



# JOURNAL OF NACAA

ISSN 2158-9459

VOLUME 18, ISSUE 2 – DECEMBER, 2025

Editor: Bindu Poudel-Ward, PhD

**Malone, A.<sup>1</sup>, Vitale, P.<sup>2</sup>, Herrera, C.<sup>3</sup>, Boren, J.<sup>4</sup>, carpio, C.<sup>5</sup>, Rashin, KRL<sup>6</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Associate direction of Cooperative Extension Service, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, 88003

<sup>2</sup>Extension Economist, New Mexico State University, las cruces, New Mexico, 88003

<sup>3</sup>Software Developer, Ld, New Mexico State University, las cruces, New Mexico, 88003

<sup>4</sup>Associate Dean and Director of Cooperative Extension Service, New Mexico State University, las cruces, New Mexico, 88003

<sup>5</sup>Professor and Department Head of Extension Economics, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico, 88003

<sup>6</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Agriculture and Extension Education  
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, NM 88003

## **Needs and Program Effectiveness of the Cooperative Extension Service in New Mexico**

### **Abstract**

This study assesses employee needs and satisfaction of New Mexico State University Cooperative Extension Service (CES) to enhance statewide extension programs. An online survey using quantitative and qualitative data evaluated collaboration, training and resources, administration, outreach, and organizational culture. Findings revealed high satisfaction with the outreach mission, inclusivity, and reaching new populations, but concerns about employee turnover, research collaboration, and opportunities for more administrative engagement. Recommendations include better use of Agricultural Experiment Station facilities, improved communication, and employee retention. The study offers a replicable model for other state CES programs to identify internal needs and strengthen program effectiveness.

**Keywords:** need assessment, employees, Cooperative Extension Service, satisfaction, collaboration

## **Introduction**

The Cooperative Extension Service (CES), a partnership between local, state, and federal institutions in the United States, plays a vital role in delivering research-based knowledge to local communities. These programs cover agriculture, 4-H youth development, economic development, and family and consumer sciences. Assessing CES employees' needs is essential to keeping CES programs relevant.

A needs assessment is a process used to identify gaps between current conditions and desired outcomes. Various models have been applied to conduct needs assessment of extension programs, including the discrepancy model (Witkin & Altschuld, 1995), the participatory model (Arnstein, 1969), and the asset-based approach (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). These models rely on various data collection methods such as surveys and questionnaires, focus groups, interviews, secondary data collection, and community forums and Delphi techniques (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014; Krueger & Casey, 2014; Patton, 2008; Linstone & Turoff, 1975). These models guided both the survey design and the interpretation of the data in this study. The discrepancy model influenced the structure of Likert-type questions that measured satisfaction and frequency, allowing us to quantify perceived gaps in areas such as training, collaboration, and resources. The participatory model shaped the inclusion of open-ended questions that invited employees to share their ideas, needs, and priorities, ensuring their voices informed both data collection and conclusions. Meanwhile, the asset-based approach guided the identification and analysis of existing organizational strengths, such as the strategic direction, efforts to expand outreach, and community relationships.

Several State Extension Services have conducted needs assessments to enhance service quality and employee satisfaction. For example, the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service utilized focus groups and interviews to identify educational needs and to examine factors influencing job satisfaction, revealing that job satisfaction was strongly influenced by leadership quality, communication, teamwork, recognition, and job clarity (Boltes, Lippke & Goodwin, 1995). At the University of Florida, statewide

studies explored extension employee retention and job satisfaction, emphasizing the importance of personal motivation, work-life balance, and organizational culture (Harder, Gouldthorpe & Goodwin, 2014). A subsequent study investigated employee burnout causes, highlighting job demands, lack of control, and insufficient rewards as key factors (Harder, Gouldthorpe, & Goodwin, 2015). Similarly, North Dakota State University examined sources of employee satisfaction, with top motivators including the ability to help others and work with youth (Hodous & Young, 2014).

