Community Resource and Economic Development

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

1. Name of the Planned Program
Community Resource and Economic Development

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
<th>% 1862 Extension</th>
<th>% 1890 Extension</th>
<th>% 1862 Research</th>
<th>% 1890 Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Community Resource Planning and Development</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of professional FTE/SYs expended this Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year: 2007</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Actual dollars expended in this Program (includes Carryover Funds from previous years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Lever 3b &amp; 3c</td>
<td>1890 Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331787</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862 Matching</td>
<td>1890 Matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331787</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862 All Other</td>
<td>1890 All Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1160000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity
Strategic planning training and strategic planning for comunities, infrastructure planning, community service plans, medical facilities and services planning, training of county elected officials, engineering and manufacturing consulting, community economic development studies, community leadership and agricultural leadership development, and entrepreneurship training and development.

2. Brief description of the target audience
The target audience includes community leaders (volunteer and elected), agricultural leadership participants and alums, and business owners/prospective owners, hospitals, schools, chambers of commerce, other agencies
V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

Target for the number of persons (contacts) reached through direct and indirect contact methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Direct Contacts Adults</th>
<th>Indirect Contacts Adults</th>
<th>Direct Contacts Youth</th>
<th>Indirect Contacts Youth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>5650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>39248</td>
<td>1833913</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Number of Patent Applications Submitted (Standard Research Output)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Extension</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target
Output #1

Output Measure
- Number of community services plans completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output #2

Output Measure
- Number of education modules completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output #3

Output Measure
- Number of county officer training courses conducted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Output #4

Output Measure
- Number of manufacturing firms receiving applications engineering assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V(G). State Defined Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O No.</th>
<th>Outcome Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number improving business skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of manufacturing jobs created or retained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of communities where capacity was increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of participants that plan to open/expand a business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Number of communities that build plans for growth and/or improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Number of leadership class graduates actively participating in community or industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures
   Number improving business skills

2. Associated Institution Types
   • 1862 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:
   Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantitative Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement
   Issue (Who cares and Why)
   The number of people working at home grows annually by 5-10% (Link Resources, 1995). One reason for this is the economic situation (OCES, 1989, 1994). In Oklahoma, those economic reasons develop from our ranking of 40th in individual per capita income and 9th in the number of people at or below poverty (2002 Statistical Abstract). Other reasons are: lifestyle changes, increased family time, being one's own boss, and entrepreneurship.

   What has been done

   Results
   Based on previous work, in the last 5 years 30 new food-based businesses have started after participating in Basic Training. Studies show 28% of respondents started a business after attending a workshop. With an average income, this means over $1,500,000 annually will be added to local Oklahoma economies. An owner's start-up guide, Putting It All Together, has been provided to over 400 Oklahoma entrepreneurs and also to 15 other states. It has been rated as an excellent resource by over 90% of survey respondents. Food Business Basics, a start-up guide, has been developed and provided to more than 1500 aspiring entrepreneurs including all participants in the Food & Agriculture Products Center, Basic Training, classes.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Community Resource Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome #2

1. Outcome Measures
   Number of manufacturing jobs created or retained

2. Associated Institution Types
   • 1862 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:
   Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantitative Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement
   Issue (Who cares and Why)
Of the over 5000 manufacturers in Oklahoma, approximately half are located in rural areas and are extremely important to their local economies. The loss or downsizing of even one of these wealth-generating small or mid-sized companies can have devastating consequences for the host and surrounding communities. These rural firms face particular difficulty in getting relevant and usable information and technical assistance that will keep them abreast of the rapid changes in manufacturing technology.

What has been done

To address the difficulties faced by our small rural manufacturers, the College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology and the Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources at Oklahoma State University work in partnership to provide technical assistance through the Applications Engineering program. Since 1997, Applications Engineers have been deployed in the state in collaboration with the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service and the Oklahoma Manufacturing Alliance to provide on-site engineering assistance.

In order to receive engineering assistance the client must agree to a post-project impact assessment. This impact assessment is done using procedures developed by the National Institute for Standards and Technology for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. The client is contacted some months after the completion of an activity and is asked a series of questions designed to assess the impact of the effort.

Results

The impact of this program is measured in several ways. One is the economic value of the service to the company as reported by the client. Another measure is the number of jobs created or retained. Both impacts are measured by an independent survey of the client. Number of jobs created or retained is translated into economic impact using an income multiplier to compute the direct, indirect, and induced effects due to a change in the number of jobs in the manufacturing sector.

