed in the District Office in order to help maintain their identity and mission of serving S.E. Nebraska.
5. Extension specialists with joint appointments need support from administrators, not only for their research appointment, but also, for their Extension appointment. Administrators must look at more than research and publishing for promotion.

6. In relation to the previous recommendations, a Research and Extension Center away from campus would be effective in addressing district problems. This would be ideal, but not necessarily practical if given the economic climate. The A.R.D.C. was suggested as a possible location.

7. Need more specialist help in the community resource development area to address rural revitalization and to support programs in urban areas.

Program Role - Group #2

Summary of Discussion

- SREC specialists are very important to us. Very Useful
- SREC specialists have a better understanding of SREC problems and are more committed to helping District Field staff.
- SREC specialists are generally more accessible
- Stronger allegiance to the District.
- SREC specialists located in departments tend to lose their identity as specialists assigned to the district.
- When located in a department, SREC specialists are more available to help state-wide.
- Agents tend to identify those in District office a SREC specialist. Those in subject matter departments, state.
- 50% Research-50% Extension; a good combination; less Extension tends to get lost.

Recommendations:

1. SREC should maintain a good basic group of specialists to concentrate in the major areas of program emphasis of S.E. Nebraska

2. Appointments should be no less than 50% Extension in order to keep a balance of program efforts.

3. SREC specialists should be housed in the District Office in order to help maintain their identity and mission of serving S.E. Nebraska.

Discussion Leader - Bob Voboril

Recorder - Jim Novotny
EXTENSION AGENT RETREAT
SOUTHEAST RESEARCH & EXTENSION CENTER
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

April 13, 1987

AREA OF DISCUSSION: Visibility (Objective #4)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Is it necessary to increase SREC public visibility?

Clientele don't discriminate between state or district specialist which limits district's visibility.

Location of district headquarters discourages SREC visibility. The district offices in out-state Nebraska play a different role than that of District V because of differing needs. It is important for out-state taxpayers to be able to identify with the arm of the university in their area and to see their tax dollars servicing their needs. In District V, UNL and IANR are visible, so SREC's visibility becomes absorbed.

Does the district need visibility? What is the purpose of SREC? Is it to serve as a support staff for county and state staff in comprehensive program development and applied research, or is it to work directly with clientele?

If the purpose of SREC is to support agents and specialists, then increased public visibility for SREC is not necessary. Increased visibility may be necessary to maintain funding for SREC, however, to the general public, increased visibility could be confusing and seem like one more layer of bureaucracy.

The group concurred that SREC plays a critical role in joint program development efforts for southeast Nebraska and is a vital link between county and state subject matter specialists. SREC visibility should not compete with, or undermine the visibility of the county program.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

The district should receive its visibility through the activities and functions of the county office. The county office should deal directly with the public. The district shall provide the support for county programs through administration and specialists in designated program areas.

Select groups (4-H Councils, home study groups, advisory groups, etc.) should be informed about district's programs so they would be a part of special district activities.

To enhance the visibility of cooperative extension at the local level, the district should provide expertise in documentation and evaluation of county programs. They should provide coordination of county programs so they receive publicity from a district-wide thrust. District staff should provide expertise in communications to assist county staff in developing video mass-media programs.

More visibility needs to be provided for the total extension service as a part of UNL and should not be segmented.

Applied research should be an integral part of the total extension program and should be an important part of public credibility and visibility.

ADDITIONAL OBSERVATIONS:

Extension specialists are doing much applied research but lose the research visibility because of no research appointment. More applied research needs to be done in home economics, community development and youth development.

If SREC increases visibility, is the unit also ready to invest the time necessary to service all the phone calls etc. as a result of increased visibility?

Is the research done at Mead in tune to the needs of the southeast district, or does state research take priority? Conditions in the extreme southeast corner of the district vary greatly from those in Mead.

COMMITTEE LEADERS: Kahl & Williams

COMMITTEE RECORDERS: Brown & Burson

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
Damkroger, Fech, Hall, Mundorf, Schwab, Wyant, Zeilinger, Carson, Hall, Hansen, Henneman, Hopp and Jurging
EXTENSION AGENT RETREAT  
SOUTHEAST RESEARCH & EXTENSION CENTER  
COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

AREA OF DISCUSSION _Future Role of SREC as a Representative of the_  
TOTAL UNIVERSITY of Nebraska-Lincoln (Objective #5)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Difficulty in accessing resources from some departments of University of Nebraska.