Building on these efforts, the present study addresses a gap in the literature by assessing the professional needs, programming challenges, and organizational assets specific to CES employees at New Mexico State University (NMSU), with a focus on broad programming effectiveness rather than solely on job satisfaction among extension employees. At NMSU, the CES is part of the College of Agriculture, Consumer and Environmental Sciences (ACES). Guided by the theoretical models above, and employing both quantitative and qualitative methods, this research provides a structured yet inclusive approach to understanding internal perspectives within New Mexico CES. In doing so, it also offers a potential framework for other State Extension Programs to adapt in pursuit of organizational improvement and employee satisfaction.

## **Materials and Methods**

An online survey was developed to assess satisfaction across five key domains: (1) collaboration among academic (research/teaching) faculty at the main campus, research faculty at the Agricultural Experiment Station, state specialists and county agents; (2) satisfaction with training and resources; (3) satisfaction with administration; (4) satisfaction with outreach expansion efforts; (5) organizational culture status.

## **Participants**

Of 225 invited employees (70 faculty, 155 staff), 69 completed the survey between August and September 2023 (response rate: 31%). This response rate may introduce bias, as more engaged employees may be overrepresented. However, the responses offer valuable insights into employee opinions for improving CES program effectiveness, as almost one of three are represented in the survey.

Regarding experience, 43% of respondents had 1–5 years of service, while smaller percentages had 6–29 years. Only 2% had over 30 years of service, suggesting a relatively early-career workforce.

Respondents were distributed across districts and departments: 39% were from the Northern District, 37% were from the Extension Department specialist (main campus), 13% were from the Southwest District, and 10% were from the Eastern District.

Roles included county agents (28%), county directors (18%), specialists (30%), district/department administrators (7%), county support staff (12%), and administrative support staff (5%). Respondents represented multiple program areas: Agriculture (39), Nutrition/Health/Family (38), 4-H and Youth (24), and Economic Development (4). Several respondents indicated that they work across more than one program area.

## **Assessment**

Collaboration satisfaction was assessed through five indicators: access to the College academic research/teaching faculty, use of Agricultural Experiment Station facilities, frequency of collaboration with Agricultural Experiment Station research faculty, the working relationship between state specialists and county agents, and the perceived need for additional support from state specialists.

Satisfaction with training and resources focused on available training opportunities, access to materials, and administrative support. Satisfaction with administration focused on communication, knowing county activities, and valuing employees' input. Satisfaction with outreach expansion was assessed by examining efforts to reach new populations

and community partners and the adequacy of engagement tools. Finally, the organizational culture includes assessments of inclusion, strategic direction, acceptance of changes, and awareness of mission.

All items were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale: 1 (Extremely Dissatisfied/Never/Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Extremely Satisfied/Always/Strongly Agree) (Table 1).

## **Procedure**

We distributed the survey via Qualtrics. A designated CES administrator served as the point of contact and was the only individual with access to identifiable data. To enhance response rates, Dillman's Tailored Design Method (2007) was applied. Employees received an initial email about the study's importance, followed by a personalized link and reminder. We ensured responses were anonymous at the time of distribution.

## **Data analysis**

The survey included 25 Likert-type and 8 open-ended questions (Appendix A2). Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages) within Qualtrics. For qualitative analysis, we used Qualtrics Text iQ for initial coding, with manual Excel coding as needed. The team refined all the code for accuracy. To examine differences in satisfaction responses across CES employee demographic groups, chi-squared tests were performed using both Python and R to assess the consistency of results. The survey was approved by the NMSU Institutional Review Board.

Table 1. Sample Questions Measuring Satisfaction and Frequency of Collaboration

	Extremely Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Extremely Satisfied
1. Questions for satisfaction					
1.How satisfied are you with the accessibility of ACES academic faculty?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.How satisfied are you with the working relationships between county agents and state specialists?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. How satisfied are you with the resources available to do your job?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. How satisfied are you with NMSU CES administration's communication throughout the organization?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. NMSU CES is poised to expand its outreach to new populations and community partners in New Mexico	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
NMSU CES embraces diversity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Question for frequency	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often	Always
1.How often do you utilize the Agricultural Experiment Station/Science Center facility?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

## **Results**

We organized the results into five categories: (1) satisfaction with collaboration among academic research/teaching faculty, research faculty at AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION, state specialists and county agents, (2) satisfaction with training and resources, (3) satisfaction with administration, (4) satisfaction with outreach expansion efforts, and (5) organizational culture.

