

## VI. ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

### VI. ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

##### 1. Name of the Planned Program

### VI. ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

##### 1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
601	Economics of Agricultural Production and Farm Management		20%		20%
602	Business Management, Finance, and Taxation		20%		20%
607	Consumer Economics		30%		30%
608	Community Resource Planning and Development		30%		30%
	<b>Total</b>		100%		100%

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

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

Year: 2007	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	0.0	5.0	0.0	3.0
<b>Actual</b>	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0

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

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c	1890 Extension	Hatch	Evans-Allen
0	231184	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
0	184545	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
0	0	0	0

## VI. ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

#### 1. Brief description of the Activity

During the year, Southern University Agricultural Research and Extension Center's personnel worked with several entities to strengthen the links between businesses, community based organizations and outreach education. Leadership Training (for adult and youth) were conducted with business consultants, community leaders, policy makers participating and making presentations. Grant writing workshops to empower individuals, businesses and communities and enhance their skills on how to write for successful grants were conducted. The annual Procurement Opportunity conference: Connecting Business with Contracts; the Annual Community and Faith Leadership Conference; Economic Smart Fair; Small Business Exposition; and several workshops, classes, training sessions, panel discussions, seminars, etc. were held to introduce and expose small business owner (and potential owners) to management and technical issues/opportunities. The Center for Rural and Small Business Development (CRSBD), the Southwest Center for Rural Initiatives (SCRI), and other personnel supported economic and community development activities. Various media sources were used to disseminate and publicize information about activities. Research-based and other valuable information were communicated to the clientele through extension personnel in the form of publications, home/office visits, demonstrations and other educational resources.

Collaboration and partnership with local, state and federal agencies, peer institutions, and private organizations/associations were utilized in seeking and delivering services to citizens. Some of the collaborating entities were: Southern University College of Business, USDA/RD - Rural Cooperative Service, SBA, Baton Rouge Chambers of Commerce, the Louisiana Procurement Technical Assistance Center, the Louisiana Small Business Development Center Network, Chase Bank, The Mayor-President's Office, etc. In FY 2007, no research project was specifically conducted under the Economic and Community Development Program. However, research projects conducted in other program areas such as Sustainable Agricultural Systems, Urban Forestry and Natural Resource Management, Nutrition and Health, and Family and Human Development were used to accomplish some of the objectives of the Economic and Community Development Program. Research personnel working in the aforementioned program areas partnered with the College of Business and other entities in assisting extension personnel to develop program activities to meet and address the needs of clientele.

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

Rural and urban dwellers in Louisiana continued to experience high levels of poverty due to lack of economic opportunities. Improving this low quality of life was the focus of this planned program. About 17 percent of Louisiana residents (and in some of the rural parishes or counties as high as 27 percent) continued to live below the poverty level. The majority of these communities lacked opportunity for business start-ups, business expansions, housing, economic development and growth. Under-represented, underserved, socially and economically disadvantaged groups in traditionally agricultural and urban communities in the State were targeted for the purpose of encouraging business and economic development.

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

#### 1. Standard output measures

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
Plan	16000	100000	0	0
2007	6151	341248	0	0

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

##### Patent Applications Submitted

Year	Target
Plan:	0
2007:	0

##### Patents listed

VI. ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

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

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

1. Number of educational program activities

Year	Target	Actual
2007	200	127

Output #2

Output Measure

2. Number of educational contacts

Year	Target	Actual
2007	116000	347399

Output #3

Output Measure

3. Number of published materials distributed

Year	Target	Actual
2007	30000	6094

Output #4

Output Measure

4. Number of research publications

Year	Target	Actual
2007	3	0

VI. ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

<b>O No.</b>	<b>Outcome Name</b>
1	1. Percent of clients who gained new knowledge/skills, awareness and/or changed attitudes
2	2. Percentage of clients who adopt recommendations
3	3. Percentage of clients who utilized skills to gain positive economic results

## VI. ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

### 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

Appropriations changes

Public Policy changes

Government Regulations

Competing Public priorities

Competing Programmatic Challenges

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

#### Brief Explanation

Changing neighborhoods, reduced facilities such as school, stores, churches, reduction in employment outlets, were some of the side issues facing SUAREC clients. These issues required additional resources which have been dwindling for the last couple of years.

Both federal and state dollars received via formula funds have remained "flat" for several years. However, as general prices increased, so did the cost of conducting program activities. These two squeezing factors had a great impact on SUAREC's ability to provide adequate resources for program activities. Also, incessant directives regarding the use (directives to reduce) of state funds sometimes at critical program implementation stages affected the timeliness of executing activities.

Population changes and competing programmatic challenges also affected the outcomes of the program activities. Our clientele are predominantly poor, socially and economically disadvantaged, therefore more resources were needed to accomplish the targeted objectives. Louisiana was still recovering (rebuilding) after hurricanes Katrina and Rita, there was continuous shifting of population as those who evacuated returned to their homes.

## VI. ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

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

#### 1. Evaluation Studies Planned

After Only (post program)

Before-After (before and after program)

During (during program)

Case Study

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

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

#### Evaluation Results

In addition to the regular surveys conducted during program activities, a general customer satisfaction survey involving all planned programs was conducted during FY 2007. The main goal of the survey was to assess the overall satisfaction of clients regarding the services they received from SUAREC. The other objectives of the survey were: (1) to assess how useful SUAREC services were to the clients in carrying out their business, community, and family functions and meeting other needs; (2) to determine the responsiveness of SUAREC personnel to the needs of clients; and (3) to solicit clients' inputs on ways that SUAREC can best serve them by enhancing their ability to meet business, community, and family needs.

To ensure that evaluation was culturally contextual, stakeholders' involvement and inputs were strongly encouraged and utilized. The survey did not include clients in special programs where it is mandatory that participants' identity be kept confidential. Survey forms were sent via postal mail to clients.

#### Results

74.3% of the respondents indicated that the quality of services they received was very good while 23% said it was good.

97% of the respondents indicated that the services they received were useful.

97% of the respondents indicated that information they received was clear and helpful.

97% of the respondents indicated that services provided by SSUAREC met their needs.

Despite the high level of satisfaction, more services and activities were requested by clients.

#### Key Items of Evaluation