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Welcome!

To “A 25-Year Overview of AgrAbility Demographics”
Our AgrAbility Mission

“The vision of AgrAbility is to enhance quality of life for farmers, ranchers, and other agricultural workers with disabilities, so that they, their families, and their communities continue to succeed in rural America.”

Source: Retrieved from www.agrability.org/about/program/#mission
Who Is an AgrAbility Client?

• An AgrAbility client is an individual with a disability engaged in production agriculture as an owner/operator, family member, or employee who has received professional services from AgrAbility project staff during an on-site visit.
Figure 1. Number Client Reports Per Grant Year and Number New Clients Per Grant Year
Chip Petrea Worked Diligently with National Easter Seals.

• Thank you, Chip!

• Without your good work, we would not have the early data from Easter Seals (1992-2000).
Figure 2. Total Number Client Reports and Total Number New Clients (Actual)
Figure 4. Most Prevalent Origins of Disability in Total Sample Client Reports and in New Client Sample

Total Sample Reports ($N = 18,438$)

- Chronic nonincident: 43.2%
- Non-ag incident: 30.2%
- Ag. incident: 20.0%
- Missing: 6.6%

New Client Sample ($N = 7,779$)

- Chronic nonincident: 41.7%
- Non-ag incident: 32.2%
- Ag. incident: 19.5%
- Missing: 6.6%
What Were the Primary Causes of Disabilities?

• Primary causes of reported disabilities were among our new client sample \((N = 7,779)\):
  – 41.7% Chronic nonincident-related disabilities.
  – 32.2% Non-agricultural incidents.
  – 19.5% Agricultural incidents.

• Most clients worked with AgrAbility 2-7 years \((M = 14.85 \text{ months})\).
Figure 5. Total Number Client Reports and Number New Clients (Actual + Estimated)
How Many Clients Did We Serve?

• Each year between 1991 and 2016, 8-25 SRAPs served an average of approximately:

  – 490 new clients.

  – 1,190 new + ongoing + reopened + closed cases.
Figure 6. Number New Clients Per Year
How Similar Were Our Two Groups?

• Our two groups were similar in:
  – **Age** (52.1 new; 52.7 total).
  – **Gender = Male** (75.1% new; 78.0% total).
From 25 years of Demographic Data
We Learned that:

• AgrAbility provided information, education, and service to an estimated 11,754 new clients (1992-2015) with c. 490 new participants added each year.

• The average age was 52.12 years.

• 75.1% were male.
From 25 years of Demographic Data We Learned that:

• Counting both new and repeat clients, AgrAbility served 27,201 clients over 24 years (1992-2015) which on average was 1,133 clients served each year.
Providing Demographic Data Helps.

• Providing demographic data annually helps:
  – Us be accountable to NIFA, taxpayers, farmers, and ranchers.
  – Us provide data to policy makers as they decide to continue, discontinue, or expand AgrAbility funding.
  – NAP Advisory Team make decisions based on empirical data.
Providing Demographic Data Helps.

• Providing demographic data annually helps:
  – NAP shape in-service training.
  – Provides directions for marketing efforts.
  – Demonstrates the breadth of the overall AgrAbility Project during our first 25 years (1991-2016).
How Many SRAPs Are Collecting ILW and QOL data?

![Graph showing the number of SRAPs collecting ILW and QOL data over time from 2007 to 2019. The graph indicates a significant increase in the number of SRAPs collecting data between 2011 and 2013.](image-url)
Why Join Us?

1. Document your project’s *effectiveness* at increasing clients’ ILW and QOL levels.
2. Enhance your chances of *receiving funding* next time with empirical evidence of your SRAP’s quality and effectiveness.
3. Increase your chances for *outside funding* by demonstrating your accountability.
4. Contribute to AgrAbility’s *Mission*. 
Our Steps Toward Evidence-Based AgrAbility Programming

Pretests from 11 SRAPs ($N=398$), (Jackman, Fetsch, & Collins, 2016)

Pretest-Posttest Changes from 10 SRAPs ($N=191$), (Fetsch, Jackman & Collins, 2017)

Treatment-Comparison with 12 SRAPs ($N=225$), (Fetsch & Turk, 2018)

Behavioral Health with 14 SRAPs ($N=273$), (Fetsch & Collins, 2018)

AgrAbility Motivation (2020), (Fetsch, Leathers, & Morgan)

AgrAbility Demographics (In preparation)

QOL SEM (In preparation)

Who Gains the Most/Least? (In preparation)
We are building a road to Evidence-Based AgrAbility Programming over the next three years—Together!
Won’t You Join Us? Here’s How:

1. Send an email to robert.fetsch@colostate.edu.
2. Seek IRB approval from your Land-Grant University.
3. Study and use the same protocol.
4. Adapt CO to __ on pp. 1-2 & mail.
5. Enter your data into an Excel file that we will provide, proof perfectly & email to me.
Questions?
& Answers
Thank you very much!
Further Research Is Needed to Answer...

• What can we learn from AgrAbility demographics?

• How effective is AgrAbility at improving behavioral health levels of clients?

• What can we learn from those who improved the most? What did they and their SRAPs do differently?
What Are Our Newest Directions?

• How do we get more matched pretest-posttest QOL data?
• Is AgrAbility more effective at enhancing the behavioral health levels of farmers and ranchers with disabilities than no treatment?
• What are we learning about who gains the most from AgrAbility in our qualitative case studies project?
Future Directions for Our Qualitative Case Study by Hamida Jinnah & Paige Tidwell, University of Georgia

• Methods
• Key interview questions
• Preliminary themes from the data
To Answer These Questions...

• More SRAPs are encouraged to join us.
• SRAPs are encouraged to collect more matched pre-test and post-test data.
History of NAPEC

• Fourteen SRAPs conducted a 13-year* AgrAbility treatment versus non-AgrAbility treatment comparison, pretest-posttest study to answer three questions:
  – Do AgrAbility participants’ overall QOL and ILW levels improve?
  – Do AgrAbility participants’ behavioral health levels improve?
  – Does a group of AgrAbility participants’ behavioral health levels improve more than those of a group of non-AgrAbility participants?

* 2/20/2007-10/20/2019
National AgrAbility Project Evaluation Committee (NAPEC) Produced Results

- Published 8 refereed journal articles, & 2 are in preparation.
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Let’s discuss how you and I might get these results to AgrAbility stakeholders and decision makers?
Figure 3. Frequencies by Age Groups from 17,713 Client Reports Compared with 7,452 New Clients (2001-2015)
What percent of AgrAbility clients’ origin of disabilities do you think is ag related?

• 55%?
• 26%
• 11%?
• 8%?
191 New Clients’ Origin of Disabilities were....

- Chronic non-incident: 55%
- Non-ag incident: 26%
- Ag incident: 11%
- Missing: 8%
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