### **Satisfaction with collaboration among academic research/teaching faculty, research faculty, state specialists, and county agents**

One of CES's main goals is to communicate scientific knowledge to the public. To achieve this, CES employees must stay informed about research developed at state universities (Tables A1, A2).

With regard to accessibility of academic research/teaching faculty, 40% were satisfied (extremely satisfied 8%, satisfied 32%), and 19% were dissatisfied (extremely dissatisfied 6%, dissatisfied 13%). We also asked about satisfaction with research faculty and Agricultural Experiment Station facilities: 34% were satisfied, and 11% were dissatisfied. Regarding satisfaction with the relationship between state specialists and county agents, 43% expressed satisfaction, and 32% were dissatisfied (Table A1). We also further inquired whether additional support from state specialists was needed; 61% indicated yes, while 39% said no (Table A2). Specific areas of requested support among those wanting additional support included livestock (8 responses), agriculture (6), risk/family/estate planning (5), and new agent training (3).

We also asked how often employees collaborated with the College's academic research/teaching faculty (Table A3). Results showed 45% collaborated frequently (always 3%, very often 9%, sometimes 33%), 25% rarely, and 29% never. For collaboration with Agricultural Experiment Station faculty, 35% collaborated frequently, 26% rarely, and 39% never. The use of Agricultural Experiment Station facilities was generally low. While 25% of respondents reported occasional use, the majority indicated minimal engagement, with 15% using them rarely, 22% very rarely, and 37% never. Thus, CES employees appear to underutilize Agricultural Experiment Station facilities.

## **Satisfaction with training and resources**

We asked employees about professional development and training opportunities. More than half of the employees were satisfied with the training and resources (51% satisfied and 21% dissatisfied) (Table A4). Regarding job resources, 54% were satisfied and 30% were dissatisfied. 66% felt they had sufficient resources to communicate effectively with the clientele. We subsequently asked about resource needs and training areas demand with open-ended questions (Table A5). Top needs for resources were equipment support (10 responses) and miscellaneous needs (10), followed by media and communications training (9), limited English proficiency (LEP) resources for the audiences that have limited English proficiency (8), funding (6), software training (5). Recommended training topics included enhancing the ability of state specialists and county agents to work with diverse audiences (14), employee development (8), agricultural production (6), grant writing/management (6), and reporting/accountability (4).

In summary, most employees were satisfied with the training and resources. Employees identified a need for equipment, communication training, and training to work with diverse audiences.

## **Satisfaction with the administration**

Data showed 42% were satisfied with communications from the CES administration, and 30% were dissatisfied. Regarding the administration's awareness of county-level activities, 32% were satisfied, and 34% were dissatisfied. While 39% of employees felt the administration valued their input, 28% reported feeling undervalued (Table A6).

## **Awareness of reaching new audiences**

According to survey respondents, NMSU CES was actively expanding its outreach, with 57% of respondents agreeing that current efforts were effective, while 23% expressed



disagreement. In addition, 47% of employees agreed with the statement that they have the necessary tools, training, and skills for outreach, while 30% disagreed (Table A7).

Responses to open-ended questions (Table A8) identified some needs to expand outreach: funding (14 responses), staffing (12), program development assistance (9), and marketing resources (7). Employees were also asked about mechanisms to prioritize programming initiatives to reach new populations and communities. The main mechanisms identified were community assessments (16), program balance (13), and expansion of current programs (10). Overall, outreach to new audiences was viewed positively, with needs focused on funding and staffing.

### **Organization culture**

Most employees agreed CES embraces diversity (62%) and inclusion (61%) (Table A8). With respect to employees' satisfaction with organizational direction, 47% were satisfied and 29% were dissatisfied (Table A9). In addition, 50% indicated that CES, as an organization, is open to incremental change. Finally, 89% indicated they were aware of CES's mission, vision, and values, and 71% expressed familiarity with their department's strategic plan. Thus, most employees viewed CES as inclusive, understood its mission, and thought that CES is open to change.