Extension has proven to be strong resource.

Extension doesn't represent total University.

Competing with Community Colleges, State Colleges and other higher education agencies in education.

Could combine Cooperative Extension and Department of Adult and Continuing Education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Cooperative Extension Service should accept the responsibility of being the sole outreach delivery system for the total University of Nebraska. It is recommended that a committee be organized to study models from other states and develop a plan for implementation in Nebraska. The following suggestions, however, are given:

a. A total University commitment is necessary.

b. Public announcement through mass media would be required.

c. The "Cooperative Extension Service" name should be changed to be more descriptive and easily identifiable with the University.

d. The title "Extension Agent or Specialist" should be changed to better identify staff as University Educators.

e. The county office should be the contact through which all University program arrangements for that county are made.

f. The public should be able to contact the county office for most University information.

g. The roles of Extension Boards must be adjusted.

h. Funds and staff must be provided to meet the increased demands on county offices.

i. Requirements and job descriptions for county staff must be adjusted.

DISCUSSION LEADER ____________________________ 
Burson (a.m.) and Brown (p.m.)

DISCUSSION RECORDER ____________________________ 
Skipton (a.m.) and Kahl (p.m.)
AREA OF DISCUSSION  Future Priorities for SREC (Objective #6)

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION - As society changes, our priorities must also change. We must look at an integrated systems approach as we assist families and communities to address these concerns:

CBO - Community revitalization, a stagnant economy, and water quality.

Agriculture - Government farm programs, agriculture diversification, productive agriculture.

Home Economics - Improving the quality of family life, nutrition and family health.

4-H - Improvement of the management system, retaining our teens, teaching life time skills, defining the role of paid staff in county and state fairs - (time on fairs vs. time spent on educational programs).

RECOMMENDATIONS - Umbrella Priority

STRENGTHEN RURAL & URBAN COMMUNITIES

Integrated Programs

1. Building Life Skills for Youth
2. Family Life and Health
3. Economics of Family & Business
4. Environmental Quality

AGRICULTURE HOME ECONOMICS YOUTH

1. Economics 1. Family Life 1. Middle Volunteer
   - farm programs 2. Family Health Management
2. Environmental Quality 3. Nutrition 2. Leadership Development
    Consumerism
    - decision making
    - money management
    - relationships

CONSIDER:

Agents traditional role in the Extension Club Program
Agents traditional role in State Fair, Ak-Sar-Ben, Camp, other
Reduce maintenance responsibilities in community organizations,
special interest groups, etc.

DISCUSSION LEADER  Don Miller - Susan Williams

DISCUSSION RECORDER  Cheryl McKeag - Kay McKinzie
SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

1. There has to be a different approach to programming in urban counties. Urban counties are unique and different, and should be handled differently than rural counties.

   A. Utilize science base and use it as an example of how to interface general agencies.
   
   B. Utilize telecommunications and other delivery systems - new technology.
   
   C. Urban media people prefer to work with one staff person and not all staff.
   
   D. Piggyback other programs (example: Virginia has its own satellite system in each county because of down feed for medical programs).
   
   E. Educate media as to what Cooperative Extension Service is doing.
   
   F. Develop well defined program areas in the urban county programs.
   
   G. Processing and handling agriculture products to add value to Nebraska products (example: goat cheese).
   
   H. School enrichment program needs projects from district and state staff.
   
   I. Need to be more visible, such as: change office hours; do more weekend programming; use ads in newspapers; initiate flex-time, etc. Disregard traditional operating methods.
   
   J. More utilization of individuals with specific skills in the Extension Program.
   
   K. Need more assistance in 4-H management systems; specific 4-H Urban Specialist.
   
   L. School day care programs come to Extension for information, should we be doing something in this area?

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Need to program specifically for urban audiences.

2. In order to implement better Extension programming, the SREC administration needs to change its management style and how it deals with needs of urban counties.

