

# 2007 Oklahoma State University Combined Research and Extension Plan of Work

## Brief Summary about Plan of Work

This plan of work is a joint plan for the Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station (OAES) and the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) – entities of the Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources at Oklahoma State University. Oklahoma contains a broad array of natural resources, agricultural production regions, commodities produced, communities, families, businesses, and industries. Vast forage production areas, the ability to graze winter wheat, and the sub climate of the high plains have made cattle production an enormous industry in Oklahoma. Wheat, poultry, hay for sale, cotton, nursery crops, forest products, nuts and vegetables all play an important role in the broad agricultural economy. Rapidly changing communities ranging in population from those defined as frontier-like to thriving cities also exist within the state's boundaries. High levels of unemployment and low incomes plague portions of the state. Human health issues are major economic and social concerns as Oklahoma often ranks high in risk factors and diseases such as heart disease and diabetes. The level of value added to raw products in the state is low and needs to improve to continue to help diversify rural economies. Considerable untapped opportunity exists for the improved use of natural resources for recreation and the development of bio-based industries. Oklahoma does not sit in a vacuum. Issues, challenges, and opportunities with respect to agricultural production, the environment and natural resources, communities and markets, scientific discovery, and technology development exist with Oklahoma's neighbor states, within the region and nation.

The OAES and OCES missions provide direction to address all of the issues, challenges and opportunities related to the areas discussed above. As part of the Land Grant System, the OAES and OCES provide a continuum from the generation of knowledge and technologies to the transfer of the knowledge and technologies and their practical applications to the final users. The OAES deals with research problems and needs that are identified throughout the agricultural, food and natural resource systems and within the scientific community. OCES concentrates on the delivery of research-based education, technology, and information for agricultural producers, food and agricultural businesses, families and youth, and communities. Much of the needs assessment occurs at the grassroots level through the OCES, as well as, through industry, commodity groups, community organizations, advisory boards, professional associations, agencies and governmental entities. Most of the issues and challenges identified are diverse and complex. In recognition of this reality, the OAES and OCES have organized much of their efforts into multi-disciplinary, issued-based teams. In addition, most teams have members representing research and extension programming efforts. The programming presented in this plan of work was largely developed by many of these teams.

This plan of work represents only a portion of the total effort of the OAES and OCES. However, it does represent the breadth of work to be done and addresses many of the high priority issues identified by stakeholders. Just as the teams are integrated from a research and extension standpoint and among disciplines they are integrated with respect to funding sources. This plan includes more effort than that which could be accomplished by the federal appropriations and the required match alone. Each program is likely to employ federal funding, state and/or local funding as well as grant and contract resources.

The overall goal of this plan developed by the OAES and OCES is to use scientific knowledge and related technologies and information to help Oklahoma (as well as the region and nation) use its agricultural, natural resource, and human base to foster economic development, improve the environment and its management, and the quality of life of its citizens. The impacts of these efforts include economically successful and competitive agricultural and natural resource producers, an adequate supply of healthy food, a healthy and well-nourished population, a balanced and thriving ecosystem with

environmentally-sustainable industries, and enhanced economic opportunity and quality of life for all of Oklahoma's residents.

**Estimated number of professional FTEs/SYs to be budgeted for this plan.**

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	159.0	0.0	55.0	0.0
2008	162.0	0.0	60.0	0.0
2009	165.0	0.0	63.0	0.0
2010	164.0	0.0	65.0	0.0
2011	163.0	0.0	66.0	0.0

**Merit Review Process**

**The merit review process that will be employed during the 5-Year Plan of Work cycle**

- Internal University Panel
- Combined External and Internal University Panel
- Expert Peer Review
- Administrative Review

**Brief explanation**

All Experiment Station projects, whether supported by Hatch or McIntire-Stennis funds, are peer reviewed prior to submission. This includes the Special Grants. It should be noted that stakeholder input into the planning process, position priorities, and research areas to be pursued by the scientists could be considered as the initial step in the review process. This valuable input helps in the merit and relevancy of our projects; it is a continual practice during the decision process to fill new positions, and direct research efforts and approaches to high priority needs.

Each department in OAES is required to have three reviews for a project (selected by the appropriate Department Head), with one of those reviews being external to the department. In those cases, this will be from another department in the Division, from another College at OSU, or another state with expertise in the area. These reviews are approved at both the departmental and OAES Directorate levels before submission to CSREES. The principal investigator is required to respond to the comments provided by the reviewers before final approval is granted. Most departments utilize the attached checklist.

All OAES/OCES teams are required to have a team plan of work which is reviewed by team members, the administrative leaders, and the appropriate OAES/OCES assistant and associate directors. All team plans of work are reviewed with respect to relevance, the Division Strategic Plan, stakeholder input, and team competitive advantage. All individual OCES plans of work (5-year and annual) developed by county, area, district and state program professionals are reviewed in reference to quality and relevance by at least two individuals with program and/or administrative responsibility pertinent to the individual's program area. The reviewers assess the merit of the program plans of work with respect to issues, needs, and problems identified through stakeholder input, quantity of effort planned in relation to appointment, and plans to evaluate and report program quality and impact. County Educator plans are reviewed by the appropriate district subject matter specialist, district director, and state program leader (when appropriate). Area and district specialist plans are reviewed by the district director, the subject matter department head, and appropriate assistant director/state program leader. State specialist plans are reviewed by the appropriate department head and the appropriate assistant director/state program leader.

## Evaluation of Multis & Joint Activities

### 1. How will the planned programs address the critical issues of strategic importance, including those identified by the stakeholders?

The planned programs are based on input from stakeholder groups (see stakeholder sections), staff, and scientists who identified high priority issues. Some are programs that are long-term and enduring in nature and others may be relatively new and directed at recently identified priorities. CSREES and Oklahoma State University strategic plans as well as state and federal legislative initiatives play a roll in which priority issues can and will be addressed. In many cases, stakeholders are involved in the implementation of applied research efforts and educational/demonstration activities. Numerous stakeholder groups provide funding to help undertake high priority programming on issues deemed to have strategic importance to those stakeholders.

### 2. How will the planned programs address the needs of under-served and under-represented populations of the State(s)?

In general all research programs serve to train a multicultural group of graduate students. In addition, the Division is in the process of developing a new diversity plan that will require all teams and units to seek means and methods to be more inclusive of diverse personnel and audiences. Some examples of the types of special efforts afforded by planned programs follow.

The Farm and Agribusiness Management program will work closely with the Oklahoma JumpStart Coalition for Personal Financial Literacy which allows it to more effectively reach underserved youth populations with financial education. In addition, this program team works closely with the E (Kika) de la Garza Institute for Goat Research at Langston University (1890 Institution) which permits both entities to better reach a significant underserved populations of agricultural producers (including African American and Hispanics) in the goat production and marketing arena. Finally, this group has a longstanding effort to improve the education opportunities specifically directed at women involved and interested in agriculture.

The Agricultural Biosecurity program involves numerous non-traditional stakeholder groups. Through these efforts many underserved audiences will be contacted and provided an opportunity to participate in program activities.

The Integrated Pest Management program team often works closely with many of the tribal (Native American) environmental specialists in conducting program activities and providing input on tribal land usage and pest programs. This team also has opportunity to reach many Hispanics through some of its work with applicator training.

The Community Resource and Economic Development program has the opportunity to reach underserved populations on a regular basis. For example the rural service and infrastructure activities often provide the most help for underserved populations. Rural medical and health facilities retention and expansion is a primary example of this. This program team often works with Langston University (rural development roundtable) to find ways to reach a broader audience. Most of the rural economic development programs have a positive effect on income levels in otherwise lower-income areas. This program worked closely with the Greenwood District (a traditional African-American district) in Tulsa on numerous development projects. In addition, this team worked closely with the city of Guymon on housing, medical facilities and other services with a large population change (Hispanic).

The Oklahoma 4-H Youth Development program typically reaches over 500,000 participants per year with between 23% and 26% of the participants comprised of non-white audiences. We expect the youth program activities outlined in this plan of work will have similar success in reaching underserved populations in the state.

The Family Resiliency and Economic Well-Being and Human Nutrition and Health program has a long history of reaching large numbers of low-income, under-served and minority audiences. Through nutrition activities, activities with the courts and prisons, activities with low income populations, welfare and related program participants, etc. this program team reaches tens of thousands of individuals from underserved groups every year. We expect the program activities will continue to reach these audiences.

The Plant Biological Technologies program and the Structure and Function of Macromolecules program teams both are heavily involved in undergraduate research training and mentoring programs. This program typically has special grants to involve minority students in research. These undergraduate research training programs have typically concentrated on African American students and Native American students.

### 3. How will the planned programs describe the expected outcomes and impacts?

The planned program teams developed outcomes that they project to occur in relation to the program activities. It is projected that many of these outcomes will occur during the plan period, however it is very likely that many of the programs will have resultant outcomes that occur beyond the plan period, often well beyond. In addition, it is likely that many other outcomes will occur because of the planned programs. The teams will hope to also capture a measure of some of these outcomes as well. Teams will be careful to try to establish base levels to do a better job in estimating the outcomes and impacts of programs. Most outcomes will have impacts of some nature. When feasible and reasonable, the teams will attempt to capture meaningful measures of the impact of the outcomes. Teams are expected to document progress relative to projected outcomes, and impact when appropriate.

### 4. How will the planned programs result in improved program effectiveness and/or efficiency?

In the Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources at Oklahoma State University, planning (strategic and program) is critical in the development of faculty and staff and the direction of their efforts. Because these programs are strongly guided by the input from stakeholders and the publics served by the Division, historically the programs of the Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station (OAES) and the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) have proven very effective in serving the state, region and nation. The planned programs outlined in this plan of work are expected to continue that success in meeting the recognized needs of producers, families, communities, entrepreneurs, businesses, governments, and science and technology. The OAES and OCES believe strongly in the need to develop and support multidisciplinary teams to provide the knowledge discovery, technology development and education and information delivery necessary to meet the issues facing Oklahoma and the nation. Most of the teams have members with responsibilities in research and team members with responsibilities in extension, as well as many with joint appointments. In addition, most of the teams have members with state-level responsibilities as well as those with area and county responsibilities. Special opportunities will be afforded the teams to develop high priority funding needs within the Division to receive additional support to undertake the programs outlined in the planned programs. Many of these programs have already received funding through the first round of the Division's Targeted Initiative Program (TIP). This special funding allows the Division to specifically target some of its maintenance funds to increase the effectiveness of these team efforts. This team concept will allow OAES and OCES to continue to serve the publics and identified stakeholders in an efficient and effective manner into the future.

## Stakeholder Input

### 1. Actions taken to seek stakeholder input that encourages their participation (Check all that apply)

- Use of media to announce public meetings and listening sessions
- Targeted invitation to traditional stakeholder groups
- Targeted invitation to non-traditional stakeholder groups
- Targeted invitation to traditional stakeholder individuals
- Targeted invitation to non-traditional stakeholder individuals
- Targeted invitation to selected individuals from general public
- Survey of traditional stakeholder groups
- Survey of traditional stakeholder individuals
- Survey of the general public
- Survey specifically with non-traditional individuals
- Survey of selected individuals from the general public
- Other

**Brief explanation.**

Collecting, analyzing, and communicating stakeholder input is a continuous and broad-based process within the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service (OCES) and the Oklahoma Agricultural Experiment Station (OAES). In this process, a variety of strategies and techniques are used to seek stakeholder input and encourage participation. The Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (DASNR) has a broad-based advisory council representing industry, agencies and communities. In addition, all the DASNR units have one or more advisory committees. OAES and OCES use OSU and DASNR media resources to seek input from traditional and new stakeholders. Other strategies may include: attending meetings with commodity groups such as Ok Wheat Growers Assoc., Ok Wheat Commission, Ok Peanut Commission, Ok Hay and Seed Assoc., Ok Greenhouse Growers, Ok Nursery and Landscape Assoc., Texas-Oklahoma Cotton Working Group, Ok Vegetable Assoc., Oklahoma-Texas Watermelon Association, Ok Turfgrass Research Foundation, Ok Wheat Research Foundation, Ok Golf Course Superintendents Assoc., Ok Crop Improvement Assoc., Turfgrass Producers International, Ok Home and Community Education Assoc., Ok Grain and Feed Assoc., Grain Elevators and Processors Society, Ok Grape Growers and Winemakers Assoc., Ok Pecan Growers Assoc., Ok Cattlemans Assoc., Beef Industry Conference Advisory Committee, Ok Beef Industry Council; feedback from grantors; advisory committees and boards, feedback at professional meetings; grower contacts; meeting with food industry HACCP roundtable; attending regional research and extension committees; feedback on journal manuscript submissions, feedback on grant proposals, RFPs for grants; attending scientific society meetings; and direct contacts with producers, growers, processors, manufacturers, community leaders. Seeking stakeholder input will also include targeting agencies, governmental and non-governmental entities such as: Ok Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry, Ok Council on Economic Education, Ok Bankers Association, Federal Reserve Bank, Noble Foundation, Kerr Center for Sustainable Agriculture, Consumer Credit Counseling Services, Ok Department of Human Development and Family Services, Ok Agricultural Statistical Services.

Following are some recent examples of other efforts. The Community and Rural Economic Development team was very involved in the statewide Rural Economic Development Initiative (REDI) which asked for county-level input directly from businesses, entrepreneurs and potential entrepreneurs regarding economic and business development needs. In addition, a statewide rural entrepreneurship listening session was held in cooperation with the Southern Rural Development Center.

The Human Nutrition and Health team purchased advertising inviting public to attend five regional human nutrition and health community forums around Oklahoma. This team also typically mails invitations to community forums to specific stakeholder group members and to targeted non-traditional groups, including Native Americans, African Americans, Hispanics, and pregnant and lactating women to participate in input sessions.

**2(A). A brief statement of the process that will be used by the recipient institution to identify individuals and groups stakeholders and to collect input from them**

**1. Method to identify individuals and groups**

- Use Advisory Committees
- Use Internal Focus Groups
- Use External Focus Groups
- Open Listening Sessions
- Needs Assessments
- Use Surveys

**Brief explanation.**

The OCES has a well-defined program advisory committee system that provides grass roots input for program planning. Once or twice a year, county extension staff seek input from program advisory committee (PAC) members on program needs related to OCES/OAES strategic program priority areas. Advisory committee members are selected to represent various geographic areas of each county. They are representative of agricultural interests, youth, families, community and government leaders, and the general public. Committee members also represent the ethnic diversity of the county, as well as different socioeconomic groups.

Priority issues identified by county PACs are compiled by District Extension Program Specialists. The District Specialists summarize the issues within each strategic program priority, and make them available to District Directors and the state office. District priority issues are reviewed and compiled at the state office and provided on the OCES website. These needs are given special attention in the development of individual plans of work. They also provide direction for major extension and research programs.

Another formal means of acquiring stakeholder input comes through the development and revision of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources strategic plan. In that process considerable effort is made to acquire input both internal and external to OSU and the Division's research and extension efforts. Drafts of the strategic plan are widely distributed with input coming directly to the VP Agricultural Programs.

Input on research directions from stakeholders is solicited through many ways in addition to the traditional communication with departments. Each department prepares its own strategic plan in concert with that of the Division. Faculty and staff input is actively sought in standing and ad hoc committees, and faculty teams may jointly prepare "white papers" on specific issues of concern. External stakeholder input is also received from many different sources. Information, review, listening and update sessions are held periodically with user groups to identify needs and share results of research. Each of these organizations is composed of members spanning the state's ethnic and socioeconomic groups. The OAES also initiates communication with under-served and/or under-represented citizens including Oklahoma's Native American nations, the African-American community, and other minority groups. Additionally, there is frequent interaction with commodity-based organizations, the Oklahoma Farmers' Union and the Oklahoma Farm Bureau. Other opportunities for face-to-face interactions with our constituents are provided at numerous field days and community programs.

OAES/OCES continue to seek input from agencies and associations that represent the state's businesses and communities, such as the Oklahoma Small Business Bureau. State agricultural representatives in the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture are in frequent communication, as are Oklahoma legislative and administrative groups and Federal agencies.

**2(B). A brief statement of the process that will be used by the recipient institution to identify individuals and groups stakeholders and to collect input from them**

**1. Methods for collecting Stakeholder Input**

- Meeting with traditional Stakeholder groups
- Survey of traditional Stakeholder groups
- Meeting with traditional Stakeholder individuals
- Survey of traditional Stakeholder individuals
- Meeting with the general public (open meeting advertised to all)
- Survey of the general public
- Meeting specifically with non-traditional groups
- Survey specifically with non-traditional groups
- Meeting specifically with non-traditional individuals
- Meeting with invited selected individuals from the general public
- Other

**Brief explanation**

See questions 1 and 2a.

**3. A statement of how the input will be considered**

- In the Budget Process
- To Identify Emerging Issues
- Redirect Extension Programs
- Redirect Research Programs
- In the Staff Hiring Process
- In the Action Plans
- To Set Priorities
- Other

**Brief explanation.**

Stakeholder input is considered in all of the above situations. It is very important in working with our state legislature in securing new recurring and special funding for the OCES and OAES. In addition, it plays a strong role in identifying the faculty and other professional position priorities in the hiring process. In addition to these tactical moves, it also can play a very large role in strategic changes. For example, stakeholder input was important in the development of a new Natural Resources Department within the Division. Grassroots stakeholder input is the driving force in development of county educator and area

specialist individual 5-year plans of work and annual planning efforts. Stakeholder input and the development of it is part of the extension field staff career ladder criteria. Many of our research programs and extension programs work closely with commodity groups and their related research/education foundations to develop a joint set of priorities for applied research and extension projects in the state. Specific listening opportunities and advisory groups often bring about significant programming changes such as a strong emphasis on research in wheat quality and performance or need for education in diet and nutrition. The Oklahoma extension service and agricultural experiment station have 31 active teams working on issues important to the people of Oklahoma, the region and the nation. Food processing and quality research is often strongly influenced by an advisory committee as well as the individual manufacturers and entrepreneurs with whom the Food and Agricultural Product Center works. Federal initiatives and grant opportunities also provide input that helps mold and direct some efforts.