The most common responses to open-ended questions inquiring about processes for CES improvement included employee recruitment and retention (12 responses), increased pay/funding (9), and reporting/accountability (9). Other suggestions for improvement included additional efforts in marketing, inter-agency coordination, and professional development (civil rights and diversity, and employee onboarding (6 each) (Table A10).

The top responses to open-ended questions about NMSU's strengths included diverse programming (18), community relationships (17), and community impact (14), followed by trusted information (7) and youth education (6). Supportive administration and partnerships were also mentioned. Finally, responses to an open-ended question

focusing on other concerns about NMSU CES included a lack of staffing, insufficient infrastructure support, communication problems, and limited leadership training.

### **Satisfaction across various groups of employees**

We tested whether satisfaction levels were associated with years of service, geographic work area, employee roles, and program areas. Nine satisfaction type questions included in the survey in Appendix A2 were used for these analyses.

Chi-square tests and cross-table analysis (Table A11) revealed some trends worth mentioning. The association between satisfaction with collaboration involving academic research/teaching faculty and years of service was significant at the 10% level ( $p = 0.059$ , degrees of freedom = 20), with employees having fewer years of service generally reporting lower satisfaction. Although results were not significant at 5% level, this trend extended to the association between years of service and satisfaction with the collaboration with the research faculty, the relationship between state specialists and county agents, administration communication, and organizational culture based on visual trends in the cross-tabulation.

A significant association was found between employee location and satisfaction in certain categories: working relationships between state specialists and county agents ( $\chi^2(12) = 24.26$ ,  $p = 0.019$ ), communication with administration ( $\chi^2(12) = 25.20$ ,  $p = 0.014$ ), and the extent to which CES administration values employee input ( $\chi^2(12) = 21.35$ ,  $p = 0.045$ ). Employees in the Northern District reported higher levels of satisfaction than those in the Southern and Eastern Districts, in that order. However, these findings should be interpreted cautiously due to low numbers in some response groups. Satisfaction was not found to be associated with employees' current role or program area.

### **Discussion**

Overall, across all satisfaction-related questions, a larger proportion of NMSU CES employees indicated they were satisfied rather than dissatisfied. However, the study

revealed several critical issues affecting the CES at NMSU, highlighting areas that require attention to improve overall program efficiency and employee satisfaction.

### **Satisfaction with collaboration among ACES academic research/teaching faculty, research faculty, state specialists, and county agents**

A large percentage of respondents (61%) indicated that they need additional support from extension specialists. This highlights the need to enhance communication and coordination between county agents and state specialists to better address this need.

Another key issue identified was the limited collaborative efforts of Extension staff with academic research/teaching faculty and research faculty at the Agricultural Experiment Station. Effective extension programs rely on the seamless integration of research and practical application. The limited collaboration reduces the flow of valuable information and innovations that could enhance program development and outreach efforts. Without stronger connections between researchers and extension specialists, the potential impact of extension services remains restricted. The underutilization of Agricultural Experiment Station facilities was also identified as a missed opportunity. These facilities can potentially serve as valuable hubs for research, training, and outreach. Establishing structured partnerships, regular joint meetings, and shared research initiatives can bridge the gap between research and practical application. Additionally, better integration of Agricultural Experiment Station facilities into CES programs will maximize their potential for research, training, and outreach.

### **Satisfaction with training and resources**

Although most employees were satisfied with their professional training, about 1 in four (26%) seem to think that professional development opportunities in CES do not meet their needs or expectations. Employees also expressed a need to access essential resources, such as updated technology, funding, and program materials. Furthermore, expanding training opportunities and ensuring consistent resource access will enhance employee performance. Regular workshops, updated technology, and adequate funding for program materials can enable CES employees to deliver more effective extension services. These results differed from Havercamp, Christiansen & Mitchell (2003), who

stated that research/teaching materials and equipment requirements were adequate, while they lacked time to complete their job-related tasks in the Nevada Cooperative Extension.

