Extension Education in Trinity County

Making a Difference
The Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service has long been dedicated to educating Texans. Extension education evolved nationwide under the 1914 federal Smith-Lever Act, which sought to extend university knowledge and agricultural research findings directly to the people. Ever since, Extension programs have addressed the emerging issues of the day, reaching diverse rural and urban populations.

In Texas, all 254 counties are served by a well-organized network of professional Extension educators and some 100,000 trained volunteers. Extension expertise and educational outreach pertain to the food and fiber industry, natural resources, family and consumer sciences, nutrition and health, and community economic development.

Extending Knowledge
Providing Solutions

Among those served are hundreds of thousands of young people who benefit annually from Extension’s 4-H and youth development programs.

Texans turn to Extension education for solutions. Extension agents and specialists respond not only with answers, but also with resources and services that result in significant returns on the public’s investment. Extension programs are custom-designed for each region of the state, with residents providing input and help with program delivery. Here are just a few highlights of Extension impacts on this county and its people.

Trinity County – Summary of 2013 Educational Contacts

- Total Educational Programs Conducted -- 340
- Total Participants -- 6740
- Total Contacts – 97,502
- 4-H Members -147
- 4-H Volunteers -- 29
- 4-H Clubs -- 5
- Curriculum Enrichment Participants -- 392
- Master Volunteers--6
- Master Volunteer Hours --30
- 4-H Volunteer Hours --
- Office Contacts -- 648
- Phone Calls -- 921
- Newsletter/Mail/E-Mail Contacts -55,498
Relevance:
A large majority of Trinity County’s residents are involved either directly or indirectly in the county’s six million dollar beef and forage production industry. Education keeps them current on new practices and technologies to assist them in management efficiency. The knowledge producers acquire by attending educational workshops provides them with the knowhow to minimize inputs and maximize outputs without losing quality. The issues addressed by Extension programming were identified by the Trinity County Beef and Forage Committee and individual county producers who are concerned about the direction of the beef cattle industry as they attempt to maintain and/or rebuild their drought forced herd and forage reductions. These programs were targeting 200 Trinity County beef producers.

Response: Texas AgriLife Extension and the Beef and Forage Committee of Trinity County assisted with the development of the following programs and information to address relevant issues facing beef and forage producers:

- Multi-County Beef and Forage Series I 5/5/13 (25 participants)
- Multi-County Beef and Forage Series II 7/12/13 (35 participants)
- Multi-County Beef and Forage Series III 10/4/13 (23 participants)
- Cow Country Beef 706 10/9/2013 (80 participants)
- District 5 Beef Tour 5/8-9/2013 (57 participants)
- Cow Country Congress (October 24, 2013) 177 participants. Topics included Marketing Beef, Water Rights, Legislative Update from State Representative Trent Ashby, Trinity River water issues, Generational Turnover and Low Stress Handling Cattle with Dogs.
- Pesticide Training, Testing and Recertification (September 6, 2013) 133 participants. Topics included Parasites in Beef Cattle, Winter Pastures, Pond Management, Laws & Regulations and Pesticide Update
- Pesticide Training, Testing and Recertification 11/22/2013 (107 participants)
- Quarterly Ag Newsletter sent to producers focusing on timely educational information
- Weekly Newspaper Articles 30 articles published in 2 papers for a possible 168,000 impressions
- KIVY Radio Broadcast - 2 broadcasts with a possible 500,000 impressions

Results: The Series I, II, and III Multi-County Beef and Forage workshops, District 5 Beef Tour, Cow Country Beef 706 workshop and the Cow Country Congress were evaluated for economic impact. From the completed retrospective post evaluations, participants responded with the following economic details regarding their expected monetary benefit from implementing Extension Educational Best Practices per head of cattle and acre of land: 43 respondents of the District 5 Beef Tour completed the evaluation instrument with measurable programmatic data. 51 respondents of the Cow Country Beef 706 Session 1 indicated they would use appropriate pasture management following the drought. 20 stated they had already adopted this practice.

Economic Impact:
Producers attending the District 5 Beef Tour anticipate an economic impact over $271,019.25 from cattle and forage production as a result of this program

- 34 of 43 (79%) increase in knowledge about Sexing Technologies and reproduction technologies for their beef herds as a result of this program
- 15 of 20 (75%) indicated they would use appropriate pasture management following the drought. 20 stated they had already adopted this practice
- 18 of 25 (72%) indicated they would adopt practices associated with potential of participating in different markets. 15 stated they had already adopted this practice
Producers attending the Cow Country Beef 706 Series Session 1 determined $47,667.00 to be of economic impact for their cattle herds.