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

Animal Enterprises

**2. Program knowledge areas**

- 305 Animal Physiological Processes 4 %
- 304 Animal Genome 4 %
- 303 Genetic Improvement of Animals 2 %
- 307 Animal Management Systems 35 %
- 315 Animal Welfare/Well-Being and Protection 5 %
- 306 Environmental Stress in Animals 2 %
- 311 Animal Diseases 15 %
- 302 Nutrient Utilization in Animals 5 %
- 121 Management of Range Resources 24 %
- 308 Improved Animal Products (Before Harvest) 4 %

**3. Program existence**

- Mature (More than five years)

**4. Program duration**

- Long-Term (More than five years)

**5. Brief summary about Planned Program**

Beef cattle and forage production and beef cattle receiving and feeding will encompass many of the production processes around the beef production industry in Oklahoma. Animal health, performance, and product quality and the underlying mechanisms influencing growth and development of beef cattle will be high priority. Continue research to help identify the biological links that exist between animal morbidity, reduced performance, and meat quality as well as nutrition and physiological issues. The interaction of forages in the cow-calf segment of the industry will also be a priority. Electronic identification, traceability, and data management will also be a significant program area along with improving management through programs such as MasterCattleman and grazing systems.

**6. Situation and priorities**

Cattle and forage production represent the largest segment of Oklahoma's rural and agricultural economy. These enterprises face difficulties because of the internal and external changes faced by managers including commodity prices, fuel, fertilizer and input prices, domestic policies, globalization, environmental issues and regulations, labor issues and regulations, intergenerational transfer, tax issues, rural-urban fringe pressures, transportation issues, bio-security and information technology.

With demand for higher quality products and an increase in value-based marketing, beef producers need health management practices that have the potential to increase their profitability and beef product quality for the consumer. In addition, Bovine viral diarrhea virus (BVDV) represents the most economically important disease to U.S. and Oklahoma beef cattle producers. The BVDV causes a variety of diseases including respiratory, digestive, mucosal disease, and fetal diseases/infections (abortions, stillbirths, persistently infected calves [(PI)] and congenital malformations). Economically, bovine respiratory disease (BRD) is the most important disease affecting feedlot cattle, with annual economic losses due to death, decreased feed efficiency, and medicine costs estimated at \$800-900 million. BRD accounts for approximately 75% of feedlot morbidity and from 50 to 80% of mortality. PI calves or calves exposed to PI calves are more susceptible to BRD. Although the medical costs attributable to the treatment of BRD are substantial, the economic impact of BRD on animal performance, carcass merit, and meat quality are likely even more devastating. "Healthy" steers have greater daily gains and more U.S. Choice carcasses than cattle identified as "sick" at some point during the finishing period. Steers with lung lesions plus active lymph nodes had \$73.78 less net return, of which 21% was due to medicine costs and 79% due to lower carcass weight (8.4% less) and lower quality grade (24.7% more U.S. Standards).

**Priorities**

Beef cattle and forage educational priorities:



- Electronic identification, traceability, and data management
  - Enhancement of demonstrations at university owned facilities
  - Master Cattleman program
  - Development/refinement of forage management/grazing educational programs
    - Natural resources and grazing management
  - Multi-species grazing
  - Controlling/managing invasive species
  - Further development of grazing systems
  - Development of watering systems for livestock
    - Beef production systems
  - Electronic identification, traceability, and data management
  - Heifer development systems
  - Comparison of calving seasons and timing of weaning in a beef production system context
  - Increasing feeder cattle value
  - Reducing labor, fuel and equipment costs of various production systems and components
- Identify the biological links that exist between the animal morbidity, reduced animal performance, and meat quality.

#### **7. Assumptions made for the Program**

Appropriated and sponsored funding will increase

Appropriate research-based will continue to be develop relevant information for cattle and forage producers

#### **8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program**

Information is developed that improves decision making and increases efficiency and profitability of Oklahoma farms and ranchers is developed and disseminated.

Management skills of Oklahoma cattle and forage managers are improved allowing them to obtain better efficiency, higher profitability, reduced risks, and improved quality of life.

Evaluate the effects of animal morbidity on feedlot performance, carcass characteristics, meat quality, genomics, and proteomics.

Identify the biological links that exist between the BRD complex, reduced animal performance, and meat quality. Identifying these links will ultimately allow us to provide cattle producers with improved management strategies for receiving high-risk calves, and improve meat quality for consumers of beef.

Strong, profitable and efficient cattle and forage enterprises improve the economic viability of rural Oklahoma communities.

#### **9. Scope of Program**

- In-State Extension
- In-State Research
- Integrated Research and Extension

#### **Inputs for the Program**

##### **10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds**

- Yes

##### **11. Expending other then formula funds or state-matching funds**

- Yes

##### **12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program**

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	22.0	0.0	8.0	0.0
2008	22.0	0.0	9.0	0.0
2009	24.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
2010	23.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
2011	23.0	0.0	10.0	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

Develop research-based information such as peer reviewed journal articles, scientific reviews, and abstracts.

Develop decision aids and management programs developed that assist cattle and forage managers in improved, better informed decisions.

Conduct educational programs to improve the management skills, profitability and other success factors of people managing cattle and forages. Outputs for these activities would include fact sheets, books, and other extension publications, conference proceedings, web sites and conferences.

Identify BVDV infected beef breeding herds and develop a control program including biosecurity and enhanced vaccination programs.

Demonstrate the economic effects of BVDV and BRD to the stocker and feedlot operations.

Support for BVDV control at the breeding herd for increased economic return.

In animals exposed to BVDV, BRD, or both, we will identify biological links that exist between the bacteria and/or virus, reduced animal performance, and meat quality.

### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Group Discussion</li> <li>● One-on-One Intervention</li> <li>● Demonstrations</li> <li>● Other 1 (Scientific Presentations)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Public Service Announcement</li> <li>● Newsletters</li> <li>● Web sites</li> <li>● Other 1 (Journal Articles)</li> </ul>

### 15. Description of targeted audience

Managers, owners and employees of farms, ranches and agribusinesses, research scientists, extension personnel, beef cattle producers, and the general public.

**16. Standard output measures**

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	550	1550	100	200
2008	575	1800	100	200
2009	600	2050	100	200
2010	625	1800	100	200
2011	650	2550	100	200

**17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents**

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	1
2010	1
2011	1

**18. Output measures****Output Text**

Conferences, symposiums, and meetings

2007 Target: 20  
 2008 Target: 25  
 2009 Target: 25  
 2010 Target: 25  
 2011 Target: 25

**Output Text**

Peered reviewed journal articles

2007 Target: 10  
 2008 Target: 14  
 2009 Target: 15  
 2010 Target: 16  
 2011 Target: 14

**Output Text**

Extension publications: fact sheets, proceedings, books, manuals, bulletins

2007 Target: 15  
2008 Target: 15  
2009 Target: 18  
2010 Target: 20  
2011 Target: 20

## Outcomes for the Program

### 19. Outcome measures

#### Outcome Text: Awareness created

##### Outcome Text

Number of producers registered with a premise ID

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 10000  
2008 Target: 25000  
2009 Target: 50000  
2010 Target: 59000  
2011 Target: 59000

##### Outcome Text

Number of cattle identified in compliance with the National Animal Identification Plan

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 25000  
2008 Target: 100000  
2009 Target: 1000000  
2010 Target: 4000000  
2011 Target: 5100000

##### Outcome Text

Total number of producers certified as Master Cattlemen

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 250  
2008 Target: 300  
2009 Target: 350  
2010 Target: 400  
2011 Target: 450

##### Outcome Text

Number of producers implementing improved management, grazing systems and beef production systems resulting in improved sustainability.

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 2000  
2008 Target: 3000  
2009 Target: 3000  
2010 Target: 4000  
2011 Target: 4000

**Outcome Text**

Number of producers implementing management programs to decrease the incidence and economic impact of BVDV and BRD

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0

2008 Target: 5

2009 Target: 10

2010 Target: 50

2011 Target: 500

**20. External factors which may affect outcomes**

- Natural Disasters (drought, weather extremes, etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programmatic Challenges
- Populations changes (immigration, new cultural groupings, etc.)

**Description**

Changes in the internal and external business environment facing farm and ranch managers

The ability of internal and external agencies to continue funding this research.

Appropriations changes

Public policy changes – A change in emphasis on the importance of animal growth and animal diseases

Competing public priorities – significant change in beef consumption for example

**21. Evaluation studies planned**

- After Only (post program)
- Retrospective (post program)
- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)

**Description**

Acceptance of research manuscripts in peer reviewed journals and participant evaluations conducted at the conclusion of various educational programs will be used to determine the effectiveness.

Costs of BVDV and BRD can be readily assessed in receiving and finishing yards. Therefore, economic benefits to producers who adopt improved management practices will be assessed.

**22. Data Collection Methods**

- Whole population
- On-Site
- Unstructured
- Observation
- Journals

**Description**

The team will solicit formal and informal evaluations from educational participants to determine the effectiveness of the information provided and to assess additional educational needs.

Data on animal morbidity and mortality will be collected from producers adopting management changes to assess economic

impacts of this planned program.

**1. Name of the Planned Program****Crop Enterprises****2. Program knowledge areas**

- 213 Weeds Affecting Plants 15 %
- 215 Biological Control of Pests Affecting Plants 4 %
- 204 Plant Product Quality and Utility (Preharvest) 11 %
- 201 Plant Genome, Genetics, and Genetic Mechanisms 10 %
- 211 Insects, Mites, and Other Arthropods Affecting Plants 18 %
- 212 Pathogens and Nematodes Affecting Plants 5 %
- 133 Pollution Prevention and Mitigation 4 %
- 216 Integrated Pest Management Systems 15 %
- 102 Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships 6 %
- 205 Plant Management Systems 12 %

**3. Program existence**

- Intermediate (One to five years)

**4. Program duration**

- Long-Term (More than five years)

**5. Brief summary about Planned Program**

Improve wheat quality traits and dual-purpose varieties. Expand use of no-till systems in wheat and wheat cropping rotations. Use canola, cotton, and other crops in rotations with wheat to improve weed control and pest management as well as risk and income considerations. Cotton growers in Oklahoma and Kansas will be targeted for addition of cotton acres. Other systems in Oklahoma (and Kansas with respect to Canola) will be investigated and demonstrated for improved cropping rotation systems.

**6. Situation and priorities**

Wheat is the crop with the highest gross receipts in Oklahoma. Over 6.2 million acres are planted annually. Wheat is important for the production of grain as well as for a forage for livestock. Wheat quality has become a significant factor in world sales over the last fifteen years. Breeding and management for a variety of characteristics related to quality has become a very high priority. Emphasis on grain quality has traditionally focused on physical kernel characteristics and breadmaking quality, but the arrival of Hard White Winter wheat to the southern Great Plains has turned our attention to a new set of traits, such as kernel color, sprouting tolerance, and noodle quality.

Wheat is typically a low margin enterprise and cost reduction related to pests, disease, and fertilizer are important factors in its production. Oklahoma wheat farmers have been in a continuous wheat to wheat system for over 20 years. This has resulted in various cultural and pest management problems. Reduced tillage and no-till systems are being developed and extended to improve soil quality and reduce producer input costs.

Diversifying the cropping system will aid in alleviating some of these problems and provide growers with another crop without loss of income. The team is presently working with canola as a crop rotation for wheat. This is to provide improved weed control, pest management and additional income for the grower. The team will also look at other potential diversification systems such as yellow peas in various cropping systems. Only about 72% of hard red winter wheat grain is utilized for human consumption. In-house research and the published literature recognize the potential benefit that wheat straw and wheat by-products, such as bran, germ, and milling shorts, can offer in the form of biologically active components for nutraceutical development. Cotton may also prove to be a crop that can once again substitute for wheat or other crops, work into rotations in parts of the state. A group is presently working with cotton production in Oklahoma and Kansas. Objectives are to generate and extend information on cotton varieties and their adaptation to this area. Previous work with cooperators has resulted in increased acreage in 2003 from 180,000 to 242,000 acres in 2005.

**Priorities**

Develop highly-adapted winter wheat cultivars with marketable grain-quality and extending that research to the wheat producers of the State.

Develop integrated research and extension projects to improve the viability of no-till crop production in Oklahoma.

Identify potential crops for diversification and develop and test practical cropping rotation systems.

Identify potential areas for re-introduction of cotton and assess the viability of cotton in rotations in these areas of the state.

Develop a wheat biorefinery system that will generate value-added products from wheat fractions and enhance the value of wheat produced in Oklahoma.

#### 7. Assumptions made for the Program

Rotation crops can be found to provide for diversification with minimum negative effect on income.

Variety selection, soil fertility and pests are manageable.

There is a viable market for rotation alternative crops.

#### 8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program

To improve wheat quality (grain and forage), production practices, production systems, and broaden uses for products of wheat.

Produce wheat with qualities demanded by relevant markets.

To provide wheat growers in Oklahoma cropping alternatives which provide an economic return without increased inputs.

To improve cropping systems returns through cotton production.

#### 9. Scope of Program

- In-State Extension
- In-State Research
- Integrated Research and Extension
- Multistate Extension
- Multistate Integrated Research and Extension

#### Inputs for the Program

##### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

##### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

##### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	11.3	0.0	6.0	0.0
2008	11.5	0.0	6.5	0.0
2009	11.5	0.0	6.5	0.0
2010	11.5	0.0	6.5	0.0
2011	11.5	0.0	6.5	0.0



## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

Wheat variety development and testing  
 Develop a no-till production manual  
 Wheat quality and product development and testing  
 Wheat management newsletter, website  
 Develop a Canola production manual.  
 Test and demonstrate alternative cropping systems and rotations  
 Improve web-based delivery of cropping systems information  
 Weekly crop updates during production season  
 Grower meetings/workshops  
 Field/demonstration days

### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Demonstrations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Newsletters</li> <li>● Web sites</li> </ul>

### 15. Description of targeted audience

Wheat growers, dual-purpose wheat producers, millers, bakers, wheat importers, seed growers and dealers, wheat breeders, crop producers, potential cotton, canola and other crop producers and nutraceutical producers.

### 16. Standard output measures

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	1500	2500	0	0
2008	2000	4000	0	0
2009	2500	4000	0	0
2010	3000	8000	0	0
2011	3500	10000	0	0

### 17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	0
2010	0
2011	0

## 18. Output measures

### Output Text

#### Field Demonstrations

2007	Target:	30
2008	Target:	30
2009	Target:	30
2010	Target:	30
2011	Target:	30

### Output Text

#### Varieties of wheat realeased

2007	Target:	1
2008	Target:	2
2009	Target:	1
2010	Target:	2
2011	Target:	1

### Output Text

#### Crop production manuals and production newsletters

2007	Target:	14
2008	Target:	15
2009	Target:	14
2010	Target:	18
2011	Target:	15

### Output Text

#### Cotton weekly crop updates

2007	Target:	10
2008	Target:	11
2009	Target:	12
2010	Target:	12
2011	Target:	12

### Output Text

#### Cotton Web Page

2007	Target:	1
2008	Target:	1
2009	Target:	1
2010	Target:	1
2011	Target:	1

## Outcomes for the Program

### 19. Outcome measures

#### Outcome Text: Awareness created

##### Outcome Text

Increase in cotton production in eastern and central Oklahoma

##### Outcome Type: Long

2007 Target: 1500

2008 Target: 2000

2009 Target: 3000

2010 Target: 5000

2011 Target: 6000

##### Outcome Text

Change in acreages that have crop rotations involving wheat

##### Outcome Type: Medium

2007 Target: 5000

2008 Target: 10000

2009 Target: 20000

2010 Target: 35000

2011 Target: 60000

##### Outcome Text

Change in fertilization and pesticide inputs due to diversified systems

##### Outcome Type: Medium

2007 Target: 5000

2008 Target: 10000

2009 Target: 15000

2010 Target: 35000

2011 Target: 40000

##### Outcome Text

Number of acres where minimum or no-till production practices are applied

##### Outcome Type: Long

2007 Target: 300000

2008 Target: 450000

2009 Target: 550000

2010 Target: 800000

2011 Target: 1200000

##### Outcome Text

Number of varieties accepted by seed producers and producers to address end-use quality issues

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 1

2008 Target: 1

2009 Target: 1

2010 Target: 1

2011 Target: 1

**Outcome Text**

Percentage of dual-purpose wheat acreage where first hollow stem criterion used for decision making

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 40

2008 Target: 50

2009 Target: 60

2010 Target: 70

2011 Target: 75

**20. External factors which may affect outcomes**

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

**Description**

Extreme weather conditions would affect wheat production, cotton production, and the diversity crops and cropping systems. Weather could also affect the progress of breeding programs. Government regulations and policies could change practical applications of systems by either mandating requirements or prohibiting critical inputs. Progress of chemists could affect the rate of adoption of biorefining processes. Changes in countries purchasing Oklahoma wheat and the requirements of millers and bakers will play a role in the rate of progress.

**21. Evaluation studies planned**

- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)

**Description**

Progress in development of wheat varieties with respect to improvement of resistance to leaf rust, stripe rust, soil-borne mosaic virus, aphids, and tolerance to low-pH, A1-toxic soils will be evaluated on an ongoing basis based on characteristic reproducibility and overall characteristic desirability. Selection has long been performed under a grain-only management system, but resources are being re-channeled toward selection in a dual-purpose environment under the GRAZENGRAIN® breeding system. Quality trait testing will be conducted in the Oklahoma Food and Agricultural Products Center to measure progress.

For cropping system and reduced tillage programming, base line data will be obtained from wheat growers on their inputs and rotation systems. Base line data will also be obtained from cotton producers on their inputs. As the programming progresses, growers will be queried as to their inputs at that point in time. At the end of the program comparisons will be made on the base line inputs and the inputs as they were obtained through time. In addition, the number of acres in a diversity cropping system and in cotton will be compared at the end with the beginning acres. In addition, the number of acres in cotton will be compared at the end with the beginning acres.