### **Satisfaction with the administration**

Some concerns regarding administrative engagement were also noted. Satisfaction remains higher than dissatisfaction in all areas, suggesting that employees were generally positive but would benefit from improved communication, county engagement, and feedback responsiveness. Improving administrative engagement is also necessary. Leadership should actively communicate with employees, seek input, and address field-level concerns. Transparent decision-making and clear policies can reduce confusion and strengthen organizational cohesion.

### **Employees' turnover**

An issue identified by analyzing employee characteristics, specifically, the high proportion of employees with only a few years of service, is the high level of employee turnover. This is a problem, as high turnover rates disrupt program continuity, making it challenging to maintain strong relationships with communities and stakeholders. Moreover, high levels of employee turnover were the top priority identified by employees when asked about other concerns, and also when inquired about factors hindering the expansion of their programming to new populations. Retention strategies identified in the literature include career advancement opportunities, competitive compensation, flexible scheduling, adding variety to daily activities, continuous communication about CES work impact, and strengthening support systems (Benge, Harder & Goodwin, 2015, Riggs and Beus 1993).

### **Implications for extension**

Although this study focused on New Mexico State University's CES, the findings reveal some challenges identified in other state extension systems. Limited collaboration between university researchers and county agents, underutilization of agricultural experiment stations, and high staff turnover among early-career extension employees have been reported in other state CES programs, including those in Texas, Arizona,

and Colorado (McLellan 2014, University of Arizona Cooperative Extension 2023, Harder, Gouldthorpe & Goodwin, 2015). These states—like New Mexico—work in large rural territories with culturally diverse populations and limited staffing resources, making internal coordination and workforce retention especially critical.

The study's integration of the discrepancy, participatory, and asset-based needs assessment models offers a replicable framework for other states aiming to assess and strengthen their CES programs. For instance, CES programs with a strong research base but fragmented communication between departments may benefit from adapting this survey model to evaluate faculty accessibility and state–county collaboration (Havercamp, Christiansen & Mitchell, 2003). By providing both a theoretical and data-driven foundation, this research contributes to NMSU CES internal improvement and offers a transferable tool and process that other CES programs can adopt to evaluate employee satisfaction, optimize extension programming, and retain talented staff.

## **Conclusion**

This study identified key strengths and areas for improvement within the NMSU CES. NMSU CES's strengths include progress in reaching new audiences through a strong organizational culture, effective embrace of diversity and inclusion, and employees' clear understanding of its core mission, vision, and values. However, there are opportunities to enhance relationships with research entities, communications, and resource accessibility.

Improved partnerships between county agents and academic research/teaching and research faculty are essential to ensure the timely dissemination of scientific knowledge in community programs.

Sustained professional development, improving infrastructure support, and fostering transparent communication between administration and employees are recommended steps forward. Leveraging existing assets, such as Agricultural Experiment Station

facilities, and establishing clear pathways for cross-unit collaboration can further enhance service delivery.

The research approach and findings offer a model for other state Extension programs to assess internal needs and develop data-driven strategies to improve employee satisfaction and overall program performance. Future research could build on this study by conducting longitudinal assessments and incorporating stakeholder perspectives to gain a comprehensive understanding of system-wide needs.

### Literature Cited

Arnstein, S. 1969. A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225> accessed on August 13, 2025.

Benge, M., Harder, A., and Goodwin, J. 2015. Solutions to burnout and retention as perceived by county extension agents of the Colorado State University extension system. *Journal of Human Sciences and Extension*, 3(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.54718/NSXN7559> accessed on August 13, 2025.

Boltes, B. V. Lippke, L. A., and Gregory, E. 1995. Employee satisfaction in extension: A Texas study, *Journal of Extension*, 33(5), Article 7. <https://open.clemson.edu/joe/vol33/iss5/7> accessed on August 13, 2025.

Dillman, D.A. 2007. *Mail and internet surveys: the tailored design method* (2nd ed.) John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., and Christian, L. M. 2014. *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition*, Wiley. ISBN 978-1-118-45614-9.

