# STANDARDS FOR MEASURES OF EFFICIENCY FOR 2009\*

These standards were estimated from 2008 prices and costs, along with production and physical inputs from previous years. (Estimates were made as of November 1, 2009.) The physical standards are based on results obtained by record-keeping farmers. Teachers may wish to have this information as a means of comparing these standards with students' results or with those of farmers in record-keeping classes.

No results are given here for measures of size of enterprise. Such comparison can be made among students having enterprises of the same kinds. Teachers should, of course, use their judgment as to how many of the measures of efficiency to expect individual students or classes to complete.

#### 1. LIVESTOCK

Efficiency Measures	Calves <u>2</u> sold	008 Calves fed out
BeefCow:		
1. Percent calf crop	90%	98%
2. Weight produced/cow (lb.)	477	1,143
3. Returns/\$100 feed fed	\$ 86	\$ 104
4. Returns above feed/cow	\$ (51)	\$ 33
5. Average price received-market sales	\$ 94.83	\$ 94.23
6. Feed cost/cwt. produced	\$ 75.77	\$ 71.78
7. Lb. feed/cwt. produced		
a. Grain	161	286
b. Protein and minerals	<u>33</u>	<u>83</u>
c. Total concentrates	— 194	369
d. Hay and dry roughage	853	434
e. Corn silage and other silage	614	493
f. Pasture (days)	43 days	22 days
8. Death loss: % of weight produced	8.2%	3.3%

<sup>\*</sup>The data in this publication was taken from the Advance Report 2008 Farm Income and Production Cost Summary from Illinois Farm Business Records, AE-4566, April 2009, which is a summary of records of farmers enrolled in the Illinois Farm Business Farm Management (FBFM) program. The physical efficiency factors would not change a great deal for comparison with 2009 records; however, the prices of feed and market prices for grain and livestock for 2009 may vary from the figures given due to variable weather conditions. Values used for determining feed cost were: corn: \$4.70, oats: \$3.30, wheat: \$6.63, commercial feeds at actual cost and hay and roughage at on-farm value.

	Efficiency Measures	Average <u>Farms</u>	2008 80 – 149 Cows per Farm
Dairy:			
1.	Milk/cow (lb.)	21,002	20,936
2.	Butterfat/cow (lb.)	771	<i>7</i> 71
3.	Returns above feed/cow	\$ 1,775	\$ 2,576
4.	Returns/\$100 feed fed	\$ 172	\$ 225
5.	Average price of milk/cwt.	\$ 18.98	\$ 19.16
6.	Feed cost/cwt. milk equivalent*	\$ 11.10	\$ 8.06
7.	Lb. feed/cwt milk equivalent*		
	a. Grain	28	21
	b. Protein and minerals	<u>18</u>	<u>14</u>
	c. Total concentrates	46	35
	d. Hay and dry roughage	21	21
	e. Corn silage and other silage	138	106
8.	Death loss: % of weight produced	14.6%	12.9%
9.	Percent of cows dry	12.6%	11.7%

<sup>\*</sup>Milk equivalent equals value of beef produced divided by average price received per cwt. milk plus cwt. of milk produced.

	2008 Average <u>Farms</u>
Feeder Cattle Enterprises:	
1. Gain animal/day (lb.)	2.81
2. Returns/\$100 feed fed	\$ 102
3. Average price received	\$ 91.26
4. Average price paid	\$ 103.49
5. Total return per 100 pounds	\$ 69.62
6. Feed cost/cwt. produced	\$ 68.02
7. Return above cost of feed/cwt. produced	\$ 1.60
8. Lb. feed/cwt. produced	(()
a. Farm grain b. Commercial feed	662 49
c. Total concentrates	711
d. Hay and dry roughage	58
e. Corn silage and other silage	390
9. Death loss: % of weight produced	2.5%
Team 1888 /s of Weight Produced	2.670
	2008 Average
	<u>Farms</u>
Sheep:	
1. Percent lamb crop	161%
2. Returns/\$100 feed fed	\$ 106
3. Price received/cwt. sold-market	\$ 111.98
4. Price received / cwt. sold-breeding	\$ 46.28
5. Feed cost/cwt. produced	\$ 69.40
6. Lb. feed/cwt. produced	272
a. Concentrates	372 412
<ul><li>b. Hay and dry roughage</li><li>c. Pasture (days)</li></ul>	1 day
7. Death loss: % of weight produced	6.5%
7. Death 1000. 70 of Weight produced	0.0/0