**22. Data Collection Methods**

- Mail
- On-Site
- Structured
- Observation
- Tests

### **Description**

Potential new breeding lines will be laboratory tested and field tested for production and quality characteristics – data will be gathered annually. Product quality traits will be tested through the wheat quality lab. Information will be obtained one-on-one from individual wheat growers and cotton growers. A mail survey is likely to be conducted with assistance of the Oklahoma Agricultural Statistical Service to determine baseline information on acreages, pesticide use, rotations, etc. Similar targeted surveys may be employed over the course of the planning period.

**1. Name of the Planned Program**

Plant Biological Technologies

**2. Program knowledge areas**

- 123 Management and Sustainability of Forest Resources 5 %
- 132 Weather and Climate 5 %
- 206 Basic Plant Biology 14 %
- 212 Pathogens and Nematodes Affecting Plants 53 %
- 211 Insects, Mites, and Other Arthropods Affecting Plants 5 %
- 201 Plant Genome, Genetics, and Genetic Mechanisms 5 %
- 203 Plant Biological Efficiency and Abiotic Stresses Affecting Plants 13 %

**3. Program existence**

- Mature (More than five years)

**4. Program duration**

- Long-Term (More than five years)

**5. Brief summary about Planned Program**

Plant microbe interaction research will stress: Molecular, cellular, anatomic pathways of transmission of microbes from plant to plant: population variation in pathogens and vectors, molecular causes of disease symptoms, interactions of pathogens with other organisms and viruses, microbial movement pathways within the plant, and membrane or cell surface phenomena in interorganismal interactions. Plant stress research will emphasize: plant interactions with: insects, pathogens, temperature extremes, water stress (drought and excess), and oxidative stress. As situations change priorities and inputs will have to change as well. Team direction depends on funding sources as well as changing scientific priorities as garnered from stakeholder input. The fundamental overlying emphasis on this program is to better understand how the ubiquitous microorganisms, environmental factors, and other organisms interact with plant life in our environment and in agricultural settings of importance to human kind.

**6. Situation and priorities**

Plant losses to environmental stresses are enormous. Estimates of crop losses due to drought run over \$1 billion per year in the U.S. Losses to the citrus industry from freeze damage topped \$700 million in just three California counties in 1998. Heat stress causes both chronic and acute damage that contributes to average yields being three- to seven-fold lower than record yields. Average crop losses to insects have been estimated at 13%. The need for increased resistance to biotic and abiotic stresses has been recognized as a national research priority. The Plant Stresses: Abiotic and Biotic Team addresses: insects, pathogens, temperature extremes, water stress (drought and excess), and oxidative stress.

Microorganisms affect the growth and development of plant life upon which we all depend in both positive and negative ways. The Plant Microbe Interaction Team covers a wide spectrum of research relating to plant microbe interactions. The fundamental overlying emphasis on this program is to better understand how the ubiquitous microorganisms interact with plant life in our environment and in agricultural settings of importance to human kind.

**Priorities**

Identify plant genotypes with superior stress tolerance from existing germplasm and utilize traditional breeding to improve stress tolerance in crop species.

Identify and isolate and identify targets for marker-assisted selection and gene transfer for improved stress tolerance.

Discover physiological and biochemical mechanisms of injury and acclimation in plant stress responses.

Establish and refine capabilities and infrastructure to enable the use of proteomics and metabolomics in plant stress studies including using to study aphid/plant interactions, focusing on both the plant and aphid.

Determine how susceptible and resistant plants respond to aphid feeding to identify resistance factors that could be used in crop protection.

Identify low molecular weight and peptide phytotoxins secreted by plant pathogenic fungi and characterize their contribution to plant disease.

Interaction of *Pseudomonas syringae* with various plant hosts.

Study molecular factors involved in the movement of spiroplasmas through insect cellular barriers.

Assess population diversity among natural communities of phytopathogenic mollicutes.

Develop strategies for controlling insect-transmitted plant pathogens on cucurbit yellow vine disease (CYVD) and other plant diseases.

Biological control of soilborne diseases.

Control of anthracnose disease caused by *Colletotrichum gloeosporioides* on *Euonymus fortunei*.

Identify genes whose induction is necessary for an effective hypersensitive disease resistance response in cotton.

Clone and sequence the *Gossypium hirsutum* genes for the second step in gossypol biosynthesis, preparatory to blocking that step via gene silencing.

Enhance resistance to spring dead spot in seeded bermudagrass varieties

Isolate and identify bacteria that promote growth or disease resistance in wheat

Explore the biodiversity of viruses and plant bacterial pathogens found in natural environments.

Characterization of Wheat Leaf Proteome and of aphid feeding induced changes in wheat leaf protein expression

## 7. Assumptions made for the Program

Plant stress injury and mechanisms of acclimation have identifiable bases.

Plants and/or production practices can be modified to reduce losses to stress.

Continued availability of funding, facilities and talented and trained personnel.

## 8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program

Increase productivity by reducing crop losses to environmental stress

Increase our understanding of specific plant microbe interactions of significance to agriculture and the environment in which we live

Harness the knowledge and resources of plant microbe interaction for the protection of agricultural or ecologically important plant species

Expand knowledge base

Train students who will increase research capability in the subject areas

## 9. Scope of Program

- In-State Research
- Multistate Research

## Inputs for the Program

### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0
2008	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0
2009	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0
2010	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0
2011	0.0	0.0	6.0	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

Design and conduct research, including the development of methods and procedures

Write and submit grant proposals to private, state and federal agencies

Generate scientific publications - communicating scientific results to a wide range of scientists

Training of professional scientists - graduate and undergraduate students, technicians and post docs in the scientific discipline

File patents

### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other 1 (professional journals)</li> <li>Other 2 (professional meetings)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Newsletters</li> <li>TV Media Programs</li> <li>Web sites</li> </ul>

### 15. Description of targeted audience

Scientists and scientific societies

Governmental science organizations

Educational institutions

Applied researchers and extension specialists

Students

Private, federal, state, and industrial funding agencies

Other stakeholders (producers, consumers, educators, public)

### 16. Standard output measures

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	75	100	50	0
2008	75	125	50	0
2009	75	150	50	0
2010	75	150	50	0
2011	75	150	50	0

### 17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	1
2009	2
2010	1
2011	2



## 18. Output measures

### Output Text

Grant proposals written and submitted

2007	Target:	20
2008	Target:	20
2009	Target:	22
2010	Target:	22
2011	Target:	22

### Output Text

Peer-reviewed publications including journal articles

2007	Target:	25
2008	Target:	25
2009	Target:	27
2010	Target:	27
2011	Target:	25

## Outcomes for the Program

## 19. Outcome measures

### Outcome Text: Awareness created

#### Outcome Text

Graduate students graduated

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007	Target:	14
2008	Target:	14
2009	Target:	16
2010	Target:	16
2011	Target:	16

## 20. External factors which may affect outcomes

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

### Description

Any natural disasters, economic downturns, policy changes or government changes that negatively affect appropriations or change research directives will adversely affect outcomes. Funding levels are affected by public priorities and governmental priorities which are tied to national and local economic performance to a certain degree as perceived by decision makers.

## 21. Evaluation studies planned

- During (during program)

### **Description**

Through strategic planning process, logic models will continually be updated to reflect changes in inputs. The program will be evaluated annually using the above mentioned benchmarks.

### **22. Data Collection Methods**

- On-Site
- Unstructured

### **Description**

Annually, information concerning critical benchmarks will be gathered and evaluated. Year-by-year data will be evaluated in order to look for areas where improvement may be obtained. Data collection will consist of an email spreadsheet sent to all PI's. Those that are returned will be incorporated into our ongoing evaluation. Data will also be collected on graduating students.

## 1. Name of the Planned Program

Commercial and Consumer Horticulture

## 2. Program knowledge areas

- 204 Plant Product Quality and Utility (Preharvest) 5 %
- 502 New and Improved Food Products 7 %
- 903 Communication, Education, and Information Delivery 32 %
- 205 Plant Management Systems 40 %
- 901 Program and Project Design, and Statistics 10 %
- 202 Plant Genetic Resources 6 %

## 3. Program existence

- Mature (More than five years)

## 4. Program duration

- Long-Term (More than five years)

## 5. Brief summary about Planned Program

Overall objective is to support the commercial horticulture industry, home and community based gardeners, and youth horticulture projects in Oklahoma through mission-oriented fundamental and applied research and extension outreach activities. Research goals include identification of adapted cultivars; determine feasibility of horticultural crops in rotation with agronomic crops; develop integrated production and processing systems for high-value alternative horticultural crops; proven varieties and cultivars, and develop sustainable and/or organic production systems for commercial horticultural crops. Support education and technology transfer in these areas and others related to commercial horticulture, with emphasis on supporting E-Extension. Support consumer horticulture and home gardeners and the related industry.

## 6. Situation and priorities

Both commercial and consumer horticulture research and extension are important to the citizens of Oklahoma. This program plan discusses both horticultural efforts.

The need for science-based, locally-relevant information is greater than ever now that Oklahoma producers are looking to horticultural crops as alternatives to traditional field crops. The ornamental horticultural industry also is experiencing growth as more people approach retirement and disposable incomes provide the time and money to increase demand. Commercial horticulture program priorities are: a) Support for cultivar evaluation; b) Horticultural crops as part of rotation plans with agronomic crops; c) Support for E-Extension; d) "Seed to market" production of high-value alternative horticultural crops; and e) Sustainable and/or organic production of commercial horticultural crops.

Gardening continues to be ranked one of the top leisurely activities (three out of four households, an estimated 82 million households, participated in one or more indoor and outdoor lawn and garden activities in 2004). A recent survey by the Garden Writers Association indicates that 4 out of 5 households surveyed indicated they had some form of garden or yard. Consumers spent an estimated \$36.8 billion on their lawns and gardens (an average of \$449 per household) in 2004. Studies also indicate that a great deal of satisfaction and benefits come from gardening including a healthier body and mind and increased property value. Rapid urban growth and population aging coupled with increased interest in the environment and home gardening has prompted an ever-increasing number of garden and landscape inquiries. County offices report that over 50% of the phone calls received are consumer horticulture related.

Consumer horticulture and urban forestry priorities relevant are: a survey of Oklahoma consumers (gardeners), improving consumer horticulture web-based delivery, Master Gardener training, pesticide training and education, and youth at risk-obesity/school vegetable gardens.

## 7. Assumptions made for the Program

Appropriated funding will remain at present levels, while sponsored funding will increase. Financial support from horticultural

industries will increase. Key research and extension personnel will be replaced in a timely manner. OAES branch stations where program research is conducted will have sufficient personnel and funding through the Field & Research Services Unit to sustain research infrastructure. Publishable results will be obtained from research, and recommendations can be given based on these results. Oklahoma educational TV will continue to broadcast "Oklahoma Gardening". eXtension will grow and become a viable outlokk for information.

#### 8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program

Develop and communicate science-based, locally-relevant information to support the commercial horticulture industry in Oklahoma. Improve the economic return to horticultural producers while protecting the environment and ensuring food safety and quality.

Increase, support, and strengthen statewide Master Gardener Program to assist existing and new county participants and increase contacts made through Master Gardener activities and programs.

Provide gardening information/education to the homeowners and gardening enthusiasts in environmentally responsible best management garden, lawn, and landscape practices- including continued adaptation of IPM principles through programming by counties and Master Gardener programs.

Increase awareness of benefits of gardening activities on the health of youth and adults. Increased information on the health related benefits of the consumption of fruits, vegetables and nuts; more school vegetable gardens.

#### 9. Scope of Program

- In-State Extension
- In-State Research
- Integrated Research and Extension
- Multistate Extension
- Multistate Integrated Research and Extension
- Multistate Research

#### Inputs for the Program

##### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

##### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- No

##### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	14.0	0.0	2.6	0.0
2008	14.0	0.0	2.6	0.0
2009	14.0	0.0	2.6	0.0
2010	14.0	0.0	2.6	0.0
2011	14.0	0.0	2.6	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

Conduct research to evaluate cultivars of traditional and nontraditional horticultural crops and ornamental plants.  
 Conduct research into crop cultural systems, particularly the feasibility of horticultural crops in rotation with agronomic crops.  
 Conduct research to develop "seed to market" production systems for high-value alternative horticultural crops like cilantro and herbs.  
 Conduct research to develop sustainable and/or organic production systems for commercial horticultural crops.  
 Provide demonstrations and education and disseminate information to support Oklahoma's commercial horticulture industry, with emphasis on electronic resources.  
 Survey Oklahoma Consumers (Gardeners) to assess the needs and wants of the gardening public  
 Upgrade the web-based delivery  
 Review and revise annually or as needed Fact sheets and other publications.  
 Educational programs are conducted based on public interest and County Educator requests.  
 Participate and support eXtension Consumer Horticulture/Master Gardener Community of Practice  
 Conduct Master Gardener/Junior Master Gardener Training  
 Conduct pesticide training and education  
 Assist in Youth at Risk – Obesity/School Gardens

### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● One-on-One Intervention</li> <li>● Demonstrations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Newsletters</li> <li>● TV Media Programs</li> <li>● Web sites</li> </ul>

### 15. Description of targeted audience

Horticultural crop producers, commodity groups, food processors, landscape professionals, input suppliers such as seed and chemical companies, peer scientists, extension specialists and county professionals, horticultural dealers and merchants, greenhouses, Master Gardeners, home owners, communities, and youth.

### 16. Standard output measures

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	90000	975000	1500	0
2008	100000	1000000	2000	0
2009	140000	1200000	2500	0
2010	150000	1200000	3000	0
2011	150000	1200000	3500	0

### 17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	0
2010	0
2011	0

## 18. Output measures

### Output Text

New Master Gardeners trained

2007 Target: 300  
 2008 Target: 350  
 2009 Target: 350  
 2010 Target: 400  
 2011 Target: 400

### Output Text

Manuscripts submitted for consideration of publication in peer-reviewed journals

2007 Target: 3  
 2008 Target: 3  
 2009 Target: 3  
 2010 Target: 3  
 2011 Target: 3

### Output Text

Number of Extension publications completed - fact sheets, newsletters, trial reports, web-based materials

2007 Target: 5  
 2008 Target: 6  
 2009 Target: 6  
 2010 Target: 6  
 2011 Target: 6

### Output Text

Number of statewide "Oklahoma Gardening" shows produced

2007 Target: 35  
 2008 Target: 35  
 2009 Target: 35  
 2010 Target: 35  
 2011 Target: 35

## Outcomes for the Program

### 19. Outcome measures

#### Outcome Text: Awareness created

##### Outcome Text

Number of horticultural crop producers newly certified as organic

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 2

2008 Target: 2

2009 Target: 3

2010 Target: 3

2011 Target: 4

##### Outcome Text

Number of volunteer hours provided to community horticulture programs statewide

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 13000

2008 Target: 14000

2009 Target: 14000

2010 Target: 14000

2011 Target: 15000

##### Outcome Text

Number of home gardeners experiencing increased awareness and knowledge about environmental issues and IPM principles

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 2000

2008 Target: 2500

2009 Target: 2500

2010 Target: 3000

2011 Target: 3000

### 20. External factors which may affect outcomes

- Natural Disasters (drought,weather extremes,etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programatic Challenges
- Populations changes (immigration,new cultural groupings,etc.)

#### Description

Natural disasters can destroy experiments and, if broad in scale, may lead to economic downturns. Decreases in appropriated funding will adversely affect outcomes.

Detailed, reliable statistics are not available for Oklahoma horticultural crop production. Figures from the Census of Agriculture underreport actual production and are not updated yearly. It will take a public policy change to be able to track changes in horticultural crop acreage and production in Oklahoma. Stakeholders must be willing to accept change.

## 21. Evaluation studies planned

- After Only (post program)
- Retrospective (post program)
- During (during program)

### Description

In the first year, baseline data will be obtained on cultivar diversity among grape growers and on number of horticultural crop producers certified as organic. Use of extension publications and websites will be analyzed. Surveys will assess the appropriateness and usefulness of short courses, workshops, and field days. Pre- and post- testing will be conducted on Master Gardener trainees. Contacts completed by Master Gardeners will be recorded and evaluated. Funded grant proposals and peer-reviewed publications will be counted annually.

## 22. Data Collection Methods

- Sampling
- Whole population
- Mail
- On-Site
- Unstructured

### Description

Use of extension publications will be monitored and visits to websites will be counted.

Surveys will assess the appropriateness and usefulness of short courses, workshops, and field days. Specific information on cultivar diversity among grape growers will be obtained from these surveys and from one-on-one interactions. Funded grant proposals and peer-reviewed publications will be counted annually. Certifications of organic producers will be tracked. Surveys will be employed to measure outcomes in consumer horticulture. In the case of websites, an online survey will be implemented, measuring before and after use.



## 1. Name of the Planned Program

### Ecosystem and Environmental Quality and Management

## 2. Program knowledge areas

- 205 Plant Management Systems 7 %
- 605 Natural Resource and Environmental Economics 9 %
- 121 Management of Range Resources 10 %
- 123 Management and Sustainability of Forest Resources 9 %
- 104 Protect Soil from Harmful Effects of Natural Elements 7 %
- 111 Conservation and Efficient Use of Water 10 %
- 403 Waste Disposal, Recycling, and Reuse 14 %
- 112 Watershed Protection and Management 14 %
- 133 Pollution Prevention and Mitigation 15 %
- 136 Conservation of Biological Diversity 5 %

## 3. Program existence

- Mature (More than five years)

## 4. Program duration

- Long-Term (More than five years)

## 5. Brief summary about Planned Program

1. Develop approaches to integrate conservation into tradition land management; 2. develop approaches to restore degraded ecosystems; 3. determine impacts and management approaches for invasive species; 4. develop economic alternatives based on natural resources that can be integrated into traditional land management; 5. understand impacts and develop approaches to mitigate land fragmentation; 6. water and air quality management and policy; 7. animal waste management; 8. surface water and watershed issues; 9. waste disposal and management

## 6. Situation and priorities

Oklahoma contains a vast array of ecosystems due the variability in soil types, climatic conditions, altitude, and historic use. This situation presents considerable issues and opportunities. These include: different management approaches on all natural resources of the area and develop approaches to manage landscapes for multiple uses; invasive species threat to all ecosystems of Oklahoma and the major negative economic impacts on agricultural enterprises; the effects of land use and management decisions on our natural resources and the conservation of natural resource combined with sustainable systems for rural development; the social and ecological importance of managing large-scale processes and patterns across multiple land ownerships; nonpoint source pollution control, riparian management, stream channel management and restoration, water quality and other environmental standards, biocriteria for aquatic systems, and fishery protection and management; confined animal waste systems; water management and water policy; solid waste management; improved public natural resource education and information; the development of sustainable multiple-use ecosystems; and the restoration and management of native plant communities.