The multiplier was developed from data collected from two different sources. First, the average salary for manufacturing in Oklahoma ($34,323) was taken from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics published information for 2001. Secondly, the income multiplier of 2.2 was obtained from IMPLAN data for Oklahoma. The total economic impact can be computed by multiplying the average annual salary times the income multiplier to arrive at $75,511 for each new or retained job in the manufacturing sector.

In 2007, the Applications Engineers client projects had the following impacts:

Sales increase $87,325,002
Sales retained (otherwise been lost) $19,057,500
Cost savings $8,590,919
Costs avoided $13,643,600
268 new jobs created at $75,511 per job $20,236,948
306 jobs retained at $75,511 per job $23,106,366
4 jobs lost at $75,511 per job -$302,044
Investment in new plant facilities and equipment $16,403,940
Total impact $188,062,231

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Community Resource Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome #3

1. Outcome Measures
   Number of communities where capacity was increased

2. Associated Institution Types
   • 1862 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:
   Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantitative Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement
Community Resource and Economic Development

Issue (Who cares and Why)

Stories abound of angry, frustrated citizens who feel they have little power to influence important public decisions affecting their lives. This frustration is often characterized as apathy with little effort made to look deeper at the desire of regular people to express their views on public issues but believe they do not have a venue to do so.

New county government officials are elected regularly and new employees hired often. By state law some need to receive training and others in order to do their job better.

What has been done

Deliberative forums provide a safe, non-partisan venue for Oklahomans to struggle with challenging public issues. These deliberations are based on the idea that in a democracy citizens have the responsibility to get together to talk through their common concerns, weigh possible alternative actions to address these problems, and inform policy makers and other community leaders about the desired direction for public action. Public deliberation provides a means by which Oklahomans make choices about the basic purpose and direction for their communities and county. As conveners, moderators, and recorders/reporters of deliberative forums, Extension professionals and other community leaders perform a non-biased, non-advocacy role in engaging Oklahomans in building community.

Also, 76 training classes were offered for county officials and their to learn a broad variety of mandatory subjects and elective subjects.

Results

Oklahoma Partnership for Public Deliberation (OPPD) has sustained continuous operation, pursuing its mission to foster participation in reasoned and informed decision making for the public good. The OPPD has conducted eleven Moderators & Recorders Academies (OMRA) to prepare approximately 225 Oklahomans to convene, moderate, record and report deliberative forums and study circles. These persons are prepared to give leadership to deliberative forums. To date, nearly 250 public forums have been conducted in Oklahoma on a wide range of topics.

Each year, the OPPD conducts 25-30 deliberative forums involving 1200-1400 people. Based on a joint study conducted by Oklahoma Cooperative Extension and Missouri Outreach and Extension in 2001, the following impacts are projected for Oklahoma forum participants:

- Contact made with office holders (62%)
- Community taskforce/study group was organized to address the issue (42%)
- Issue is now on the table, in the community (38%)
- Participants began to network with others on the issue (52%)

County government officers and/or employees from all seventy-seven counties attended one or more short-courses, one to two days in length. (Total attendance over 1,800.) Newly elected officials and newly hired employees find these short-courses to be of critical importance because they learn day to day county government duties. A good example is the Purchasing Procedures short-course. Purchasing agents are required by law to have the training. All other county officials benefit by avoiding illegal purchasing activity and avoiding conflict between requisitioning officers and the purchasing agent.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Community Resource Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome #4

1. Outcome Measures

   Number of participants that plan to open/expand a business

2. Associated Institution Types

   - 1862 Extension
3a. Outcome Type:
Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantitative Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)
Small businesses in rural areas tend to struggle to establish a market presence and compete in today's economy.

What has been done
The Oklahoma State University e-commerce program (established in mid-2007) has provided training to over 40 small businesses on how to plan, effectively set up, and promote their websites, which can help address these issues.

