MU Extension leadership (program directors, regional directors, continuing education directors and support unit leaders) adopted the North Central Cooperative Extension Association (NCCEA) Banner Outcomes. The NCCEA Banner Outcomes provide a set of criteria for program evaluation and continuous improvement including expected outcomes and leading indicators. These Missouri Banner Outcomes will become MU Extension’s level of accountability for program efforts. They also provide measures for delivering outcomes in several areas of the MU Strategic Plan.

• MU Extension will utilize Banner Outcomes in making decisions about our reporting priorities, including the Excellence in Extension/Land-Grant Impacts system
• Our reporting system(s) will have an increased number of more specific indicators that will tell the story of the impacts offered by the Banner Outcomes, but they should NOT be viewed as only what we should collect.
• Banner Outcomes is a tool to engage in cross-program and continuing education (CE) discussions about program priorities and impact reporting.
• Banner Outcomes will outline how to incorporate the indicators and how to collect state-level data that allows us (and other states) to collectively contribute to impacts described by the Banner Outcomes.
• Banner Outcomes will identify evaluation processes, mechanisms and approaches that can be shared among program areas and CE Units to generate the type of outcomes described within the Banner Outcomes.

Missouri Banner Outcomes will enable MU Extension to provide information about program outcomes across all disciplines and program areas. Following are the categories of Banner Outcomes with their expected measurements:

Economic value
• Jobs and employment
• Economic return
• Workforce preparedness and development

Engagement in public issues
• Public involvement in community decision-making
• Inclusiveness, representation and empowerment in civic decisions
• Organizational and leadership development that supports groups, coalitions and organizations in the interests of the public good
• Finding and mobilizing community resources for the implementation of community decisions
• Community changes as a result of public engagement
Health and physical well-being

- Improving diet and nutrition
- Reducing illness through preventative action
- Reducing rates of obesity
- Access to appropriate health care
- Mental health — personal and community

Environmental quality

- Soil management changes that reduced soil loss/transport.
- Management changes that improve water quality in surface and ground water.
- Management changes that improve air quality and energy efficiency.

Emergency management

- Preparedness
- Response
- Recovery

Collaboration and leveraging the expertise of the land-grant university

- Increased access to the expertise of the land-grant university
- Increased access to other organizations
- Collaboration and facilitation of partnerships that address critical problems and priorities
- Leveraging expertise and funding beyond land-grant universities
- Leveraging appropriated resources to increase revenue through fees, grants, contracts, gifts and endowments
- Extended reach of MU Extension programs as a result of engaged volunteers
Economic value

Economic value is a measure of the benefits that MU Extension programs bring to individuals, families, organizations, businesses and communities. Economic value is measured in three parameters:

1. Jobs and employment
   - Number of permanent full- and part-time* jobs created by program participants
     - Dollar value — average salary
   - Number of permanent full- and part-time* jobs retained by program participants
     - Dollar value — average salary

   *A permanent part-time job is defined as not having a minimum number of hours with or without benefits. Self-employment is a job.

2. Economic return
   - Increase in net income
   - Number of businesses created
   - Number of businesses retained
   - Increase in savings
     - Dollar value of efficiencies and savings, including individual, family, business, organization and community
     - Number of program participants that report reducing their reliance on predatory lending facilities three months after the conclusion of the program
   - Resources leveraged by businesses, organizations and communities
     - Value of volunteer hours by community or organization

3. Workforce preparedness and development
   - Number of individuals directly participated in this extension programming
   - Number of participates who made significant increases in skills and knowledge as measured by achieved certification
   - The economic value of the acquired skills and certification
   - Number of youth who enter the workforce with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and health needed for the 21st Century workplace
Environmental quality

A. Soil management changes that reduced soil loss and transport.
   • Number of individuals directly participated in this extension programming
   • Number who made a significant change and adopted management strategies in their operation that led to a reduction in soil from leaving the field or location
   • Number of acres where “T” was achieved as the results of this programming. Soil loss tolerance for a specific soil, also known as the T value, is the maximum average annual soil loss expressed as tons per acre per year that will permit current production levels to be economically maintained indefinitely.
   • The estimated tons per year of soil or sediment that was kept from moving off the field because of management practices adopted by the land manager
   • The economic value of the soil kept on site