### Priorities

Programming priorities include:

Restoration and management of crosstimbers and prairie ecosystems for multiple uses.

Reduction of negative effects of invasive species, such as Eastern Redcedar and Sericea lespedeza.

Improved understanding and application of government programs for conservation of natural resources (CRP, WHIP, WRP, CSP, etc.).

Development of a landscape-level perspective that considers the importance of ecological and social consequences of ecosystem management that is dependent on broad scale patterns in a private land state.

Research and extension programming related to water quality and quantity and the interface of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, as well as, animal waste, stream erosion, emerging contaminants, and water policy.

Natural resources education for general public including youth.

Air quality and soil quality

## **7. Assumptions made for the Program**

Increased communication among researchers, teachers, and extension workers involved in environmental and waste management efforts will lead to increases in productivity and effectiveness of programs.

Presentation of symposia to address environmental and waste management issues of importance to Oklahoma will lead to state-of-the-art research and extension programs addressing the most relevant issues.

Conservation can be integrated into traditional management and used to develop new economic alternatives

Stakeholders will be active participants in program development and implementation

## **8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program**

Increased productivity and profitability of forest and rangeland ecosystems

Expanded knowledge base in natural resources

Conservation practices integrated into tradition land management

Approaches to restore degraded ecosystems

Determine and communicate impacts and management approaches for invasive species

Economic alternatives based on natural resources that can be integrated into traditional land management

Understand impacts and develop and communicate approaches to mitigate land fragmentation.

Improved communication of environmental quality and waste management information

Slowed rate of degradation of surface water and watersheds

## **9. Scope of Program**

- In-State Extension
- In-State Research
- Integrated Research and Extension
- Multistate Extension
- Multistate Integrated Research and Extension
- Multistate Research

## **Inputs for the Program**

### **10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds**

- Yes

### **11. Expending other then formula funds or state-matching funds**

- Yes

### **12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program**

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	7.4	0.0	8.0	0.0
2008	7.4	0.0	8.0	0.0
2009	7.5	0.0	8.0	0.0
2010	7.5	0.0	9.0	0.0
2011	7.5	0.0	9.0	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

- Design and conduct research
- Submit grant proposals
- Produce scientific publications
- Specialty conferences to address environmental issues of concern to Oklahoma,
- An Environmental Quality and Waste Management publications series
- A website that expands upon the information presented in the publication series, providing the range of information
- A high-visibility symposium series will share high quality research and extension programs with technical and lay audiences.
- Poultry Waste Management Education
- Water Quality educational programs

### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Group Discussion</li> <li>● Demonstrations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Web sites</li> <li>● Other 1 (LISTSERV and newsgroup)</li> </ul>

### 15. Description of targeted audience

Scientists, students, related agencies (Federal, State, private), land owners, farmers, ranchers, communities, consumers, land developers, state legislators, commodity groups, community leaders

### 16. Standard output measures

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	350	1500	150	150
2008	475	5525	175	175
2009	400	550	200	200
2010	400	600	225	225
2011	400	625	250	250

**17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents**

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	1
2010	1
2011	1

**18. Output measures****Output Text**

Grant proposals written and submitted

2007 Target: 10  
 2008 Target: 11  
 2009 Target: 12  
 2010 Target: 12  
 2011 Target: 12

**Output Text**

Manuscripts submitted for consideration of peer-reviewed publication

2007 Target: 22  
 2008 Target: 24  
 2009 Target: 24  
 2010 Target: 24  
 2011 Target: 24

**Output Text**

Extension conferences, workshops and training sessions

2007 Target: 25  
 2008 Target: 25  
 2009 Target: 25  
 2010 Target: 25  
 2011 Target: 25

### Output Text

Research and Extension reports and fact sheets

2007 Target: 5  
2008 Target: 5  
2009 Target: 5  
2010 Target: 5  
2011 Target: 5

## Outcomes for the Program

### 19. Outcome measures

#### Outcome Text: Awareness created

##### Outcome Text

Peer-reviewed publications

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 12  
2008 Target: 14  
2009 Target: 16  
2010 Target: 16  
2011 Target: 16

##### Outcome Text

Number of poultry producers and poultry litter applicators acquiring initial waste management certification and number maintaining certification

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 1100  
2008 Target: 1200  
2009 Target: 1200  
2010 Target: 1200  
2011 Target: 1200

##### Outcome Text

Percentage of poultry producers using at least one waste management BMP

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 60  
2008 Target: 70  
2009 Target: 75  
2010 Target: 80  
2011 Target: 85

##### Outcome Text

Number of acres applying BMPs (including prescribed burning) for Ecosystem restoration of native prairies, shrublands and forests

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 1000000

2008 Target: 1200000

2009 Target: 1500000

2010 Target: 1700000

2011 Target: 2000000

**Outcome Text**

Number of manure test conducted for land application by confined animal operations

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 1250

2008 Target: 1500

2009 Target: 1600

2010 Target: 1600

2011 Target: 1600

**Outcome Text**

Percentage of poultry operations conducting soil testing at least every other year

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 85

2008 Target: 90

2009 Target: 92

2010 Target: 92

2011 Target: 92

**20. External factors which may affect outcomes**

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

**Description**

Changes in policy and laws, the interest of the public in environmental issues, economic development opportunities, changes in agricultural commodity prices.

**21. Evaluation studies planned**

- After Only (post program)
- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)
- Comparisons between program participants (individuals,group,organizations) and non-participants
- Comparisons between different groups of individuals or program participants experiencing different levels of program intensity.
- Comparison between locales where the program operates and sites without program intervention

**Description**

Pre- and Post- testing related to changes in attitude and knowledge; the changes in level of funding for research and extension efforts, adoption of BMPs and certification of waste management training, change in practices related to waste management and application of prescribed burning.

## **22. Data Collection Methods**

- Sampling
- On-Site
- Observation

### **Description**

Pre- and pos-testing, surveys to producers, numbers certified, land management cooperatives and organizations, surveys on invasive species.

## 1. Name of the Planned Program

Food Processing, Product Storage, and Food and Product Safety

## 2. Program knowledge areas

- 502 New and Improved Food Products 6 %
- 711 Ensure Food Products Free of Harmful Chemicals, Including Residues from Agricultural and Other Sources 24 %
- 401 Structures, Facilities, and General Purpose Farm Supplies 7 %
- 701 Nutrient Composition of Food 6 %
- 723 Hazards to Human Health and Safety 6 %
- 712 Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins 18 %
- 501 New and Improved Food Processing Technologies 7 %
- 503 Quality Maintenance in Storing and Marketing Food Products 12 %
- 403 Waste Disposal, Recycling, and Reuse 5 %
- 216 Integrated Pest Management Systems 9 %

## 3. Program existence

- Mature (More than five years)

## 4. Program duration

- Long-Term (More than five years)

## 5. Brief summary about Planned Program

Develop methods to rapidly identify food allergens and bacterial toxins of concern and by introducing microbial, toxin, and allergen intervention and control strategies.

Advance the techniques and strategies that improve food production through process development and operations optimization.

Develop techniques for evaluating new food sources and uses and enhancing nutraceuticals in foods.

Improve food packaging.

Evaluate the role of processed foods in value-added agri-tourism.

Optimize food manufacturing capacity utilization.

Improve the safety of stored food and agricultural products

Improve storage and handling of agricultural products

## 6. Situation and priorities

Improve the value, quality, and safety of foods and agricultural products by advancing food processing, safety, and storage technologies. These efforts are primarily conducted through the efforts of the Oklahoma Food and Agricultural Products Research and Technology Center and the Oklahoma Stored Products Research and Education Center and their affiliated faculty and staff.

### Priorities

Advance the techniques and strategies that improve food production through process development and operations optimization.

Develop techniques for evaluating new food sources and uses and enhancing nutraceuticals in foods.

Improve food safety by introducing microbial, toxin, and allergen intervention and control strategies.

Develop methods to rapidly identify food allergens and bacterial toxins of concern.

Improve food packaging. Minimizing waste and enhancing utilization of food processing byproducts.

Evaluate the role of processed foods in value-added agri-tourism.

Optimize food manufacturing capacity utilization.

Development of a systems approach for assessment of plant by-products recovered from food processing for specific functional nutraceuticals, especially antioxidants and antibiotics.

Provide an estimate of lipid by-product (commercial fat, oil, and grease) production in the State. Evaluate feasibility of biodiesel plant and determine optimum location.



Conduct research and outreach on management and protection of durable post harvest agricultural commodities and all value-added food products produced from such commodities in relation to:

Commercial storage management

Quality management in food processing, warehouse storage, and retail outlets

On-farm storage management

Management of multiple grains and oilseeds in small storages

Quality-Oriented Storage and Handling

Bioterrorism prevention and response

Implement organic approaches to pest management

## 7. Assumptions made for the Program

Appropriated and sponsored funding will continue at similar levels. Key research and extension personnel will be replaced in a timely manner.

Agricultural commodities and value-added food products from them will require adequate protection and management techniques for the foreseeable future.

## 8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program

Improve the value, quality and safety of processed foods.

Reduce waste in food processing.

Provide effective, economical and safe methods for storing and processing commodities and food products, and to provide useful information about such methods to users.

Develop means and methods for the rapid detection of allergens and foodborne toxins, and help transfer these technologies for routine testing in the food industry and possibly for biosecurity screening of processed foods.

## 9. Scope of Program

- In-State Extension
- In-State Research
- Integrated Research and Extension
- Multistate Integrated Research and Extension

## Inputs for the Program

### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	1.3	0.0	1.8	0.0
2008	1.3	0.0	1.9	0.0
2009	1.4	0.0	1.8	0.0
2010	1.4	0.0	1.8	0.0
2011	1.4	0.0	1.8	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

Conduct research that evaluates food processing technologies with the aim of improving food value, quality, and safety. Provide technical applications, demonstrations and education for food processors.

Develop rapid detection methods for one family of allergens and one bacterial toxin. Pecans will serve as our allergen model while Staphylococcus enterotoxin will provide our biotoxin model. Our program will use two approaches. Immunomagnetic affinity and recovery will be used to develop a mechanism to bind and recover allergen- and enterotoxin-derived particles directly. Then a combination of oligo-tagged secondary antibodies and PCR amplification will be used to amplify the detection signal and allow for rapid detection methods.

Conduct research that evaluates agricultural product storage and handling technologies with the aim of improving quality, safety, and costs. Provide technical applications, demonstrations and education for grain and food storage providers and handlers.

### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Group Discussion</li> <li>● One-on-One Intervention</li> <li>● Demonstrations</li> <li>● Other 1 (Scientific presentations)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Newsletters</li> <li>● Web sites</li> <li>● Other 1 (Journal articles)</li> </ul>

### 15. Description of targeted audience

food processors; handlers, manufacturers, and marketers of grain, feed and food; food safety regulators

### 16. Standard output measures

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	450	5500	0	0
2008	500	6000	0	0
2009	450	7500	0	0
2010	450	8000	0	0
2011	450	8000	0	0

### 17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	1
2009	0
2010	2
2011	0

## 18. Output measures

### Output Text

Peer-reviewed journal articles

2007	Target:	3
2008	Target:	5
2009	Target:	5
2010	Target:	6
2011	Target:	4

### Output Text

Number of conferences and other extension outreach presentations

2007	Target:	8
2008	Target:	8
2009	Target:	8
2010	Target:	8
2011	Target:	8

## Outcomes for the Program

## 19. Outcome measures

### Outcome Text: Awareness created

#### Outcome Text

Number of processors and/or regulatory agencies implementing new rapid testing methods

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007	Target:	0
2008	Target:	0
2009	Target:	5
2010	Target:	50
2011	Target:	500

#### Outcome Text

Number of food processors implementing new technologies or technology improvements

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007	Target:	2
2008	Target:	2
2009	Target:	4
2010	Target:	4
2011	Target:	4

#### Outcome Text

New products produced

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0

2008 Target: 0

2009 Target: 1

2010 Target: 0

2011 Target: 1

**Outcome Text**

Grain storage, food or pest control entities adopting new process or product

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 10

2008 Target: 25

2009 Target: 25

2010 Target: 50

2011 Target: 25

**20. External factors which may affect outcomes**

- Natural Disasters (drought,weather extremes,etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programatic Challenges
- Populations changes (immigration,new cultural groupings,etc.)

**Description**

Appropriations from government and the industry. Changes in the economy, natural disasters, public policy changes, competing public priorities, competing programmatic challenges, and population changes all have a profound effect on the food industry and each can either promote or inhibit the food industry's willingness or in some cases ability to support progress in this area. Government support provides an unbiased avenue of funding that allows researchers to affect changes in processing that in the long-term benefits the safety, value, and quality of this nations food supply.

Government regulations and public policy changes effect how industry conducts its business and plays a critical role the focus of research efforts.

Economic and regulatory influences seem the strongest external factors on stored product protection. Pesticide and food safety regulations affect how commodities will be managed. Since all the products ultimately come from crops, natural disaster can have a significant impact on the economy of stored products.

**21. Evaluation studies planned**

- After Only (post program)
- Before-After (before and after program)
- Comparison between locales where the program operates and sites without program intervention

**Description**

Provided nutraceuticals can be identified and utilized from specified waste stream (near-term, wine production waste). Better utilization of the by-product reduces economic impact of waste on processor and improved utilization reduces organic accumulation in local landfills. Evaluate economic impact on processors capturing value. Evaluate economic impact on community's landfill usage from program usage.

Provided biodiesel production is feasible. Compare economic impact in communities where fat, oil, and grease is diverted to biodiesel production and those where it is not.

Research programs are evaluated at the end and prior to requests for additional funds. Extension and outreach programs are evaluated based on before and after assessment of student knowledge.

## **22. Data Collection Methods**

- Sampling
- Observation

### **Description**

Records are kept of all food processing firms that are clients of the Food and Agricultural Product Center. A survey of grain storage providers will be done to establish changes in practices.

## 1. Name of the Planned Program

Family Resiliency and Economic Well-Being and Human Nutrition and Health

## 2. Program knowledge areas

- 802 Human Development and Family Well-Being 30 %
- 607 Consumer Economics 7 %
- 724 Healthy Lifestyle 16 %
- 703 Nutrition Education and Behavior 17 %
- 602 Business Management, Finance, and Taxation 4 %
- 806 Youth Development 10 %
- 801 Individual and Family Resource Management 16 %

## 3. Program existence

- Mature (More than five years)

## 4. Program duration

- Long-Term (More than five years)

## 5. Brief summary about Planned Program

These programs focus on concerns from advisory and agencies across the state and include issues related to : overweight youth and adults, health risks, dietary intake, physical activity, attitudes and behaviors concerning food, risky behaviors by youth, and food safety. They also concern the economic struggles of many Oklahoma families and the opportunities for increasing family incomes.

## 6. Situation and priorities

Among children and adolescents, obesity increases the risk of diabetes, hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, cardiovascular disease, gall bladder disease and arthritis. Over the past decade, the percentage of those overweight has steadily increased in Oklahoma. Over half of Oklahoma's adult population has been classified at risk for health problems related to being overweight. The health-related economic cost of overweight to business is substantial and as much as 36 percent of health care costs relate to overweight.

Oklahomans know they need to eat well to be healthy yet a majority fail to meet the minimum recommended number of daily servings from the USDA MyPyramid grains; fruit; vegetable; and milk groups and total fat and simple sugar intake continue to exceed recommendations.

Diabetes is major risk factor of heart disease, which is the leading cause of death in Oklahoma and the nation. Individuals with diabetes are two to five times more likely to die from heart disease and stroke. Oklahoma has over 402,566 cases of diabetes, and about 1,800 annual deaths from diabetes. The cost of Diabetes in Oklahoma is over \$180,998,509,000.

Heart and blood vessels, also called cardiovascular diseases (CVD), are the leading cause of deaths in the Oklahoma and the nation. In 2002 cardiovascular diseases cost the nation an estimated \$329.2 billion, including health expenditures and lost productivity (AHA, statistical update, 2002). The death rate due to Heart Disease is 15% higher in Oklahoma than the United States rate.

It is estimated that food borne diseases cause 76 million illnesses, 325,000 hospitalizations, and 5,200 deaths in the United States each year. Medical costs and lost wages due to food borne salmonellosis, only 1 of many food borne infections, have been estimated to be more than \$1 billion/year. All persons are at risk of food borne illness but pregnant women, infants, the elderly and the immunocompromised at greatest risk of serious illness and death.

Oklahoma lags well below the national average on various measures of income, including per capita income (\$17,646 versus \$21,587) and median household income (\$33,400 versus \$41,994). Oklahoma also ranks among the top five states for per capita bankruptcy rates and percentage of population living below the poverty level.

Affordable housing is a major concern for all Americans. Many still lack the requisite skills and information for maintaining

homeownership.

Young people have control over considerable amounts of money and will continue to do so throughout their lives, yet studies continue to suggest that teens lack basic economic and money management skills.

Many Oklahoma citizens have considered starting their own business as a means to generate additional income. Entrepreneurship continues to be a core economic engine throughout the state's history. Yet, many of the businesses fail within the first five years or do not achieve a level of return to match entrepreneurs from other states.

High risk behaviors in children and youth, such as disconnecting from school, alcohol and substance use, premature sexual activity, violence, and delinquency, have been identified as critical issues. The aim is to teach children how to think rather than what to think by changing thinking styles, enhancing children's social adjustment, promoting pro-social behavior, and decreasing impulsivity and inhibition.