Results
Prior to the training, 49% indicated that they had a website. 80% of the respondents indicated that the website planning was very useful for their business, while 76% found the information on website promotion very useful. After the training, 92% of respondents planned on either developing a website or altering their current site.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Community Resource Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome #5

1. Outcome Measures
Number of communities that build plans for growth and/or improvement

2. Associated Institution Types
• 1862 Extension
• 1862 Research

3a. Outcome Type:
Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantitative Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)
The health sector is an often underappreciated component of many rural economies, typically accounting for between 10 – 20% of all jobs and income. This sector has had considerable difficulty remaining viable in traditional systems in rural areas. Thus many rural areas are subject to loss of facilities and services.

What has been done
The purpose of the Community Health Engagement Program is to actively engage community residents in health care decision making by showing them the importance of the health sector to their local economy. Options to upgrade health services are explored by using local surveys and budgets to assess feasibility.

Results
In 2007, 10 communities went through this process, and several made the decision to upgrade their services. A new physicians clinic was opened in Blanchard, Oklahoma; and the hospital in Hugo, Oklahoma decided that attempting to pass a city-level sales tax was the best way to fund future improvements. Several other communities are currently undergoing the process and may be implementing additional health services in the future.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Community Resource Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome #6**

1. **Outcome Measures**
   Number of leadership class graduates actively participating in community or industry

2. **Associated Institution Types**
   • 1862 Extension

3a. **Outcome Type:**
   Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. **Quantitative Outcome**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Quantitative Target</th>
<th>Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3c. **Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement**

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

Enabled and well informed leadership has been shown to be one of the key factors to successful transition and sustainability of rural communities. Oklahoma's communities face challenges on several fronts. These challenges often include shifting populations, competition for economic development, and inadequate infrastructure and community services to support economic development and population changes. There is also concern about the short supply of community leaders prepared to meet those challenges. The development of local community leaders has been identified and emphasized on the state and national level. One Oklahoma study identified the need to provide opportunities at the local level to develop community leaders and assist with community improvement.

**What has been done**

Extension Family & Consumer Sciences programs has supported community leadership development through curriculum, educational sessions and consulting. From 1987 – 2002, the Family Community Leadership Program taught leadership to community teams working to address local issues, training about 200 persons in approximately 30 counties. The concept of team learning and collaboration was applied to the Initiative for the Future of Rural Oklahoma (Initiative), launched in 2002 by an interdisciplinary team including the departments of Agricultural Economics, Human Development & Family Science, and Design, Housing & Merchandising. The effort included 13 projects encompassing 17 counties and features educational programming in two areas: Leadership Development (addressed here) and Economic Development. The purpose of the Initiative was to enhance and develop the effectiveness of community leaders and county Extension Educators to identify and address critical issues confronting the community, especially those relating to leadership and community development. The current Developing Effective Leaders Program supports numerous county-Extension-based leadership programs in Oklahoma.

The Leadership Development program area is grounded in the concept of local management and implementation. The curriculum includes a menu of leadership topics prepared in modules for use at the local level.

The Oklahoma Agricultural Leadership Program provides selected individuals with two-year training in leadership development.

**Results**
Through the Initiative, a variety of leadership strategies and skills were development and used to address community needs including:
- Creation of strong, enduring multi-county/multi-community leadership teams
- Development of mission statements for community leadership teams
- Utilization of citizen engagement approaches
  - Surveys
  - Deliberative Forums
- Involving youth to plan and conduct community development projects
- Creation and implementation of strategic plans
- Seeking additional resources through grantsmanship
- Learning more about other communities by conducting study tours

A variety of community development projects were implemented. Examples included the following:
- Community-wide tourism project
- Community pride programs
- Shop-at-home program
- Airport improvement project
- Building sidewalks
- Main Street improvement
- Visual merchandising seminars
- Community marketing video
- County sister-city program
  - Primary care facility
  - Home-based and small business assistance projects
- County-wide economic development team
- Economic and community development conference
- Community economic development resource binder
- Community beautification through fire training
- County-wide high-speed internet access
- First-ever community-wide long-range plan
- County-wide clean-up and beautification
- Business development/expansion project
- Value-added merchandising

OALP is making a difference, as several alums serve in major leadership positions at local, state, and national levels.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KA Code</th>
<th>Knowledge Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>608</td>
<td>Community Resource Planning and Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes
- Competing Public priorities

Brief Explanation

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies and Data Collection)

1. Evaluation Studies Planned
- After Only (post program)
- Retrospective (post program)
- Before-After (before and after program)
- Case Study

Evaluation Results
(No Data Entered)

Key Items of Evaluation
(No Data Entered)