			<u>20</u>	08	
	F(G)	All	350 or more Litters per	Feeder Pigs Fed *	Feeder Pigs Sold
	<u>Efficiency Measures</u>	<u>Farms</u>	Farm	(Averages)	(Averages)
Swine	:				
1.	Number of litters farrowed	400	850		954
2.	Pigs farrowed/litter	10.54	10.65		11.74
3.	Pigs weaned/litter	9.12	9.19		10.76
4.	Litters farrowed per female/year	2.03	2.08		2.20
5.	Returns/\$100 feed fed	\$115	\$ 120	\$ 106	\$ 149
6.	Ave. weight/market hog sold (lb.	.) 261	262	266	19**
7.	Ave. price received per cwt.				
	market hog ***	\$ 45.93	45.82	\$ 44.53	\$ 29.71
8.	Feed cost/cwt. produced	\$ 38.76	\$ 36.94	\$ 30.12	\$ 63.03
9.	Lb. feed/cwt. produced				
	O	244	242	173	385
	b. Commercial feeds	<u>82</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>124</u>
	c. Total concentrates	326	316	242	509
10.	Death loss: % of weight produced	l 3.1%	3.3%	2.2%	5.2%
11.	Average price paid/cwt.			\$ 267.06	
12.	Average weight purchased			13	

<sup>\*</sup>Purchase weight of 20 pounds and less.

Feeder pig sales weight reflects a trend for weaning sales being adopted and does not include traditional feeder pig sales.

### 2. CROPS

	<u>(</u>	Grain Sorgl	num	Corn	Soybeans	Oats	Wheat
1. 2.	Yield/acre Hours/acre	2.1		2.6	See page 5 2.2	1.7	1.8
3. 4.	Labor cost/acre Direct cost/acre*	\$ 240.00	Mult	iply above ho \$ 345.00	ours by average : \$ 190.00	rate used per \$ 110.00	r hour \$ 210.00
5. 6.							
7.	Average Illinois farm prices	:					
	Year 2008 Annual June 2009 Sept. – 2009 Year 2009 Annual (estima	\$ 4.42 \$ n/a \$ n/a te) \$ 3.16		\$ 4.70 \$ 4.01 \$ 3.27 \$ 3.76	\$ 11.53 \$ 11.80 \$ 10.10 \$ 10.26	\$ 3.30 \$ n/a \$ n/a \$ 2.63	\$ 6.63 \$ 4.29 \$ 3.25 \$ 4.22

<sup>\*</sup> Figured on the basis of detailed costs. Includes depreciation of machinery and equipment, does not include cost of land, labor, or an interest charge.

Note: Hours for crops include both direct and indirect labor. Indirect hours are those used for such things as repair and maintenance of machinery and buildings, hauling manure, and general farm upkeep. <u>Indirect hours usually make up about 30 percent of total hours.</u>

<sup>\*\*</sup>Average weight and price received for the feeder pig enterprise is for the feeder pigs only. It does not include any cull sows or boars.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup> per head for feeder pigs sold

