

# Community Development

Community Development

## V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

### 1. Name of the Planned Program

Community Development

## V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

### 1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
111	Conservation and Efficient Use of Water	10%		10%	
601	Economics of Agricultural Production and Farm Management	20%		20%	
608	Community Resource Planning and Development	40%		40%	
803	Sociological and Technological Change Affecting Individuals, Families and Communities	10%		10%	
805	Community Institutions, Health, and Social Services	10%		10%	
903	Communication, Education, and Information Delivery	10%		10%	
	<b>Total</b>	100%		100%	

## V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

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

Year: 2008	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
<b>Plan</b>	5.2	0.0	2.3	0.0
<b>Actual</b>	6.0	0.0	2.0	0.0

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

Extension		Research	
<b>Smith-Lever 3b &amp; 3c</b> 97928	<b>1890 Extension</b> 0	<b>Hatch</b> 127594	<b>Evans-Allen</b> 0
<b>1862 Matching</b> 97928	<b>1890 Matching</b> 0	<b>1862 Matching</b> 127594	<b>1890 Matching</b> 0
<b>1862 All Other</b> 234605	<b>1890 All Other</b> 0	<b>1862 All Other</b> 453087	<b>1890 All Other</b> 0

**V(D). Planned Program (Activity)**

**1. Brief description of the Activity**

Local leadership steering committees were formed; committees and communities were trained, coached and mentored. 24 communities participating in the Horizons 2 project completed their community visioning processes and began the implementation phases of their development efforts. About 25 new communities from Southern Idaho were recruited to participate in Horizons 3 and leadership teams have been formed, early training has been completed.

Data Tools for Understanding Communities were updated, distributed, and discussed in public forums across the state, and a related peer-reviewed bulletin was published.

Economic Development, Diversity & Vitality Projects (Customer Relations, Business & Community Entrepreneurship, and Analysis of Economic Viability of Planned Businesses):

Nine small business workshops were developed and delivered in north and northcentral Idaho, the primary region for the Two Degrees Northwest program. Two regional models (I-O/SAM) were built with data for 2006 to explain linkages among economic sectors and to supplement trends analysis found in some web sites. A paper entitled "The Export Economy of Gateway Communities: Fremont, Madison, Teton Counties in Idaho." was presented in the 37th Mid Continent Regional Science Association.

Other economic development activities included customer service training, assistance with grant writing, assistance with building of a community center and a 4-H building, and engaged service on dozens of local development boards and committees.

**2. Brief description of the target audience**

- Small business owners
- Government organizations/and agencies
- Local community non-profit organizations
- Entrepreneurs - current and future
- Elected officials, decision makers, and key stakeholders
- State and local employees
- New leaders and individuals currently serving in leadership roles
- Small business and community and potential community leaders
- Future and current leaders.
- Local and state leaders, and homeowners
- Developers, real estate agents, landowners, citizens and communities
- County Commissioners and their staff and staff in the Mayors' offices
- Chambers of commerce, independent entrepreneurs and the Economic Development Councils and Economic Development Corporations in different counties.
- State and local employees
- Research scientists

**V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)**

**1. Standard output measures**

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

	<b>Direct Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Adults</b>	<b>Direct Contacts Youth</b>	<b>Indirect Contacts Youth</b>
<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Target</b>
<b>Plan</b>	847	0	43	0
2008	10335	25789	11208	685

Community Development

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

### Patent Applications Submitted

Year	Target
------	--------

Plan:	0
-------	---

2008:	0
-------	---

### Patents listed

## 3. Publications (Standard General Output Measure)

### Number of Peer Reviewed Publications

	Extension	Research	Total
Plan	0	1	
2008	7	4	11

**V(F). State Defined Outputs****Output Target****Output #1****Output Measure**

Steering Committees/Teams formed.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	2	24

**Output #2****Output Measure**

Materials/Curriculum developed.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	3	8

**Output #3****Output Measure**

Presentations/Workshops.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	34	71

**Output #4****Output Measure**

Trainings- Series/Short Courses.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	6	6

**Output #5****Output Measure**

Conferences organized or implemented.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	1	2

**Output #6****Output Measure**

Ind/Boards/Com- Mentored/Coached.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	13	25

**Output #7****Output Measure**

Communities served.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	20	46

**Output #8****Output Measure**

Counties served.

<b>Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Actual</b>
2008	32	32

**V(G). State Defined Outcomes**

O No.	Outcome Name
1	O: Elected officials, decision makers, government agencies, and civic organizations will become knowledgeable about data relevant to their communities. I: Number of participants who increase knowledge about local data & how to find it. (Retrospective Post)
2	O: Entrepreneurs: Current & future Idaho Entrepreneurs learn business practices and develop skills needed for starting a business I: Number of participants learning skills
3	O: Entrepreneurs establish or expand their business I: Percentage of business owners establishing or expanding their business. (Annual survey/3 yrs.)
4	O: Customer: Small business owners & government organizations in Idaho learn customer relation practices. I: Number of participants achieved a threshold level of knowledge. (Pre/post test)
5	O: Customer: Small business owners and government organizations adopt customer oriented operating practices I: Percentage of participants indicated adoption of 1/2 recommended practices. (6 mo. follow-up checklist survey)
6	O: Leadership: Incumbent and emerging leaders learn skills for leadership positions. I: Number of participants with increased skills
7	O: Leadership: New leaders will assume leadership roles I: Number of new leaders serving in communities. (2 yr. follow up checklist/count)

**Outcome #1**

**1. Outcome Measures**

*Not reporting on this Outcome for this Annual Report*

**2. Associated Institution Types**

**3a. Outcome Type:**

**3b. Quantitative Outcome**

Year	Quantitative Target	Actual
------	---------------------	--------

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

**Issue (Who cares and Why)**

**What has been done**

**Results**

**4. Associated Knowledge Areas**

KA Code	Knowledge Area
---------	----------------

**V(H). Planned Program (External Factors)**

**External factors which affected outcomes**

Economy

Appropriations changes

Competing Public priorities

Competing Programmatic Challenges

Other (Budget)

**Brief Explanation**

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

**1. Evaluation Studies Planned**

After Only (post program)

Retrospective (post program)

Before-After (before and after program)

During (during program)

Time series (multiple points before and after program)

### **Evaluation Results**

Evaluation results for a series of small business workshops were as follows:

Non-extension faculty who taught as part of the workshop series received E's for Excellent 87% of the time and G's for Good, 12% of the time. Most report learning new skills and/or gaining a greater understanding of some business activity, such as marketing, than they had before the workshop. The few F's for Fair were because the classroom facilities in the rural communities where workshops were held, were not always ideal -- crowded and stuffy in one case. We won't hold workshops in that location again.

Participants overall liked the networking opportunity they had with other existing or future entrepreneurs in their own or nearby communities. They often wrote that they would not have been able to participate if the workshops had been held in more distant, larger communities.

Participants said they would like more one-on-one time with mentors or teachers during the workshops and they would like to see more classes offered in their communities, as well as follow-up clinics to support their efforts.

The impacts of the workshops include new knowledge and skills learned by participating Entrepreneurs and expanded networks of peers and service providers.

### **Key Items of Evaluation**