#### Priorities

Reduce the increase in overweight/obesity  
Improve dietary intake  
Reduce the increase in diabetes  
Reduce the increase in heart disease death rates  
Improve food safety for consumers  
Reduce family financial stresses  
Homebuyer education  
Improve youth consumer and financial skills  
Assist entrepreneurs  
Reduce risk behaviors and problems in children and youth

#### 7. Assumptions made for the Program

- Program will experience "customer acceptance" --schools, after school programs, community youth groups will allow the program to be taught.
- The focus issue of Obesity/Overweight is a long-term challenge citizens of Oklahoma will battle.
- Quality programming efficiently uses resources, is research-based, policy-relevant, and effective in bringing about desired change.
- Children and youth's resiliency is enhanced by assets such as support, empowerment, boundaries, expectations, constructive use of time, achievement motivation, positive values, social competencies, and positive identity.
- Approaches must be multi-faceted, fit local needs, and integrated in family, school, and community contexts.
- Both universal and targeted approaches are necessary, valuing efforts to engage diverse audiences.
- Programming will have a positive economic and social impact.

#### 8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program

- Oklahoma citizens will have decreased risk factors associated with obesity and overweight
  - Oklahoma citizens will be more financially secure today and in the future.
- Increased problem-solving skills will be used by children/youth  
Children/youth will exhibit fewer problem behaviors in schools.  
Decreased risk factors for children/youth.

#### 9. Scope of Program

- In-State Extension
- Integrated Research and Extension

#### Inputs for the Program

##### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

##### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

**12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program**

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	35.4	0.0	0.4	0.0
2008	36.4	0.0	0.4	0.0
2009	35.8	0.0	0.4	0.0
2010	35.8	0.0	0.4	0.0
2011	35.7	0.0	0.4	0.0

**Outputs for the Program****13. Activity (What will be done?)**

- Development of new curricula
- Adaptation & supplementation of existing curricula
- Development of marketing plan and materials
- Development of surveys, evaluation tool
- Searching out and applying for appropriate grants
- Delivery through classes, One-on-One, News Releases/TV/Radio, Participation in Events, Displays

Deliver I Can Problem Solve and other possible curricula resources to communities including children, youth, parents/caretakers, teachers, agencies and service providers, schools, and out-of-school programs.

Provide training and other staff development opportunities to county educators

Create public awareness of programs and resources through promotional and educational materials to be distributed to teachers, agency professionals, and other community members.

**14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts**

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Group Discussion</li> <li>● One-on-One Intervention</li> <li>● Demonstrations</li> <li>● Other 1 (Coach/train teachers one-on-one)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Public Service Announcement</li> <li>● Newsletters</li> <li>● TV Media Programs</li> <li>● Web sites</li> <li>● Other 1 (Social marketing in youth settin)</li> <li>● Other 2 (Radio interviews)</li> </ul>

**15. Description of targeted audience**

Youth, children; parents; teachers; adult volunteers; middle to low income families; race and ethnicity will also be recognized as an identifier of audiences; caretakers, agencies & service providers, schools, policy makers.

**16. Standard output measures**

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



	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	1500	100000	2400	1000
2008	2000	150000	3000	2000
2009	2000	150000	3000	2000
2010	2000	150000	3000	2000
2011	2000	150000	3000	2000

**17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents**

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	0
2010	0
2011	0

**18. Output measures****Output Text**

Revised online curriculum

2007 Target: 1  
2008 Target: 1  
2009 Target: 1  
2010 Target: 0  
2011 Target: 0

**Output Text**

Promotional materials and marketing campaign

2007 Target: 1  
2008 Target: 1  
2009 Target: 1  
2010 Target: 1  
2011 Target: 0

**Outcomes for the Program****19. Outcome measures****Outcome Text: Awareness created****Outcome Text**

Participants demonstrate improved food, nutrition, and/or physical activity behaviors

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 240

2008 Target: 240

2009 Target: 240

2010 Target: 240

2011 Target: 240

**Outcome Text**

Participants plan to utilize recommended financial management practices

**Outcome Type:** Short

2007 Target: 300

2008 Target: 300

2009 Target: 300

2010 Target: 300

2011 Target: 300

**Outcome Text**

Participants plan to manage their use of credit and/or reduce debt

**Outcome Type:** Short

2007 Target: 300

2008 Target: 300

2009 Target: 300

2010 Target: 300

2011 Target: 300

**Outcome Text**

Participants will plan or revise an asset building strategy

**Outcome Type:** Short

2007 Target: 180

2008 Target: 180

2009 Target: 180

2010 Target: 180

2011 Target: 180

**Outcome Text**

Participants will utilize recommended financial management practices

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0

2008 Target: 0

2009 Target: 0

2010 Target: 60

2011 Target: 60

**Outcome Text**

Participants will manage their use of credit and reduce debt

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0  
2008 Target: 0  
2009 Target: 0  
2010 Target: 60  
2011 Target: 60

**Outcome Text**

Participants in assest building classes will have bought a home, started a savins account, started a retirement account, started a business, or made a positive change in their financial process

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0  
2008 Target: 0  
2009 Target: 0  
2010 Target: 24  
2011 Target: 24

**Outcome Text**

Number of teachers and child care providers learning interpersonal cognitive problem-solving techniques

**Outcome Type:** Short

2007 Target: 30  
2008 Target: 75  
2009 Target: 100  
2010 Target: 50  
2011 Target: 50

**Outcome Text**

Number of teachers and child care providers using interpersonal cognitive problem-solving techniques with children/youth

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 25  
2008 Target: 60  
2009 Target: 75  
2010 Target: 30  
2011 Target: 30

**Outcome Text**

Number of children and youth using interpersonal cognitive problem-solving skills

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 500  
2008 Target: 1000  
2009 Target: 1250  
2010 Target: 750  
2011 Target: 750

**20. External factors which may affect outcomes**

- Natural Disasters (drought,weather extremes,etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programmatic Challenges
- Populations changes (immigration,new cultural groupings,etc.)
- Other

#### **Description**

Changes in economy may affect participants' consumption of fruits and vegetables in addition to dairy and whole grain products

Public policy changes in schools, such as school wellness policies, may affect participants' healthy food choices and participation in physical activity

#### **21. Evaluation studies planned**

- After Only (post program)
- Retrospective (post program)
- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)
- Time series (multiple points before and after program)
- Case Study
- Comparisons between program participants (individuals,group,organizations) and non-participants

#### **Description**

Methodologies used will be determined by target audience, available resources, and by meeting IRB standards. Plans are to use a variety of sampling methods for the healthy Oklahoma and economic well-being programming. All team members will receive in-service education on maintaining confidentiality, proper methods of survey and distribution of forms. Scripts for explaining the process to program participants, and consent forms will be developed. Demographic information will be gathered, pre and post survey data will be gathered and statistical analyses will be conducted to determine gains in knowledge. Follow up data will be collected to determine behavioral change.

An evaluation plan is in the process of being designed for the positive youth development program implementation beginning July 1, 2006. The strategies will particularly focus on evaluating impact of the core curriculum on interpersonal cognitive problem-solving skills with children and youth, their teachers, and/or parents. This may include designing or purchasing instruments for measuring change in knowledge and behavior. Qualitative data may also be collected through self-reports, focus groups or interviews.

#### **22. Data Collection Methods**

- Sampling
- Mail
- Telephone
- On-Site
- Unstructured
- Case Study
- Tests
- Other

#### **Description**

Participants in some elements of the program will be pre/post testing representing a population sample. Homebuyer Education certification requires passing a knowledge-based examination. Other techniques will be used to assess the direct benefits of the sessions offered. County educators will identify and obtain consent from schools, community agencies, day care centers, etc who have access to the target population age children and their parents. Data will be collected from teachers, parents, and children using unstructured interviews, questionnaires, and pre-post- testing methods.

## 1. Name of the Planned Program

4-H Youth Development

## 2. Program knowledge areas

- 608 Community Resource Planning and Development 5 %
- 806 Youth Development 95 %

## 3. Program existence

- New (One year or less)

## 4. Program duration

- Long-Term (More than five years)

## 5. Brief summary about Planned Program

This program contains three relative new youth development efforts around geospatial technologies in agriculture, environmental education, and youth community leadership development.

Geospatial technologies and related agriculturally applied technologies will demand specialists and personnel with an expertise in the technology. This provides an enormous potential for career opportunities for today's youth. This geospatial efforts are designed to help youth get a leg-up in this technology.

The Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service 4-H Youth Development program is developing teams of youth and adults in seventeen counties to research and educate the public about environmental issues. Because these concerns vary across Oklahoma, well water testing is the common phase for this initiative. In addition, County Environmental Education Teams are developing county action plans to identify local issues such as stream monitoring, riparian restoration, mapping illegal dumping sites and other environmental efforts.

The "future" decision makers need opportunities to develop life long learning skills; positive job skills and work ethics; increased awareness for public service and volunteerism; develop a connection with and desire to return to home community; and skills for problem solving and teamwork. To assist rural communities in strengthening their human capital teams of teens and an adult mentor(s) will be trained and coordinated by County Cooperative Extension staff. OCES Professionals and volunteers will be used to support and develop local Service Learning teams who participate in the mandatory "Building Leaders for Tomorrow" (BLT) training.

## 6. Situation and priorities

Geospatial technologies such as remote sensing, GPS and Geographical Information Systems have the potential to enhance production agriculture by increasing efficiency and reducing inputs. GPS/GIS is a cutting edge technology which uses satellites to locate precise positions on earth and creates maps. Development and implementation of these technologies will require a professional workforce with skills and knowledge about agriculture, GPS/GIS systems, robotics, and related technology. Youth have the potential to be the scientists and researchers of tomorrow who will research, develop and enhance these future agricultural practices.

Oklahoma's valuable environmental resources are in serious need of protection and improved stewardship. Restoration and enhancement of resources requires expanded awareness, knowledge, and appreciation of the environment and an upgrade of the stewardship ethic.

Oklahoma communities struggle with providing young people positive alternatives to substance abuse, teen pregnancy, and poor health and nutrition choices. Community leaders, parents, and schools representatives observe both youth and even adults lack community interest and skills for making sound choices. In many instances existing community organizations struggle with recruiting, training, and retaining viable volunteer base necessary to meet community needs.

### Priorities:

Youth leaders will develop an in-depth knowledge of career opportunities in precision agriculture and geospatial fields.

Youth will understand how current technology and precision agriculture relate.

A web-based project curriculum will be developed for training teens and volunteers to use within 4-H Technology and Precision Agriculture project clubs.

Start precision agriculture and geospatial 4-H project clubs by training 4-H volunteers and teen leaders.

Incorporate the precision agriculture curriculum into the Oklahoma Ag in the Classroom program.

Youth will become environmental stewards by recognizing how the actions of society affect environmental quality.

Youth will understand they have a voice in environmental (and other broad) issues in their communities.

County teams of youth and adults will identify environmental issues in their community, then select and implement an appropriate community project.

Youth will explore career opportunities in environmental science fields.

Educators and county teams of youth will understand and implement well-water testing procedures and wellhead assessment techniques to identify non-point sources of pollution and potential groundwater contamination risks.

Youth will understand the implications of groundwater pollution.

Increased public awareness of well-water quality practices and wellhead maintenance.

Increased collaboration and organization of youth organizations to address youth issues of: substance abuse, teen pregnancy, childhood obesity, nutrition and health, stress management, healthy choices, life skills development and job training.

Develop positive role models and character education.

Instill a social and civic awareness of community needs and providing adult and youth audiences with the skills for taking a proactive role in their communities.

## **7. Assumptions made for the Program**

Appropriate and sponsored funding will continue at similar levels. Key personnel will be replaced in a timely manner.

Youth will be recognized as a viable resource who can work along side adults to make a significant difference in their community.

## **8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program**

Youth leaders involved in precision agriculture project clubs will develop an in-depth knowledge of career opportunities in precision agriculture and geospatial fields.

Youth engaged in the 4-H Youth Development Geospatial Technology Team programming will understand how current technology and precision agriculture relate.

Youth and educators involved in this program will become environmental stewards by recognizing how the actions of society affect environmental quality, and they will educate others in environmental practices.

Collaborations with other youth serving organizations and community leaders. Share existing resources and training opportunities for both youth and adult volunteers.

Identified opportunities for short-term youth and adult volunteerism.

Well trained extension personnel as community leaders in volunteer recruitment, utilization and retention.

## **9. Scope of Program**

- In-State Extension

## Inputs for the Program

### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	34.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
2008	34.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
2009	34.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
2010	34.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
2011	34.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

Create a pilot-tested, web-based project curriculum which will be widely used in county extension programs. This curriculum will be designed to introduce students to precision agriculture and geospatial technology.

Start precision agriculture and geospatial 4-H project clubs by training 4-H volunteers and teen leaders to utilize the new materials to start precision agriculture project clubs.

Incorporate the precision agriculture curriculum into the Oklahoma Ag in the Classroom program. This curriculum will cover geospatial technologies and agricultural topics such as GPS/GIS, robotics, remote sensing, and precision agriculture.

Train Educators and county teams to conduct well water assessments. Trainings may include: Water-quality models, Bluethumb monitoring, Aqua times, Mapping Abandoned wells, Watershed, streambank restoration, Storm drain labels etc.

Recruit Volunteers interested and committed to the concept of developing strong Youth-Adult Partnerships for the benefit of serving the community.

Provide training and materials for initiating and maintaining teams of youth and adults committed to serving the community.

Train and graduate the first class of 4-H Volunteers.

Involve community leaders and other youth serving agencies as instructors/resources during the training process.

**14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts**

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Group Discussion</li> <li>● One-on-One Intervention</li> <li>● Other 1 (Complete action plans)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Web sites</li> </ul>

**15. Description of targeted audience**

Youth (grades 6-8) in 10 pilot counties will test new agricultural technology curriculum.

Youth and adult leaders in 16 counties will conduct environmental impact programming to other 4-H youth and the public.

Youth and adult 4-H mentors and/or other youth serving agencies, and teens, as well as volunteers recruited to work with underserved audiences.

**16. Standard output measures**

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	42	150	425	750
2008	52	150	550	1000
2009	55	150	650	1200
2010	56	150	750	1300
2011	57	150	750	1500

**17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents**

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	0
2010	0
2011	0

**18. Output measures****Output Text**

Web-based pilot curriculum - lessons developed and tested



2007	Target:	10
2008	Target:	10
2009	Target:	10
2010	Target:	0
2011	Target:	0

#### Output Text

New Geospatial 4-H project clubs with an emphasis on precision agriculture

2007	Target:	0
2008	Target:	5
2009	Target:	10
2010	Target:	15
2011	Target:	20

#### Output Text

Youth-adult environmental education teams

2007	Target:	90
2008	Target:	150
2009	Target:	200
2010	Target:	225
2011	Target:	225

#### Output Text

Teams of youth and adults interested in and committed to developing strong youth-adult partnerships for serving the community

2007	Target:	42
2008	Target:	52
2009	Target:	55
2010	Target:	56
2011	Target:	57

#### Output Text

Groups subsequently assisted and trained by "graduating" classes of youth community leadership.

2007	Target:	0
2008	Target:	10
2009	Target:	13
2010	Target:	14
2011	Target:	15

### Outcomes for the Program

#### 19. Outcome measures

##### Outcome Text: Awareness created

##### Outcome Text

Participants interested in pursuing a career in geospatial and precision technologies fields

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0  
2008 Target: 0  
2009 Target: 150  
2010 Target: 200  
2011 Target: 250

**Outcome Text**

Number of well-water assessments conducted

**Outcome Type:** Short

2007 Target: 200  
2008 Target: 250  
2009 Target: 300  
2010 Target: 0  
2011 Target: 0

**Outcome Text**

Number of well owners beginning voluntary well water testing for bacteria

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 5  
2008 Target: 10  
2009 Target: 15  
2010 Target: 20  
2011 Target: 0

**Outcome Text**

Number of youth/adults that continue volunteer well-water testing and other environmental monitoring past training

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0  
2008 Target: 0  
2009 Target: 0  
2010 Target: 100  
2011 Target: 0

**Outcome Text**

Number of community leadership action plans completed

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 42  
2008 Target: 52  
2009 Target: 55  
2010 Target: 56  
2011 Target: 57

**Outcome Text**

Number of trained and "graduated" youth and adult volunteers still providing direction tho their communities in elected and/or volunteer roles

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0

2008 Target: 0

2009 Target: 0

2010 Target: 0

2011 Target: 157

**20. External factors which may affect outcomes**

- Competing Programatic Challenges
- Populations changes (immigration,new cultural groupings,etc.)

**Description**

Community leadership development program will be dependent on community support and participation by other youth serving organizations, changes in county staffing or turnover and changes in county demographics.

**21. Evaluation studies planned**

- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)
- Time series (multiple points before and after program)
- Comparisons between different groups of individuals or program participants experiencing different levels of program intensity.

**Description**

Geospatial programming will be tracking participation in lesson usage and 4-h club development, throughout the program. At the end of the program cycle we will assess the number of teens participating in the program and their career interest in geospatial fields.

Environmental education programming will be tracking the number of water-wells tested and the test results. It will also be collecting activity reports from educators indicating the status and success of their county program. At the end of the program cycle it will conduct focus groups with teens to determine the impact of the program on the teen participants.

The community leadership programming will pre-and post with evaluation tools to determining the effectiveness of Youth-Adult Partnership and Youth in Governance. In addition, progress during training and community service project will be through written Action Plan and information observation. Finally, a national evaluation tool will be adapted for long-term evaluation.

**22. Data Collection Methods**

- Whole population
- Mail
- Telephone
- On-Site
- Unstructured
- Observation

**Description**

The extension educators involved in the geospatial programming will observe and interview the teens participating in the program and report their findings.

The extension educators involved in the environmental education programming will observe and interview the teens participating in the program and report their findings.

Community leadership programming will use pre-and post tools, written Action Plans and information observation, a nationally developed tool for our long-term evaluation.

# **1. Name of the Planned Program**

Turfgrass Development and Management

## **2. Program knowledge areas**

- 212 Pathogens and Nematodes Affecting Plants 20 %
- 202 Plant Genetic Resources 8 %
- 201 Plant Genome, Genetics, and Genetic Mechanisms 1 %
- 216 Integrated Pest Management Systems 20 %
- 204 Plant Product Quality and Utility (Preharvest) 2 %
- 206 Basic Plant Biology 1 %
- 203 Plant Biological Efficiency and Abiotic Stresses Affecting Plants 3 %
- 211 Insects, Mites, and Other Arthropods Affecting Plants 7 %
- 205 Plant Management Systems 27 %
- 111 Conservation and Efficient Use of Water 11 %

## **3. Program existence**

- Mature (More than five years)

## **4. Program duration**

- Long-Term (More than five years)

## **5. Brief summary about Planned Program**

Improve varieties, management and applications of turfgrasses including positive impacts on the economy, the environment and society.