B. Management changes that improve water quality in surface and ground water.
   • Number of individuals directly participated in this extension programming
   • Number of individuals who made a significant change and adopted management strategies in their operation that led to improved water quality
     o Reduction on phosphorus, nitrogen and pesticides in surface water
     o Reduction in nitrogen and coliform bacteria in drinking water
   • The economic value of the improved water quality
   • Number of watershed plans developed
   • Number of acres under watershed plan
   • The economic value of watershed plan

C. Management changes that improve air quality and energy efficiency.
   • Number of individuals directly participated in this extension programming on air quality
   • Number of individuals who made a significant change and adopted management strategies in their operation that led to improved air quality
   • The economic value of the improved air quality
   • Number of program participants who reported an increase in indoor air quality within their home
   • Number of individuals directly participated in this extension programming on energy efficiency
   • Number of individuals who made a significant change and adopted management strategies in their operation that led to improved energy efficiency
   • The economic value of the improved energy efficiency
   • Number of program participants who installed one or more energy conservation technologies in their home, farm or business
   • Number of program participants who installed a new home building technology discussed during the program
Health and physical well-being

A. Improving diet and nutrition
   • Number of individuals directly participated in this extension programming
   • Number of individuals who made a positive change in accessing healthy food
   • Number of individuals who made a significant increase in their consumption of fruits and vegetables, whole grains, and/or decrease in their consumption dietary fat

B. Reducing illness through preventative action
   • Number of individuals directly participated in this extension programming
   • Number of individuals who indicate they are more capable of caring for themselves or another older adult, so they can live independently
   • Number of individuals who indicate they feel more capable of caring for themselves and their chronic disease
   • Number of individuals who made a significant increase in time spent doing physical activity

C. Reducing rates of obesity
   • Number of individuals who report reduced body mass index (BMI)

D. Access to appropriate health care
   • Number of communities who adopt one or more of the new, healthier policies
   • Number of food policy councils created
   • Number of medical doctors writing prescriptions for nutrition and health classes

E. Mental health — personal and community
   • Number of individuals directly participated in this extension programming
   • Number of individuals who indicate they have skills to identify mental health signs and symptoms in adults
   • Number of individuals who indicate they have skills to identify mental health signs and symptoms in youth
   • Number of individuals who report a reduced stress level at the conclusion of the program
Emergency management

A. Emergency Preparedness

Planning processes and actions to prepare for an emergency before it occurs to reduce loss and protect human health taken by families, businesses and communities.

- Number of individuals who made a change in their home, property or farm to reduce loss and protect human health as a result of this programming
- Estimate potential fiscal impacts (reduction of losses) that these changes could result for individuals if an emergency were to occur (e.g., financial losses avoided by being prepared).
- Number of businesses and farms that made a change and/or implemented a preparedness plan to reduce loss and protect human health
- Estimate potential fiscal impacts (reduction of losses) that these changes could result for businesses if an emergency were to occur (e.g., financial losses avoided by being prepared).
- If emergency planning assistance grants were appropriate for these businesses, estimate the amounts secured by this programming.
- Number of communities engaged in emergency preparedness planning that results in the development of a plan
- Total population of those living in areas potentially impacted by those plans
- Estimate potential fiscal impacts (reduction of losses) that these community plans protect (e.g., financial losses avoided by being prepared).
- If emergency planning assistance grants were appropriate for these communities, estimate the amounts secured by this programming.
- Number of Community Organizations Active in Disasters (COAD) — Long Term Recovery Committees (LTRC) or Local Emergency Planning Committees (LEPC) — formed
- Number of COADs (LTRC or LEPC) active

B. Emergency Response — assisting in immediate actions

Actions taken by families, businesses and communities to generate an immediate response to an emergency to reduce loss and protect human health

- Number of extension professionals involved in this immediate emergency response
  - public information management
  - intergovernmental service coordination (non-specific, but necessary for coordination among emergency responders)
  - providing medial, health related services
  - the restoration of community services (food, water and electrical service)
C. Emergency Recovery

Actions taken by families, businesses and communities to recover from an emergency to reduce loss and protect human health, access support organizations (local, state and federal mental health; USDA-NIFA; FEMA; etc.) and community scale revitalization and collective rebuilding and restoration efforts