3. Access to TV coverage as a delivery mode.

4. Staff people to answer problems over phone to allow agents to spend prime time on programming.
RECOMMENDATIONS Con't

5. Examine roles of Urban Extension Boards.
6. Need shorter turn-around time for specialists answers to questions from counties.
7. More resources available for value adding to agriculture business.
8. Specialist need to respond to needs of county staff and provide support for agents to do more indepth programming.
9. Add a communications specialist.
10. Add a marketing specialist.
11. Investigate and support flex-time and extended hours of urban offices.
12. Support additional county staff with specialized subject matter expertise.
13. Support additional district staff with specialized subject matter expertise in the areas of food and nutrition, urban farm management, economics and finance and horticulture.
14. Develop more horticulture truck farming.
15. Continue re-training and add a system for earning continuing education credits for staff.
16. Develop programs for non-resident land owners.
17. Applied food and nutrition concepts.
18. Continue investigating alternative land uses.
19. Programming for the high population of elderly in the urban communities.
20. 4-H - Identify the science and knowledge basis of individuals in the community and utilize the expertise in delivering program information to 4-H groups.

DISCUSSION LEADER Don Miller & Dorothy Callahan
DISCUSSION RECORDER Cheryl McKeag & Dennis Belot
The Committee was divided into two groups to discuss questions about the Southeast Research and Extension Center for the program review process. One group met in the morning and the other in the afternoon. Four questions were presented to each group after they were given background information. The four questions were:

1. What should be the future direction of the Southeast Research and Extension Center within the campus structure?

2. What is the need for visibility of the Southeast Research and Extension Center to the staff and public?

3. Should the Southeast Research and Extension Center expand its role to serve the total University of Nebraska-Lincoln?

4. What are the major program priorities of the Southeast Research and Extension Center for the next five years?

Both groups were asked to offer recommendations to clarify the mission of the Southeast Research and Extension Center during the coming years. The recommendations from both groups is as follows:

GROUP #1 MORNING GROUP

Question #1: What should be the direction of the Southeast Research and Extension Center within the campus structure?

RECOMMEND THAT:

1. The role of the Southeast Research and Extension Center during the next five years be more closely tied to the research effort either with joint appointments or by better communications with existing research components.

2. The Southeast Research and Extension Center take advantage of its campus location to utilize expertise throughout UN-L and exercise leadership that will aid Extension Service programming throughout the state. Concentrate on opening channels for cooperative research with the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources departments.

3. The forestry Extension program remain as it is now.

Question #2: What is the need for visibility of the Southeast Research and Extension Center to the staff and public?

RECOMMEND THAT:

The Southeast Research and Extension Center strive to become more visible to both the 23 southeast counties and the University community by publicizing projects, placing a Southeast Research and Extension Center sign in front of the headquarters building,
Question #3: Should the Southeast Research and Extension Center expand its role to serve the total University of Nebraska-Lincoln?

RECOMMEND THAT:

The Southeast Research and Extension Center should not expand programs to other subject matter areas unless funds are allocated for this purpose.

Question #4: What are the major programming priorities for the Southeast Research and Extension Center during the next five years?

RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING PROGRAM PRIORITIES:

1. Water quantity and quality
2. Soil conservation and maintenance
3. Food processing
4. Alternative crops
5. Family stress
6. 4-H youth programs
7. Communication links with agricultural and non-agricultural corporations.

GROUP #2 AFTERNOON GROUP

Question #1: What should be the direction of the Southeast Research and Extension Center within the campus structure?

RECOMMEND THAT:

1. The addition of research to the Southeast Research and Extension Center role is not appropriate at this time.
2. The Southeast Research and Extension Center administrators and faculty encourage the Institute of Agriculture and Natural Resources research efforts that would be relevant to southeast Nebraska.
3. The Extension forestry program be continued as it is presently.
4. Coordination be encouraged between Extension and research programs.

Question #2: What is the need for visibility of the Southeast Research and Extension Center to the staff and public?

RECOMMEND THAT:

The Southeast Research and Extension Center continue to do a good job of serving southeast Nebraska and no other promotional efforts for visibility will be needed.
Question #3: Should the Southeast Research and Extension Center expand its role to serve the total University of Nebraska-Lincoln?

RECOMMEND THAT:

An expanded role be considered only if it doesn't interfere with on-going Extension programs or take an excessive amount of staff time or use other resources.

Question #4: What are the major program priorities of the Southeast Research and Extension Center for the next five years?

