

soccer field, and a running track. Additional athletic facilities are now under construction.

Memorial Recreation Area: In 1968 a Recreation Lodge was completed in the vicinity of the college ski slopes located off Route 10 in Cobleskill. The close proximity of this facility to the college enables the students to participate in skiing and other outdoor recreational activities.

Agricultural Engineering Building: Completed in 1966, this building provides the finest laboratories for Agricultural Engineering Technology.

DeWitt C. Dow, Jr., Agricultural Complex: The Agricultural Complex, located on Route 7 across from the main campus, was completed in early spring of 1966. The complex is comprised of a Dairy Barn, Hay Storage Building, Storage and Shop, and a Farm Machinery Building. These facilities provide modern housing for the college's dairy herd and young stock for laboratory instruction with students.

Edward B. Hewes Animal Husbandry Complex: Also located on Route 7, this complex includes a Meat Processing Building, Judging Pavilion, and Classroom Building. These facilities are used for instruction in the processing of beef and other meat products, for instruction in the application of the animal sciences relating to beef, dairy, horses and livestock, as well as space for class lectures and discussions in the animal sciences.

Earl H. Hodder Horticulture Complex: This complex, completed in 1966, includes laboratories for instruction in floral design, display and merchandising, the soil sciences, nursery management courses, supporting greenhouses to produce the crops used in the program, and a laboratory facility where students actually propagate and grow all types of flowers, shrubs, and plants. Presently under construction is an addition to this complex.

Jared Mackey Service Building Complex: A Service Building Complex which aids the Maintenance Department in maintaining the new campus facilities was put into operation in 1966.

Special Services Center: This building was completed in August of 1969. The focal point of the campus at the terminus of the Loop Road, this building is organized on two levels with business offices, counseling center, mailroom, Faculty Student Association offices, and lounges at the Loop Road entrance. Above this level are located the executive offices, admissions, student personnel, and academic offices.

Campus Nursery School: The campus nursery school is located in the Nursery Education Annex adjacent to the campus. Classes are rotated to the new Laboratory-Classroom Building.

College Infirmary: One of the newer buildings on campus, completed January 1, 1971, is the College Health Center. The building design concept consists of a simple plan constructed around the main nurses' station as a core. Control of all occupied areas of the building can be maintained from one central point. The building is located centrally between the main campus, the new dormitory complex, and the agricultural campus directly off the main service road. The building can be easily reached from any point on campus and has three treatment rooms, a

pharmacy, six 2-bed bedrooms and related areas.

Laboratory-Classroom Building: Also completed in January of 1971 was the Laboratory-Classroom Building for the programs in Business and Nursery Education. The building contains accounting laboratories, secretarial science laboratories, a typing laboratory, office machines laboratory, accounting machines laboratory, a computer center, and distributive education laboratories as well as a Nursery Education facility encompassing a curriculum laboratory with observation booth, creative activities laboratory, nursery activities laboratory, equipment laboratory. Also provided are offices, conference rooms, and lounges for the two programs. The building is located in front of Frisbie Hall with close proximity to the library now under construction.

Dorms I, II, III, IV, V: Five dormitories housing 1,032 students were completed in 1971-72 enabling the college to provide living accommodations for our increasing student enrollment.

New Dining Hall and Recreation Building: Also included in the complex is a second dining hall facility and recreation building to accommodate the 1,032 students being housed in the new dormitory complex. The dining hall will enable the college to serve 500 students at one time per meal. The Recreation Building also located in this same complex was completed in 1972. This building features a large lounge with fireplace, meeting room, and game room, as well as a music area and lounge.

Food Service Building: Located in the new dining hall mentioned above, are new Food Service Administration laboratories which has enabled the college to expand its curriculum in Food Service Administration. The building boasts two basic foods laboratories, a catering laboratory, a food service laboratory, general purpose classrooms and faculty offices for the Food Service Administration faculty.

Campus Development Program: Plans for the future development program will be designed to strengthen every phase of the college operation within the limitations imposed by the State of New York. It is hoped that new facilities being contemplated will provide the college with the ability to enroll additional numbers of students throughout this decade.

STUDENT LIFE

The college offers the student the opportunity to work closely with fellow classmates and faculty not only in the academic classroom, but also in a well-rounded life of co-curricular and social activities on and off campus. The administration and faculty are firm in the belief that the co-curricular program contributes significantly to the development of the college citizen for daily living.

STUDENT HANDBOOK

The Student Handbook is given to each student at the beginning of the academic year. It explains the official policies of the college as listed in the catalog, student rules and student regulations, and a description of student organizations and activities.