#### 3. SCHEDULE OF LAND VALUES FOR RECORD ANALYSIS PURPOSES -- 2009

This schedule gives a relationship of land values to average soil productivity ratings of improved land for use in farm business records in the Illinois Farm Business Farm Management Association. The average soil ratings are based on an average level of management for the different soil types. This combination of level of management and soil type will vary across the state. To determine the average soil rating for your soil type and level of management, refer to Circular 1156, *Soil Productivity in Illinois*. These values are for record analysis purposes only and were adjusted to a 2008 basis by using the index of land prices for Illinois as reported by the USDA. (The figures for 2009 were calculated by multiplying 1979 Base Year Land Value figures by 2.02

Soil ratings	Land values	Soil ratings	Land values	Soil ratings	Land values
100	\$ 6767	<i>7</i> 5	\$ 5151	50	\$ 2525
95	6565	73 70	4646	45	2121
90	6262	65	4141	40	1717
85	5858	60	3636	35	1515
80	5555	55	3030	30	1212

LAND INTEREST: 2.60% times above land values.

LAND TAXES: An estimate to determine this part of the land charge for crop enterprise can be made by multiplying .006 (.6%) by the above land values.

## 4. ILLINOIS PRELIMINARY CROP YIELD REPORT -- (Estimate of Nov. 1, 2009)

At this time, crop-yield data are not available for all crops by counties; therefore, the yields are shown by crop reporting districts.

Yields of Principal Crops, by Districts and State, Illinois, 2008 and 2009

District+	C	orn	Soybean		Wh	eat
and State	2008*	2009**	2008*	2009**	2008*	2009**
		(Yield p	er acre harves	ted for grain	bushels)	
Northwest	184	176	47	47	70	70
Northeast	183	172	46	45	71	75
West	193	180	50	46	65	57
Central	193	196	51	51	67	67
East	177	173	48	50	72	82
W. Southwest	174	177	48	46	63	58
E. Southeast	165	167	46	42	62	53
Southwest	156	129	45	38	62	55
Southeast	151	154	41	39	64	56
Illinois	179	175	47	45	64	59

<sup>\*</sup> From the Illinois Agricultural Statistics Service, Springfield, Illinois.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Yield estimates as of November 1, 2009.

<sup>+</sup> NORTHWEST: Bureau, Carroll, Henry, Jo Daviess, Lee, Mercer, Ogle, Putnam, Rock Island, Stephenson, Whiteside, Winnebago; NORTHEAST: Boone, Cook, De Kalb, Du Page, Grundy, Kane, Kendall, Lake, La Salle, McHenry, Will; WEST: Adams, Brown, Fulton, Hancock, Henderson, Knox, McDonough, Schuyler, Warren; CENTRAL: De Witt, Logan, McLean, Macon, Marshall, Mason, Menard, Peoria, Stark, Tazewell, Woodford; EAST: Champaign, Ford, Iroquois, Kankakee, Livingston, Piatt, Vermilion; WEST SOUTHWEST: Bond, Calhoun, Cass, Christian, Greene, Jersey, Macoupin, Madison, Montgomery, Morgan, Pike, Sangamon, Scott; EAST SOUTHEAST: Clark, Clay, Coles, Crawford, Cumberland, Douglas, Edgar, Effingham, Fayette, Jasper, Lawrence, Marion, Moultrie, Richland, Shelby; SOUTHWEST: Alexander, Clinton, Jackson, Johnson, Monroe, Perry, Pulaski, Randolph, St. Clair, Union, Washington, Williamson; SOUTHEAST: Edwards, Franklin, Gallatin, Hamilton, Hardin, Jefferson, Massac, Pope, Saline, Wabash, Wayne, White.

# Prepared by

#### David K. Wilson

Information Technology and Communication Services
College of Agricultural, Consumer and Environmental Sciences
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
1401 S. Maryland Drive
Urbana, Illinois 61801

217/244-5171 FAX 217/333-0005

## Dwight Raab

Extension Specialist, Farm Management, Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics assisted in preparing these materials and his help is sincerely appreciated.

 $Information\ Technology\ and\ Communication\ Services\ (ITCS)\ provides\ equal\ opportunities\ in\ programs\ and\ employment.$ 

BAJ