RECOMMEND THE FOLLOWING PROGRAM PRIORITIES:

1. Information services (i.e. data bases, computer software use and etc.).
2. Broad field of marketing, including alternative crops.
3. Youth development (i.e. adapting to change, lack of employment opportunities, training for careers).
4. Developing human capital.
5. Adapting to change.
7. Conservation and management of soil and water.
8. Diversification of agricultural production.
SREC INVITED CITIZENS GROUP
April 2, 1981

An invited group of eight citizens from southeast Nebraska met on Thursday April 2, 1981 to provide input for the SREC program review. Four questions were raised concerning the future role of SREC. Statements from the discussion and recommendations about the future role of SREC follow:

Question #1 Is it necessary that the Southeast Research and Extension Center increase its public visibility? What level of public visibility do you feel is appropriate for the Southeast Research and Extension Center?

Discussion Statements

1. Because of their off-campus locations, other centers have much more visibility. The only way for SREC to have this visibility is to move off campus.

2. Mead has a lot of visibility except for Home Economics.

3. SREC has a special strength because of its location on campus. Take advantage of this location and the credibility of the University. The public doesn't particularly care who answers questions as long as they get a satisfactory answer.

4. Visibility is a function of the county Extension agent and the Extension office in the county. Extension agents need to sell their programs which ultimately helps SREC. Possibly more work with commercial concerns would help programming efforts in the counties.

5. Future funding depends on the knowledge available at the university and the accuracy of this knowledge. Visibility will result from quality.

RECOMMEND THAT:

1. SREC continue to take advantage of its unique position on the university campus.

2. Stress visibility of Extension offices in the county as the result of good programming.

3. Utilize citizens groups to help protect and represent SREC.
Question #2 Should SREC accept a responsibility in assisting other University departments and colleges (non-agriculture related) to dispense information to the public?

Discussion Statements

1. It is important to look of the profile of the general population. A high percent of the population in the southeast district is located in an urban setting. More benefits to this audience might have an impact on the legislature. The Extension delivery systems is an excellent vehicle to extend information to the public.

2. The mainstreet program (Pilot program in Osceola) is a good example of extending program to a different audience.

3. There was some concern about getting into non-agricultural issues. Agriculture is fighting for its life. Mainstreet is suffering.

4. Should go to College of Business Administration and cooperate with them. Have to think beyond agriculture. Work with other departments such as Engineering, Business Administration and etc. Should be a total university approach.

5. Reduce paper work to relieve Extension Agents job, so they will have time to do other things.

6. Taught people to produce, now it is time to stress marketing and the bottom line.

RECOMMEND THAT:

Within the limits of the governing laws for Extension, expand the mission of the Extension Service by cooperating with other University Departments. Share expertise and take advantage of the brainpower throughout the university. In turn, this will provide a broader power base for Extension.

Question #3 Would it be in the best interest of the residents of southeast Nebraska to have a research component as part of the function of the Southeast Research & Extension Center, to address research needs of southeast Nebraska?

Discussion Statements

1. Refer to October 20, 1986, "Report of Research Needs of Southeast Nebraska. Research needs are being addressed now. No advantage to change unless research needs are not being met.

2. It is important to keep research in departments, so researchers can relate to each others.

3. This question is more of an administrator's concern.
than a clientele concern.

RECOMMEND THAT:

No changes be made in the administrative structure for accomplishing research in southeast Nebraska unless the research needs are not being met.

Question #4 What are the major program priorities of the Southeast Research and Extension Center for the next five years?

Discussion Statements

After a considerable discussion, the following topics were listed for SREC Extension programming during the next five years:

RECOMMEND AS PRIORITY PROGRAMMING AREAS (Not in rank order)

1. Improving the quality of family life (Including nutrition, EFNEP program and youth development)

2. Competitive and profitable crop and livestock production (maximize livestock and crop production efficiency, make a profit in business and genetic engineering)

3. Economic and community development

4. Environmental and water quality (conservation tillage and conservation of all resources)
IANR DEPARTMENT HEADS
SREC Program Review
May 18, 1987

The IANR Department Heads were invited to a luncheon and discussion period to provide their input for the SREC program review. Seventeen departments or units were represented. Five topics were discussed that concerned the future role of SREC in the organization. Although no vote was taken, the following statements seemed to reflect group consensus about the future role of SREC:

**Topic**

A. THE ROLE AND MANAGEMENT OF APPOINTMENTS BETWEEN SREC AND IANR DEPARTMENTS

*Question* Is it in the best interest of the program to have specialists with CES appointments within SREC to also have their ARD appointments within SREC?

*Group Consensus:*

1. Research needs for southeast Nebraska can be met through IANR departmental research programs.

2. With the exception of urban research, southeast Nebraska does not have unique research needs.

3. No need to designate research scientists only for southeast district.

4. Need for urban research is primarily in disciplines of Entomology, Plant Pathology and Horticulture. If shift is made to accommodate this need with present resources, other phases of program will suffer.