MANPOWER FOR THE FUTURE

Dan J. Deets – USDA Personnel Management Specialist

In June of 1972 the NACTA National Convention devoted its attention to the topic of "The Agricultural Industry – In Transition." Such a subject seemed especially apropos at a time when a large number of people across our nation were reading and discussing Alvin Toffler's "Future Shock." The following material is based on my speech to the Convention.

As educators your involvement with the future and all it portends is an everyday event. However, like most of us in other occupations, you tend to take certain facets of your job for granted. But whether you're preparing your students for the agricultural technology of tomorrow or the business language of today your product is the manpower of the future. It is not a responsibility to be taken lightly. The fact you have devoted so much attention in this Convention to those factors bearing on the needs of your students indicates your awareness of the burden you bear.

At this time I intend to briefly share with you some of the events and factors shaping the employment market in agriculture, in general, and in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in particular. These influences have been grouped into four categories for discussion purposes:

1. Factors affecting or potentially affecting USDA Programs;
2. Influences on USDA employment levels;
3. The agricultural employment outlook; and
4. Conditions affecting the selection of students in the job market.

Historical Perspective

The decade of the '60's probably saw the last of the hiring

heyday's in USDA. Our employment levels have dropped from 86,000+ in 1968 to 83,000 in 1972. At the same time the number of persons hired for positions filled primarily by college graduates leveled off to around 2,500 per year for the period 1967 - 1972 as compared to 4,000 - 5,000 hires each year from 1962 - 1966. This represents a reduction in hiring activity of about 50%. In spite of this trend you will still find a USDA office in almost every one of the 3,000 counties in the United States.

Trends Worth Noting

Although the subsequent USDA speakers are in a better position to evaluate trends and their potential impact in USDA programs it is worth capsulizing a few to give you a feel for the amount and breadth of changes that could affect agricultural manpower needs:

1. The number of farms and farmers continue to dwindle. By the year 2000 it is estimated only 2 million farmers will be involved in growing food and fiber for the nation.

2. Our commodity surpluses steadily become smaller as reflected in the stocks held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Questions are now being raised as to the need for maintaining a minimum grain reserve as a hedge against some kind of unforeseen disaster.

3. As our Agribusiness industry grows, more manpower is required in the areas of meat and poultry inspection and commodity grading whether handled on a Federal or State level. The recent trend has been for more states to turn over their mandatory inspection programs to USDA. On the other hand, to the extent that agribusiness growth improves prices for farm products the number of USDA price support loans decreases.

4. Population growth has been slowed and there is now some indication that the rural to urban migration may eventually be reversed as more

of our people flock to the suburbs and beyond.

5. Many hopes are being pinned on rural development as one answer to help solve both the plight of our urban areas and ills of our rural communities. The Rural Development Act of 1972 provides extensive new credit authority to USDA to help establish businesses and industrial sites outside of the urban areas.

6. Although the "when" of welfare reform remains a question there is a probability that its eventual enactment will change several USDA programs, such as those involving food stamps and commodity donation.

7. Consumerism and other public interest movements are becoming increasingly critical of Federal operations. These groups are also more inclined to seek legal redress through the courts. Agriculture has not been exempt from this development. Last year USDA's policies on food stamp eligibility and on funding the school lunch program came under attack.

8. Recently an article in the Washington Post highlighted a report by the Agribusiness Accountability Project entitled "Hard Tomatoes, Hard Time, The Failure of the Land-Grant College Complex." This study scores the close association of the Land-Grant Colleges with agribusiness interests and cites examples of how the writers feel the public interest is being neglected, and even harmed, by this relationship.

The Federal Employment Picture

A variety of changes relating to Federal employment have also produced mixed results in this category. In line with the President's policy to trim the Federal bureaucracy and reduce costs, the Office of Management and Budget has prescribed both lower employment ceilings and average grades reduction goals for Executive Agencies during Fiscal Year 1972. These restrictions are likely to continue in Fiscal Year 1973.

In USDA we were required to reduce our employment from slightly over 84,000 to 83,000 by June 30, 1972. Currently we have about 82,600 employees. Our early achievement of the employment goal was due in a large part to the increased number of retirements induced by an annuity increase effective July 1, 1972. However, retirements have the potential of running at a high level over the next several years. By 1975 almost 23% of USDA's current employees will be eligible to retire. How many of these employees take advantage of their eligibility depends heavily on the extent to which annuities rise under the cost-of-living adjustments and Congress' willingness to liberalize benefits.

A large number of retirements would improve our ability to hire newly graduated college students at a rate higher than the 2,400 - 2,700 figure typical of the last few years.

Other factors will have a constricting effect on the number and kind of college graduates USDA will be seeking. Among these are the Secretary's Minority Employment Program, the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 (EEO) and the realignment of functional and program assignments within the Department.