## **6. Situation and priorities**

Turfgrass beautifies and stabilizes an estimated 30 million acres of land in the United States. Turfgrasses are the largest intensively managed plant system in the U.S. Continuous growth in turfgrass acreage is projected since turf usage is directly linked to urbanization. Turfgrasses developed and dominated in ecosystems governed by fire and continuous grazing. To maximize the benefits provided by turfgrasses, humans have replaced fire and animal grazing in urban settings with herbicides and mowing. Uncertainty of turf performance has been reduced with additions of fertilizer and irrigation water. Ever increasing turfgrass visual and functional performance is expected by our affluent society. Meanwhile, pests continue to co-evolve to feed on turfgrass and abiotic environmental stresses continue to provide limitations in turf ecosystems. Turfgrass managers are expected to maintain turfgrass in a manner that provides the ultimate in visual and functional benefits to human-kind in a cost-effective manner with little to no negative environmental impact. Our team will continue to identify and develop improved turfgrasses as well as necessary responsible management practices that will aid turfgrass managers in meeting their goals.

## **7. Assumptions made for the Program**

Appropriated and sponsored funding will continue at similar levels with consumer price-indexed increases. Fee-based educational programming will continue. Fee-based consultation will be explored when the end-user seeks in-depth time-intensive consultation services that should be offered for purchase by industry cooperators. Laboratories, field facilities and associated equipment will need to be replaced as needed. Key research and extension personnel will be replaced in a timely manner. Research and demonstration land holdings will increase proportional to the number of species/varieties and products that the turf industry is generating and requesting to be tested.

## **8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program**

New turf germplasm/varieties will be generated by our program. These products will have improved abiotic and biotic stress resistance/tolerance. Research will identify the elite performing varieties from both our program and from industry. Research will identify new or refined integrated management practices. Educational materials will be developed featuring improved varieties and how to properly maintain them. Intense and effective educational programming will be conducted to help integrate this information into existing management programs. Rational decision making based on the combination of science, perception and sound public policy will be made by the turf industry and the public at large. Resultant adoption of integrated turfgrass management strategies will occur and turfgrass performance can be maintained or improved with reduced potential

negative environmental impacts.

### 9. Scope of Program

- In-State Extension
- In-State Research
- Integrated Research and Extension
- Multistate Extension
- Multistate Integrated Research and Extension

### Inputs for the Program

#### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

#### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

#### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	1.6	0.0	2.7	0.0
2008	1.6	0.0	2.7	0.0
2009	1.6	0.0	2.7	0.0
2010	1.6	0.0	2.7	0.0
2011	1.6	0.0	2.7	0.0

### Outputs for the Program

#### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

New turf germplasm/varieties will be generated by our program. These products will have improved abiotic and biotic stress resistance/tolerance. Research will identify the elite performing varieties from both our program and from industry. Research will identify new or refined integrated management practices. Educational materials will be developed featuring improved varieties and how to properly maintain them. Intense and effective educational programming will be conducted to help integrate this information into existing management programs. Rational decision making based on the combination of science, perception and sound public policy will be made by the turf industry and the public at large. Resultant adoption of integrated turfgrass management strategies will occur and turfgrass performance can be maintained or improved with reduced potential negative environmental impacts.

#### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● One-on-One Intervention</li> <li>● Demonstrations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Newsletters</li> <li>● Web sites</li> </ul>

**15. Description of targeted audience**

Audiences include governmental, private industry and multiple end-user areas. Research audiences: basic and applied plant science/turf science researchers, including those from the CSSA, and ASHS. Funding agency audiences: USGA, GCSAA, USDA, OTRF and many private corporations. New cultivars developed as well as products such as trade articles, fact sheets, and educational programming will be provided to the target audiences characterized as the turfgrass production sector (sod and seed producers), service sector (landscape/lawn care and pest control operators) and turf managers (which include the golf course, parks & grounds, right of way managers and home consumers).

**16. Standard output measures**

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	2000	10000	0	0
2008	2000	10000	0	0
2009	2000	10000	0	0
2010	2000	10000	0	0
2011	2000	10000	0	0

**17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents**

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	0
2010	0
2011	1

**18. Output measures****Output Text**

Number of peer-reviewed journal articles manuscripts submitted

2007 Target: 2  
 2008 Target: 2  
 2009 Target: 2  
 2010 Target: 2  
 2011 Target: 2

**Output Text**

Number of final stage experimental bermudagrasses sent to national testing phase in the NTEP bermudagrass trial

2007 Target: 0  
2008 Target: 0  
2009 Target: 0  
2010 Target: 0  
2011 Target: 0

#### Output Text

Number of turf/roadside vegetaion management workshops conducted

2007 Target: 15  
2008 Target: 15  
2009 Target: 15  
2010 Target: 15  
2011 Target: 15

#### Output Text

Number of turfgrass managers trained in improved varieties and integrated turfgrass management systems

2007 Target: 500  
2008 Target: 500  
2009 Target: 500  
2010 Target: 500  
2011 Target: 500

### Outcomes for the Program

#### 19. Outcome measures

##### Outcome Text: Awareness created

##### Outcome Text

New varieties appearing in the Oklahoma sod trade for the first time

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0  
2008 Target: 1  
2009 Target: 0  
2010 Target: 1  
2011 Target: 0

##### Outcome Text

New turf varieties used by the Oklahoma golf course industry

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0  
2008 Target: 0  
2009 Target: 0  
2010 Target: 0  
2011 Target: 2

##### Outcome Text

Number of turfgrass manager participants intending to adopt improved turf management practices

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 400

2008 Target: 400

2009 Target: 400

2010 Target: 400

2011 Target: 400

## 20. External factors which may affect outcomes

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

### Description

Natural disasters, funding by governmental, NGO's and private industry partners as well as changing public/governmental policy are projected to contribute to the greatest amount of uncertainty in achieving program goals.

## 21. Evaluation studies planned

- Retrospective (post program)
- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)
- Time series (multiple points before and after program)

### Description

Yearly survey of 50+ Oklahoma sod producers will continue to be conducted. Survey will confirm availability of new and older varieties in the trade.

Oklahoma Golf course industry is surveyed every 7 to 10 years for adoption of new varieties and acreage of improved varieties.

Conference/Workshop participants will be surveyed to determine their intent to adopt improved varieties and IPM techniques conveyed during workshops. Workshop participants will include those from spring dead spot management workshops, Campus IPM workshops and the Oklahoma/Arkansas Turfgrass Management Short course.

Approximately 2% of all turf management consultation clients from the previous year are surveyed each year informally by phone to determine the clients' success in problems solving, need for further information and customer satisfaction with the recommendations that were provided by the turfgrass specialist.

## 22. Data Collection Methods

- Sampling
- Mail
- Telephone
- On-Site
- Unstructured
- Observation
- Tests
- Journals

### Description

Informal survey of individual clientele will be conducted by phone. Workshop attendees will be surveyed by paper form at the conclusion of workshops for knowledge gained as well as their intent to adopt new



knowledge into existing programs and their anticipated gains. Development of yearly sod source directories is a direct measures adoption of new/improved turfgrass varieties.

### **1. Name of the Planned Program**

Community Resource and Economic Development

### **2. Program knowledge areas**

- 608 Community Resource Planning and Development 100 %

### **3. Program existence**

- Mature (More than five years)

### **4. Program duration**

- Long-Term (More than five years)

### **5. Brief summary about Planned Program**

Rural Oklahoma faces many challenges including a need to diversify and enhance the local economies and continue to provide a viable quality of life. The planned program will focus on local economic development, infrastructure and community services, local government, and leadership development. All of these focus areas are needed if rural Oklahoma is to prosper.

The Initiative Team has a strong history of cooperative efforts. The “healthy communities” workgroup includes many team members. We have organized and delivered in-service training programs and developed training materials that cut across program lines and geographic boundaries. We anticipate these cooperative efforts will continue.

There are several sub-categories or areas of specialization within the team. These areas include:

- Economic Development;
- Infrastructure and Community Services;
- Local Government;
- Leadership Development;
- Manufacturing Assistance; and
- Entrepreneurship.

### **6. Situation and priorities**

Rural Oklahoma is diverse. Some counties have severe declining population. Other rural counties are experiencing growth and urban sprawl. Priorities will focus on providing educational programs and applied research results that assist rural leaders in dealing with specific local issues. The program will focus on efforts in economic development, infrastructure and community services, local government, leadership development, manufacturing assistance, and entrepreneurship.

### **7. Assumptions made for the Program**

1. There is a need for research and technical assistance in rural Oklahoma;
2. OSU has capabilities to respond;
3. Funding and staffing will be at least constant and perhaps increase.

### **8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program**

1. Assist in efforts to diversify the local economy in rural areas of Oklahoma.
2. Improve well being of community residents and aid in enhancing quality of life.

### **9. Scope of Program**

- In-State Extension
- In-State Research
- Integrated Research and Extension

## Inputs for the Program

### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	12.7	0.0	0.8	0.0
2008	12.9	0.0	0.8	0.0
2009	12.9	0.0	0.8	0.0
2010	12.9	0.0	0.8	0.0
2011	12.8	0.0	0.8	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

Strategic planning training and strategic planning for communities, 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.

### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Group Discussion</li> <li>● One-on-One Intervention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Newsletters</li> <li>● Web sites</li> </ul>

### 15. Description of targeted 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

### 16. Standard output measures

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	880	5650	0	0
2008	890	10650	0	0
2009	890	10650	0	0
2010	890	10650	0	0
2011	890	10650	0	0

17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	0
2010	0
2011	0

18. Output measures

Output Text

Number of community services plans completed

2007 Target: 30  
2008 Target: 30  
2009 Target: 30  
2010 Target: 30  
2011 Target: 30

Output Text

Number of education modules completed

2007 Target: 1  
2008 Target: 1  
2009 Target: 1  
2010 Target: 1  
2011 Target: 1

Output Text

Number of county officer training courses conducted

2007 Target: 35  
2008 Target: 35  
2009 Target: 35  
2010 Target: 35  
2011 Target: 35

**Output Text**

Number of manufacturing firms receiving applications engineering assistance

2007	Target:	45
2008	Target:	50
2009	Target:	50
2010	Target:	50
2011	Target:	50

**Outcomes for the Program**

**19. Outcome measures**

**Outcome Text: Awareness created**

**Outcome Text**

Number improving business skills

**Outcome Type:** Short

2007	Target:	150
2008	Target:	150
2009	Target:	150
2010	Target:	150
2011	Target:	150

**Outcome Text**

Number of manufacturing jobs created or retained

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007	Target:	50
2008	Target:	50
2009	Target:	50
2010	Target:	50
2011	Target:	50

**Outcome Text**

Number of communities where capacity was increased

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007	Target:	30
2008	Target:	30
2009	Target:	30
2010	Target:	30
2011	Target:	30

**Outcome Text**

Number of participants that plan to open/expand a business

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 100

2008 Target: 100

2009 Target: 100

2010 Target: 100

2011 Target: 100

**Outcome Text**

Number of communities that build plans for growth and/or improvement

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 15

2008 Target: 15

2009 Target: 15

2010 Target: 15

2011 Target: 15

**Outcome Text**

Number of leadership class graduates actively participating in community or industry

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 75

2008 Target: 100

2009 Target: 100

2010 Target: 125

2011 Target: 150

**20. External factors which may affect outcomes**

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

**Description**

Resources and priorities are impacted by unexpected events. A down turn in the economy may mean fewer resources are available to do this work. Some events are beyond our control.

**21. Evaluation studies planned**

- After Only (post program)
- Retrospective (post program)
- Before-After (before and after program)
- Case Study

**Description**

Programs will be evaluated after delivery. Most will have immediate post-evaluation. Selected programs will have medium term and long term post-evaluations.

Some case studies will be conducted to enhance evaluation and feedback.

In all cases, outcomes are expected to lead to economic or societal impacts. In some cases, there will be economic outcomes such as jobs created or retained. In other cases, social impacts will relate to enhanced quality of life. These evaluation studies are intended to try to capture this information.

## **22. Data Collection Methods**

- Sampling
- Mail
- Telephone
- On-Site
- Case Study

### **Description**

Survey data collection will follow standard research procedures and will be as detailed as resources allow. Case studies will be well thought out and, on occasion, may be graduate student research projects.

## 1. Name of the Planned Program

Integrated Pest Management

## 2. Program knowledge areas

- 601 Economics of Agricultural Production and Farm Management 5 %
- 202 Plant Genetic Resources 5 %
- 133 Pollution Prevention and Mitigation 10 %
- 901 Program and Project Design, and Statistics 5 %
- 211 Insects, Mites, and Other Arthropods Affecting Plants 15 %
- 216 Integrated Pest Management Systems 20 %
- 205 Plant Management Systems 5 %
- 215 Biological Control of Pests Affecting Plants 5 %
- 212 Pathogens and Nematodes Affecting Plants 15 %
- 213 Weeds Affecting Plants 15 %

## 3. Program existence

- Mature (More than five years)

## 4. Program duration

- Long-Term (More than five years)

## 5. Brief summary about Planned Program

The IPM team will (1) examine stakeholder needs relative to pest management, (2) develop education and research programs to address pest management issues, (3) deliver findings and IPM recommendations to stakeholders through appropriate delivery systems, and (4) evaluate short and long-term impact of IPM recommendations.

## 6. Situation and priorities

Targeted pests and emerging pest problems affect net profitability of agricultural enterprises and the quality of life in non-agricultural systems. Consumers demand a safe supply of food & fiber, and want it produced in an environmentally appropriate way. The availability of conventional pesticide tools continues to decrease, making it essential that IPM programs are effective, safe and sustainable. It remains critical to stakeholders that the IPM team assesses stakeholder priorities, conducts targeted research, and delivers extension and education programs that address safety and sustainability of current and future pest management approaches, and evaluate the impact of short and long-term management recommendations. The IPM team has developed the following priorities: Assess Research and Extension Needs for Oklahoma's "Minor Crops" and Turf Industries; Evaluate IPM strategies in no-till systems; Develop management approaches for aphids in winter canola; expanding the PEET multiple-objective decision support system to include insecticides and fungicides; and the continue to develop management approaches for problem weeds.

## 7. Assumptions made for the Program

Appropriated and sponsored support for the core group of research and extension faculty will need to be maintained at similar levels. Personnel will need to be replaced.

## 8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program

The IPM team will address identified stakeholder priorities for management of pests by developing research, extension, and evaluation programs that ensure the safety and viability of pest management approaches, while increasing net profitability and improving the quality of life in agricultural and non-agricultural systems.

## 9. Scope of Program



- In-State Extension
- In-State Research
- Integrated Research and Extension
- Multistate Extension
- Multistate Integrated Research and Extension
- Multistate Research

## Inputs for the Program

### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	5.5	0.0	2.1	0.0
2008	5.3	0.0	2.1	0.0
2009	5.3	0.0	2.1	0.0
2010	5.3	0.0	2.1	0.0
2011	5.3	0.0	2.1	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

Assessment of stakeholder priorities for IPM  
 Conduct targeted research on pest status, suppression and IPM approaches  
 Develop and deliver IPM programs to stakeholders  
 Develop pesticide applicator education and pesticide information  
 Assess impact of educational activities on stakeholder IPM

### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Group Discussion</li> <li>● One-on-One Intervention</li> <li>● Demonstrations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Newsletters</li> <li>● TV Media Programs</li> <li>● Web sites</li> </ul>

### 15. Description of targeted audience

Agricultural Producers, Agricultural Groups, Commercial Growers, Retailers, Agricultural Professionals (private, commercial and non-commercial), and landowners, nurseries, individual stakeholders.

**16. Standard output measures**

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	500	3700	0	0
2008	1000	4000	0	0
2009	1000	4300	0	0
2010	1000	4600	0	0
2011	1000	4900	0	0

**17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents**

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	0
2010	0
2011	0

**18. Output measures****Output Text**

Stakeholder assessment

2007 Target: 1  
 2008 Target: 1  
 2009 Target: 0  
 2010 Target: 0  
 2011 Target: 1

**Output Text**

IPM schools, conferences and workshops

2007 Target: 10  
 2008 Target: 12  
 2009 Target: 14  
 2010 Target: 16  
 2011 Target: 18

**Output Text**

Pesticide applicator education schools and workshops

2007 Target: 10  
2008 Target: 15  
2009 Target: 20  
2010 Target: 21  
2011 Target: 25

## Outcomes for the Program

### 19. Outcome measures

#### Outcome Text: Awareness created

##### Outcome Text

Peer reviewed research publications and extension publications

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 2  
2008 Target: 3  
2009 Target: 2  
2010 Target: 3  
2011 Target: 2

##### Outcome Text

Increased use of pest management approaches for targeted cropping system acres

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 3600  
2008 Target: 3900  
2009 Target: 4200  
2010 Target: 4500  
2011 Target: 4800

##### Outcome Text

Number of trained certified pesticide applicators

**Outcome Type:** Short

2007 Target: 100  
2008 Target: 110  
2009 Target: 120  
2010 Target: 130  
2011 Target: 140

##### Outcome Text

Increase in percent of growers with knowledge of and adoption of Glance n Go aphid sampling procedure in wheat

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 0  
2008 Target: 0  
2009 Target: 30  
2010 Target: 0  
2011 Target: 0

## **20. External factors which may affect outcomes**

- Natural Disasters (drought,weather extremes,etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Populations changes (immigration,new cultural groupings,etc.)

### **Description**

Any factors that affect production systems and IPM (research and extension ) will affect outcomes.

## **21. Evaluation studies planned**

- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)

### **Description**

For educational programs, before and after, and surveys during the program will evaluate knowledge of IPM information or program. A followup survey on "Glance and Go" monitoring method is planned for the planning period - a baseline survey was done previously.

