

# Animal Production and Protection

Animal Production and Protection

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

### 1. Name of the Planned Program

Animal Production and Protection

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

### 1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
301	Reproductive Performance of Animals	16%	16%	16%	16%
302	Nutrient Utilization in Animals	15%	15%	15%	15%
303	Genetic Improvement of Animals	16%	16%	16%	16%
305	Animal Physiological Processes	8%	8%	8%	8%
306	Environmental Stress in Animals	5%	5%	5%	5%
307	Animal Management Systems	23%	23%	23%	23%
311	Animal Diseases	8%	8%	8%	8%
312	External Parasites and Pests of Animals	3%	3%	3%	3%
313	Internal Parasites in Animals	3%	3%	3%	3%
315	Animal Welfare/Well-Being and Protection	3%	3%	3%	3%
<b>Total</b>		100%	100%	100%	100%

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

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

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	4.5	0.3	3.0	0.8
<b>Actual</b>	9.0	1.1	3.0	0.8

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

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c 744109	1890 Extension 358860	Hatch 529770	Evans-Allen 146054
<b>1862 Matching</b> 744109	<b>1890 Matching</b> 358860	<b>1862 Matching</b> 529770	<b>1890 Matching</b> 146054
<b>1862 All Other</b> 0	<b>1890 All Other</b> 0	<b>1862 All Other</b> 0	<b>1890 All Other</b> 0

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

**1. Brief description of the Activity**

A bull testing program and heifer evaluation program was conducted at two locations per year in Georgia. The Georgia Beef Challenge evaluated calves for feedlot performance and carcass evaluation in commercial feedlots located in Iowa.

The University of Georgia's "Beef Team" offered the Master Cattlemen's Program. This program involves detailed, in-depth educational seminars related to beef cattle. A maximum of two programs were offered annually throughout the state.

Faculty maintained a web site for the International Dairy Heat Stress Consortium. Regional workshops were held for producers and were conducted as requested by extension personnel across Georgia. Faculty assisted with the Commercial & Purebred Dairy Projects as well as other 4-H & FFA activities, including dairy evaluation & dairy quiz bowl. Dairy farms in Georgia participated in a financial research study. The financial performance results of this program were published and shared in an effort to increase farm profitability.

Studies were conducted to examine swine intake regulation. These added to our understanding of the key regulatory points that can be applied in the industry to improve efficiency and reduce cost of production. Studies examining the efficiency of nitrogen and phosphorous utilization were conducted concurrently that have the potential to reduce the environmental impact of animal agriculture.

Annually this program updated Extension agents and clientele in pest control, through one-on-one discussions, meetings, or publications. It provided pest overviews for organizations such as the Georgia Cattlemen's Association. Every year faculty updated eleven sections of the Georgia Pest Management Handbook and provided biennial estimation of pest losses in livestock and dairy production.

Research continues that compares different bahiagrass and bermudagrass. Evaluation of new forages including Coastcross II for grazing and hay quality; and, pigeon peas for grazing and for grain production for cattle feeding continues. By-product feeds are being evaluated for nutritional and economic value in beef production systems.

New scientific information was made available to scientific peers through the publication of original research articles in scientific journals. More applied knowledge was disseminated to the audience at large (producers, practicing veterinarians, extension personnel) by publishing results in journal articles or departmental research reports and by coordinating presentations with extension personnel.

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

The target audience was sheep, goat, beef & pork producers, dairymen, county agents, veterinarians, and industry professionals.

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

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	2500	20000	400	1600
2007	4335	28050	1075	2270

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

**Patent Applications Submitted**

**Year Target**

**Plan: 0**

**2007: 0**

**Patents listed**

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

**Number of Peer Reviewed Publications**

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

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

**Output Target**

**Output #1**

**Output Measure**

Number of significant publications including referred journal articles, bulletin and extension publications.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	12	57

**Output #2**

**Output Measure**

Number of educational contact hours generated from formal educational programs or presentations for county extension agents.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	500	777

**Output #3**

**Output Measure**

Number of educational contact hours generated from formal educational programs or presentations for clientele.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2007	1500	724

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

O No.	Outcome Name
1	Number of additiional direct extension contacts made by county faculty not receiving federal funds, staff or volunteers as a direct result of the work of faculty receiving federal funds within this planned program.
2	Number of Master Cattlemen certifications granted through this planned program.
3	Increase in the farm gate value of livestock production in Georiga. Reported in millions of dollars.
4	Number of invited presentations by faculty as a direct result of the success of this program.
5	Percentage of program participants reporting increased knowledge after program participation.
6	Percentage of program participants responding to follow-up survey that indicate changing at least one production practice as a result of this program.

**Outcome #1**

**1. Outcome Measures**

*Not reporting on this Outcome for this Annual Report*

**2. Associated Institution Types**

**3a. Outcome Type:**

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
------	---------------------	--------

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

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

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

**External factors which affected outcomes**

Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)

Economy

Public Policy changes

Government Regulations

Competing Programmatic Challenges

Populations changes (immigration, new cultural groupings, etc.)

**Brief Explanation**

Public policy on biofuel and impact on land use, food supply, and feed supply. Government regulations on meat inspection. General down-turn in economy meant less money for new enterprises.

Drought, high feed prices and marketing situations from milk diversions and pooling.

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

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

After Only (post program)

Retrospective (post program)

Before-After (before and after program)

During (during program)

Case Study

Comparisons between program participants (individuals,group,organizations) and non-participants

Comparisons between different groups of individuals or program participants experiencing different levels of program intensity.

Comparison between locales where the program operates and sites without program intervention

Other (Comparing results to standard practices)

### **Evaluation Results**

Number of new enterprises established - 9; Number of new enterprises in business after two years - 7; Number of profitable enterprises after five years-1.

Data show that feeding 12% soybean oil compared to 6% decreased the proportion of milk saturated fatty acids and increased the proportions of monounsaturated fat and linoleic acid without affecting. Milk yield, protein, lactose and fat contents were not affected.

### **Key Items of Evaluation**