- 69 of 80 (85.7%) participants that filled out the survey showed an increase in knowledge on how to evaluate feeder calves as a result of this program.
- 91.8% ranked this item good or excellent for after the program knowledge compared to 34.7% who considered themselves good or excellent before the program.
- 62 of 80 (77.6%) participants had an increase in knowledge in determining important considerations when selling feeder calves.

Producers attending the Beef and Forage I, II, and III Workshops determined $202,839.75 total anticipated economic impact for their cattle herds

- 11 of 11 (100%) of the participants that filled out the survey plan to adopt recommended supplemental feeding practices to meet nutritional needs
- 12 of 13 (92.3%) of the survey’s filled out noted that they will adopt the use of body condition scores in determining nutrimental needs in beef cattle
- 10 of 11 (90.9%) of the participants will use soil testing to improve nutrient management
- 9 of 10 (90%) of the participants said they would implement a disease prevention and management plan by adopting a herd health and vaccination program
- 19 of 23 (82.6%) of the participants said they would implement strategies to manage available forage
- 19 of 22 (86.4%) of the participants said they would use recommended practices/technology to control weeds
- 11 of 11 (100%) of the participants said they will use supplemental feeding practices to meet nutritional needs

Summary: After a brutal year in 2011, in which producers faced drought forced cattle sales and major hay reductions, 2012 was slightly more favorable but not by much. Producers in 2013 faced the decisions of rebuilding or maintaining herd numbers. This year’s workshops educated producers in strategies to maximize their inputs, evaluate their operations for efficiency, make cost effective cattle purchases, and manage their herds effectively. The rebuilding process has been inhibited by the high cost of cattle. Many producers have upgraded to hybrid grasses that are more drought tolerant over the past 2 years. Producers are using Texas A&M AgriLife best management practices as they manage herds and re-plant pastures as they try to restore their operations to pre 2011 drought destruction. Most producers have employed weed management strategies to control the multitude of native weeds and numerous new weed varieties over the past two years that were brought in from other parts of the U.S. By using the practices presented in AgriLife programming efforts these multi-county producers will net a total of $521,526 in anticipated economic impact.
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Relevance: Quality Counts is a program for Texas 4-H and FFA youth livestock exhibitors. Texas has the highest number of 4-H and FFA livestock projects in the nation at 89,776 head. Animals included in these market and breeding projects are beef cattle, sheep, swine and goats. With the broiler and fryer species added, the 89,776 head increases dramatically. Most of these animals make it into the food supply continuum and the breeding industry inherits the rest. The purpose of Quality Counts is to provide an opportunity for youth across Texas to learn personal character attributes and acceptable livestock management practices associated with these projects.

Response: Local and major youth livestock shows are very important to Trinity County youth. These youth are considered meat producers who must raise a safe meat product for public consumption. Feeding, medicating and care of live animal projects must meet certain standards to be a quality product. With over 325 Trinity County projects entering the food chain annually, Quality Counts guidelines ensures a quality product. Quality Counts helps participants expand and/or achieve character building. A good attitude, fair-play, honesty, respect, trustworthiness, and citizenship are stressed by Quality Counts. Youth market participants must interact with judges, parents, students, teachers, other community members and exhibitors during livestock shows. Most youths, raised in an agriculture enriched lifestyle, exhibit elevated quality character traits than the average youth. Quality Counts reinforces those traits.

Evaluation Method: To determine the level of knowledge gained from the program, a pretest and post test was administered to the 16 participants. The result data is noted below.