## **22. Data Collection Methods**

- Sampling
- Whole population
- Mail
- On-Site

### **Description**

IPM members assessing stakeholder priorities and effectiveness of IPM programs will utilize on-site survey methodologies and/or mail surveys to address larger populations. A producer survey will be used for collecting data on Glance and Go use.

## 1. Name of the Planned Program

Agricultural Biosecurity

## 2. Program knowledge areas

- 712 Protect Food from Contamination by Pathogenic Microorganisms, Parasites, and Naturally Occurring Toxins 20 %
- 903 Communication, Education, and Information Delivery 10 %
- 211 Insects, Mites, and Other Arthropods Affecting Plants 5 %
- 213 Weeds Affecting Plants 5 %
- 212 Pathogens and Nematodes Affecting Plants 60 %

## 3. Program existence

- New (One year or less)

## 4. Program duration

- Long-Term (More than five years)

## 5. Brief summary about Planned Program

The Agricultural Biosecurity Team will focus initially on the development of an Oklahoma Center for Agricultural Microbial Forensics and Biosecurity (CAMFAB). The Center will be designed as a framework within which communication among Team members is facilitated and initiatives related to research, teaching and outreach are supported.

Initial efforts will focus on graduate education and research, to include the development of a multi-disciplinary, multi-OSU-branch core curriculum and targeted research projects.

Training for extension agents and other first detectors, and development of a broad-based undergraduate course in Agricultural Biosecurity also are planned.

## 6. Situation and priorities

Through history, threats of biological weapons and bioterrorism have been directed against agricultural targets including plant and animal resources. If strategically deployed, such agents could cause significant economic losses through commodity losses, trade restrictions, embargoes, and economic detriment to the rural communities whose infrastructure is dependent upon the agricultural infrastructure. It is a priority for OSU to respond to state and national needs related to the prevention of, and preparation for, events of deliberate introduction of a biological agent with the intent to harm U.S. agricultural resources.

### Short term priorities – Established by the Homeland Security Team

Develop a cooperative, multi-institutional Oklahoma initiative in agriculturally- and food safety related microbial forensics. Cooperators may include OSU (Stillwater, Tulsa, CHS), OAES, OCES, the Oklahoma Bureau of Investigation, the Oklahoma Memorial for the Prevention of Terrorism, the Oklahoma Working Group on Agricultural Biosecurity, OU and possibly other entities.

Host, at OSU, a National workshop to develop the concept of an OSU Institute for Microbial Forensics. Invitees will include representatives from the FBI, CIA, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, the Oklahoma agricultural security community, OSU administration and OSU faculty and staff.

C. Establish OSU as a credible and relevant research provider in the area of agricultural microbial forensics.

1. Support the research project of a graduate student in food safety related forensic diagnostics development (S. Gilliland, PI)
2. Support the exploration of microbial variability in global populations of a major phytopathogenic bacterial

model, *Pseudomonas syringae*, for forensic discrimination (Fletcher, Bender and Melcher, PIs)

3. Initiate a research project on population diversity among populations of a major plant pathogenic virus model: Tomato spotted wilt virus (Melcher, PI)  
Offer a short workshop/training course on forensic issues.

The purpose of the course will be to prepare State educators, diagnosticians, researchers, extension agents, students and postdocs, producers and first detectors/responders (anticipate submission of a TIP proposal for this in FY 07).

Sociological impacts of terrorism (preparedness for and sociological/psychological impacts of an agroterrorism incident).

Oklahoma has strong agricultural commodity groups and a strong agricultural economic base. A terrorist attack focused on the agricultural industry in Oklahoma would be devastating. Response during a time of crisis is critical to minimizing the effects of the event. Using the appropriate communication methods is vital to minimizing the effects of an attack. In addition, understanding the sociological and psychological impacts of an agricultural terrorist attack can help in preparation for responding to such an event. (Cartmell, PI)

Link the activities of the Homeland Security Team with those of the OSU Center for Veterinary Health Sciences (CVHS).

The CVHS has been involved in biodefense initiatives pertinent to biological agents and emerging infectious diseases, with programs supported by NIH/NIAID. Technological platforms and related expertise have been established, and linkage of the CVHS biodefense program to the priorities of the DASNR Homeland Security Team are a priority. Through this multi-college collaboration, the biodefense-related research and training program at OSU can be expanded and strengthened.

#### Longer term/associated objectives

Explore the possibility of developing a graduate program in Microbial Forensics at OSU  
Develop an undergraduate course in agricultural biosecurity at OSU

### **7. Assumptions made for the Program**

Agricultural biosecurity issues will receive increasing state and national attention in the near term. Significant new research, educational and extension initiatives will be needed to respond to agricultural biosecurity-related needs of Oklahoma and the U.S.  
Funding opportunities may increase, particularly at the national level, for such efforts.

### **8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program**

To bring the overall Oklahoma agricultural enterprise to an optimal state of biosecurity prevention and preparedness and to serve as a significant contributor to the National agricultural biosecurity system, particularly in the emerging discipline of plant pathogen forensics.

### **9. Scope of Program**

- In-State Extension
- In-State Research
- Integrated Research and Extension
- Multistate Research

## Inputs for the Program

### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
2008	1.0	0.0	2.0	0.0
2009	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0
2010	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0
2011	2.0	0.0	4.0	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

\*Establish the Oklahoma Center for Agricultural Microbial Forensics and Biosecurity, a multi-disciplinary unit to support and address issues of crop and food biosecurity, and their impacts

\*Host a Workshop on Plant Pathogen Forensics to shape the emerging new discipline of plant pathogen forensics and to define a role for OSU and Oklahoma in that discipline.

\*Conduct scientific research targeted specifically towards plant pathogen forensics, sociological impacts of terrorism, and other areas of agricultural biosecurity

\*Develop an academic "track" for students seeking M.S. or Ph.D. degrees in established programs such as Plant Pathology, Biochemistry, Plant Sciences or Forensic Sciences, who seek plant pathogen forensics

Offer a short course on microbial forensics to prepare State educators, diagnosticians, researchers, extension agents, students and postdocs, producers and first detectors/responders

Develop an undergraduate course in Agricultural Biosecurity

### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Group Discussion</li> <li>● Other 1 (Graduate Training)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Web sites</li> <li>● Other 1 (State initiatives)</li> <li>● Other 2 (Federal initiatives)</li> </ul>

**15. Description of targeted audience**

Key members of National and Oklahoma homeland security community (DHS, FBI, CIA, etc)

Key members of National and Oklahoma agricultural leaders and representatives

Oklahoma extension personnel

Master gardeners

Oklahoma producers and crop consultants

OSU students and faculty

Professional/scientific societies

Key industries

The public

**16. Standard output measures**

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	100	150	0	0
2008	100	200	0	0
2009	100	350	0	0
2010	100	300	0	0
2011	100	300	0	0

**17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents**

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	0
2010	0
2011	1

**18. Output measures****Output Text**

Number of OSU faculty and staff affiliated with the new Oklahoma Center for Agricultural Microbial Forensics Biosecurity

2007 Target: 6

2008 Target: 7

2009 Target: 8

2010 Target: 8

2011 Target: 10

**Output Text**

Workshops to develop the discipline of plant pathogen forensics, train "first responders", and state and national stakeholders



2007 Target: 1  
2008 Target: 1  
2009 Target: 1  
2010 Target: 1  
2011 Target: 1

#### Output Text

Number of grant/contract proposals submitted in agricultural microbial forensics and biosecurity

2007 Target: 1  
2008 Target: 1  
2009 Target: 1  
2010 Target: 1  
2011 Target: 1

#### Output Text

Number of journal articles submitted with emphasis on agricultural microbial forensics and biosecurity

2007 Target: 1  
2008 Target: 2  
2009 Target: 2  
2010 Target: 2  
2011 Target: 3

### Outcomes for the Program

#### 19. Outcome measures

##### Outcome Text: Awareness created

##### Outcome Text

Establishment of the Oklahoma Center for Agricultural Microbial Forensics and Biosecurity

##### Outcome Type: Short

2007 Target: 1  
2008 Target: 0  
2009 Target: 0  
2010 Target: 0  
2011 Target: 0

##### Outcome Text

Number of invitations to agricultural biosecurity team members for participation in initiatives, programs, presentations, and consultations related to agricultural biosecurity and microbial forensics

##### Outcome Type: Long

2007 Target: 10  
2008 Target: 15  
2009 Target: 20  
2010 Target: 20  
2011 Target: 20

#### Outcome Text

Number of forensics-relevant journal articles published

**Outcome Type:** Short

2007 Target: 1

2008 Target: 2

2009 Target: 2

2010 Target: 2

2011 Target: 2

#### Outcome Text

Percentage of agricultural producers, handlers and processors employing at least one new (to them) practice to enhance biosecurity

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0

2008 Target: 10

2009 Target: 20

2010 Target: 30

2011 Target: 50

#### 20. External factors which may affect outcomes

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

#### Description

National initiatives in agricultural biosecurity are likely to increase if there are new terrorist or biological attacks on or within the U.S. Funding for such initiatives will rise or fall depending on financial demands caused by national disasters, the economy (gas prices, war in Iraq, etc), as well as on appropriations changes. Changes in the Federal government, and in public policy, will affect the nature and strength of security programs. International cooperation in the area of agricultural biosecurity is likely to increase, as cross-border cooperation is necessary for effective management of pathogens that ignore borders.

#### 21. Evaluation studies planned

- During (during program)
- Time series (multiple points before and after program)

#### Description

Evaluation will be done annually by email questionnaire to (1) Team members, to document their activities and products, and (2) to members of the Advisory Committee, composed of members of the national security community.

#### 22. Data Collection Methods

- Sampling
- Unstructured
- Observation

#### Description

Evaluation will be done annually by email questionnaire to (1) Team members, to document their activities and

products, and (2) to members of the Advisory Committee, composed of members of the national security community.

# 1. Name of the Planned Program

## Structure and Function of Macromolecules

# 2. Program knowledge areas

- 501 New and Improved Food Processing Technologies 4 %
- 203 Plant Biological Efficiency and Abiotic Stresses Affecting Plants 4 %
- 312 External Parasites and Pests of Animals 4 %
- 201 Plant Genome, Genetics, and Genetic Mechanisms 4 %
- 311 Animal Diseases 4 %
- 212 Pathogens and Nematodes Affecting Plants 4 %
- 211 Insects, Mites, and Other Arthropods Affecting Plants 4 %
- 206 Basic Plant Biology 4 %
- 305 Animal Physiological Processes 64 %
- 304 Animal Genome 4 %

# 3. Program existence

- Intermediate (One to five years)

# 4. Program duration

- Long-Term (More than five years)

# 5. Brief summary about Planned Program

Basic scientific inquiry aimed at the identification of macromolecules and macromolecular interactions, and characterization of structural and functional features of these molecules and their interactions that modulate growth, development, health and pathophysiological processes in plant and animal systems. Development of an understanding of critical biological and physiological processes and interactions at a molecular level leading to new insights that can be exploited for the improvement of plant and animal health.

# 6. Situation and priorities

-In the post-genomic era, the ability to predict protein structure, function and interactions from genomic data holds huge potential for making advances in public health and agriculture.

-Macromolecules govern plant and animal physiology and pathophysiology, hence an understanding of their structure-function relationships can be used to attack or improve agriculturally relevant physiological processes.

-Sophisticated instrumentation and highly trained staff are needed to carry out the experiments that will generate a knowledge base, which would make such predictions feasible.

-Interactions between faculty and staff with a common interest in structural biology, and a breadth of expertise are required to fully exploit the current knowledge base to solve current and future problems.

-Methods for solving and predicting the structure of complex oligo/polysaccharides are woefully inadequate.

Priorities will be to:

a. carry out basic research into the interactions between and the structure and function of macromolecules occurring in plant and animal systems.

b. build, foster and maintain a cohesive critical mass of research faculty with a diverse set of expertise that focus on the study of structural biology.

c. obtain funding to acquire and maintain state of the art equipment to enhance the research capabilities relating to protein structure/ function/ interactions on the OSU campus.

d. acquire and maintain support for "Core" facilities that are critical to the research mission of DASNR and Oklahoma State University: the need to restore the "Hybridoma Facility (HYCABS)" is specifically noted, particularly to develop intellectual property that is patentable or that can be licensed.

e. attract sufficient extramural support to establish an extramurally funded "Structural Biology" Center at OSU that will stimulate collaborations and research productivity.

f. Long-term goals are to grow knowledge, and to use this knowledge to contribute to the enhancement of the State's agricultural productivity.

## 7. Assumptions made for the Program

- New and improved technologies will be continued to be developed that will accelerate solving macromolecular structures, and interaction networks.
- Patentable or licensable discoveries or technologies will be generated by researchers.
- Appropriated and sponsored funding will continue at a similar or enhanced level.
- Funding levels will allow adding key faculty, and vacated positions to be replaced in a timely fashion.
- Funding levels will allow key technical and "core" facility personnel to be added and/or replaced in a timely manner: the assumed restoration the "HYCABS Core" is specifically noted, particularly its relationship to the development of patentable and licensable intellectual property.
- Faculty and staff with necessary skills can be recruited.
- External funds for the purchase of new instrumentation and technologies will be obtained that will serve as catalyst for stimulating research productivity and collaborations.
- Increased research productivity will lead to new research discoveries that will subsequently translate into increased extramural funding throughout the course of the project.
- Discoveries will have economic impacts.
- The team initiative will lead to increased interactions and collaborations between research groups on and off campus.

## 8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program

- To make fundamental scientific discoveries that will enhance our understanding of molecular mechanisms involved in the regulation of macromolecular interactions, and determination of macromolecular structures, and the relationships of macromolecular structure to function that can be exploited for the improvement of plant and animal health.
- To assemble a critical mass of researchers in structural biology who will work together to generate a continuous stream of extramural funding and allow the establishment of a "Structural Biology" Center at OSU.

## 9. Scope of Program

- In-State Research
- Multistate Research

## Inputs for the Program

### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	0.0	0.0	6.4	0.0
2008	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0
2009	0.0	0.0	7.4	0.0
2010	0.0	0.0	7.9	0.0
2011	0.0	0.0	8.4	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

Basic research will be conducted that will make fundamental discoveries which will enhance our understanding of molecular mechanisms involved in the regulation of physiological processes in plant and animal systems.

- New faculty and staff will be recruited to build, foster and maintain a cohesive critical mass of research faculty with a diverse set of expertise that focus on the study of structural biology.
- Grant proposals will be written to acquire and maintain state of the art equipment to enhance the research capabilities relating to protein structure/ function/ interactions on the OSU campus.
- Funds will be applied for/ solicited from national, state and university sources to acquire, maintain and restore support for "Core" facilities that are critical to the research mission of DASNR and Oklahoma State University.
- Proposals will be submitted to attract sufficient extramural support to establish an extramurally funded "Structural Biology" Center at OSU that will stimulate collaborations and research productivity.
- Design and conduct basic research to fill critical gaps in scientific knowledge that will address needs, issues and problems that ultimately can be translated into an improvement in plant and animal health.
- Develop new research methods and procedures
- Train undergraduate and graduate students, and postdoctoral associates
- Publish scientific articles
- Write and submit grant proposals
- Attend and present scientific findings at professional meetings
- File patents for protection of intellectual property and negotiate licensing agreements for technology transfer
- Interact with other researchers both on and off the OSU campus.

#### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
● {NO DATA ENTERED}	● {NO DATA ENTERED}

#### 15. Description of targeted audience

Team members

- Departments and department heads
- OSU administrators
- Other faculty and other scientific researchers in DASNR, at OSU & the scientific community
- Students and post-docs
- Federal, state, and private funding agencies
- Scientific journal editors, readers & the scientific community
- Candidates for open faculty and staff positions.
- Patent officers
- Agricultural, environmental, life, and human science industries
- General public and elected officials

#### 16. Standard output measures

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	0	0	0	0
2008	0	0	0	0
2009	0	0	0	0
2010	0	0	0	0
2011	0	0	0	0

**17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents**

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	1
2010	1
2011	2

**18. Output measures****Output Text**

Number of manuscripts submitted based on reserach efforts

2007 Target: 24  
 2008 Target: 26  
 2009 Target: 28  
 2010 Target: 30  
 2011 Target: 32

**Output Text**

Number of extramural grants submitted with preliminary data from research efforts

2007 Target: 16  
 2008 Target: 18  
 2009 Target: 20  
 2010 Target: 22  
 2011 Target: 22

**Output Text**

Number of presentations given at meetings and conferences to disseminate research results

2007 Target: 12  
 2008 Target: 14  
 2009 Target: 16  
 2010 Target: 19  
 2011 Target: 22

**Outcomes for the Program****19. Outcome measures****Outcome Text: Awareness created****Outcome Text**

Number of graduate students graduated and postdoctoral associates mentored in structural biology

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 5  
2008 Target: 6  
2009 Target: 7  
2010 Target: 8  
2011 Target: 10

**Outcome Text**

Number of manuscripts published

**Outcome Type:** Short

2007 Target: 16  
2008 Target: 18  
2009 Target: 20  
2010 Target: 24  
2011 Target: 28

**Outcome Text**

Number of invitations faculty receive to present research findings at universities and colleges and national and international meetings

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 3  
2008 Target: 4  
2009 Target: 5  
2010 Target: 6  
2011 Target: 7

**Outcome Text**

Number of new plant varieties developed from research

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0  
2008 Target: 0  
2009 Target: 0  
2010 Target: 1  
2011 Target: 1

**Outcome Text**

Number of new drugs that move into clinical or veterinary application

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0  
2008 Target: 0  
2009 Target: 0  
2010 Target: 1  
2011 Target: 1

**Outcome Text**

number of new pesticides developed that replace hazardous or less environmentally safe alternatives currently in use.



**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0

2008 Target: 0

2009 Target: 0

2010 Target: 0

2011 Target: 1

**20. External factors which may affect outcomes**

- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Competing Public priorities

**Description**

Economic conditions determine tax revenue collections and the ability of DASNR, the university, and the state and national government to fund research and development and implementation of the team initiative.

- Priorities set at the local, state and national levels determine what budget cuts will be made and/ or what programs will be funded.

