Ensuring Safe Communities

Ensuring Safe Communities

V(A). Planned Program (Summary)

1. Name of the Planned Program

Ensuring Safe Communities

V(B). Program Knowledge Area(s)

1. Program Knowledge Areas and Percentage

KA Code	Knowledge Area	%1862 Extension	%1890 Extension	%1862 Research	%1890 Research
805	Community Institutions, Health, and Social Services	95%			
806	Youth Development	5%			
	Total	100%			

V(C). Planned Program (Inputs)

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

Year: 2008	Extension		Research	
	1862	1890	1862	1890
Plan	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Actual	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0

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

Extension		Research	
Smith-Lever 3b & 3c	1890 Extension	Hatch	Evans-Allen
0	0	0	0
1862 Matching	1890 Matching	1862 Matching	1890 Matching
232682	0	0	0
1862 All Other	1890 All Other	1862 All Other	1890 All Other
0	0	0	0

V(D). Planned Program (Activity)

1. Brief description of the Activity

Establish COAD (Community Organizations Active in Disasters). Provide disaster educational materials & presentations to communities and organizations. Build partnerships with local, state, federal agencies and organizations. Consult with local emergency planning committees and/or citizen councils. Represent Extension at meetings of federal, state and local emergency management organizations after disasters. Assist local entities in identification of funding sources for community emergency management and homeland security, eg., USDA-RD, fire grants, etc. Provide disaster preparedness and mitigation leadership for Extension itself. Coordinate and participate in Extension disaster activities.

2. Brief description of the target audience

Targeted audience is all social groups in the community, including low-income and minority, Spanish-speaking, community organizations, local government, home builders, agencies that assist in disaster, businesses and farmers. No limitation on gender, ethnic or religious diversity, lifestyle choice, etc.

V(E). Planned Program (Outputs)

1. Standard output measures

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

	Direct Contacts Adults	Indirect Contacts Adults	Direct Contacts Youth	Indirect Contacts Youth
Year	**Target**	**Target**	**Target**	**Target**
Plan	3000	22000	550	1500
2008	1786	1967	1151	199

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	0	
2008	0	0	0

V(F). State Defined Outputs

Output Target

Output #1

Output Measure

Number of communities assisted with training and facilitation for disaster preparedness.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	45	50

Output #2

Output Measure

Number of partners.

Year	Target	Actual
2008	100	146

V(G). State Defined Outcomes

O No.	Outcome Name
1	Citizens learn about hazards & risks in Missouri.
2	Communities, local businesses and citizens learn preparedness and mitigation strategies to reduce impacts of disasters.
3	Builders learn about incorporating safe rooms into home construction.
4	Communities & schools learn about school disaster mitigation, preparedness and exercises.
5	Communities adopt disaster mitigation plans and principles.
6	Community Organizations Active in Disaster (COADs) created and function to meet citizen needs.
7	Community and businesses improve hazard mitigation programs and disaster plans.
8	Practices adopted such as disaster plans and kits developed and safe rooms incorporated into building practices.
9	Communities, businesses, schools and homes are supportive of local emergency management.
10	Communities, businesses, schools and homes become more disaster resilient.
11	Communities, businesses, schools and citizens are more prepared for disasters.
12	Communities, businesses, schools and citizens recover quickly and with less cost.
13	Adoption of practices and plans, creation of COADs, effectiveness of COADs in disaster.

Ensuring Safe Communities
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

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.)

Brief Explanation

State and local funding decreased. Natural disasters and other emergency situations are unpredictable.Severe hail, windstorms, tornadoes, ice, snow storms, flooding and drought resulted in eight (8) Presidential disaster declarations for the state of Missouri, on which MU Extension assisted during FY08:

- September 2007 Severe Storms and flooding – 7 counties
- December 2007 Severe Winter Storm - for all 114 Missouri Counties and the Independent City of St. Louis
- December 2007 Severe Winter Storm – 42 counties
- February 2008 Severe Storms, Tornadoes and flooding – 9 counties
- March 2008 Severe Winter Storms and Flooding – 18 counties
- March 2008 Severe Storms and Flooding – 75 counties
- May 2008 Severe Storms and Tornadoes – 3 counties
- June 2008 Severe Storms and Flooding- 66 counties

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)
Case Study
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.

Evaluation Results

In the fall of 2007 a second internal evaluative inquiry was developed to determine the extent to which the CEMP has prepared faculty, employees and county offices for emergencies and disasters. The study was intended also to determine if any discernable individual and institutional behavior changes related to emergency management/preparedness could be attributed to the CEMP.There were four evaluative questions guiding the evaluation: (1) Has the CEMP made the University of Missouri Extension (faculty/employees/offices) more prepared for disaster? (2) Has the institution/organization aided in the process? (3) How has this effort affected/influenced programming at the individual level? (4) Has this effort affected MU Extension employees on a personal level (family, home, etc.)?

Several themes emerged and though there were varying degrees of opinions, most respondents agreed on major questions. The themes included communication, training, involvement, preparation, and support.In all areas those surveyed indicated that there were significant increases in every area across MU Extension as a whole.Most important was the regional offices were better prepared for potential disasters, they and their families were significantly more prepared and the programming created numerous opportunities to become more involved with multiple organizations at the local level.In summary, the CEMP is making a significant preparedness impact on employees and local offices within MU Extension and is meeting its goal of developing and delivering preparedness materials throughout the state.

Key Items of Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to determine the efficacy of the program for a key audience, Extension itself.If the program cannot affect knowledge and behavior change internally and make itself more prepared for disaster then the program has little value outside of Extension amongst organizations, groups and citizens.This evaluation indicated clearly that CEMP has had a direct and measurable impact on extension faculty, staff and local offices.

Another evaluation is planned to determine the efficacy of the Faith-Based inititave conducted during the summer months of 2008.It is planned to determine the scope and impact of the programming. This evaluation will ask community organizations and citizens if and how programming has impacted their level of disaster preparedness or resiliency.