

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

Program # 6

1. Name of the Planned Program

Natural Resources and Quality of Life

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
101	Appraisal of Soil Resources			6%	
102	Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships			15%	
104	Protect Soil from Harmful Effects of Natural Elements			1%	
111	Conservation and Efficient Use of Water			5%	
112	Watershed Protection and Management			8%	
123	Management and Sustainability of Forest Resources			1%	
133	Pollution Prevention and Mitigation			5%	
134	Outdoor Recreation			1%	
135	Aquatic and Terrestrial Wildlife			21%	
605	Natural Resource and Environmental Economics			6%	
608	Community Resource Planning and Development			7%	
801	Individual and Family Resource Management			7%	
802	Human Development and Family Well-Being			4%	
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families, and Communities			10%	
805	Community Institutions, Health, and Social Services			3%	
	Total			100%	

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

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

Year: 2010	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	0.0	0.0	16.0	0.0
Actual	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0

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

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c	1890 Extension	Hatch	Evans-Allen
0	0	826468	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
0	0	826468	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
0	0	8492525	0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

Basic and applied research was conducted to address underlying principles related to natural resources and to assist in the implementation of efficient, effective management actions to conserve natural resources and ensure the sustainable use of those resources. Research was also conducted in human environmental science to address quality of life issues, such as family finance. Research findings were disseminated via appropriate scientific publications, conferences, workshops, trainings, etc.

2. Brief description of the target audience

Researchers, scientists, extension specialists, conservation managers, policy makers, community leaders.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

2010	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Plan	0	0	0	0
Actual	0	0	0	0

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

Patent Applications Submitted

Year: 2010
 Plan: 0
 Actual: 0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

2010	Extension	Research	Total
Plan	0	90	
Actual	0	102	0

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

- Number of peer reviewed journal articles

Year	Target	Actual
2010	60	57

Output #2

Output Measure

- Number of other peer reviewed publications (book chapters, proceedings, abstracts, etc).

Year	Target	Actual
2010	30	41

Output #3

Output Measure

- Number of invited papers and invited presentations

Year	Target	Actual
2010	30	49

Output #4

Output Measure

- Number of graduate degrees awarded

Year	Target	Actual
2010	20	15

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O. No.	OUTCOME NAME
1	Research results will improve understanding of management and conservation of natural resources - including water, soil, forests and wildlife. Research will also lead to an improved understanding of the natural environment, ecosystems, weather and climate.
2	Research efforts will result in new knowlege that will lead to improved management of natural resources and quality of life in human environments.

Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

Research results will improve understanding of management and conservation of natural resources - including water, soil, forests and wildlife. Research will also lead to an improved understanding of the natural environment, ecosystems, weather and climate.

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #2

1. Outcome Measures

Research efforts will result in new knowledge that will lead to improved management of natural resources and quality of life in human environments.

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Research

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Knowledge Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
2010	{No Data Entered}	0

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

Fueled by high unemployment rates brought on by economic recession, hunger in America has become a major issue. It is estimated that more than 50 million Americans, including 17 million children, were "food insecure" in 2009. Keeping track of the severity, scope, and location of the problem is key to combating hunger.

What has been done

To be treated effectively, hunger must be identified at the local level. Faculty at the University of Missouri have collaborated to produce the Missouri Hunger Atlas 2010. At the county level, this report documents the breadth and extent of hunger need, and the performance of public and private programs in meeting that need.

Results

This report will help public officials identify the best places to target their efforts, identify those agencies that are successful in their missions, and bring more awareness to the hunger issue. The Missouri Hunger Atlas is the only tool in the country studying the problem at a local level throughout the state.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
608	Community Resource Planning and Development
805	Community Institutions, Health, and Social Services

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programmatic Challenges

Brief Explanation

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

1. Evaluation Studies Planned

- During (during program)

Evaluation Results

Individual faculty were reviewed by their respective Division Directors. Faculty submitted their research goals and accomplishments. Besides evaluating individual progress, the Division Directors reviewed research progress and accomplishments in the context of the planned program. Results show continued progress in both basic and applied research.

Points of evaluation included the following:

Research focus: Was it relevant and consistent with the objectives of the planned program?

Successful scholarship: Were research results conveyed through peer reviewed publications?

Successful grantsmanship: Was the research quality high enough to successfully compete for external grant funds?

Key Items of Evaluation