-Pools of suitable candidates may not be available to attract qualified individuals to fill faculty and staff positions.

-Availability of commercial expertise and instrumentation outside of the OSU campus may be come more attractive to campus scientists and potential collaborators.

**21. Evaluation studies planned**

- During (during program)
- Time series (multiple points before and after program)

**Description**

The data relative to numbers for evaluation of outputs and outcomes will be collected annually and trends plotted.

Data on past trends will be researched

**22. Data Collection Methods**

- Other

**Description**

The data necessary to gather the numbers for evaluating outputs and outcomes are available from the office of department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology and other DASNR departmental offices, and the DASNR and OSU administration. Also, researchers will be polled to know of industrial/medical applications of findings.

The data will be collected annually and trends plotted.

Data on past records is equally available.

## 1. Name of the Planned Program

Farm and Agribusiness Management

## 2. Program knowledge areas

- 601 Economics of Agricultural Production and Farm Management 50 %
- 602 Business Management, Finance, and Taxation 50 %

## 3. Program existence

- Mature (More than five years)

## 4. Program duration

- Long-Term (More than five years)

## 5. Brief summary about Planned Program

This program is a broad spectrum of farm management, economics, and business management programming applied to the agricultural sector of Oklahoma and the region. It includes farm-level decision making, product handling, transportation, processing, manufacture and retail.

## 6. Situation and priorities

Production agriculture and agribusiness firms are a vital part of Oklahoma's rural economy. These firms face difficulties because of the internal and external changes faced by managers including commodity prices, fuel, fertilizer and input prices, domestic policies, globalization, environmental issues and regulations, labor issues and regulations, intergenerational transfer, tax issues, rural-urban fringe pressures, transportation issues, bio-security and information technology. The team's priorities include:

Improved understanding of the economic systems involving Oklahoma farms and agribusinesses

Development of enterprise budgets, decision aids and other tools to improve and enable improved decision making and improve efficiency and profitability.

Development of educational programs to improve and enable improved decision making and improve efficiency and profitability.

Collect, summarize, and disseminate agricultural information required for agricultural decision making

Help farm and agribusiness managers to identify and use technology to manage and effectively use information.

Conduct research and develop, maintain, and deliver educational programs and materials to assist producers and agribusiness managers in identifying and managing risks

Assist new and existing agribusiness firms in identifying market opportunities and developing new products and marketing systems.

## 7. Assumptions made for the Program

Oklahoma State University will continue to develop relevant research-based information that can be provided to farm and agribusiness decision makers.

Oklahoma State University and its county, state and national partners will provide adequate resources to support this vital team effort.

## 8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program

Information is developed that improves decision making and increases efficiency and profitability of Oklahoma farms and ranchers is developed and disseminated

Through the efforts of the Farm and Agribusiness Management Team the management skills of Oklahoma farm and

agribusiness managers are improved allowing them to obtain better efficiency, higher profitability and reduced risks.

A strong, profitable and efficient production agriculture and agribusiness sector improves the economic viability of rural Oklahoma communities.

## 9. Scope of Program

- In-State Extension
- In-State Research
- Integrated Research and Extension

## Inputs for the Program

### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	8.8	0.0	3.5	0.0
2008	8.8	0.0	3.5	0.0
2009	8.8	0.0	3.5	0.0
2010	8.8	0.0	3.5	0.0
2011	8.8	0.0	3.5	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

Research based information developed

Decision aids developed that assist farm and agribusiness managers in improved decisions

Educational programs conducted that improve the management skills of farm and agribusiness managers

Farm and agribusiness managers are able to better understand economic consequences and make more informed decisions

### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Group Discussion</li> <li>● One-on-One Intervention</li> <li>● Demonstrations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Public Service Announcement</li> <li>● Newsletters</li> <li>● Web sites</li> </ul>

**15. Description of targeted audience**

Managers, owners, and employees of farms and agribusinesses

**16. Standard output measures**

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	500	1000	100	200
2008	500	1000	100	200
2009	500	1000	100	200
2010	500	1000	100	200
2011	500	1000	100	200

**17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents**

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	0
2009	0
2010	0
2011	0

**18. Output measures****Output Text**

Number of board members of farmer-owned cooperatives receiving credentialed director training for board governance

2007 Target: 50  
 2008 Target: 50  
 2009 Target: 50  
 2010 Target: 50  
 2011 Target: 50

**Output Text**

Number of software decision analysis aids developed

2007 Target: 2  
 2008 Target: 2  
 2009 Target: 2  
 2010 Target: 2  
 2011 Target: 2

**Output Text**

Number of manuscripts submitted to refereed journals

2007 Target: 3  
2008 Target: 3  
2009 Target: 3  
2010 Target: 3  
2011 Target: 3

#### Output Text

Number of farm income tax management schools conducted

2007 Target: 10  
2008 Target: 10  
2009 Target: 10  
2010 Target: 10  
2011 Target: 10

#### Output Text

Number of economists trained at other universities to deliver packer-feeder workshops and classes

2007 Target: 5  
2008 Target: 5  
2009 Target: 0  
2010 Target: 0  
2011 Target: 0

### Outcomes for the Program

#### 19. Outcome measures

##### Outcome Text: Awareness created

##### Outcome Text

Number of tax preparers using information from OCES tax schools

**Outcome Type:** Short

2007 Target: 300  
2008 Target: 300  
2009 Target: 300  
2010 Target: 300  
2011 Target: 300

##### Outcome Text

Number of credentialed board members serving on agricultural cooperative boards (cumulative)

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 40  
2008 Target: 80  
2009 Target: 130  
2010 Target: 150  
2011 Target: 175

##### Outcome Text

Number of beef producers applying some level of financial management decision skills learned through Master Cattleman

certification

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 75

2008 Target: 100

2009 Target: 100

2010 Target: 200

2011 Target: 250

**Outcome Text**

Number of specialty crop producers and goat producers improving farm management and/or financial management skills

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 25

2008 Target: 75

2009 Target: 150

2010 Target: 100

2011 Target: 100

**20. External factors which may affect outcomes**

- Natural Disasters (drought,weather extremes,etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Public Policy changes
- Government Regulations
- Competing Public priorities
- Competing Programatic Challenges
- Populations changes (immigration,new cultural groupings,etc.)

**Description**

Changes in the internal and external business environment facing farm and agribusiness managers and/or changes in the team's resources in assisting these decision makers may influence the team's effectiveness

**21. Evaluation studies planned**

- After Only (post program)
- Retrospective (post program)
- Before-After (before and after program)
- During (during program)

**Description**

Participant evaluations conducted at the conclusion of various educational programs will be used to determine the team's effectiveness. Post surveys will determine application of new knowledge and skills. Changes in business performance will be reviewed at least on a case basis.

**22. Data Collection Methods**

- Sampling
- Mail
- Case Study
- Other

**Description**

The team will solicit formal and informal evaluations from educational participants to determine the effectiveness of the information provide and to assess additional educational needs. Tax school participants and Master Cattleman certified producers will be surveyed to determine extent of application of skills and parctices learned.

# **1. Name of the Planned Program**

Sensor-Based Technologies for Agricultural and Biological Systems

## **2. Program knowledge areas**

- 402 Engineering Systems and Equipment 50 %
- 307 Animal Management Systems 15 %
- 102 Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships 10 %
- 205 Plant Management Systems 25 %

## **3. Program existence**

- Mature (More than five years)

## **4. Program duration**

- Long-Term (More than five years)

## **5. Brief summary about Planned Program**

Development and testing of sensor-based technologies and supporting science to improve production efficiency of plant, animal agriculture production systems and related biological systems. Development of technologies to improve plant and animal food safety, processing, and product quality. Development and testing of sensor technologies to optimize inputs into these systems. Conduct education and technology transfer to expedite adoption and application of sensor based technologies in the agricultural industry.

## **6. Situation and priorities**

This research initiative began in 1989. Since that time, we have worked closely with groups including the Oklahoma Wheat Commission, Oklahoma Feed and Chemical Dealers Association, Oklahoma Fertilizer Research and Education Foundation, Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation and other agriculture related groups. We have worked closely with individual farmers to conduct on farm research and extension, and conducted numerous field day and demonstrations (both formal and informal). We have worked closely with the agricultural press including the Farmer Stockman, Successful Farming, and the Furrow. In all cases, we intentionally designed our efforts to obtain the participation of stakeholder.

We are working with manufacturers of technologies developed as part of previous research and regularly seek and receive input. Among those are NTech Industries, Ukiah, CA and Toro, Inc. Minneapolis, MN.

Conduct research to discover the scientific knowledge required to develop sensor and sensor/control systems. Develop sensors and control systems for plant and animal production systems: to optimize inputs for production, economic return, and environmental impact.

## **7. Assumptions made for the Program**

Appropriated and sponsored funding will continue at similar levels. Key research and extension personnel will be replaced in a timely manner.

## **8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program**

Through the use of various sensor-based technologies, improve the economic return to agricultural producers, improve overall efficiency and efficacy of agricultural inputs, improve environmental quality, improve value and quality of processed agricultural products, and provide mechanisms to enhanced food safety.

## **9. Scope of Program**

- In-State Extension
- In-State Research
- Integrated Research and Extension
- Multistate Research

## Inputs for the Program

### 10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds

- Yes

### 12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	4.3	0.0	3.0	0.0
2008	5.3	0.0	3.5	0.0
2009	6.2	0.0	4.0	0.0
2010	6.1	0.0	4.0	0.0
2011	5.2	0.0	4.0	0.0

## Outputs for the Program

### 13. Activity (What will be done?)

Conduct research into nutritional and pest management needs of wheat, corn, cotton, native, improved pasture, and turf grass in relation to sensed properties. Conduct research into animal grazing system to optimally manage plant and animal subsystems. Conduct research to invent and improve sensors and control systems for agriculture production and processing systems. Conduct research to create decision support systems incorporating sensors into plant and production systems.

### 14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Group Discussion</li> <li>● One-on-One Intervention</li> <li>● Demonstrations</li> <li>● Other 1 (Extension Publication)</li> <li>● Other 2 (Journal Articles)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Newsletters</li> <li>● TV Media Programs</li> <li>● Web sites</li> <li>● Other 1 (Agricultural Press)</li> </ul>

### 15. Description of targeted audience

Crop and livestock producers, food processors, input suppliers, equipment manufacturers.

### 16. Standard output measures

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



	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	300	800	0	0
2008	300	1000	0	0
2009	400	1200	0	0
2010	400	1000	0	0
2011	400	1000	0	0

**17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents**

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	0
2008	1
2009	0
2010	1
2011	0

**18. Output measures****Output Text**

Training sessions and demonstrations for use of new technologies and applications

2007 Target: 5  
 2008 Target: 6  
 2009 Target: 8  
 2010 Target: 10  
 2011 Target: 15

**Output Text**

New technology applications

2007 Target: 2  
 2008 Target: 2  
 2009 Target: 2  
 2010 Target: 2  
 2011 Target: 2

**Output Text**

Number of trained extension personnel using hand-held sensors with producers

2007 Target: 26  
 2008 Target: 30  
 2009 Target: 30  
 2010 Target: 34  
 2011 Target: 34

## Outcomes for the Program

### 19. Outcome measures

#### Outcome Text: Awareness created

##### Outcome Text

Commercialization of hardware/instrumentaion

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0

2008 Target: 0

2009 Target: 0

2010 Target: 1

2011 Target: 1

##### Outcome Text

Number of producers adopting and practicing sensor-based technologies

**Outcome Type:** Medium

2007 Target: 100

2008 Target: 200

2009 Target: 500

2010 Target: 750

2011 Target: 1000

##### Outcome Text

Number of acres where sensor-based technologies are applied

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 10000

2008 Target: 20000

2009 Target: 40000

2010 Target: 55000

2011 Target: 70000

### 20. External factors which may affect outcomes

- Natural Disasters (drought,weather extremes,etc.)
- Economy
- Appropriations changes
- Other

#### Description

The driving forces for development and adoption of these technologies are unlikely to change. These forces include: escalating fuel and fertilizer crops, constant or declining commodity prices, increased pressure to improve environmental stewardship, and limited and expensive labor. Based on our past experience in conducting research and extension programs on sensor based agricultural technologies, money has always been a limited factor. However, we have always been able to find a source of funding to continue the research and extension programs.

The principal limitation is commercializing the technologies. We were successful with previous technologies because we were able to find a company willing to manufacture the devices and producer organizations willing to support the development and extension of the technologies. Without these groups, this program will not succeed.

## 21. Evaluation studies planned

- During (during program)
- Time series (multiple points before and after program)
- Comparisons between different groups of individuals or program participants experiencing different levels of program intensity.

### Description

We will work closely with cooperators identified by state specialists and county educators. We will assist them in evaluating technologies and monitor results. On farm tests results will be used to determine benefits of these technologies. Follow up meetings with individual cooperators will be conducted to determine the extent to which they adopt the technologies.

## 22. Data Collection Methods

- Unstructured
- Case Study
- Observation

### Description

See previous question. This program initially targets individual cooperators. Ultimately, formal extension program will be conducted to educate producers. However, it has been experience that the most effective way to introduce technologies is to work with innovative farmers. Neighbors of these individuals tend to adopt practices that were proven successful.

## 1. Name of the Planned Program

Bio-Based Products Development

## 2. Program knowledge areas

- 511 New and Improved Non-Food Products and Processes 100 %

## 3. Program existence

- Intermediate (One to five years)

## 4. Program duration

- Long-Term (More than five years)

## 5. Brief summary about Planned Program

Explore the opportunities in biobased product development, from production of raw materials, i.e. feedstocks, to the product proof-of-concept prior to commercialization. A wide range of crops (existing and potentially-viable) and residues will be evaluated and utilized in developing and/or improving the conversion efficiency for the production of biofuels and value-added products.

## 6. Situation and priorities

Development of a viable bio-based products industry is contingent on sustainable, dependable, and economical feedstock supply systems. Potential feedstocks include seed and/or vegetative parts (including harvesting/processing residues) of plants grown in Oklahoma for food, feed, or livestock herbage. Oklahoma offers an abundance of opportunity for the growth of a variety of crops that can be converted into biofuels. In addition to biofuels, many other valuable products could be produced from Oklahoma crops and agricultural residues. With the increasing energy cost and concerns of environmental quality, bio-based products such as biopesticide and biofertilizer are gaining increasing attention.

Information is needed on species and species cultivars adaptable to selected systems as influenced by: climatic and edaphic differences across the state, cultural requirements, economics of production, and conversion technology requirements. In biofuels production, the major challenge is overcoming the difficulty in converting lignocellulosic materials, such as grasses and agricultural residues, into ethanol. The two main approaches to accomplish this task are: hydrolysis of polysaccharides into sugars that are fermented to ethanol by microorganisms, and gasification of biomass to carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, and hydrogen which can be fermented by certain microorganisms to ethanol. Research may also focus on extracting valuable components from biomass, such as nutraceuticals, and valuable uses of waste products from biofuels production would be beneficial to establishing "biorefineries." Analysis of potential bioprocesses for both economic feasibility and environmental impact is necessary to assess their commercial viability and to identify potential areas of improvement.

## 7. Assumptions made for the Program

Maintaining an adequate level of funding

Maintaining existing and hiring of new faculty and support personnel

## 8. Ultimate goal(s) of this Program

To answer the critical questions and issues that must be addressed prior to industry taking the results of this research to commercialization.

## 9. Scope of Program

- In-State Research
- Multistate Research

**Inputs for the Program****10. Expending formula funds or state-matching funds**

- Yes

**11. Expending other than formula funds or state-matching funds**

- Yes

**12. Expending amount of professional FTE/SYs to be budgeted for this Program**

Year	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
2007	0.0	0.0	3.0	0.0
2008	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.0
2009	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0
2010	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0
2011	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0

**Outputs for the Program****13. Activity (What will be done?)**

- Project proposals
- Technical presentations
- Technical papers
- Journal articles
- Patents
- Products taken to commercialization by industry

**14. Type(s) of methods will be used to reach direct and indirect contacts**

Extension	
Direct Method	Indirect Methods
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Education Class</li> <li>● Workshop</li> <li>● Group Discussion</li> <li>● One-on-One Intervention</li> <li>● Demonstrations</li> <li>● Other 1 ()</li> <li>● Other 2 ()</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Newsletters</li> <li>● TV Media Programs</li> <li>● Web sites</li> <li>● Other 1 ()</li> </ul>

**15. Description of targeted audience**

Other scientists, industry, agricultural producers, commercial developers

**16. Standard output measures**

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	Target	Target	Target	Target
2007	0	0	0	0
2008	0	0	0	0
2009	0	0	0	0
2010	0	0	0	0
2011	0	0	0	0

**17. (Standard Research Target) Number of Patents**

Expected Patents	
Year	Target
2007	2
2008	2
2009	2
2010	2
2011	2

**18. Output measures****Output Text**

## Journal Articles

2007 Target: 4  
2008 Target: 5  
2009 Target: 6  
2010 Target: 6  
2011 Target: 6

**Output Text**

## Technical papers and presentations

2007 Target: 10  
2008 Target: 12  
2009 Target: 15  
2010 Target: 15  
2011 Target: 15

**Output Text**

## New processes developed

2007 Target: 0  
2008 Target: 1  
2009 Target: 2  
2010 Target: 1  
2011 Target: 2

## Outcomes for the Program

### 19. Outcome measures

#### Outcome Text: Awareness created

##### Outcome Text

Products/processes taken to commercialization by industry

**Outcome Type:** Long

2007 Target: 0

2008 Target: 1

2009 Target: 1

2010 Target: 2

2011 Target: 4

### 20. External factors which may affect outcomes

- Appropriations changes

#### Description

Significant support has been received through Special Grant via Federal Initiative process.

### 21. Evaluation studies planned

- During (during program)

#### Description

Progress will be evaluated annually by Initiative Team (self-assessment) and the sub-group of the Sun Grant Initiative Advisory Board.

### 22. Data Collection Methods

- Observation
- Journals
- Other

#### Description

Progress will be measured through the dissemination of scientific information (i.e. technical presentations, journal articles published, etc.) and number of products being commercialized.