5. It is advantageous for research components to remain in departments because of facilities, equipment, supplies and the opportunity to consult with colleagues.

6. Departments need to be aware of research needs in the Southeast District and meet those needs, if possible. The SREC research committee provides input for the Departments to consider.

7. It is easier to recruit new faculty for research assignment within the traditional department setting.

8. District Director and Department Head confer on promotion, tenure and salary. This arrangement has worked well in the past.
9. If SREC moved off campus, structure would become more like other centers. Campus setting is unique and requires a different arrangement.

**Question** Would it be in the best interest of Extension if SREC Extension specialists (100%) have their total appointment within SREC as opposed to a joint appointment between SREC and the subject matter department (X% SREC + X% Department =100%)?

**Group Consensus:**

1. This is an individual case by case question.

2. Specialists with research appointments should be housed in departments.

3. From a career standpoint, it is advantageous for faculty to have joint appointments between research and Extension.

**Topic**

**B. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PROGRAMMING ROLE OF THE SREC SPECIALIST TO SOUTHEAST DISTRICT EXTENSION AGENTS**

**Question** How important are SREC Extension Specialists in carrying out Extension programs in Agriculture and Community Resource Development?

**Group Consensus:**

1. It depends on the subject matter. For certain specialized subject matter (ex: Doug Duey - expertise is primarily confined to southeast Nebraska) the specialist is a very important source of information for southeast Nebraska. However, in most cases, it doesn't make any difference. Extension specialists with statewide responsibilities are just as accessible as those with district responsibilities.

2. Extension agents are aware of the subject matter specialties of SREC Specialists and contact them accordingly. If the expertise is not available at SREC, it is just as easy to contact a specialist in a department.

3. The matter of contacting specialists where ever housed was not considered to be a problem.

4. Calls should be directed to the most knowledgeable person.
C. THE FUTURE ROLE OF SOUTHEAST RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CENTER AS A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE TOTAL UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN

Question Should SREC accept a responsibility in assisting other University departments and colleges (non-agriculture related) to dispense information to the public?

Group Consensus:

1. Future program direction must conform to the role and mission of the Extension Service. Caution must be exercised whenever program changes are being considered.

2. The teaching and educational role of the Extension Service fits the basic mission of the University of Nebraska as a land grant institution. Therefore, the Cooperative Extension Service is an integral part of IANR and the University.

3. A peripheral role of service might jeopardize the Cooperative Extension Service in the future. For example, the Division of Continuing Studies was identified as an expendable program when budget cuts were being considered. This may be an indication that the Division was perceived more as a service entity rather than education.

4. County Extension offices might serve as an information source for brochures, bulletins and other information pieces for other University departments or units. However, the distribution of these materials would not require additional programming efforts or time of the Extension Agents.

D. THE MAJOR PROGRAM PRIORITIES OF SOUTHEAST NEBRASKA FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS

Question That are the three highest topic areas for programming in the next five years within Research, Extension and Forestry?

Group Consensus:

1. Urban oriented programs (will involve primarily, Entomology, Plant Pathology and Horticulture)

2. Water Quality

3. Conservation Reserve Program (how to utilize for wildlife)
4. Economic Development
5. Broiler Industry
6. Soil and Water Conservation
7. Agricultural Profitability
8. Specialty Crops (Onions, greenhouse culture and etc.)
9. Problems impacting families (Housing, finances, etc.)

Topic

E. THE NEED FOR VISIBILITY OF SOUTHEAST RESEARCH AND EXTENSION CENTER TO STAFF AND PUBLIC

Question  Is it necessary that the Southeast Research & Extension Center increase its public visibility?  What level of public visibility do you feel is appropriate for the Southeast Research and Extension Center?

Group Consensus:

1. People don't think of SREC as a place. It is a part of East Campus. Public doesn't care about organizational structure. It is more in University minds than in the public's. Major asset is that location is on campus.

2. Location and visibility is not that important. With such a large staff, the administrative function of SREC is obviously very important.

3. The importance of visibility is no different for SREC than for IANR Departments. The entire University has a visibility problem.

4. SREC visibility should be through programs conducted in counties. Good county programs will provide visibility for the counties and strengthen SREC.

Report by: Robert J. Florell
            Don Miller