For several years the Department of Agriculture has set its own internal hiring goals to increase the employment of minority groups and women, especially in the professional, technical and administrative fields. This has resulted in increased emphasis on student employment programs from which the transition to regular employee status is more easily made upon graduation. Some of you may be familiar with the terms associated with these programs such as "student trainee" and "cooperative education." A "Federal Junior Fellow" is another kind of student employee about which you may hear more often as the program is implemented on a nation-wide basis. These are programs that, while not designed specifically for EEO considerations, are particularly useful as recruitment tools.

Many of you may be somewhat tired of hearing about EEO, but it is a fact of life in the Federal Government which is likely to continue receiving emphasis for some time to come. As pointed out by my previous statement on USDA's own minority program, the present administration has not backed away from the principle that the Federal establishment is to set the national standard.

From our viewpoint in personnel management it appears that growing pressures for greater action from the Spanish-speaking and American Indian communities will result in the Federal establishment being asked to pursue EEO activities with renewed vigor. The President's announced 16-Point Program for Spanish-speaking Americans is but one indication that this

assessment is a valid one.

The recently passed EEO Act of 1972 also creates new obligations for Federal Agencies. Under the Act both national and regional action plans must be prepared annually. These plans must contain, in addition to affirmative employment activities, provisions for training and education programs to assist employees in advancing to a level which utilizes their full potential. While upward mobility programs may reduce the need for new college graduates, they do provide opportunities for both two and four year colleges to participate with the Federal Government in furnishing the training and educational resources required for their successful operation.

For those of you who have followed the metamorphosis of the USDA, the news of another reorganization is not startling. Over the last several years a number of major changes have been started or completed. The impetus for three recent realignments stems from the Administration's desire to decentralize Federal activities and at the same time to regroup programs in line with national priorities. One result has been that the programs concerned with assisting the needy in meeting their food requirements became embodied in the Food and Nutrition Service. Its parent Agency, the Consumer and Marketing Service, subsequently lost its meat and poultry inspection programs to a new regulatory Agency called the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service which also inherited some activities from the Agricultural Research Service . . . and to top it all off, each of these resulting Agencies reorganized on a regional basis. Such turmoil tends to postpone recruiting activities until the dust settles.

The Job Outlook

After having gotten a feel for the milieu in which Federal personnel management operates you may be more sympathetic with the lack of preciseness with which I handle the subject of the agricultural employment outlook. Strangely enough, however, there are some things which can be said with a degree of certainty.

In the short run, the condition of the current job market is not one which gives students particular cause for joy upon graduation. Most Federal registers are so full with applicants that many have had to be closed to prevent a further build up. General biologists are particularly plentiful and the number of Forestry graduates continues to exceed the demand. Ecology graduates find no large demand (at least within USDA) for their area of study unless they were fortunate enough to also have enough credit hours to complete a more conventional major.

Within the gloom there are a few bright spots, but not many are within the traditional agricultural fields. The best bets for employment with USDA in the foreseeable future lie in the fields of accounting, agribusiness, agricultural economics, microbiology, veterinary medicine, plant pathology, soil science, and landscape architecture. In extremely short supply are sanitary and mining engineers. Jobs in meat and poultry inspection, which draw from several agricultural and biological fields, are also likely to be available.

Taking a longer view, several points seem worth mentioning. Over the last 5 to 6 years around 25% of our college trained employees have worked in jobs in the agricultural and biological sciences. At the same time about two-thirds of our new hires are for these same fields. These ratios are not likely to change significantly over the next few years although one would expect the credit and economic orientations of the Rural Development Act to eventually increase the demand for persons trained in accounting, finance, economics and business administration. On the other hand, given the growth in meat and poultry inspection programs, the shortage of veterinarians, and the demand for better quality control measures in food inspection, it is not unreasonable to assume that both State and Federal agencies will look to the Universities for persons whose training equips them to handle jobs in these programs.

Recruitment and Selection

It seems ironic that at a time when the Federal Government

has fewer jobs to offer than in the past, circumstances in the general economy should combine with the concerns of our young people to create a situation where students are literally knocking down the doors of our employment offices to obtain a Federal career. Only a few years ago government recruiters were not particularly welcome on many campuses and their visits in search of talent were something less than productive. This situation perhaps, points up the dangers of one of my personal pet-peeves. I'm sure you've heard it noted before that one or more recruiters are particularly successful on campuses because of the special assistance they've received from certain professors. Hopefully each of us here takes our profession seriously enough we don't fall into the "personal choice" trap.

On the contrary, we should be ready to acknowledge to students the multitude of career opportunities which lie in both the public and private domains. From a professional perspective, which career the student chooses is no reflection on us, but rather is based on his own individual needs.