Donaldson, J. and Franck, K. L. 2015. Needs assessment guidebook for extension professionals, The University of Tennessee Extension Institute of Agriculture. PB 1839. <https://eesd.tennessee.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/242/2021/10/PB1839-1.pdf> accessed on August 13, 2025.

Harder, A., Gouldthorpe, J. and Goodwin, J. 2014. Why work for extension? An examination of job satisfaction and motivation in a statewide employee retention study. *Journal of Extension*, 52(3), Feature, v52-3a5. <http://doi.10.34068/joe.52.03.04> accessed on August 13, 2025.

Harder, A., Gouldthorpe, J., and Goodwin, J. 2015. Exploring organizational factors related to extension employee burnout. *Journal of Extension*, 53(2), Feature, v53-2a2. <https://doi.org/10.34068/joe.53.02.21> accessed on August 13, 2025

Havercamp, M., Christiansen, E., and Mitchell, D. 2003. Assessing extension internal organizational need: An Action Research and Learning Process. *Journal of Extension*, 41(5) Feature Articles, 5FEA2. <https://open.clemson.edu/joe/vol41/iss5/3> accessed on August 13, 2025.

Kanter, J., Leinfelder-Miles, M., Clark, M., Lundy, M. E., Koundinya, V., Long, R., Light, S. E., Brim-DeForest, W., Linqvist, B., Putnam, D., Hutmacher, R.B., and Pittelkow, C. M. 2024, Setting research and extension priorities for agronomic crops in California, *California Agriculture* 78 (2): 88–99. <https://californiaagriculture.org/article/118769-setting-research-and-extension-priorities-for-agronomic-crops-in-california>

accessed on August 13, 2025.

Kretzmann, J. P., and McKnight, J. L. 1993. *Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets*. ACTA Publications.

Krueger, R. A., and Casey, M. A. 2014. *Focus Groups: A practical guide for applied research*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, Sage Publications, Inc, ISBN-13: 978-141296475.

Linstone, H. A., and Turoff, M. 1975. The Delphi method: techniques and applications. *Journal of Marketing Research* 18(3), Addison-Wesley Publisher. <http://doi:10.2307/3150755> accessed on August 13, 2025.

McLellan, M. S. 2014. Organizational and individual factors related to retention of county extension agents employed by Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University). Texas A&M University Repository. <https://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/items/5a9e103c-c3dd-4b8c-991d-efc52cd1b044> accessed on August 13, 2025

Patton, M. Q. 2008. *Utilization-focused evaluation*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, Sage publishers.

Riggs, K. and Beus. K. 1993. Job satisfaction in extension, *Journal of Extension*, 31(2, Summer), Feature Articles, 2FEA5. <https://open.clemson.edu/joe/vol31/iss2/6> accessed on August 13, 2025.

University of Arizona Cooperative Extension. 2023. Leading Arizona communities into the 21st century. <https://extension.arizona.edu/news/leading-arizona-communities-21st-century> accessed on August, 2025.

Witkin, B. R., and Altschuld, J. W. 1995. *Planning and conducting needs assessments: A practical guide*. Sage Publisher.

## Appendix 1. Detailed Results of the Survey

**Table A1. Satisfaction with Collaborations Among Academic Research/teaching Faculty, Research Faculty at Agricultural Experiment Station, State Specialists and County Agents.**

	Extremely Satisfied (%)	Satisfied (%)	Neutral (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Extremely Dissatisfied (%)
Accessibility of academic research/teaching Faculty (n=66)	8	32	41	13	6
Research faculty and research facilities at Agricultural Experiment Station (n=63)	14	20	52	8	3
State Specialist and County Agents Relationship (n=65)	14	29	24	26	6

Note: 1. n is the number of responses

**Table A2: Need for Support Program from Extension Specialists**

1. Do you need additional support from specialists in your program area(s): Yes: 61%, No: 39% (n=59)

Question	Main topic	Ranks
2. Topics for specialists to offer(n=37)	Collaboration	Livestock/range management (8 responses), Agriculture (6 responses), Risk/family/Estate planning (5 responses), Diabetes, Mental health, Weight loss (5 responses), New agent training (3 responses), Hands-on-training (4 responses), State-wide programming initiatives (1 response), Expanding outreach (1 response)