- Number of individuals reached who then acted to improve their situation to recover
- Number of farms assisted
- Number of businesses assisted
- Dollar value of grants, loans and capital investments of those businesses impacted
- Of the businesses with preparedness plans that you assisted in development, what was the actual savings of being prepared?
- Number of communities assisted
- If this programming assisted communities to access and/or distribute disaster relief funding, how much financial assistance was distributed?
- Number of volunteers engaged in COADs (LTRC or LEPC) recovery efforts
- Number of volunteer hours in COADs (LTRC or LEPC) recovery efforts
Engagement in public issues

Extension programming that is focused on engaging citizens and non-governmental organizations in community-based decision-making about public policy or community priorities, and the implementation of a governmental response to an issue of public good or public interest.

A. Public involvement in community decision-making
   • The numbers and participant demographics engaged in community decision-making process
   • The number of participants who reported increased knowledge or skills to engage in this specific type of community-based decision-making

B. Inclusiveness, representation and empowerment in civic decisions
   • Number of participants from under-served or under-represented populations

C. Organizational and leadership development that supports groups, coalitions and organizations in the interests of the public good
   • Number of participants who took on new leadership roles

D. Finding and mobilizing resources in the community for the implementation of community decisions
   • What actions did the engaged take (e.g., policy creation or modification, the setting of community priorities, implementation of public program, etc.)?
   • Volunteer hours generated by communities and organizations as result of programs
   • Number and value of grants and other resources acquired by communities and organizations
   • Number of community and organizational policies and plans adopted or implemented
   • Dollar value of efficiencies and savings for the individual, family, business, organization or community

E. Community changes as a result of public engagement
   • What (direct or indirect) impacts occurred from this enhanced engagement (e.g., increases in collaborations, leveraged funding, expertise, community satisfaction, etc.)?
   • Number of new nonprofit organizations created
   • Number of new nonprofit organizations re-energized
   • Number of business created
   • Number of business retained
   • Number of jobs created
   • Number of jobs retained

Note: These economic and job numbers might be created here and roll up into the economic value Banner Outcome. We don’t want to double count.
Collaboration and leveraging the expertise of the land-grant university

A. Increased access to the expertise of the land-grant university
   • Number of new extension programs developed and launched per year that use research-based information from new researcher partnerships
   • Number of follow-up research projects per year that engages campus and field faculty
   • Number and percent offerings of new extension curriculum developed using peer-reviewed research

B. Increased access to other organizations
   • Number of businesses, corporations, communities and organizations where new partnerships were developed

C. Collaboration and facilitation of partnerships that address critical problems and priorities
   • Number and dollar amount of research proposals submitted involving campus extension partnerships
   • Number and dollar amount of research proposals funded involving campus extension partnerships

D. Leveraging expertise and funding beyond land-grant universities
   • Educators and agents assigned to municipalities (FTE):
     o Federal Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
     o State Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
     o Local Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
   • Educators and agents assigned to counties (FTE):
     o Federal Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
     o State Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
     o Local Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
   • Educators and agents assigned to multicounty regions (FTE):
     o Federal Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
     o State Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
     o Local Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
   • Educators and agents assigned statewide responsibility (FTE):
     o Federal Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
     o State Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
     o Local Appropriated Funding (dollar value)
E. Leveraging appropriated resources to increase revenue through fees, grants, contracts, gifts and endowments

- Program revenues (fees cost-recover, etc.): (dollar value)
- Federal competitive grants or contracts: (dollar value)
- State competitive grants or contracts: (dollar value)
- Local competitive grants or contracts: (dollar value)
- Current value of gifts and endowment funds: (dollar value)
- Estimate annual rate of return: (percent)

F. Extended reach of MU Extension programs as a result of engaged volunteers

- Volunteers supporting municipality-based CES programs
  - Number of individual volunteers per year
  - The amount of hours of all per year
- Volunteers supporting county-based CES programs
  - Number of individual volunteers per year
  - The amount of hours of all per year
- Volunteers supporting multicounty and regional CES programs
  - Number of individual volunteers per year
  - The amount of hours of all per year
- Volunteers supporting statewide delivered CES programs
  - Number of individual volunteers per year
  - The amount of hours of all per year