Without belaboring the point or being overly redundant on what some of my previous colleagues have stated regarding the type of graduates they seek, I would like to cover a few of the concerns of the Federal employers in USDA. Our Agencies generally look for persons who have some combination of traits (e.g., course work, grade average or trend, work experience, interest, attitudes, evidence of adaptability, and willingness to relocate) that gives them the impression this would be an employee who will grow in his job and do it well.

There is, of course, a list that could be compiled ad infinitum on other things that employers seek. Extracurricular activities related to the professional field or which give evidence of leadership, recommendations, appearance, etc., are all considered. But in the end it all boils down to technical competences plus an apparent ability to work well with people, plus a specific interest in us.

In a number of basic areas higher education is apparently not doing as well as it should. We, in personnel management, con-

tinue to receive comments that many college graduates are unable to communicate well, either orally or in writing. A closely associated deficiency has been in the area of personal relations. Yet these two things are fundamental to getting any job done through people.

Other management comments relating to students preparation for the job market include an uncertainty as to what they want to do and generally possessing unrealistic expectations about their first job.

In terms of the employment environment our recruiters find that most students are not familiar with Federal hiring procedures, nor with the Agencies themselves to which they make application, nor with the kind of jobs likely to be found with that Agency. As a result, these students lack eligibility on the appropriate Civil Service Examination and employment discussions must be hedged to take this fact into account.

All this suggests that universities, 4 year colleges and junior colleges need to pay closer attention to the needs of their students. Career counseling, job information, and assessments of each individual's strengths and weaknesses, or lack of them, are elements critical not only to the student's relative success, but to society's as well. Are these elements that your institutions can afford to overlook and still fulfill a meaningful role in a modern technological society?

Wrapping It Up

Earlier I mentioned that there were a number of changes affecting agriculture which have already occurred or loom on the horizon. The rapidity and quantity of these alterations make it difficult to judge exactly where we are headed and what they portend for career choices and preparation. There are some threads, however, that seem to flow through these whirlpools and eddys. Hopefully, I've succeeded in highlighting a few of them for you today.

NACTA Journal Manuscript No. 10/27/72/12

AN ANALYSIS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE MEAT AND LIVESTOCK EVALUATION CONTESTS

F. C. Mello, Jr.,¹ D. I. Davis,² D. D. Dilley³
California State University, Fresno, California 93710

For many years intercollegiate meat and livestock judging contests have played a principal role in:

- (1) providing experience and competition for students venturing into the field of meat and livestock science,
- (2) innovating an arena for the application of continually changing trends and desires of the meat and livestock industry and the consumer, and
- (3) initiating an interest in modifying and expanding college meat science curriculums.

Kelly (1971) surveyed changes, combinations and reorganization of meats, livestock and live animal-carcass evaluation contests. The interest in this subject is a result of:

- (1) an acceleration in livestock and meat science research and expanded efforts to devise more desirable methods for the standardization and evaluation of livestock,
- (2) the inclusion of live animal-carcass evaluation contests into the spectrum of intercollegiate judging events, and
- (3) the specialization of livestock and meat science brought about by various technological advances.

Surveys have been conducted consisting of opinions of livestock and meat judging coaches, government personnel, livestock and meat science professors and researchers and other

interested persons. Findings in these surveys (Bray, 1967; Lidvall, 1967; Miller, 1967; and Ritchie, 1967) indicated that livestock and meats contests should continue to operate separately, because in some cases meats contests deal more specifically with subject matter more important to the meat packer whereas the livestock contests can be more applied to livestock production. In many cases time and facilities may be a limiting factor for either type contest.

The purpose of this survey dealt with the following:

- (1) methods for improving existing judging contests,
- (2) opinions related to the formation of intercollegiate meats or livestock evaluation contests in the western states, and
- (3) the role of live-animal-carcass evaluation contests as related to intercollegiate meat and livestock evaluation contests.

Materials and Methods

Two-hundred twenty-nine questionnaires consisting of ninety-two questions as shown in Table 1 (see appendix) were utilized in this study. The questionnaires were sent to various universities and colleges, government agencies, industry personnel, and other interested organizations and persons. The data were expressed in terms of percentages in favor of each specific question. A space was provided on the survey forms for respondents to offer extra suggestions or comments where strong opinions existed. These responses are reported but no attempt has been made to identify the sources of comments or opinions given as justification for answers received to questions.

¹ Present address: Department of Animal Science, University of Wyoming, Laramie

² Present address: Texas Agricultural Extension Service, Box 1298, Fort Stockton, Texas

^{1, 2 & 3} at time of study: Graduate assistant and assistant Professors in Department of Animal Science, respectively. California State University - Fresno.