**Table A3. Frequencies of Collaborations**

	Always (%)	Very Often (%)	Sometimes (%)	Rarely (%)	Never (%)
Collaboration of academic research/teaching faculty (n=66)	3	9	33	25	29
Collaboration with Research Faculty at Agricultural Experiment Station (n=64)	0	12	23	26	39
	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Very Rarely	Never
Research Facilities at Agricultural Experiment Station (n=67)	9	16	15	22	37

**Table A4. Satisfaction with Training and Resources**

	Extremely Satisfied (%)	Satisfied (%)	Neutral (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Extremely Dissatisfied (%)
Professional development and training (n=68)	13	38	22	19	7
Resources available(n=68)	28	26	14	20	10

**Table A5: Training and Resources from Two Open-ended Questions**

Having Resource: Yes:66% and No:34% (n=68)

Questions	Main topic	Ranks
Tools to enhance communication with clientele (n=47)	Resources	Resource/equipment support (10 responses), Media & communications training (9), Limited English proficiency (LEP) (8), Funding support (6), 4-H/other software support training (5), Information sharing platform (5)
Training topics to offer by CES administration (n=52)	Training	Working with diverse audiences (14 responses), Employee development (8), Role of middle manager (7), Ag. Production (6), Grants writing & management (6), New employee training (6), Reporting accountability training (6), Community development (4), Administrative assistant training (4), Conflict resolution/difficult people (4), Mental health (4), Volunteer management (3), Promotion & tenure (2), Program development (2)

**Table A6. Satisfaction with CES Administration**

Resources	Extremely Satisfied (%)	Satisfied (%)	Neutral (%)	Dissatisfied (%)	Extremely Dissatisfied (%)
Administration communication through CES(n=66)	12	30	27	20	10
NMSU CES's pulse about what is taking place in the counties(n=66)	11	21	33	25	9
Values input from the employees(n=66)	12	27	32	16	12

Note: n is the number of responses

**Table A7. Expanding Outreach with Degrees of Agreement Questions**

Resources	Strongly Agree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
CES is prepared to expand Outreach to New populations and community partners(n=69)	17	40	18	16	7
CES has the necessary tools for outreach(n=69)	8	39	22	27	3

**Table A8. Expanding Outreach with Open-Ended Questions**

Questions	Main topic	Ranks
Identify areas where you can expand your programming to reach new populations (n=55)	Outreach	Additional funding (14), More staffing (12), Program development assistance (9), Marketing resources & strategies (7), Administrative vision/engagement (6), Infrastructure (5), Focused programming (5), Time (4), Training (3), Incentives (3), New partnerships (2)
Prioritize programming efforts that target new populations for your program (n=51)	Outreach	Community assessment (16), Finding program balance (13), Current program expansion (10), Elimination of ineffective programs (8), Additional funding (5), Building new relationships/partnerships (4), Increased training (3), Multiple language program offerings (1)

Note: n is the number of responses

**Table A9. Assessment of Organizational Culture**

Organization direction	Strongly Agree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Neutral (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Strongly Disagree (%)
Embracing diversity(n=67)	34	28	21	12	4
Embracing inclusion(n=67)	25	36	21	13	4
Satisfaction with organizational direction <sup>2</sup> (n=67)	9	38	22	22	7
CES acceptance of change (n=68)	16	34	22	19	9
Employees' awareness of the mission(n=66)	54	35	4	4	1
Employees' awareness of the extension department's strategic plan(n=66)	26	45	12	10	6

Note: 1. n is the number of responses.

