

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

Program # 16

1. Name of the Planned Program

Sustainable Energy - Environmental Family and Youth Issues

Reporting on this Program

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
403	Waste Disposal, Recycling, and Reuse	45%		0%	
804	Human Environmental Issues Concerning Apparel, Textiles, and Residential and Commercial Structures	55%		0%	
	Total	100%		0%	

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

1. Actual amount of FTE/SYs expended this Program

Year: 2013	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actual Paid Professional	6.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actual Volunteer	0.5	0.0	0.0	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
45000	0	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
45000	0	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
230000	0	0	0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

Development and introduction of new curricula

- Outreach to families, schools, child care providers, direct assistance, demonstrations, and educational opportunities to food, healthy, eating, exercise, diet, etc.
- Development of surveys, evaluation tools
- Delivery through classes, One-on-One, News Releases/TV/Radio, Participation in Events, Displays
- Provided training and other staff development opportunities to county educators

2. Brief description of the target audience

Homeowners, youth, adults, families, community leaders

3. How was eXtension used?

eXtension is provided as an educator resource.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

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

Patent Applications Submitted

Year: 2013
 Actual: 0

Patents listed

3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

2013	Extension	Research	Total
Actual	2	0	2

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

- Number of OSU Facts published

Year	Actual
2013	2

Output #2

Output Measure

- Number of other publications including but not limited to Bulletins, Technical Manuals, Reports as well as PowerPoint presentation and Spreadsheets, etc. distributed for use by others

Year	Actual
2013	0

Output #3

Output Measure

- Number of in-service training sessions

Year	Actual
2013	4

Output #4

Output Measure

- Number of certification Training sessions

Year	Actual
2013	0

Output #5

Output Measure

- Number of other training sessions, workshops, etc. conducted

Year	Actual
2013	3

Output #6

Output Measure

- Number of presentations at Extension organized meetings

Year	Actual
-------------	---------------

2013 2

Output #7

Output Measure

- Number of presentations at other meetings and events (professional meetings, invitations to speak to community groups, etc.)

Year	Actual
2013	2

Output #8

Output Measure

- Number of workshops, conferences, etc. organized

Year	Actual
2013	0

Output #9

Output Measure

- Number of posters or displays

Year	Actual
2013	0

Output #10

Output Measure

- Number of other demonstrations, displays, exhibits, and models

Year	Actual
2013	0

Output #11

Output Measure

- Number of newsletters

Year	Actual
2013	0

Output #12

Output Measure

- Number of website hits

Year	Actual
2013	0

Output #13

Output Measure

- Number of radio and television presentations

Year	Actual
2013	0

Output #14

Output Measure

- Number of newspaper, and magazine articles written

Year	Actual
2013	0

Output #15

Output Measure

- Average number of phone calls and/or email requests responded to on a weekly basis

Year	Actual
2013	0

Output #16

Output Measure

- Number of websites

Year	Actual
2013	0

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

V. State Defined Outcomes Table of Content

O. No.	OUTCOME NAME
1	Percentage increase in composting, donation of goods for others to use, repurpose, and recycle
2	Percentage increase in energy efficiency
3	Percentage decrease in food and packaging waste and use of disposable products
4	Percentage increase in maintenance, conservation, and protection of natural resources (air, land, water)
5	Percentage increase in communities that establish or continue collection points/times for recycling or reuse of consumer and agriculture goods

Outcome #1

1. Outcome Measures

Percentage increase in composting, donation of goods for others to use, repurpose, and recycle

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Actual
2013	0

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

Oklahoma ranks 11th in the nation in total energy consumption per capita. The average American produces 4.4 pounds of garbage every day, but only recycles 1.5 pounds of that waste. Just over 50% of Oklahoma households have access to recycling programs.

What has been done

Abuse of the state's natural resources can have far-reaching and long-lasting consequences for Oklahoma's economy and the well being of its citizens. In order to advance the socio-economic development of the state, educational programs have been created and implemented to educate Oklahomans on how to be better stewards of the environment.

Results

In 2013 363 individuals attended educational programs which taught them how to decrease food and packaging waste, reuse disposable products and packaging, and turn items that would have been otherwise thrown away into useful items.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code	Knowledge Area
403	Waste Disposal, Recycling, and Reuse

Outcome #2

1. Outcome Measures

Percentage increase in energy efficiency

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #3

1. Outcome Measures

Percentage decrease in food and packaging waste and use of disposable products

2. Associated Institution Types

- 1862 Extension

3a. Outcome Type:

Change in Action Outcome Measure

3b. Quantitative Outcome

Year	Actual
2013	0

3c. Qualitative Outcome or Impact Statement

Issue (Who cares and Why)

Oklahoma ranks 11th in the nation in total energy consumption per capita. The average American produces 4.4 pounds of garbage every day, but only recycles 1.5 pounds of that waste. Just over 50% of Oklahoma households have access to recycling programs.

What has been done

Abuse of the state's natural resources can have far-reaching and long-lasting consequences for Oklahoma's economy and the well being of its citizens. In order to advance the socio-economic development of the state, educational programs have been created and implemented to educate Oklahomans on how to be better stewards of the environment.

Results

In 2013 363 individuals attended educational programs which taught them how to decrease food and packaging waste, reuse disposable products and packaging, and turn items that would have been otherwise thrown away into useful items.

4. Associated Knowledge Areas

KA Code **Knowledge Area**
403 Waste Disposal, Recycling, and Reuse

Outcome #4

1. Outcome Measures

Percentage increase in maintenance, conservation, and protection of natural resources (air, land, water)

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

Outcome #5

1. Outcome Measures

Percentage increase in communities that establish or continue collection points/times for recycling or reuse of consumer and agriculture goods

Not Reporting on this Outcome Measure

V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)

External factors which affected outcomes

- Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)
- Economy
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities

Brief Explanation

Statewide issue team format has changed educator focus and reduced activity in some planned programs

V(I). Planned Program (Evaluation Studies)

Evaluation Results

In 2013 educators were still adapting to the new evaluation and reporting process, resulting in no formal evaluation data for this program.

Key Items of Evaluation

In 2013, Issue Team-specific Evaluation Questionnaires were collected after planned program curriculum delivery. These questions utilized a retrospective approach.