Evaluation Results: Table 1 Knowledge based true/false and multiple choice questions from a pretest / posttest evaluation approach with 16 youth participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions and or true false statements</th>
<th>Correct Response</th>
<th>Pre-test % Correct</th>
<th>Post-test % Correct</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intramuscular injection should be given in the ______________________________</td>
<td>Neck</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During 2000, how many pounds of carcass were produced by Texas livestock show market swine, goats, lambs and steers?</td>
<td>16 million</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding a medicated feed to livestock five days before a terminal show is okay?</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is okay to administer drugs not labeled for specific species?</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A broken needle is a type of chemical hazard?</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food safety is something all livestock participants are involved in?</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth exhibiting market livestock projects are considered producers in the food supply continuum?</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic prods, buzzers or slappers should be used to handle animals</td>
<td>False</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal health products are used to _____________</td>
<td>Prevent/treat illness or injury</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's not the producer’s responsibility to produce a safe product.</td>
<td>True</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a drug for pneumonia to treat ringworms without consulting a veterinarian is an example of?</td>
<td>Off label</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next section focuses on matching questions that are associated with Quality Counts and the youth market animals that enter the food supply after livestock shows.

Table 2: The matching section asks the participants to match the pounds of dressed livestock project meat to the corresponding animal species which enters the consumer meat supply continuum. The Quality Counts participant’s data is represented in the following table. A pretest / posttest evaluation approach was used to measure the youth participant’s knowledge.
List the six pillars of character
Participants were asked to list the six pillars of character from a pretest / posttest evaluation approach. The data is listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six Pillars of Character</th>
<th>Pre-test %</th>
<th>Post-test %</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>+ 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustworthiness</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Open ended question: “Define Quality Counts.”
Pretest: 3 out of 16 youth (19 %) answered correctly.
Post-test: 16 out of 16 youth (100 %) answered correctly. This was a 100 % positive change after completing the Quality Counts curriculum.

Summary:
Participants revealed a large increase in knowledge. Quality Counts will continue to build the youth of Trinity County into more well-rounded individuals. Visual evaluation of the participants and animals at the Trinity County Fair showed quality animals and positive character traits. The Quality Counts curriculum was a great success for all participants involved.
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Contests

Ag Products ID 1 Participant:
Senior Wes Jones High Point individual

Foods and Nutrition:

Forestry 16 Participants:
Groveton 4H Team 1 – 1st Place District
Groveton 4H Team 2 – 3rd Place District
Centerville 4H Team 1 – 2nd Place District
Centerville 4H Team 2 – 4th Place District

Hay Judging 8 participants:
Groveton 4H Team 1 – 1st place
Groveton 4H Team 2 – did not place

Livestock Judging 4 participants:
(Junior Blayne Hull 11th place overall) (Intermediate Mikayla Davidson 6th place overall) (Intermediate Luke Eichman 8th overall) (Senior Loren Eichman 1st overall) (Senior Addyson Hart 2nd overall)

District Photography 5 participants:

Shooting Sports 46 participants:

District
Team Results – (Seniors Team 1 2nd, Team 2 3rd) (Intermediates Team 1 2nd, Team 2 5th) (Juniors Team 1 2nd)

State:
Trinity Team 2 Brianna Dial Emily Hogg, Garrett Scoggins, Sean Luce 15th place out of of 29 teams
Trinity Team 3 Dustin Pickle, Deanna Dial, Hunter Thompson, Wrangler Fry 19th place out of 29 teams

Wildlife:

District (Groveton 4H Team 1 1st, Centerville 4H Team 1 2nd)
Regional Contest (Groveton 4H Team 1 2nd place, Centerville 4H Team 2 5th)
State Contest (Groveton Team 1 5th)
FCS Education Events Presented
Fathers Reading Every Day (FRED)

Developed by the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service, an educational agency affiliated with the Texas A&M System, Fathers Reading Every Day (FRED) is a program designed to encourage fathers, grandfathers, and other positive male role models to read to their children on a daily basis. The program aims to increase father involvement in children’s literacy development and to improve the quality of father-child relationships.

The FRED program has a unique history, in that it is named after a real father, Fred Bourland, who read to his own children as they were growing up. Inspired by her father’s example, Extension Family Economic Specialist Dr. Lynn Bourland White came up with the original concept underlying FRED, while Dr. Stephen Green, Extension Child Development Specialist, developed the program’s structure and content. A lifelong reader himself, Fred continually expanded his own knowledge through reading—the daily newspaper, a farm magazine, or the Bible. The father of three daughters, Fred firmly believed that reading opened the door of opportunity for himself and his children—and that reading can do the same for others.

I presented the FRED program to 15 Fathers in an attempt to persuade them to read to their kids. There was an oral presentation and written information for the Fathers.

Donuts for Dads

I presented an informational program for 8 Dads at Trinity Head Start in hopes of compelling them to be better Dads.
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