2. This is the satisfaction question.

**Table A10. Other Open-Ended Questions related to CES Programs**

Questions	Main topic	Ranks
What are some processes that we can implement or use to improve NMSU CES? (n=56)	CES program	Recruitment and retention of employees (12), Increased pay, funding, and county budgets (9), Reporting and accountability (9), Marketing (8), Increased inter-agency coordination (8), Career & professional development training (6), Civil rights & diversity (6), Employee on boarding (6), Stakeholder assessments (5), Building community connections (5), Establishing consistent program standards
Some things you feel the NM CES is doing successfully (n=59)	CES program	Diverse Program offerings (18), Community relationships (17), Community impacts (14), Trusted information (7), Youth education (6), Supportive administration (5), Partnership building (2)
Add any other comments you would like to make about NMSU CES (n=31)	CES Program	Staffing concerns (9), infrastructure Support (8), organizational Communication (7), Leadership development (3)

**Table A11. An example of a cross-table for the frequencies between years of service and collaboration of academic faculty.**

Years of Service	Dissatisfied	Satisfied	Neutral	Total Responses
0–5 years	4	10	11	25
6–10 years	4	2	4	10
11–15 years	2	3	3	8
16–20 years	1	5	2	8
21+ years	0	4	4	8
Unknown	2	3	3	8

Note: Dissatisfied category includes very dissatisfied, and satisfied category includes very satisfied

## **Appendix A2. The List of Survey Questions**

### *Demographic Questions*

1. What is your current role in NM CES? (county support staff, county agent, county director, specialist, administrative support, district or department administrator)
2. What is your current program area?
3. Where do you currently work? (Northern, Southwestern, Eastern, Main campus)
4. How many years have you worked for NMSU CES? (1- 5 Years, 6-11, 12-17, 18-23, 24-29, 30 years more)

### *Collaboration with Academics*

5. How satisfied are you with the accessibility of the ACES academic faculty?
6. How often do you collaborate with ACES academic faculty in your area to assist with programming?

### *Collaboration with Research*

7. How often do you utilize the Agricultural Experiment Station/Science Center facility in your area to assist with programming?
8. How often do you collaborate with Agricultural Experiment Station/Science Center researchers in your area to assist with programming?
9. How satisfied are you with the accessibility of the Agricultural Experiment Station/Science Center facility and researchers in your area?

### *State & county relationships*

10. How satisfied are you with the working relationships between county agents and state specialists?
11. Do you need additional support (curriculum, program development) from specialists in your program area(s)?
- 12. What topics would you like specialists to offer in your program area? (Open-ended question 1)**

### *Training & Resources*

13. How satisfied are you with the level of professional development and training opportunities offered to you as an employee of NMSU CES?
14. How satisfied are you with the resources (equipment, supplies) available to do your job?
15. Do you have the resources needed to communicate effectively with your clientele?
- 16. What tools or training would aid you in your ability to enhance communication with clientele?(Open-ended question 2)**
- 17. CES administration would like to offer more professional development training opportunities to employees. Please identify your areas of interest or need:(Open-ended question 3)**

### *Administration*

18. How satisfied are you with NMSU CES Administration's communication throughout the organization?
19. How satisfied are you with NMSU CES Administration's pulse on what is taking place in the counties across NM?

20. How satisfied are you with how NMSU CES Administration values input from employees?

*Expanding outreach*

21. NMSU CES is poised to expand its outreach to new populations and community partners in New Mexico.

22. NMSU CES staff have the necessary tools (training, skills, knowledge) to attract new populations and community partners in diverse communities.

**23. What help would you need to expand your programming to new populations and communities? (Open-ended question 4)**

**24. How would you prioritize programming initiatives to reach new populations and communities?**

**Think of the programs/activities you might be willing to give up to make your efforts more intentional (Open-ended question 5).**

*Organizational culture*

25. NMSU CES embraces diversity.

26. CES embraces inclusion.

27. As an employee of NMSU CES, how satisfied are you with the direction the organization is headed?

28. NMSU CES, as an educational organization, is willing to accept some incremental levels of change.

29. I am aware of the core mission, vision and values of CES.

30. I am aware of my Extension Department's Strategic Plan and the associated objectives.

**31. What are some processes that we can implement or use to improve NMSU Cooperative Extension Services? Please explain how. (Open-ended question 6)**

**32. What are some things you feel the New Mexico Cooperative Extension Service (CES) is doing successfully? (Open-ended question 7)**

**33. Please add any other comments you would like to make about NMSU CES (Open-ended question 8)**

*Note:* Bold fonts indicate open-ended questions.